

DISPUTATIO THEOLOGICA
DE
SPIRITU SANCTO,
SIVE
DOCTRINÆ ORTHODOXÆ
DE
SPIRITU SANCTO

THEOLOGICAL DISPUTATION ON THE HOLY SPIRIT, OR ORTHODOX DOCTRINE ON THE HOLY SPIRIT

By Friedrich Adolph Lampe (1683-1729)

Translated by Reformed_Galenist. AI: Claude Sonnet 4.0

CHAPTER II. ON THE PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.	1
CHAPTER III. CONTAINING A REFUTATION OF THOSE WHO DENY THE HOLY SPIRIT IS A PERSON	11
CHAPTER IV. DEMONSTRATING THE DEITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT	30
CHAPTER V. VINDICATING THE DEITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AGAINST ADVERSARIES	46

CHAPTER II. ON THE PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Among those things which Scripture reveals concerning the nature of the HOLY SPIRIT, this is foremost: that He constitutes a true PERSON, distinct from the Father and the Son by personal attributes and operations. The first evidence of this truth is demonstrated by the very characteristic name He bears. For not only does this name, when referring to an incorporeal being, consistently denote a rational, understanding, and willing subject, but it is also so closely joined in a series with the names of the Father and the Son that—just as it is certain that the names of the Father and the Son indicate personal relations—so too it is manifestly taught that the same applies to the Holy Spirit. Thus, in Matthew 28:19, baptism is prescribed in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. From this, it is clear that the name belongs to the Holy Spirit in the same sense as it does to the Father and the Son. The singular number forcefully indicates this, as Ambrose beautifully observes in *De Spiritu Sancto*, Book I, Chapter 4: "He said 'in the name,' not 'in the names.' Therefore, it is not one name of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Spirit, but one God."

Now, that name may signify either the authority by which baptism is conferred or the honor to which baptism tends—both of which certainly presuppose something personal. For authority resides only in a person who possesses the power to command, nor does honor belong except to a person who demands, merits, receives, approves, and is capable of it. No less evident is 2 Corinthians 13:13, where the Holy Spirit is added to the Lord Jesus Christ and God the Father as the Author of a particular blessing—namely, Communion, which is derived from Him in the same way as Grace is from the Son and Love from the Father.

Equally clear is 1 John 5:7, where the Holy Spirit is joined to the Father and the Word as a third Witness. Hence it follows that, just as the testimony of the Father and the Son is personal, so too must the testimony of the Holy Spirit be regarded as personal.

II. The general objection against this argument is that the name HOLY SPIRIT in many passages does not strictly designate a person, but merely some quality. How unwillingly this is pretended will be noted in its proper place. For the present matter, it suffices that in the passages just cited, a personal subject must absolutely be understood. We shall briefly expose the futility of the petty exceptions by which this is called into question.

Regarding Matthew 28:19, some caution (a) that it is not unusual for things and persons not pertaining to God's essence to be joined together in reference to Him. To this end, they cite: that in Acts 20:32, the word of His grace is added to God; that in Ephesians 6:10, the Lord is joined with the strength of His might; that in Philippians 3:10, Christ is connected with the power of His resurrection; that in 2 Thessalonians 1:9, the Lord is paired with the glory of His might; that in Revelation 3:12, Christ Himself says: I will write upon him the name of My God and the name of the city of My God, even though that city is not a person.

But all these objections are beside the point. In the first four passages cited, personal names do not appear. In all of them, there is nothing equivalent to baptism in the name of multiple subjects, which are joined together by personal names. For this is such a predicate that necessarily presupposes personality in the subjects.

As for the specific passage in Acts 20:32, to commend something not only to a person but also to His authority, love, or faith is an expression exceedingly common in both Latin and Greek discourse. Therefore, when the Apostle commends the Ephesians to God and the word of His grace, he is merely clarifying more precisely what in God is the foundation of that confidence with which he entrusts them. Moreover, from the very structure of the sentence and its connection with what follows, it is evident that the Apostle is dealing with only one personal subject in the singular.

Add to this what we have noted concerning this passage in our Dissertation on New Testament Texts Concerning the Λόγος, §18ff.

In Ephesians 6:10, "the strength of His might" is not opposed to Christ as one person to another, but is rather subjoined to Him by the relative pronoun αὐτοῦ in such a way that nothing more need be understood than the irresistible force of His power. The same occurs in Philippians 3:10 and 2 Thessalonians 1:9.

As for the Apocalypse, apart from the fact that the subject matter is entirely different, it cannot simply be said that the city of the Lord is not a person. For the mystical body, consisting of persons united among themselves, certainly possesses something personal. Such is that universal Church which is here depicted under the emblem of a city.

(b) They further object that the one into whom someone is baptized is not necessarily a person, since Acts 19:3 states that certain individuals were baptized into John's baptism. But I would not wish for an awkward phrase—one not used by the Apostle but rather employed

by John's disciples out of sheer ignorance—to be brought forward as prejudicial to the truth. Moreover, the context plainly supports our position. For when they confessed their ignorance of the Holy Spirit, the Apostle immediately asked, "Into what then were you baptized?"—thereby clearly indicating that those who had been properly baptized could not have been unaware of the Person of the Holy Spirit, since such persons ought to have been baptized in the name of the Holy Spirit.

Hence also the imprudent response of these men—'εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα' ('into John's baptism')—he immediately corrects and shows that John baptized 'εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν' ('into Christ Jesus'), which is at once explained by 'εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ' ('into the name of the Lord Jesus').

(c) Those who understand the Spirit here as the power and breath of God, by which minds are illumined, instructed in truth, and their tongues guided (as Wolzogenius speaks in the Racovian Catechism), suppose that He is regarded as a Teacher of the Gospel, whose disciples all Christians are—and that they are therefore rightly baptized into His name. But how barren would it be to argue from this foundation that the Holy Spirit, as a Teacher, is distinct from the Father! For how, O Anti-Trinitarian, do you conceive of the Father teaching the Church through the Son? Is it perhaps through that same power and breath which you call the Holy Spirit? Either, then, you rashly stain the most solemn formula of Baptism with the frigid blemish of tautology, or it is plain that you have brought forth no coherent account of your distinction between the three Teachers of the Church.

(d) There is also an appeal to the words of Hilary, who writes that baptism is performed "in the confession of the Author, the Only-begotten, and the Gift"—from which some deduce that he did not acknowledge the Holy Spirit as a Person of God.

These words appear in *De Trinitate*, Book II, §1, and it is true that Hilary spoke somewhat obscurely concerning the third Person. Erasmus himself found this troubling, as he testifies in his preface. This knotty passage certainly deserved an interpreter, and among the other difficulties addressed in the preface, the Parisian editor of Hilary's works, Petrus Constant, might have resolved it. Nevertheless, Hilary's language regarding the Person of the Holy Spirit remains too obscure for our opponents to derive any advantage from it. Nor are there lacking clear expressions—especially in the cited book, §31ff.—which imply a personal distinction.

III. Concerning the passage 2 Corinthians 13:13, the chief objection raised against us is that the word *κοινωνία* (communion) ought not to be taken actively but passively in reference to the Holy Spirit—as in 1 Corinthians 10:16—so that the "communion of the Holy Spirit" is understood as the effect of Christ's grace and the Father's love. In Philemon 4:6, "ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεως" ("the communion of faith") refers to the fellowship which faith generates and sustains. Most pertinent is Philippians 2:1, where *κοινωνία πνεύματος* ("communion of the Spirit") either denotes that bond of fellowship among saints of which the Holy Spirit is the Author, or signifies what the Spirit Himself effects.

IV. Regarding 1 John 5:7, (a) it is objected that in the immediately following clause ("on earth there are three that bear witness"), these witnesses are not personally distinct. We respond:

(α) Although the witnesses on earth are not personally distinct, they are nevertheless really distinguished as separate witnesses.

(β) That they are not personally distinct arises from the fact that their subjects are not personal. In our verse, however, the personal nature of the subjects is evident from the names Father and Son.

(γ) When the same name is applied to multiple subjects in the same statement, it must be interpreted in the same sense for each. Therefore, since the Father and the Son are properly called Witnesses, the same must be affirmed of the Holy Spirit.

(b) Servetus's frivolous assertion scarcely merits refutation—that the one and same person of the Father is called three Witnesses because He both testified in word that Jesus is His Son and confirmed this word by various works and gifts of His Spirit. What could be more absurd than to divide a single Witness—who both declares His testimony orally and confirms it with signs—into three Witnesses? Or if anyone should imagine that God, by some forced and unprecedented metaphor, intended to appeal to different modes of bearing witness as if they were different Witnesses, would not this fabrication yield at most two such fictitious witnesses?

V. Secondly, we appeal to the full range of other passages where the Holy Spirit is so joined with other personal subjects that no doubt remains that He too constitutes a personal subject. Isaiah 48:16 coordinates Him with the Son. Matthew 12:31–32 is even more emphatic, since there the Holy Spirit is contrasted with Beelzebub, the prince of demons, as person to person. Parallel conjunctions appear in 2 Samuel 23:2–3, Haggai 2:4–5, and elsewhere. The Apostles, too, in Acts 15:28, unite person with person: "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us." The joint testimony of the Holy Spirit with our spirit is proclaimed in Romans 8:16 (cf. verse. 26).

VI. Thirdly, the Holy Spirit is so joined to the other Persons that He is simultaneously distinguished from them as another Person. John 14:16: "I will ask the Father, and He will give you another Helper, that He may abide with you forever." The word ἄλλος (another) not only distinguishes the Holy Spirit from the Son as person from person but also substitutes Him as one person for another—as I, following others, have demonstrated in my commentary on this passage.

Wolzogenius objects that the Savior here institutes a comparison between Himself and the Spirit of truth merely for rhetorical elegance, just as David in Psalm 119:23—after saying "princes conspire against me"—calls God's statutes his "counselors." But apart from the fact that the Lord speaks here in dogmatic style, numerous other indicators of personality abound, chief among them the pronoun ἐκεῖνος (He) in John 15:26; 16:8, 13–14—a demonstrative John habitually uses for personal subjects. Moreover, the Psalm passage involves not comparison but opposition (which can exist even between subjects of different natures). But when subjects are compared and so alike that one succeeds the other in the same work, they must share the same nature.

VII. Fourthly, we derive our argument from the personal attributes and faculties proper to rational beings—all of which are ascribed to the Holy Spirit:

Intellect: Neh. 9:20; Isa. 11:2; 1 Cor. 2:10; 12:11; John 14:26; 16:13. Will: John 3:8; 1 Cor. 12:11; Acts 15:28. Power: Isa. 11:2; Mic. 2:7; Eph. 3:16.

VIII. Fifth, personal offices are frequently ascribed to the Holy Spirit. Such are those of Paraclete, Teacher, Judge, and especially Angel of Jehovah, the emphasis of which relations we shall examine in their proper place.

IX. Sixth, our theologians have excerpted from the sacred pages a complete and extensive catalogue of personal operations. To this pertains that He operates as He wills (1 Cor. XII. 11), that He searches the deep things of God (1 Cor. II. 10), that He convicts (John XVI. 8), that He strives (Gen. VI), that He speaks (Acts XXVIII), that He commands (Acts XIII. 2), that He leads or impels the sons of God (Rom. VIII. 14), that He makes intercession for them (Rom. VIII. 26), that He guides into truth and announces things to come (John XVI. 13; 1 Pet. I. 11), that He teaches (Luke XII. 12; John XIV. 26), that He appoints bishops (Acts XX. 28).

X. Related is the seventh point, that passive affections also, which fall only upon a person, are predicated of the Holy Spirit. To this we refer that He is tempted (Acts V. 9), that a lie is committed against Him (Acts V. 3), that He is provoked (Isa. LXIII. 10), that blasphemy is committed against Him (Matt. XII. 31), that He is grieved (Eph. IV. 30).

XI. A general prejudice is raised against these four arguments from the fact that all these expressions can be explained by mere prosopopoeia. But to dispel this smoke which they sell, it suffices to observe:

A. That no example of prosopopoeia so constant and dominating throughout the entire Scripture can be brought forward.

B. When such things are predicated concerning certain qualities which fall only upon a person, then manifest criteria are at hand from which it can be gathered that the subject is not personal, and that prosopopoeia concerning it can and ought to be admitted. For either it will be able to be proved from the nature of the thing itself of which there is discourse, that personal predicates conflict with its nature, and therefore are to be understood figuratively; or in the very context and other sayings there will not be lacking traces from whose comparison it will be clear that the Holy Spirit speaks through figure, or it will be established from suitable authors that such a manner of speaking is not unusual: but nothing of all these things occurs in the present case.

C. The greatest part of the passages which we have produced is such that they can be understood only of a person. For 1) the expressions for the most part occur not in a poetic, allegorical, or parabolic manner of speaking, but in plain, historical, and dogmatic discourse. 2) The personal properties which are predicated of the Holy Spirit are joined with a personal being. 3) Emphatic adjectives and pronouns are very often added to the names, which call us away from all prosopopoeia.

We have seen an example of this matter just now in §. 6. in the title of Paraclete. Thus Acts XIII. 2. when it says: "Separate for me Barnabas and Paul for the work to which I have called

them," the pronoun *μοι* and the first person verb *προσκεκλημαι* do not allow us to understand anyone other than the Holy Spirit. For the former designates that the Holy Spirit was both the Author and the end of this separation. The latter, that already before He manifested this counsel to the Teachers of the Antiochene Church, He had immediately called Barnabas and his companions to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. Similarly Acts V. 9. the Holy Spirit is said to have been tempted. Where is a similar example of this phrase employed through *prosopopoeia*? What could be harsher than if someone should maintain that some quality or accident had been tempted?

XII. The objection which is made by those who bring forward certain passages that seem to them necessarily to require *prosopopoeia* abundantly betrays their bad cause, since they support it with most inept examples when better ones are not available. It is therefore scarcely worth the effort to dwell upon them. Among the strongest is, for example, the passage Rom. VIII. 26. concerning which VOLKELIUS says: "What is clearer in that passage of the Apostle, when he says that the Spirit Himself makes intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered: but He who searches the hearts knows what is the mind of the Spirit, because He makes intercession for the saints according to God. For what? Does the Holy Spirit properly speaking pray and pour out prayers to God for us? Does He properly speaking groan and sigh? Is it not evident that this is attributed to the Spirit because He excites those groanings in the hearts of the pious?". What, I ask, is the logic of that consequence, that the Holy Spirit is not a person because He does not properly pray or sigh? For we grant that groanings and prayers are attributed to the Holy Spirit by metonymy. But what prevents Him from being a person who is therefore said to pray and sigh because He produces these effects in the regenerate?

XIII. Eighth, we appeal to the personal appearances of the Holy Spirit. Concerning these the most distinguished SCHMEDESIUS delivered an inaugural oration at Hanover, in which, although we do not give our approval to all the examples adduced, nevertheless the principal ones are relevant to the present matter. Among these stands out:

A. The appearance of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove. For here a personal name is given to a rational subject, which descends, which appears in the visible form of a dove, which comes upon Christ, which is distinguished from other divine and human persons present in this act, which is beheld by the eyes. Does he not therefore become blind in the meridian light, who does not perceive as if with his very eyes that the Holy Spirit is a Person?

XIV. Vain therefore are the evasions which are opposed. We do not renew the dispute about the external form of the dove, after those things which we have discussed concerning it at John I. 32. Although that controversy contributes little to the importance of this dispute, we have nevertheless thought it safe to adhere to the received opinion, which maintains that the form of a dove, and indeed a fiery one, was truly present. But as to what is objected: 1) that the form of a dove, since it is an irrational subject, does not represent a person, and that therefore God has been accustomed to appear under the form of a man or angel; this cannot inject scruple into us. In symbolic appearances which have been exhibited to the Prophets, persons have everywhere been set forth through brute or even inanimate subjects. Too well known in the visions of Ezekiel and John are the enigmas of the Cherubim, or four living creatures, of the stars, of the Lamb, of the dragon, and so forth, for us to dwell upon them. That magnificent symbol of the divine presence itself in Israel, the Pillar of cloud and fire,

protests against this most false pretension. Although we shall soon show that representations of the Holy Spirit under personal form are not lacking.

Furthermore it is pretended that this appearance is employed in vain to prove the personality of the Holy Spirit, a) because descent from heaven is likewise attributed to things which inhere in substances, and particularly to perfect gifts, as James I. 17. b) because such things are sometimes subjected to the eyes through visible and distinct forms, as appears from Acts II. 3. where divided tongues expressed the faculty of diverse languages.

But we respond that the examples are most dissimilar, both because no personal subject is commemorated in these passages; and because in the former passage there is no question of proper and local descent, but metaphorical; and because the formal symbol of the Holy Spirit is placed by us not in descent alone, but in some visible form of a dove; and because the very passage Acts II. 3-4, when rightly examined, favors us. For those divided tongues sprang forth from one fire as it were, which was an indication of the Holy Spirit present here. This is clear, a) because τὸ ἐκάθισε must be referred to the immediately preceding noun πῦρ, so that you may know that one fire, separated into several flames having the likeness of tongues, sat upon the head of each individual. Hence β) immediately for the sake of explanation it is added: "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit," who indeed after He had descended upon them in the visible form of fire, also so occupied their minds that they depended solely upon His guidance. For the Evangelist continues: "And they began to speak in other tongues, as that Spirit gave or granted them to speak." In this matter they were similar to the Savior Himself, who likewise after the visible descent of the Holy Spirit upon Him is immediately described as full of the Holy Spirit and led by Him into the wilderness (Luke III. 22 compared with IV. 1).

XV. Nor are there lacking B. Several appearances in which the Holy Spirit expressly assumes the person either of a Man or of an Angel. Under the form of a Man He occurs in Ezekiel 9. 2-4. As an Angel He is beheld in the vision of Zechariah Chap. 1.9, 2.7 and other occasions to be more closely examined in their proper place.

XVI. Persuaded by these arguments, the Doctors of the true Church throughout all ages have defended the personal subsistence of the Holy Spirit. For this matter it will suffice to adduce certain selected testimonies of the Apostolic and Ante-Nicene Fathers. CLEMENT OF ROME to the Corinthians Ep. 1. §. 46: Οὐχὶ ἓνα Θεὸν ἔχομεν, καὶ ἓνα Χριστόν; καὶ ἐν πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος, τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ μία κλήσις ἐν Χριστῷ. "*Do we not have one God and one Christ? And there is one Spirit of grace, who has been poured out upon us, and one calling in Christ.*" It is manifest that the Spirit of Grace is considered as a Person, not only from His conjunction with the remaining persons, but also because He is distinguished from Grace itself, and therefore from His gifts, as their Author. A similar saying of the same [Clement] BASIL praises in De Spiritu Sancto cap. 29: "Ζῆ ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ὁ Κύριος, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον." "God lives, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit." Whence however he drew this, is unknown, as COTELERIUS noted at the cited place. Nor does GRABIUS teach that it lacks suspicion of spuriousness in Spicilegium Patrum T. I. p. 301.

XVII. At the beginning of the second century IGNATIUS to the Philadelphians §. 5. writes thus: "Just as the Pseudo-Prophets and Pseudo-Apostles drew one and the same evil spirit, deceitful and seducer of the people; so also the Prophets and Apostles received one and the

same Holy Spirit, good, principal (ἡγεμονικόν), true, Teacher from God through Christ. For there is one God of the O. and N.T. One mediator between God and men; for the creation of intelligible and sensible creatures and for providence useful and accommodated to things. But there is one Paraclete, who worked in Moses, the Prophets and the Apostles." Those things which he has in the Epistle to the Philippians agree with this.

IRENÆUS also reviews a catalogue of personal operations of the Holy Spirit both in the brief formula of faith which occurs in lib. I. cap. 2. and in the recounting of His various offices in lib. III. cap. 19: "The Holy Spirit descended into the Son of God made man: that He might become accustomed to dwell with Him in the human race; and to rest in men; and to work in them the will of God; and to renew them from oldness to the newness of Christ. Likewise: that men might be desired by God." Indeed he says that the Holy Spirit was given for this reason, that since the Devil was thrust down from heaven, we might have a Paraclete there where we have the Devil as accuser.

Nor do we doubt that ATHENAGORAS had the same faith, writing in *Legatio pro Christianis* cap. X: "Although we say that the Holy Spirit Himself, acting in the Prophets, thus flows forth from God and is reflected back to Him, as rays emitted from the Sun return. Who therefore would not wonder that we, who preach God the Father, and God the Son, and the Holy Spirit, so that we expound the power of their union and the distinction of their order, are called impious and godless men?"

Those things which he has in cap. XXII tend toward the same end, which how wickedly they have been twisted by PETAVIUS and SANDIUS to object Sabellianism to Athenagoras, WORMIUS will teach in *Historia Sabellianismi* cap. VIII. §. 1. ff. after BULL *Defensio fidei Nicaenae* c. V. Add NOURRY *De Scripturibus Seculi II Dissertatio* cap. 5.

But nothing is more explanatory than TERTULLIAN'S disputation expressly instituted against Praxeas, where among other things he says: *The third is the Spirit from the Father and the Son.* This he proves in c. IX. from John XIV. 16. "*For I will ask, says Christ to the disciples, 'the Father and He will send you another advocate, the Spirit of truth.' Thus He calls the Paraclete another from Himself, just as we call the Son another from the Father, so that He might show the third degree in the Paraclete, just as we show the second in the Son, for the sake of observing the οἰκονομία. The very fact that the Father and Son are called [distinct names], are they not one thing different from another? For indeed all things will be what they are called, and what they are, they will be called; and the diversity of names cannot be confused at all, because neither can the things of which they will be the names.*"

XVIII. The consensus of the Fathers of the Third Century is also manifest. So far is it from the case that suspicion of denied personality of the Holy Spirit falls upon ORIGEN, that he is rather thought to have paved the way for the Arians and to have taught an essential difference of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son. From CYPRIAN'S *Treatise on the Holy Spirit* the CENTURIATORS and others bring forward an excellent passage in Cent. III. cap. 4. p. 30. But they have not observed that it must be referred to spurious offspring. More would be available if those things published in that age against Sabellius had come down to us. For although according to WORMIUS *Historia Sabellianismi* cap. 1. §. 5. the controversy waged with them touched the Son more than the Holy Spirit, nevertheless the honor of the latter has not been neglected. Whence DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA in his epistle to

Xystus reports that the dogma of Sabellius was considered by the Doctors of the Church as ἀναισθησιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος [insensibility to the Holy Spirit] in EUSEBIUS Ecclesiastical History lib. VII. cap. 6.

XIX. Finally, we do not doubt that this truth was acknowledged in the ancient Catechesis of the Jews itself. The discourses of John the Baptist, the Savior, and the Apostles presuppose this. Hence the Jews are not said to deny the Holy Spirit, but to blaspheme, to resist Him, and so forth. Nor is this doctrine entirely absent from the more ancient monuments of the Jews. To this particularly pertains the fact that שכ״נה Schechina, that is, the symbol of the divine presence, and רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ are often used promiscuously concerning the same subject, which the distinguished VITRINGA established with suitable examples against BUXTORF in Observationes Sacrae lib. I. c. 4. §. 4.

DANZIUS Initia Christi p. 191. Nevertheless they call the שכ״נה Angel, indeed ומליץ סרסור Mediator and Interpreter, and they attribute many personal things to it, which are fitting to the offices both of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. It should be added that the Cabbalistic Writers speak of it as if of a third Father and third Architect, as the distinguished JOH. MEIERUS shows from R. MENACHEM of Recanati and R. SCHABTAI in De Mysterio Trinitatis pag. 26 & 57.

XX. At least imprudently CLERICUS and others, more indifferent than is fitting concerning the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity, indeed even SAM. BASNAGIUS Exercitationes ad Baronium p. 44-45 and JAC. BASNAGIUS Historia Judaeorum Tom. III. Lib. IV. §. 19, maintain that the Jews at the time of Christ were ignorant of the Third Person. Indeed, what EIPHANIUS asserts in Haereses concerning the Samaritans is extended to the Jews in general: "Πνεῦμα δὲ ἅγιον οὐ παραδέχονται, καὶ γὰρ ἠγνόησαν" - "But they do not receive the Holy Spirit, for indeed they were ignorant of Him." But those who think thus appeal to Acts XIX, where those who had been washed with John's baptism, when asked about the Holy Spirit, replied: "Whether there is a Spirit, we have not even heard."

Nevertheless, nothing can be drawn from this to establish total ignorance of the Holy Spirit among the Jews. For first, the stupor of these few cannot be drawn as an example for the entire Jewish Church. Otherwise this declaration would also tend to the prejudice of the very doctrine of John the Baptist, whom nevertheless it is clear from the Gospel history seriously informed his hearers about Baptism through the Holy Spirit and fire while baptizing them. Hence ODHELIUS in Synagoga Bifrons p. 25, although he denied without foundation that these men had heard nothing about the Holy Spirit from the Pharisees, if they were baptized by John himself, judged that this question should be ascribed to their blindness.

Furthermore, nothing prevents us from thinking with GROTIUS and PEARSON in Symbolum p. 543 that the more abundant measure of the Holy Spirit poured out upon the Apostles is chiefly regarded in that examination. Thus it can be supposed that they had indeed heard from John the promise of pouring out the Spirit, although nothing certain about the fulfillment of this promise had been conveyed to them.

Compare the most distinguished WEIDNER in the reciprocal letters concerning this matter with GEORG. DETHARDING and inserted in the Acta Eruditorum Rostochiensia Collection I. Act. 3.

XXI. It could more easily be conceded that the Sadducees did not acknowledge the Holy Spirit, as EPIPHANIUS Haereses XIV, GREGORY NAZIANZEN Oration XXXVII De Spiritu Sancto, PHILASTRIUS in Dositheo maintain, whom PETAVIUS follows in Theologia Dogmatica de Trinitate lib. I. cap. 14. §. 1.

But even this is not rightly proved. They indeed appeal to Acts XXIII. 8: "The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both." In this saying πνεῦμα has a general signification to some, so that it denotes any substance devoid of body. In this way the Sadducees would have been plainly theoretical atheists of the crudest sort, which is not clear, as the distinguished PEARSON also observes in the cited place.

Others explain πνεῦμα properly concerning the Third Person. They favor us insofar as according to their opinion the Pharisees believed in the Holy Spirit. Nor would we hesitate to join them, unless it were clear from the context that the matter concerns the dogma of resurrection, to which faith in the existence of the Holy Spirit does not so closely pertain. Therefore Spirit is more correctly taken for the soul surviving after the death of the body, compared with JOSEPHUS Antiquities XVIII. 2. teaching that the Sadducees denied ψυχῆς τὴν διαμονὴν the permanence of the soul together with rewards and punishments.

Notwithstanding this, the words in v. 9 spoken by the Scribes from the sect of the Pharisees: "εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ἢ ἄγγελος" can be referred to the Holy Spirit, to whom those Scribes attribute a personal work. For it is not necessary to use the word πνεῦμα in the same sense in both places. For Luke intended one thing, these Scribes another.

XXII. Some have illustrated the antiquity of this dogma by comparing also the testimonies of the Gentiles. Thus after other Fathers diligent in heaping up these testimonies, CHALCIDIUS in Timaeus and from him STEUCHUS EUGUBINUS De Perenni Philosophia lib. II. c. 3. pretend that through the Soul of the world in the schools of the Platonists an ancient tradition concerning the Holy Spirit Creator of the world was propagated. To the same effect JUSTIN Apology II relates a passage of PLATO in the Epistle to Dionysius, who had inquired of him concerning the nature of God, saying: "*Thus Plato spoke of Him as third, because he had read in the same writings what we recited above: 'And the Spirit of God moved upon the waters.'*"

This observation PFANNER illustrated in Theologia Gentilis cap. 3. §. 2-3, TH. GALE Philosophia Generalis lib. I. cap. 2. Sect. 3. §. 3 & lib. III. c. 2. Sect. 1. 5. 4, GROTIUS De Veritate Religionis Christianae lib. 4. §. 12, ROD. CUDWORTH De Systemate Intellectuali Mundi lib. I. c. 4, HUETIUS Alnethanae Quaestiones lib. II. cap. 3. This seemed so significant to JOH. SIMLER that he drew from it a singular argument for the personal subsistence of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, it is not pleasing to adhere to this position, both because of the notable difference that has been shown by others between the Platonic and Christian Trinity, and especially because that dogma concerning the Soul of the world has more impiety in its depths than has been observed by many. Hence JAC. THOMASIUS rejects as shameful and learnedly refutes the attempt to reconcile the Soul of the world with the Holy Spirit in his Pentecost program and in his erudite book De Stoica Mundi Exustione Dissertatio XIV. §. 18 ff. It must be confessed, however, that the later Platonists—among whom PLOTINUS is especially to be commemorated with his book Περὶ τῶν τριῶν ἀρχικῶν

ὕποστάσεων (On the Three Principal Hypostases) written expressly on this subject, which occupies the first place in the Fifth Ennead, and his disciple AMELIUS—deliberately mixed certain things into their writings by which they attempted to accommodate Platonism to Christianity. But it would have been better if they had found no rivals among Christian philosophers.

CHAPTER III. CONTAINING A REFUTATION OF THOSE WHO DENY THE HOLY SPIRIT IS A PERSON

The foremost among those who deny the personal distinction of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son, and therefore His true existence, are the Jews. For notwithstanding the traces of right faith remaining among the ancients, the more recent ones plainly reject it.

We do not dwell on recounting the blasphemies with which they burden our doctrine, concerning which EISENMENGER may be consulted in *Judaismus Revelatus* P. I. c. 6. The Spirit Himself will severely vindicate His honor, which they trample underfoot.

Nevertheless, it will be useful to expound their opinion briefly, so that the muddy sources from which the Pseudo-Christian Pneumatomachi have drunk may be all the more evident. Among them MAIMONIDES in *More Nevochim* Part I. cap. 40 gives six homonymous meanings of the word רוח, asserting that it designates: 1. Air 2. Wind 3. Vital spirit or breath 4. The incorruptible part of man, or the soul 5. Divine intellectual influence instilled by God into the Prophets, by whose virtue they prophesy 6. Purpose and will

He then adds: "You see therefore that this word RUACH, when attributed to God, is everywhere taken partly in the fifth, partly in the sixth and final signification, insofar as it designates will."

This Jewish interpretation represents a fundamental departure from orthodox Christian understanding of the Holy Spirit's personal subsistence. By reducing the Spirit to either divine influence or divine will, Maimonides and subsequent Jewish thought effectively deny the personal, hypostatic reality of the Third Person of the Trinity. The significance of this position extends beyond Jewish theology, as Lampe indicates that these "muddy sources" influenced later Christian heretics who similarly denied the personality of the Holy Spirit. The systematic reduction of רוח to non-personal categories—whether natural phenomena (air, wind), human faculties (breath, soul), divine operations (prophetic influence), or divine attributes (will)—provides a theological framework that undermines Trinitarian doctrine. This represents a clear contrast to the Christian understanding, which maintains that while the Holy Spirit may operate through these various means, He remains a distinct divine Person, not merely a force, influence, or attribute of God.

II. They adhere especially to the fifth notion, by which they understand the gift of Prophecy through the Holy Spirit: and indeed in such a way that they consider two different grades of Prophecy thus named, as the same MAIMONIDES teaches extensively in the cited work Part

II. c. 45. He defines the first thus: when someone is so instructed and endowed by Divine aid that he is moved and animated by it to accomplish some great and heroic deed. The second is when a man feels some thing or faculty arise within himself and rest upon him, which impels him to speak; so that he speaks either concerning sciences and arts, or Psalms and Hymns, or useful and salutary precepts for right living, or political and civil matters, or finally Divine things; and indeed while awake and in the ordinary vigor of the senses.

What is of the worst character in this opinion is that these grades of Prophecy, which they think are called the Holy Spirit, are considered as inferior and are distinguished from another series of grades, which he describes in the same place as grades of true Prophecy. FRISCHMUTH has abundantly taught in De Scripturae Distinctione Cap. II. §. 9 ff. how the Jews abuse this distinction in diminishing the authority both of the Hagiographa, which they are accustomed to call כתובים, and particularly of the Prophet Daniel.

Nevertheless, it is clear that this is the acumen of more recent [Jewish scholars] even from that Talmudic passage in Gemara SANHEDRIN Cap. I. Sect. 13, in which the gift of Prophecy in general is understood through the Holy Spirit: משמתו נביאים האחרונים הגי זכריה מלאכי נסתלק רוח הקדש מישראל

"From the time that the later prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi died, the Holy Spirit was taken away from Israel."

III. Moreover, that this error has flourished among the Jews for long centuries is evident from this very saying. The same is established from the TARGUMS OF JONATHAN and ONKELOS, in which the Holy Spirit is accustomed to alternate with Prophecy. For this reason EPIPHANIUS in Ancoratus §. 118 calls the Sabellians "δευτέρους Ἰουδαίους" (second Jews). From this arose the occasion for JEROME in Epistle 65 to Pammachius to object the Jewish error to LACTANTIUS: "*Lactantius,*" he says, "*in his books, and especially in his epistles to Demetrianus, entirely denies the substance of the Holy Spirit and by Jewish error refers Him either to the Father or to the Son, and demonstrates that the sanctification of both Persons is shown under His name.*" VINCENT OF LÉRINS likewise warns in Commonitorium against heresies c. XVII that Photinus in the Jewish manner denied the fullness of the Trinity and thought there was no person of the Holy Spirit. Indeed ATHANASIUS in Oratio contra Gregalium Sabellii and BASIL in Epistle 64 assert that Sabellianism is "Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ἐν προσήματι Χριστιανισμοῦ" (Judaism under the pretense of Christianity). Hence the Fathers considered Sabellianism to be Judaism, and the opposite Arianism to be subtle Paganism. THEODORET contra Sabellianos in Baluzius' Miscellanea Tom. IV. pag. 3: "*Behold therefore how Sabellius indeed, fleeing Arius, became a Jew, but how Arius, fleeing Sabellius, became a pagan.*"

IV. But those among Christians who have attacked the Personal substance of the Holy Spirit can be reduced to five principal classes. For they said that the Holy Spirit was either simply one and the same three-named person with the Father and Son, or some part of the divine essence, or a certain mode of thinking in God, or the power of God, or His peculiar gift. These indeed agree in foundation, but nevertheless in such a way that the later hypotheses illustrate the first. For those who held the Holy Spirit to be a mere name had to give a reason why that name recurred so often in the Scriptures. Therefore some derived this cause more distinctly from the cruder concept of parts of the divine essence; others from the mode of

internal divine operation, which they called love; others from the externally efficacious divine operation, which is the power of God; others from the very effect of divine operation, which was the gift of God. Thus one and the same root divided itself into four branches of error.

V. Therefore, those who with Praxeas, Noetus, Sabellius, Photinus and others thought to constitute the Holy Spirit as one and the same person with the Father and Son have laid the foundation of manifold vanity. Leo the Great attributes the same to the Priscillianists in his Epistle to Turribius of Astorga. CHRIST. WORMIUS in *Historia Sabellianismi* cap. 2 thought that their origin should be traced back to Simon Magus. IRENAEUS indeed testifies in *De Haeresibus* lib. I. c. 10 that he said he had descended in Samaria as the Father, in Judea as the Son, and to the remaining nations as the Holy Spirit. AUGUSTINE however differs from him in *De Haeresibus* cap. 1, relating that he boasted that he had given the Law to the Jews on Mount Sinai in the person of the Father; that he had putatively appeared in the time of Tiberius in the person of the Son; and that afterwards he had come upon the Apostles as the Holy Spirit in fiery tongues.

All these things fall back to this: in what sense did that impure impostor say according to JEROME on Matthew XXIV: "I am the Word of God, I am the beautiful one, I am the Paraclete, I am all things of God"? Did he seriously establish some system of doctrine? Or, mocking the Gentiles from *κακοζήλια* of the Christians, did he ascribe to himself with unbridled license of speech whatever they attributed to the Son and Holy Spirit?

VI. It would have been desirable if the Fathers who wrote against Praxeas and his followers had explained more clearly how they interpreted both the remaining names and particularly the name of the Holy Spirit. If we listen to EPIPHANIUS in *Haereses* LXII, the Sabellians understood some part of the Deity. For thus he writes in §. 1:

"This is their opinion: That the Father and Son and Holy Spirit are the same, so that three appellations belong to the same hypostasis. Or just as in one man there is body and soul and spirit. So that the Father is like the body, the Son like the soul: and the Spirit is finally held in the very Divinity like the human spirit. Which they also declare by the similitude of the Sun; in which, although there is one hypostasis, there is nevertheless a threefold act, namely the power of illuminating and of heating and the circular figure. And indeed that power of heating, that is, heat and burning, corresponds to the Spirit; but the power of illuminating to the Son; and the Father is finally like some form of the whole hypostasis."

This passage reveals the sophisticated yet fundamentally flawed theological system of the Sabellians. Rather than crude modalism, they developed elaborate analogies to explain how one divine hypostasis could manifest in three different modes. The anthropological analogy (body-soul-spirit) and the solar analogy (form-light-heat) represent attempts to maintain divine unity while accounting for the scriptural testimony to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

However, these analogies ultimately reduce the persons of the Trinity to mere aspects, operations, or parts of a single divine being. The Holy Spirit becomes merely the "heating power" of God rather than a distinct divine person. This represents a fundamental departure from orthodox Trinitarian doctrine, which maintains both the unity of the divine essence and

the real distinction of the three persons.

Although something seems to be said here, nevertheless the most diverse concepts are confused. For to posit parts outside of parts in the divine essence is in itself a capital error, ascribing something corporeal to God, from which those are very far removed who understand a certain power in God, for example of illuminating and heating, through the Son and Holy Spirit.

VII. Those who have treated the matter more subtly have substituted certain modes of thinking in God. Of their number are those whom AUGUSTINE describes in *De Fide et Symbolo* cap. 19. *Opp. Tom. VI. p. m. 118*. "Nevertheless," he says, "some have dared to believe that the very communion of the Father and Son, and, so to speak, the Deity, which the Greeks call θεότητα, is the Holy Spirit: so that since the Father is God and the Son is God, that very Deity, as it were, joins them together, both He by begetting the Son, and He by adhering to the Father and being made equal to Him from whom He was begotten. Therefore they say that this Deity, which they also want to be understood as the mutual love of both and charity, is called the Holy Spirit," etc.

He immediately adds laboriously the sayings of Scripture which those who think thus employ. Not only does he not refute this opinion, as PETAVIUS notes in *De Trinitate* lib. VII. c. 12. §. 5, but also in §. 20 he proposes the arguments of dissenters rather coldly, indeed he suggests that they are not very compelling, and finally leaves the whole matter in the middle, adding: "Therefore, whether that opinion is true, or something else, unshaken faith must be held."

And there exist sufficiently manifest passages in the books *De Trinitate* which reveal that the Bishop of Hippo himself was inclined toward this view. Although this opinion cannot be reconciled with the personal subsistence of the Holy Spirit, since love is a certain inclination of the will, and therefore nothing but a certain mode of thinking, which is attributed promiscuously to individual divine Persons, nevertheless the authority of AUGUSTINE has drawn many into the same mind, as PETAVIUS teaches in the cited place.

Indeed, through THOMAS AQUINAS and PETER LOMBARD it was brought into Christian schools and took firm root. It cannot be denied, however, that this opinion has been considerably mitigated by the Scholastics, especially the more recent ones.

For they contend that AUGUSTINE himself implicitly retracted it, and they want the Holy Spirit to be called love insofar as He is the product of the love of the Father and Son through His eternal spiration; as can be seen in BECANUS, VALENTIA and others who twist themselves here into various coils. But two things especially have midwived this concept: one, that the Disputations against the Donatists and Arians rendered quite many Doctors of the Church inclined toward the other extreme more than was right; the other, that this very thing was thought to reconcile Platonic Philosophy excellently with Christian faith.

It is known how closely what the Egyptians and ancient Orphics commemorated concerning Love agrees with the Holy Spirit Creator of the World, which TRIBBECHOVIUS exhibits in summary in *De Creatione Mundi* in *Fasciculus Crenii* Tom. I. p. 291 ff. HUETIUS also acknowledges in *Alnethanae Quaestiones* Lib. II. c. 3 that what PLOTINUS brought forth

concerning this Love in Ennead VI. lib. 8. c. 15 is very close indeed to faith concerning the Holy Spirit.

To this pertains that CLAUDIANUS MAMERTUS in *De Statu Animae* lib. II, when he had said in cap. 6 that the Holy Spirit is love, seeks in cap. 7 to reconcile this with Plato's doctrine. How successfully, let others see. It certainly does not please us that in the preceding sections he establishes a double image of the Trinity in man: as to the body through measure, number and weight; as to the soul through memory, counsel and will. Whence he says in cap. 5 that the weight of the soul is the will, which is more properly called Love, and is compared with the Holy Spirit. CAMPANUS' oration *De Spiritu Sancto* edited by the distinguished BUNEMANN with notes deserves to be read in the same opinion.

VIII. Of those who thought that some divine Power should be understood by the Holy Spirit, the crowd of Gnostics leads the column. Concerning Cerinthus that testimony of EPIPHANIUS is known, *Haereses* XXVIII. §. 1: "Then he taught thus: that after Jesus grew up, who was born from the seed of Joseph and Mary, Christ, that is, the Holy Spirit, had descended upon him from that supreme God in the form of a dove at the Jordan, and then had revealed to him the unknown Parent and through him to posterity. And therefore immediately, as that heavenly power poured itself into him, he performed portents and miracles." And perhaps to this class will belong those who according to Ignatius in the *Epistle to the Trallians* utterly denied the Holy Spirit.

IRENÆUS has similar things in lib. I. c. 26. & THEODORETUS *hæret. fab.* lib. II. cap. 3. From which it is clear that Cerinthus, for whom Valentinus is mentioned by TERTULLIAN *contra Prax.* c. 37, preceding Sabellius, confounded Christ with the Holy Spirit equally as with the Father, and at the same time held Him for that virtue by which Jesus, being filled, wrought miracles. That these traces were read by the rest of the Gnostic crowd is established even from that Excerpt of THEODOTUS in CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA §. 16: "Moreover, a bodily dove was seen, which some say is the Holy Spirit, who together with Valentinus make τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς εὐθυμῆσεως τοῦ Πατρὸς, τὴν κατέλευσιν πεποιημένον ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ Λόγου σάρκα the Spirit of the Father's Enthymesis, making the descent upon the flesh of the Word."

I do not wish to compare the rest in those excerpts pertaining to this cause, lest we weave too much delay at the threshold. To the same I would refer those who have dreamed of two or three Spirits or Paracletes, such as are commemorated in *Const. Apostol.* VI. 11. & *Can. Apost.* XLI. For these places see Cotelerius. It is necessary that MARCELLUS OF ANCYRA revived this error, if THEODORETUS rightly expressed his opinion in *hæret. fabul.* II. 10, where, after he had said that according to him a certain extension of the divinity of the Father came into Christ, he adds: "He says that the Holy Spirit is an extension of an extension, and that this was given to the Apostles." These things are of even worse punctuation, if according to the Gnostics he understood that extension of divine power in the manner of material emanation. However, a learned man, J. G. GERRET, attempts to free Lactantius from suspicion of similar error in *Exam. Theolog. Lactant. quæst.* III. The Bogomils, coming forth in the 11th century, were closer to him, concerning whose monstrous errors among other things EUTHYMIUS reports in *Panopliæ Tit.* XXIII, that they deceived the simple, saying they believed in the Father & Son & Holy Spirit, but in truth attributed three names to the Father, and deliriously imagined him endowed with bodily form emitting two rays from twin membranes of the brain, one of the Son, the other of the Holy Spirit, etc.

IX. Furthermore, that there were those who explained the name of the Holy Spirit in such a way that they understood by it a divine gift, is clear from the Author of the Consultations of Zacheus and Apollonius Lib. II. cap. 14: *I believe you hold in the preceding title that the Holy Spirit is especially denied by the Sabellians and is said to be a gift rather than the giver according to impious traditions, and that the authority of this evil is usurped by sacred testimonies above all, because He is read to be both given and received; the Savior speaking thus to the Apostles: "And breathing on them He said: Receive the Holy Spirit," etc.*

LUCAS DACHERIUS indeed, who edited this book in Spicilegium Patrum Tom. I, notes in the preface that our author was mistaken in his description of the Sabellian heresy, while he ascribes to Sabellius what belongs to Macedonius. But I fear that he equally with his defender WORMIUS in the cited work cap. 7 may not have sufficiently understood the Macedonian dogma, which with the Semi-Arians admitted the personal subsistence of the Holy Spirit. It was certainly at hand that some Sabellians, wishing to bring forward some reason for the notion of the Holy Spirit, would descend to this point, that they would so call Him a gift or some effect of God in men.

This very thing seems to have happened to the followers of PAUL OF SAMOSATA, who imbibed errors related to the Sabellians, among whom it is related by LEONTIUS in De Sectis Art. 3 that he called the Spirit that grace which came upon the Apostles. But this was a more serious error, because along with the Personality of the Holy Spirit it also removed His Deity.

X. In the more recent age after the Reformation, others have drunk from these impure fountains, adopting now these, now those concepts promiscuously. Before others, the earlier Anabaptists have been rendered suspect of denying the personal subsistence of the Holy Spirit; but the more recent ones have absolved themselves from this crime by their Confessions. This prejudice was born both from the excessive fastidiousness of some in the Colloquy of Frankenthal and Emden concerning the word "person," and from the confusion of the cruder Enthusiasts with the Anabaptists. For it is manifest that they recooked the monster of emanations of the divine essence once excluded by the Gnostics. Nor shall we act unjustly if we refer the famous MICHAEL SERVETUS among the first of their standard-bearers. Although he in De Trinitate Erroribus Lib. II. fol. 59 ff. declares his opinion concerning the Holy Spirit in such a way that it appears he understands by Him nothing but internal operations in the souls of those who are sanctified, nevertheless he reveals Enthusiasm more clearly in the books De Restitutione Christiana, in which he asserted that the lucid forms of all things exist eternally in God, and particularly concerning the Holy Spirit he says: "One is the Holy Spirit of Christ, eternal, containing the substances and measures of many Spirits. The Spirits of God's Elect are distinct among themselves, and are one Spirit in God."

From this flows that impious assertion in the same work, page 559: "Our internal man is God, just as Christ is God, and the Holy Spirit is God." See Bibliotheca Bremensia Class 1. p. 748-749.

I do not wish here to compare the colluding dogmas of Theophrastus Paracelsus, Weigel, Böhme, Stiefel, Felgenhauer and others of the same flour, especially since, although they seem to agree in general concept, yet in its more proper exposition they chatter many things imperceptible, discordant, indeed impious and tending toward mere materialism.

For what the others conceal more secretly, JOH. CASP. WESTPHALUS openly professes in *Pathologia Daemoniaca* published at Leipzig 1707, in which he proposes God as "*fire filling all things through emanation and physical radiation, whose essential aura is called the Holy Spirit and is like a divine particle and third part in all men, through which men are converted, Prophets sing of future things, and which was incarnated in Christ Himself.*"

It is worthy of indignation that some obscure person has falsely attributed to the truly pious Theologian JOHANN ARNDT in a letter supposedly written by him, that he held the Holy Spirit not as the third Person of the Trinity but as divine power emanating into creatures, as is established from the *Relatio Innocua* of the distinguished LOESCHER A. 1705. p. 816.

XI. Those who hold the divine Persons as modes of thinking form no small harvest. POIRET is undoubtedly to be numbered among the cruder ones. For he says in *Oeconomia Divina* I. cap. 2. §. 5: "*Nothing is necessary in God besides God Himself, besides the proper idea and knowledge of God, and His proper Love; or, to expound the same thing in other words, nothing is necessary in God except the eternal Son of God and His Holy Spirit.*"

Indeed, in the same work c. 15 it is asserted that unless He enjoys possession through Love of Himself, there would be nothing in God except a certain dark and confused fountain of vain aspirations and most urgent and most grievously tormenting disquietudes. He compares these properties in God with the faculties of the soul in the following sections, and teaches that the image of the Father exists through justice in Conscience, of the Son through Truth in Intelligence, of the Holy Spirit through Charity in the faculty of loving. But he establishes in Cap. X that the soul itself is of divine nature, and not created from nothing, but begotten from God, and thus at the same time approaches the Enthusiasts.

The Hattemists nourish no less a monster, though more secretly, for whom the Holy Spirit is nothing but an impulse of God, such as they imagine to themselves, essential for communicating Himself to His creatures, as is established from the Dutch exposition of PONT. van HATTUM's symbol page 8. But also that famous DEURHOF in the *Theology* which he published in Dutch, Lib. I. cap. 4. p. 46 ff., understands by the Holy Spirit that love by which God rests in Himself and delights. This however can easily be reconciled with the system of that acute philosopher from the common people, in which created spirits themselves are nothing but modifications of some universal Thought.

XII. Many among the Papists have entangled themselves more subtly in this error, variously twisting Augustine's concept. An example is that description of the Holy Spirit which FRID. NAUSEA brings forth in *Explicatio in Symbolum Apostolicum* p. 118: "He is nothing other than God carried into His essence through reciprocal love proceeding from the Father and Son." Understanding this indeed, that because God the Father loves His essence, similarly the Son also loves the same, it is established that this carrying of love taken passively, i.e., that the Father and Son are carried to their essence through unique love, becomes substance.

Those who have become known under the name of Deists or Naturalists have struck upon the same rock. Thus to ARTHUR BURY in *Latitudinario Orthodoxo* p. 63, the Holy Spirit designates Power, Activity, Grace, just as the Father designates Eternity, Goodness, etc., the Son Wisdom, Veracity, Justice. Nor have some Theologians who think rightly and piously in other matters been sufficiently cautious here. JAC. ALTINGIUS in *Heptad. VI. diss. 1* presses his thumb against Augustine and others who, following the opinions of Philosophers, understand Love by the Holy Spirit.

Indeed, he assigns the three faculties of the soul, namely Intellect, Will, and Power, as an image of the Holy Trinity, attributing the last to the Holy Spirit. HERMANN DEUSING, excessively inflamed with the study of allegories, in *Mysteries of the Trinity, Diff. III. §.124*, says: "The Holy Spirit is the will of the Father and the Son, by which the Father wills the Son, that is, His truth, and the Son wills and loves Himself." Yet he does not simply understand the will of God through the Holy Spirit, but that will especially which in the New Testament is expressed through His outpouring and spiritual vivification, by which he understands not even an essential mode of thinking, but a mere mode of operation *ad extra* through the Holy Spirit. He endeavors to illustrate this opinion more fully in what follows.

XIII. The Socinians generally wish to confine the error both of those who say the Holy Spirit is a power and of those who say He is a divine gift. This is evident at first glance from the distinction of VOLKELIUS in *De Vera Religione lib. V. c. 14*, where he says: "The Holy Spirit is to be considered in two ways, either insofar as He is of God and Christ and proceeds from Him, or insofar as He is communicated to man and thus dwells in him. In the former way are ascribed those things which properly belong to God and Christ and which He effects through His Spirit; in the latter, those things which are accomplished by His power and instinct in man."

Generally, according to the Catechism of Racovian, *Sect. VI. cap. 6*, "the Holy Spirit is a power or efficacy flowing from God into men and communicated to them, by which He separates them from others and consecrates them to His uses," which power they consider as common to the Father and Son and existing in both, naturally in the Father, but in the Son by the benefit and grace of God.

But among themselves they dispute whether by that power a mere gift and effect of God is indicated, and thus something created, which SOGINUS leaves undecided against Wiek in *cap. 10*; or whether it is some divine quality and thus an essential property in God, which SMALCIUS acknowledges against Grawer concerning the Holy Spirit; or whether both notions are to be joined, which OSTORODUS tends to with his followers; or finally whether it designates something intermediate between God and the created thing.

This latter position CRELLIUS defends in *Tractatus de Spiritu Sancto et de Deo cap. 22*, for whom the Holy Spirit is not a power naturally residing in God, but a certain quality flowing from that very power residing in God and, as it were, intermediate between that power in God and the more manifest effects proceeding from it. In this way he falls into the very whirlpool of emanations of the Valentinian and Enthusiastic schools.

This is evident at first glance from the similitudes which he employs in *lib. I. De Uno Deo Patre Sect. 3. c. 9*. "There is," he says, "an immense supply of Spirit with God, which resides

in Him as in its fountain, but proceeds and flows from Him when and insofar as He wills, not otherwise than light from the Sun, or like that force which they call influence from the stars, or like heat from fire into things placed near it."

But when that power of God insinuates itself through diverse effects, hence they think that certain more special divine gifts in the strict sense are called the Holy Spirit. This is the reason why SMALCIUS contends in Examen 157 Errorum, error 137, that there is not one Holy Spirit, but several and indeed unequal in dignity. The same and others speak in such a way that they seem to concede that a more abundant knowledge of divine things, hope of eternal life, and finally the Gospel itself have been called the Holy Spirit.

Following in these footsteps, the Author of *Du Platonisme dévoilé*, SOUVEREIN, Part I. c. 3, likewise understands by the Spirit nothing but ἐνέργεια or the efficacy of God, which coincides with the Word, except that the Word looks more to external operation, the Spirit to internal. But he subtly distinguishes between the Spirit of God and the Holy Spirit. By the former he understands the divine efficacy conspicuous in all the works of God; by the latter, however, the communication of extraordinary gifts which was made to the Prophets and especially to Christ.

More recently J. WATTS has published in English a new Socinian system of the Doctrine of the Trinity, with certain dissertations added to illustrate it, the fifth of which deals expressly with the Holy Spirit. He indeed thinks in Sect. 2. p. 126 that he is to be distinguished from Socinus, Schlichting, and Crellius insofar as he holds not an accidental but an essential or substantial Power in God for the Holy Spirit. But he does this in such a way that he does not think this notion consistently obtains everywhere. For he often defends with the cruder Sabellians that the Holy Spirit is God Himself, p. 130 ff.

XIV. But there is enough of forces. Let us now survey the weapons, both those by which all generally attack the Personality of the Holy Spirit, and those by which the chief standard-bearers of individual cohorts defend their own positions. To the former pertain all arguments by which personal distinction is banished from the divine essence in general. We now dismiss those, intending to examine only those which are specifically opposed to the Personality of the Holy Spirit.

XV. The RACOVIAN CATECHISM Section VI, chapter 6 vigorously applies the first and strongest battering ram, contending that many things which are attributed to the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures are in no way suitable to any person, such as: that He is given from Him, and this either according to measure or without measure; that He Himself is poured out, and is poured out from Him; and that men are made to drink of Him, and they are either baptized in Him, given in double portion, distributed in parts, certain things are His firstfruits, He Himself is taken away and taken away from Him, that He was not at some time, finally that He is extinguished, etc. To these others add that He is the gift of God, that the Apostles gave the Holy Spirit, that He is given through breathing, that He is said to be in God Himself, that we are sealed with Him, that Christ is said to be anointed with the Holy Spirit, etc.

XVI. All these things can be blown away with one breath, since it suffices that the Holy Spirit in all such places can be considered in relation to His gifts. Nothing in this departs from the

common manner of speaking, that what is predicated of the cause is suitable to its effect. This metonymy has foundation not only in the usage of speaking, but also in the thing itself. For what is the cause of a cause is also the cause of what is caused. Therefore what is proper to the effect is also fittingly attributed to the cause. Unless this stood firm, it would be all over for the affections and ἀνθρωποπαθείας which are most frequently attributed to God Himself in the sacred writings. Let the adversaries therefore produce a reason why soul is ascribed to God, why shortening of soul, why grief, repentance, ignorance, remembrance, why He is said to receive consolation, to rest, to breathe, and so forth. As improperly as such things are said of God, so improperly also can the sacred style attribute to the Person of the Holy Spirit things which do not fall upon a person per se.

XVII. Add B) that the examples produced contain nothing that is very foreign to the nature of a person. Most frequent are those in which the Holy Spirit is said to be given. But is not a person given when we are admitted into communion with him in such a way that we can not only enjoy his goods, but also consider his very virtues and actions as our own, insofar as they are expended for us, and as property devoted to us? Is not thus a bridegroom given to a bride, a bride to a bridegroom, a son to a father, a king to a people, a teacher to disciples, and so forth? Is not the Son of God, whom they confess to be a Person, most frequently considered as given by the Father? Is not the same one who is said to be given elsewhere described as the author of spiritual gifts? (1 Corinthians 12:11).

XVIII. Yet lest they stick to the manner in which the Spirit is sometimes said to be given, nothing in it departs from a person. a) That God has given to us from His Spirit is said in 1 John 4:13. But "from" here denotes the efficient cause, and therefore nothing else is designated except that He gave those gifts which have the Spirit as author, and which are also called χαρίσματα ἐκ Θεοῦ (gifts from God) in 1 Corinthians 7:7. Add that the phrase in Revelation 21:6 plainly agrees: Δώσω ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς ζωῆς "I will give from the fountain of the water of life." For this fountain is a symbol of the divine Person, as in Jeremiah 2:13, Proverbs 36:8. And by the same reasoning the Holy Spirit in relation to His gifts has the character of a fountain.

But CRELLIUS'S objection is vain when he pretends that this phrase alternates with the phrase in 1 John 3:24. For there it is simply said that God has given the Spirit Himself; but here it aims more specifically at the fruits of this given Spirit, and particularly at that ἀγάπη of verse 12 so greatly commended, which occupies the first place among them (Galatians 5:22).

b) The same Spirit is said to be given not according to measure in John 3:34. We have treated extensively of the sense of this phrase in the Commentary. But what prevents the Holy Spirit from being a Person, even if through Him the most ample measure of such gifts is understood? And why should we not determine that His very Person is here involved? For those words most conveniently admit this sense, that the Spirit Himself, whether given or devoted to Christ or to the faithful of the New Testament, is assigned as property with this power and condition, that He might flood first Christ, then His people, with the most abundant river of His gifts. Add that also the Manna formerly divided according to measure was a figure of the Person of Christ, as a Savior sufficient for all.

c) That He is given in double portion refers to 2 Kings 2:9, which we solved in chapter 1, §. 15.

d) That the Apostles gave the Holy Spirit is most false. For although through the laying on of hands the faithful received the Holy Spirit in the Apostolic Church, nevertheless this χειροθεσία was not the cause of the giving of the Holy Spirit, but only some moral means of it, or an external seal. This is clear a) because prayers to God preceded on behalf of others, that they might receive the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:15). β) because sometimes the Holy Spirit was given without that imposition (Acts 10:44, 11:15). γ) because the command and declaration of God concerning giving the Holy Spirit preceded (Acts 9:17, 13:2 ff.). d) because those by whose ministry the Spirit was distributed to others, they themselves lost nothing of Him.

e) That the Holy Spirit was given through the breathing of Christ cannot be extorted by any strings from John 20:22. For equally as the laying on of hands, it was nothing but an external symbol elegantly foreshadowing the method of the economy of the Holy Spirit and sealing the certainty of His promise. This is clear a) because the Apostles received the gift of the Holy Spirit not immediately, but on the fiftieth day after this appearance of the Lord. β) That quality which is here assigned to the disciples cannot be given through breathing. The authority of remitting and retaining sins required infallibility, even concerning facts. What does this have in common with breathing? γ) The gift of infallibility presupposes a Person internally teaching and warning concerning those cases in which infallible judgment was to be exercised.

XIX. We shall expedite the rest equally easily. 2) That the pouring out of the Holy Spirit designates His very mission has already been warned in chapter 1, §. 14. What appears distorted in that symbol? Do not rivers equally as fountains bear the emblem of Teachers, and therefore of persons? What therefore prevents us from considering the supreme Teacher as a river poured out? What is distorted in the fact that the faithful are made to drink from this river? Is it more absurd to represent personal drink than food? Is not Christ Himself bread, and food equally as spiritual drink (1 Corinthians 10:3-4), of which the Fathers ate and drank? Is not Christ's flesh to be eaten and His blood to be drunk (John 6:53-54)? Is not Christ Himself that Manna which is to be eaten (John 6:49-50, Revelation 2:17)?

This is not shaken by the citation of Peter in Acts 2:17: "I will pour out ἀπὸ πνεύματός μου of my Spirit." For he here followed the LXX, who thus rendered what was simply said in Joel 2:28: "I will pour out my Spirit." But Peter was unwilling to correct this version, since ἀπὸ can be understood here in the same sense as we expounded in the preceding §.

XX. 3) Related is the allegory of Baptism ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, mention of which is made in Matthew 3:11, Mark 1:8, Luke 3:16, John 1:33. For the same emblem of river or water is regarded, whence this Baptism is opposed to Baptism ἐν ὕδατι. And union with the Person of the Holy Spirit, and His personal operation, is required not only for the satisfaction but also for the purification of souls.

XXI. Major 4) appearance occurs in those places which seem to hint at the distribution of the Holy Spirit, to which besides 2 Kings 2:9, Acts 2:17, 1 John 4:13, which we have already solved, is usually referred Numbers 11:17, Hebrews 2:4, Romans 8:23. Whence VOLKELIUS argues thus: "No person can be given to several persons, and indeed very distant from each

other, at the same time." Thus he is blind in the very light. For is not a king simultaneously given to several subjects? Does not this much more apply to a divine Person, who by the very perfection of His essence is present everywhere? Is not this the true reason why the Holy Spirit is compared to a river, widely diffusing waters, namely that it might be foreshadowed that He suffices for many?

The added citations are nothing but smoke. a) In Psalm 51:11 David prays that the Spirit of holiness of Jehovah not be taken away from him. But persons are also taken away when they die (Isaiah 57:1). And more closely pertaining to this is that those are said to be taken from us of whose sweet companionship we are deprived (Ezekiel 24:16). Thus Christ Himself as bridegroom was to be taken away from the disciples (Matthew 9:15, Mark 2:20).

b) But there is another reason for the passage Numbers 11:17, where Jehovah says: וּאֶצְלַחֵי מִן הָרוּחַ אֲשֶׁר עָלֶיךָ וְשָׂמַתִּי עֲלֵיהֶם "And I will take from the Spirit who is upon you and will put Him upon them." This promise is narrated as fulfilled in verse 25.

But these words would be inconveniently understood of mere spiritual and prophetic gifts, since Moses did not lose what was granted to the Seventy Elders. The subsequent life of Moses teaches this, in which he displayed illustrious specimens of the same Spirit dwelling in him. Therefore without foundation the SYRIAC rendered "I will diminish, I will shorten from your Spirit"; although CALVIN approaches this, determining that something was taken away from Moses as a punishment. All things flow correctly if we determine that the Person of the Holy Spirit is here hinted at, whom Jehovah promises will operate in those Seventy in the same manner as He had operated in Moses. The Holy Spirit is indeed a Fountain in His own people which does not dry up, even if many drink from it, and a Lamp whose light does not fail, even if other torches are kindled from it.

c) But what is more manifest than that in Hebrews 2:4 by μερισμοὺς Πνεύματος ἁγίου are designated not passive distinctions of the Holy Spirit into parts, but active distributions of charisms which the Holy Spirit institutes? For there is immediately added κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν, "according to His will," namely of the Holy Spirit, to whom in the parallel place 1 Corinthians 12:4 ff. διαίρεσεις distributions of charisms are attributed as to their Author, καθὼς βούλεται, "as He wills."

d) The firstfruits of the Holy Spirit in Romans 8:23 pertain much less to this point. For not to mention that there were firstfruits which had the type of persons, Paul commemorates not so much Firstfruits which are the Holy Spirit Himself, as Firstfruits which the Holy Spirit as the fountain of all goods grants.

22. Furthermore 5) from the fact that the Spirit is said not yet to have been, nothing can be gathered against His personality. For persons are said not to be, even if they truly are, when they are not perceived through their operations. Thus God Himself is said not to be where He does not manifest Himself in a certain way (1 Kings 19:11-12). Thus Christ says He is no longer in the world (John 17:11) from the time when He ceased to manifest Himself through His works in the world.

XXIII. That 6) the Holy Spirit is said to be extinguished in 1 Thessalonians 5:19 does not infringe upon His personality. For persons are also said to be extinguished who have spread

singular light about themselves. Hence concerning David we read that the light in Israel should not be extinguished (2 Samuel 21:17). And to be extinguished among good authors is the same as to die. Indeed, entire armies are extinguished, as tinder is extinguished, when they are so destroyed that nothing more is to be feared from their fire (Isaiah 43:17).

XXIV. They stick to 7) the passage 1 Corinthians 2:11, from which VOLKELIUS argues thus: "That which is established to be in God, just as man's spirit is in man. From which it is gathered that the Holy Spirit is not a person, unless we want a person to be in a person, and indeed not reciprocally or vice versa (for neither is God in His Spirit), which can happen in no way."

Response: a) The pretended comparison between the Spirit of God and man's spirit works for us. For man's spirit is an intelligent substance. b) If the third point of comparison is placed in the mode by which the Spirit is in man, too much is proved, because man's spirit is part of him. Therefore the analogy is regarded only in knowledge, which is a personal operation. c) To snatch from us the phrases by which the Son is said to be in the Father, and the Father in the Son, it is craftily noted that God is not said to be reciprocally in the Spirit. But since in the same way the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one (1 John 5:7), hence it flows of itself that in the same manner as the Father is in the Son, the Father and Son are in the Holy Spirit. Thus Jehovah was present to Elijah in the gentle whisper representing the Holy Spirit (1 Kings 19:12).

XXV. Argument 8) from passages in which we are said to be sealed with the Holy Spirit (Ephesians 1:13, 4:30; 2 Corinthians 1:22) is urged with SMALCIUS thus: "No one is sealed by a person, but a person is one who seals; but in reality men are sealed."

Response: Nothing prevents considering a Person as a Seal. For to be sealed metaphorically is the same as to be confirmed. Now indeed we are also confirmed by Persons, for example when a vase is offered to a creditor. And children are pledges of conjugal love. Thus in GELLIUS hostages are called pledges in Noctes Atticae 17.2. Hence in the sacred writings the emblem of a seal concerning persons occurs in Song of Songs 8:6, Haggai 2:24, Jeremiah 22:24.

And ABARBANEL from the sense of the ancient Masters on Exodus 40 teaches concerning יהוה שכינה that its name is the same as the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, יהוה חותמו בכניו, "And that seal is of the Holy One, blessed be He, designated by all His attributes." Nor does the metaphor disagree by which the Son of God is called χαρακτήρ in Hebrews 1:3.

But also 2) better Interpreters think that it is not so much a matter of sealing in which the Holy Spirit is the seal, as of which the Holy Spirit is the author. For in Ephesians 4:30 it is said ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε, that is, "by whom you were sealed," the τῷ ἐν here, as most frequently, agreeing with the Hebrew כּ. Nor does it hinder that that ἐν is omitted in Ephesians 1:13, because any verb admits the dative of cause, as the Grammarians teach.

XXVI. As concerns the anointing 9) which is commemorated concerning the Holy Spirit in Acts 10:38, when God is said to have anointed Christ with the Holy Spirit and power, there is nothing catachrestic in it. If the adversaries think that either the very Power of God is

designated through hendiadys, or His gifts, why do they consider it gentler to attribute unction to Power or gifts than to a Person? Since this metaphor supposes that a Person is compared to oil or ointment, why will this be harsher than the emblem of water, which we have shown befits the Holy Spirit in §. 16, or the metaphors of clothing, salt, etc., which are used of persons?

XXVII. They defend their own positions equally unsuccessfully. We dismiss those who, considering the Holy Spirit as a particle or degree of divine emanation, while they overturn the concept of simplicity and spirituality in God, shake the foundations of primary truth known through nature itself. We shall oppose only a few things to those who either hold the very God operating, or a certain mode of thinking, or some divine Power for the Holy Spirit, or think that different notions should be joined as occasion arises.

XXVIII. To make the first hypothesis probable, WATTS observes 1) that "frequently the spirit of man from the phrase of Scripture expresses man himself. Thus the renewal of the spirit of the mind is the same as the renewal of the mind itself (Ephesians 4:23), just as by similar pleonasm the body of the flesh of Christ (Colossians 1:22) designates the flesh itself."

2) He appeals to places in which God and His Spirit seem to him to alternate, for example 2 Samuel 23:2-3, Acts 5:3-4, Psalm 139:7. Thus the inspiration of the Prophets, which is the work of the Holy Spirit, is considered as the work of God Himself (2 Peter 1:21 compared with 2 Timothy 3:16, Hebrews 1:1). Thus the Temple of the Holy Spirit is the Temple of God Himself (2 Corinthians 6:16 compared with 1 Corinthians 6:19). 3) He adds places in which the Soul of God designates God Himself (Isaiah 1:14, 42:1; Hebrews 10:38).

Response: Scripture cannot contradict itself. Therefore, since there exist places in which the Holy Spirit is distinguished from the remaining Persons, which we have examined in chapter 2, §. 1 ff., one must not depart from this notion without weighty cause. That distinction does not occur in the sayings brought forward. 1) Mind in the style of the New Testament is considered as consisting of spirit and soul. This is established from 1 Thessalonians 5:23 and Hebrews 4:12. Soul in the former place fittingly expresses the appetitive and sensitive faculties, but spirit the purely spiritual ones. In the latter, ψυχή [soul] regards the qualities of nature, πνεῦμα [spirit] those of grace, which are the effects of the Holy Spirit. According to this distinction, which we prefer, the Apostle exhorts the faithful that by means of that grace of the Holy Spirit which has fixed its seat in their mind, they should continue to urge on the work of renewal. But in Colossians 1:22 the body of the flesh of Christ is distinguished from His glorified body.

2) That which is in question is presupposed when the names of God and the Holy Spirit are pretended to alternate, which in the very passages adduced are evidently distinguished. Meanwhile there is a most serious cause why that which is ascribed to the Holy Spirit is predicated in other sayings concerning God or concerning the remaining persons. For both the unity of the persons in operating and that divine order by which the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son in operating requires this.

3) The Soul of God does not pleonastically designate God Himself, but ἀνθρωποπάθως [anthropomorphically] the intimate inclination and affection of His will.

XXIX. Against the second opinion we warn 1) that they everywhere run into the principles of metaphysics. They consider Power as a faculty different from Will and Intellect. They also separate Judgment from Will, and as it seems convenient to them for their hypothesis, they distinguish and arrange the faculties of the soul.

2) They furthermore have Scripture contrary to themselves. For it a) makes whatever they attribute privately to the Holy Spirit common to the remaining persons and vice versa. Thus, for example, God in general is called Love (1 John 4:8). Love is attributed to the Father, Wisdom to the Holy Spirit, and so forth. b) Furthermore, those things in which they place the essence of the Holy Spirit, Scripture considers as His attributes, while it attributes to Him will, power, etc., which presuppose a personal subject in which they inhere, as was warned in chapter 2, §. 7. c) The love of God is expressly distinguished from the Holy Spirit in Romans 5:5, because it is said to be poured out through Him.

XXX. They contend that certain sayings of Scripture indeed fight for them, but which so little accomplish the matter that Greg. de VALENTIA honestly acknowledges in *Commentaria Theologica* Tom. 1, disp. 2, q. 11 that it is not established from the Scriptures concerning this, but that the authority of the Doctors and reason consonant with Scripture, which has nevertheless already been destroyed, must be followed here. Those things indeed which AUGUSTINE produces in the cited work 1, §. 9 are most trivial. For we have already shown that 1 John 4:8, 16 and Romans 5:5 are adverse to this error. p. 150, some error here.

DEUSING indeed devotes singular effort in the cited work §. 139 ff. to vindicating the former saying for himself. But I am not so sharp in intellect that I can draw out even one argument in probable form from that whole reasoning. Weaker ones follow, for example: "that the Holy Spirit is called the gift of God; that through the Holy Spirit we are reconciled to God; for we are not reconciled to Him except through love; that regeneration is the work of the Holy Spirit, and so forth."

More appearance of reason is contained in the passage which DEUSING cites for himself from 1 Peter 3:17: εἰ θέλει τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ [if the will of God wills], where τὸ θέλειν [the willing] is the action of the subject which is called the will of God. Perhaps he wanted to follow AUGUSTINE, who in lib. 22 contra Faustum cap. 20 thus cites this passage: "It is better for those doing good, if the Spirit of God wills, to suffer than those doing evil."

Although ERASMUS, ESTIUS, MILLIUS, etc. contend that a corrupt exemplar was used, nevertheless nothing prevents suspecting that he is said to favor his hypothesis tacitly by this citation: אם כן ירצה רצון האל "if He wills to favor."

GROTIUS notes that it is a Hebraism, as if to say: "The will of God here does not here indicate the Holy Spirit more than it does when εὐδοκία [good pleasure] and βουλή [counsel] are assigned to Him."

This construction indeed has emphasis, not only that it might be indicated that will of God is gracious, as LORINUS observes, but also that it is holy and immutable.

XXXI. We hear no more from those thirdly who deny that the Holy Spirit is a Person because He is described as the Power and Gift of God. For 1) the consequence itself wavers. For just

as nothing hinders a Person from being considered as a gift, according to §. 14, so also even if the Holy Spirit were sometimes called the Power of God, nothing would thereby depart from His personality. For quite often powers are persons: Reuben in Genesis 49:3, Simon Magus in Acts 8:10, Angels in 1 Peter 3:22. The very Son of God is also called the Power of His people in 1 Corinthians 1:24, Proverbs 27:1. Nor is it improbable that Gabriel is a symbolic name of the Holy Spirit, as I showed in Exercise 3 on Psalm 45, p. 120-121. But that name designates the Power or Strength of God, and nevertheless it is given to a personal subject.

2) Most frequently the Holy Spirit is distinguished from power and gifts, as cause from action and effect. His distinction from power evidently occurs in Luke 1:17, 35; 4:14; Acts 1:8; 10:38; Romans 15:13, 19; 1 Corinthians 2:4; 2 Corinthians 6:6-7. He is equally manifestly discriminated from gifts in 1 Corinthians 12:7; Acts 2:4; 6:5, 10; 13:52. Add the places in which the Holy Spirit is considered as the author of certain peculiar benefits of grace, mention of which has already been instituted in Chapter 1, §§. 12 and 14. Thus He is called the Spirit of truth in John 15:26; 16:13, and indeed in such a way that the reason is added, because He leads into all truth; Spirit of adoption in Romans 8:15; Spirit of wisdom in Ephesians 1:18, etc.

3) There is immense perplexity among those who think thus, through which they disagree not only among themselves, but also with themselves. Whether they consider this Power as a quality of God or as a quality of a creature, they remain uncertain. Neither concept can be applied to all places, whence they prefer now this, now that, as it serves their arguments. And certainly both are equally absurd.

If it is a quality in God, then it does not differ from His very power, and therefore it was not necessary that effects should be so often ascribed to the Holy Spirit, which have God Himself immediately as their cause. If it is a quality infused into man, then they are overwhelmed by the whole abundance of those sayings which attribute divine properties and operations to the Holy Spirit. But it is more absurd when it is defined as some intermediate quality. For what, I ask, is intermediate between God and creature? Or if something is, is it substance or attribute? If substance, therefore a Person. If attribute, it requires a substantial subject in which it inheres, which since it must be either God or creature, since no middle nature is given, through a circle these metaphysicians return to the same goal of war from which they thought they had departed.

XXXII. With these things presupposed, that cloud of Scripture sayings which is opposed will vanish. The greatest is their heap of those which they adduce for the notion of Power. We have already begun to cut down this forest, while in the preceding §. num. 2 we indicated that certain of the chief ones fight for us because of the distinction which they make between the Holy Spirit and the Power of God. Nevertheless, the RACOVIAN CATECHISM and its followers form certain instances.

1) They appeal to hendiadys [one thing through two words], "by which the same thing is usually expressed by two words to illustrate it more, for example when in Matthew 3:11, Luke 3:16 it is written that Christ will baptize in the Holy Spirit and fire, when in Mark it is simply said that He will baptize in the Holy Spirit. The same reason applies to the passages Luke 1:17, Acts 10:38. But this is especially required in Luke 1:35, since Matthew 1:20 speaking of

the same matter, the Angel makes mention of the Holy Spirit alone: nor indeed was any other power besides the Holy Spirit necessary for Christ to be conceived."

Response: We do not acknowledge hendiadys except when the matter demands it. But this happens where synonyms of entirely the same things occur. This is not found in the cited passages. For Spirit and fire, equally as Spirit and power, can be distinguished as cause and effect, especially since it is evident that the word δύνναμις [power] is proper to those extraordinary gifts which were the external sign of the poured-out Holy Spirit, not only in the plural, but also in the singular (Mark 6:5; 9:1, 39; Luke 4:36; Acts 4:33, etc.). Hence an elegant distinction is made in Romans 15:19 between the power of signs and wonders and the power of the Spirit of God.

But that Mary in chapter 1:8 narrates the praise of John the Baptist more by summary is immediately apparent to one examining it. Therefore he commemorates the principal matter, the Baptism of the Spirit, but omits its external sign and demonstration, the Baptism of fire; by this very thing teaching that greater account should be taken of the former. Furthermore, that in Luke 1:35 the divine power of the Son of God Himself is not to be understood by the Power of the Most High, which abundantly distinguishes it from the third hypostasis, ought to have been proven by stronger arguments. It was not necessary that the causes of the Lord's incarnation be explained to Joseph as fully as to Mary. But it was entirely necessary that the Savior of the world being born should join His power with the operation of the Holy Spirit, and that a tabernacle of body should appear for Himself.

2) To weaken the force of the argument from 2 Corinthians 6:7-8, they object "that Paul understands by the Holy Spirit the power communicated to him by God and exerting itself in him: but by the name of power, those very miracles which God wrought outside Paul by His power, making faith for his word and preaching: for not all the power of God is the Holy Spirit."

Response: 1) This is an example of how they assign now this, now that notion to the Power of God as it pleases them to serve their hypothesis, now confounding it with the Holy Spirit, now distinguishing it from Him. 2) It can suffice for us that the Adversaries are forced to acknowledge that a distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Power of God must sometimes be admitted. Especially since that distinction is such that it can also be applied with sound sense to the remaining places in which mention is made of both simultaneously. But if in those places Scripture so often hints that the Power of God is something different from the Holy Spirit, how will they persuade us that the remaining places, which simply inject mention of the Power of God, should certainly be interpreted concerning the Holy Spirit?

3) Most clear is the place in Romans 15:19, in which the power of the Holy Spirit is commemorated, which would be the same as "power of power" if the error of the Pneumatomachi [Spirit-fighters] stood firm. CRELLIUS thus attempts to weaken this, saying a) "that power and efficacy can again be another power and efficacy dependent on the former; b) that the genitive of the Holy Spirit should be taken as a genitive of specification, as the gift of the Holy Spirit is taken for the gift which is the Holy Spirit, and the pledge of the Spirit for the pledge which is the Spirit, and the promise of the Spirit for the thing promised,

which is the Holy Spirit." WATTS p. 150-151. c) "He adds a third escape, namely that a pleonasm [redundancy] can be established here, such as also occurs in Ephesians 1:5, 19; 6:10."

Response: These arguments leak from every side. a) Power of power is not properly given unless by the former a substance is understood in which the latter inheres as an attribute. Add that this is applied quite catachrestically [improperly] to a phrase in which the matter is not simply about power of power, but about the power of such a subject which is distinguished by a personal name. b) But the sayings added are twisted contrary to the scope of Scripture. How the Holy Spirit is a gift we have taught in §. 14. Furthermore, by the same reason by which He is called a seal in §. 22, He can also be called a pledge. But that the promise of the Holy Spirit is the same as the Holy Spirit promised is pretended gratuitously.

But let us grant that these and more examples exist, does it therefore follow that such a genitive of specification obtains in the place about which we dispute? Although even this being conceded, they will gain nothing for their cause, since this Power of the Holy Spirit is further distinguished from the power of signs. Nevertheless, we think this should by no means be conceded, since the simplicity of the phrase favors us, which must be destroyed not by hypotheses but by reasons.

The tenor of the construction is added. For Paul glories in those things which Christ worked through him ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει Πνεύματος ἁγίου [in power of signs and wonders, in power of the Holy Spirit]. Why should we establish without cause a genitive of cause in the former phrase, and a genitive of specification in the latter? Do not all things flow more easily if we establish that Paul, joining the causes of the wonderful effects of Gospel preaching, progresses from external to internal, from instrumental to efficient?

Finally c) just as we order pleonasm [redundancies] to depart from the style of the Holy Spirit, so in the sayings brought forward we find nothing analogous to our phrase. That the accumulation of sayings in those breathes not redundancy but singular emphasis, the best Interpreters have indicated, to whom we refer for the sake of avoiding prolixity. It suffices for us here that no mention of a personal subject occurs in all these phraseologies.

4) The same WATTS in the cited work joins another class of passages "in which he considers the names of the Holy Spirit and Power to alternate. Thus the miracles of Christ in Matthew 12:28 are attributed to the Holy Spirit, but in Luke 5:17 to the Power of the Lord. Thus the promise of the Spirit in Acts 1:4, 2:33 is called Power from on high in Luke 24:49. Thus in Zechariah 4:6 the Spirit of God is opposed to human power. Thus the resurrection of Christ in Ephesians 1:19, 2 Corinthians 13:4 is ascribed to the Power of God, but in 1 Peter 3:18 to the life-giving Spirit. The same obtains concerning our resurrection in 1 Corinthians 6:14 compared with Romans 8:11, etc."

Response: The same response returns here which was given in §. 25, n. 2 concerning sayings in which God and the Holy Spirit seemed to alternate. For from the same fountain of unity and order of operating in God must be sought the reasons why the same effect is sometimes ascribed to the Holy Spirit, sometimes to divine power in general.

5) The same author on p. 127 considers "that God wished to accommodate Himself in this way to the expressions of the nations in the East. Thus Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4:8-9, 18 acknowledges that the Spirit of the Holy Gods is in Daniel; and Pharaoh in Genesis 41:38 declares the same concerning Joseph."

Response: 1) To what extent certain traces of knowledge of the true God were present in these Kings cannot be determined. That some existed is established either from their commerce with the Hebrews, from Joseph's praised zeal in teaching the Egyptians (Psalm 105:22), from the efficacy which Joseph's words seem to have exerted on Pharaoh, from the confession finally which Nebuchadnezzar's experience of divine power expressed (Daniel 3:28-29). 2) Even if no such indications of knowledge were present, it would suffice that the Kings could speak thus concerning Joseph and Daniel from public report and from the testimony of others, just as Belshazzar in Daniel 5:14: "I have heard concerning you that the Spirit of the Gods is in you." 3) But if nevertheless with DRUSIUS, CLERICUS and others these expressions are thought to savor of paganism, who does not know that subordinate Polytheism reigned in Egypt equally as in Babylon? Why then also from the Gentile hypothesis would not the Spirit of the Gods designate an intelligence or some demon, from whom they thought those Holy Men were inspired?

XXXIII. Finally WATTS writes an Apology for those who think that most of these senses, if not all, can be admitted according to the diversity of the matter being treated. At the end, p. 162 ff., he notes "that in the sacred style, conformably to the Hebrew language and other Oriental tongues, the same word admits several notions. He produces as examples the words Law, Grace, Faith, Justice, Flesh, Body, Soul, etc. He especially clings to the word Word, which although sometimes is Personal, designating Christ, nevertheless sometimes denotes divine Power, but at other times signifies Revelation itself."

Response: This entire reasoning, which is rubbed over with little observations injurious to the wisdom and certainty of the sacred style, is beside the point, since personal names ought to be produced as examples, recurring so often, and not once or twice, but transferred in most places to designate now these, now those things.

CHAPTER IV. DEMONSTRATING THE DEITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Sacred Scripture celebrates the supreme and equal Deity of the Holy Spirit with the Father and Son, if not as frequently as that of the Son, yet equally clearly. To one who would seek some advantage for a bad cause from the rarer mention of this truth, a double prejudice could be opposed. For first, it was fitting that He who speaks through all the Prophets and Apostles as His scribes and secretaries should speak less about Himself, since the very work would abundantly praise its Author. Furthermore, He confesses His own affairs by commemorating the Glory of His own Deity in very few words. Who but an open enemy of Sacred Scripture would not rise up to the Holy Spirit testifying about Himself even once or twice, from whose perfect holiness it would be wicked to suppose that He would have wished to fraudulently seize even the smallest particle of Divine Glory for Himself.

Nevertheless, there is no small heap of testimonies pertaining to this matter, which, although already produced by many others, we shall here review with due selection in such order that it may be evident that not only Divine Names without any reservation, but also Divinity itself in full emphasis is ascribed to the Holy Spirit. The comparison of these has the more weight, the more evidently not only sound Reason teaches, but also the Holy Spirit Himself inculcates in the Word of the Lord, that God will not give His Glory to another.

II. Among the NAMES, יהוה excels, which we vindicate for the Holy Spirit: From the direct application of certain passages in the New Testament to the Holy Spirit, which in the Old Testament read the name יהוה. Let there be compared Hebrews III. 7-9 with Psalm XCV. 7-8 and Exodus XVII. 1-7. Hebrews IX. 7-8 with Leviticus XVI. 1-2. Hebrews X. 15-16 with Jeremiah XXXI. 31-33. From those sayings in the New Testament in which the name Κύριος is attributed to the Holy Spirit in such a way that it is evident it should be held as a translation of the name יהוה. Thus in the words of 2 Corinthians III. 17: "Now the Lord is the Spirit," the name Lord corresponds to Jehovah, because it is clear from the comparison with verse 16 that the matter concerns that Lord to whom Israel, with the veil of Moses removed, is to be converted at some time. But that this is Jehovah is manifest even from Hosea III. 5.

Nor does it hinder that the Lord seems to be the subject of this statement, to which HILARY in De Trinitate lib. II and BASIL in Contra Eunomium lib. III already inclined, the former understanding God in general by Lord, the latter specifically the second person. For AUGUSTINE in De Trinitate lib. II already rightly replied to them: "Lest anyone should think that the Son was signified and therefore the Spirit was mentioned on account of incorporeal substance," he continued: "But where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. But no one would doubt that the Spirit of the Lord and the Holy Spirit are the same." The same mind was held by CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT, and OECUMENIUS. Nor does any reason appear why HAMMOND, GROTIUS, CLERICUS, and WHITBY should concede to the Socinians that Christ is here indicated by Lord. For nowhere is the Son of God called Spirit by antonomasia.

And since the word Πνεῦμα recurring frequently in this chapter designates nothing but the third Hypostasis, and our comma easily admits the same notion, we rightly adhere to it.

IV. The most learned WHITBY observes two things to the contrary. 1) He pretends that Christ is called Spirit metonymically in the same way as He is called Way, Life, Resurrection, etc., because He is the Cause and Giver of the Holy Spirit and His operations. But it is not permitted to argue from those abstract words to a personal and characteristic name. Who, I ask, would undertake to defend that the Father is somewhere called Christ, because He is the first source of His mediatorial office and therefore also of all His benefits? 2) He presses the final words of v. 18: ἀπὸ Κυρίου Πνεύματος, which he thinks should be rendered "from the Lord of the Spirit," not "from the Spirit of the Lord," as it seems to many, because otherwise according to the constant usage of sacred style it should have been read in inverted order: ἀπὸ Πνεύματος Κυρίου.

We confess that this reasoning is compelling for refuting those who through the latter version can snatch this phrase also from us. But since it is equally plainly unusual for the Son to be called Lord of the Holy Spirit, we seize upon this observation for our cause, and we are

sense with the accusative gathered by learned men, cannot be doubted. The distinguished WOLFIUS cited and excerpted them in his notes on this passage, and to those adduced deserved to be added PEARSON in *Symbolum Exerc. 8*, WITTICH in *Causa Spiritus Sancti §. 17*, WITSIUS in *Symbolum Apostolicum Exerc. 23. §. 21*, and DEUTSCHMANN in his singular dissertation on this passage defended at Wittenberg 1667.

But this being admitted, the final words of verse 4, οὐκ ἔψευσω ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ, illustrate that phrase and aggravate the crime of Ananias from the fact that lying to the Holy Spirit, he lied not to men, but to God. Thus that Spirit is exalted above all the Apostles, although they enjoyed the highest excellence above all other mortals, and is said to be God Himself. And singular strength is added to this opinion when in verse 9 Sapphira, partner in the crime, is said πειράσαι τὸ Πνεῦμα Κυρίου, to have tempted the Spirit of the Lord. For πειράζειν here corresponds to ἥμαρ, which frequently denotes sin fraudulently committed against the very God of Israel (Exodus 17:2, 7; Numbers 14:22; Psalm 78:62, 95:10, 106:15).

8. But how vain is their evasion when they want these words to be taken in the same way as 1 Thessalonians 4:8: "he who rejects us does not reject man, but God," and likewise Exodus 16:8, Matthew 10:40, Luke 10:16, where similar expressions occur, CALOVIUS has most fully taught in *Examen libri Crellii de Uno Deo Patre* p. 464 ff., beyond the praised authors. The more we wonder that after other Arminians, LIMBORCH himself in *Theologia Christiana* 2.17.6.23 rejected this saying. Different indeed, to add our own small contribution, is the reason of our passage from those others, because through the Holy Spirit and the Apostles, considered as men, different personal subjects are designated. Ananias is not accused of lying against the Apostles, but rather against the Holy Spirit, who indeed was in them, but nevertheless did not pertain to their persons.

Therefore either the Holy Spirit will designate some middle substance between God and the Apostles, or He will be the same as He who is immediately called God. The former not only repugnant to the analogy of Faith and Reason, but also to the context, because this being posited, the assumption should have been instituted thus: "you have not lied to the Holy Spirit, but to God." And therefore the latter must necessarily be admitted.

B. Those who despised Moses and the Apostles are therefore said to have despised God and Christ Himself, because they spoke in their name. But here the reason for the crime is plainly different. Ananias lies to the Holy Spirit, not as to a Legate of God, but as to the omniscient Searcher of hearts.

C. But also CRELLIUS with his brethren, adhering to this objection, cut down their own vineyards. For first, it is right that they admit the subsistence of the Holy Spirit. For nothing is more forced than to say that someone lies to a Gift of God, or tempts it. It is added that they themselves pretend that the same sin was here committed against the Holy Spirit and the Apostles. Second, just as the reason why those despising Moses and the Apostles despised God Himself was no other than because they were Legates of God, so the reason why those lying to the Apostles would lie to God Himself was this, because the Authority of God's Legates belonged to them. But since they had their mission from the Holy Spirit speaking through their mouth (Matthew 10:20, Acts 2:4, 7:51, 8:29, etc.), it is evident that the Holy Spirit is God Himself.

9. Nor should the saying of 1 Corinthians 3:16 be neglected here: Οὐκ οἴδατε, ὅτι ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐστε, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; "Do you not know that you are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwells in you?" For that the word God here is to be understood so broadly as to include the Holy Spirit is clear from this, both because it is immediately added that the Spirit of God dwells in believers, and because Paul, referring to this passage in chapter 6:19 of the same Epistle, directly calls the body of the faithful the Temple of the Holy Spirit.

CYPRIAN already drew the same extension of the name Θεός from this saying in Epistle 73 to Jubaianus, writing concerning one baptized by heretics: "If he has obtained remission of sins and has been sanctified and made 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? Neither could he become a Temple of this one, who denies Christ to be God. If of the Holy Spirit? Since the three are one, how can the Holy Spirit be placated toward him who is an enemy either of the Father or of the Son?"

This is the more compelling because that Θεός of whom the Apostles are said to be συνεργοί in verse 1 is the Holy Spirit Himself, as PLACEUS notes against CRELLIUS in Tom. 2, p. 1118.

10. But that these Names are attributed to the Holy Spirit in full emphasis is evident, since the entire Perfection and Glory of most absolute Deity is predicated of Him. To this pertains in general, that He is said to be One with the Father and Son (1 John 5:7); that He is commemorated in the same order with the Father and Son there, where association of a creature has no place, namely Isaiah 48:16, Matthew 28:19, 1 Corinthians 12:4-6, 2 Corinthians 13:13, which sayings have already been vindicated in chapter 2, §. 1 ff.; and that He is asserted to be in God, as the spirit of man is in man (1 Corinthians 2:10-11). For it is permitted to infer from this that just as the spirit of man pertains to the essence of man, so the Spirit of God constitutes the very divine essence by the same Necessity of Nature as the Father and Son.

But this will be clear more distinctly from the fact that Scripture predicates of Him both truly divine Attributes and their manifestation, both active through Works requiring divine omnisufficiency, and passive through the admission of religious Worship belonging to God alone. Nothing beyond this can anyone demand with any appearance of equity for overthrowing all doubts concerning the divine Glory of the Holy Spirit.

11. Since all DIVINE ATTRIBUTES are contained in the Idea of most perfect Life, He who possesses whatever pertains to it in the most perfect manner must certainly be acknowledged as God. Whatever constitutes most perfect life is accomplished by most perfect intellect and will. The former belongs to the omniscient Spirit, the latter to the omnipotent. He possesses both in the most perfect manner who through absolute Eternity, and therefore through the very Necessity and Independence of His Nature, is the Possessor of such excellence. But the sacred pages supply so vast and sublime a concept concerning the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

12. OMNISCIENCE includes adequate Knowledge of God Himself and of all creatures. The Apostle clearly ascribes both to the Holy Spirit in 1 Corinthians 2:10-11. For here is first established the most universal object of His Knowledge, namely all things, not excepting the

very depths of God. Moreover, that the mode of this Knowledge is adequate is evident, both because there is nothing in Him beyond the depths of God, and because this Knowledge is denied to any Creature: "The things of God no one knows except the Spirit of God."

13. To wrest this club from us, the Adversaries commit various beggings of the question, for example: that the Holy Spirit is here distinguished from God; that men have received Him; that He is said to be from God; that it cannot be said that He alone knows the things of God, since the same things are known by the Father and Son besides Him; and similar things, which we have partly addressed in Chapter 3, §. 24, and which will partly fall from the examination of His Relations. More closely pertaining to the matter is:

A. "That searching the depths of God does not agree with divine omniscience." The Fathers have responded to this difficulty in two ways. Some thought that this is ascribed to the Holy Spirit absolutely, which He does for unbelievers, whom He impels to search τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ. SCHLICHTING and CLARK seize upon the same for their cause. Yet this cannot be admitted, both because the words breathe greater emphasis, since our Apostle teaches that τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ are ἀνεξερεύνητα even to themselves in Romans 11:33, and because from the force of the opposition in verse 11 it is clear that the matter concerns the Spirit of God, who is in God.

Many note that τὸ ἐρευνᾶν indicates not ignorance, but through ἀνθρωποπάθειαν most accurate knowledge. SUICER will give passages under this word. We rest in the latter response, not only because such a figure is most frequent, but also because ἐρευνᾶν occurs expressly in this sense in Revelation 2:23. Thus also רָקַח, which the LXX put for ἐρευνᾶν in Job 28:27, is attributed to God. And the context confirms this interpretation, because what the Holy Spirit is said to search in verse 10, the same He is asserted to know in verse 11.

B. ENJEDINUS adds "that τὰ πάντα here should be restricted to those things which pertain to the doctrine of salvation." But neither does the necessity of this limitation appear in the text; and even if it were conceded, no prejudice would accrue to us from it. For to all those things contained in the doctrine of salvation pertain the divine decrees, whose intimate knowledge befits no one unless he was part of them. Hence all the sayings which declare Him to be the Author of the divine Word and especially of the Prophetic oracles make for the omniscience of the Holy Spirit.

14. Our Savior ascribes OMNIPOTENCE to the Holy Spirit in John 3:8, compare with our notes. 1 Corinthians 12:11 agrees with this. For who will deny that He who works all things which He wills and as He wills is omnipotent? Nor does SCHLICHTING extricate himself here otherwise than through the fiction of prosopopoeia, which we destroyed in Chapter 2, §. 11.

More speciously SAM. CLARKE in De Trinitate Part 1, cap. 4, n. 1228 pretends that those words καθὼς βούλεται should be referred to the Father; and he wants the same to have been the mind of IRENAEUS in that Symbol which is read in lib. 4, cap. 62, and of ATHANASIUS in various places. But besides the fact that suspicion of this reference is plainly absent from John 3:8, the same would also render the construction most harsh, since between these words and the mention of God or the Father made in verse 6, not only does so great an

interval intervene, but also mention of the Holy Spirit is injected for the fifth time in the intervening clauses, with every other subject excluded.

Nor is any account taken of our phrase in the words of ATHANASIUS. And if he had done so, he would have been contrary to himself, since in Ad Serapionem Epistles 1 and 3, as well as De Incarnatione §. 14, he expressly adduces this saying to defend the supreme Deity of the Holy Spirit.

But IRENAEUS in the cited place professes "πίστιν ὀλόκληρον εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ τὰς οἰκονομίας Πατρὸς τε καὶ Υἱοῦ σκηνοβατοῦν, καθ' ἑκάστην γενεάν ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, καθὼς βούλεται ὁ Πατήρ" - "complete faith in the Spirit of God, who set forth the dispensations of the Father and Son, according to which He was present to the human race in each generation, as the Father wills."

By these words it is not likely that he aims at our saying. For he treats of a plainly different matter, namely concerning the dispensations or Economies of the Father and Son - those namely which he had just described, through which the Son of God was made man. Add that the orthodox faith of IRENAEUS concerning the Holy Spirit is established from other sources, as we shall soon prove.

15. OMNIPRESENCE vindicates the same Divine Perfections for the Holy Spirit, which is celebrated in Him in Psalm 139:7. The phrases here are so sublime that such presence falls only upon God. And what had been said concerning the Spirit of the Lord is soon predicated of God Himself. Those also who are persuaded concerning the Most Holy Trinity will apprehend an evident trace of that mystery in this clause, which makes such a distinction between Jehovah, His Face, and His Spirit, that without tautology these words cannot be drawn elsewhere. LORINUS heaps up very many sayings of the Fathers who acknowledged this. But this being granted, who will not acknowledge Him to be omniscient and omnipotent, whose eyes and hand no one will escape?

The same is proven by the immense amplitude of the Operations of the Holy Spirit to be enumerated in their proper place, filling heaven and earth in the whole Kingdom both of Nature and of Grace with the innumerable multitude of objects. For the Holy Spirit is not only present to men separated from Him; but He also assists as an inhabitant to each and every Angel, Principality, Throne, and Dominion, as DIDYMUS says in lib. 1 De Spiritu Sancto. This is the more compelling because these operations extend to the very Son of God and His universal Kingdom.

Whence whatever confirms the Deity of the Son also pleads indirectly for the Deity of Him whose Temple and Anointed the Son of God Himself wished to be. BIDELELL indeed had thought he had found something significant, opposing that operations separated by the greatest intervals of places are also attributed to Satan at the same time, and this by an immediate mode of acting. For this matter he appeals to Mark 4:15: "Satan comes immediately and takes away the word sown in their hearts." But CLOPPENBORG gave him a thorough combing in Tom. 2, p. 493 ff., indicating both that he fraudulently uses the word "immediately," which the English Version puts for εὐθέως "forthwith," and that Satan does not necessarily denote the Prince of Demons, but also any of his angels. Add that whatever he

does through the allurements of the world or any impious persons is also rightly attributed to Satan.

16. That the Holy Spirit is ETERNAL is established from those passages which teach that He was not only present at the beginning of Creation (Genesis 1:3), but pre-existed in the very eternal Decree and Counsel. For that the Spirit is designated by the mind of the Lord in Romans 11:34 is clear from the comparison with Isaiah 40:13. And Proverbs 8:23, the eternal Anointing of Wisdom presupposes the Oil of the Holy Spirit.

17. The DIVINE WORKS which are ascribed to Him extend most widely. The Father and Son have undertaken nothing, brought nothing into act, of which He has not been a partner. That He was part of the divine Decree and Creator of the World is established simultaneously from the passages just adduced. The latter is confirmed by Job 26:13, 33:4, Psalm 33:4. But He is also active in the Conservation and Renovation of the world (Psalm 104:29-30, 147:18), and indeed is the Author of miracles, declining from the order of this visible World and therefore having the likeness of New Creation (Matthew 12:28, Acts 2:4, 1 Corinthians 12:4-11).

There are added all the Operations of Grace, especially those which concern the application of Salvation, both in regard to the very Son of God, who, notwithstanding the omnisufficiency of His own Deity, wished to be filled and led by this Spirit (Isaiah 61:1-2, Matthew 3:16, 4:1, 12:28, Luke 4:1), and in regard to the universal Church and individual elect, whom He efficaciously vivifies, converts, preserves, and finally will resurrect and glorify, as will be more abundantly evident from the examination of the Economy of the Holy Spirit, from which singular dissertation the most renowned Theologian of Jena, JO. FR. BUDDEUS, demonstrated His Divinity.

18. It is clear that Divine Honor must be given to Him who manifests such conspicuous specimens of His Deity. Therefore, whatever can be referred to Him is attributed to the Holy Spirit. The highest point of this consists in ADORATION. Whether examples of prayers directed to the Holy Spirit are sufficient is controversial.

We concede that they are rather rare, and this from the divine economy, according to which He Himself is the Spirit of prayers (Zechariah 12:10). However, no cloud is objected to the divine Glory of the Holy Spirit from this. For both through prayers generally directed to God and at the same time the Spirit who is in God is honored; and that efficacy which He exerts when He renders the elect suitable for the worship of God is so glorious and truly divine a work that He is thereby glorified eternally by them.

Yet to show that some examples exist, we appeal to the trisagion of Isaiah 6:3, which appears to pertain also to the Holy Spirit from what is noted in §7. Hence its parallel in Revelation 4:8 must be extended to it. Also add the place brought in Daniel 9:19. In the New Testament also, the command of Adoration of the Holy Spirit is evident from the comparison of Matthew 9:38 with Acts 13:1-4. Nor does the example seem to be lacking in Acts 4:24-25, since it is manifest from the person speaking in Psalm 2:1, who spoke through the mouth of David, that it was the Holy Spirit, distinguished from Jehovah and His Anointed, and from the comparison with Acts 1:16. But also Simeon in Luke 2:29 adores that Lord who had foretold that he would see Christ, who was the Holy Spirit, as is shown in verse 26.

19. These specimens enjoy so much greater weight, as it is more evident that such things are attributed to the Holy Spirit which suppose or involve the office of Adoration. This is clear from the VOWS of the Saints, who truly ask for divine benefits from the Holy Spirit. For such vows are nothing else than a testimony about Him, whom we consider as the Fountain of such goods, whom we beseech by prayers. Among such vows we count the Priestly Blessing in Numbers 6:25, where it is vowed to Jehovah, who is third in order, that He may lift up His face and grant peace, as well as the Pauline vow in 2 Corinthians 13:13 and that of John in Revelation 1:4, in which χάριν καὶ εἰρήνην grace and peace are prayed ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπτὰ πνευμάτων, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ from the seven spirits who are before His throne. Exceptions, by which this place seems to be liable to some others, easily vanish when we have proved, first, that the explanations of those who understand by the seven Spirits something other than the third Person of the Deity contain nothing probable; second, that there are sufficient reasons why the Apostle wished to designate by the name of seven Spirits only the Holy Spirit.

20. Those who strive to weaken the demonstrative force of this statement contend that these seven Spirits denote either sevenfold Gifts and Operations considered abstractly, or, as most incline, as many principal Angels from the heavenly family. To the former we oppose that the name is personal; and it is commemorated in the middle place between the Persons of the Father and the Son; and the source of the benefit which is vowed is distinguished from the benefit itself. Nor does τὸ ἐν διὰ δυοῖν have place here, which GROTIUS pretends, as if peace from God and the seven Spirits were peace from God operating through seven modes; since Hendiadys is not only very rare in the sacred writings, but especially in personal names, particularly those occupying the middle place between preceding and following personal names, it has no place.

Against the latter it argues that nowhere in other places of Scripture is this honor attributed to Angels, that divine gifts should be sought from them; which also does not befit them, since Grace and Peace contains the sum of all good things, comprehended in the solemn Vow both Priestly in Numbers 6 and Apostolic, in almost all the beginnings of Paul's Epistles; that it is very difficult to conceive that Angels occupy the middle place between the Father and the Son; that finally these Seven Spirits in chapters 4 and 5 are not reckoned among creatures exhibiting honor to God, but are immediately joined with the description of His Throne and therefore with the object of the following Doxologies.

It is indeed objected that to stand before the throne belongs only to attending subjects, to receive commands. But in the text it is not read that they stand, but that they are before His throne, and that in the same place as the Lamb, and therefore in the midst of the throne (Revelation 5:6). Nor is that place which they urge, 1 Timothy 5:21, πρὸς διόνυσσον. For to appoint Angels as Witnesses, and to pray for divine Gifts from Angels, are actions differing by the whole heaven.

Therefore it is not surprising that not only almost all the ancients, but also among the moderns the better Interpreters understand the Holy Spirit here with such consensus, that PERERIVS himself, despite the ingratitude of the Papists, acknowledged in disputation 7 on the Apocalypse that this opinion is almost common among Interpreters, so that he does not dare entirely disapprove it when uttered by so many and such great Men. And it is all the

more troublesome that some among the Protestants, BEZA, HAMMOND, JOH. MEDE, H. MORE, have conceded to the same opinion, indeed that JOH. REYNOLDS has placed it as the foundation of his Angelic System, which he published in English in 1723.

21. But so that the Interpreters, at least those placed outside the parts, may be more favorable to us, it must be observed more accurately to what the Apostle looked in his salutation. The hypothesis of those who with AUGUSTINE, COCCEJUS, GRELLUS, VITRINGA think that Isaiah 11:2 is alluded to, does not exhaust the matter. For the attributes there ascribed to the Spirit of Jehovah make up not a septenary, but a senary. Therefore nothing else can be drawn from this at most than that in sacred phraseology it is not unusual to distinguish different properties of the same divine Spirit as if they were different Spirits; which also happens in Romans 8:15, where the Spirit of bondage and the Spirit of adoption, although they are the same person, are commemorated as different.

Therefore those who think that the type of the golden Candlestick is to be considered hit closer to the mark: either with the distinguished WITSIUS in the cited work 1, §. 31, looking at the seven lamps of the containing work, proceeding from the lampstand itself; or with others to the oil through the seven *תקצומ* tubes or funnels in Zechariah 4 derived into its bowl; or, what seems most fitting to me, to the very Sacred Fire, which burned divided through seven flames in this Candlestick.

Hence it is that these seven Spirits are called *ἑπτὰ λαμπάδες πυρὸς καίόμεναι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου* seven lamps of fire burning before the Throne (Revelation 4:5), and with the *ἀστραπαῖς* lightning flashes proceeding from the throne (compare Daniel 7:10) they are so joined that there is no doubt that the same Fire, which proceeded from the throne like a river, divided in these *λαμπάσι πυρὸς*, that is, lamps, which were entirely nothing but fire, although they preserved the form of lamps, formed as many rays or shining horns of fire above the head of the Lamb (Revelation 5:6). Therefore the same matter was here, fire one body divided into seven shining strictures. And this was analogous to that Phenomenon of the same Fire, foreshadowing the same Spirit of God, but distinguished in the figures of flaming tongues (Acts 2:3).

22. But lest any scruple remain which could arise from the fact that this unusual and enigmatic naming of the Holy Spirit occurs in the Apostolic Salutation, which seemed to require a simpler style, we bring forward three things to be observed.

First, the entire description of the Holy Trinity, which John addresses in his vow, is composed from the enigmas of the following visions. This was done most wisely, since by this means a path was laid out for understanding the mystery of the visions themselves and especially the representations of the Holy Trinity in a God-befitting manner. Therefore, this description presents the Holy Spirit not as He is in His essence, but as His image was both in the Vision and in that Type of the Sanctuary from which that Vision was derived. Therefore, those who consider our interpretation inconvenient are ignorant of the method of Typological discipline, in which the same personal subject in relation to His various operations or objects is very often represented under divided species. Thus two Altars, sacrifices multiplied at the same time, drops of blood divided through sevenfold sprinkling, and so forth, foreshadowed the same Sacrifice of Christ, indeed the same Christ, and His various relations and applications.

23. Secondly, we especially urge that τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα here should with greater right be rendered seven Winds rather than seven Spirits. For it is clear from the cited places in Revelation 4 and 5 that these πνεύματα were visible. Yet the word πνεῦμα is never attributed to any visible body. But if you ask in what form these Winds could have appeared? None certainly more fitting than structures of fire, which, inflamed by the rapidity of movements in the air and driven by them, most swiftly fly around and divide themselves most widely, just as is accustomed to happen in the greatest tempests and storms, which are usually mixed with lightning. Hence Winds and flames of fire occur as joined emblems of the same subjects in Psalm 104:4. Indeed, the Holy Spirit Himself was poured out under the joined phenomena of a mighty wind and tongues of fire in Acts 2:2-3, and is therefore emphatically called רוּחַ בַּעַר, Spirit or Wind of fire.

It deserves to be compared to this place the most learned commentary of NIC. NONNIUS, my most closely joined colleague, whose exquisite erudition combined with rare virtue threatens a singular honor to the Christian world equally as to the Literary world, on the Baptism of Fire adorning the Bremen Museum Vol. 1 p. 468 ff. For there especially in §. 8 ff. he has collected very many things concerning fiery Winds, Presters, and Typhoons, which bring no small light to this hypothesis of ours.

24. Third, the Evangelist himself provides the key to unlocking this mystery in Chapter 5:6, where seven horns and seven eyes are joined together, either because in those Horns, that is, fiery lamps, as many eyes appeared, or because the same little flames appearing above the head of the Lamb had the likeness both of horns and of radiating eyes. I have treated of shining Horns in Bibliotheca Bremensia Class 2, p. 680 ff. But also shining eyes are described by the same phrase ὡσεὶ λαμπάδες πυρός in Ezekiel 1:27, Daniel 10:6. Compare the distinguished ELSNER illustrating this phrase in Observations on Apocalypse 1:14.

But concerning these, in place of explanation is added οἱ εἰσι τὰ ἑπτὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πνεύματα τὰ ἀπεσταλμένα εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, which words are manifestly drawn from Zechariah 4:10, where concerning those seven eyes directed to the stone in chapter 3:9 and looking at the plumb line in Zerubbabel's hand it is said: יהוה עיני המה משוטטים בכל הארץ. The LXX there read ἑπτὰ οὗτοι ὀφθαλμοὶ εἰσιν οἱ ἐπιβλέποντες ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. But the Apostle substituted ἀπεσταλμένα for ἐπιβλέποντες, since שׁוֹט also denotes to wander, to traverse, and that by force of mission. Thus it is used of Joab surveying the Israelites in 2 Samuel 24:2. But also concerning the eyes of Jehovah in 2 Chronicles 16:9 the same phrase occurs, with an addition which can be considered as its exegesis.

But those Seven Eyes, just as they are referred to the Divine Economy when they are called the Eyes of Jehovah, so they are the same as the Spirit of the Lord in verse 6. For what is there predicted to be accomplished not by armies nor by strength, but by the Spirit of Jehovah, the same in verse 10 compared with 2 Chronicles 16:9 is attributed to the Eyes of Jehovah. Not contemptible traces of this truth occur in the Cabala of the Jews, in which the name שכניה, which we noted in Chapter 2:19 was given to the Holy Spirit, is the same as the Kingdom of the world, namely to be administered through the Messiah and His Spirit. But this Kingdom comprehends the Seven lower Sephiroth, which they call seven lamps and seven voices and thunders, and also seven eyes from Zechariah.

See RHENFERD'S Dissertation p. 25 ff. These things suffice to vindicate the noble passage, which the distinguished BUDDEUS has also considerably illustrated with his own observations in *Meditatio Pentecostalis*.

25. For the same Honor of Adoration furthermore argues B. That a TEMPLE is assigned to the Holy Spirit in 2 Corinthians 3:16, 6:19. But a Temple is the House of God, and indeed such a one as is precisely destined for His invocation (Isaiah 56:7). Deeply moving here is AUGUSTINE'S prayer in lib. 1 contra Maximinum Num. 2: "Would we not be anathematized by the truth of Christ and by the Church of God if we made a Temple of wood and stones to some most excellent holy Angel, since we would exhibit to a creature that service which is owed to God alone? If therefore we would be sacrilegious by making a Temple to any creature, how is He not true God, to whom we do not make a Temple, but we ourselves are His Temple?"

Nor do I think I shall wander beyond the olive trees when I refer here those phrases by which the Holy Spirit is said to rest upon the Prophets and Illustrious Men of the Old Testament (Numbers 11:25, 2 Kings 2:14), upon the Messiah (Isaiah 11:2), upon the faithful of the New Testament (1 Peter 4:14). For the phrase of resting concerning the inhabitation of the Lord in the Sanctuary of the Old Testament occurs quite frequently (Psalm 95:11, 132:8, 14). And the Rest of the Spirit of Jehovah alternates with the Rest of His soul (Isaiah 63:2). And the LXX in the same sense put ἀναπαύειν for שכן in Isaiah 57:15.

But most emphatic here are Peter's words: Μακάριοι, ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται "Blessed are you, for the Spirit of glory and of God rests upon you." For that Δόξα or Glory alludes to the Cloud of Glory resting upon the Sanctuary, that is, the שכנה itself, concerning which the Masters of the Hebrews speak in a similar manner. To this contribute among other things the words of BERESCHIT RABBA 26 on Genesis 9: למה היו זקנים בוכים לפי שראו שלא שרתה שכנה בבית האחרון והאיל שלא שרתה בו שכנה למה נאמר גדול יהיה וגו' "Why were the elders weeping? Because they saw that the Schechina did not rest in the second Temple. But if the Schechina did not rest in it, why was it said, 'The glory of this latter house shall be greater'?"

The distinguished HASAEUS will give more, most learnedly as usual, on Haggai 2, §§. 7-8.

26. C. Among the modes of invoking the Lord is to be reckoned OATH in His name, or appeal to Him as supreme Judge and Witness. The Apostle exhibits this honor to the Holy Spirit in Romans 9:1.

D. But also BAPTISM in His name (Matthew 28:19) is an honor befitting God alone (1 Corinthians 1:13). Compare Chapter 2, §. 12. FAUSTINUS excellently urges this argument at the end of his book against the Arians: "But also when the Lord commands that the Gentiles be baptized in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, it is most evident that the Holy Spirit is not a creature, either from that very association which He has together with the Father and Son, or because the Lord never commanded that anyone be baptized in the name of a creature. For much would be detracted from divine power if, along with the confession of the divine name, an equal confession of a creature were also placed. And it is well that He placed one name, saying: 'In the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit,' so that one principal authority of the indivisible and perfect Trinity might be believed."

But that Baptism at the same time involves Invocation is manifest from its conjunction with this in Acts 22:16.

E. Add that we are bound to FAITH in the Holy Spirit, and indeed with the same emphasis with which faith in the Father and Son is to be exercised. Hence believing and being baptized in relation to the entire Trinity is joined in Matthew 28:19. And the Testimony of the Holy Spirit equally as of the remaining persons is to be received as the Testimony of God through Faith (John 5:7, 9-10). DIDYMUS in lib. 2 De Spiritu Sancto not badly compares here Ephesians 4:5: "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism." For here not only are Faith and Baptism joined, but Unity is also assigned to both, because namely it operates in one and the same manner concerning the Holy Spirit as concerning the Father and Son. Whence it follows that if Faith in the Father and Son involves Adoration, Faith in the Holy Spirit extends equally far.

F. But He also declares Himself to be the Goal of the entire Evangelical Ministry in Acts 13:2, commanding: "Separate for ME Barnabas and Saul." Therefore the Apostles were devoted to the service of the Holy Spirit, although they wished to be considered only as servants of the Lord (1 Corinthians 7:23).

27. However, a controversy has been raised by some concerning whether it is fitting to direct prayers distinctly to the Holy Spirit apart from the Father and Son, and to ask from Him either the same or certain different benefits individually. John Forbes at least in *Instructio Historiae Theologicae* lib. 1, cap. 23 considers that it is not a suitable mode of adoration if the three Persons are invoked as if separately in a continuous series with three distinct adorations. As concerns us, we judge that the examples we have adduced abundantly establish this matter, and those who admit them will simultaneously acknowledge that the Holy Spirit has been addressed separately by the saints, both for the same benefits and for different ones.

Nor is it to be feared that in this way something divided in the divine Essence will present itself to the one praying, provided only that he is persuaded of the Unity of that Essence. For whoever distinctly asks the same benefit from the Three Persons confesses that His glory pertains to the individual Persons. And whoever prays for different benefits, that order is before his eyes according to which Benefits, separated as to effect and the nature of the object, but as to nature intimately connected to each other, are desired from those Persons who, as Scripture teaches, have the closest relation to them. The distinguished Zacharias Grapius has treated this matter more extensively in *Theologia Recentium Controversiarum* Part 1, p. 178 ff.

28. As evidently as Sacred Scripture finally asserts the Divine Honor of the Holy Spirit, so clearly does it condemn injury to Him, and threatens His VENGEANCE so atrocious that it befits only the supreme Majesty of God. It suffices to note in this matter that Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is declared unforgivable in Matthew 12:31-32. For the foundation from which flows the gravity of such punishment, which is not to be remitted forever, can be nothing other than the infinite dignity of the Person against whom this sin is committed.

29. It is vainly objected that this sin is not therefore unforgivable because the Holy Spirit Himself is God, but because he who sins against the Holy Spirit, by the same act sins against God with uplifted hand. For it concerns precisely such a sin as is distinguished from sins against the Father and Son.

B. CLARK in the cited work p. 187 adds that here the works of the Holy Spirit are to be understood, not the person: for no reason is available why Blasphemy against the person of the Holy Spirit should be more unforgivable than against the person of the Son. But since the works of the Holy Spirit are the most efficacious means for the conviction of men, therefore their rejection is the greatest aggravation of guilt.

Response: 1. Just as Blasphemy against the Son concerns His person, so the same must be determined concerning Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. 2. Blasphemy properly is a vice which has as its object not a thing, but a person, since it is in reality a most atrocious species of calumny. 3. We reverse the argument. For no certain preeminence of dignity can be attributed to the work of the Holy Spirit in the present case, in which it was a matter of miracles, which were the works of both the Son and the Holy Spirit. 4. The circumstances give another very plain reason. For the Majesty of the Son was thus far concealed, but the Majesty of the Holy Spirit struck the eyes and mind. 5. Those very works which CLARK grants to the Holy Spirit were divine.

C. He adds that not sin in general, but specifically Blasphemy against the Spirit is declared unforgivable not because of this singular Act, but because of an incorrigible Habit, of which such an Act was a Sign, whence also in the following verse 33 this similitude is employed, that a bad tree is known by bad fruit.

Response: We easily admit the former member of this observation. But we deny 1) that incorrigible and unforgivable are synonyms. The latter is the foundation of the former. The most obstinate sinner does not resist the will of God except insofar as he is left to himself and excluded from the efficacy of Christ's merit. 2) The consequence is also null, for whether a Habit or an Act of sin is indicated, it is all the same to us, as long as it has not been refuted that the aggravation of it in this place is sought from the dignity of the object.

30. The Ante-Nicene Church itself from the beginnings of Christianity has risen up to the weight of so many arguments. Vain are the attempts of CRELLIUS, SAND, and WHISTON against this truth, the latter of whom proceeds to such audacity in Account of the Primitive Faith Article 20, p. 369 ff. that he asserts that not before the declining 4th century was the Holy Spirit either directly named God or invoked by Christians. Yet he affirms this with the same faith with which a little later he praises PETAVIUS as agreeing with him, adducing his words from Theologia Dogmatica Tom. 2, lib. 1, c. 14, in which he says that most Christians had not dared to openly profess the Holy Spirit as God, and also that the first of all Synods, the Alexandrian in 362 AD, decreed that the Holy Spirit should be held as God.

For it is manifest that PETAVIUS there deals only with those Fathers who in the 4th century fought against the Arians and Macedonians. For in the preceding sections the same author had shown that first Origen had dared to openly violate the dignity of the Holy Spirit, but that the Nicene Synod had defined nothing concerning the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, since no question about it had been raised. But he notes that the dissimulation of the 4th-century

Fathers arose from a study of peace and concord. Indeed in lib. 3, c. 7 he expressly proves against CRELLIUS that very many before Hilary, indeed before Dionysius of Alexandria, had asserted the true and supreme Deity of the Holy Spirit.

31. And how truly we vindicate the Antiquity of the Church for ourselves, even that most ancient Doxology, already employed by POLYCARP and the Church of Smyrna, teaches, which is directed to the Holy Spirit equally as to the Father and Son. For although the Ancients promiscuously asserted that the Father and Son should be glorified now with the Holy Spirit, now in the Holy Spirit, the latter is nevertheless to be understood economically and explained through the former, as DION. PETAVIUS in *Theologia Dogmatica* P. 2, Lib. 2, cap. 6, GEORG. BULL in *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae* Sect. 11, p. 55 ff., and JOH. FRID. BURG in *Dissertatio de Spiritus Sancti Glorificatione* Leipzig 1711 have abundantly proved after others.

Already in the 2nd century JUSTIN MARTYR in *Apology* 1, §. 6, declaring the common faith of Christians of his time, says: "Ἄλλ' ἐκεῖνόν τε, καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ Υἱὸν ἐλθόντα καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἐπομένων, καὶ ἐξομοιουμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατόν, πνεῦμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνούμεν, λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες." "But Him equally (namely the Father) and the Son, who came from Him and taught us these things, and the army of other good angels who follow Him and are fashioned after His likeness, and the Prophetic Spirit we religiously honor and adore, venerating them in reason and truth."

This is so clear that WHISTON in the cited work Article 21, p. 376 confesses that these expressions of JUSTIN could have excited a dispute as to how far Adoration befits the Holy Spirit, unless Light appeared from the Apostolic Constitutions as to how this matter stands. As if any light could be hoped for from a spurious writing to be referred to the times of the Arians rather than from the writings of JUSTIN MARTYR.

But it is also clear that ATHENAGORAS designates the Holy Spirit with the name of GOD from the passage cited in Chapter 2, §. 17; to which add that in the same work §. 22 he says: "We assert God and His Son the Word and the Holy Spirit united according to power."

We join IRENAEUS lib. 4, cap. 12, who concerning the passage Isaiah 57:16 "The spirit shall go forth from me, and I have made every breath," speaks thus: "Assigning the Spirit properly to God, whom in the last times He poured out through the adoption of sons into the human race; but showing the breath commonly in creation and made by Him. But that which is made is different from Him who made it. Therefore the breath is temporal, but the Spirit is eternal." For when he says "τὸ πνεῦμα ἰδίως ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τάξας," which the Interpreter renders "assigning the Spirit properly to God," he acknowledges that the Holy Spirit pertains to the *ιδιότητα* of the divine essence, and from this foundation he places Him before all creatures and attributes eternity to Him from before. Compare MASSUET *Dissertation on Irenaeus* 3, Article 5, §. 63.

But what is clearer than that passage of TERTULLIAN against Praxeas cap. 2? "He thinks the one God is not to be believed otherwise than if he says that He Himself is the same both Father and Son and Holy Spirit: as if He were not thus also one in all things, through the unity of substance, and nevertheless the Sacrament of the *οικονομία* is preserved, which

disposes the unity into Trinity, directing three: Father and Son and Holy Spirit. But three not in status but in degree; not in substance but in form; not in power, but in aspect: but of one substance and one status and one power: because one God, from whom these degrees and forms and aspects are assigned in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."

32. At the beginning of the 3rd century CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA in Paedagogus lib. 3 at the end makes this summary of prayers: that giving thanks night and day alike until that perfect day, we may praise, and praising may give thanks to the Son and Father σὺν καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, with the Holy Spirit also. And although ORIGEN as well as DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA are spoken ill of because of their corrupted doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, nevertheless both acknowledged His Deity. The former strives to terrify PAUL OF SAMOSATA in his Response to Propositions through this: "Not with impunity," he says, "will you endure, who are blasphemous against the benign Holy Spirit. But the Spirit is God." Concerning the latter, BASIL THE GREAT himself confesses in Opera Vol. 2 Ad Amphilochium c. 20: "We find Origen in many places of his Expositions on the Psalms attributing Glory to God together with the Holy Spirit." The same author acknowledges the same concerning JULIUS AFRICANUS, Origen's σύγχρονος.

33. As manifest as these things are, so vain are the clouds which the Pneumatomachi spread. WHISTON according to his custom glories chiefly in the Apostolic Constitutions in the cited place Article 19, p. 340 ff. But besides the fact that we reject them, he produces no decisive passage, if you depart from the words adduced from lib. 6, c. 11: "Ἐνα Θεὸν, ἐνὸς Υἱοῦ Πατέρα, οὐ πλειόνων, ἐνὸς παρακλήτου διὰ Χριστοῦ, τῶν ἄλλων ταγμάτων ποιητήν, ἕνα δημιουργόν, διαφόρου κτίσεως διὰ Χριστοῦ ποιητήν."

But in order to extort from this what he wanted, it was necessary that he reshape and transpose the text without any authority of the manuscripts, in this manner: "ἐνὸς παρακλήτου διὰ Χριστοῦ ποιητήν ἕνα, τῶν ἄλλων ταγμάτων δημιουργόν" etc. Whence he thus renders it: "One God, Father of one Son, not of many, Maker of one Paraclete through Christ, Creator of other orders, Maker of different creatures through Christ."

But even in that version the fault is manifest, since the word ἕνα is neglected, which could not pour forth sound sense from WHISTON'S hypothesis; and no reason appears for the distinction between ποιητήν and δημιουργόν; and he seems to have been unaware that all the obscurity in the text, which COTELERIUS had partly acknowledged, vanishes through the Viennese Codex, which reads: "ἐνὸς παρακλήτου διὰ Χριστοῦ προβολέα." For the Father is called προβολεὺς of the Holy Spirit, insofar as the Spirit proceeds from the Father's substance, as CLERICUS rightly observed at this place.

From IGNATIUS also, whose letters are considered genuine, nothing is presented that shows any appearance of dissent in this article, but only from their more extended paraphrase, which CLERICUS shows in a certain dissertation to be the work of a man maliciously midwifing Arian dogmas, which he added to the heel of the Apostolic Fathers. That no less injury is done to Montanus and the Montanists equally as to the Novatians when their consent is appealed to, since for other reasons we do not consider them among our own, there is no need to show. Consult concerning both NAT. ALEXANDER Sec. 2, Dissertations 3 and 9.

34. But that some babble that not even through the Nicene Synod was provision made for the honor of the Holy Spirit has long been addressed by AMPHILOCHIUS of Iconium in his Epistle to the Synod inserted in COTELERIUS' Greek Monuments T. 2, p. 101: "It was then necessary for the Fathers to explain more fully concerning the doctrine of the Only-Begotten; since they were striving to cut out the heresy of Arius which had recently arisen at that time. And since at that time there was silence concerning the question about the Holy Spirit, therefore they added nothing more. But to those who read prudently, the doctrine concerning the Spirit which is contained in that faith will seem sufficient. For they taught that just as faith ought to be held in the Father and Son, so also faith ought to be held in the Spirit: neither introducing any other nature into the divine and blessed Trinity, nor cutting away anything from the Trinity in that exposition of faith."

But from the time when the error of the Semi-Arians prevailed, in complete Councils not only particular ones—Alexandrian, Illyrian, Roman—but also the 2nd Ecumenical Constantinopolitan, provision was abundantly made for the honor of the Holy Spirit even through a new clause added to the Nicene Symbol. We do not indeed deny that some even among the Post-Nicene Fathers were too scrupulous, more than was right, in attributing the name of GOD to the Holy Spirit. But they repeatedly declare that this arose chiefly from the fact that they did not think the name of God should be directly attributed to the Third Person, which must be referred to their *παρερμηνείας*, since otherwise they defended His divine essence vigorously.

But suspicion remains that some of them used a certain dissimulation, lest they exasperate the Macedonians, whom they considered to be united with them from the beginning against the Arians. In which matter if they suffered anything humanly, afterwards observing that their hope had been frustrated, they fought quite frankly and strenuously for the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

35. In the very writings of the Jews such things exist from which it is established that they were not strangers to acknowledging the Deity of the Holy Spirit. To this pertain the words in the Chapters of R. ELIESER Cap. 33:

והוציאו לבקעת דורא והראהו עצמות יבשות הרבה מאוד וגו' אמר לו יש בי כח רבי פנחס אומר לאחר כ' שנה שנהרגו כולם בבבל שרה רוח הקודש על יחזקאל להחיות אותן והיה לו לומר רבוננו של עולם יש בך כח לעשות יותר מאלו אלא בארץ עצמותיו נקברו לא לפיכך האמין לא כאילו ידעת אתה אלהים י"י אמר תקבר תמאה אדמה על ראתה שנ טהורה

R. Pinehas says: Twenty years after all were killed in Babylon, the Holy Spirit rested upon Ezekiel, and led him to the valley of Dura, and showed him many dry bones... He (the Holy Spirit) said to him: "I have the power to vivify them." And he should have responded to Him: "Lord of the world, You have the power to do much more than these," but he said: "Jehovah God, You know this," as if he had not believed. Therefore his bones were not buried in pure earth, as it is said: "And you shall be buried in impure earth."

The same is confirmed by the name שכינה ascribed to the Holy Spirit, as we noted in Chapter 2, §. 19. For the name שכינה is reckoned among the divine names by the Jews, as abundantly appears from the passages which BUXTORF excerpted in *Historia Arcae* cap. 14, CRAMER in *Theologia Israelis* Part 2, p. 343 ff., RHENFERD in his dissertation p. 19 ff., EISENMENGER in *Judaismus Revelatus* P. 1, Cap. 6, p. 268, and others; and also from the

synonymy which exists among the Jewish Masters between שכינה and the phrase יהוה כבוד, which the most distinguished TH. HASAEUS, the honor of myself, my country, and the Church, has most learnedly executed in his dissertation on Haggai 2:8 ff. praised above.

Nevertheless, we do not adhere to them very much, since from what we have noted in Chapter 3, §§. 1-2, it is established that under the confession of the Deity of the Holy Spirit lurks the poison of Sabellianism.

CHAPTER V. VINDICATING THE DEITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AGAINST ADVERSARIES

I. If what EPIPHANIUS reports concerning the HELCESAITES is true, those most ancient ones were enemies of the Deity of the Holy Spirit from the very times of the Apostles. For he says in Haeresis 19, §. 4 that their author, whom he names Helxai or Jelxai, around the times of Trajan, associating himself with a certain Jewish sect of the Ossenes, declared that the Holy Spirit was female in sex and similar to Christ, standing like an image above a cloud and between two mountains. He adds in Haeresis 53, §. 1 that they confess Christ in word, whom they think to be a creature and to appear always repeatedly: and that He first indeed fashioned the very body of Adam, and again, when it seemed good to Him, put it on: that the Holy Spirit is His sister in female form, both Christ and the Holy Spirit consisting of ninety-six miles in height, twenty-four in width.

But here we read nothing but portents of riddles, which their very name indicates these men affected. For that this was not so much a personal as a sectarian name, EPIPHANIUS'S own explanation teaches, translating it as δύναμιν ἀποκεκαλυμμένην [hidden power], because Hel (הל) signifies power, and chai (חַי) hidden. In this derivation I indeed agree with PETAVIUS, which is much simpler than those of Scaliger and Rhenferd.

I scarcely doubt that they were an offspring of the Gnostics, since the dogmas of Jews, Christians, and Gentiles were joined together in their Confession, they begged the appearance of the greatest Mysteries through obscurity of words, and they rejected all martyrdom. Whence I would refer these very things which they are said to have babbled concerning Christ and the Holy Spirit to the masculine and feminine Syzygies of the Gnostics, through which they seem to have understood nothing but powers and emanations of divine operations.

Therefore what they ascribed as personal to the Holy Spirit along with Christ were nothing but absurd allegories, since they considered Christ and the Holy Spirit as divine powers infused into the leaders of their Sect, among whom were also women, and designated them by the name Helxai. In this way they are to be referred not to enemies of the Deity, but of the personality of the Holy Spirit along with the Jews, from whom they chiefly arose, and other Gnostics, concerning whom we spoke in Chapter 3, §. 8. Concerning them deserve to be consulted, besides those cited by ITTIG De Haeresibus Sect. 2, cap. last, TILLEMONT

Histoire Ecclésiastique Tom. 2, part 2, p. 85 ff., BASNAGE Annales Ecclesiastici ad A. 104, and RHENFERD Dissertatio p. 151 ff.

2. No less momentous blasphemy is attributed to MONTANUS by CYRIL OF JERUSALEM Catecheses 16, asserting in §. 4 that this man, nearly insane and mentally deranged, dared to assert that he himself was the Holy Spirit. The same thing THEODORET Haereticarum Fabularum lib. 3, c. 2 and PSEUDO-AMBROSE ad Thessalonicenses 5 have handed down concerning him. That he was at least said to be the Paraclete by his followers, EUSEBIUS Historia Ecclesiastica 5.14, BASIL Epistle to Amphilochius canon 1, and GREGORY THE GREAT lib. 9, ep. 61 are authorities.

But from TERTULLIAN and others, learned men have abundantly shown that it is not established that Montanus progressed to such a degree of madness, but rather that he himself and his genuine followers held the orthodox opinion concerning the Most Holy Trinity, although there were various sects among the Montanists, of which one asserted that the Paraclete dwelt more fully in Montanus than in the Apostles, but another also taught the error of Sabellianism; and therefore undoubtedly called some singular Power of God in Montanus the Paraclete or Holy Spirit. This latter is clear from those words of JEROME in his Epistle to Marcella, in which he testifies that the Montanists say that God, because He could not save the world through two stages (in Moses and Christ), finally descended through the Holy Spirit into Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla, insane women. Here deserve to be compared what ITTIG De Haeresibus Sect. 2, cap. 13, §. 3, NAT. ALEXANDER ad Historiam Sec. 2, diff. 3, BASNAGE Annales ad A. 171 have brought forward to diminish this charge against Montanus.

III. I would place in the same category others who are reported to have attributed the name of the Holy Spirit to themselves or to other mere men. The HIERACITES seem to have intended this when, as EPIPHANIUS records, they asserted that Melchizedek was the Holy Spirit, understanding by this a heavenly power through him. The Author of the Questions on the Old and New Testament, question 109, leans toward the same opinion. CYRIL also in the cited work accuses MANES of the same crime as Montanus, although it is otherwise clear that the Manichaeans spoke distinctly concerning the Holy Spirit. From the same category, Muslims pretend that Muhammad is that Paraclete or Spirit of truth whom Christ promised, whose denomination's origin MARACCIUS investigates in Alcorani Prodrum 2, p. 26 ff. Concerning Guilelma of Bohemia at the end of the 13th century, JOH. MABILLON likewise commemorates in Museum Italicum T. 1, p. 19-20 that she was held to be the Holy Spirit incarnate. The same author reports that the same impiety was attributed to a certain Dulcino of Vercelli in the Chronicle of Nangianus at the year 1306.

IV. Therefore ORIGEN is considered the first to have more openly denied the Deity of the Holy Spirit, teaching that He was as much inferior to the Son as the Son is to the Father, and therefore so much of the substance of the Son that nevertheless He was made by Him. For this matter he also abused the passage John 1:3, asserting that the Holy Spirit was made through the Word, because it was written universally: "All things were made through Him." This has been abundantly established against Origen's admirers by PETAVIUS De Trinitate lib. 1, c. 14, §. 8 ff. and HUET Origeniana lib. 2, Q. 2, who also did not neglect to note how the same error passed to his disciples: Dionysius of Alexandria, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Pierius the Alexandrian Presbyter, and finally Eusebius of Caesarea.

V. Those who spoke more incautiously than ORIGEN were those who, striving to reconcile Platonic Philosophy more closely with Christianity, held the Platonic World Soul for the Holy Spirit. For it is established that just as the Stoics wanted the World Soul to be God Himself, so the Platonists taught that it was born from God, and although it was God in a certain degree, it was nevertheless only secondary. Nevertheless, CHALCIDIUS in his work on the Timaeus, CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA lib. 2 contra Julianum at the end, JEROME in Epistle to the Ephesians lib. 2, and others attempted to make Plato here favorable to the Christian School.

Nor perhaps would it be necessary to commemorate this, unless this error had erupted more forcefully in subsequent times. For HONORIUS OF AUTUN De Philosophia Mundi lib. 1.15 says: "The world soul according to some is the Holy Spirit." And especially ABELARD'S brain appears to have been disturbed by this concept, as is clear from his Theologia Christiana, which is inserted in MARTENE'S Anecdota Tom. 5, lib. 1, cap. 5, although to that extent the error is excusable, since he softens Plato's sayings about the World Soul through benign interpretation.

VI. I do not linger now on APOLLINARIUS, who is blamed by some for asserting that the Holy Spirit is less than the Son, and the Son less than the Father. But since that distinguished man suffered many things unworthily and was exposed to the envy of many of his time because of the gifts bestowed upon him, this is most unworthy of all. This appears even from that very passage of THEODORET Haereticarum Fabularum 4.8, where he is accused in one breath both of this subordination and of Sabellianism, although these are ἀσύστατα [incompatible].

Add that, as SUIDAS testifies, he was among the chief προμάχοις [champions] of τοῦ ὁμοουσιῶν [the homoousios] against the Arians, so much so that historians affirm that Athanasius—and how great he was!—was ὡς παῖδα κριθῆναι [judged as a child] compared to Apollinarius. Greater suspicion weighs upon ARIUS himself. For although neither in his remaining writings nor in Alexander's letters does any mention of the Holy Spirit occur, whence nothing was established by the Nicene Synod against his error concerning the Holy Spirit, nevertheless with the Deity of the Son shaken, neither could the Deity of the Holy Spirit be saved.

And according to AUGUSTINE Haeresis 49, the Arians wanted the Holy Spirit to be a creature of a creature, that is, created by the Son Himself. Their opinions concerning this matter were quite divided, some establishing that the Holy Spirit was a creature, others that He was God of an inferior order, others declaring that they were ignorant to which genus He should be attributed, as is evident from GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS Oration 37. Indeed, one might conclude that the coarser Arians sometimes adhered more closely to the footsteps of Origen and spoke more modestly about the Holy Spirit than the Semi-Arians, from the examples of Eustathius, Eudoxius, and Eunomius, if the sails were not to be furled.

VII. From the flock of the Semi-Arians indeed came forth that famous MACEDONIUS, to whose followers the name of PNEUMATOMACHI [Spirit-fighters] specifically stuck. This undoubtedly arose from the fact that they seemed to think more correctly than the coarser Arians concerning the person of the Son, and therefore had this peculiarity, that they excepted only the person of the Holy Spirit from communion with the supreme Deity.

Hence AUGUSTINE describes their error thus in *De Haeresibus* cap. 52: "The Macedonians are from Macedonius, Bishop of the Church of Constantinople, whom the Greeks also call Πνευματομάχους [Pneumatomachi], because they contend concerning the Holy Spirit. For concerning the Father and Son they think correctly, that they are of one and the same substance or essence: but concerning the Holy Spirit they are unwilling to believe this, saying that He is a creature. Some rather call these Semi-Arians, because in this question they are partly with us, partly with them. Although they are reported by some not to call the Holy Spirit God, but the Deity of the Father and Son, and to have no proper substance."

From these words it is clear that it has not been sufficiently explained what exactly was Macedonius's mind. It is not credible that they denied only the personality of the Holy Spirit, with the Deity admitted, as the last ones wanted, whom AUGUSTINE and undoubtedly from him, although he names PHILASTRIUS, the AUTHOR OF THE PRAEDESTINATUS cap. 52 commemorates, as we have already noted in chapter 3, §. 9. For the constant consensus of antiquity repugnant to this, and the very name of Pneumatomachi branded upon them by Canon 1 of the Council of Constantinople, since we have taught in the cited place that the cradle of that error is far more ancient.

Yet by lapse of time the name of Pneumatomachi also stuck to those who sided with Sabellius, as is clear from JOHN OF DAMASCUS *De Haeresibus* num. 74. Nor has it been established that Macedonius thought correctly concerning the Son and deserted the orthodox faith only in the concept concerning the Holy Spirit. PHILASTRIUS *De Haeresibus* cap. 67, ATHANASIUS *Ad Serapionem* Ep. 1, §§. 1-2, RUFINUS lib. 1, c. 28, RATRAMNUS lib. 2 *contra Graecos* cap. 2 indeed assert this.

However, EPIPHANIUS *Haeresis* 73, §. 27, although he speaks more kindly in *Haeresis* 74, §. 1, SOCRATES lib. 2, c. 45, where he also testifies that he was held by very many to be a fabricator of the word ὁμοιούσιος [homoiousios], THEODORET *Historia Ecclesiastica* 2.2, wish to persuade the contrary. Indeed, PHILASTRIUS himself attacked his error under the name of Semi-Arians.

But the authors agree in this, that he asserted the Holy Spirit to be a mere Creature. In this way he turned out far worse than ORIGEN. For he had taught that [the Spirit] was made only from the substance of the Son, but these wanted [Him] to be created from nothing.

VIII. But what kind of Creature the Holy Spirit was to Macedonius is more difficult to determine. Both PETAVIUS and the most learned GOETZ, who has commented *ex professo* on the Macedonians (whose dissertation is inserted in VOGT'S *Historia Haeresiologica* Tom. 1, Fascic. 1), have left this untouched. According to RUFINUS *Historia Ecclesiastica* lib. 1, c. 25, Macedonius taught that the Holy Spirit was a force created by God, which inheres in created things through division of essence. But this smacks of the Platonic World Soul and therefore of Origen's system, from which it is established by many testimonies of the ancients that Macedonius made a divorce.

PHILASTRIUS says that he preached Him to be made and created Spirit. But from others it appears that he considered this created Spirit as a certain excellent Angel. Hence he not only is spoken ill of by GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS *Oration* 44 because he made Him ὁμόδουλον

[fellow-slave] to himself, and by PHOTIUS Epistle p. 6 because εἰς δούλους, καὶ ὑπηρέτας τὴν δεσποτικὴν καὶ ὑπερκειμένην αὐτοῦ συνέταττε κυριότητα [he coordinated His absolute and supreme dominion among slaves and servants], "he coordinated His absolute and exalted dominion with servants and ministers"; but SOZOMEN also openly says Historia Ecclesiastica 4.27: "He asserted that the Holy Spirit was without the same honor and dignity (as the Father and Son): διάκονον καὶ ὑπηρέτην καλῶν, καὶ ὅσα περὶ τῶν θείων ἀγγέλων λέγων τις, οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοι [calling Him servant and minister, and saying whatever things one might say about the divine angels without error]."

The same tendency appears in those words of EPIPHANIUS Haeresis 74, §. 8: "Nor as the other Spirits, is the Spirit of Truth something created or made: nor is that Angel of Great Counsel called after the manner of the remaining Angels." And ATHANASIUS manifestly says Epistle 1 ad Serapionem §. 1: "Not without grief you have signified to me that certain ones, detesting the impious heresy of the Arians against the Son of God, have indeed departed from them, but these same ones think wrongly concerning the Holy Spirit, and contend that He is not only a created thing, but also one of the ministering spirits, and differs from the Angels only in degree."

From these statements it appears how incautiously GOTH. ARNOLD undertook the patronage of Macedonius and his followers in Historia Haeresiologica Part 1, lib. 4, c. 8, §. 26 ff., whom the most learned ITTIG therefore struck with sharp censure in Opuscula Theologica p. 408 ff. But that BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX and WILLIAM THE ABBOT pretended that this error was propagated through ABELARD undoubtedly arose from the fact that they did not grasp his mind, since from his writings it appears sufficiently that he approached closer to the camp of the Sabellians than of the Arians, concerning which matter the excerpts can be consulted which NAT. ALEXANDER exhibits from them in Sec. 12, dissert. 7, Act. 6.

IX. Among the more recent ones, VALENTINUS GENTILIS especially followed in the footsteps of Origen, pretending that the Holy Spirit equally as the Son is so distinguished from the Father by nature itself that the Father is the essentiator of the Holy Spirit, but He is essentiated by Him. This appears from his Protheses extant at the end of CALVIN'S Opera 8.10.22.24.36 ff. The same in a brief admonition to the Polish Brothers occurring there reveals that already in his time many in Poland had been infected with the same poison. But this error was much more revived through GUIL. WHISTON, following in the footsteps of RICHARD BROKLESBY, as is clear from his Confession, which he himself [mentions] in his Response to Observations (in Articles 19 and 21, as published by Allixii): "*The Holy Spirit is a divine person of God, made under the supreme God through our Savior, or (in the proper sense) proceeding from the Father and the Son, with perfections and offices entirely different from the Son of God, superior in nature and all attributes to subordinate creatures, but inferior to the Father and Son, and subordinated to them in the creation and government of things, inspirer of Prophets and Apostles, worker of miracles, Paraclete of the Church, great author of sanctification in all the pious, and chief witness of the Savior.* 21. *The supereminent dignity of the Holy Spirit must be admitted and asserted, and also a fitting degree of divine worship must be rendered to Him.*"

X. More subtle is the error of SAM. CLARKE, since he by no means wishes to acknowledge that the Holy Spirit is a creature or created being of God, although he acknowledges that He

is a substance so distinguished from God the Father from all eternity that He is simultaneously subordinated to Him, and depends on His will both as to Essence and as to Power, in *Doctrina Scripturae de Trinitate* Part 2, Proposition 40 ff. Whence also certain alternating writings have arisen between him and WHISTON.

Against this stone many others in our time have stumbled, conceiving a certain natural subordination, which is usually called Platonic Trinity or softer Arianism, some conceiving it more subtly than others, among whom GEORGE BULL, RAD. CUDWORTH, WALLIS, and other most learned men in England should be referred. Not to mention Arminians sometimes declaring a mind too inclined to this error: EPISCOPIUS, LIMBORCH, and others. The latter indeed in *Theologia Christiana* lib. 2, c. 17, §. 21 says: "There is a certain supereminence of the Father with respect to the Son, and of the Father and Son with respect to the Holy Spirit, by reason of dignity and power: For it is more worthy to generate than to be generated, to spirate than to be spirated." But he denied his thumb to him, and the distinguished ADRIANUS A CATTENBURG refuted him in *Spicilegium Theologicum Christianum* lib. 2, cap. 17.

XI. Closer to the MACEDONIANS approached JOH. BIDELELL, Master of Arts of Oxford, who in other matters agreeing with Socinus [ὁμόσηφος] established that the Holy Spirit is a created person and Prince of Angels, and acquired followers for himself in conventicles held in London, who CHRIST. SANDIUS narrates in *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitariorum* p. 159 were called Bidellians. CHR. M. PFAFF enumerates his books in *Historia Theologiae Literariae* lib. 3, p. 328-329.

CLOPPENBORG and NIC. ARNOLD ex professo refuted him from among our own in *Atheismo Sociniano* Jo. Bidelli, with whom should be compared V. E. LOSCHER'S *Parerga Sacra* Exerc. 2 and J. FRID. MAYER'S dissertation *De Joh. Bidelli vita ac sententia* Hamburg 1700. More monstrous was the dogma of an ANONYMOUS ENGLISHMAN, who in *Vindiciae Unitariorum* dared to fashion impiously three subordinate gods: the Son of God, the Holy Spirit as Prince of Good Angels, and the Devil as Prince of Evil Angels, whose reasons it is not necessary to collect specifically, since his φλυαρία [idle talk] vanishes of itself with the refutation of BIDELELL.

XII. CHRIST. SANDIUS was closest to this face of error, having published a paradoxical problem concerning the Holy Spirit: whether by Him the genus of holy Angels might be understood? together with a refutation of the opinion of the Socinians denying that the Holy Spirit is a person. Cologne 1678. Against him both CHR. WITTICH first in *Causa Spiritus Sancti* 1678, then in *Causa Spiritus Sancti Victrix* 1682 edit., and JUST. CHRIST. SCHOMER in *Assertione Endoxa Fidei Christianae* 1679 expressly drew their pens. But also a dissertation by J. FRID. MAYER *De Christoph. Sandio, illiusque sententia, Spiritum S. esse genus Angelorum* 1697 was discussed.

XIII. But the dogma concerning the World Soul has been introduced into the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in various ways. For first, there were not lacking those who, though not with evil intention, persisted in comparing the System of Plato with the System of Christians, for example AUG. STEUCHUS *De Perenni Philosophia* lib. 2, c. 3, p. 105 ff., HANNIBAL ROSSELIUS in *Mercurius Trismegistus* Tom. 2, Comm. 1, H. MORE *Mysterium Pietatis* lib. 1, c. 4, who nevertheless simultaneously observes in *Enchiridion Metaphysicum* Part 1, cap.

28: "The Platonists acknowledged a double Soul, one Divine, the other Mundane; the latter is at most nothing else than a Μέγαν Δαίμονα [Great Demon] according to PLOTINUS, but the former, τὴν θεϊὰν ψυχὴν [the divine soul], is the very third Hypostasis."

Since however it is otherwise sufficiently established concerning the gradation of Plato's Three Principles, and moreover such excellent attributes are ascribed to the World Soul that they exceed the measure of a Creature, whence some have expounded it through God's Providence, we rightly reject this diligence as dangerous. Much more abominable is the Enthusiastic Impiety which confounds whatever the Chemists have commented concerning the Spirit of the World and the Archaeus [universal principle], whatever the Philosophers concerning the Universal Intellect, Hylarchic Principle or Plastic Nature, with the doctrine of Moses concerning the Holy Spirit.

That this error was defended by POSTEL is established from his Confessio inserted in Bibliotheca Bremensia Cl. 7, p. 706 ff., §. 13. Indeed, that the very Philosophers' Stone was indicated by the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross through this Universal Spirit, GASSENDI in Tom. 3 Opera in Examine Fluddiana Philosophiae Art. 1, p. 249 is the authority. From the same impure fountain CHRIST. FRIEDEBORN around the year 1643 taught that God in the first place created Queen Sophia, the universal Spirit of the world, and betrothed her to the Son, from her all things are born, and the Angels themselves.

See COLBERG Christianismus Platonicus P. 1, cap. 5, §. 5. But how certain Philosophers—J. A. COMENIUS, who specifically in Synopsis cap. 2 de visibilibus mundi principiis twists Scripture to his own sense, DAV. BECK, HENR. NOLL, and a certain masked ARNOLD BACHIM—have stumbled against this stone, is to be seen from the special dissertations of AD. RECHENBERG and JOH. HENR. ERNEST De Anima Mundi.

XIV. But also the error of those has been revived by some who applied the name of the Holy Spirit to mere men. SANDIUS assists these in the cited work, contending that at least sometimes the Holy Spirit designates the sanctified mind of man. More directly sin those who with BRENDEL and others call the Spirit of God that divine particle which they place in individual souls. That it is taught in Papism that Joseph, the Blessed Virgin's spouse, is the Holy Spirit incarnate, JOH. BELL is the author in Innocentia Religionis A. 1714, p. 751.

Not far from this fiction stands FR. JOH. BURR'S heresy, pretending that the Blessed Virgin is the Holy Spirit incarnate in Anne's womb, as is clear from the Analecta to his history, which were inserted by the distinguished SCHELHORN in Amoenitates Literariae Tom. 5. Not to mention that among DAVID GEORGE'S blasphemies it is related that he said he himself was the Holy Spirit. The same concerning a certain MARTIN STEINBACH, a wine merchant of Sélestat, THEOD. ZWINGER reports in Vol. 5 Theatrum lib. 4, f. 1328, and concerning Eva Margreta Buttler, the Acta brought forward in this case by J. FRID. MAYER in his dissertation De Abominabili Pietistarum Trinitate p. 3 ff. declare.

XV. So manifold has been the battle line of adversaries in recent times against the Holy Spirit that, relying on the Spirit's aid to rout them, we shall first dilute the little reasons by which they commonly dispute against us, then we shall easily destroy separately the foundations of the peculiar hypotheses which some of them have adopted.

XVI. Among the little reasons opposed to us, let the first be that the Holy Spirit is never directly called God. The contrary indeed has been abundantly proved by us in Chapter 4, §. 7 ff. Yet since there are those who admit the antecedent, among whom GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS Oration 37 and ERASMUS in his Ecclesiastes, as well as the silence of HILARY and BASIL should be referred, it can be added ex abundantia [from abundance] that the consequent also does not bind. For first, it suffices that other equivalent names and truly divine predicates are attributed to some subject, so that it may be acknowledged as divine, even if the name God in so many letters does not occur concerning it. Furthermore, most of those who use this argument admit that the Son of God is sometimes called God. But if from this name directly given to some subject they do not yet wish to be convinced concerning its Deity, they frivolously demand from us that we prove this name is given to Him to establish the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

XVII. Secondly, they appeal to passages "in which mention is made of the Father and Son, but silence is kept concerning the Holy Spirit." Response: It suffices that He is commemorated in one order with the Father and Son in such circumstances which exclude all partnership of creatures. Add that the omission of one or another person does not exclude it, since one is in the other; that according to the Economy of salvation certain more special works are to be referred to one person rather than another; and that just as the operation and glory of the Father is not excluded when the Son joins Himself with the Holy Spirit, for example Matthew 12:28, 31-32, so neither is the operation and honor of the Holy Spirit excluded when Christ treats privately concerning Himself and the Father, John 5:17, 23.

XVIII. Thirdly, they argue in various ways from the distinction of the Holy Spirit from God Himself. For they say:

A. "He who is distinct from God is not God. But that the Holy Spirit is distinguished from God is manifest from 2 Corinthians 13:13, Ephesians 4:4-6, etc."

Response: By the name God, Scripture understands either the very Nature of God, or the three persons considered in their totality, or the person of the Father or Son viewed economically. Now indeed the argument does not hold unless the Adversaries produce a passage in which the Holy Spirit is simply proposed as distinct from the Nature of God. But this they cannot do, since all the controverted sayings must be taken in the second or third sense.

B. "He who gave the Holy Spirit is Jehovah alone. For to whom it is said in Nehemiah 9:6: 'You yourself, Jehovah, are alone,' to the same it is said in verse 20: 'You gave Your good Spirit to instruct them...'"

Response: We deny 1) the antecedent. For in verse 6 it treats in general concerning God the Creator of the World, and therefore the Creator Spirit Himself is included; since in the following passages, including verse 20 itself, more special operations of individual Persons according to various Economies are distinctly enumerated. 2) The consequent wavers, since Jehovah alone is not considered in opposition to the Holy Spirit, but to the idols of the nations, to whom the glory of Creation does not belong.

C. "If the Holy Spirit has intellect and will distinct from God, He is not God. But the antecedent is evident from 1 Corinthians 2:10, 12, etc."

Response: We stick to the response already given to the first objection. For in these passages the intellect and will of the Holy Spirit are not distinguished essentially from the very Nature of God, but rather concerning both faculties such things are predicated which involve supreme perfection, as has been shown in the preceding chapter, §. 12 ff.

XIX. Fourthly, they sometimes wish to apply such a distinction concerning the Holy Spirit which would involve that He is less than the Father and Son. Thus for example when the Savior says in Matthew 12:28: "If I cast out demons by the Spirit of God," they interpret the preposition "by" [ἐν] as concerning an instrument and minister.

Response: 1) That in John 3:21 it is said concerning the works of the faithful themselves that they are done in God. 2) That the particle ἐν [in] is often equivalent to σὺν [with], and therefore can here designate partnership in divine work with the Son.

XX. Fifthly, "they strike closer to the mark when they want certain things attributed to the Holy Spirit which overthrow the idea of supreme perfection."

A. "They elicit ignorance attributed to the Holy Spirit concerning the Father and Son from Matthew 11:27, since there it is said that no one knows the Father except the Son, nor the Son except the Father," as if it were not manifest that the Father and Son here are not opposed to the Holy Spirit, but to the wise men of this age, from whom Jesus wished to draw away His disciples and attract them into His own teaching. More absurd is that some infer from 1 Corinthians 2:10 that since the Holy Spirit searches the deep things of God, He is destitute of knowledge of them. For we have established the contrary from this passage in Chapter 4, §. 13.

B. "For the contingency of the Holy Spirit it is adduced that all things were made through the Word (John 1:3), but the Holy Spirit should not be excepted from all those things. And how the Macedonians formerly abused this matter with some corrupt punctuation, we have abundantly taught in the Commentary on this passage." But with this rejected, the cavils of the Heretics collapse of themselves, since according to the genuine sense of the words, in the latter member all those things are restricted to those which were made. More frivolous is what is adduced from Amos 4:13, where the Lord is said to be רוח בורא [boré ruach], which should not be rendered as "creating the Spirit" but "creating wind," as the context shows.

C. "In fraud of the Omnipresence of the Holy Spirit is twisted the fact that He changes place; for this matter appeal is made to the Holy Spirit descending from heaven in bodily form (Luke 3:21-22)." But when the Orthodox respond that the same is said concerning God in Genesis 18, Exodus 3, 19, 20, etc., they object "that in these passages it was not God Himself who descended, but only an Angel, sustaining the person and name of God." But this very thing is what we deny, since we are persuaded that in the adduced passages the very Angel of the Covenant, or Son of God, exhibited some external symbol of His presence.

D. "Finally, the dependence of the Holy Spirit they establish from an accumulation of several passages, for example that He is sent by God, does not speak from Himself but from God

who sent Him, receives from another, and prays to God, etc. (Isaiah 48:16; John 16:7, 13-14; Romans 8; Revelation 22:17)." All these things, although they make up no small cloud of weapons if enumerated separately, we nevertheless repel with one blow, since they contain nothing but phrases to be explained θεοπρεπῶς [in a manner befitting God] from the economy of Salvation, as the Catalog of divine operations of the Holy Spirit to be exhibited in its proper place will indicate.

XXI. Sixthly, the divine Honor of the Holy Spirit is assailed through certain little exceptions.

A. "They do not consider Him to be necessary, who think that the faithful themselves can be ignorant of what He is, and they deduce this from Acts 19:2." But not only is it not established whether those were truly believers, but also that it does not there treat of ignorance of the person of the Holy Spirit, indeed that knowledge of the Holy Spirit is considered as necessary for Baptism is evident from what was said in Chapter 2, §. 2.b and §. 20.

B. "They urge that the Son of God commanded that we should worship the Father in His name, without any mention of the Holy Spirit (John 14:13-14, 16:23)." But we oppose, both that no exclusion of the Holy Spirit occurs here; and that in the Father the Holy Spirit also is worshipped; and that the scope of the passages which are adduced is by no means that the object of prayers should be treated, but only that the distinction between the mode of praying in the Old and New Testament should be indicated, consisting in this, that now with the Savior of the World completed, they can approach the throne of grace by virtue of His merit, which had not been permitted before. Therefore these sayings do nothing to call into doubt the arguments for the Adoration of the Holy Spirit produced by us.

XXII. And indeed any person whatsoever depressed below divine majesty is unsuccessfully substituted for the Holy Spirit. How jejune BIDELL disputes for his Angel Prince is clear from the fact that he only supposes in general that Holy Spirit and Good Angel are equally synonymous as unclean spirit and evil angel are. In which assertion many things are supposed without any proof, which we simply reject, for example that unclean spirit is a name privately befitting the Prince of Devils; that the same is the nature of good spirits as of evil ones, although the Principality of the Devil draws its origin not from nature but from his fall; that the name of Archangel is given to the Holy Spirit; and if this can be made probable, that it is not to be interpreted economically but essentially. For as long as these things are not confirmed, no argument from the sacred writings is available in favor of this opinion.

XXIII. Nor does SANDIUS use heavier armor, especially since the chief part of his position has already been occupied by us. For, to dismiss what he twists from the Apocrypha and Fathers to his cause:

A. "He urges such phrases in which division of the Holy Spirit seems to him to be taught, for example when God is said to pour out from His Spirit (Joel 2:28-29, Acts 2:17-18), to give from His Spirit (1 John 4:13, Numbers 11:17, 25), and indeed a double portion (2 Kings 2:9). Add John 3:34, Hebrews 2:4." How little these help the author appears from what was brought forward in Chapter 1, §. 15 and Chapter 3, §. 18, and especially §. 21. But by the same effort collapses what is adduced as a peculiar argument, that the Holy Spirit occurs under the

emblem of rivers of living water in the plural (John 7:38, Revelation 22:1).

B. "He adduces various sayings in which he considers Angels to be placed in place of the Holy Spirit. Thus Mark 13. 32. ignorance of the day of judgment is attributed to Angels; Mark 8. 38. and in other sayings the companionship of Angels with the Advent of Christ to judgment is joined. Gal. 4. 14.: 'As an Angel of God you received me, as Christ Jesus.' Jes. 63. 9. 'The Angel of his face saved them,' which passage compared with Exod. 23.20.21 he urges should be explained. Luke 12. 8. 9. 'The Son of man will confess and deny before his Angels.' Confer Apoc. 3.5. 1Tim. 5. 21. I testify before God, the Lord Jesus Christ and the elect Angels, where through the testimony of Angels the testimony of the Holy Spirit is designated, from coll. 1 John 5. 7. he attempts to prove. Hebr. 12. 21-24. The celestial Jerusalem itself denotes the Holy Spirit, although that is shortly described through myriads of Angels and the firstborn. Finally, he adheres most strongly to Ap. 1.4. where by seven Spirits he wishes Angels to be understood.

Resp. 1. Certain of these passages plainly do not pertain to this matter. For Jer. 63. as well as Exod. 23. the Son of God himself is designated. That in Hebr. 12. Angels are expressed through the celestial Jerusalem is a frigid invention. 2. He accumulates very many things supported by this argument alone, since it seemed fitting to him that the Holy Spirit should have been commemorated there; which since it is not expressed *κατα ῥητον* [explicitly], that he is suggested through Angels. This is so facetious that it does not merit serious refutation. 3. Although among the three supreme and celestial Witnesses the Holy Spirit is rightly numbered to confirm the Testimony of the Gospel; through this it is not destroyed that Angels will also hold the place of secondary witnesses in Judgment. 4. For vindicating the last statement concerning the Person of the Holy Spirit, what we noted in the preceding Chapter §. 19. fq. will suffice.

C. "Just as the spirit of error, Satan, the Devil, collectively designates a multitude of Angels, so the names Spirit of truth, Paraclete, etc. should be understood concerning a similar collection." Resp. 1. The trope in the antecedent is fictitious; For evil Angels certainly have a singular Prince. 2. The conclusion is most absurd. What does the divine Spirit have in common with a miserable creature?

D. "Who in Acts 8. 26. is called Angel of God and 5. 29. Spirit, and 6. 39. Spirit of the Lord is heard." Resp. 1. That the same subjects are treated here should not be supposed, but should have been proved. 2. Nor even thus would the Author have gained anything, both because it treats of an Angel in the singular, and because we easily permit that the Holy Spirit sometimes bears the schema of an Angel economically.

E. "The Holy Spirit is that finger of God by which the Law was written, Exod. 31. 18. But now it is established that the Law was given through the ministry of Angels from Acts 7. 53.58. Gal. 3. 19." To be accommodating, we deny nothing but the consequence. What prevents the Holy Spirit as well as Angels from having been active in promulgating the Law in different respects and order?

F. "Through the Holy Spirit, by whom holy men spoke when moved, 2 Pet. 1. 21. that Angels are to be understood seems probable to him, both because prophecy is also ascribed to an evil Spirit 1 Kings 18. 10. and because in 1 Cor. 14. 32. Angels are denoted by the spirits of the

prophets." Resp. Saul's prophecy was not a prediction of future things, which belongs to God alone, but madness. But the spirits of good prophets are called their very minds moved by the Holy Spirit.

G. "2 Cor. 11. 14. The Apostle calls an Angel of light the Holy Spirit," although ORIGEN thought thus, it is by no means established, and if it were established, no help would thereby accrue to SANDIUS, since Paul uses the singular.

H. "That the Holy Spirit is sent by God involves that he is an Angel." Resp. We have already conceded that the schema of an Angel befits the Holy Spirit in the Economy of salvation. But what has that to do with an army of Angels, and indeed created ones?

I. "Acts 2. The Holy Spirit appeared under the form of flames of fire. But that those were Angels appears from Ps. 104. 5." Resp. When it is said that the Lord makes his Ministers flames of fire, neither is it necessary that Angels be understood privatively through Ministers, nor is reference made precisely to that external symbol alone of tongues of fire; but the holy zeal is described emblematically, which they were about to exercise in performing their duty.

K. "From the words Acts 23. 8. The Sadducees say there is no resurrection, neither Angel, nor Spirit, but the Pharisees confess both; thus he concludes: Therefore Angel and Spirit are one and the same." Resp. That they are not one and the same is clear from the express distinction of the Evangelist. Nevertheless, we recognize that it is one and the same doctrine divided into two parts, by which the Sadducees denied immaterial essences, to which both Angels and separated spirits of the dead are referred, as we acknowledged in Ch. 11. §. 21.

But how great a harvest of absurdities flows from this assertion easily appears. For not only do all things contradict which have been declared concerning the divine and unique essence of the Holy Spirit, but also what Scripture teaches concerning the nature of Angels. For it attributes various imperfections to them, which are utterly incompatible with the perfections ascribed to the Holy Spirit. To this most particularly pertains that their holiness is mutable, Job 4. 18.

XXVII. Those who dream that the Holy Spirit is the Soul of the world, it is right that they should above all prove the existence of such a universal created Spirit. Which nevertheless cannot be expected from them, since this dogma is injurious to God himself, attributing divine operations to a creature, and at the same time adverse to Scripture, which plainly ignores this intermediate cause of natural phenomena, and derives all actions ascribed to it proximately from the power imparted immediately by the Creator to creatures themselves individually and preserved in them, as would be easy to demonstrate. But they also more audaciously trample upon the Glory of God, while mixing the very Spirit of God himself with this chimera of their invention, they make God himself the Author of sin. But against such strong weapons they have nothing to oppose except certain passages of Scripture, in which diverse divine operations, relating to the Power and Government of God in Nature and Grace, are attributed to the Spirit of the Lord, such as are Gen. 1. 4. Job 27. 3. 33. 4. Ps. 104. 29. 30. 147. 18. Jes. 40. 7. Ezech. 37. 5. 14. But since nothing prevents us from establishing that the divine Spirit himself is celebrated in those passages, there is no need for us to dwell upon them.

XXVIII. But the confusion of the divine Spirit with the human, which we mentioned in the last place, can easily be dissolved. Those who transform the Soul into a divine particle are refuted in another place and by the same arguments by which the Spinozistic Apotheosis of the World is refuted. Those who attribute Incarnation to the Holy Spirit do not directly attack his Deity, but labor under excessive boasting about themselves or presumption about others. Finally, the sayings which should prove that any sanctified minds of the saints are rightly called the Holy Spirit accomplish this by no means. What, I ask, would compel us to explain joy in the Holy Spirit in Rom. 14. 17. through joy in a sanctified mind? Why should not the δυναμις Πνευματος ἁγίου [power of the Holy Spirit] in Rom. 15. 13. designate the efficacy of the Holy Spirit himself, which is the origin of joy and peace, occurring among the fruits of the Holy Spirit in Gal. 5. 22.? Who would not judge that to pray in the Holy Spirit Jude v. 20. is tantamount to praying through his internal power, who as the Spirit of supplications is celebrated in Zach. 12. 10. Rom. 8. 26.? The more inept these little reasonings are, the more clearly the splendor of Deity in the Holy Spirit breaks through all these clouds.

parei na p.200

parei na p 182