

# Of the Son of God and of the Holy Spirit:

## Part Three

JOHN MILTON

It is singular, however, that those who maintain the Father and the Son to be one in essence, should revert from the gospel to the times of the law, as if they would make a fruitless attempt to illustrate light by darkness. They say that the Son is not only called God, but also Jehovah, as appears from a comparison of several passages in both testaments. Now Jehovah is the one supreme God; therefore the Son and the Father are one in essence. It will be easy, however, to expose the weakness of an argument derived from the ascription of the name of Jehovah to the Son. For the name of Jehovah is conceded even to the angels, in the same sense as it has been already shewn that the name of God is applied to them, namely, when they represent the divine presence and person, and utter the very words of Jehovah. Gen. 16:7, “the angel of Jehovah found her,” compared with v. 10, “the angel of Jehovah said unto her, I will multiply thy seed exceedingly,” and v. 13, “she called the name of Jehovah who spake unto her — .” 18:13, “and Jehovah said,” etc., whereas it appears that the three men whom Abraham entertained were angels. Gen. 19:1, “there came two angels”; v. 13, “and Jehovah hath sent us” — compared with v. 18, 21, 24, “Oh, not so, אֲדֹנָי (adonai) and he said unto him, See, I have accepted thee . . . then Jehovah rained . . . from Jehovah out of heaven.” Gen. 21:17, “the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven . . . God hath heard” compared with v. 18, “I will make him a great nation.” So Exod. 3:2, 4, “the angel of Jehovah . . . when Jehovah saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him” — compared with Acts 7:30, “there

appeared to him an angel of the Lord in a flame of fire in a bush.” If that angel had been Christ or the supreme God, it is natural to suppose that Stephen would have declared it openly, especially on such an occasion, where it might have tended to strengthen the faith of the other believers, and strike his judges with alarm.

In Exod. 20, on the delivery of the law to Moses, no mention is made of anyone, except Jehovah, and yet in Acts 7:38 the same Stephen says, “this is he that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina”; and in v. 53 he declares that “the law was received by the disposition of angels.” Gal. 3:19, “it was ordained by angels.” Heb. 2:2, “if the word spoken by angels was steadfast,” etc. Therefore what is said in Exodus to have been spoken by Jehovah, was not spoken by himself personally, but by angels in the name of Jehovah. Nor is this extraordinary, for it would seem unsuitable that Christ the minister of the gospel should also have been the minister of the law: “by how much more also he is the mediator of a better covenant,” Heb. 8:6. On the other hand it would indeed have been wonderful if Christ had actually appeared as the mediator of the law, and none of the apostles had ever intimated it. Nay, the contrary seems to be asserted, Heb. 1:1, 2, “God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.”

Again it is said, Num. 22:22, “God’s anger was kindled . . . and the angel of Jehovah stood in the way for an adversary unto him”; v. 31, “then Jehovah opened the eyes of Balaam, and he saw the angel of Jehovah.” Afterward the same angel speaks as if he were Jehovah himself, v. 32, “behold I went out to withstand thee, because thy way is perverse before me”: and Balaam says, v. 34, “if it displease thee —”; to which the angel answers — “only the word that I shall speak unto thee, that thou shalt speak.” v. 35 compared with v. 20 and with chap. 23:8, 20. Josh. 5:14, “as captain of the host of Jehovah am I come,” compared with 6:2, “Jehovah said unto Joshua.” Judges 6:11, 12, “an angel of Jehovah . . . the angel of Jehovah” — compared with v. 14, “Jehovah looked upon him, and said —.” Again, vv. 20, 21, “the angel of God . . . the angel of Jehovah”; and v. 22, “Gideon perceived that he was an angel of Jehovah” — compared with v. 23, “Jehovah said unto him” — although the angel here, as in other instances, personated the character of Jehovah: — v. 14, “have not I sent thee?”; v. 16, “surely I will be with thee, and thou shalt smite the Midianites”: and Gideon himself addresses him as Jehovah, v. 17, “show

me a sign that thou talkest with me." 1 Chron. 21:15, "God sent an angel — "; vv. 16, 17, "and David saw the angel of Jehovah . . . and fell upon his face, and said unto God — "; vv. 18, 19, "then the angel of Jehovah commanded Gad to say unto David . . . and David went up at the saying of Gad, which he spake in the name of Jehovah."

But it may be urged that the name of Jehovah is sometimes assigned to two persons in the same sentence. Gen. 19:24, "Jehovah rained . . . from Jehovah out of heaven." 1 Sam. 3:21, "Jehovah revealed himself unto Samuel in Shiloh by the word of Jehovah." Jer. 34:12, "the word of Jehovah came to Jeremiah from Jehovah, saying — ." Hos. 1:7, "I will save them by Jehovah their God." Zech. 3:1-3, "standing before the angel . . . and Jehovah said unto Satan, Jehovah rebuke thee" — and again, "before the angel." I answer, that in these passages either one of the two persons is an angel, according to that usage of the word which has been already explained; or it is to be considered as a peculiar form of speaking, in which, for the sake of emphasis, the name of Jehovah is repeated, though with reference to the same person: "for Jehovah the God of Israel is one Jehovah." If in such texts as these both persons are to be understood properly and in their own nature as Jehovah, there is no longer one Jehovah, but two; whence it follows that the repetition of the name can only have been employed for the purpose of giving additional force to the sentence. A similar form of speech occurs, Gen. 9:16, "I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature"; and 1 Cor. 1:7, "waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Thess. 3:12, 13, "the Lord make you to increase . . . to the end he may stablish your hearts . . . before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Here whether it be "God, even our Father," or "our Lord Jesus," who is in the former verse called "Lord," in either case there is the same redundancy.

If the Jews had understood the passages quoted above, and others of the same kind, as implying that there were two persons, both of whom were Jehovah, and both of whom had an equal right to the appellation, there can be no doubt that, seeing the doctrine so frequently enforced by the prophets, they would have adopted the same belief which now prevails among us, or would at least have laboured under considerable scruples on the subject: whereas I suppose no one in his senses will venture to affirm that the Jewish Church ever so understood the passages in question, or believed that there were two persons, each of whom was Jehovah, and had an equal right to assume the title. It would seem,

therefore, that they interpreted them in the manner above mentioned. Thus in allusion to a human being, 1 Kings 8:1, "then Solomon assembled the elders of Israel . . . unto king Solomon in Jerusalem." No one is so absurd as to suppose that the name of Solomon is here applied to two persons in the same sentence. It is evident, therefore, both from the declaration of the sacred writer himself, and from the belief of those very persons to whom the angels appeared, that the name of Jehovah was attributed to an angel; and not to an angel only, but also to the whole church, Jer. 33:16.

But as Placaeus of Saumur thinks it incredible that an angel should bear the name of Jehovah, and that the dignity of the supreme Deity should be degraded by being personated, as it were on a stage, I will produce a passage in which God himself declares that his name is in an angel. Exod. 23:20, 21, "behold, I send an angel before thee, to keep thee in the way . . . beware of him, and obey his voice; provoke him not, for he will not pardon your transgressions; for my name is in him."

The angel who from that time forward addressed the Israelites, and whose voice they were commanded to hear, was always called Jehovah, though the appellation did not properly belong to him. To this they reply, that he was really Jehovah, for that angel was Christ; 1 Cor. 10:9, "neither let us tempt Christ," etc. I answer that it is of no importance to the present question, whether it were Christ or not; the subject of inquiry now is, whether the children of Israel understood that angel to be really Jehovah? If they did so understand, it follows that they must have conceived either that there were two Jehovahs, or that Jehovah and the angel were one in essence; which no rational person will affirm to have been their belief.

But even if such an assertion were advanced, it would be refuted by Exod. 33:2, 3, 5, "I will send an angel before thee . . . for I will not go up in the midst of thee . . . lest I consume thee in the way. And when the people heard these evil tidings, they mourned." If the people had believed that Jehovah and that angel were one in essence, equal in divinity and glory, why did they mourn, and desire that Jehovah should go up before them, notwithstanding his anger, rather than the angel? who, if he had indeed been Christ, would have acted as a mediator and peace-maker. If, on the contrary, they did not consider the angel as Jehovah, they must necessarily have understood that he bore the name of Jehovah in the sense in which I suppose him to have borne it, wherein there is nothing either absurd or histrionic. Being at length prevailed upon to go up with them in person, he grants thus much only, v. 14, "my presence shall go with

thee” — which can imply nothing else than a presentation of his name and glory in the person of some angel. But whoever this was, whether Christ, or some angel different from the preceding, the very words of Jehovah himself show that he was neither one with Jehovah, nor co-equal, for the Israelites are commanded to hear his voice, not on the authority of his own name, but because the name of Jehovah was in him. If on the other hand it is contended that the angel was Christ, this proves no more than that Christ was an angel, according to their interpretation of Gen. 48:16, “the angel which redeemed me from all evil”; and Isa. 63:9, “the angel of his presence saved them” — that is, he who represented his presence or glory, and bore his character; an angel, or messenger, as they say, by office, but Jehovah by nature. But to whose satisfaction will they be able to prove this? He is called indeed, Mal. 3:1, “the messenger of the covenant”: see also Exod. 23:20, 21, compared with 1 Cor. 10:9, as before. But it does not therefore follow, that whenever an angel is sent from heaven, that angel is to be considered as Christ; nor where Christ is sent, that he is to be considered as one God with the Father. Nor ought the obscurity of the law and the prophets to be brought forward to refute the light of the gospel, but on the contrary the light of the gospel ought to be employed to illustrate the obscurity necessarily arising from the figurative language of the prophets.

However this may be, Moses says, prophesying of Christ, Deut. 18:15, “Jehovah thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken.” It will be answered that he here predicts the human nature of Christ. I reply that in the following verse he plainly takes away from Christ that divine nature which it is wished to make co-essential with the Father, “according to all that thou desiredst of Jehovah thy God in Horeb . . . saying, Let me not hear again the voice of Jehovah my God,” etc. In hearing Christ, therefore, as Moses himself predicts and testifies, they were not to hear the God Jehovah, nor were they to consider Christ as Jehovah.

The style of the prophetic book of Revelation, as respects this subject, must be regarded in the same light. Chap 1:1, 8, 11, “he sent and signified it by his angel.” Afterwards this angel (who is described nearly in the same words as the angel, Dan. 10:5, etc.) says, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come”; v. 13, “like unto the Son of man”; v. 17, “I am the first and the last”; 2:7, etc., “what the Spirit saith unto the churches”; 22:6, “the Lord God sent his angel”; v. 8, “before the feet of

the angel which showed me these things"; v. 9 "see thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant," etc. Again, the same angel says, v. 12, "behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me," etc., and again, v. 13, "I am Alpha and Omega," etc., and v. 14, "blessed are they that do his commandments," and v. 16, "I Jesus have sent my angel," etc.

These passages so perplexed Beza, that he was compelled to reconcile the imaginary difficulty by supposing that the order of a few verses in the last chapter had been confused and transposed by some Arian (which he attributed to the circumstance of the book having been acknowledged as canonical by the Church at a comparatively late period, and therefore less carefully preserved), whence he thought it necessary to restore them to what he considered their proper order. This supposition would have been unnecessary, had he remarked, what may be uniformly observed throughout the Old Testament, that angels are accustomed to assume the name and person, and the very words of God and Jehovah, as their own; and that occasionally an angel represents the person and the very words of God, without taking the name either of Jehovah or God, but only in the character of an angel, or even of a man, as Junius himself acknowledges, Judges 2:1, etc.

But according to divines the name of Jehovah signifies two things, either the nature of God, or the completion of his word and promises. If it signify the nature, and therefore the person of God, why should not he who is invested with his person and presence, be also invested with the name which represents them? If it signify the completion of his word and promises, why should not he, to whom words suitable to God alone are so frequently attributed, be permitted also to assume that name of Jehovah, whereby the completion of these words and promises is represented? Or if that name be so acceptable to God, that he has always chosen to consider it as sacred and peculiar to himself alone, why has he uniformly disused it in the New Testament, which contains the most important fulfillment of his prophecies; retaining only the name of the Lord, which had always been common to him with angels and men? If, lastly, any name whatever can be so pleasing to God, why has he exhibited himself to us in the gospel without any proper name at all?

They urge, however, that Christ himself is sometimes called Jehovah in his own name and person; as in Isa. 8:13, 14, "sanctify Jehovah of hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread: and he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel," etc., compared with 1 Peter 2:7, 8, "the same

is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling," etc. I answer, that it appears on a comparison of the thirteenth with the eleventh verse — "for Jehovah spake thus to me," etc. — that these are not the words of Christ exhorting the Israelites to sanctify and fear himself, whom they had not yet known, but of the Father threatening, as in other places, that he would be "for a stone of stumbling . . . to both the houses of Israel," that is, to the Israelites, and especially to the Israelites of that age. But supposing the words to refer to Christ, it is not unusual among the prophets for God the Father to declare that he would work himself, what afterwards under the gospel he wrought by means of his Son. Hence Peter says, "the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling." By whom made, except by the Father? And in the third chapter, a quotation of part of the same passage of Isaiah clearly proves that the Father was speaking of himself; v. 15, "but sanctify the Lord God" — under which name no one will assert that Christ is intended.

Again, they quote Zech. 11:13, "Jehovah said unto me, Cast it unto the potter; a goodly price that I was prized at of them." That this relates to Christ I do not deny; only it must be remembered, that this is not his own name, but that the name of Jehovah was in him, Exod. 23:21, as will presently appear more plainly. At the same time there is no reason why the words should not be understood of the Father speaking in his own name, who would consider the offences which the Jews should commit against his Son, as offences against himself; in the same sense as the Son declares that whatever is done to those who believed in him, is done to himself. Matt. 25:35, 40, "I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat . . . inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." An instance of the same kind occurs, Acts 9:4, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?"

The same answer must be given respecting Zech. 12:10, especially on a comparison with Rev. 1:7, "every eye shall see him, and they also that pierced him"; for none have seen Jehovah at any time, much less have they seen him as a man; least of all have they pierced him. Secondly, they pierced him who "poured upon them the spirit of grace," Zech. 12:10. Now it was the Father who poured the spirit of grace through the Son; Acts 2:33, "having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this." Therefore it was the Father whom they pierced in the Son. Accordingly, John does not say, "they shall look upon me," but, "they shall look upon him whom they pierced," chap. 19:37. So also in the verse of Zechariah alluded to, a change of persons takes place —

“they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only Son”; as if Jehovah were not properly alluding to himself, but spoke of another, that is, of the Son. The passage in Malachi 3:1, admits of a similar interpretation: “behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me, and Jehovah, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold he shall come, saith Jehovah of hosts.” From which passage Placaeus argues thus: he before whose face the Baptist is to be sent as a messenger, is the God of Israel; but the Baptist was not sent before the face of the Father; therefore Christ is that God of Israel. But if the name of Elias could be ascribed to John the Baptist, Matt. 11:14, inasmuch as he “went before him in the spirit and power of Elias,” Luke 1:17, why may not the Father be said to send him before his own face, inasmuch as he sends him before the face of him who was to come in the name of the Father? for that it was the Father who sent the messenger, is proved by the subsequent words of the same verse, since the phrases “I who sent,” and “the messenger of the covenant who shall come,” and “Jehovah of hosts who saith these things,” can scarcely be understood to apply all to the same person. Nay, even according to Christ’s own interpretation, the verse implies that it was the Father who sent the messenger; Matt. 11:10, “behold, I send my messenger before thy face.” Who was it that sent? — the Son, according to Placaeus. Before the face of whom? — of the Son: therefore the Son addresses himself in this passage, and sends himself before his own face, which is a new and unheard of figure of speech; not to mention that the Baptist himself testifies that he was sent by the Father, John 1:33, “I knew him not, but he that sent me . . . the same said unto me,” etc.

God the Father therefore sent the messenger before the face of his Son, inasmuch as that messenger preceded the advent of the Son; he sent him before his own face, inasmuch as he was himself in Christ, or, which is the same thing, in the Son, “reconciling the world unto himself,” 2 Cor. 5:19. That the name and presence of God is used to imply his vicarious power and might resident in the Son, is proved by another prophecy concerning John the Baptist, Isa. 40:3, “the voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of Jehovah; make straight in the desert a highway for our God.” For the Baptist was never heard to cry that Christ was *Jehovah* or *our God*.

Recurring, however, to the Gospel itself, on which, as on a foundation, our dependence should chiefly be placed, and adducing my proofs more



especially from the evangelist John, the leading purpose of whose work was to declare explicitly the nature of the Son's divinity, I proceed to demonstrate the other proposition announced in my original division of the subject — namely, that the Son himself professes to have received from the Father, not only the name of God and of Jehovah, but all that pertains to his own being — that is to say, his individuality, his existence itself, his attributes, his works, his divine honours; to which doctrine the apostles also, subsequent to Christ, bear their testimony. John 3:35, “the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things unto him;”, 13:3, “Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things unto him, and that he was come from God.” Matt. 11:27, “all things are delivered unto me of my Father.”

But here perhaps the advocates of the contrary opinion will interpose with the same argument which was advanced before; for they are constantly shifting the form of their reasoning, Vertumnus-like, and using the twofold nature of Christ developed in his office of mediator, as a ready subterfuge by which to evade any arguments that may be brought against them. What Scripture says of the Son generally, they apply, as suits their purpose, in a partial and restricted sense; at one time to the Son of God, at another to the Son of Man — now to the Mediator in his divine, now in his human capacity, and now again in his union of both natures. But the Son himself says expressly, “the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand,” John 3:35 — namely, because “he loveth him,” not because he hath begotten him — and he hath given all things to him as “the Son,” not as Mediator only. If the words had been meant to convey the sense attributed to them by my opponents, it would have been more satisfactory and intelligible to have said, the *Father loveth Christ*, or the *Mediator*, or the *Son of Man*. None of these modes of expression are adopted, but it is simply said, “the Father loveth the Son”; that is, whatever is comprehended under the name of the Son.

The same question may also be repeated which was asked before, whether from the time that he became the Mediator, his Deity, in their opinion, remained what it had previously been, or not? If it remained the same, why does he ask and receive everything from the Father, and not from himself? If all things come from the Father, why is it necessary (as they maintain it to be) for the mediatorial office, that he should be the true and supreme God; since he has received from the Father whatever belongs to him, not only in his mediatorial, but in his filial character? If his Deity be not the same as before, he was never the supreme God. From

hence may be understood John 16:15, “all things that the Father hath are mine” — that is, by the Father’s gift. And 17:9, 10, “them which thou hast given me, for they are thine; and all mine are thine, and thine are mine.”

In the first place, then, it is most evident that he receives his name from the Father. Isa. 9:6, “his name shall be called Wonderful . . . the everlasting Father”; if indeed this elliptical passage be rightly understood: for, strictly speaking, the Son is not the Father, and cannot properly bear the name, nor is it elsewhere ascribed to him, even if we should allow that in some sense or other it is applied to him in the passage before us. The last clause, however, is generally translated not “the everlasting Father,” but “the Father of the age to come” — that is, its teacher, the name of father being often attributed to a teacher. Philipp. 2:9, “wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and hath given him (καὶ ἔχαρισάτο — *kai echarisato*) a name which is above every name.” Heb. 1:4, “being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.” Eph. 1:20, 21, “when he set him at his own right hand . . . far above all principality . . . and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.” There is no reason why that name should not be Jehovah, or any other name pertaining to the Deity, if there be any still higher: but the imposition of a name is allowed to be uniformly the privilege of the greater personage, whether father or lord.

We need be under no concern, however, respecting the name, seeing that the Son receives his very being in like manner from the Father. John 7:29, “I am from him.” The same thing is implied in John 1:1, “in the beginning.” For the notion of his eternity is here excluded not only by the decree, as has been stated before, but by the name of Son, and by the phrases — “this day have I begotten thee,” and “I will be to him a father.” Besides, the word “beginning” can only here mean “before the foundation of the world,” according to John 17:5, as is evident from Col. 1:15-17, “the first born of every creature: for by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth . . . and he is before all things, and by him all things consist.”

Here the Son, not in his human or mediatorial character, but in his capacity of creator, is himself called the first born of every creature. So too Heb. 2:11, “for both he that sanctifieth, and they that are sanctified, are all of one”; and 3:2, “faithful to him that appointed him.” Him who was begotten from all eternity the Father cannot have begotten, for what was made from all eternity was never in the act of being made; him whom

the Father begat from all eternity he still begets; he whom he still begets is not yet begotten, and therefore is not yet a Son; for an action which has no beginning can have no completion. Besides, it seems to be altogether impossible that the Son should be either begotten or born from all eternity. If he is the Son, either he must have been originally in the Father, and have proceeded from him, or he must always have been as he is now, separate from the Father, self-existent and independent. If he was originally in the Father, but now exists separately, he has undergone a certain change at some time or other, and is therefore mutable. If he always existed separately from, and independently of, the Father, how is he from the Father, how begotten, how the Son, how separate in subsistence, unless he be also separate in essence? since (laying aside metaphysical trifling) a substantial essence and a subsistence are the same thing. However this may be, it will be universally acknowledged that the Son now at least differs numerically from the Father; but that those who differ numerically must differ also in their proper essences, as the logicians express it, is too clear to be denied by anyone possessed of common reason. Hence it follows that the Father and the Son differ in essence.

That this is the true doctrine, reason shews on every view of the subject; that it is contrary to Scripture, which my opponents persist in maintaining, remains to be proved by those who make the assertion. Nor does the type of Melchisedec, on which so much reliance is placed, involve any difficulty. Heb. 7:3, "without father, without mother, without descent; having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God." For inasmuch as the Son was without any earthly father, he is in one sense said to have had no beginning of days; but it no more appears that he had no beginning of days from all eternity, than that he had no Father, or was not a Son. If, however, he derived his essence from the Father; since the divine essence, whose property it is to be always one, cannot possibly generate the same essence by which it is generated, nor can a subsistence or person become an agent or patient under either of the circumstances supposed, unless the entire essence be simultaneously agent or patient in the same manner also.

Now as the effect of generation is to produce something which shall exist independently of the generator, it follows that God cannot beget a co-equal Deity, because unity and infinity are two of His essential attributes. Since therefore the Son derives his essence from the Father, he is posterior to the Father not merely in rank (*ordine*) (a distinction unauthorized by Scripture, and by which many are deceived), but also in

essence; and the filial character itself, on the strength of which they are chiefly wont to build his claim to supreme divinity, affords the best refutation of their opinion. For the supreme God is self-existent; but he who is not self-existent, who did not beget, but was begotten, is not the first cause, but the effect, and therefore is not the supreme God. He who was begotten from all eternity, must have been from all eternity; but if he can have been begotten who was from all eternity, there is no reason why the Father Himself should not have been begotten, and have derived His origin also from some paternal essence. Besides, since father and son are relative terms, distinguished from each other both in theory and in fact, and since according to the laws of contraries the father cannot be the son, nor the son the father, if (which is impossible from the nature of relation) they were of one essence, it would follow that the father stood in a filial relation to the son, and the son in a paternal relation to the father — a position, of the extravagance of which any rational being may judge. For the doctrine which holds that a plurality of hypostasis is consistent with a unity of essence, has already been sufficiently confuted. Lastly, if the Son be of the same essence with the Father, and the same Son after his hypostatical union coalesce in one person with man, I do not see how to evade the inference, that man also is the same person with the Father, an hypothesis which would give birth to not a few paradoxes. But more may perhaps be said on this point, when the incarnation of Christ comes under consideration.

With regard to his existence. John 5:26, “as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself”; 6:57, “as the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me . . .” This gift of life is for ever. Heb. 1:8, “unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever” — hence verses 11, 12, “they shall perish but thou remainest . . . but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.”

With regard to the divine attributes. And first, that of *Omnipresence*; for if the Father has given all things to the Son, even his very being and life, He has also given him to be wherever He is. In this sense is to be understood John 1:48, “before that Philip called thee . . . I saw thee.” For Nathanael inferred nothing more from this than what he professes in the next verse — “thou art the Son of God,” and 3:13, “the Son of man which is in heaven.” These words can never prove that the Son, whether of man or of God, is of the same essence with the Father; but only that the Son of man came down from heaven at the period of his conception in the

womb of the Virgin, that though he was ministering on earth in the body, his whole spirit and mind, as befitted a great prophet, were in the Father — or that he, who when made man was endowed with the highest degree of virtue, by reason of that virtue, or of a superior nature given to him in the beginning, is even now “in heaven”; or rather “which was in heaven,” the Greek  $\omega\upsilon\upsilon$  (*ohn*) having both significations. Again, Matt. 18:20, “there am I in the midst of them”; 28:20, “I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” Even these texts, however, do not amount to an assertion of absolute omnipresence, as will be demonstrated in the following chapter.

*Omniscience.* Matt. 11:27, “all things are delivered unto me of my Father, and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.” John 5:20, “the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things”; 8:26, “I speak those things that I have heard of him”; v. 28, “then shall ye know that . . . as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things”; v. 38, “I speak that which I have seen with my Father”; 15:15, “all things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you”; 2:24, 25, “he knew all men . . . for he knew what was in man”; 21:17, “thou knowest all things”; 16:30, “now are we sure that thou knowest all things . . . by this we believe that thou camest forth from God”; 3:31-34, “he that cometh from heaven . . . what he hath seen and heard . . . he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him.” Rev. 1:1, “the revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him” — whence it is written of him, 2:23, “I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts” — even as it is said of the faithful, that they know all things; I John 2:20, “ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.” Even the Son, however, knows not all things absolutely; there being some secret purposes, the knowledge of which the Father has reserved to Himself alone. Mark 13:32, “of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father”; or as it is in Matt. 24:36, “my Father only.” Acts 1:7, “the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power.”

*Authority.* Matt. 28:18, “all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” Luke 22:29, “I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me.” John 5:22, “the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son”; 5:43, “I am come in my Father’s name”; 7:16, “my doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me”; 8:42, “I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me”; 12:49, 50, “I

have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak"; 14:24, "the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me"; 17:2, "as thou hast given him power over all flesh." Rev. 2:26, 27, "to him will I give power . . . even as I received of my Father."

*Omnipotence.* John 5:19, "the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise"; v. 30, "I can of my own self do nothing"; 10:18, "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again: this commandment have I received of my Father." Hence Philipp. 3:21, "he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." Rev. 1:8, "I am . . . the Almighty": though it may be questioned whether this is not said of God the Father by the Son or the angel representing his authority, as has been explained before: so also Psalm 2:7.

*Works.* John 5:20, 21, "for the Father . . . will shew him greater works than these . . . for as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will"; v. 36, "the works that my Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me": — it is not therefore his divinity of which they bear witness, but his mission from God; and so in other places. 8:28, "then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself"; 10:32, "many good works have I shewed you from my Father"; 11:22, "I know that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee"; v. 41, "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me." So likewise in working miracles, even where he does not expressly implore the divine assistance, he nevertheless acknowledges it. Matt. 12:28 compared with Luke 11:20, "I cast out devils by the Spirit, or finger, of God." John 14:10, "the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." Yet the nature of these works, although divine, was such, that angels were not precluded from performing similar miracles at the same time and in the same place where Christ himself abode daily: John 5:4, "an angel went down at a certain season into the pool." The disciples also performed the same works. John 14:12, "he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do."

The following gifts also, great as they are, were received by him from the Father. First, the power of conversion. John 6:44, "no man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him"; 17:2, "that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him"; and so uniformly; whence arises the expression, Matt. 24:31 — "his elect."

Wherever therefore Christ is said to have chosen any one, as John 13:18 and 15:16, 19, he must be understood to speak only of the election to the apostolical office.

Secondly, creation — but with this peculiarity, that it is always said to have taken place *per eum*, through him, not by him, but by the Father. Isa. 51:16, “I have put my words in thy mouth, and I have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, Thou art my people.” Whether this be understood of the old or the new creation, the inference is the same. Rom. 11:36, “for of him” (*ex eo*) — that is, of the Father — “and through him (*per eum*), and to him, are all things; to whom be glory for ever.” 1 Cor. 8:6, “to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom (*a quo*) are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom (*per quem*) are all things.”<sup>1</sup> But the preposition *per* must signify the secondary efficient cause, whenever the *efficiens a quo*, that is, the principal efficient cause, is either expressed or understood. Now it appears from all the texts which have been already quoted, as well as from those which will be produced hereafter, that the Father is the first or chief cause of all things. This is evident even from the single passage, Heb. 3:1-6, “consider the Apostle . . . who was faithful to him that appointed him . . . who hath builded the house,” that is, the church. But He “that appointed him,” v. 2, and “builded all things, is God,” that is, the Father, v. 4.

Thirdly, the remission of sins, even in his human nature. John 5:22, “the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son.” Matt. 9:6, “that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, then saith he,” etc. Acts 5:31, “him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.” Hence Stephen says, 7:60, “Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.” It clearly appears from these passages that the following expression in Isaiah refers primarily to God the Father, 35:4-6, “behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompense, he will come and save you: then the eyes of the blind shall be opened,” etc. For it was the Father who appointed Christ “to be a Saviour,” Acts 5:31, and the Father is said “to come unto him,” John 14:23, and “do the works,” as has been proved before.

<sup>1</sup> The remaining passages on the same subject are cited in Chap. VII, treatise “On Christian Doctrine.”

Editor’s note: unless otherwise indicated, footnotes are from the 1908 edition.

Fourthly, preservation. John 17:11, 12, “holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me . . . I kept them in thy name”; v. 15, “I pray . . . that thou shouldest keep them from the evil.” Col. 1:17, “by him all things consist.” Heb. 1:3, “upholding all things by the word of his power,” where it is read in the Greek, not *of his own power*, but “of his,” namely, of the Father’s power.<sup>2</sup>

Fifthly, renovation. Acts 5:31, “him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel.” 1 Cor. 1:30, “of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” 2 Cor. 4:6, “for God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ”; v. 17-21, “behold, all things are become new, and all things are of God, who hath reconciled himself to us by Jesus Christ . . . we pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled unto God: for he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” Hence Jer. 23:6 may be explained without difficulty: “this is his name whereby he shall be called Jehovah our righteousness,” and 33:16, “this is the name wherewith she shall be called” (that is, the Church, which does not thereby become essentially one with God) “Jehovah our righteousness.”

Sixthly, the power of conferring gifts — namely, that vicarious power which he has received from the Father. John 17:18, “as thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world.” See also 20:21. Hence Matt. 10:1, “he gave them power against unclean spirits.” Acts 3:6, “in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk”; 19:34, “Jesus Christ maketh thee whole.” What was said before of his works, may be repeated here. John 14:16, “I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter”; 16:13ff., “the Spirit shall receive of mine . . . all things that the Father hath are mine, therefore said I that he shall take of mine”; 20:21, 22, “as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you . . . receive the Holy Ghost.” Hence Eph. 4:8, “he gave gifts to men”;

<sup>2</sup> This subject is considered again by Milton in Chap. VIII of the treatise “On Christian Doctrine,” dealing with Providence, where the chief government of all things is shown “to belong primarily to the Father alone; whence the Father, Jehovah, is often called by the prophets not only the Preserver, but also the Saviour. Those who refer these passages to the Son, on account of the appellation of Saviour, seem to conceive that they hereby gain an important argument for his divinity; as if the same title were not frequently applied to the Father in the New Testament.” See also Chap. XIII.



compared with Psalm 68:18 whence it is taken — “thou hast received gifts for men.”

Seventhly, his mediatorial work itself, or rather his passion. Matt. 26:39, “O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me.” Luke 22:43, “there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him.” Heb. 5:7, 8, “who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared: though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered.” For if the Son was able to accomplish by his own independent power the work of his passion, why did he forsake himself; why did he implore the assistance of his Father; why was an angel sent to strengthen him? How then can the Son be considered co-essential and co-equal with the Father? So too he exclaimed upon the cross — “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” He whom the Son, himself God, addresses as God, must be the Father — why then did the Son call upon the Father? Because he felt even his divine nature insufficient to support him under the pains of death. Thus also he said, when at the point of death, Luke 23:46, “Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.” To whom rather than to himself as God would he have commended himself in his human nature, if by his own divine nature alone he had possessed sufficient power to deliver himself from death? It was therefore the Father only who raised him again to life; which is the next particular to be noticed.

Eighthly, his resuscitation from death. 2 Cor. 4:14, “knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you.” 1 Thess. 4:14, “them also which sleep in Jesus shall God bring with him.” But this point has been sufficiently illustrated by ample quotations in a former part of the chapter.

Ninthly, his future judicial advent. Rom. 2:16, “in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.” 1 Tim. 6:14, “until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Tenthly, divine honours. John 5:22, 23, “the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father . . . which hath sent him.” Philipp. 2:9-11, “God hath highly exalted him, and hath given him a name . . . that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow . . . and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.” Heb. 1:6, “when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.” Rev. 5:12, “worthy is the Lamb that was slain to

receive power," etc. Hence Acts 7:59, "calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit"; 9:14, "all that call upon thy name." 1 Cor. 1:2, "with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord." 2 Tim. 2:22, "with them that call upon the Lord out of a pure heart," that is, as it is explained, Col. 3:17, "whatsoever ye do . . . do it in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him." 2 Tim. 2:19, "every one that nameth the name of Christ." It appears therefore that when we call upon the Son of God, it is only in his capacity of advocate with the Father. So Rev. 22:20, "even so, come, Lord Jesus" — namely, to execute judgment, "which the Father hath committed unto him, that all men might honour the Son," etc., John 5:22, 23.

Eleventhly, baptism in his name. Matt. 28:18, 19, "all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." More will be said on this subject in the next chapter.

Twelfthly, belief in him; if indeed this ought to be considered as an honour peculiar to divinity; for the Israelites are said, Exod. 14:31, "to believe Jehovah and his servant Moses." Again, "to believe the prophets" occurs, 2 Chron. 20:20, and "faith toward all saints," Philem. 5, and "Moses in whom ye trust," John 5:45. Whence it would seem, that *to believe in any one* is nothing more than an Hebraism, which the Greeks or Latins express by the phrase *to believe any one*; so that whatever trifling distinction may be made between the two, originates in the schools, and not in Scripture. For in some cases *to believe in any one* implies no faith at all. John 2:23, 24, "many believed in his name . . . but Jesus did not commit himself unto them"; 17:42, "many believed on him, but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him." On the other hand, *to believe any one* often signifies the highest degree of faith. John 5:24, "he that believeth on him (*qui credit ei*) that sent me, hath everlasting life." Rom. 4:3, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." 1 John 5:10, "he that believeth not God." See also Titus 3:8. This honour, however, like the others, is derived from the Father. John 3:35, 36, "the Father hath given all things into his hand: he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life"; 6:40, "this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life"; 12:44, "Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me." Hence 14:1, "ye that believe in God, believe also in me." 1 John 3:23, "this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ." It may

therefore be laid down as certain, that *believing in Christ* implies nothing more than that we believe Christ to be the Son of God, sent from the Father for our salvation. John 11:25-27, “Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this? She saith unto him, Yea, Lord; I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world.”

Thirteenthly, divine glory. John 1:1, “the Word was with God, and the Word was God”; 1:14, “we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father,” *παρὰ Πατρός* (*para patros*); 1:18, “no man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him”; 6:46, “not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God” ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ (*ho ohn para tou theou*); 17:5, “glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.” No one doubts that the Father restored the Son, on his ascent into heaven, to that original place of glory of which he here speaks. That place will be universally acknowledged to be the right hand of God; the same therefore was his place of glory in the beginning, and from which he had descended.<sup>3</sup> But the right hand of God primarily signifies a glory, not in the highest sense divine, but only next in dignity to God. So 17:24, “that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me; for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.” In these, as in other passages, we are taught that the nature of the Son is indeed divine, but distinct from and clearly inferior to the nature of the Father — for to be with God, *πρὸς Θεὸν* (*pros theon*), and to be from God, *παρὰ Θεῶν* (*para theo*) — to be God, and to be in the bosom of God the Father — to be God, and to be from God — to be the one invisible God, and to be the only-begotten and visible, are things so different that they cannot be predicated of one and the same essence.

Besides, considering that his glory even in his divine nature before the foundation of the world, was not self-derived, but given by the love of the Father, he is plainly demonstrated to be inferior to the Father. So Matt. 16:27, “in the glory of his Father.” Acts 3:13, “the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus.” Col. 1:19, “it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell”; 2:9, “in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.” Eph.

---

<sup>3</sup> Editor’s note: Milton’s Arian Christology differs at this point from the Socinian position represented by this journal.

3:19, “that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.” These passages most clearly evince that Christ has received his fulness from God, in the sense in which we shall receive our fulness from Christ. For the term “bodily,” which is subjoined, either means *substantially*, in opposition to the “vain deceit” mentioned in the preceding verse, or is of no weight in proving that Christ is of the same essence with God. 1 Pet. 1:21, “who gave him glory, that your faith and hope might be in God”; 2:4, “chosen of God and precious.” 2 Pet. 1:16, 17, “we were eye-witnesses of his majesty; for he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him —.” 1 Pet. 4:11 compared with 2 Pet. 3:18, “that God in all things may be glorified, through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever: but grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; to whom be glory both now and for ever.” On a collation of the two passages, it would seem that the phrase “our Lord,” in the latter, must be understood of the Father, as is frequently the case. If, however, it be applied to the Son, the inference is the same, for it does not alter the doctrine of the former passage. John 12:41, citing Isa. 6:3, 5, “these things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him,” — that is, the glory of the only-begotten, given to the Son by the Father. Nor is any difficulty created by Isa. 42:8, “I am Jehovah, that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.” For though the Son be “another” than the Father, God only means that He will not give His glory to graven images and strange gods — not that He will not give it to the Son, who is the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and upon whom He had promised that He would put His Spirit, Isa. 42:1. For the Father does not alienate His glory from Himself in imparting it to the Son, inasmuch as the Son uniformly glorifies the Father. John 13:31, “now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him”; 8:50, “I seek not mine own glory; there is one that seeketh and judgeth.”

Hence it becomes evident on what principle the attributes of the Father are said to pertain to the Son. John 16:15, “all things that the Father hath are mine”; 17:6, 7, “thine they were, and thou gavest them me; . . . now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee.” It is therefore said, v. 10, “all mine are thine, and thine are mine” — namely, in the same sense in which he had called the kingdom his, Luke 22:30, for he had said in the preceding verse, “I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me.”

Lastly, his coming to judgment. 1 Tim. 6:14-16, “until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in his time he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see.”

Christ therefore, having received all these things from the Father, and “being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God,” Philippi. 2:6, namely, because he had obtained them by gift, not by robbery. For if this passage imply his co-equality with the Father, it rather refutes than proves his unity of essence; since equality cannot exist but between two or more essences. Further, the phrases “he did not think it” — “he made himself of no reputation” (literally, “he emptied himself”) appear inapplicable to the supreme God. For *to think* is nothing else than to entertain an opinion, which cannot be properly said of God. Nor can the infinite God be said to empty Himself, any more than to contradict Himself; for infinity and emptiness are opposite terms. But since he emptied himself of that form of God in which he had previously existed, if the form of God is to be taken for the essence of the Deity itself, it would prove him to have emptied himself of that essence, which is impossible.

Again, the Son himself acknowledges and declares openly, that the Father is greater than the Son; which was the last proposition I undertook to prove. John 10:29, “My Father is greater than all”; 14:28, “My Father is greater than I.” It will be answered, that Christ is speaking of his human nature. But did his disciples understand him as speaking merely of his human nature? Was this the belief in himself which Christ required? Such an opinion will scarcely be maintained. If therefore he said this, not of his human nature only (for that the Father was greater than he in his human nature could not admit of a doubt), but in the sense in which he himself wished his followers to conceive of him both as God and man, it ought undoubtedly to be understood as if he had said, My Father is greater than I, whatsoever I am, both in my human and divine nature; otherwise the speaker would not have been he in whom they believed, and instead of teaching them, he would only have been imposing upon them with an equivocation. He must therefore have intended to compare the nature with the person, not the nature of God the Father with the nature of the Son in his human form. So 14:31, “as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do.” John 5:18, 19: Being accused by the Jews of having made himself equal with God, he expressly denies it: “the Son can do nothing of himself,” 5:30, “as I hear I judge, and my judgment is just; because I

seek not mine own will, but the will of my Father which sent me"; 6:38, "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me."

Now he that was sent was the only begotten Son; therefore the will of the Father is other and greater than the will of the only begotten Son. 7:28, "Jesus cried in the temple, saying . . . I am not come of myself"; 8:29, "he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him." If he says this as God, how could he be left by the Father, with whom he was essentially one? if as man, what is meant by his being "left alone," who was sustained by a Godhead of equal power? And why "did not the Father leave him alone"? — not because he was essentially one with him, but because he "did always those things that pleased him," that is, as the less conforms himself to the will of the greater. 8:42, "neither came I of myself" — not therefore of his own Godhead — "but he sent me": he that sent him was therefore another and greater than himself; 8:49, "I honour my Father"; 8:50, "I seek not mine own glory"; 8:54, "If I honour myself, my glory is nothing"; it is therefore less than the Father's glory. 10:24, 25, "if thou be the Christ, tell us plainly . . . the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me." 15:10, "as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." 16:25, "the time cometh when I shall no more speak to you in proverbs, but I shall shew you plainly of the Father." 20:17, "I ascend unto my Father and your Father; and to my God and your God." Compare also Rev. 1:8, "I am Alpha and Omega," and v. 17, "I am the first and the last." See also 2:8, 3:12, "him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God," which is repeated three times successively. Here he, who had just before styled himself "the first and the last," acknowledges that the Father was his God. Matt. 11:25, 26, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth; because thou hast hid these things . . . even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight."