

Of the Son of God and of the Holy Spirit: Part Two

JOHN MILTON

With regard to the name of God, wherever simultaneous mention is made of the Father and the Son, that name is uniformly ascribed to the Father alone, except in such passages as shall be hereafter separately considered. I shall quote in the first place the texts of the former class, which are by far the more considerable in point of number, and form a large and compact body of proofs. John 3:16, "God so loved the world, that he gave his own Son," etc.; 6:27, "him hath God the Father sealed"; 6:29, "this is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent"; 14:1, "ye believe in God, believe also in me." What is meant by believing in any one, will be explained hereafter; in the meantime it is clear that two distinct things are here intended — "in God" and "in me." Thus all the apostles in conjunction, Acts 4:24-26, "lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God which hast made heaven and earth . . . who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage . . . against the Lord, and against his Christ?" Rom. 8:3, "God sending his own son." 1 Thess. 3:11, "now God himself, and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you." Col. 2:2, "to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ"; 3:3, "your life is hid with Christ in God." 2 Tim. 4:1, "I charge thee therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ." 1 John 4:9, "the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son." So also where Christ is named first in order. Gal. 1:1, "by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead." 2 Thess. 2:16, "now our Lord

Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father.” The same thing may be observed in the very outset of all the epistles of St. Paul and of the other apostles, where, as is natural, it is their custom to declare in express and distinct terms who he is by whose divine authority they have been sent. Rom. 1:7, 8; 1 Cor. 1:1-3; 2 Cor. 1:1-3; and so throughout to the book of Revelation. See also Mark 1:1.

The Son likewise teaches that the attributes of divinity belong to the Father alone, to the exclusion even of himself. With regard to omniscience. Matt. 24:36, “of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels of heaven, but my Father only”; and still more explicitly, Mark 13:32, “not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.”

With regard to supreme dominion both in heaven and earth, the unlimited authority and full power of decreeing according to his own independent will. Matt. 6:13, “thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever”; 18:35, “so likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not,” etc.; 26:29, “in my Father’s kingdom”; 20:23, “to sit on my right hand and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.” It “is not mine” — in my mediatorial capacity, as it is commonly interpreted. But questionless when the ambition of the mother and her two sons incited them to prefer this important demand, they addressed their petition to the entire nature of Christ, how exalted soever it might be, praying him to grant their request to the utmost extent of his power whether as God or man; 20:20, “worshipping him, and desiring a certain thing of him,” and 20:21, “grant that they may sit.” Christ also answers with reference to his whole nature — “it is not mine to give”; and lest for some reason they might still believe the gift belonged to him, he declares that it was altogether out of his province, and the exclusive privilege of the Father. If his reply was meant solely to refer to his mediatorial capacity, it would have bordered on sophistry, which God forbid that we should attribute to him; as if he were capable of evading the request of Salome and her sons by the quibble which the logicians call *expositio prava* or *equivoca*, when the respondent answers in a sense or with a mental intention different from the meaning of the questioner. The same must be said of other passages of the same kind where Christ speaks of himself; for after the hypostatical union of two natures in one person, it follows that whatever Christ says of himself, he says not as the possessor of either nature separately, but with reference to the whole of

his character, and in his entire person, except where he himself makes a distinction. Those who divide this hypostatical union at their own discretion, strip the discourses and answers of Christ of all their sincerity; they represent everything as ambiguous and uncertain, as true and false at the same time; it is not Christ that speaks, but some unknown substitute, sometimes one, and sometimes another; so that the words of Horace may be justly applied to such disputants: “*Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?*” Luke 23:34, “Father, forgive them,” etc. John 14:2, “in my Father’s house.” So also Christ himself says, Matt. 26:39, “O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.” Now it is manifest that those who have not the same will, cannot have the same essence. It appears, however, from many passages, that the Father and Son have not, in a numerical sense, the same intelligence or will. Matt. 24:36, “no man knoweth . . . but my Father only.” Mark 13:32, “neither the Son, but the Father.” John 6:38, “I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.” Those therefore whose understanding and will are not numerically the same, cannot have the same essence. Nor is there any mode of evading this conclusion, inasmuch as this is the language of the Son himself respecting his own divine nature. See also Matt. 26:42, and v. 53, “thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?” Mark 14:36, “Abba Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me,” etc. Luke 22:29, “I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me”; 23:46, “Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.” John 12:27, “Father, save me from this hour.” If these prayers be uttered only in his human capacity, which is the common explanation, why does he petition these things from the Father alone instead of from himself, if he were God? Or rather, supposing him to be at once man and the supreme God, why does he ask at all for what was in his own power? What need was there for the union of the divine and the human nature in one person, if he himself, being equal to the Father, gave back again into his hands everything that he had received from him?

With regard to his supreme goodness. Matt. 19:17, “why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God.” We need not be surprised that Christ should refuse to accept the adulatory titles which were wont to be given to the Pharisees, and on this account should receive the young man with less kindness than usual; but when he says, “there is none good but one, that is, God,” it is evident that he did not choose to be

considered essentially the same with that one God; for otherwise this would only have been disclaiming the credit of goodness in one character, for the purpose of assuming it in another. John 6:32, “my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven”; 6:65, “no man can come unto me” — that is, to me, both God and man — “except it were given unto him of my Father.”

With regard to his supreme glory. Matt. 18:10, “their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.” John 17:4, “I have glorified thee on the earth.” Nay, it is to those who obey the Father that the promise of true wisdom is made even with regard to the knowing Christ himself, which is the very point now in question. John 7:17, 18, “if any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself: he that speaketh of himself speaketh of his own glory; but he that seeketh his glory that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him”; 15:8, “herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples.” Matt. 7:21, “not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father that is in heaven”; 12:50, “whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.”

Thus Christ assigns every attribute of the Deity to the Father alone. The apostles uniformly speak in a similar manner. Rom. 15:5, 6, “the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like-minded one toward another, according to Christ Jesus”; 16:25-27, “to him that is of power to establish you . . . according to the commandment of the everlasting God . . . to God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ — our Lord,” as the *Vetus Interpres* and some of the Greek manuscripts read it. 1 Tim. 6:13-16, “I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who witnessed a good confession . . . until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who alone hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, nor can see; to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen.”

With regard to his works. See Rom. 16:25-27; 1 Tim. 6:13-16, as quoted above. 2 Cor. 1:21, 22, “now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us.” Now the God which stablisheth us, is one God. 1 Peter 1:2, “elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit

unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.” Even those works which regard the Son himself, or which were done in him. Acts 5:30-33, “the God of our fathers raised up Jesus . . . 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.” Gal. 1:1, “by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.” Rom. 10:9, “if thou shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.” 1 Cor. 6:14, “God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise us up by his own power.” 1 Thess. 1:10, “to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead.” Heb. 10:5, “sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me.” 1 Peter 1:21, “who by him do believe in God that raised him up from the dead.” So many are the texts wherein the Son is said to be raised up by the Father alone, which ought to have greater weight than the single passage in St. John 2:19, “destroy the temple, and in three days I will raise it up” — where he spake briefly and enigmatically, without explaining his meaning to enemies who were unworthy of a fuller answer, on which account he thought it unnecessary to mention the power of the Father.

With regard to divine honours. For as the Son uniformly pays worship and reverence to the Father alone, so he teaches us to follow the same practice. Matt. 6:6, “pray to thy Father”; 6:9: “after this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father, which art in heaven,” etc.” 18:19, “as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven.” Luke 11:1, 2, “teach us to pray,” etc., “and he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven.” John 2:16, “make not my Father’s house an house of merchandise”; 4:21-23, “the hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him”; 15:16, “that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you”; 16:23, “in that day ye shall ask me nothing; . . . whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.” Rom. 1:8, 9, “first, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all . . . for God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son,” etc.; 5:11, “we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ”; 7:25, “I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord”; 15:6, “that ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” 1 Cor. 1:4, “I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ”; 2 Cor. 1:3, “blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort.” Gal. 1:4,

5, "who gave himself . . . according to the will of God and our Father; to whom be glory for ever and ever." Eph. 1:3, "blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc.; 2:18, "for through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father"; 3:14, "for this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." 3:20, 21, "now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end." Philippians 1:2, 3, "grace be unto you and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. I thank my God upon every remembrance of you." See also Col. 1:3, and 3:17, "whatsoever ye do . . . do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him." 1 Thess. 1:2, 3, "we give thanks to God for you all, making mention of you in our prayers: remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father"; 1:9, 10, "to serve the living and true God; and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead." See also 2 Thess. 1:2, 3, and 2 Tim. 1:3, "I thank God, whom I serve from my forefathers." Now the forefathers of Paul served God the Father alone. See also Philem. 4, 5, and 1 Peter 1:3 and 4:10, 11, "as every man hath received the gift . . . let him speak as the oracles of God . . . as of the ability which God giveth, that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ." James 1:27, "pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father, is this." 1 John 2:1, "we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous"; 2 John 4-6, "walking in truth, as we have received a commandment from the Father . . . this is love, that we walk after his commandments." Rev. 1:6, "who made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever." Matt. 21:12, "Jesus went into the temple of God." Here however my opponents quote the passage from Malachi 3:1, "the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant." I answer, that in prophetic language these words signify the coming of the Lord into the flesh, or into the temple of the body, as it is expressed in John 2:21. For the Jews sought no one in the temple as an object of worship, except the Father; and Christ himself in the same chapter has called the temple his Father's house, and not his own. Nor were they seeking God, but "that Lord and messenger of the covenant"; that is, him who was sent from God as the mediator of the covenant; — he it was who should come to his Church, which the prophets generally express figuratively under the image of the temple. So

also where the terms God and man are put in opposition to each other, the Father stands exclusively for the one God. James 3:9, “therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God.” 1 John 2:15, 16, “if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him: for all that is in the world . . . is not of the Father, but of the world.”

But it is strenuously urged on the other hand, that the Son is sometimes called God, and even Jehovah; and that all the attributes of the Deity are assigned to him likewise in many passages both of the Old and New Testament. We arrive therefore at the other point which I originally undertook to prove; and since it has been already shown from the analogy of Scripture, that where the Father and the Son are mentioned together, the name, attributes, and works of the Deity, as well as divine honours, are always assigned to the one and only God the Father, I will now demonstrate, that whenever the same properties are assigned to the Son, it is in such a manner as to make it easily intelligible that they ought all primarily and properly to be attributed to the Father alone.

It must be observed in the first place, that the name of God is not unfrequently ascribed, by the will and concession of God the Father, even to angels and men, — how much more then to the only begotten Son, the image of the Father. To angels. Psalm 97:7, 9, “worship him all ye gods . . . thou art high above all the earth; thou art exalted far above all gods,” compared with Heb. 1:6. See also Psalm 8:5. To judges. Exod. 22:28, “thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people.” See also, in the Hebrew, Exod. 21:6; 22:8, 9; Psalm 82:1, 6, “he judgeth among the gods.” “I have said, Ye are gods, and all of you are children of the most High.” To the whole house of David, or to all the Saints. Zech. 12:8, “the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the Lord before them.” The word אֱלֹהִים (*elohim*), though it be of the plural number, is also employed to signify a single angel, in case it should be thought that the use of the plural implies a plurality of persons in the Godhead: Judges 13:21, 22, “then Manoah knew that he was an angel of Jehovah: and Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen God.” The same word is also applied to a single false god. Exod. 20:3, “thou shalt have no other gods before me.” To Dagon: Judges 16:23. To single idols: 1 Kings 11:33. To Moses: Exod. 4:16 and 7:1. To God the Father alone: Psalm 2:7, 45:7, and in many other places. Similar to this is the use of the word אֲדֹנָיִם (*adonim*), *the Lord*, in the plural number with a singular meaning; and with a plural affix according to the Hebrew

mode. The word אֲדֹנָי (*adonai*) also with the vowel *Patha* is frequently employed to signify one man, and with the vowel *Kamets* to signify one God, or one angel bearing the character of God. This peculiarity in the above words has been carefully noticed by the grammarians and lexicographers themselves, as well as in בָּעַל (*ba'al*) used appellatively. The same thing may perhaps be remarked of the proper names בְּעָלִים (*be'alim*) and אֲשֶׁת־אֲשֶׁת־אֲשֶׁת־אֲשֶׁת (*ashtarot*). For even among the Greeks, the word δεσπότης (*despotēs*), that is, Lord, is also used in the plural number in the sense of the singular, when extraordinary respect and honour are intended to be paid. Thus in the *Iphigenia in Aulis* of Euripides, λίαν δεσπότησι πιστὸς εἶ (*lian despotaisi pistos ei*) [l. 304, Beck's edition] for δεσπότη (*despotē*), and again εὐκλέες τοι δεσποτῶν θνήσκειν ὑπερ (*euklees toi despotōn thnēskein uper*) [l. 312] for δεσπότη (*despotou*). It is also used in the *Rhesus* and the *Bacchae* in the same manner.

Attention must be paid to these circumstances, lest anyone through ignorance of the language should erroneously suppose, that whenever the word *Elohim* is joined with a singular, it is intended to intimate a plurality of persons in unity of essence. But if there be any significance at all in this peculiarity, the word must imply as many gods as it does persons. Besides, a plural adjective or a plural verb is sometimes joined to the word *Elohim*, which, if a construction of this kind could mean anything, would signify not a plurality of persons only, but also of natures. See in the Hebrew, Deut. 5:26; Josh. 24:19; Jer. 10:10; Gen. 20:13. Further, the singular אֱלֹהִים (*eloah*) also sometimes occurs, Deut. 32:18, and elsewhere. And the singular noun אֲדֹנָי (*adon*) is joined with Jehovah, Exod. 23:17. It is also attributed to Christ with the singular affix, Psalm 110:1, אֲדֹנָי (*l'adoni*), "Jehovah said unto my Lord," in which passage the Psalmist speaks of Christ (to whom the name of *Lord* is assigned, as a title of the highest honour) both as distinct from Jehovah, and, if any reliance can be placed on the affix, as inferior to Jehovah. But when he addresses the Father, the affix is changed, and he says, v. 5, אֲדֹנָי (*adonai*), "the Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath."

The name of God seems to be attributed to angels because as heavenly messengers they bear the appearance of the divine glory and person, and even speak in the very words of the Deity. Gen. 21:17, 18; 22:11, 12, 15, 16, "by myself have I sworn, saith Jehovah." For the expression so frequently in the mouth of the prophets, and which is elsewhere often

omitted, is here inserted, for the purpose of shewing that angels and messengers do not declare their own words, but the commands of God who sends them, even though the speaker seem to bear the name and character of the Deity himself. So believed the patriarch Jacob: Gen. 31:11-13, "the angel of God spake unto me, saying . . . I have seen all that Laban doeth unto thee. I am the God of Bethel" etc.; 32:30, "I have seen God face to face"; compared with Hos. 12:3, 4, "he had power with God, yea, he had power over the angel." Exod. 24:10, 11, "they saw the God of Israel . . . also they saw God." Deut. 4:33, "did ever people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard, and live?" Yet it is said, Exod. 33:20, "there shall no man see me and live." John 1:18, "no man hath seen God at any time"; 5:37, "ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape." 1 Tim. 6:16, "dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, nor can see." It follows therefore that whoever was heard or seen, it was not God; not even where mention is made of God, nay, even of Jehovah himself, and of the angels in the same sentence. Gen. 28:12, 13, "behold the angels of God . . . and behold, Jehovah stood above them." 1 Kings 22:19, "I saw Jehovah sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him." Isa. 6:1, 2, "I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne . . . above it stood the seraphim." I repeat, it was not God himself that he saw, but perhaps one of the angels clothed in some modification of the divine glory, or the Son of God himself, the image of the glory of his Father, as John understands the vision, 12:41, "these things said Esaias, when he saw his glory." For if he had been of the same essence, he could no more have been seen or heard than the Father himself, as will be more fully shown hereafter. Hence even the holiest of men were troubled in mind when they had seen an angel, as if they had seen God himself. Gen. 32:30, "I have seen God." Judges 6:22, "when Gideon perceived that he was an angel of Jehovah, Gideon said, Alas, O Lord Jehovah, for because I have seen an angel of Jehovah face to face." See also 13:21, 22, as before.

The name of God is ascribed to judges, because they occupy the place of God to a certain degree in the administration of judgment. The Son, who was entitled to the name of God both in the capacity of a messenger and of a judge, and indeed in virtue of a much better right, did not think it foreign to his character, when the Jews accused him of blasphemy because he made himself God, to allege in his own defence the very reason which has been advanced. John 10:34-36, "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods

unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" — especially when God himself had called the judges children of the Most High, as has been stated before. Hence 1 Cor. 8:5, 6, "for though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many, and lords many), but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him."

Even the principal texts themselves which are brought forward to prove the divinity of the Son, if carefully weighed and considered, are sufficient to shew that the Son is God in the manner which has been explained. John 1:1, "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." It is not said, from everlasting, but "in the beginning." "The Word" — therefore the Word was audible. But God, as he cannot be seen, so neither can he be heard; John 5:37. The Word therefore is not of the same essence with God. "The Word was with God, and was God" — namely, because he was with God, that is, in the bosom of the Father, as it is expressed, v. 18. Does it follow therefore that he is one in essence with him with whom he was? It no more follows, than that the disciple "who was lying on Jesus' breast," John 13:23, was one in essence with Christ. Reason rejects the doctrine; Scripture nowhere asserts it; let us therefore abandon human devices, and follow the evangelist himself, who is his own interpreter. Rev. 19:13, "his name is called the Word of God" — that is, of the one God: he himself is a distinct person. If therefore he be a distinct person, he is distinct from God, who is unity. How then is he himself also God? By the same right as he enjoys the title of the Word, or of the only begotten Son, namely, by the will of the one God. This seems to be the reason why it is repeated in the second verse — "the same was in the beginning with God"; which enforces what the apostle wished we should principally observe, not that he was in the beginning God, but in the beginning with God; that he might show him to be God only by proximity and love, not in essence; which doctrine is consistent with the subsequent explanations of the evangelist in numberless passages of his gospel.

Another passage is the speech of Thomas, John 20:28, "My Lord and my God." He must have an immoderate share of credulity who attempts to elicit a new confession of faith, unknown to the rest of the disciples, from this abrupt exclamation of the apostle, who invokes in his surprise

not only Christ his own Lord, but the God of his ancestors, namely, God the Father; as if he had said, Lord! what do I see — what do I hear — what do I handle with my hands? He whom Thomas is supposed to call God in this passage, had acknowledged respecting himself not long before, 20:17, “I ascend unto my God and your God.” Now the God of God cannot be essentially one with him whose God he is. On whose word therefore can we ground our faith with most security; on that of Christ, whose doctrine is clear, or of Thomas, a new disciple, first incredulous, then suddenly breaking out into an abrupt exclamation in an ecstasy of wonder, if indeed he really called Christ his God? For having reached out his fingers, he called the man whom he touched, as if unconscious of what he was saying, by the name of God. Neither is it credible that he should have so quickly understood the hypostatic union of that person whose resurrection he had just before disbelieved. Accordingly the faith of Peter is commended “blessed art thou, Simon” — for having only said — “thou art the Son of the living God,” Matt. 16:16, 17. The faith of Thomas, although as it is commonly explained, it asserts the divinity of Christ in a much more remarkable manner, is so far from being praised, that it is undervalued, and almost reproved in John 20:29, “Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.” And yet, though the slowness of his belief may have deserved blame, the testimony borne by him to Christ as God, which, if the common interpretation be received as true, is clearer than occurs in any other passage, would undoubtedly have met with some commendation; whereas it obtains none whatever. Hence there is nothing to invalidate that interpretation of the passage which has been already suggested, referring the words — “my Lord” — to Christ — “my God” — to God the Father, who had just testified that Christ was his Son, by raising him up from the dead in so wonderful a manner.

So too Heb. 1:8, “unto the Son” — or “of the Son” — “he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.” But in the next verse it follows, “thou hast loved righteousness,” etc., “therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows,” where almost every word indicates the sense in which Christ is here termed God; and the words of Jehovah put into the mouth of the bridal virgins, Psalm 45, might have been more properly quoted by this writer for any other purpose than to prove that the Son is co-equal with the Father, since they are originally applied to Solomon, to whom, as appropriately as to Christ,

the title of God might have been given on account of his kingly power, conformably to the language of Scripture.

These three passages are the most distinct of all that are brought forward; for the text in Matt. 1:23, “they shall call” (for so the great majority of the Greek manuscripts read it) “his name Immanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us,” does not prove that he whom they were so to call should necessarily be God, but only a messenger from God, according to the song of Zacharias, Luke 1:68, 69, “blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us,” etc. Nor can anything certain be inferred from Acts 16:31, 34, “believe on the Lord Jesus Christ — and he rejoiced, believing in God with all his house.” For it does not follow from hence that Christ is God, since the apostles have never distinctly pointed out Christ as the ultimate object of faith; but these are merely the words of the historian, expressing briefly what the apostles doubtless inculcated in a more detailed manner — faith in God the Father through Christ. Nor is the passage in Acts 20:28 more decisive — “the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood”; that is, with his own Son, as it is elsewhere expressed, for God properly speaking has no blood; and no usage is more common than the substitution of the figurative term blood for offspring. But the Syriac version reads, not “the Church of God,” but “the Church of Christ”; and in our own recent translation it is, “the Church of the Lord.” Nor can any certain dependence be placed on the authority of the Greek manuscripts, five of which read τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ (*tou Kurious kai Theou*), according to Beza, who suspects that the words τοῦ Κυρίου (*tou Kurious*) have crept in from the margin, though it is more natural to suppose the words καὶ Θεοῦ (*kai Theou*) to have crept in, on account of their being an addition to the former. The same must be said respecting Rom. 9:5, “who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.” For in the first place, Hilary and Cyprian do not read the word *God* in this passage, nor do some of the other Fathers, if we may believe the authority of Erasmus; who has also shewn that the difference of punctuation may raise a doubt with regard to the true meaning of the passage, namely, whether the clause in question should not rather be understood of the Father than of the Son. But waiving these objections, and supposing that the words are spoken of the Son; they have nothing to do with his essence, but only intimate that divine honour is communicated to the Son by the Father, and particularly that he is called God; which is nothing more than

what has been already fully shown by other arguments. But, it is said, the same words which were spoken of the Father, Rom. 1:25, "the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen," are here repeated of the Son; therefore the Son is equal to the Father. If there be any force in this reasoning, it will rather prove that the Son is greater than the Father; for according to the ninth chapter, he is "over all," which, however, they remind us, ought to be understood in the same sense as John 3:31, 32, "he that cometh from above, is above all; he that cometh from heaven is above all." In these words even the divine nature is clearly implied, and yet, "what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth," which language affirms that he came not of himself, but was sent from the Father, and was obedient to him. It will be answered, that it is only his mediatorial character which is intended. But he never could have become a mediator, nor could he have been sent from God, or have been obedient to him, unless he had been inferior to God and the Father as to his nature. Therefore also after he shall have laid aside his functions as mediator, whatever may be his greatness, or whatever it may previously have been, he must be subject to God and the Father. Hence he is to be accounted above all, with this reservation, that he is always to be excepted "who did put all things under him," 1 Cor. 15:27, and who consequently is above him under whom he has put all things. If lastly he be termed "blessed," it must be observed that he received blessing as well as divine honour, not only as God, but even as man. Rev. 5:12, "worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing"; and hence, 5:13, "blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

There is a still greater doubt respecting the reading in 1 Tim. 3:16, "God was manifest in the flesh." Here again Erasmus asserts that neither Ambrose nor the *Vetus Interpres* reads the word God in this verse, and that it does not appear in a considerable number of the early copies. However this may be, it will be clear, when the context is duly examined, that the whole passage must be understood of God the Father in conjunction with the Son. For it is not Christ who is "the great mystery of godliness," but God the Father in Christ, as appears from Col. 2:2, "the mystery of God and of the Father, and of Christ." 2 Cor. 5:18, 19, "all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ . . . to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Why therefore should God the

Father not be in Christ through the medium of all those offices of reconciliation which the apostle enumerates in this passage of Timothy? “God was manifest in the flesh” — namely, in the Son, his own image; in any other way he is invisible: nor did Christ come to manifest himself, but his Father, John 14:8, 9. “Justified in the Spirit” — and who should be thereby justified, if not the Father? “Seen of angels” — inasmuch as they desired to look into this mystery. 1 Peter 1:12, “preached unto the Gentiles” — that is, the Father in Christ. “Believed on in the world” — and to whom is faith so applicable, as to the Father through Christ? “Received up into glory” — namely, he who was in the Son from the beginning, after reconciliation had been made, returned with the Son into glory, or was received into that supreme glory which he had obtained in the Son. But there is no need of discussing this text at greater length: those who are determined to defend at all events the received opinion, according to which these several propositions are predicated not of the Father but of the Son alone, when they are in fact applicable both to the one and the other, though on different grounds, may easily establish that the Son is God, a truth which I am far from denying — but they will in vain attempt to prove from this passage that he is the supreme God, and one with the Father.

The next passage is Titus 2:13, “the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.” Here also the glory of God the Father may be intended, with which Christ is to be invested on his second advent, Matt. 16:27, as Ambrose understands the passage from the analogy of Scripture. For the whole force of the proof depends upon the definitive article, which may be inserted or omitted before the two nouns in the Greek without affecting the sense; or the article prefixed to one may be common to both. Besides, in other languages, where the article is not used, the words may be understood to apply indifferently either to one or two persons; and nearly the same words are employed without the article in reference to two persons, Philipp. 1:2, and Philem. 3, except that in the latter passages the word “Father” is substituted for “great.” So also 2 Peter 1:1, “through the righteousness of [our] God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.” Here the repetition of the pronoun ἡμῶν (*emon*) without the article, as it is read by some of the Greek manuscripts, shews that two distinct persons are spoken of. And surely what is proposed to us as an object of belief, especially in a matter involving a primary article of faith, ought not to be an inference forced and extorted from passages relating

to an entirely different subject, in which the readings are sometimes various, and the sense doubtful — nor hunted out by careful research from among articles and particles — nor elicited by dint of ingenuity, like the answers of an oracle, from sentences of dark or equivocal meaning — but should be susceptible of abundant proof from the clearest sources. For it is in this that the superiority of the gospel to the law consists; this, and this alone, is consistent with its open simplicity; this is that true light and perspicuity which we had been taught to expect would be its characteristic. Lastly, he who calls God, “great,” does not necessarily call him supreme, or essentially one with the Father; nor on the other hand does he thereby deny that Christ is “the great God,” in the sense in which he has been above proved to be such.

Another passage which is also produced is 1 John 3:16, “hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us.” Here, however, the Syriac version reads *illius* instead of *Dei*, and it remains to be seen whether other manuscripts do the same. The pronoun *he*, ἑκεῖνος (*ekeinos*) seems not to be referred to God, but to the Son of God, as may be concluded from a comparison of the former chapters of this epistle, and the first, second, fifth, and eighth verses of the chapter before us, as well as from Rom. 5:8, “God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” “The love of God,” therefore, is the love of the Father, whereby he so loved the world, that “he purchased it with his own blood,” Acts 20:28, and for it “laid down his life,” that is, the life of his only begotten Son, as it may be explained from John 3:16, and by analogy from many other passages. Nor is it extraordinary that by the phrase, “his life,” should be understood the life of his beloved Son, since we are ourselves in the habit of calling any much-loved friend by the title of life, or part of our life, as a term of endearment in familiar discourse.

But the passage which is considered most important of all, is 1 John 5 part of the twentieth verse — for if the whole be taken, it will not prove what it is adduced to support. “We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, (even) in his Son Jesus Christ: this is the true God, and eternal life.” For “we are in him that is true, in his Son” — that is, so far as we are in the Son of him that is true: — “this is the true God”; namely, he who was just before called “him that was true,” the word *God* being omitted in the one clause, and subjoined in the other. For he it is that is “he that is true” (whom that we might know, “we know that the Son of

God is come, and hath given us an understanding”) not he who is called “the Son of him that is true,” though that be the nearest antecedent — for common sense itself requires that the article “this” should be referred to “him that is true” (to whom the subject of the context principally relates), not to “the Son of him that is true.” Examples of a similar construction are not wanting. See Acts 4:10, 11, and 10:16; 2 Thess. 2:8, 9; 2 John 7. Compare also John 17:3, with which passage the verse in question seems to correspond exactly in sense, the position of the words alone being changed. But it will be objected, that according to some of the texts quoted before, Christ is God; now if the Father be the only true God, Christ is not the true God: but if he be not the true God, he must be a false God. I answer, that the conclusion is too hastily drawn; for it may be that he is not “he that is true,” either because he is only the image of him that is true, or because he uniformly declares himself to be inferior to him that is true. We are not obliged to say of Christ what the Scriptures do not say. The Scriptures call him “God,” but not “him that is the true God”; why are we not at liberty to acquiesce in the same distinction? At all events *he* is not to be called a false God, to whom, as to his beloved Son, he that is the true God has communicated his divine power and glory.

They also adduce Phil. 2:6, “who being in the form of God.” But this no more proves him to be God than the phrase which follows — “took upon him the form of a servant” — proves that he was really a servant, as the sacred writers nowhere use the word “form” for actual being. But if it be contended that “the form of God” is here taken in a philosophical sense for the essential form, this consequence cannot be avoided, that when Christ laid aside the form, he laid aside also the substance and the efficiency of God; a doctrine against which they protest, and with justice. “To be in the form of God,” therefore, seems to be synonymous with being in the image of God; which is often predicated of Christ, even as man is also said, though in a much lower sense, to be the image of God, that is, by creation. More will be added respecting this passage hereafter.

The last passage that is quoted is from the epistle of Jude 4, “denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.” Who will not agree that this is too verbose a mode of description, if all these words are intended to apply to one person? or who would not rather conclude, on a comparison of many other passages which tend to confirm the same opinion, that they were spoken of two persons, namely, the Father the only God, and our Lord Jesus Christ? Those, however, who are accustomed to discover some extraordinary force in the use of the article,

contend that both names must refer to the same person, because the article is prefixed in the Greek to the first of them only, which is done to avoid weakening the structure of the sentence. If the force of the articles is so great, I do not see how other languages can dispense with them.

The passages quoted in the New Testament from the Old will have still less weight than the above, if produced to prove anything more than what the writer who quoted them intended. Of this class are, Psalm 68:17-19, “the chariots of God are twenty thousand . . . the Lord is among them . . . thou hast ascended on high . . . thou hast received gifts for men.” Here (to say nothing of several ellipses, which the interpreters are bold enough to fill up in various ways, as they think proper) mention is made of two persons, “God” and “the Lord,” which is in contradiction to the opinions of those who attempt to elicit a testimony to the supreme divinity of Christ, by comparing this passage with Eph. 4:5-8. Such a doctrine was never intended by the apostle, who argues very differently in the ninth verse — “now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?” — from which he only meant to show that the Lord Christ, who had lately died, and was now received into heaven, “gave gifts unto men” which he had received from the Father.