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THE PREFACE.

THE following Collection is a Specimen of a Method to determine a controverted Point of Fact, viz. What was the Sense of the Ante-nicene Fathers concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity and our Saviour's Divinity? For as to the Stress to be laid on their Authority in Controversies of Faith, I meddle not with it. I see all Parties would be glad to have them on their Side: And I confess, it affords me a sensible Pleasure to observe, that the Scripture-Doctrine in this momentous Point, was so long preserved pure and uncorrupt-ed in the Christian Church. I cannot bear, that the Memory of Persons eminent for primitive Zeal and Holiness should be treated with Contempt; as their other Accomplishments were far from being Contemptible, so the real Proofs that they gave of their Love to Christ and his Truth by resisting
resisting even unto Blood, oblige us to honour and esteem 'em. But I adore the Fulness of the Scriptures: and if any one should thrust away my Bible, to make room for their orthodox and learned Works, I cannot tell, whether I could observe due Decorum in repelling such an Attempt.

I only appeal to them as competent Witnesses of the Primitive Doctrine of Christ's Divinity, as held by themselves, and reputed Apostolical and Scriptural in their Time. And considering it as a Fact, or Point of Christian Antiquity, I see no Cause to despair of its being determin'd with a good degree of Certainty: Since we still have many valuable Monuments of Antiquity, in which they explain and defend the great Points of Christian Faith, it may justly be matter of Wonder, if an impartial Enquirer cannot find out their real Doctrine. Indeed, while we content our selves with a general View of the Fathers, and only catch at a few broken Passages, applying 'em to a particular Purpose, we may find something to say on both Sides, and dispute on long enough. But
The PREFACE.

I have been long persuaded, that it is not impossible to find out a Method, that would bid fair to bring our Debates about this Fact to a good Issue.

In order to this, I cannot think of any more unexceptionable and safe Method, than to take a full View of all the Antenicene Writers say on this great Point, and so to methodize the several Passages, that those of the like Import may by their Harmony carry the stronger Evidence with them, and more general and ambiguous Expressions may be illustrated by those of a more clear and determinate Sense. And then to clear up any remaining Obscurities, and to carry the Matter to the utmost degree of Certainty it is capable of, it may be of good Use, not only to call in all the Aids that solid Criticism will afford, but accurately to enquire into the Maxims and Principles those Authors go upon in their Reasonings, and make use of them to determine their Sense, and find out their Scheme. Words and Sentences may sometimes admit different Senses, and leave room for Evasions: But the Princi-
ples an Author lays Stress on in his Arguments, lead us to his inward Sense. I have observ'd what strange Work they make with the Antients, who bring a Set of Principles of their own to them, and make use of them to determine their Sense, and find out their Opinion concerning particular Points; when, perhaps, they knew nothing of those Principles, but had very different ones in view in their Expressions. And I'm apt to think, that the greatest Injustice is done to Authors, both sacred and others, generally in this way. How far Dr. Clarke has been guilty of this unfair dealing in support of his Scheme, has been observed by others: he has made use of some Maxims of his own to draw Consequences from the Primitive Writers, without any Proof of their being owned by them, or so much as known to them. But to them that are not servilely disposed to swallow every thing, he has, I think, afforded a Preservative against his own Mistakes, by applying his Maxims to the Post-nicene Fathers and other Orthodox Writers, and drawing Consequences from them directly.
directly contrary to their known Sentiments. I cannot help thinking, that this is a solid Demonstration, that his way of treating Authors has no Tendency to lead us to their real Sense.

It is not enough, that the Principles, by which we explain an Author's Expressions, and judge of his Scheme be true, or even self-evident, but they must be owned by him; else they will not justify our Consequences from him. As for Instance; if any one finding in Laëntius, these Words: "It is impossible, but that every thing that now has a being, must sometime have had a beginning;*" should hastily conclude, that he did not believe the Being of God, upon this self-evident Maxim, viz. That which is not absolutely eternal, but once had a beginning, is not God; he would very much misrepresent Laëntius, who had no Doubts about the Existence of God, tho' he might hold a Principle really inconsistent with it: Or if he

* Quia fieri non potest, quin id, quod sit, aliquando esse coeperit; consequens est, ut quando nihil ante illum (Deum) fuit, ipse ante omnia ex seipso sit procreatus. Inflit. Lib. 1. Cap. 7. p. 18. Ed. Cant.
had said, *That the Father and Son both had a beginning of their Existence, and there was a time when they were not*; it would not be just to infer, that he deny'd the Divinity of the Father and Son. In like manner, if it was true, that Origen deny'd the absolute Omnipotence (παντοδυναμίαν) of God, as many have supposed*, we could not infer his being of Arian Principles, tho' he had deny'd the Son to be Almighty in the same Sense. It would be easy to multiply Instances of this Sort, if the designed Bounds of a short Preface would permit. He that regards only particular Expressions of an Author, without minding the Principles that are the Substratum of his Reasonings, goes no deeper than the Surface, and can scarcely avoid often drawing wrong Consequences from his Words: But he that finds out his Principles, penetrates into his Scheme, and by an allowable Inquisition draws his inward Sense from him. The former, for want of a Key, will find, it may be, many Obscurities and seeming Inconsistencies in him:

but the latter will see, that he is not so often at Variance with himself, as the hasty and superficial Reader is apt to suppose.

This Method I have endeavoured to exemplify in the following Sheets, by giving a full View of all the decisive, together with many illustrating and corroborating Passages of Irenæus, whether seeming to be for or against the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, and our Saviour’s Godhead. I have placed ’em in such a Light and Order, as, I hope, will give no just Cause of Complaint. And have labour’d to make him, as much as might be, his own Interpreter. And if any learned Reader will be at the Pains to take his Meaning along with his Words, and treat him with common Justice and Candor, which, I think, is due to dead as well as living Authors, I doubt not, but he will find him entirely consistent with himself.

Had I been to chuse an Arbitrator in the Controversy of the Trinity, and a Witness of the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, before the Rise of Arianism, I don’t see, that any just Exception could have
have been made by either Side against Irenæus. He lived so near the Apostolick Age, that he was a Disciple of good old Polycarp, an Apostolical Man, and faithful Martyr of Chrift, who learned his Doctrine from the Apostle John, that great Asserter of his beloved Master's Divinity; and was by him (John) appointed Bishop of Smyrna. This we learn from Irenæus himself, who in his Epiftle to Florinus, lately fallen into Herefy, writes to this Purpofe: "* The Elders of the laft Age, "who were the immediate Disciples of the "Apostles, never taught you these Doc-"trines. For when I was but very young "in the lower Asia with Polycarp, I law

* Apud Eufeby. H. E. Lib.V. Cap. 20. --Ταύτα τῷ δόγματι, οὐ τὴν ἡμῶν πρεμνοτειρί, οἱ καὶ τῷ Ἀποστλῆς εὐφοροφήτηται, τῷ παρεδεχομένῳ τοι, εἴδομεν ἐν τοῖς τοῖς ἐν τῇ κατῳ Ασίᾳ προς τὸ Πελοπόννησον, ἐκπροσώπου τοίς ἐν τῇ Βασιλαίῃ ἐστί, καὶ περικρατῶν εὐδοκίμων παρὰ ἀυτῷ, μᾶλλον ὡς τὰ ταῦτα διαμορφώθηκεν, τῶν ἰεραχροσομοίων αἱ τοῖς ἐν πάσιν μαθηταῖς εὐμακρωθήσεται τῷ Βυζίτῃ, εἰνότερον αὐτῷ ἔστι με δύναται ἀπεφθάνει καί τοῦ τόπου, εἰ ὁ καθηγημένος· εὐλέγετο ὁ Μακαρίος· Πελοπόννησος καί τῆς προθήκης αὐτῶς καί τῆς οἰκουμένης καί τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τῷ Βίῳ, καί τῆς σωματοῦ· ῥίδια καί τῆς διακήδεται ὡς ἑπειτοῖς πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος καί τῆς μετα Ἰσαϊων εὐκαραστήθη ἐν αὐτῷ, καί τῆς μετα τῶν λείπων τῶν ἑορτασμῶν τοῦ Κυρίου καί ὡς ἀπειροηγοῦν τῶν λόγων αὐτῶν, καί περὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῦ ἐν τῷ τῷ παρὰ ἐκκοινεῖται καί περὶ τῶν ὑπεραμίαν ἢτος καί περὶ τῆς ἐνδεκαετίας, ὡς παρὰ ἀυτοῦ ἐν τῇ Τόπῳ τῶν λόγων παραληφθῆς ὁ Πελοπόννησος, ἀπήγγελε πάντα τῷ διά τοῦ γεγονός, τῆς ἤπατος ἐν τῷ καθήμεν ἢποτι σωματοῦ τῷ γεγονός. ταῖς καὶ τὸτε διὰ τοῦ τοῦ ὅτι τῇ Ἰεροῦ γεγονεῖ σπείρως ἔστιν, ἀπομαρτιστεῖμον· αὐτῶ ἢπ ἐν χαρτὶ, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ ἐν ἐκχίδα κατούμεν καί ἀληθῶ διὰ τὴν χαριν τῇ Ἰεροῦ γνώσεως αὐτώ ἀναμαρτιστεῖμον.
you living in great Splendor in the Imperial Court, and endeavouring to recommend your self to him. I remember what then passed much better, than much later Occurrences; for those early Impressions that are made upon us in our tender Years, growing up with us, are deeply inlay'd in the Memory. So that I can tell the very Place where the blessed Polycarp sat and discourse'd; as also his going out, and coming in, the Manner of his Life, and the Make of his Body. I remember his Sermons to the People, and how he reported, what intimate Conversation he had with (the Apostle) John, and others who had seen the Lord: And how he was wont to repeat their Sayings, and what he had heard from them concerning the Lord. And all that Polycarp reported concerning his Miracles and Doctrine, as he had received of Eye-witnesses of the Word of Life, was agreeable to the Scriptures. These Things, even at that Age, thro' the Mercy of God toward me, I attentively heard, and recorded 'em, not on paper,
"Paper, but my very Heart; and to this "Day, by the Grace of God, I with Plea-"sure ruminate upon them." Thus from Irenæus's own Words, wherein he breaths forth the Apostolical Spirit, we learn how greedily he imbib'd pure Christian Doc- trine from the Mouth of holy Polycarp; how much he valu'd it, and how faithful-ly he retain'd it. And his great Worth, Abilities and Orthodoxy were so well known, that he acquired great Authority in the Church, and learnedly defended its Doctrine against the antient Hereticks. He also made a Stand against the first Workings of a Spirit of Tyranny in the Roman See, by his celebrated Epistle to Pope Victor, on Behalf of the Asiatic Churches. And I may add, that it does not appear that he was in the least tinctured with the Notions of any Sect of Philosophers; lest any should think, he derived any of his Doctrines from their Speculations. So that, upon the whole, I can see no Reason to doubt, but Irenæus's Doctrine in this weighty Point, which lies so near the Center of Christi-
anity, is the same that the Apostles preached, and the Catholic Church then believed, whereof we cannot easily have a more authentic and unexceptionable Witness, since Inspiration ceased. But my pitching upon him for a Specimen of this Method, was owing to an Accident, that the World is not at all concerned to know.

I have added a short Dissertation on Prov.viii.22. as read by the Fathers in the Septuagint Version. And, another much larger concerning the Use and Import of the Terms γεννητός, ἀγεννητός, γεννητός and ἀγεννητός in relation to the Doctrine of the Trinity, in which some Passages of Irenæus are more fully considered, is, for some Reasons, reserved for another Opportunity, tho' at first designed to be annexed to this Collection, and sometimes referred to in it.

Thus this small Essay ventures abroad, and is submitted to the Judgment of the Learned and Impartial. If by the Blessing of God it should be in the least serviceable to the Cause of Truth, and the Great Redeemer's Honor, I shall think my Time and
and Pains well bestow'd. If any impartial Friend, or candid Adversary should discover any Mistake, or important Omission in it, I shall reckon my self obliged to him for giving me Notice of it; and shall not fail to acknowledge it, if ever I should have an Opportunity.

I must confess, I have no great Relish of the vulgar Method of managing Controversies: And therefore if any Writer should in that Spirit and Way attack a few Passages, not essential to the Cause I plead, I cannot promise, that I shall pay the Compliment of a Reply to such an Attempt: But if any thing weighty and substantial, that affects the Merits of the Cause, should appear, I shall think my self obliged to take some Notice of it.

And as the Design of this Tract is to enquire into an important Fact, and to furnish the Reader with all the Help that *Irenæus* could afford, to settle his Judgment concerning it; I am not at all concern'd, that the Heat of the Controversy is over, before it appears in the World. For, tho' some may overlook it upon that Score, yet,
yet, I hope, the allaying of Mens Heats will rather make room for a cool and impartial Consideration of an Essay, not written in the Method and Spirit of Controversy, nor designed to raise Mens Passions, but to clear up a Point of Christian Antiquity.

I only add, that even in case the World should not encourage the Author to carry this Design any further, in a like View of other Ante-Nicene Writers, the Method here exemplified may yet be of some Use to those that would not take Things upon Trust, but acquaint themselves with Primitive Christianity, by going to the Fountain-head, and reading the Fathers themselves.
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THE PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST's Divinity,
Set forth in a full Collection of the passages concerning it in Irenæus.

CHAP. I.

Some General Principles, either plainly express'd, or into which his Reasonings must necessarily be resolv'd.

I. Prin. THERE is but one only True God, who created all things.

This Irenæus lays the greatest Stress on, as the first Principle of all Religion, and uses it as a Test of men's Schemes of Doctrine.

"Since we hold the Rule of Truth, faith he,
"which is, that there is one God Almighty,

Lib. i. 22 1. Cum teneamus autem nos regulam veritatis, id eft, quia fit unus Deus omnipotens, qui omnia condidit per verbum suum. Hanc ergo tenentes regulam, licet valde varia & multa dicant, facile eos deviâffe à veritate argumentus. Omnes enim fere quotquot sint Hæreses, Deum quidem unum dicunt, sed per sententiam malam immanent; quemadmodum & gentes per Idololatriam."

B "who
who created all things by his Word.—

tho' the Heretics say many things, and of

very different import, we easily shew, that

they depart from the Truth. For almost

all the Heretics own in words but one God,

but by a corrupt meaning change (and un-
dermine this Article)—even as the Gen-
tiles do by their Idolatry."

To settle the meaning of this first Article, as understood by Irenæus, I observe,

1. All the Gnostics agreed, that there was but one supream God, who in some point of Eternity, immediately or mediately, produced several other subordinate Powers, of whom the Creator was one: yet Irenæus represents 'em, as subverting the Article of the Divine Unity by holding a plurality of Gods, and consequently symbolizing with the idolatrous Gentiles.

2. He expressly denies all other Gods, besides the one true God, whether superior, inferior, or co-ordinate. a "The Creator, faith he, is the only God, and there is no other God besides him." And he proves, b there is no God either above, or beneath him.

3. It unavoidably follows, that, if he held the Son to be God at all, he believ'd him to be the same God with the Father: and when he asserts the one God and Creator to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and says, He is that God, above whom there is no other God: he

a ii. 16. 3. Fabricator Deus hic, qui mundum fecit, solus est Deus, & non est alius Deus præter eum.


must
must be understood, according to his scope, to exclude the *Valentinian Aeons*, which the Heretics plac’d above the Creator, &c. But in consistence with this great Principle of the Unity of God, and his notion of the ineffable Union of the Father and Son, to include the Son in the Father, as always understood to be in, and with him, not as a Creature, or another God, but the same God. The Heretics held one supreme, and many subordinate Gods; *Irenaeus* opposes to this Tenet the first Article of the Creed, plainly grounded on Scripture, and universally received in the Churches. But still it would be ask’d, who this one God is? *Irenaeus*, in answer to this describes him as the Creator of the World, and the Father of Christ. And that he understood him to be the one God, not exclusive of the Son and Spirit, but, according to the Christian Scheme of Doctrine, having in himself the other two glorious Persons, will appear by comparing two passages.

The former is to this purpose: "This God *(i.e. the one God) is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and therefore the Apostle Paul said; One God the Father, who is over all, and thro’ all, and in us all.""

In another place he explains these words of the whole ever-blessed Trinity, which must therefore be included in the one God, tho’ the Father only is expressly mention’d.

"Thus, faith he, one God the Father is manifested, who is over all, and thro’ all, and in

---

"ii. 2. 6. Quoniam autem hic Deus, est pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi; & ideo Paulus Apostolus dixit: unus Deus pater, qui super omnes, & per omnia, & in omnibus nobis, Eph. iv. 6."
all. The Father is over all;—the Word is thro' all;—and the Spirit is in us all.

II. Prin. All things, besides the uncreated God, had a beginning of their Being, and consequently a precarious Existence and Duration, depending entirely upon the good Pleasure of the Creator: And this is the great Difference between God and the Creature.

In answer to an Objection against the Immortality of the Soul, which is not a necessary Being, because a Creature, he says:

Let 'em learn, that God alone, who is Lord of all, is without beginning and end, truly and for ever the same, and existing after the same manner. But all things that have been, or still are made by him, have a beginning of their Existence, and for that reason are inferior to him, that made 'em, because they are not uncreated. And they continue their Existence unto Eternity by the Will of God their Creator: as he gave 'em their Being at first, so also Continuance in it.

Again: "God differs from Man in this, that God makes, and Man is made: And he that

\[\text{Et sic unus Deus pater ostenditur, qui est super omnia, & per omnia, & in omnibus. Super omnia quidem Pater: per omnia autem Verbum: in omnibus autem nobis Spiritus.}\]

\[\text{Dicant, quoniam fine initio & fine fine, verè & semper idem, & eodem modo se habens solus est Deus, qui est omnium Dominus. Quæ autem sunt ab illo omnia, quæcunque facta, & sunt, initium quidem suum accipiant generationis, & per hoc inferiorma sunt ab eo qui ea fecit. Perfeverant autem & extenduntur in longitudinem sæculorum, secundum voluntatem FACTORIS DEI: ita ut sic initio fierent, & postea ut sint, eis donat.}\]
makes, is ever the fame: but what is made,
must receive a beginning, and succeeding
Space of Existence, and Growth and Im-
provement: And God is the Benefactor,
and Man the Receiver: And God is perfect
in all things, ever like, and equal to him-
sel: since he is all Light, all Mind, and all
Substance, and the Fountain of all good
things: But Man is capable of Increase and
Improvement in gradual Approaches toward
God.

Again: All created Beings had a begin-
ing: and things that once had a beginning,
are capable of Dissolution, are in Subjection,
and depend upon their Maker.

III. Prin. The want of necessary Existence is
the Ground of the Imperfection of all things
that had a beginning: an utter Incapacity to re-
ceive Perfection is inseparable from a created Be-
ing: It must at first pass thro' a sort of Infan-
cy, and a state of Growth and improvement,
and so by slow steps arrive to its design'd Acme.

—Upon this principle he accounts for Man's
being not made perfect at first, i. e. as knowing,
glorious, and incapable of sinning, as he will
be in Heaven.

iv. 11. 2. Et hoc Deus ab homine differt, quoniam
Deus quidem facit, homo autem fit: & quidem qui facit, sem-
per idem est; quod autem fit, & initium, & medietatem, &
adjectionem, & augmentum accipere debet— & Deus qui-
dem perfectus in omnibus, ipse fibi æqualis & similis; totus
cum fit lumen, & totus mens, & totus substantia, & fons om-
nium bonorum: homo vero profectum accipiens, & augmen-
tum ad Deum.

s iii. 8. 3. Quæ vero ab eo sunt facta, initium sumpfe-
runt, &c.

v. Locum integrum infra exhibendum.

h "To
To God, faith he, as being ever the same, and uncreated, for his own part, all things are possible: But things made by him, as they afterwards had a beginning of their existence, must for that very reason fall short of their Maker. For things but lately produced, could not be necessarily and eternally existent; and as not necessarily existent, they must needs come short of perfection: And as they are but of yesterday, they are in an infant state; and consequently for want of use and exercise are incapable of their highest improvement, &c.

Again: "Thus God has the pre-eminence in all things, as he alone is uncreated, the first of all beings, and the Author of the being of all others:" But all the rest continue in subjection to God.

IV. Prin. He that is subject to a Superior, cannot be called God, or the great King.

Upon this Principle he argues against them that held the Creator to be only a subordinate Deity, from Mat. v. 34, 35. compared with Isa. lxvi. 1. Whence it appears, that 'tis the Creator, whose Throne Heaven is.

"Be-"
Besides him, faith he, there is no other God; else our Lord would never call him God, or the great King;—For he that has any Superior above him, and is in the power of another, can neither be styled God, nor the great King.

V. Prin. There is no Creature, or Order of Creatures higher, or more excellent, than the Angels.

This Supposition runs thro' his whole Book; when he ascends to the top of the Creation, he mentions only the several Names, or Orders of Angels.

VI. Prin. He that is himself a Creature, cannot have Dominion over the Creation.

This is to our Author a self-evident Maxim, by which he confutes the Devil's claim to a delegated Dominion over this lower World, contain'd in these Words: All these things are delivered to me, &c.

k iv. 2. 5. Et præter hunc alius non est Deus; Cæterum à Domino neque Deus, neque magnus Rex diceretur. Qui enim super se habet aliquem superiorem, & sub alterius potestate est; hic neque Deus, neque magnus Rex dici potest.

i.i. 30. 3. Quid autem illa, quæ super Cælum, & quæ non prætereat, quanta sunt, Angeli, Archangeli, Throni, Dominationes, Potestates innumerabiles?

Ibid. §. 6. — Si per ipsos ea, quæ sunt super Cælos, facta sunt; dicant nobis, quæ sit invisibilium natura; enarrent numerum Angelorum, & ordinem Archangelorum; demonstrent Thronorum Sacramenta, & doceant diversitates Dominationum, Principatum & Potestatum atque Virtutum.

Item. iii. 25. 3. Sapientiam igitur præcellet Pater super omnem humanam & Angelicam Sapientiam.
"The Creation, faith he, is not in his power; since he is one of the Creatures himself."

Other more special Maxims shall be produced in their proper places.

**C H A P. II.**

Passages relating to the two distinct Natures, the Divine and Human, united in the Person of Christ.

I. **O** UR Saviour was not a mere Man, but as begotten of the Father, had a glorious Divine Nature, præ-existent to his Incarnation.

"— The Word of God, who is the Saviour of all, and Ruler of Heaven and Earth,— who also assumed Flesh, and was anointed with the Spirit by the Father, became Jesus Christ.— For as the Word of God was Man, of the Root of Jesse, and the Son of Abraham, the Spirit of God rested upon him, and he was anointed to preach Glad-tidings to the

---

m v. 22. 2. Illud igitur quod ait: *Hæc omnia mihi traditafunt, & cui volo, do ea, ut in superbiam elatus ait. Neque enim conditio sub ejus potestate est: quandoquidem & ipse unus de creaturis est.*

*ii 9. 3. — Verbum Dei, qui est Salvator omnium, & Dominator Coeli & Terræ,— qui & assumpsit Carnem, & unctus est à Patre Spiritu, Jesus Christus factus est— nam secundum id quod verbum Dei homo erat, ex Radice Jesse, & Filius Abraham, secundum hoc requiescebat Spiritus Dei super eum, & ungebatur ad evangelizandum humilibus. Secundum autem quod Deus erat, non secundum Gloriam (natur æ divinarum, secundum opinionem) judicabat, &c.*

"humble."
humble. But as he was God, he did not judge according to Appearance.

"Having clearly demonstrated, that the Word, that was in the beginning with God,—was, at the time appointed by the Father, united to his own Workmanship, and became a suffering man, I have left no room for their contrary Opinion, who say; If Christ was then born, he had no being before. For I have shewn, the Son of God did not then begin to exist, but was ever with the Father, &c.

II. The αὐτός, or Divine Nature of Christ did assume true and perfect human Nature, consisting of Soul and Body, into a close and ineffable Union with Himself, so as to make but one Christ.—Irenæus did not dream of the αὐτός its being passible, and supplying the Place of an human Soul in the Man Christ Jesus.

The Valentinians divided the Person of Christ, by distinguishing Christ from the Saviour, and both from Jesus; they held, that the Superior Nature, which they called Christ, was not personally united to the Man Jesus, but only descended on, and dwelt in Him a while, and then return'd to his place above.

To this Error he opposes the Catholic Doctrine of the Union of the two Natures in the same Person of Christ, which he affirms from Scripture by many Arguments c.

\[\text{Vide Libri 3iii caput 16um per totum, &c.}\]
The Son of God became the Son of Man, that thro' Him we might receive the Adoption of Sons, the Man having in him, and as it were, holding and containing the "Son of God," (i.e. *The Human Nature was like a Tabernacle, or Vessel fill'd with the Indwelling Deity;*) Therefore Mark also faith: The "beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God, as it is written in the Prophets, Mar. i. 1. "owning the Son of God Jesus Christ to be one and the same Person, who was preach'd "by the Prophets, and is Emmanuel of the "fruit of David's body."—

Here he strongly expresses and proves, that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and the Son of Man, was not one, and another, but one and the Same Person; He that was of the Seed of David after the Flesh, was declared to be the very Son of God, Rom. i. 1, 2, 3, 4. He who came of the Jews, with respect to the assumed humanity, was also God over all, blessed for Ever, chap. ix. 7. The same Person, who was the Son of God by eternal Generation, was made of a Woman by his birth in time, Gal. iv. 4. For upon these Texts he grounds his Doctrine of the Unity of Christ's Person. Besides, it deserves a Remark too, that Irenæus supposeth all along, the Filiation belong'd properly and originally to Christ's Divine Nature, and was founded in eternal Generation; he never dreamt, that the

---

*Filius Dei, hominis filius factus, ut per eum adoptionem percipiamus, portante homine, & capiente, & complectente Filium Dei. Propter hoc & Marcus ait: Initium Evangelii Jesu Christi Filii Dei, quemadmodum Scriptum est in Prophetis. Unum & eundem sciens Filium Dei Jesus Christum, qui à Prophetis annuntiatus est, qui ex fructu Ventris David Emmanuel, &c.*

Son
Son of God was a Name of an Office, or Title grounded on his Birth of a Virgin; but uses it in Contra-distinction to his human Nature, by which he was the Son of Man. The Man Christ was the Son of God only by Virtue of a personal Union with the λόγος, who was the Son of God by Nature, i. e. by Eternal Generation, and being God of the Same Nature with the Father.

2. e "The only begotten Word of God, who is ever present with Mankind, being intimately united to his own Workmanship, according to the Father’s good Pleasure, and made Flesh, is Jesus Christ our Lord, who suffer’d for us."

3. f "He united Man to God; for if it had not been Man that overcame the Enemy of Man, He had not been justly vanquish’d. Again; had it not been God that gave us Salvation, we could never with any certainty have depended upon it. And if Man had not

* iii. 16. 6. —Necieientes, quoniam hujus Verbum Unigenitis, qui semper humano generi adeit, unitus & * consparsus suo plasmati secundum placitum Patris, & caro factus, ipse est Jesus Christus Dominus nofiter, qui paflus eft pro nobis.—

* Περιμεῖται, quo serè fentu apud Plutarchum in Romulo, συντηματι τοῦ, i. e. anima Corpori commixta, cum intimè una dictur. v. Missuet. Not. in loc.

f iii. 18. 7. "Et uenit ei, — τὸ ἀκρωτον τοῦ Θεοῦ: η μὴ ἀλήθεια ἑνίκησεν τὸ αὐτόπαλον τῷ αὐτῷ, ἐκ αὐτὸς ἀνεκάθισεν ο ὄχθος τοῦ θάνατος, η μὴ ὁ Θεὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐκείνου τῷ θανατῷ, ἐκ αὐτὸς ἀνεκάθισεν ο ὄχθος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐκ αὐτὸς ἁλλοπραΰτης ἀρχηγοῖς ἰδιοὶ τῇ ὑποτείνου, ἐκ αὐτὸς ἁλλοπραΰτης ἀρχηγοῖς ἰδιοὶ τῇ ὑποτείνου, ἐκ αὐτὸς ἁλλοπραΰτης ἀρχηγοῖς ἰδιοὶ τῇ ὑποτείνου, ἐκ αὐτὸς ἁλλοπραΰτης ἀρχηγοῖς ἰδιοὶ τῇ ὑποτείνου.

Confer locum plane geminum, cap. sec. i. — Qui Filius Dei eft, filius hominis factus eft; — non enim aliter poteramus incorruptelam & immortalitatem, percipere, &c.

C 2 " been
been united to God, he could never have been partaker of Immortality: For the Mediator between God and Men, must, by being closely ally'd to both Parties, restore mutual Friendship and Concord betwixt 'em.

'Tis evident, he here by God means the true God, or one who has the Nature of God; and not a God by Appointment, or by being entrusted with Dominion. For as his Office of Mediator between God and Men, made it necessary he should be true Man, so by a parity of Reason he must likewise have the nature of God. And as he was ally'd to us by Consubstantiality, and the same common Nature, so his Alliance to the other party must also imply Consubstantiality with God. If a subordinate Ruler's being united to our Nature, had any tendency to make us immortal, then a mere Man, entrusted with such Divine Dominion, might be qualify'd to be our Mediator, and the Author of Eternal Salvation; which saps the very Foundation of his Argument.

4. § "That we consist of a Body taken from the Earth, and a Soul receiving the Spirit from God, no Body will deny: Therefore "the Son of God became the Same," (assum'd a Soul and Body) "summing up his own Workmanship in Himself; and upon that account "owns himself to be the Son of Man."

He proceeds to prove there the Truth of his human Nature from the Sufferings of his Body,

§ iii. 22. 1. Nos autem quoniam corpus sumus de terrâ acceptum, & anima accipiens a Deo Spiritum, omnis qui-cunque consitebitur. Hoc itaque factum est Verbum Dei, saum plasima in semetipsum recapitulans: & propter hoc filium hominis se confitetur. — v. quæ sequuntur.
and Sorrows of his Soul. His Reasonings are resolved into this Principle, That He had not been true Man, without assuming both the Constitu-
tuents of a Man, the Body and Soul. Compare with this what he elsewhere says.

h "—Man is made after the Likeness of God, "and not a part of Man: the Soul and Spirit "may be a part of the Man, but not the Man "himself: a compleat Man is a Composition "and Union of a Soul receiving the Spirit of "the Father, and of that Flesh joined with it, "which was made after the Image of God. 

Again: i "The fleshly Frame is not by it "self a perfect Man; but the body and part of "a Man: nor is the Soul in it self a Man; but "the Soul, and a part of the Man: nor is the "Spirit a Man; for 'tis called the Spirit, and "not a Man. But all these put together, and "united, make a compleat Man.

j. k "The Prophets, who set him forth as "Emmanuel to be born of the Virgin, signi-
"fy'd the union of the Word of God with his

h v. 6. 1. —Fit homo secundum similitudinem Dei, sed "non pars hominis. Anima autem & Spiritus pars hominis effe posuunt, homo autem nequaquam. Perfectionem autem homono commixtio & adunio eft animae assummentis Spiritum Patris, & admixta ci carni, quae eft plasmata secundum Imaginem Dei.

i Et post paucas. Neque enim plasmatio carnis ipfa se-
cundum se homo perfectione eft; sed corpus hominis, & pars hominis. Neque enim & anima ipsa secundum se homo; sed anima hominis, & pars hominis. Neque Spiritus homoeus; Spiritus enim, & non homo vocatur. Commixtio autem & "unitio horum omnium, perfectionem hominem efficit.

k iv. 33. 11. Et qui eum ex Virgine Emmanuel praedi-
cabant, adunio eum verbi Dei ad plasmam ejus manifestabant: quoniam Verbum caro eft; & Filius Dei Filius hominis; —& hoc factus, quod & nos, Deus fortis eft, & inenarrabile habet genus.
own Workmanship, that the Word should be made Flesh, and the Son of God the Son of Man;—and that being made of the Same Nature with us, He is the mighty God, Isa. ix. 6. and has an ineffable Generation, chap. liii. 8. 6. 1 "Remember, that you are redeemed by the Flesh and Blood of our Lord, and holding the Head, from which the whole Body of the Church, being knit together, increaseth, [Col. ii. 19.] that is, the Son of God's coming in the Flesh, both confessing Him to be God, and firmly believing his human Nature,—&c. 7. m "The Lord by the Law confuted Satan, saying: It is written again, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. Shewing, by that saying taken out of the Law, his own human Nature, that being Man he should not tempt God; but as it concern'd him (Satan,) that he should not tempt the Lord his God, in that Man that was visible:” i.e. God manifested in Christ's human Nature. I cannot see, that, tho' this Passage is somewhat obscure, it is fairly capable of any other sense. To κατα τ' ἄνθωπον, must be opposed to Christ's Divine Nature, and consequently signify his Manhood, which was under the Law. And then he observes, that the Reason and Equity
of that prohibition extended to the Devil also, tho' not a Man; and that he should not tempt his Lord, even appearing in the Nature of Man. An apostate and fugitive Servant ought not to lift up his Hand against his Master and Sovereign; for he afterwards says, the Word did overcome, and bind him, as his own Fugitive, or Run-away Servant n.

8. "As the light Wood sunk under Water, and the heavy Iron swam, 2 Kings vi. 6. "so God the Word being united to Flesh by a physical and hypothistical Union, the heavy " and earthly Nature was lifted up to Heaven " by the Divine Nature."

Tho' this Passage is only taken out of a Greek Catena on the Books of Kings, found in the French King's Library; yet he that will be at the trouble to compare it with some Passages in Ireneus not unlike it p, will see little Reason to doubt of its Genuineness.

n v. 21. § 3. Fugitivum eum homo ejus, & *Legis Transgressorem, & Apostatam Dei ostendens, postea jam Verbum constanter eum colligavit, quasi suum Fugitivum.

* Legis Transgressorem ostendit Satanam Dominum, quod Dominum Deum suum in Carne conspicuum tentare aures effeat: nam illud huc referendum puto.


p Confer 1. 5. c. 17. 4. necnon l. 4. c. 34. 4.
CHAP. III.

The Passages, wherein the Father, Son and Spirit are mention'd.

1. "THE Church, tho' it be dispersed "over all the World unto the ends "of the Earth, received from the Apostles and "their Disciples, the Faith in one God, the Fa- "ther Almighty, the Maker of Heaven, and "Earth, and Sea, and all things in them: And in "one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who was in- "carnate for our Salvation: And in the Holy "Ghost, who by the Prophets foretold the "Dispensations of God, and the Advents, and "the Birth of a Virgin, and the Passion, and "the Resurrection from the Dead, and the bo- "dily Ascension to Heaven, of the beloved "Christ Jesus our Lord.—

2. "We hold the Rule of Truth, which "is, that there is one God Almighty, who "made

a i. 10. i. 'H μὴν ὥσπερ ἐκκυλθείσα, καθ' ὅλος καὶ ὄλας ἐνεκυλημένος, ὅσα περάσαντας ἁγίας διεσπαρμένας, παρὰ τὸν ἀπόστολαν, καὶ τῶν ἐκίσσων ἑκατέρων παραλαξίνη ἡν ἐν Θεῷ, πατέρα πανορίζε- τορα, πεποιηκότας ὑμᾶς ἐμοί, καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰς ἀλαστρες, ζά πάντα τα ἐν ἀντιοι, πάσιν’ ἐν ἑνὶ Χριστὸν Ιησοῦν, ὑιὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν σωκολάβεχα ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀντιόους σωχηδίας καὶ ἑκὼς πνεύμα αὕγιον, τὸ ἑκ τῶν προφητῶν κακορυφικάς τας ὁμοφορίας, καὶ τας ἑκείοις, καὶ τὴν ἐκ παρθένος γέννησιν, καὶ τὸ ψάρι, καὶ τὴν ἐγκηριον ἐν νεκρῶ, καὶ τὴν ἐνακριβε ἐν τοὺς ὑπομοκ οὐαλυσιν τοῦ ἐναντιομοθεσ ἑνἰ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἑκρί ἢμων.

b i. 22. i. Cum teneamus autem nos Regulam Veritatis, id est, quia sit unus Deus omnipotens, qui omnia condidit per Verbum suum, & aptavit, & fecit ex eo quod non erat, ad hoc ut sint omnia, quemadmodum Scriptura dicit: Verbo enim Domini Caeli firmati sunt, & Spiritus oris ejus omnis virtus eorum.
made—all things out of nothing by his Word;
as the Scripture faith: By the Word of the
Lord were the Heavens established; and by the
Spirit of his Mouth all their Hosts, Psal. xxxiii.
6. And again: All things were made by him;
and without him was nothing made, Joh. i. 3.
(now from all things nothing is excepted)
but the Father made all things by him, whe-
ther visible or invisible—and not by An-
gels, nor by any Powers separated from his
own Mind: for the God of all stands in need
of nothing: but by his own Word and Spi-
rit makes, and orders and governs, and gives
being to all things. He that made the
World,—and formed Man, he is the God
of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the
God of Jacob, above whom there is no other
God, nor Principality, nor Power, nor Ple-
ntity: This is the Father of our Lord Jesus
Christ.—
3. c "(The Creator) himself freely and by
his own Power made, disposed, and finish'd
all things of himself;—He alone is found to
be God, who made all things, the alone Om-
nipotent,
nipotent, and the alone Father creating all
things visible and invisible—by the Word
of his Power: And he adjusted and disposed
all by his Wisdom; and the comprehending
all things, himself alone can be comprehende
by none: Himself is the Creator, Author
and Lord of all things: And there is none
besides him, or above him, not that Mo-
ther, which they falsely imagine, nor Mar-
cion’s other God, nor any Pleroma of thirty
Æons, nor a Bythus, nor Proarche,
nor any one of the monstrous Inventions of
these, and of all Heretics. But the one God
the Creator alone, he is above all Principal-
ity and Power, and Dominion, and Might:
This is the Father, this is God, this is the
Creator and Maker, who by himself, that is,
by his own Word and Spirit, made Heaven,
and Earth, and Seas, and all things that are
in ’em: He is just, he is good: This is he
that formed Man, that planted Paradise, that
framed the World, that sent the Deluge,
and solus Pater condens & faciens omnia, & viﬁbilia, & inviﬁbilia.—Verbo virtutis suæ: Et omnia aptavit, & dispoſuit Sa-
pientiæ suæ, & omnia capiens, solus autem a nemine capi po-
test: ipse fabricator, ipse conditor, ipse inventor, ipse factor, ipse Dominus omnium: & neque praeter ipsum, neque super ipsum, neque Mater, quam illi admentiuntur; nec Deus al-
ter, quem Marcion affinxit; nec Pleroma 30 Æonum, quod vanum offensum est; neque Bythus, nec Proarche; nec in totum quidquam eorum, quæ ab his, & ab omnibus Hære-
ticis deliriuntur. Sed solus unus Deus Fabricator, hic qui eft supe r omnem Principalitatem, & Potestatem, & Dominatio-
em, & Virtutem: hic Pater, hic Deus, hic conditor, hic factor, hic fabricator, qui fecit ea per semetipsum, hoc eft, per Verbum, & per Sapientiam suam, Cælum, & Terram, & Maria, & omnia quæ in eis sunt: hic juetus, hic bonus: hic eft qui formavit hominem, qui plantavit Paradīsum, qui fabri-
cavit mundum, qui Diluvium induxit, qui Noē salvavit: hic Deus
that faved Noe: This is the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, the God of the living, whom the Law shews forth, and the Prophets declare, whom Christ reveals, and the Apostles preach, and the Church believes in. This Father of our Lord Jesus is revealed and made known to all, that have any Discovery of him, by his own Word, who is his Son."

I have set down these important Passages almost entire, tho' several things in 'em will with more Propriety come under Consideration hereafter. The Reader may please to observe concerning 'em, a few Particulars.

1. That the Truths contained in 'em are deliver'd as the known and avowed Doctrine of the whole Catholic Church, received from the Apostles and their immediate Disciples, and carefully preserved in the Primitive Creeds.

2. There are three Persons, in whom they believed, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: the two latter often called the Word and the Wisdom of God: And the Doctrine of this glorious Trinity was, it seems, the Summary and Groundwork of all that Christians believ'd.

3. 'Tis as plain almost as Words can make it, that when the one God, the only Omnipotent and Creator of all, besides whom there is no God, is said to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, 'tis not to exclude the Son and Holy Ghost, but the imaginary Deities of the Valentinians, and other Heretics. For clearing this, it must

Deus Abraham, & Deus Isaac, & Deus Jacob, Deus vivorum, quem & Lex annuntiat, quem Prophetæ præconant, quem Christus revelat, quem Apostoli tradunt, quem Ecclesia credit. Hic Pater Domini nostrri Jesu Christi, per Verbum suum, qui est Filius ejus, per eum revelatur & manifestatur omnibus, quibus revelatur.
be observed, that our Author's professed Design was to confute the wild Schemes of the several Sects of the Gnostic Heretics, of whom the Valentinians were the chief. They taught, that the Demiurgus, or Creator of the World, was not the supream God, but far inferior to him. Their supream God and Father of all they called Bythus, i.e. the Depth, or incomprehensible Being, &c. him they supposed to have silently enjoy'd himself from all Eternity; and at last, long before the beginning of the World, to have produced a glorious Æon, equal to himself, and capable to comprehend him: whom they called the only-begetten (Monogenes) and the Mind, (Nus) they coupled him with another Female-Æon emitted at the same time, termed (Alethia) Truth. These soon propagated another brace of Æons, called Logos and Zoë, the Word and the Life; and so others proceeded from them, till the Number of thirty was filled up, all contained in one Plerōma, or Plenitude. The last Female-Æon, called Sophia, Wisdom, thro' an immoderate Desire to search out, and comprehend the unknown Father, had almost loft her Place in the Plerōma of the Æons: And tho' recover'd after some time, yet produced a monstrous Birth, called Mother Achamoth; a blind, shapeless Æon, made up of Ignorance and Passion, cast forth without the Plerōma, and yet under some Influence and Management of those within it: She produced the Demiurgus, or the Creator, who made the World. Others had Schemes different from this: Some held the World was created by seven Angels, the first of whom was the Patron of the Jews, and Author of the Law. Marcion held two Gods, a supream, that sent Christ,
who alone was good; and a subordinate, who made the World, and gave the Law; him he supposed to be just without Goodness. However, they generally agreed, that the Creator and God of the Old Testament, was not the supreme Father that Christ came to reveal; whom they supposed to be unknown before.

Now considering, that 'tis this heap of Blasphemy and monstrous Opinions, and not the Doctrine of the Trinity that Irenæus is disproving, to take his Words, curtailed and mangled, and, by clapping 'em in after an Arian Proposition, to set 'em in such a Light, that the Reader must understand 'em to have been leveled against the Divinity of the Son and Spirit, will not, I think, bear so much as an Appearance of Ingenuity and fair Dealing. Let the Reader, that would not be imposed upon, carry his Scope in his Thoughts, and take a view of his Expressions in their native Simplicity, and try whether they will bear the Arian Sense. When he so strongly afferts, there is but one only God, he expresseth the known Doctrine of the Church, in Opposition not only to more supreme Gods, but to one supreme, and others subordinate; which Tenet is common to the Arians with all the Heretics he opposes: hence he afferts, there is no God, not only above him, but besides him. When he had proved, that the Creator of the World is the one God, he adds, This is the Father of Christ, in Opposition to their Opinion, who held, that the God revealed by Christ, and the Maker of Heaven and Earth, were two different Beings.—When he says of the one God,

---

that there is no God above him, his professed Scope directs us to understand him simply to deny their Scheme, who set many Gods above the Creator, and not to insinuate any Distinction between him, and a subordinate God, or Gods, that have another God above them: for this is really the heretical Scheme opposed by him, and utterly inconsistent with Christian Principles. But that the impartial may judge, whether the Son and Spirit are here struck off by the exclusive Terms, or all along taken in with the Father, as supposed to be inseparably united to him, according to Christian Doctrine, I shall give a brief view of the Evidence in the Margin e.

*Characters of the one only God here set down.

1. He is the Creator of all things.

2. He has his Word and Wisdom in, and with himself, which cannot be supposed to be Beings distinct from him in Nature, or to be separately consider'd.

3. He is incomprehensible to all others.

4. He is the God of Abraham, &c. the God of the living.

5. He planted Paradise, caused the Flood, saved Nor, &c.

6. The Son and Spirit are included in the one only God.

1. This Character belongs to the Son and Spirit, which were not inferior Agents in this Work, as shall be shewn.

2. The Son and Spirit are termed his Word and Wisdom, to express their inessential Union with Him, in opposition to separate Powers and all subordinate Agents, and not to make 'em mere Attributes.

3. But the Son comprehends him, as shall be shewn; and therefore is not opposed to him, but included in him here.

4. Christ himself with the Father is the God of the living, &c. iv. 5. 2.

5. All these, and the like are often ascribed personally to the Son.

6. He
But Irenæus sufficiently explains himself, and expressly shews whom he intended to exclude by these Terms:—"There is no other God, " faith he, either besides him, or above him, " not Achamoth, nor Marcion's other God, nor " the thirty Æons, nor the Bythus, &c. But " the one God the Creator alone."— The Argument grounded on the exclusive Terms shall be fully consider'd in a proper Place: I would only observe at present, that, as they are sometimes taken respectively, not excluding all absolutely, but only those that the Author's Scope led him to exclude; as Irenæus prefaces the third Passage set down above, with such an Assertion, quod & solum verum est, And this only is the Truth: i.e. This is the Truth, and not the contrary Doctrine, or any other Opinion not consistent with it: So our Author cannot be supposed to exclude from the Godhead the Son and Spirit, that are, in his strong Expression of the Unity, the Father himself.

4. When all things are said to be created by the Son and Spirit, the Divine Work of the Creation is not ascribed to Creatures, Instruments, or inferior Agents; for he distinguishes them from the Angels, and all separate Powers, distinct from the one God; and looks upon it as inconsistent with the Divine Self-sufficiency, to employ any Agents in this glorious Work, not of the same

6. He is supposed to be uncreated.

7. He made all things alone, and by himself.

8. He is above all Principality, &c.

6. So is the Son, for all things were made by him; and all here admits no Exception, as Irenæus expressly observes.

7. The Son and Spirit then are not excluded, but reckon'd one with himself.

8. So is the Son, Eph. i. 21.

Nature,
Nature, and one with himself; as hereafter shall be more fully shewn.

7. Tho' there are three Divine Persons, yet they make not so many Gods; for the Son and Spirit are not considered as created Beings, or Powers distinct from the one God, but included in him, and so closely united to the Father, that they may be called himself:—By himself, faith he, i.e. by his Word and Spirit he made Heaven and Earth, &c. And this way of working shew'd his Self-sufficiency, that he needed not the Co-operation or Instrumentality of any Being besides himself. How could he more plainly intimate, that the Son and Spirit are one God with the Father? To do any thing, ἐν ἑαυτῷ, by himself, is a Greek Phrase, opposed to the Agency of others; and plainly here, and in the Passage to be next produced, was intended to exclude the Agency of Angels, or any subordinate Powers, that are not God himself. Now according to the Arian Scheme, Irenaeus his Expression would be a glaring Contradiction; and he should have said, God created the World, not by himself, but by his Word and Spirit. If any orthodox Father, descanting on the Apostle's Words, Heb. i. 3. had said, Christ did not redeem us by Proxy, or by the Blood of Calves and Goats, but by himself, i.e. by his human Soul and Body. Every body would understand, that he supposed the Soul and Body, in which our Saviour suffered, were so inestimably united to his Divine Nature, that both made but one Christ: or if one should say, A Man did any thing by himself, i.e. with his own Hands, it would necessarily imply, that his Hands were not accounted fo-

† See chap. 8.
reign Instruments or Assistants, but Parts of the Man himself. So our Author’s Expression must signify the ineffable Union of the Father, Son, and Spirit in the same Nature and Godhead; for these Three are one God; so that the Father’s working by the Word and Spirit, was not going out of himself to make use of foreign Aid, or Agency, but exerting himself in his natural way, by those that are one with him by an ineffable Communion in the same Godhead. And he seems manifestly to refer to several Passages of Scripture, in which Creation is ascribed to God alone, exclusive of all others; as Job ix. 8. which alone spreadeth out the Heavens, &c. but especially Isa. xliv. 24.—I am the Lord that maketh all things, that spreadeth forth the Heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the Earth by my self. To create by himself, was to do it alone: and yet this does not exclude, but take in the Word and Spirit, who are not inferior Agents, but God himself. And as Irenæus’s Comment on these Words was grounded on the Christian Doctrine, so it was agreeable to the traditional Explication of the Jews; for the Chaldee Paraphrafl gives the Sense of that Text thus:—I am the Lord the Maker of all things, I stretched out the Heavens by my Word; I founded the Earth by my Power. The next Passage will farther illustrate and confirm this.

4.——h “We learn, that God is so great, “and that ’tis he that by himself created,——

adorned,

אֲנָא יִעֲבֹרְכָּלוּא תְּלִיהם שָׁמַיִם בְּניִמְרוּ
שלללוֹת אָרּעַ הָגְבוֹרִית

*iv. 20. i. Discimus, quoniam est tensus Deus, & ipse est qui per semetipsum constituit, & adornavit, & continet
adorned, and upholds all things—The Ang-
ells did not form us; nor could the Angels
themselves make the Image of God, nor any
other but the Word of the Lord, nor any
Power far remov'd from the Father of all.
For God needed none of them, to make what
he had determin'd with himself, since he had
his own Hands. For he has ever with him
his Word and Wisdom, his Son and Spirit,
by whom, and in whom he voluntarily and
frequently made all things; and to whom he ad-
dressed himself, saying, Let us make Man af-
ter our Image and Likeness; taking from him-
self the Substance of the Creatures, the Mo-
del of the Works, and the Figure of the Or-
naments of the World.
Here he seems to ascribe the Creation of the
Matter or Substance of the Universe to God
the Father, the Ideas and Patterns of Things
to the Son, and the adorning and finishing Part
to the Spirit; and observes, he was not be-
holden to others for any of these, but had 'em
all in, and of himself: which excludes the A-
gency of inferior Powers, and confirms the U-
ntity of the blessed Three, who are no other
than God himself.
Dr. Clarke saw there was need of Artifice to


tinet omnia. — Non ergo Angeli feecerunt nos, nec nos
plastinaverunt, nec Angeli potuerunt imaginem facere Dei;
neceius quis prater verbum Domini, nec virtus longe ab-
fistens a Patre univerforum. Nec enim indigebat horum Deus,
ad faciendum que ipse apud se prædefinierat fieri, quasi ipse
suas non haberet manus. Adeo enim ei semper Verbum &
Sapientia, Filius & Spiritus, per quos, & in quibus omnia li-
berè & sponte fecit, ad quos & loquitur, dicens: faciamus
hominem ad imaginem & similitudinem nostram; ipse à se-
metipso substantiam creaturarum, & exemplum factorum, &
figuram in mundo ornamentorum accipiens.

 evade
evade the force of this strong and plain Expression, viz. *God's making all things by himself*; which according to his Scheme, must mean, that God did not do this *Work by himself*, but by two subordinate Powers that execute his Will. To bring it to this Sense, which is the Contradiction of it, he produces the other Expression, viz. *His doing this Work with his own Hands, that is, his Word and Spirit*; and supposes this was intended to be explicatory of the other, and to mean no more, than that they (as subordinate Agents) *exercise the Power, and execute the Will of God*, as a *Man's own Hands execute his Power and Will*. Whereas, in good Sense, the latter Expression, as figurative and more general, should be explain'd by the former, which is proper and of a more determinate Signification; as always the more specific Declarations explain and determine the Sense of more loose and general ones. Besides, the Doctor strips the latter Expression of its Emphasis, and puts an insipid Sense upon it, in order not to explain, but really destroy the former, and advance the contradictory of it.

But let Irenæus be explained by his own Words in their intended Sense and Emphasis, and by his Argument and Scope, and not by *Arian Principles*, that he never heard of; and he'll speak consistently. *His professed Scope in this and other Places, is to confute their heretical Schemes, who held, the World was made by subordinate Powers, and not by the supream God: and tho' they supposed also, this Work was done without the Command of the Father of all, yet 'tis not this part of their Scheme he*

---

1 Scripture Doctrine, p. 282, 283. Ed. 2.
here opposes; else he would have said, *God did not authorize or command these supposed Creators*, and shew'd, that without his Pleasure nothing could be created: But he says, *God did not need 'em to execute his Will*, arguing against the Agency of all inferior Powers from the Self-sufficiency of God, who has all the requisites to Creation in, and of himself. The Argument and Scope of the Place, the necessary import of his Expression, *creating by himself*, compar'd with the Scriptures plainly refer'd to, which assert his making all things alone, all these unavoidably exclude all subordinate Agents, or created Instruments, and imply, or rather fully express God's applying himself immediately to this glorious Work. And consequently, he intended a special Emphasis in his favourite Simile of the Father's *creating with his own two Hands*, that is, the Son and Spirit: as when a Master does not sit still, and use the Ministry of his Servants, but does his Work himself, he is said to do it *with his own Hands*. ΐ δὲ εὐ φημὶ, and ἰδίας κρατήρι κρατήρι διαφέρονται are equivalent Phrases in Greek, and both signify διαφέρονται, i.e. doing any thing immediately, without the Agency of others. And thus indeed the two Expressions mutually explain one another, and are grounded on Texts of Scripture of the same import: as Isa. xlv. 12. *I, even my Hands have stretched out the Heavens.* And chap. xlviii. 13. *Mine Hand hath laid the Foundation of the Earth, and my Right-hand hath spanned the Heavens.* These Texts carry the same meaning in them with the former, that assert God's creating all things alone and by himself, and are render'd alike by the ancient Chaldee Paraphrafi, viz. that God made Heaven and Earth by his Word and Power. The ancient Jews, who dilowned
difowned all inferior Gods and Creators, undertime by the Hands of God his two glorious Powers, which are no other but the Word and Spirit of God\(^k\). And 'tis as plain from Scripture that his Hands are not different from himself.

\(^{\text{5. 1}}\) "Our Lord, after his Incarnation, received Power over all things from the Father, who made by his Word, and by his " Wisdom adorned all things."

This Power that Christ received from the Father, was not supposed by Irenæus to be his original, Divine Dominion; nor was his Father's Donation the only Foundation of his Title to sovereign Authority: for he afferts him to have been Lord of the whole Creation before his Incarnation, and as he had the same Divine Power jointly with the Father, so he had the same Title to it, which was founded in Creation. This he fully expresses elsewhere, grounding this Doctrine on the Scripture, John 1. 10, 11.

\(^{\text{m}}\) He was in the World, and the World was made by him: — He came unto his own εἰς τὰ ἑαυτᾶς,

\(^k\) See Dr. Alix's Judgment of the Jewish Church against the Unitarians.

\(^{\text{i}}\) iv. 20. 2. — Ab eodem, qui omnia Verbo fecit, & Sapientiā adornavit, accipiens omnium potestatem, quando Verbum caro factum est.

\(^{\text{m}}\) v. 18. 2. Deinde de ipso Verbo dixit: In hoc mundo erat, & mundus per ipsum factus est.—— In sua propria venit, & sui cum non recerperunt. —— Manifestè offendens, — quoniam unus Deus Pater super omnes, & unum Verbum Dei quod per omnes, per quem omnia facta sunt: & quoniam hic mundus proprius ipsius, & per ipsum factus est voluntate Patris, & non per Angelos; neque per Apostasiam, &c.

Et \(^{\text{Nö}}\) 3. Mundi enim factor verè Verbum Dei est: hic autem est Dominus nostra, qui—— secundum invisiibilitatem constant, quæ facta sunt, omnia, & in universa conditione insignius, quoniam Verbum Dei gubernans & disponens omnia; & propter hoc in sua ----- venit, &c.
into his own World, where he had right to so-
vereign Dominion, as a Man has in his own 
House) and his own receiv'd him not. — " This 
shews, faith he, that there is one God the 
Father over all, and one Word of God, that 
is thro' all, by whom all things were made: 
and that this World is his own, and was made 
by him by the Will of the Father, and not 
by Angels (supposed to do it without his Con-
sent or Command) nor by Apostasy, &c."

— And a little lower: "The Word of God 
is truly the Maker of the World: now this is 
our Lord, who—after an invisible manner up-
holds all things that were made, and fills and 
pervades the whole Creation, because he is 
the Word of God governing and disposing 
all things; and therefore he came into his 
own World." And even in the place under 
Consideration, he gives a plain Hint of Christ's 
original Dominion, that, as the Word of God, 
and Creator of the World, he had antecedent-
ly to his Incarnation and the Father's Donation, 
and also distinguishes from it his mediatorial 
Power derived by a new Grant from the Fa-
ther; for it was given him as a righteous Man. 
As God by rescuing Israel from Egyptian Bond-
age acquired a new Title to be the Lord their 
God, without derogating from his essential and 
original Right to the Allegiance of all his Cre-
tures.

Besides, it should be observed, that Irenæus,

n Accipiens omnium potestatem, quando Verbum caro 
factum est, ut quemadmodum in Cælis principatum habuit 
Verbum Dei, sic & in terrâ haberet Principatum, quoniam 
Homo justus, qui peccatum non fecit. — principatum autem 
habeat eorum quæ sunt sub terra, ipsè primogenitus mor-
tuorum factus.
in inculcating this Derivation of Power to the Mediator, had no thought of degrading him; or leading us to the origin of all his Power and Divine Dominion, as the Arians would have it believe'd without Proof: But by the Scripture-Doctrine of the Saviour's being appointed Lord of the whole Creation by the Father, he confutes the Heretics, who held, that the Father of Christ had no Title to Sovereignty in this World by Creation: his Argument runs thus; Christ (as Man and Mediator) received Power over the whole Creation from his own Father: now, how could he deliver to him a World that was not his own? Would the infinitely just and good be liberal of what he had no right to; and send his Son as an Usurper into the Workmanship and Possession of another? He concludes therefore, this World must be God's by Creation.

6. p "Man is made up of Soul and Flesh, "formed after the likeness of God, and fashioned by his Hands, that is, by the Son and "Spirit, to whom he said, Let us make Man, "Gen. i. 26.

7. q "Tho' we cannot find Solutions of all "the Difficulties of Scripture, yet we must not "see!

o Ibid. Omnia mihi, inquit, tradita sunt à Patre meo; m
nisi feste ab eo, qui omnia fecit: non enim aliena, sed su
tradidit ei.

Confer. v. 2. 1. Vani autem & qui in aliena dicunt Deum venisse, velut aliena concupiscentem, uti eum hominem, qui ab altero factus est, exliberet ei Deo, qui neque fecisset, neque condidisset, &c.

p iv. Praef. 4. Homo est autem temperatio animae & car
nis, qui secundum similitudinem Dei formatus est, & per
manus ejus planus factus est, hoc est, per Filium & Spiritum; quibus & dixit: Faciamus hominem.

q ii. 28. 2. Si autem omnium, quae in Scripturis requi
runtur,
seek for another God, besides the true one;
but leave such things to the God that made
us; being well assured, that the Scriptures
are perfect, as being endited by the Word
and Spirit of God.

8. "In the name of Christ, he that anoint-
ed, he that was anointed, and the Unction it
self, with which he was anointed, are under-
stood. Now it was the Father that anointed
him, and the Son was anointed with the Spi-
rit, who is the Unction: wherefore the Word
faith by Isaiah; The Spirit of God is upon me,
because he hath anointed me; signifying the
anointing Father, the anointed Son, and the
Unction, which is the Spirit.

9. "God is known by Men, not in respect
of his Greatness, or his Substance;—but
only so far as to satisfy 'em, that he who
made 'em—and by his Word establish'd,
and by his Wisdom framed all things, is the
only true God.

10. "There is in, and thro' all one God
the
the Father, and one Word, the Son, and one Spirit, and one Salvation to all that believe in him.

11. "When that which is perfect is come, we shall not see another Father, but the same, that now we long to see;—nor shall we look for another Christ and Son of God, but him that was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered, and whom we believe in, and love:—nor receive any other holy Spirit, but the same that is with us, and cries, Abba, Father. 

12. "By all these Methods is God the Father manifested, by the Operation of the Spirit, by the Ministry of the Son, and by the good Pleasure of the Father.

13. "So Rahab the Harlot, condemning herself, because she was an Heathen, and guilty of all manner of Sins, yet received, and hid in her House the three Spies,—viz. the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."

Irenæus is speaking of the Signification of some typical Actions and historical Passages in the Old Testament; and supposes, that as Moses...
his marrying an Ethiopian Woman, was a Prediction convey'd by Things of the future Conversion of the Gentiles; so Rahab's entertaining the Spies, whom by a slip of Memory he supposed to be Three, was a typical Representation of the Sinners of the Gentiles, their receiving the Holy Trinity by obedience to the Gospel.

14. "The spiritual Man has a found Faith in one God Almighty, of whom are all things, and a firm Belief in the Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord, by whom are all things, and the Dispensations, by which the Son of God became Man, and in the Spirit of God, who gives the Knowledge of the Truth, and explains the Dispensations of the Father and the Son."

Again: "He owns, that God, and the "Word, and the Spirit are ever the fame.

15. "Man is made after the Image and
"Likeness of the uncreated God, by the Father willing and giving out Orders, by the Son executing and creating, and by the Spirit nourishing and encreasing."

See this Passage fully vindicated in the subjoined Dissertatio concerning the use of the Word, αγάπηντο:—Man was made in the Likeness, as well as by the Operation of the Son and Spirit, to whom the Father said: Let us make Man after our Image.—And are necessarily here included in the uncreated God and Creator of all.

16. b "As Christ’s two Hands stretched out on the Cross, signified the People of the Jews and Gentiles dispersed unto the ends of the Earth; so there was one Head betwixt’em, because there is but one God, who is over all, and thro’ all, and in us all.

And a little after he shews who this one God is, in these Words: c "Thus one God the Father is manifested, who is over all, and thro’ all, and in all. The Father is over all, and he is the Head of Christ; and the Word is thro’ all, and he is the Head of the Church; and the Spirit is in us all, and he is the living Water, that the Lord gives to all that believe on him aright."

Here he expressly declares, that in the one

b v. 17.4. —Dux quidem manus, quia & duo populi dispersi in fines terrae: unum autem medium Caput, quoniam & unus Deus super omnes, & per omnes, & in omnibus nobis.

c Ibid. 18.2. Et sic unus Deus Pater ostenditur, qui est super omnia, & per omnia, & in omnibus, super omnia quidem Pater, & ipse est Caput Christi: per omnia autem Verbum, & ipse est Caput Ecclesiae: in omnibus autem nobis Spiritus, & ipse est aqua viva, quam praestat Dominus in recte credentibus, &c.
God there is a Trinity of Persons; and tho' the Father only is mention'd by the Apostle, Eph.iv.6. yet 'tis not to be understood exclusive of the Son and Spirit, but they are included, as having the same Godhead, and inseparably united with the Father.

From the whole it appears the Doctrine of a Trinity was believed and preached in the Primitive Church, as the great fundamental Article of Christianity, contain'd in all their Creeds, and professed by all their Catechumens, when received into the Communion of the Church by Baptism. And they believed in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, as three Persons in the same Godhead, and not as God and two Creatures; else they would never have joined 'em together, as of the same Nature and Order: For Irenæus censures it as a great Absurdity in the Valentinians, that they reckon'd their Propator with the rest, as one of the thirty Æons, because they supposed him to be self-existent, and the others produced in time. "The Father of all, faith he, ought not to be numbered with the other Æons: He that was not prolated, and self-existent, with those that were prolated, and begotten in time; the incomprehensible with them that are comprehended by him.---For as he is more excellent than the rest, he ought not to be reckon'd with
"with them."—Had it been the constant known
Practice of the whole Christian Church to num-
ber two Creatures with the infinite God and
Father of all, why should the like be imputed
to the Heretics, as a great Incongruity?—If the
Christian Trinity (τριάς) was a Collection of
Beings so different in Nature and Dignity, as
the Arians say, why should the Valentinian Tria-
contas, or number of thirty be, upon the same
account, any Crime?

C H A P. IV.

General Passages relating to Christ's Deity.

1. "Neither our Lord, nor the Holy
Ghost, nor the Apostles would
ever positively and absolutely have given any
one the Title of God, unless he were truly
God; nor valued any one Lord, in their own
Person, but him that is Lord of all, viz. God
the Father, and his Son, who received from
the Father Dominion over the whole Crea-
tion.—

— b "But when the Scripture calls them
Gods that are not so, it does not simply and
fully stile 'em so, but with some Restriction,

a iii. 6. 1. Neque igitur Dominus, neque Spiritus Sanctus,
neque Apotolici cum, qui non esset Deus, definitivè & absolutè
Deum nominassent aliquando, nisi esset verè Deus: neque
Dominum appellassent aliquem ex sua personâ, nisi qui do-
minatur omnium, Deum Patrem, & Filium ejus, qui Domi-
nium accipit à Patre suo omnis Conditionis.

b Ibid. 3. Cum autem eos, qui non sunt Dii, nominat,
non in totum.——Scriptura ostendit illos Deos; sed cum
aliquo additamento & significacione, per quam offenduntur
non esse Dii.——

"and
and super-added Hint, by which it appears, "that they are not Gods."

We have here a plain Maxim and Rule of interpreting Scripture, and deciding that great Point, viz. *Who is to be looked upon as true God.* Let us see also how he applies it.

1. "Since the Father is truly Lord, and the Son is truly Lord, the Holy Ghost has justly given them the Title of Lord.

2. Again: "Thy Throne, O God, is for ever:—Thou lovest Righteousness, and hatest Iniquity: Therefore God, thy God hath anointed thee,—Psal. xlv. 6, 7. The Spirit has given both the Title of God, viz. the Son, that is anointed, and the Father, who anointed him.

And again: God stood in the Assembly of the Gods, and in the midst judges the Gods, Psal. lxxxi. 1. He speaks of the Father and Son, and of those that received the Adoption of Sons; that is, the Church, which is the Synagogue of God, that God, *i.e.* the Son gather'd by himself, (or in his own Person.) Of whom he says again: *The God of Gods, the Lord hath spoken,* &c." He insists on this Argument at large in seve-
ral Chapters; and shews, that he that is stiled God in Scripture, without any diminishing Addition to shew he is not God, but only called so, is God in the proper and primary Sense.

e "It has been fully demonstrated, that the Prophets and Apostles never stiled any one God or Lord, but the true and only God.

Again: f "It has been plainly shewn, that neither the Prophets, nor the Apostles, nor the Lord Christ ever confessed any one to be Lord or God in their own Person, but him that is primarily (the Arians would say, in the highest Sense) God and Lord. For the Prophets and Apostles confess the Father and Son, and stile none else either God or Lord, and the Lord himself taught his Disciples only, that the Father is that God and Lord, who is the only God and Governor of all.

Again: g "The Preachers of Truth, and the Apostles of Liberty stiled none other God or Lord, but the only true God, the Father, and his Word, who has the Pre-eminence in all things."

* iii. 8. 1. Manifestè ostenfum est, quoniam nunquam neque Prophetæ, neque Apostoli alium Deum nominaverunt, vel Dominum appellaverunt, præter verum & folum Deum.


g Ibid. 15. 3. —Neminem alium Deum vocaverunt, vel Dominum nominaverunt, qui Veritatis fuerunt prædictores, & Apostoli libertatis, nisi folum Verum Deum, Patrem & Verbum ejus, qui in omnibus principatum habet.
Here he proves, that none is absolutely styled God or Lord in Scripture, but the only true God, who is (præcipue Deus & Dominus) primarily God and Lord. And this is not the Father only; but he takes Pains to demonstrate, that the Son too is styled God and Lord in this primary, undiminished Sense; and so is included in the only true God. This is undeniable Fact, that every one must see, that reads Irenæus: And 'tis as plain he intended to prove, that he who is styled God absolutely and without Restriction, must be supreme God, i.e. the only true God; for his Scope is, to affer the supreme Deity of the Creator, whom his Adversaries suppose to be only an inferior Power, that had a God above him. And his Rule, by which he proves his Supremacy, as well as proper Godhead, he applies to the Son, as well as the Father. Whereas, had he argued upon Arian Principles, he would have said, the Father only was God in this Sense; and when the Son is called God, 'tis not absolutely, but with some lessening Addition or Circumstance, that shows he is not God in the highest Sense: For Arians treat the Son, as our Author does those that are, no Gods; that is, when he is styled God in sacred Writ, they labour to show there is something added to qualify the Sense of the Word, and bring it down to that low Acceptation, in which they ascribe Divinity to him.

Nor is there any room for an Evasion here by pleading, that by the Godhead, which is common to the Father and Son, he meant only Dominion; and that Christ is truly and properly God, as he has real Power and Authority derived from the Father: for our Author never dreamt of this profound Criticism, that confounds
founds the Titles of God and Lord, which he always speaks of as very distinct: This would have alter'd his whole Scheme of Thoughts, and way of reasoning on this Subject; Moses must have been allow'd to be a true God in the lower Sense, as clothed with real Authority and Power by God. h But, faith he, "Moses was " made a God before Pharaoh; and yet he is " not stiled truly Lord, or God by the Pro- " phets, but is called by the Spirit, Moses the " faithful Servant of God."— But one Passage, if well consider'd, will fully clear this Point: When Irenæus comes to make use of the above- mention'd Rule for the Confutation of the Her- retics who deny'd the supream Godhead of the Creator; i " This, faith he, manifestly con- " futes those Deceivers and perverse Sophistlers, " who say, He is God and Father by Nature, " whom they have invented; but the Creator " is by Nature neither God nor Father, but " only is stiled so, because he has Dominion " over the Creation; so say these perverse Cri- " tics, employing their Wit and Invention a- " gainst God.” The Valentinians, it seems, when told, that the Creator is frequently stiled

h iii. 6. 5. Et ipse autem Moses homo Dei existens, Deus quidem datus est ante Pharaonem: non autem verè Dominus appellatur, nec Deus vocatur à Prophetis, sed Fidelis Moses Famulus & fereus Dei, dicitur à Spiritu; quod & erat.

i iv. 1. 1. —Manifellè falsa ostenduntur ea quæ dicunt circumventores & perversissimi Sophistæ, dicentes, naturaliter & Deum & Patrem esse, quem ipsi adinvenerebant: De- miurgum vero naturaliter neque Deum, neque Patrem esse, sed verbo tenus dici, cœ quod dominetur conditionis, ficer dicunt perversi Grammatici, excogitantes in Deum.

Conf. Tertullian adv. Hermog. c. 3. Deus substantiæ ipsius nomen, id est, Divinitatis; Dominus vero non substantiæ, sed potestatis.
God in Scripture, endeavour'd to come off by an uncatholic Distinction, viz. A Being may be called God, either upon account of the Divine Substance and Perfections; and in this Sense the Bythus only is God: or upon account of Divine Dominion, tho' he has not the Nature of God; and thus the Creator comes by the Title of God. And this was one of their Mysteries, for which he calls 'em perverse Critics, that rack'd their Invention to ungod their Maker; and yet even they durst not carry the Criticism so far as to say, the Word God did not signify his metaphysical Nature and Substance, but only his Dominion over his Creatures; tho' this would have served their Purpose much better. 'Tis plain, however, our Author rejects the heretical Distinction of a God by Nature, and a God by Dominion, and the Criticism of those bright Men, who held, the Creator might be stiled God on the score of mere Dominion, without the Divine Nature and Substance.

Our Evidence for Irenæus his holding the Catholic Doctrine of Christ's Divinity runs not so low, that I need collect Passages to shew he stiles him God absolutely, and compare them with his own Rule: I shall only take notice of one or two Places.

"All that saw God after his Resurrection," which he repeats a little lower. Again: The Ebionites receive not by Faith the Union of God and Man, viz. in the Person of

---

k iii. 13. 1. — Cum prædictisset omnes qui Deum post resurrectionem viderunt, intulit, &c. & infra, — qui Deum viderunt, &c.

1 v. 1. 3. Vani autem & Ebionæi unionem Dei & hominis per fidem non recipientes. — "Christ,"
"Christ."—Again:—"Some hold, that God came into a World that was not his own."
But I proceed to other Passages.

2. "If any one cannot find out the reasons of all things he enquires into, let him consider, that he is but a Man infinitely less than God, that he has receiv'd Grace but in part, and is not yet equal to, or like his Maker; nor can have experience and insight into all things, as God: But by how much he, who was made to day, and had a beginning of his Birth, is less than him who was not made, but is ever the same; by so much, in respect of Knowledge and searching out the Causes of all things, must he be less than his Maker. For thou art not unmade, O Man, nor didst thou always co-exist with God, as his own Word: But thro' his transcendent Goodness, having now a beginning of Existence, thou gradually learnest from the Word the Dispensations of God that made thee."

'Tis plain here, the Word, who teaches us Knowledge, is opposed to imperfect Man, as

m v. 2. 1. Vani autem & qui in aliena dicunt Deum venisse.

n ii. 25. 3. Si autem & aliiquis non invenerit cauam omnium quae requiruntur, cogitât quia homo est in infinitum minor Deo, & qui ex parte acceperit gratiam, & qui nondum æqualis, vel similis sit Fætori, & qui omnium experientiam & cogitationem habere non potest, ut Deus: Sed in quantum minor est ab eo, qui factus non est, & qui semper idem est, ille qui hodie factus est, & initium factūræ accipit, in tantum secundum Scientiam & ad investigandum causas omnium, minorem esse co quem fecit. Non enim infectus (Gr. αὐτομετρητός) es, ὃ homo, neque semper coexistebas Deo, sicut proprium ejus Verbum: sed propter eminentem bonitatem ejus, nunc initium factūræ accipiens, sensim discis à Verbo dispositiones Dei, qui te fecit.

G 2 uncreated,
uncreated, eternal, and perfect in Knowledge; and this is so obvious, that it would never have been question'd; but to make the Passage consistent with Men's darling Schemes.—But the Argument and Scope, compared with the plain Expressions, abundantly determine the Sense of the Place, and leave no room for Evasions. To silence the Heretics, that were great Pretenders to Knowledge in Divine Mysteries, he argues, that Man should keep within the Bounds prescribed by Nature, and be content with limited and imperfect Knowledge: For Man, faith he, is but a Creature, that had a beginning; and perfect Knowledge is the Prerogative of the uncreated and eternal God: To pretend to it is to forget we are made Beings, and grasp at Divinity. On the one side of the Comparison is God, who knows all things, because he is an uncreated, necessarily existent, and absolutely eternal Being: On the other is Man, who can have but limited Knowledge with a mixture of Ignorance, because he is a created Being, that had a beginning, and consequently must be infinitely less than his Creator in all Perfections. Now if the Word be not included in the unmade Being, by the Author's Argument he must be infinitely inferior to God; as a Creature, that had a beginning of Existence, he must be imperfect in Knowledge, &c. which no Man in his Senses can believe to have been his Opinion. And indeed he leaves not this to Consequences, but expressly places the Word on the other side of the Comparison in opposition to imperfect, ignorant Man: Man, faith he, differs from the omniscient Being, as he had a beginning of his Existence: but the Word had an eternal Co-existence with God: for as this co-existing ever with God
God is directly opposed to having a beginning of Birth and Existence, (ἀκὶ ν γενέσθαι,) of which imperfect Knowledge is a necessary Consequence, it must unavoidably signify absolute Co-eternity ; and then his being unmade, and his necessary Existence, his surpassing Man infinitely in Knowledge and all Perfections, as God and Creator, are necessarily connected with this.—But see this Passage more fully vindicated in the Dissertation concerning the Word ἄγνωστος, &c. and compare Principle 3. above.

3. „The Magi shew’d by their Gifts, who he was whom they worship’d; for they offer’d Myrrh, because he was to die—and be bury’d: and Gold, because he was that King, of whose Kingdom there is no end; and Frankincense, because he is God, who was made known in Judea, and manifested to them that sought him not.”

Christ’s Godhead, as contra-distinguish’d from his kingly Dominion, must signify his Divine Nature; in respect of which he shews, he was the God of Israel, of whom ’tis said, he was known in Judah,—Psal. lxvi. 1. and who says by the Prophet, I was made manifest to them that asked not after me, Isa. lxv. 1. And how should Frankincense have any reference to his being God, unless he supposed him to be Jehovah, to whom alone sweet Incense was offer’d daily under the Old Testament? and consequent—

—iii. 9. 2. Mattheus autem magos ab oriente venientes ait—per ea quae obtulerunt munera offendisse, quis erat qui adorabatur: Myrrham quidem, quod ipse erat, qui pro mortali humano genere moreretur & sepeliretur: Aurum vero, quoniam Rex, cujus Regni finis non est: Thus vero, quoniam Deus, qui & notus in Judæa sit, & manifestus eis, qui non quærabant eum.
ly he was the only true God, to whom they offer'd Sacrifices, and address'd all their religious Worship; for it had been Idolatry to burn Incense to any other.

4. "He who suffer'd under Pontius Pilate, is the Lord of all, and King, and God, and Judge, receiving Power from the God of all, because he was obedient to the Death."

The Words will bear, if not require, that the Genitive, omnium, of all, should be repeated, and joined with the other Substantives, thus; "Christ is Lord, King, God, and Judge of all."

And then, according to Dr. Clarke, they might be render'd to this Effect: He is suprem Lord, suprem God, &c.

5. "Who shall declare his Generation? for he is Man, and who can know him? now he knows him to whom the Father-reveals him, to let him understand, that the Son of Man, who was born not of the Will of the Flesh, nor of Man, is Christ the Son of the living God. For we have shewn from the Scriptures, that no one of all the Sons of Adam is stiled God or Lord, as he is. And all that

P iii. 12. q. 'Oti o παλαιν ετι Ποντίου Πιλάτου, δυτή-κεις των πάνω, και βασιλέως, και Θεος, και κρίτης εστιν—Quoniam qui passus est sub Pontio Pilato, hic Dominus est omnium, & Rex, & Deus, & Judex; ab eo qui est omnium Deus, accipiens potestatem, quoniam subjectus fuit sub quae ad mortem, &c.

q Ibid. 19.2. Propter hoc Generationem ejus quis narrabit? (Isa.iii.8.) quoniam homo est, & quis agnoscebit eum, (Jer.xvii.9.) Cognosce autem illum is, cui Pater qui est in Coelis revelavit, ut intelligat, quoniam is qui non ex voluntate carnis, neque ex voluntate viri natus est Filius hominis, hic est Christus Filius Dei vivi. Quoniam enim nemo in toto ex filiis Adae, Deus appellatur secundum cum, aut Dominus nominatur, ex Scripturis demonstratius. Quoniam autem ipse proprië
that never so little apply themselves to find out
the Truth, may see, that he peculiarly, above
all Men, that had ever a Being before, was
preach’d as God, Lord, the everlasting King,
and the Only-begotten, and the incarnate
Word, by all the Prophets, the Apostleis,
and the Spirit himself.—And upon account
of his twofold Generation, viz. that glorious
one of the most high Father; and his extra-
ordinary Birth of the Virgin, the Scriptures
witness concerning him, both that he should
be a suffering Man, without Form or Com-
lines;— and also the Lord the Holy One,
the Wonderful Counsellor, Isa. ix. 6. Fairer
than the Children of Men, Psal. xlvi. 2. and the
mighty God, as the Judge of all coming in
the Clouds, Dan. vii. 13.

He is Man—) So the LXX render the Hebrew Word מַנִּי, reading it with other points, מַנִּי, a Man, Jer. xvii.9. and so the Syriac Version gives the Sense of it; Man is hard-hearted above all.

Here he gives us two glorious Titles of Christ from the Prophecy, Isa. ix. 6. The Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God. If we consider how much he valu’d and prefer’d the Version ascrib’d to the 70 Interpreters, looking upon

propriè præter omnes, qui tunc fuerunt homines, Deus, & Dominus, & Rex æternus, & Unigenitus, & Verbum incarnatum prædicatur & à Prophetis omnibus, & Apostolis, & ab ipso Spiritu, adeò videre omnibus qui vel modicum de veritate attigerint.—Sed quoniam praedam præter omnes habuit in se eam, quæ est ab altissimo Patre, genituriam, præceptar autem functus est & eâ, quæ est ex Virgine, generatione; utraque Scripturae divinae de eo téssificantur: & quoniam homo indecorus & passibilis— & quoniam Dominus sanctus & Mirabilis, Consiliarius, & decorus Specie, & Deus fortis, luper nubes veniens universorum Judæx.—
'em as almost inspired in translating the Scripture, and what little regard he had to other Translations, it will appear most probable, that the more correct Copies of the LXX had this Text then according to the Hebrew. And elsewhere he joins this Text with a Clause of the preceding Chapter, and gives us the true literal Version, "I came unto the Prophetess, and she brought forth a Son, and his Name is called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God." A place of such sublime Sense was liable to be misunderstood; this occasion'd its being interpolated in the vulgar Copies; other Versions of the Words, or even ignorant Glosses were set down in the Margin, and by the Ignorance and Inattention of Transcribers crept into the Text; and either jumbled out the original pure Translation, or were joined with it; so that 'tis not easy to distinguish 'em: Thus the Alexandrian MS. has manifestly two renderings of the Words Wonderful Counsellor. And it would seem Irenæus read both, tho' perhaps not in the same Copies; for elsewhere he has, μεγάλος ἄγγελος, The Angel of the Great Counsel; which is a Gloss rather than Translation: This is a Title of the Messiah, who is the Angel of the Covenant, Mal. iii. 1. but, I think, has no reference to the Covenant here; but is to be un-

iii. 21, 3, 4. Cum tantâ igitur veritate & gratiâ Dei interpretatae sint Scripturæ, verò impudorati & audaces ostenduntur, qui nunc volunt aliter interpretationes facere—unus enim & idem Spiritus Dei—in Prophetis quidem bene praecavit, in Senioribus autem interpretatus est bene—

f iv. 33. 11. —Veni ad Prophetam, & peperit Filium, & vocatur nomen ejus Admirabilis, Consiliarius, Deus fortis.
derstood, as Jer. xxxii. according to the Hebrew, and xxvix. according to the LXX. v. 19. xvp[hebrew character] τοῦ μέγαλος θεοῦ, i. e. The Lord great in Counsel: And the Word Angel came in to explain the Word, οἱ Ἑσπερινοὶ, Wonderful, by comparing it with what the Angel, afterwards called God, said to Manoah, Judg. xiii. 18. Why askest thou after my Name, seeing it is οἱ Ἑσπερινοὶ, Wonderful? *

The Son of God appeared to bring messages to Men under the Old Testament, by way of Prelude to his Incarnation, and the Form of a Servant he was to assume; and by his Condescension concealed his highest Character: His Name was Secret and Wonderful. But he was such an Angel, as was also the Mighty God. We need go no farther than to the next Chapter to find this is a peculiar Title of the God of Israel, Isa. x. 21. The Remnant shall return—

to the Mighty God, בֶּלֶם בְּלֶם. The Words are the same.

6. "And that the Son of God, who is God, "would come from the southern part of the "Inheritance of Judah, and he that was of Beth-"lehem, where the Lord was born, would send "forth his Praise into all the Earth; as faith "the Prophet Habakkuk: God shall come from "the South, (Heb. Teman,) and the Holy One "from Mount Effrem, (Heb. Paran:) His Power "cover'd the Heavens, and the Earth is full of

* V. Philon. de nominum mutatione, pag. 810.
† iv. 20. 4. —Et quoniam ex cā parte, quae est secundum Africum hæreditatis Judæa, veniet Filius Dei, qui Deus est, & qui erat ex Bethlehem, ubi natus est Dominus, in omnem terram emittet laudationem ejus, sicut ait Habauec Propheta: Deùs ab Africo veniet, & Sanctus de Monte Effrem. Co-"operuit Celum virtut ejus, & laudatione ejus plena est ter-
ra.—Manifestè significans, quoniam Deus, & quoniam in Beth-"leem adventus ejus, & ex Monte Effrem,—& quoniam homo.
his Praise, Hab. iii. 3, 4. Plainly declaring that he is God, and that he would come at Bethlehem, and from Mount Effen; — and that he is Man.”

His professed Scope here is to prove that Christ is God as well as Man: and as his being Man signifies his having the Nature of Man, so by force of the Opposition, his being God is his having the Divine Nature, i.e. the Essence and Perfections of God. He allows that Maxim, τὸ ἐκ Θεοῦ γεννηθέν, Θεός ἐστι: He that is begotten of God, is God: for the Son of God, faith he, is God, viz. as the Son of Man is Man. And he supposes Christ is filed God absolutely, with the Article, and in the subject of a Proposition in Scripture, Θεός ἐστι Θεοίματι (ἀπὸ νότι, ἐκ Θεοδοτίνης, aut forte Glossá Marginali) Ἰεβαλ. x. τ. ε. He has the Titles of the God of Israel, and the same Glory and Majesty is ascribed to him, as may be seen in the Context refer’d to.

7. “God then became Man, and the Lord himself saved us, giving the Sign of the Virgin.”

This is the Result of the Argument display’d in the last Passage and Context, by which he proves that Christ was God as well as Man: The Laws of Argumentation require the Terms should have the same Sense and Emphasis in the Conclusion, that they had in the Premisses: now what God does he speak of in his Proofs? no less than the God of Israel, the Holy One, filed God absolutely, and, with the Article, and with a suitable display of his incomparable Majesty,

iv. 21. 1. ὁ Θεός ὃς εἶναι νότι ἐκ Θεοδοτίνης, καὶ άυτὸς κῦριός ἐστι κράς, ὃς τὸ τῆς παρθένου σημάδιον. Deus igitur homo factus est, et ipse Dominus salvavit nos, ipse dans Virginis signum.
as we have seen above; That God of whom the Prophet Isaiah faith, Chap. xxxv. 4. — Behold our God — He himself will come and save us. And Chap. lxiii. 9. The Lord himself will save us: as he cites him according to the Greek of the LXX. — The only God of Israel, of whom the Prophet Micah faith, Chap. vii. 18, 19. Who is a God like unto thee? — He will turn again; he will have Compassion upon us, &c. For from these and other Texts he proves his Godhead: Since then in the Premisses we have God absolutely in the only proper Sense, and with the Article too; 'tis too late to begin to strip it of its Emphasis in the Conclusion: This God, who was made Man, is the only true God, of whom he said such great things before.

But tho' 'tis undeniable Fact, that here Christ is styled God with the Article, and absolutely, i.e. without any addition to restrain and limit the Sense, yet Dr. Clarke denies its unlimited, or absolute Acceptation, because it refers to what went before, and so is to be resolved thus; ὁ ἄγαν ὑπὸ κοινοῦ Θεός.

Concerning this I would observe a few Particulars.

1. The Doctor's Rule is, that when Θεός, God, is put absolutely, and with the Article, it must always signify God in the highest Sense, that is the Person of the Father: now according to this new shift, it must be farther limited thus; "so that Θεός, be not apply'd to a Person spoken of before:" And then the Rule will be of very little use; for after we have had the term once, as for instance in the first Verse of the Bible, it presently loses its Spirit, and has a limited Sense, or is capable of it. Again, if the inspired Writers of the New Testament had filed
ftiled Chrifi ἐ Θεός never fo often, after they had once signify'd the Person of the Son, this would not have given any Light in this Controversy; it must have been brought down to a low Sense, ὁ ὑπάρχων Θεός, who being a God, i.e. a Person exalted to great Power.

Certainly this Evasion would have done the Valentinians great Service; for in answer to Irenæus, who proves the supreme Godhead of the Father and Son, from their being ftiled God absolutely in Scripture, they might have said, ὁ Θεός, or Θεός, has always a Reference to the God of the Jews, and even in the firft of Genesis the subject matter limits the Sense to the Creator; and is thus to be resolv'd, ἐπὶ ἐξῆς ἐπιστεύειν ὁ Θεός, i.e. ἐπὶ θεωροῦσιν ὑπάρχον Θεός: The Creator being a God.

But if the Doctor says, that when once the Word is used in the absolute, higheft Sense, it must have the fame Acceptation in the Repetition of it, by virtue of its reference to the Subject spoken of; then let this be but apply'd to the Passage under Consideration, and all is well; for we have seen Chrifi is ftiled God absolutely, and with the Article, and under the higheft Characters in the preceding Paragraph.

2. His Resolution of the Word God, with the Article, is impertinent: for, if we should suppose that we Christians had Gods many, and speaking of one particular God, should ftile him ὁ Θεός, the Article in that Case would have the fame Sense as if it were ἐπὶ τῷ, i.e. the God I am speaking of. But if Moses were the Subject of Discourse, would any understanding Person presently fay concerning him, ὁ Θεός ἐκλήσις—God spake to the Children of Israel, and think to come off by saying his Meaning was,
was, ὁ Ἱωάννης ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; i.e. Moses being a God to Pharaoh spake, &c.

3. This Criticism is grounded on a Supposition of more Gods than one. When we meet with Θεός, or Θεοί in a Pagan Writer, we must look backward to find out whether 'tis Jupiter, or Apollo, or Mercury, &c. but to us Christians there is but one God. However, since Irenæus proves, the Scripture files Christ God absolutely, and infers from it, that he is God in the primary Sense, why should any Attempts be made, against plain Fact, to evade the absolute Sense of the Word in himself? But Irenæus has fully expressed the Emphasis of the Term, ὁ Θεός, by calling him the Lord himself in the same Passage. Now since he takes this Expression from the Old Testament, he cannot mean by it any subordinate Lord, supposed by the Arians to be revealed in the New Testament; but the suprem Lord, who spake by the Prophets. And the very Expression implies his coming in Person to save us, in Opposition to any Agent or Messenger: For if the Lord had sent another, he had not saved us himself. The Scriptures he had in his Eye here seem to be these, Isa. vii. 14. The Lord himself shall give you a Sign—compared with chap. xxxv. 4. Behold our God—himself (Gr. αὐτός, he himself) will come and save you; which he understood of the Son of God: Or rather, chap.lxiii.9. which runs thus, as cited from the LXX. by Irenæus, “not a Messenger or “Angel, but the Lord himself saved them,” i.e. God will not send another as a substitute or inferior Agent, but will come in Person, as we express it, to save his People: For God comes...

See this Text considered, chap. vi. No. 15.
himself, or in Person, when any of the three Divine Persons come; the Sense of the Expression being no more, than that God saves us immediately, and not by any under-Agent: So that there is no room here for metaphysical Subtleties and Quibbles about the Word Person.

Now if any will infer from hence, that according to this Exposition of his Words, Irenæus must have held, that the Son is the Person of the Father, and so was a Sabellian: I answer, this Consequence being grounded on some metaphysical Speculations of a modern Scheme, which our Author knew nothing of, is unjuftly imposed upon him, as his Opinion: For whether the Criticism and Maxim about Person and Being be true or false, they can be of no use to find out his Meaning, unless it do appear they were owned by him. We might with as much Justice make use of Maxims of modern Philosophy, as Newton’s Principia, to settle the Meaning of Passages in Plato or Aristotle. It will be time enough to vindicate him from the Imputation of Sabellianism, when a serious Charge is advanced against him.

8. * “Christ faith to ’em again: And you have made void the Word of God by your Tradition; manifestly owning him to be Father and God, who said in the Law: Honour thy Father and Mother.—For the true God confessed a Precept of the Law to be the Word

"of God; and yet called none God, but his "Father."

Here our Saviour is styled the true God, (Gr. ὁ ἀληθινὸς, or ἀληθινός θεός) in the subject of a Proposition, in opposition to the Blasphemy of the Heretics against the God of the Old Testament, whose Word they would not take for a Proof of his being the only true God. And possibly they might suppose the Title of the true God, 1 John v. 20. was to distinguish him from the God of the Jews, whose true Godhead they deny’d: I think Irenæus took this Title from that Text, and that it denotes primarily, and directly the Truth of his Godhead, and consequentially of his Word: But if it signify only his Veracity, as the Latin Interpreter renders it, it comes to the same Sense; for the God of Truth, the God that cannot lie, are incomunicable Characters of the God of Israel.

9. "The moral Precepts common to both Testaments are Proofs of one and the same God: And this is our Lord, the Word of God, who first made Men Servants to God, and afterwards gave them Liberty,—as he faith to his Disciples; Henceforth I call you not Servants, Joh. xv. 15.—but I have called you Friends.—By saying, now I call you not Servants, he plainly hints, that it was himself that imposed upon Men a Yoke of Servitude "

iv. 13. 4. Assentire Deo, & sequi ejus verbum, & quæcungq; talia communia utrisq; sunt, unum & eundem offendunt Deum. Hic est autem Dominus nofter, Verbum Dei, qui primo quidem servos attraxit Deo, postea autem liberavit eos: quemadmodum ipse ait discipulis: Jam non dicam vos servos vos autem dixi amicos, Joh. xv. 19. In co enim quod dicit: Jam non dicam vos servos, manifetissimé
to God by the Law, and afterwards gave 'em Liberty. —— And by calling his Disciples Friends of God, he manifestly shews, that he is the Word of God, whom Abraham followed, —— and so became the Friend of God.

As sometimes, speaking of the one God, he says, He is the Father, not excluding the Son; so here he affirms the same of the Son: The one God of the Old and New Testament is our Lord Jesus Christ.

10. "And when John could not bear the Vision, (for, I fell at his Feet, faith he, as dead, Rev. i. 17.) so that the Scripture was fulfilled: No Man shall see God, and live, Exod. xxxiii. 20.) the Word revived him.

11. "The spiritual Man shall judge the Ebionites: How can they be saved, if he was not God (ο θεός) who work'd their Salvation on Earth? or how shall Man attain to Union with God, unless God (ο θεός) dwelt in Man, and became Man."

The Ebionites deny'd Christ's Divinity: In opposition to 'em he afferts his suprême Deity in plain and full terms, calling him God abso-

nisliffimè significavit se esse, qui primo quidem eam servitutem, quæ est erga Deum, hominis per legem constituit, post deinde libertatem eis donaverit. In eo autem quod amicos Dei dicit suos discipulos, manifestè ostendit se esse Verbum Dei, quem & Abraham sequens, amicus fæc tus est Deo.

2 Ibid. 20. 11. Joanne vero non sustinente visionem, (ce- eidi, enim inquit, ad pedes ejus quasi mortuos, ut ferret, quod scriptum est: nemo videt Deum, & vivet.) & vivificans eum Verbum, &c.

a Ibid. 33. 4. Ἀπεστάλη δὲ καὶ τοὺς 'Ηλίωνας τῷ Ἰωακίμῳ διά τινα συνετικήν, ἵνα μὴ Οθέος ἦν ὁ που συντρίβων ἐκεῖν ἐπί τῆς ἑγγύηται- σαλίας, ἵνα τῶν ἀνθρώπων χαρίστη εἰς Θεόν, ἵνα μὴ Οθέος ἔχουσιν εἰς ἑαυτῶν.
lutely with the Article twice: By God he must mean one that has the Nature, i. e. the Essence and infinite Perfections of God, as appears by the Opposition to Man, which signifies the humane Nature; otherwise why might not a Man exalted and made a God be our Saviour, if he meant only a God by Office and Dominion over us? — And let it be observed, he afferts also the Saviour’s Godhead, as a Qualification necessary, in the Nature of the Thing, and not merely by Divine Appointment, and consequently the utter Incompetency of any Creature for this Office: which is an Article of pure, primitive Doctrine, in opposition to their Blasphemy, who say, any one might have been appointed our Saviour.

12. "When our Lord forgave Sins, he both healed the Man, and plainly shewed, who himself was; for since none can forgive Sins but God only; and yet our Lord did forgive 'em, and heal Men; 'tis evident, that he was the Word of God, made the Son of Man, and receiving from the Father Power to forgive Sins, because he is Man, and because he is God; that as he suffered with us, as Man; so as God he might have Mercy on us, and forgive us our Debts, we owe to God our Maker.

a v. 17, 3. Peccata igitur remittens, hominum quidem curavit, semetipsum autem manifeste offendit quis est. Si enim nemo potest remittere peccata, nisi solus Deus; remittebat autem hae Dominus, & curabat homines: manifestum, quoniam ipse erat Verbum Dei, Filius hominis factus, à Patre potestatem remissionis peccatorum accipiens, quoniam homo, & quoniam Deus: ut quomodo homo compassus est nobis, tanquam Deus misereatur nostri, & remittat nobis debita nostra, quæ factori nostro debemus Deo.
No one can with any Attention and Impartiality read these Words, but must see, he allows the Truth of these Principles, viz. None can forgive Sin, but God alone, which is expressed. — And He that forgives, must be that very God, to whom we were Debtors. And he thus reasons: None can forgive Sins, but God alone: Christ forgave Sins: The Conclusion should be; therefore Christ is God. But this was not particular enough; this had left it undetermined whether he was the Father, or the Son, or Holy Spirit: The Sense of his Conclusion is, "It is evident, that he was God, not the Father, for He was not incarnate, nor was wont immediately to converse with Men, but the Word, or Son appearing in our Nature." And according to Irenæus to be the Word of God is to be God, only with a personal Distinction. The Arian Sense of these Words is evidently false, viz. Therefore he is one that has Authority from God to forgive Sins, for this would not discover who he was; he might be no more than an ordinary Prophet having a Commission to declare the Pardon of Sin, as Nathan the Prophet, 2 Sam. xii. 13. And tho' he speaks of Christ's receiving Power to forgive Sins as the Son of Man, and Saviour sent into the World, referring to his own Words, Mat. ix. 6. Yet he does not quit his Principle, viz. that he must be God, who forgives Sins, nor lay the stress of it upon his having a Commission from God: For he still expresseth the Necessity of his being God in order to exercise this Royal Power of granting Forgiveness of Sins: He was qualify'd for it by his being Man and God: As Man, he could have Compassion on those, whose Nature he wore;
and as God, he could grant pardon of Sins, which is an Act of infinite Mercy, and the Prerogative of that God, against whom we had sinned. The mere ministerial declaring of Pardon does not require, he should be God, nor is it an Act of Mercy, but of Obedience, in the Servant, that brings the Message. But Christ's forgiving Sin is exercising his Mercy, as he expresses it, referring to Mic. vii. 19. or Psal. li. 1, &c. And he grants it in a Royal Manner, as a Prince forgives Offences committed against his own Government. If we look back to the beginning of the Chapter, we shall see, that Irenæus supposes God the Father and the Son to be one and the same God, whose Precept Man transgress'd in Paradise.

"b The Precept was given to Man by the Word: For Adam, faith he, heard the Voice of the Lord God, Gen. iii. 8. The Word then might well say to the Man, thy Sins are forgiven thee, Mat. ix. 2. The very same, whom we had sinned against in the Beginning, granting remission of Sins in the End; or else, if we had transgress'd the Command of one, and it had been another, that said: Thy Sins are forgiven thee; he had neither been good, nor true, nor just." Observe, he not only infers from the Son's granting Forgiveness, that the Father, whose Command

\[\text{Datum est autem præceptum homini per Verbum: Audiret enim Adam, ait, vocem Domini Dei. Bene igitur Verbum ejus ad hominem dicit: Remittuntur tibi peccata; idem ille, in quem peccaveramus in initio, remissionem peccatorum in fine donans. Aut si alterius quemdem transgressi fumus præceptum, alius autem erat qui dixit: Remittuntur tibi peccata tua; neq; bonus, neq; verax, neq; justus est hujusmodi.}\]
Man disobeyed, grants it, but says expressly, the Word is the same, against whom we sinned: Idem ille, does not, cannot refer to the Father; the Construction will not bear it, but agrees plainly with the Logos: Verbum ejus—idem ille—Gr. ἕνεκα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Had it been the Ablative absolute, it might have seemed ambiguous; but now there is no Ambiguity in it. Besides, his ascertaining, that he who said; Thy Sins are forgiven thee, is one and the same with him, whose Precept we transgress'd, confirms the same Sense; for he never ascribes these Words to the Father.

CHAP. V.

Passages expressing the Son's Consubstantiality, or being of the same Nature and Essence with the Father: The Generation of the Son considered.

All the Passages already produced prove our Lord's Consubstantiality (τὸ ὑμὸς τούτῳ) with the Father, which implies no more, than his having the same Divine Nature, without intruding into Things we have not seen, or determining whether it be a numerical, or only specific Sameness, or somewhat different from both, and peculiar to the Three Persons of the ever-blessed Trinity, who are not separate, like Three Individuals of the human Species, nor so much one, as a single Individual, which would destroy their distinct Personality. I shall now add some Testimonies, that plainly shew, Christ is not another God, but the same God with the Father.

I. a "Peter
1. "Peter did not declare another God, but gave them notice of the Son of God, who became Man, and suffered.  
Again: "b The Apostles preached the Son of God, whom Men knew not—but did not introduce another God.

2. "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob: God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living.  
Matth. xxii. 29, 30, 31. — "Hereby our Lord plainly shew'd, that he that spake to Moses from the Bush, and declared himself to be the God of the Fathers, is the God of the Living. For who is the God of the Living, but the God who IS, above whom there is no other God? Whom also the Prophet Daniel declared, when Cyrus King of Persia said to him; Why dost thou not worship Bel? He answered: Because I worship...

a iii. 12. 3. 'Oυκ ἄλλος Θεὸς καταγίγελων, ἄλλο τὸν οὗν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν καὶ ἀνθρώπου γεγονότα, καὶ παθόντα, ἐς ἐπίγνωσιν ἄγων τὸν Ἰσραὴλ,  
b Ibid. No. 7. — Filium ergo Dei, quem ignorabant homines, annuntiabant Apostoli, — sed non alterum Deum inferebant.  
c iv. 5. 2. — Ego sum Deus Abraham, & Deus Isaac, & Deus Jacob, & adjecit: non est Deus mortuorum, sed viventium, — Per hac urig; manifestum fecit, quoniam is qui de Rubo loquutus Moyph, & manifestavit se esse Deum patrum, hic est viventium Deus. Quis enim est vivorum Deus, nisi qui est Deus, super quem alius non est Deus? Quem & Daniel Prophetam, cum dixisset ei Cyrus Rex Persarum, Quare non adorabas Bel? annunciavit dicens: Quoniam non colo Idola manufactia, sed vivum Deum. — Iterum dixit: Dominum Deum meum adorabo, quoniam hic est Deus vivus. Qui igitur a Prophetis adorabatur Deus vivus, hic est vivorum Deus, & Verbum ejus, qui & loquutus est Moyph, qui & Sadoceos redarguit, qui & Resurrectionem donavit. — Ipse igitur Christus cum Patre vivorum est Deus, qui loquutus est Moyph, qui & Patribus manifestatus est.
not Idols made with Hands, but the Living
God: —Again; I will worship, said he, the
Lord my God, because he is the Living God.
Therefore the Living God, who was wor-
shipped by the Prophets, he is the God of
the Living, and his Word, who spake to
Moses, confuted the Sadducees, and gave the
Resurrection. —Therefore Christ him-
self with the Father is the God of the Liv-
ing, who spake to Moses, and appeared to
the Fathers.

Irenæus could not invent Words more plain
and full to express, that our Saviour is the su-
preme God, the same God with the Father.
He proves him to be the God of the Living,
who spake to Moses from the Bush, and said;
I am the God of Abraham, &c. and who was
worshipped, as the Living God. And the
God of the Living is the supreme God, the
God that IS, above whom there is no other
God: Yea, afterwards he shews, he is the only
God: **d** Abraham believed first, that he is the
Maker of Heaven and Earth, the only God.

And then he joins Christ and the Father to-
gether, and affirms, that they are the God (not
the Gods) of the Living; so that he is the
same God with the Father, and he and his Fa-
ther are one, Joh. x. 30.

Dr. Whitby's Answer to this Passage, as ci-
ted by Bp. Bull, is hardly to be parallel'd.
**e** After he had taken pains to shew, that it was
not the Father, but the Son, that appeared in

---

**d** Ibid. No. 3. —Credidit Abraham Deo; —primum quidem, quoniam ipse est Factor Cæli & terræ, solus Deus.

**e** Disquisit. Mod. pp. 122, 123, 124, 125.
the Bush, and said, *I am the God of Abraham, &c.* Stupidly imagining, Dr. Bull was his Adversary in this; whereas he is only confuting an Error of the Prefs (Patriem for Patrum) in *Irenæus*’s own Words, little thinking, he was all the while betraying his wretched Cause: He answers, by denying him that spake to Moses out of the Bush to be the God of the Living &c., which is contradicting, not answering *Irenæus*: For ’tis evident, faith he, that he who spake from the Bush to Moses——is the God of the Living. Again, *The Living God, and his Word, who spake to Moses;——is the God of the Living*. Again, Christ himself with the Father is the God of the Living, who spake to Moses, and appeared to the Fathers. But he contradicts a greater than *Irenæus*, even Christ himself, who plainly teaches, that he who said to Moses, *I am the God of Abraham, &c.* is the God of the Living.

And finally, he contradicts himself; for he comes afterwards to give some Account of Christ’s being the God of the Living. Now instead of a fair Account of these plain and full Expressions of *Irenæus*, the Dr. has recourse to a Piece of *Arian* Machinery, often used to help ’em out in great Distress, viz. *The Son as the Father’s Messenger and Representative spake in his Person, when he said, I am the God of Abraham, &c.*


*Irenæus.* Is qui de rubo locutus est Moyši, & manifestavit e se esse Deum Patrum, hic est viventium Deus.——

Et post paucis: Deus vivus, hic est vivorum Deus, & Verbum ejus, qui & locutus est Moyši.——

Et postea: Ipse igitur Christus cum Patre vivorum est Deus, quiloquentus est Moyši.——

This
This Evasion is grounded on a Supposition, that Persons employed to carry Messages, were wont to speak in the Person of their Masters, and in the same Stile and Language, as if their Principals were present, and spoke themselves; which has not so much as a Shew of Probability, nor has been supported by one plain Fact: Rabshakeh speaks in his Master's Name; and yet durst not say, I am the King of Assyria: but thus faith the Great King——2 King xviii. 19, &c. The Prophets often repeat, thus faith the Lord: the Angel that appeared to Zacharias said not, I am God Almighty, but I am Gabriel, &c. Luke i. 19. Besides, if this were true, as Christ might have said, I am the Father: So had he alleged never so often, that he was the most High God, this Shift would have served 'em to get clear of such Testimonies, as well as others.

But even supposing the Truth of this Subterfuge, 'tis wholly impertinent in this Case, and is brought in without any Judgment or Modesty: For 'tis Demonstration, that Irenaeus knew nothing of it; else he could not have inferred from the Words spoken in the Bush, that the Son was the God of the Living, as he certainly does, but only that he was his Representative and Messenger. And is there any Sense or Candor in explaining an Author by a Maxim disowned by him? Besides, though an Angel might say, I am God the Father; and Rabshakeh might say, I am the Great King of Assyria, or I am Sennacherib; which is ridiculous to suppose: Yet no Man in his Senses, would say of them in the third Person, The Angel is God Almighty, or Gabriel has made it evident, that he is Jehovah; or Rabshakeh is the Great
great King; much less would any one be so ridic-
culous, as to join them together in this manner: 
Jehova and his Angel are God Almighty; or 
Rabshakeh and Sennacherib are the King of 
Assyria. Why must we be troubled with such 
Impertinencies!—Have these Men no Know-
ledge?

3. * "Our Lord taught us, that none can 
"know God, without God’s teaching of him, 
"that is, God is not to be known without 
"God.—And the Father was manifested 
"by the Word himself made capable to be seen 
"and felt, tho’ all did not equally believe him; 
"but all saw the Father in the Son: for the 
"Father is that which is invisible of the Son, 
"and the Son is that which is to be seen of the 
"Father."

The plainest Words may be perplexed with 
metaphysical Subtilties: but these Expressions, 
taken in their native Simplicity, strongly set 
forth the close and ineffable Union of the Fa-
ther and Son in the same Nature and Godhead. 
And both are God according to the former part 
of the Passage; the Father cannot be known 
without the Son revealing him, that is, God is 
not to be known without God.

4. * "It was not one that was known, and 
"another that said, No Man knows the Father;

* iv. 6. 4. Edocuit autem Dominus, quoniam Deum 
scire nemo potest, nisi Deo docente, hoc est, sine Deo non 
cognosce Deum. Et postea, N°. 6.—Et per ipsum Verbum 
vitibilem & palpabilem factum, Pater ostendebatur, etiamsi 
onnis similiiter credebant ei; sed omnes viderunt in Filio 
Patrem: Invibile et enim Filii Pater, visibile autem Patris 
Filiius.

* Ibid. N°. 7. Non ergo alius erat qui cognoscebatur, & 
alia quae dicebat: Nemo cognosceit Patrem; sed unus & idem, 
K omnia
but one and the same, whom the Father made
difficult. He is truly Man, and truly
God, from the Father, the Spirit, the An-
gels, the Creation itself, from Men, and
apostate Spirits and Devils, from the Enemy,
and finally from Death itself.'

If he means that the Son spoken of, Mat. xi.
27. and our Saviour, that spoke these Words,
are one and the same, it must be understood of
the same Person. But since in the Words, as here
cited, the Father only is mention'd, and the
Character, (qui cognoscebatur) be that was known,
best suits the Father, the most natural and obvi-
ous Sense of 'em is, that Christ the Son and the
Father are one and the same; as Job. x. 3. I and
my Father are one: that is, one, not in Person,
but in Nature and Godhead; for since he is truly
God, as here he explains himself, he must be
one and the same God; for there are not two
Gods.

5. "God the Father, and his Word, that
is always present with Mankind, are one and
the same."

The Generation of the Son may properly fall
under Consideration here, because it will far-
ther confirm his Consubstantiality, as well as
Coëternity. I shall gradually proceed in enquir-
ing into Irenæus's Doctrine concerning this in-
visible Mystery.

omnia subjecti eae Patre, & ab omnibus accipientem testimo-
nium, quoniam veré homo, & quoniam veré Deus, à Patre,
à Spiritu, ab Angulis, ab ipsa Conditione, ab hominibus, & ab
Apostaticis Spiritibus, & Daemonibus, & ab inimico, & no-
viisime à ipsa morte.

Cum sit unus & idem Deus Pater, & Verbum
ejus, semper adsistens humano generi.
1. A Son, as one has observed before us, may be two ways understood: one is a Son by Nature, because he is begotten; and another is reputed a Son, as he is made so: there is a difference between that which is begotten, and that which is made. For the one is begotten of him (the Father), and the other is made by him, either as created, or formed by Instruction.

Here Generation is contra-distinguished from Creation and other Methods of making Sons, and is allow'd to be the only Foundation of true Filiation: He who is begotten, is really a Son, and that by Nature; but he that is made a Son by Creation or otherwise, is only a reputed Son.

2. And the Word was God;—rightly infer'd, for that which is begotten of God, is God.

Whether these are our Author's own Words, or only reported from the Reasonings of the Valentinians, they certainly contain a Catholic Maxim, mentioned without the least Mark of Disapprobation. Compare Chap. 4. No 6. and Note there. And Theophilus of Antioch. And the Word was God.——The Word then is God.

k iv. 41. 2. Filius enim, quemadmodum & quidam ante nos dixit, dupliciter intelligitur: alius quidem secundum naturam, eo quod natus sit Filius; alius autem secundum id quod factus est, reputatur Filius: licet sit differentia inter natum & factum. Quoniam ille quidem ex eo natus est, ille autem ab ipso factus est, five secundum Conditionem, five secundum Doctrinae magisterium.

1. 8. 5. ἐὰς Θεός ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος, ὁ καλὸς ὁ διὸ ὃ ἐὰς ἐν Θεῷ γεννήθη, Θεός ἐστιν. Vet. Interp. Et Deus erat Verbum, consequenter; quod enim ex Deo natum est, Deus est.

m Theophil. ad Autolycum, L. 2. p. 130. Ed. Oxon.—κύριος ὁ λόγος Θεός, ἐστὶν ἐν Θεῷ· κύριος ὁ λόγος, Θεός ἐστιν. Interp. Et Deus erat Verbum, consequenter; quod enim ex Deo natum est, Deus est.
and begotten of God.—And Tertullian: \(^n\) We have learned, that this Word was prolated by God, and by Prolation begotten; and is therefore filled the Son of God, and God from the Unity of Substance.—So that what came forth from God, is God, and the Son of God, and both are one.

I shall give his Doctrine of the Generation of the Son in these Propositions.

I. Prop. Christ, with respect to his highest Nature, was ineffably begotten of God the Father; and by this mysterious Generation is the Son of God, and very God, as by his Birth of the Virgin he became true Man.

1. \(^o\) "One of the Gospels declares his princely, powerful, and glorious Birth of the Father, saying: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

2. \(^p\) "Because of his transcendently glorious Generation of the most high Father, and his extraordinary Birth of the Virgin, the Scriptures witness of him, both that he is Man— and that he is the Lord the holy One,—and the mighty God.

\(^n\) Tertull. Apolog. Cap. 21. Hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus, & prolatione generatum; & idcirco Filium Dei, & Deum dicitum ex unitate substantiae.—Ita & quod de Deo profectum est, Deus est, & Dei Filius, & unus ambo.

\(^o\) iii. 11. 8. Aliud enim (sc. Evangelium) illam quae est à Patre, principalem, & efficabilem, & gloriosam Generationem ejus enarrat, dicens sic: In principio erat Verbum, &c. Joan. i. 1, &c.

\(^p\) Ibid. 19. 2. —Quoniam praeclaram praeter omnes habuit in eam, quae est ab altissimo Patre, genituram, praeclara autem functus est & eà, quae ex Virgine, generatione; utraque Scripturae Divinæ de eo testificat & quoniam Dominus Sanctus, & Deus fortis.
3. a "The Prophet faith concerning him:

Who shall declare his Generation? Isa. liii. 8.

But you (Heretics) guessing at his Generation of the Father, and transferring the Prolation from the Word of Men made by the Tongue to the Word of God, witness against your selves, that you understand neither human nor divine Things.—If any one ask us, How then was the Son brought forth by the Father? We answer, that this Prolation or Generation,—or however else you express his Generation, which is indeed ineffable; it is understood by none, neither Valentinus, nor Marcion, nor Saturninus, nor Basilides; no, nor by the Angels, nor Archangels, nor Principalities, nor Powers; but by the Father only which begat, and by the Son, which is begotten of him. Wherefore, since his Generation is unspeakable, they that endeavour to declare the Generations and Prolations, know not what they do, undertaking to give an account of things unaccountable.

9 ii. 28. 5. Et Propheta quidem ait de eo: Generationem ejus quis enarrabit? Vos autem generationem ejus ex Patre divinantes, & verbi hominum verum factam pulationem transferentes in Verbum Dei, juiste detegimini a vobis ipsis, quod neque humana, nee divina noveritis. Et N°.6.—Si quis itaque nobis dixerit: Quomodo ergo Filius prolatus a Patre est? Dicimus ei, quia pulationem istam, sive generationem, aut quolibet quis nomine vocaverit generationem ejus inenarrabilem existentem, nemo novit; non Valentinus, non Marcion, neque Saturninus, neque Basilides, neque Angeli, neque Archangeli, neque Principes, neque Potestates, nisi solus qui generavit Pater, & qui natus est Filius. Inenarrabilis itaque generatio ejus cum sit, quicumque nintuntur Generationes & Prolationes enarrare, non sunt composites sui, ea quae inenarrabilia sunt enarrare promittentes.
II. Prop. This Generation of the Son was from all Eternity, without beginning; and consequently he is consubstantial, and co-eternal with the Father.

1. "The Heretics say, the Word was spoken forth by the Mind: which every Body knows may well enough be apply'd to the Case of Men speaking their Mind: But there cannot be any Emission in this Order, in the supreme God, since he is all Mind, and all Word (Logos,) and has nothing in him ancienter or later, or different from himself; but ever continues all uniform, similar, and perfectly one.—He that says he is all Mind, and all Word, tho' he has but imperfect Apprehensions of the Father of all; yet has more becoming Thoughts than they that transfer the Generation of a Word utter'd by Men, to the eternal Word of God, and acribe to him a beginning of his being spoken forth, and temporary Production, as to their own Word. Now wherein shall the Word of God, or rather God himself, since he is the Word, differ from the Word of
"Men, if he was generated and spoken forth "in the same Manner and Order?"

Here he plainly affirms the Co-eternity and Consubstantiality of the Word.

1. The Co-eternity of the Son, and his beginningless Generation is fully express'd, in opposition to the Heretics. They divided the Son into as many Æons almost as he has Names, viz. only-begotten Son, the Word, Wisdom, Saviour, Christ, &c. They supposed, that a Series of these and others was successively produced: and the Generation of the first-begotten was antemundane, but not absolutely eternal; and the Word had only the third place in this imaginary Series. Irenæus shews the absurdity of supposing a temporary Generation of the Word; he expressly reckons it an heretical Tenet to ascribe a beginning of Generation to him, tho' supposed to precede the Creation of the World many Ages; and we never find they presum'd to determine the precise Time or Point of Eternity, when the Pleroma was fill'd with Æons. They have unworthy Apprehensions of the incomprehensible God, who hold a temporary Generation of the eternal Word of God: The eternal Word here (α'ιδής τελεταὶ θεοῦ) as opposed to a beginning of Being, must signify absolutely eternal. Besides, a little before this Passage, he observes, that Basilides held (initia emissionum) Divine Generations that had a beginning, he borrow'd from the old Gnothic, intimating, that the Venom and Absurdity of his Herely consisted in this.

f ii. 13. 8. Hæc similiter & adversus eos, qui à Basiliade sunt, aptata sunt: & adversus reliquos Gnosticos, à quibus & hi initia emissionum accipientes, convicti sunt.
He denies that there is any thing prior, or posterior to another in God, who is a Being perfectly simple and uncompounded; whatsoever is in him, is God himself; therefore to suppose, that the Word is posterior in Existence and Duration to the Mind of God, and that his Mind must pre-exist and conceive a Thought, and then produce the Word, is to make God prior and posterior to himself, and to bring him down to a Level with imperfect Man, who in this Order produceth his Word. This is evidently his Argument here, and in other Places. Here signifies a temporary Generation, or the Production of that which once had no Being. The Order of Generation he finds fault with, is supposing the Mind to be pre-existent to the Conception, the Conception to the external Word, &c. And hence he exposeth the absurdity of the heretical Scheme, which represented some Æons older, and some younger.

"Were the Æons, faith he, emitted all at "once, or successively in some Order, so that "some of 'em are older and some later?"— and comparing them to so many Lights derived from the paternal Light, and to co-ëval Rays flowing from the Sun, he plainly levels his Argument against the temporary Production, and supposes they must be co-eternal, if generated of God. And how can one Æon, faith he, be supposed to be younger, and another elder, since there is but one Light of the whole Pleroma?"
2. The Consubstantiality (τὸ δομοστὶκὸν) of the Son is set forth in strong Expressions. The Word is God himself; the Word of God, faith he, or rather God himself, since he is the Word.—He affirms the perfect Simplicity of the Divine Being: there is nothing in God different from himself; so that his λόγος, or Word begotten of him must be of the same Essence and Nature. He often inculcates this Doctrine in parallel Passages:—

"God is not like Men, faith he, neither are his Thoughts as Mens Thoughts: For the Father of all is far removed from human Affections and Passions: He is simple, uncompounded, and uniform in his Essence; and all that is in him is like himself; since he is all Mind, and all Spirit, &c.

Again: "Since God is all Mind, and all Word, what he conceives in his Mind, is the same that he speaks forth, and what he speaks forth, is the same that he conceives. For his Conception is his Word, and his Word is his Mind, and the all-containing Mind is the Father himself.

It plainly follows, that the Word (or λόγος) who is in the Father, and ineffably begotten..."
of him, is God himself, i.e., of the same Nature and Essence with the Father: this Consequence is expressly owned by Irenæus himself in very plain Words: "The Father of all, says he, is not, as a compounded Animal, something different from his Mind; — but the Father is Mind, and the Mind is the Father. Therefore it necessarily follows, that the Word (\(\lambda.\delta.\gamma.\sigma\)) which is of him, or rather the Mind itself, since it is the Word, is perfect and impassible."

Again: "If the Word existing in the Father knows at all, he is not ignorant of him in whom he is; that is, of himself.

The Word then is not in Essence different from the Father, but so ineffably one with him, that he may be laid to be the Father himself.

Now if any one object, that in these Passages Irenæus speaks of the Internal Reason, or Word of God, but has no reference to the personal Word, who is begotten of him; I answer, 'tis undeniably plain, he speaks of the Word, which was spoken forth, and ineffably generated; and this is not the internal Reason, but the Son of God.—A little after one of the cited Passages, "He that assigns, faith he,

\[\text{ii. 17. 7. Non enim ut compositum animal quiddam est omnium Pater, præter Nun;—Sed Nus Pater, & Pater Nus. Necesse itaq; est & eum, qui ex eo est Logos, imo magis autem ipfum Nun, cum fit Logos, perfectum & impaffibilem esse.}

\[\text{Ibid. 8. Si enim existens in Patre (Logos) cognoscit, hunc in quo est, hoc est semetipsum non ignorat.}

\[\text{Similiter autem rursus & de Logon tertiam prolacionem ei à Patre donans, porro & longe Logon à Deo separavit. Et Propheta quidem ait de eo: Generacionem ejus quis enarrabit?—Si quis itaq; nobis dixerit, Quomodo ergo Filius prolatus à Patre est? \\

\"to}
to the Word Generation of the Father in the third Place,—separates him from the Father at a great Distance. Now the Prophet faith concerning him: Where shall declare his Generation?

And after he had smartly rebuked the Presumption of the Heretics in prying into, and pretending to explain this ineffable Mystery of the Generation of the Son, he subjoins the famous Passage above-cited concerning the manner of this Generation, in which he owns, it is unsearchable even to the Heavenly Intelligences.

Again, between two other Passages produced also above, he has these Words: "The Word therefore, as if it were generated in the third Place, is not ignorant of the Father, as they teach: For though this may perhaps seem probable in the Generation of Men, because they oft-times know not their Parents; yet in the Word of God it is utterly impossible.—Tis the personal, subsisting Word only that was begotten of the Father; of which therefore he reasons, as we have seen, allowing him to be of the same Essence and Substance with the Father.

On the other hand, perhaps, some will infer, that Irenæus deny'd the distinct Subsistence, or Personality of the Word, supposing him to be no more than the Reason of the Father, and consequently was of the Sabellian Notion in

See this Passage above in Prop. 1.

d ii. 17, 8. Non igitur jam Logos quasi tertium ordinem generationis habens ignoravit Patrem, quemadmodum docent hi: hoc enim in hominum quidem generatione fortasse putabitur verismile esse, eò quod sese ignorant suos parentes; in Logo autem Patris omnimodo impossibile est.
this Point: To which I answer; 'tis evident to a Demonstration from other Places, that he believed the Personality of the Word; nor can there be any rational doubt of it. And consequently, when he speaks of the Son, as the Father's Mind and Reason, he must be understood strongly to express the Unity of Substance, and not to confound the Persons, or to make the Son only an Attribute or Faculty. For as he held fast the Catholic Faith, so he had also Catholic Modesty, very different from the Pride and Presumption of Heretics: He seems plainly to allow, that the Doctrine of the Generation of the Son, his Union with, and yet Distinction from the Father, does far surpass the utmost Reach of human or angelic Thought: And therefore he supposed, these Expressions, The Mind, the Reason and Word spoken forth, not to be an Explication, but only an imperfect Illustration of this incomprehensible Mystery. For when his Thoughts and Pen were employed about this great Subject, and when he had just asserted, that all that is in God, is God himself, he adds: c "Now God is above these Things, and upon the Account of these Things, ineffable. He may well be termed the all-comprehending Mind; but is not like the Mind of Men: He may also be rightly called Light, but yet is not at all like our


"Light."
"Light. And so in all other Things the Father "of all is not like poor imperfect Men: He "is expressed and represented by these Things "in a way of Condescension; but is under- "stood far to surpass them in transcendent "Greatness. The Son then is termed the Fa- "ther's Reason and Word, not that he is only an internal Faculty, or an Expression of inward Conceptions; but to give us an Adumbration of his ineffable Unity and Coessentiality with the Father.

But I return to give farther Proofs of the Son's being of the same Substance with the Father: And if we consider his Reasonings a- "gainst the Valentinians, chiefly in the 17th Chap. of the 2d Book, we shall find it was a Prin- ciple with him, that, "On Supposition of Generation in God, that "which is begotten must be consubstantial, or "of the same Essence with the Father.

For to prove the Absurdity of that Part of their Scheme, in which the generated Æons were all, except the Only-begotten, supposed capable of Ignorance and Passion, he assumes the intermediate Idea of Consubstantiality; and argues to this Effect, "The Æons, as begotten "of the Supreme Father, must have the same "Nature, Substance, or Essence with him; "and consequently must be incapable of Im- "perfection, Ignorance, and Passion; for these "are incompatible to the Divine Substance, "which sustains the Qualities and Attri- "butes.

"If the Æons be supposed to be generated, "so

ii. 17, 3. Sed si quidem efficabiliut & secundum suam genesin unalququis; illorum (Æonum) emissus est secundum hominum
"fo as to have a separate Existence, as the "Individuals of Mankind, then those that are "begotten, must either be consubstantial to "the Father, and so like him that begat "'em; or if they appear to be unlike him, it "must be own'd, that they are of some other "Substance.

Note, This later he mentions as an Absurdity, to which the supposed Imperfection and Unlikeness of the Æons did necessarily lead, tho' inconsistent with divine Generation, and probably disown'd by the Heretics themselves.

Again: & "But if the Æons were derived "from the Word, and the Word from the "Mind, and the Mind from Bythus, as one "Light from another—they may perhaps "differ from one another in their Derivation "and Greatness: but since they are of the same "Substance with him, from whom they are "originally derived, either they must all re- "main impaffible, or the Father himself must "also partake of Passion. —Or if any one "should call them Stars, they shall all never- "theless have the same common Nature. For "tho' one Star differ from another in Glory, "1 Cor.

hominum similitudinem; vel generationes Patris erunt ejuf- dem Substantiae ei, & similes Generatort (Gr. forte, "γενέ- γενεσις της παρά του νευούσαν ἰσότητος, καὶ ὑμῆς γενεσισιν) vel si diffimiles parebunt, ex altera quâdam substantia confiteri eos esse neceßit esse.

& ii. 17. 4. Si autem, velut à lumine lumina accensæ, sunt Æones à Loga, Logos autem à Nù, & Nus à Bythe;—generatione quidem & magnitudine fortasse diffamabat ab invi- cem: ejusdem autem Substantiae cum sint cum Principi emis- sionis ipsorum, aut omnes impasibles perseverant, aut & Pa- ter ipsorum participabit passiones—Sect. 5.—Et quis Stel- las dicit eos, nihil minus eadem universi apparebunt naturâ parti-
"1 Cor. xv. 41. yet not in Quality or Substance, by which any thing is passible or impassible. But since they are all from the paternal Light, they must needs either all naturally impassible and unchangeable; or else all with the paternal Light itself be passible and capable of corrupting Changes.

Again: § "If they say, their Æons were derived, as Rays from the Sun, since they are all Consubstantial, and from the same Fountain, they must either all be capable of Passion with him, from whom they are derived, or all, one as well as another, continue impassible."

From these Passages I would observe,

1. That probably Irenæus used the Word ὑμοσύνης, Consubstantial, that was so famous afterwards in the Controversy between the Catholics and the Arians. For where the Greek is preserved, we find ὑμοσύνης is the Word that is rendered, as here, ejusdem Substantiae, of the same Substance. Tertullian renders it by Consubstantivos. And perhaps Irenæus was one of those participants. Etenim si Stella a Stella in claritate differt; sed non secundum qualitatem, nec secundum substantiam, secundum quam passibile aliquid vel impassibile est; sed aut univeros, ex Lumine cum sint paterno, naturaliter impassibiles & immutabiles esse oportet: aut univeri cum paterno lumine, & passibiles, & commutationum corruptionis capaces sunt.

§ Ibid. 7. Si autem, quomodo à Sole Radios, Æonas ipsorum emissiones habuisse dicent, ejusdem Substantiae & de codem omnes cum sint, aut omnes capaces passionis erunt cum eo, qui ipsos emisit, aut omnes impassibles perseverabunt.

2. To μὴ πνευματικὴν μὴ συνδυασίαν ἐτύγχαν (L. ἠμών) μορφάσεις, εἰπεν ὑμοσύνην ὑπῆκον ἄντι. —Spirituale quidem non potuisse eam formare, quoniam ejusdem Substantiae ei erat. & postea. —Βασιλεία πάλαι, τῷ τι ὑμοσύνῃν ἄντι. —Regem omnium ejusdem Substantiae ei, &c.

Ancients who used the term ὀμοσφαίρει concerning the Father and the Son, as Eusebius witnesses in his Epistle concerning the Decisions of the Council of Nice. For tho’ he does not directly assert the Son’s being of the same Substance with the Father, he does it consequentially. But if the Greek here was, τῶν αὐτῶν ἁρμίας, as Billius conjectures, the Sense is the very same; for the Doctrine of the Consubstantiality was often so express’d about, and after the time of the Nicene Council.

2. He explains the Sense of the Word ὀμοσφαίρει, or consubstantial, by Communion in the same Nature, ἕαδεμ naturā participantes, having the same common Nature: And it is such a Sameness of Substance or Nature, as necessarily infers all the same essential Properties: For he concludes, from the Consubstantiality of the Αἴων, that they must be incapable of Imperfections; such as Ignorance, Passion, Changes, &c.

And this he illustrates by the Comparisons of one Lamp lighted by another, and of the Rays streaming forth from the Sun; which the Orthodox Fathers also use as some imperfect Resemblances of the ineffable Generation of the Son.

---

k Apud Socrat. H. E. 1. 8. —Ἐστὶ μὲ τῶν ἀναλαίων τινὸς λόγου καὶ ἑπιφανίας ἐπισκόπης καὶ συνεργείας ἔγνωμεν ἐπί τῶν τῶν πάντως καὶ ὑπὲρ θεολογίας, τῶν τῶν ἐρμοσεῖν συναρμομένως ὁμοίως.


3. As Consubstantiality is the necessary Consequence of Divine Generation, as understood by the Ante-nicene Fathers; so the Word does not determine, whether the Identity of Substance be numerical or specific: Nor does it appear to me, that ever the Fathers enter'd into this Enquiry: They look'd upon the Unity and Distinction of the Father and Son, as incomprehensible: That the Son as God had the Nature and Substance of God, as in order to be true Man, he assum'd the Nature and Substance of Man, they firmly believ'd; but durst not measure God by our low Idea's borrow'd from the Individuals of any Species among Creatures; these secret things they left to the Lord, and were content with what God had revealed in Scripture. They held indeed, that the Son was not ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, of the same Essence, in the Sabellian Sense, which destroy'd the Distinction of Persons, and also that he was not ἐν θρόνωσιν, as the Arians held, which amounted to a Denial of his Godhead. The Catholic Medium equally avoided both these Extremes, as being subversive of the Notion of true Generation; for if there be no Distinction of Persons, 'tis plain, there can be no Generation: and on the other hand, if there was not a Communication of the same Nature, it was not Generation, but Creation.

4. When Irenæus seems to allow, that the Ἁεόν, tho' confubstantial with the Father, and one another, might differ with respect to Greatness and Glory, as Stars do, it ought not to be infer'd, that he supposed a real Inequality in the confubstantial Trinity. For, as his Adversaries supposed such an Inequality among their confubstantial Ἁεόν, he only waves that part of the
Dispute, which was not then to his Purpose, as is usual in Controversies, and carries his Argument no farther than his Scope required, and the Simile he uses would bear: For there are greater and lesser Lights, and one Star differs from another in Glory. And he here yields in the same manner the temporary and successive Derivation of Light from Light; which yet he elsewhere strenuously opposes in the Case of the eternal Word of God.

III. Prop. The Son by his Generation had not a separate Existence from the Father, nor are the two Persons two separate Beings, like the several Individuals of the human Species; but they are ineffably united, the Son being in the Father, and the Father in the Son.

n "Were the Æons united to him that emitted them, as the Rays and the Sun; or were they generated by way of Division, so that they exist separately in their proper Forms, as particular Men, and other Animals do? o "If they were thus produced, they must be supposed to be entirely separate from one
“one another, as so many Men are, without " any close Union.”

Tho’ the Rays flow from the Sun as their Fountain, yet they so necessarily co-exist, that ’tis impossible for ’em to have a separate Existence. And if the Son was so incomprehensibly begotten of the Father, as to admit of this Illustration, it follows according to Irenæus, that the Father and Son have not, cannot have such a distinct Being and separate Existence, as two individual Men. Besides, if he reckoned it a great Absurdity in the Valentinian Scheme, that their Æons, held by them to be generated of God, should be supposed to have such a distinct and separate Existence, much more would he have thought it Blasphemy to assert this concerning the Son, who has the same Esence with the Father, and is so incessably one with him, that he may be said to be the Father himself.

And this seems to lead us to the true Method, the Ancients took to explain the Unity of God, in consistence with the Distinction of Persons, and the true Godhead of the Son and Holy Ghost. As the Sun and its Rays make not two Suns, because the Rays necessarily stream from the Sun, and don’t make a distinct luminous Body; so the Father and Son are not two Gods, because the Son had not a separate Existence of himself, but proceeded from the Father by eternal Generation, and naturally and necessarily subsists in, and with him in the strictest Union. In this Sense only they refer the Unity to the Father: Had the Son and Holy

similitudinem; secundum hanc rationem uniusquique eorum separatim divisus ab altero intelligetur, quemadmodum homines, non admixtus, nec unitus alter altero.—

M 2 Spirit
Spirit been two eternal Minds, not proceeding from the Father, they could not according to their Principles have salv'd the Unity. But because there is but one Fountain of the Deity, and the Son and Spirit in their distinct Personality did not exist of themselves, but were of the Father's Substance by Generation and Procession, they cannot exist separately to make so many Gods, but naturally remain ineffably united, and one God with him.

The Principle into which his Argument here is resolv'd, he applies elsewhere to the Son, by asserting his ineffable Union with the Father.

p "By the Son, who is in the Father, and hath the Father in him, the God that truly is, is manifested.

q Again: "Not only before Adam, but before any thing was created, the Word glorify'd his Father, abiding in him, and himself was glorify'd by the Father."

p iii. 6. 2. Per Filium itaque, qui est in Patre, & habet in se Patrem, is qui est, manifestatus est Deus.

q iv. 14. 1. Non enim solum ante Adam, sed & ante omnem conditionem glorificabat Verbum Patrem suum, manens in eo; & ipse à Patre clarificabatur.
1. "It is not probable, that one made the Body, and another formed the Eyes; but the very same that created Adam from the beginning,—manifesting himself to Men in the later Days, formed the Sight of him that was blind from Adam. Wherefore the Scripture hinting at something future, says, when Adam hid himself upon account of his Disobedience, the Lord came to him in the Evening, and called him, saying, Where art thou? Gen. iii. 9. Which implies, that the same Word of God would come in the last Days to call Man.—

2. "At the Overthrow of the Sodomites, the Scripture faith; And the Lord rained on Sodom and Gomorrah Fire and Brimstone from the Lord out of Heaven, Gen. xix. 24.

a v. 15. 4. — Nec consequens est alterum quidem Corpus, alterum vero plasmasse oculos: Sed idem-ipse qui ab initio plasmavit Adam.—in novissimis temporibus semetipsum manifestans hominibus, ei qui ab Adam caecus erat, formavit visionem. Et propter hoc Scriptura significans quod futurum erat, ait, abcondito Adam propter inobedientiam, Dominum venisse vepere ad eum, & evocasse eum, & dixisse ei: Ubi es? hoc est, quoniam in novissimis temporibus idipsum venit Verbum Dei advocare hominem.—

b iii. 6. 1. Et iterum, in everstone Sodomitarum scriptura ait: Et pluit Dominus super Sodomam & Gomorrham ignem & sulfur a Domino de Coelo. Filium enim hic significat,
"Intimating, that the Son, who also conversed with Abraham, received Power from the Father to judge the Sodomites for their Iniquity."

This is an Instance of the Son, as well as the Father's being absolutely stiled Lord in Scripture; which to Irenæus was an Evidence of his true Godhead and supreme Dominion. He intimates also, that he appeared as one of the three Angels, who is called Jehovah, and with whom Abraham interceded for Sodom, Gen. xviii. — compare Job. v. 22.

3. c "The Son speaking to Moses, faith; I am come down to deliver this People, Exod. iii. 8. For 'tis he that descends and ascends for the Salvation of Men.

4. d "Deut. xxxii. 6. Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish People and unwise? Is not he thy Father that possessed thee, that made and created thee?

Again: "The Father of Mankind is the Word of God; as Moses has shew'd in these Words: Is not he thy Father that possessed thee? &c.

ficat, qui & Abraham colloquutus fit, a Patre accepto potestatem ad judicandum Sodomitas, propter iniquitatem eorum.

c Ibid. 2. — Et iterum, loquente Filio ad Moyœn; Descendi, inquit, eripere populum hunc. Ipse est enim qui descendit, & ascendit propter salutem hominum.

d iv. 10. 2. Quapropter Moyœs increpans populum, ait: Sic populus fatis, & non Sapiens, bac Domino retribuisti? — Et iterum: nonne hic idem Pater tuus possedit te, & fecit te, & creavit te?

Et Cap. 31. 2. Pater autem generis humani Verbum Dei: quemadmodum Moyœs oftendit, dicens: nonne hic ipse Pater tuus possedit te, & fecit te, & creavit te?

5. e "They
5. "They who call upon the Principalities in Heaven to open the everlasting Gates, that the King of Glory may enter, preached Christ’s Resurrection—and his Ascension to Heaven."

Christ is the King of Glory described, Psal. xxiv. where he is stiled Jehova, the mighty God, the Lord of Hosts; which are some of the peculiar, and greatest Titles of the God of Israel.

6. "Thy Throne, O God, is for ever; a Scepter of Righteousness is the Scepter of thy Kingdom. Thou hast loved Righteousness, and hated Iniquity; therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee.

7. "The Church is the Synagogue of God; which God, that is, the Son himself gather’d by himself (in Person.) Of whom he saith again. The God of Gods the Lord hath spoken, and called the Earth. What God? he of whom he said: God shall visibly come, even our God, and will not be silent; that is, the Son, &c."

These two last Texts are produced as Proofs, that the Son is truly God and Lord, because so stiled absolutely in Scripture; and can any one suppose that Irenæus took him to be a Creature or inferior God, who speaks with such Majesty, and assumes such great Titles in the 50th Psalm?

e iv. 33. 13. —Et praecipientes principibus Cælorum, aperiire æternas portas, ut introeat Rex Glorie, refurrectionem ejus, & receptionem in Coelos præconaverunt.

f iii. 6. 1. Sedes tua, Deus, in æternum; Virga directioris, &c.

2 Ibid. —Hæc enim (Ecclesia) est Synagoga Dei, quam Deus, hoc est, Filius ipse per semetipsum collegit. De quo iterum dicit: Deus Deorum Dominus loquiturus est, & vocavit terram. Quis Deus? de quo dixit: Deus manifeste veniet, Deus nofer, & non silebit: hoc est, Filius, &c.
The Son then is *Jehova*, our God, the God of Gods, the most High, who is Possessor of Heaven and Earth, to whom the Israelites offer'd their Sacrifices, &c. Let the Reader look over the whole Psalm, and judge whether any serious Person could possibly believe, that he who is spoken of, and speaks in such a lofty Strain, was but a Creature, or any one less than the most High God. I'm sure, if he be not the supreme God, who is here describ'd, we may despair to find him in the Old Testament. Ascribing these high Characters to an inferior Being, would give some Countenance to the old Heretics, that deny'd the God of the Jews, and blasphemously asserted, that partly thro'Ignorance, partly thro'Vanity he assum'd those Characters that belong'd not to him. 'Tis observable, that the Fathers did not conclude, that a Divine Person spoken of in the Old Testament, was not the Son, but the Father, because of the high Characters ascribed to him: They made no difference in this respect: But if they found in the Context any Indications, that it was a Person, who was wont to converse with Men that was to come visibly, or to be the Judge of the World, &c. they understood the Text of the Son, tho' describ'd under never so glorious Characters and Titles, as *Jehova*, the Lord of Hosts, the God of Gods, the most High, the Holy one and God of Israel, the Living and true God, besides whom there is no God, &c. Can any one, that knows the Spirit of Arianism, suspect 'em to have been in the least tinctur'd with it?

8. h "The Word, the Maker of all things," "who

\[ \text{iii. i. 8. } '\mathrm{O} \tau\nu\mathrm{v} \alpha\iota\pi\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\omega\upsilon \tau\iota\kappa\rho\iota\nu\tau\iota\varsigma \lambda\eta\gamma\varsigma \upsilon \iota \varsigma \, \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \, \iota \kappa\iota\beta\iota \mu\iota\upsilon \iota \varsigma \ \tau\iota \varsigma \nu \iota \varsigma \]
"who sits upon the Cherubim, and upholds all "things, when manifested to Men, gave us a "fourfold Gospel, ended by one Spirit. Even "as David praying for his coming, faith; Thou "that sittest upon the Cherubim, appear, Pf. lxxx. 1. 9. 1 Pfal. lxxxii. 1. "God stood in the Af- "femblly of the Gods, &c.  

I have had occasion above to observe, that Irenæus understood this, and also the 76th Psalm, God is made known in Judah, &c. concerning our blessed Lord, in both which he is spoken of as the God of Israel, and styled ὁ Θεὸς, God with the Article, without any possible reference to what preceded, because he is so styled in the be-ginning of these Psalms.

10. k Pfal. xcix. 1. The Lord reigned, let the People rage, he that sitteth upon the Cherubim (reigned,) let the Earth be moved. 

The whole Psalm must necessarily be under-stood of the supreme God, the God of Israel, who, as it follows there, is great in Zion, and whose great and terrible Name is to be praised, &c.

11. 1 Isa. vii. 14. Behold, a Virgin shall con-ceive, and bring forth a Son, and ye shall call his Name

τὸν χερουμ, καὶ τοὺς τὰ πάντα, φανερωθείς τοις αἰρέασις, εἶχες ἢμι τεταγμένος τὸ οὐραγγίλειον, ἵνα πνεύματι συνεκκατορ-

"καίω δ’ Αδωνίς ἠτέμνετο ἀντὶ τῶν παρεισα, ὥσπερ ἐκαθαρι-

νῷ ἵπτε γὰρ τοὺς χερουμ, ἵπτε γὰρ.

1 Ibid. 6. 1. ὁ Θεός ἔστιν καὶ πανωφόρης ἡμῖν, ἐν μέσῳ ἡ ἤτος διακρίνεται, & Pfal. xcvi. 1. γνωσίς εἰς τῇ Ἰσραήλ ὁ Θεός, ἐν τῇ ἐσχάλμενα μέγα τὸ ἐναρκέ ἄντος. L. 4. 33. 11.

1κv. 33. 13. Et qui dicebant: Dominus regnavit, irascens tur 

populi, qui sedet super Cherubim, commoveat terra; par-

tim cam, quæ poll affumptionem ejus facta est super cos qui 
in eum crediderunt, iram— & motum— adversus Ecclesiæm 

prophetabant, &c.

1 iii. 21. 4. Ecce, Virgo in ventre accipiet, & pariet Filium, & vocabitis nomen ejus Emmanuel, &c Diligenter igitur sig-

nificavit
Name Emmanuel, &c. „The Holy Ghost has plainly signified his Birth of the Virgin, and his Substance, viz. that he is God: (for so the Name Emmanuel signifies) and shews, that he is Man, by saying, Butter and Honey shall be eat.—But that he should not consent to Wickedness, that he might choose the Good, is his peculiar as God.”

12. m Isa. viii. 3,— 9. 6. I went unto the Prophetess, and she brought forth a Son, and his Name is called Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God.

See above, Chap. IV. No 5, and the Note upon it. Since I writ That, I have had a Suspicion, that the true Version of the later part of that famous Text, Isa. ix. 6. being put in the Margin of the vulgar Translation of the LXX. either from better Copies or the original Hebrew, might happen to creep into the Text out of its proper Place, as perhaps, Chap. viii. 3. which may be the reason of Irenæus's joining the two Texts, as here. And Clement of Alexandria seems to have produced the two Parts of that Verse from different Places in the Prophet. „The Spirit, faith he, calls the Lord himself a Child, giving forth this Oracle by Isaiah: Bebold to us a Child is born, and unto us a Son is given, whose Government (Gr. Prin-

nificavit Spiritus Sanctus— generationem ejus, quae est ex Virgine, & substantiam, quoniam Deus: (Emmanuel enim nomen hoc significat) & manifestat, quoniam homo, in eo quod dicit: Butyrum & mel manducabit. — Quod autem non consentiet nequitiae, ut eligat bonum, proprium hoc est Dei, &c. Tertull. de Anima, c. 41. Solus enim Deus sine peccato, & solus homo sine peccato Christus, quia & Deus Christus.

m iv. 33. 11. — Veni ad Prophetam, & peperit Filium, & vocatur nomen ejus Admirabilis, Consilarius, Deus, Fortis, "cipality)
**'cipaVtty) is upon his Shoulder, and his Name is called the Angel of great Counsel. Who is then the Infant Child? he, after whose Image we are Infants. By the fame Prophet he declares his Greatness: Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.—O the great God! O the perfect Child! The Son in the Father, and the Father in the Son." n'Tis plain this was not taken from the other Greek Versions, for neither Aquila, Theodotion, nor Symmachus had Άςεσ ἰσγυγος, or δυνασθι in their Versions.

13. o Neither shall we look for another Christ and Son of God, but him, who was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered, whom also we believe in, and love; as Esaias faith:

"And they shall say in that Day: Behold, the Lord our God, in whom we hoped, and rejoiced in our Salvation, Isa. xxv. 9.

14. p "Behold, our God executes Judgment, and will execute it; himself will come,


o iv. 9. 2. Neque alium Chrustum, & Dei Filium expectabimus; sed hunc, qui ex Maria Virgine, qui & passus est, in quem & credimus, quem & diligimus; quemadmodum Esaias ait. Et dicent in illa die: ecce, Dominus Deus nos fer, in quem speravimus, & exulcavit nos in salute nostra.

P iii. 20. 3. Propter hoc ergo signum salutis nostra cum, qui est ex Virgine Emmanuel, eft ipse Dominus—hoc autem & Esaias: Ecce, Deus nos fer judicium retribuit, & retributur nos: ipse veniet, & salvabit nos. V. etiam Lib. 4. C. 33. 11.
"or he will come himself, and save us, Isa. xxxv. 4.

15. "Again: That it was neither a mere Man that saves us, nor yet without Flesh (for the Angels are without Flesh) he has declared, saying: Neither an Elder (Gr. Ambassador) nor an Angel; but the Lord himself shall save them; because he loves them, and will spare them, himself shall redeem them, ch. lxiii. 9.

The learned Dr. Allix suspects, that the LXX, whose Version Irenæus follows, read in this Text of the Prophet Isaiah, not a Prince or Angel, instead of as we now have it in all the Copies. But there is no ground to suppose, that their unpointed Copy differ'd in the least from ours; only they joined the later part of the preceding Verse with this, and by their way of pointing and distinguishing, render'd it thus: And he became their Saviour out of all their Affliction; not a Messenger (Heb. יְהוָה) nor Angel; (but) himself, or the Lord himself, according to Irenæus and the Alexandrian MS. [Heb. his Face, i.e. himself in Person, as Exod. xxxiii. 14.ז וְיָחיי my Face, we render it, my Presence shall go with thee; but the LXX, אַחֲרָנֵנוּ we will go with thee, as I myself will go before thee; compare 2 Sam. xvii. 11. "and that thou go to Battel in thine own Person] saved them, &c. They read as the Text still has it, and not according to the critical Note of the Masorites, called

9 iii. 20. 4. Rurfus, quomiam neque homo tantum erit, qui salvat nos, neque sine carne, (sine carne enim Angeli sunt) prædicavit enim dicens: neque Senior, neque Angelus, sed ipse Dominus salvabit eos, quomiam diliget eos, & parcet eis, ipse liberabit eos.

the Keri; and so did the Chaldee Paraphrafr and the antient Syriac Interpreter; and R. D. Kimchi gives the Sense both according to the textual and marginal Reading. V. Com. in locum.

And יְנָשָׁה they read not with a Camets, as now, but with the long Chirec, which frequently has not (1) יְנָשָׁה for יְנָשָׁה that is a Messenger, Gr. τῆς σκόπους, it should rather have been τῆς σκόπους, as perhaps the famous Interpreters left it, and hence the Alexandrian MS. has τῆς σκόπους. But the τῆς σκόπους is tolerable, it gave occasion to the Latin Interpreter to mistake the Sense, and render it Senior, an Elder. And so Cyprian also has it (2); but Tertullian has render'd it Legatus, a Messenger (3). And finally, they did not construe יְנָשָׁה and יְנָשָׁה together, for the Angel of his Face, or Presence, but separated 'em, and supposed the later to signify God himself, in opposition to any inferior Agent, as I have represented above.

This I take to be a good Proof, that the antient Jews believed, that the Divine Person, called the 'Word of God, the Shechinah, the Angel of his Face, &c. that deliver'd their Ancestors out of Egypt, was not a created Angel, but the Lord himself. A Passage of this Import is found in the Jerusalem Talmud; where their antient Doctors say: "When the merciful God came to deliver his People out of Egypt, he did not

(3) Talmud Hierofol. Horajoth, Cap. 3. apud Buxtorfum Lex. Chal. in voce יְנָשָׁה Quando Deus misericors venit ad liberandum Israel ex Egypto, non misit Legatum vel Angelum, sed Deus Benedicitus ipse met venit, &c.
send a Messenger or Angel; but the blessed God himself came, &c. And Jonathan interprets this Text in Chaldee of the Word; and his Word, faith he, became their Redeemer, &c.

But I insert this Text to express Irenæus's Opinion of the Son, whom he understood to be here set forth, as the Lord himself, in opposition to an Angel, Ambassador, or Agent.

He often lays an Emphasis upon his being the Lord himself, as a little above: That Sign of our Salvation, faith he, is the Lord himself, who is Emmanuel of the Virgin; for it was the Lord himself, that saved them. Compare Chap. IV. No. 7. and Note there.

— He subjoins these Words, as a Passage of the same Prophet: The Lord, the Holy one of Israel remembred his Dead, that slept in the Grave (in the Land of burying) and came down to 'em, to preach to 'em the glad Tidings of his Salvation. w

This, it seems, was found in some Copies of the LXX Version, and the matter and turn of Expression was such, as might easily impose upon those Fathers that were not acquainted with the Hebrew Code: Justin Martyr suspected it was wanting in many Copies of the LXX, by a Fraud of the Jews x. I suppose this Passage was originally found in some apocryphal Writing of the Hellenistical Jews, and from thence

w iii. 20. 4. Et quoniam non solum homo erat, qui moriebatur pro nobis, Efaias ait: Et Commemoratus est Dominus Sanctus Israïël mortuarum suorum, qui dormierant in terra sepulchris: Et descendit ad eos evangelizare salutem quæ est ab eo, ut salvaret eos.

x Con. Tryph. p. 298. Ἐνώπιον Ἰ ζῶμεν ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ (lege, ἐνώπιον) Ἰωάννη τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, εἰς τὸν Υστέρωτο, κατὰ τὴν προσευματισμὸν αὐτοῦ τὸ συνάδειον αὐτοῦ.
transfer'd by some Christian to the Margin of the Greek Bible over-against some Expression of like Import in the Prophet Isaiah or Jeremiah; for 'tis ascribed to both; and so came to pass for Text in some Copies. It plainly expresseth Christ's Divine Nature, that he is that God, known by the Character of the Lord the Holy one of Israel.

17. "Because the Word of God forms us in the Womb, he faith to Jeremiah: Before I formed thee in the Belly, I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the Womb, I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a Prophet among the Nations, Jer. i. 5."

He supposeth also, that he that appeared to the Prophet Ezekiel, chap. i. and to the Apostle John, Rev. iv. as the God of Israel, sitting on a Throne supported by four Animals, was the Son of God.

18. "The Lord hath spoken in Sion, and uttered his Voice out of Jerusalem, Amos i. 2.
19. "Joel iii. 16.
20. "And because he was not only a Man "that

---
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"that dy’d for us,—the Prophet Amos (Micab)
"faith: He himself will return, and have Mer-
"cy on us; he will abolish our Iniquities, and
"cast into the depth of the Sea our Sins, Mic.vii.19.
20. d "And speaking of John, he faith thus:
"For he shall be great in the Sight of the Lord.—
"And many of the Children of Israel shall be turn

to the Lord their God; and he shall go before
"him, in the Spirit and Power of Elias,—to
"prepare a perfect People for the Lord, Luke i.
"15, 16, 17. For whom then did he prepare a
"People? and in what Lord’s Sight was he
"great? even his, who said, that John was great-
"er than a Prophet, &c. Mat. xi. 9, 10."

As the necessary Construction of St. Luke’s
Words leads us to understand these Words, the
Lord their God, as spoken of Christ, before
whom John did go as a Harbinger; so Irenæus
expounds ’em of him, who therefore is the God
of Israel; above whom there is no God. For
he produces this Text as a Proof, that he who
is here spoken of, as being stiled Lord and God
absolutely, is the supreme God, and no other
than the God of Israel, or God of the Old
Testament, whom the Jews had revolted from,
and by Repentance were to return to. e "Luke,
"faith he, simply, absolutely, and strongly con-
"fess’d him God and Lord in his own Person,
"who chose Jerusalem, and gave the Law of
"the

Amos Propheta ait, Ipse convertetur,
& misericritur nostri: dissolvet (pro καταδον, legit καταλών) injustitas nostras, & projiciet ἀποφίλις, quod habet MS. Alexandrinum; non, ut Editio Romana, ἀποφίλφισυνια, malè,) in altitudinem maris peccata nostra.

d iii. 10. 1. e Lucas—simpliciter, & absolutè, & firmè
Deum & Dominum confitens ex sua Person, cum qui elegit
Jerusalem, & legis dationem Sacerdotii fecerit, cujus eft &
"the Priesthood, and whose Angel Gabriel is.
"For he knew no other above him; for if he
"had any Knowledge of a more perfect God
"and Lord, besides him, he would never have
"stiled him—God and Lord in so full and ab-
"solute a manner,"—and then cites the Text
of Luke inserted above; where our blessed Sa-
vior is stiled God and Lord absolutely, and con-
sequently is, according to Irenæus, that God
who had no God above him; and herein his
Scheme differs from Dr. Clarke's e.

21. He understood the whole Text, Rom. ix.
5. concerning Christ, as having two Natures
joined in one Person. "And again, faith he,
"Paul writing to the Romans concerning Is-
rael, faith: Whose are the Fathers, and of
"whom Christ, according to the Flesh came, who is
"God over all (supreme God, as Dr. Clarke would
render it in another Case) "blessed for evermore."

& Angelus Gabriel. Etenim alterum super hunc nesciebat:
Si enim intelleetum perfectionis alieius Deus & Dominii, pre-
ter hunc, habuisset, non utique hunc,—absolutè, & in totum,
Dominum & Deum confiteretur—Sed & de Ioanne di-
cens, sic ait: Erit enim magnus in conspectu Domini, & multos
filiorum Israel convertet ad Dominum Deum ipsorum, &
ipsa præcedet in conspectu ejus, in Spiritu & virtute Helia,
præparare Dominum plebem perfectam. Cui ergo populum
praeparavit, & in ejus Domini conspectu ma nus factus est ?
utique ejus, qui dixit: Quoniam plusquam Prophetus habuit
aliquid Ioannes, &c.

e Scripture-Doctrine, No 534. p. 71, 72.
\[iii. 16. 2, 3, \] Neque alium quidem Iesum, alter-
num autem Christum suf.picaremur fuifi, sed unum & eun-
dem seiremus esse—Paulus ad Romanos scribens de
Israel, dicit: Quorum Patres, & ex quibus Christus secundum
carnem, qui est Deus super omnes benedictus in sæcula.
CHAP. VII.

Divine Attributes ascribed to the Son.

I. The Son is equal to the infinite Father in Greatness and Knowledge.

1. a "God doth all things in Measure and Order; and there is nothing unmeasur'd with him, because there is nothing unnumber'd. And one said well, that the immense Father himself is measur'd in the Son: For the Measure of the Father is the Son, because he comprehends (or contains) him.

2. b "Now the Father, who in respect of us, is invisible and immense, his own Word knows; and tho' he is ineffable, he declares him to us; and on the contrary, the Father only knows his own Word."

The former Passage is the Testimony of two Witnesses, Irenæus and another Catholic Father, either antienter, or contemporary, whose Saying he cites with Approbation: The Expressions are clear and strong, and can signify no less than the Equality of the Father and Son, which is the Foundation of their mutual Comprehension. For as the Reason of our Incapa-
city to comprehend God, is the Disproportion between him and us; he is infinite, and we finite; as a Nutshell cannot hold and measure the vast Ocean. So the Son’s Capacity to measure and comprehend the infinite Father is founded in an Equality of Nature. Compare what Tatian says to this Purpose: c“ That which is less, faith he, “cannot attain the comprehensive Knowledge “of that which is greater,” or of God. The Valentinians themselves were sensible of this, and so held, that the only-begotten Son, who alone could comprehend the Greatness of the Father, was equal to him d. And Irenæus, by asserting elsewhere God’s being incomprehensible to all Creatures, shews what were his Sentiments concerning the Son, who perfectly comprehends him. “ God, faith he, is in respect of his “Greatness, unknown to all that were made “by him e.

II. He is Co-eternal.

1. f“ Not only before Adam, but before “any thing at all was created, the Word glo- “rify’d his Father, abiding in him; and was “himself glorify’d by the Father, as he faith:

“Father,


d Iren. i. 1. i. — Ταύτην (Σιγνη) ἀποκαλεῖ Νῦν, ὕψος τὲ τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ πιεραλοῦ, νὴ μονὸν ἑξοδίᾳ τῷ μίγεθε τῷ πατρός.


e iv. 20. 4. Deus secundum magnitudinem quidem ignotus est omnibus his, qui ab eo facti sunt.

f iv. 14. 1. Non enim solum ante Adam, sed & ante omnem constitutionem, glorificabat Verbum Patrem suum, manens in eo; & ipse à Patre clarificabatur, quemadmodum ipse O 2
"Father, glorify me with the Glory which I had with thee, before the World was made, John xvii. 5."

'Tis observable here, 1. That there was a Relation and personal Distinction between the Father and Son, supposed in their glorifying one another, antecedent to the Son's going forth to the Work of Creation, which must be founded in a prior and eternal Generation.

2. He draws an Argument from the Father and Son's Co-existence and mutual Glorification before the Creation, to prove, that God is self-sufficient, and did not make Man, because he needed his Service; which Argument necessarily supposeth, that the Son is not a Creature, but God himself; else his needing him would destroy his Self-sufficiency, as much as his wanting Man's Service. And if any one will impartially consider the Place, he will find, that Self-sufficiency, which is the same as Independence, is supposed to be a Divine Attribute common to the Father and Son. So that Dr. Clarke greatly differs from our Author, in reckoning (τελειοτε, ἀνενδής) Perfection and Independence personal Characters of the Father, whereby he is distinguished from the Son.

3. His expressing the Son's eternal Co-existence with the Father by his being with him before the beginning of the World, is grounded on ait: Pater, clarifica me claritate, quam habui apud te, priusquam mundus fiaret.


b Scripture-Doctrine, p. 273. Ed. 2d.
this Scripture-principle, viz. *That before the Mo-
Mosaic Creation nothing had a being, but the eternal
God.* The Distinction of an ante-mundane and
absolute Eternity was unknown to the inspired
Writers and the Orthodox Fathers. *Irenæus,* in
answer to that curious Question, viz. *What
was God doing before the Creation of the World?*
owns his Ignorance and the Scriptures Silence
in this Point: An Argument, that he knew
nothing of ante-mundane Productions; else he
might have answer'd, that he produced his own
Son, a Work, according to the *Arians,* at least
as great as the Creation of the World. For to
make a *Creator* was certainly more difficult than
to create a World, which, it seems, a Creature
was capable of. But that there was a Creation
before the *Mosaic* one, and a Beginning before
the scriptural Beginning, and a temporary Be-
ing before the Commencement of Time, are
mere Fictions of Men, that would be wise a-
bove what is written: and upon that account
are to be rejected together with an ante-mun-
dane World of *Æons,* the Productions of the
fruitful Imaginations of Men.

2. k "*The Son, who always co-existed with
the Father, of old and ever since the Begin-
ing reveals the Father to Angels and Arch-
angels, to Principalities and Powers."——

---

i ii. 28. 3. —Si quis interroget: Antequam mundum
faceret Deus, quid agebat? dicimus, quoniam ita respondit
subjacet Deo. Quoniam autem mundus hic factus apoteleltos
à Deo, temporale initium accipiens, Scripturæ nos docent:
quid autem ante hoc Deus sit operatus, nulla Scriptura mani-
feáltat, &c.

k ii. 30. 9. Semper autem coëxistens Filiius Patri, olim &
ab initio semper revelat Patrem, & Angelis, & Archangelis,
&Potestatibus & Virtutibus, &c.

3. 1 "*God
God needed not the Angels for the Production of those things that he had determin'd with himself to make, since he had his own Hands: For his Word and Wisdom, his Son and Spirit are ever with him.—

Now that the Word, that is, the Son was always with the Father, I have demonstrated at large.

I have shewn, that the Son did not begin to exist when he was born, having always existed with the Father.

See more of this in the Chapter concerning the Generation of the Son; and compare Chap. IV. Passage 2, and the Note upon it, and the Dissertation in the end, upon 

III. He is unchangeable.

1. "The Word of God is ever the same.
2. "Since the Word of God is always one and the same."

IV. He is impassible in his pre-existent Nature.


2. "Et quoniam Verbum, id est, Filius, semper cum Patre erat, per multa demonstravimus.

3. "Et quia non tunc coepit Filius Dei, existens semper apud Patrem.

4. "Semper enim id ipsum (Gr. idem) Verbum Dei.

5. "Unum & idem cùm semper sit Verbum Dei, &c.
1. "The Prophets spake of him as present, who was not yet come, and as passible, who is impassible.

2. "The invisible one became visible, the incomprehensible was made comprehensible, he who is impassible, capable of suffering, and the Word, Man.

V. He is Almighty.

"The strong Man cannot be overcome by one that is less, or equal; but by one that is mightier, now the Word of God is mighty above all.

"—The Word, who is perfect in all things, because he is the powerful Word, and true Man." Again: "The Word of God powerful in all things."

He expresses the Divine Omnipotence in the same manner elsewhere: "God, faith he, is powerful in all things," i.e. God can do all things.—Perhaps he call'd the Word ἐνναυαμάτων, in imitation of the Author of the Book of Wisdom; or if it was, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἰδωνατός,

q iv. 20. 8. —Eum qui nondum aderat, adeffe dicentes (Prophetae) & impassibilibem passibilem annuntiantes.

r iii. 16. 6. —Invisibilis visibilis factus, & incomprehensibilis factus comprehensibilis, & impassibilis passibilis, & Verbum homo.

s v. 22. 1. Neque enim à minori, neque ab æquali fortis vincī potest, sed ab eo qui plus potest. Plus autem potest super omnia Verbum Dei.

iii. 8. 2. Sed & Diabolum cum dixisset fortem, non in totum, sed velut in comparatione notrà; semetipsum in omnia & verè fortem offendit Dominum.

t v. 1. 1. —Verbi, qui est perfectus in omnibus: quoniam Verbum potens, & homo verus.----& postea, Ibid.----potens in omnibus Dei Verbum.----

u iv. 20. 5. Potens est enim in omnibus Deus.

w Sap. 18. 15. —Πανδιάκως ὁ λόγος, κ. τ. ἡ. Confer
Pwaroc in the Creek, the Sense is the same. See the next Chapter.

CHAP. VIII.

The Divine Works of Creation and Providence ascribed to Christ.

I. THE Creation of the World is the Son’s glorious Work, and a Proof of his external Power and Godhead.

That we may have a just Representation of the Primitive Faith in this great Point, I shall give a brief Account of it, as deliver’d by Irenæus, in a few Propositions.

Prop. I. Creation cannot without Absurdity be ascribed to a Creature.

"It does not appear, that the Devil made any thing at all, since even he is a Creature of God himself, as the other Angels also are."

Prop. II. The Son of God made the World by an inherent Power, not communicable to other Beings.

"The Angels did not make us; nor indeed could they make the Image of God, nor any other, but the Word of God."

Confer Tertull. adv. Prax. C. 17. — Quasi qui venturus est, non sit omnipotens: cum & Filius omnipotentis tam omnipotens sit, quam Deus Dei Filius.

a iv. 41. 1. Nihil enim in totum Diabolus invenitur fecisse, vide licet cum & ipse Creatura sit Dei, quemadmodum & reliqui Angeli.

b iv. 20. 1. Non ergo Angeli fecerunt nos, nec nos placaverunt, nec Angeli potuerunt imaginem facere Dei; nec alius quis praeter Verbum Domini.
If the Word created only by the Father's Power, and that Power might be communicated to a finite Creature, 'tis undeniable that an Angel might exercise it, which *Irenaeus* denies.

**Prop. III.** Creation is a Work of Divine and Almighty Power, and a plain Proof of the Godhead of the Creator.

*Irenaeus* represents it as a great Absurdity in the Heretics, that they held this World to be the Work of an inferior Power. "They pretend, faith he, that they can shew something higher and greater than the God that made the Heaven and Earth, and all things in them."

"To ascribe the Substance of created things to the Power and Will of the God of all, is credible and consistent enough; and in this Case we may well say; *What is impossible with Men, is possible with God.* For Men cannot make any thing of nothing, but of pre-existent Matter: But God is more excellent than Men, on this account chiefly, that he himself produced Matter to work on, which had no being before.

This Principle, viz. That the Creation of the World is a Work of Almighty Power, and a demonstrative Proof of the supreme Godhead of its

---

_e* I. Pref. i._ Οις ἐνθέασθεν τι καὶ μετατέθησαν ἐκ τοῦ θεου λόγου τοῦ τρισομίου τῷ τον θεατέρι τῷ την γῆν, καὶ πρότερον τῷ τέλευτας τόνων ὕποπτως καὶ ἢρευνής.

_d* ii. io. 4._ Attribuere enim Substantiam eorum, quae facta sunt, virtuti & voluntati ejus, qui est omnium Deus, & eredibile, & acceptabile, & confians: Et in hoc bene diceitur, quoniam quae impossibilia sunt apud homines, possibilia sunt apud Deum. Quoniam homines quidem de nihilo non potunt aliquid facere, sed de materia subjacenti: Deus autem, quam homines hoc primò melior, eò quod materiam fabricationis suæ, cum ante non effet, ipse adinvenit.
immediate Author, is plainly supposed true every where by our Author; and seems indeed to be a self-evident Truth, acknowledg'd even by Heathens: And if you convince an Atheist, that an intelligent Agent was the Maker of the World; by the force of this Maxim he will own, that the immediate Author is God omnipotent and supreme. And the contrary, viz. That this glorious Fabric of the Heavens and Earth might be the Work of an inferior Agent, or a Creature, was first vented by Simon Magus, and held by the several Setts of the Gnostics, whom Irenæus expressly refutes. The Arians agree with 'em in this general Principle; and so, I think, sap the Foundations of Natural Religion, which is built on this great Principle, viz. That this World shews it self to be the Work of God, that is, of an almighty, all-wise, and infinitely perfect Being, whom we ought to know, worship and glorify as our Creator. This is the Voice of Nature, the Dictate of every Man's Conscience, and the Doctrine of the Scripture, expre.s'd in the clearest Terms, and every where supposed true in its Reasonings. No impartial Person, one would think, could admit the Arian Evasion, viz. "The Work of Creation is a manifest Proof of an eternal self-existent Being: but whether it was made by him immediately, or by another in subordination to him, doth not at all concern the Argument." For what Absurdity then is in the Valentinian

e Iren. ii. 9. 1. — Ethnicis vero ab ipsis conditione discendentibus. Ipsa enim conditionis est eum, qui condidit eam; & ipsa factura suggerit eum qui fecit; & mundus manifestat eum, qui fe dispostuit.—Confule locum.

Abfundum ducit, alium esse Deum super mundi Fabricatos — rem. Ibid. cap. x. 2.

f Appeal to a Turk, &c. p. 119.
Scheme? For if the World might be made by one that was not Almighty, how can we tell how many subordinate Powers may be between us and the supreme self-existent God? How can we convince an Infidel, that this World is not the Work of an Apostate Spirit? If once we quit this Principle, I don’t see, that we leave our selves any firm Ground to stand on, to deal with Atheists and Infidels. And then the Argument for the Existence of God, taken from the Creation, is only such an one as may be borrow’d from a Wind-mill or Joint-stool made by Man: For we must always at last run it up to a first Cause. Irenæus has precluded this Evasion several ways; as we have seen, and shall yet farther make appear in the Sequel.

Prop. IV. God the Father made the World by the Son, not as a created Instrument, or inferior Agent, but as his own eternal Word, uncreated, and of the same Nature with himself.

1. He gives the Son the Title of the Creator of the World, which according to him belongs to the principal Agent, and not to a mere Instrument.

1. § “The Word of God the Maker of all things—perfectly cur’d his own Workmanship.

2. h “The Word of God the Creator, Former and Maker of all things.”

§ v. 12. 6. Fabricator enim universorum Dei Verbum, suum plasma omni modo curavit.

h i. 15. 5. Quis sustinebit te in Schemata & numeros—concludentem universorum Conditorem, & Demiurgum, & Factorem Verbum Dei? Gr. τὸν τῶν ἀκαίρων θείον, ἰδήμωσιν, ἰδὰν τὸν Λέγον τῇ Θείᾳ.

P 2 Compare
Comparing these and the like passages, what he says concerning instruments elsewhere.

1. "We ascribe not, faith he, the felling and cutting of timber to the ax and saw, but to the man that made (and uses) them. In like manner, the father of all, according to their scheme, may be fitly stiled the maker of this world, and not the angels, &c."

2. He frequently afferts, that God made all things by himself, to exclude external, inferior agents.

3. This doctrine can hardly be more plainly express'd, than it is, in the two following passages.

1. "This discourse (viz. concerning the world's being made by instruments or inferior agents) may, perhaps, be apt to persuade, or rather seduce them that know not God, and suppose him to be like weak men, who cannot immediately make any thing, but have need of many instruments for their assistance."

2. "Quapropter non jam securim dicimus concidere ligna, vel ferram secare, sed hominem concidere & secare rectissimè quis dicat eum, qui ipfam securim & ferram ad hoc fecit, & multo prius armamenta omnia, per quam fabricata sunt securis & serra. Sic igitur juftè, secundum illorum rationem, Pater omnium dicetur fabricator hujus mundi, & non Angeli, neque alius quis mundi fabricator, præter illum qui fuit prator, &c."

3. "Si fortas fætter hic Sermo suoefiorus, five seductorius apud eos, qui ignorant Deum, & qui hominibus affimilant eum inopibus, & his qui non possunt flatim aliquid ex parato fabricare, sed indigentibus multis Organis ad eorum fabrica-
of Truth to them that know, that the self-sufficient God of all created all things by his Word, needing not the Co-operation and Assistance of Angels in the Creation, nor of any Power far inferior to himself. — But he himself, in a manner ineffable and incomprehensible to us, fore-ordained in himself, and made all things according to his own Pleasure. — Now all things that were made, he created by his never-failing Word. For it is the peculiar Glory of God, in which he excels all others, that he needs not other Instruments for creating things; and his own Word is able and sufficient for the Formation of all things."

These Words need no Commentary: To suppose God to have made the World by any Instrument, or subordinate Agent, is, according to this good Father, to entertain Thoughts un-

fabricationem: non autem verisimilis in totum apud eos, qui sciant, quoniam nullius indigens omnium Deus, Verbo condidit omnia & fecit; neque Angelis indigens adjutoribus ad ea, quae sunt, neque Virtute aliqua valde inferiori ab illo. — Sed ipsa in femetipso, secundum id quod est enarrabile, (lege, inenarrabile,) & inexcogitabile nobis, omnia prædefinans fecit, quemadmodum voluit: — omnia autem quæ facta sunt, * insatigabili Verbo fecit. Proprium est enim hoc Dei supereminentia, non indigere aliis Organis ad conditionem eorum, quæ sunt: Et idoneus est & sufficiens ad formationem omnium proprium ejus Verbum, & c.


worthy
worthy of God, and inconsistent with his Self-sufficiency: And the Power and All-sufficiency of his Almighty Word, is an Argument, that he needed not have recourse to external, created Instruments for doing this great Work. And it hence appears, that the Word created by an essential, inherent Power; else he should have said, the Father could have made an Angel the Creator of the World by lending him his Power to exercise, contrary to his Scope and Argument. But 'tis plain to a Demonstration, that the Word as Creator is opposed to all Instruments, and his creative Power is used as a Proof of God's Self-sufficiency: The Word therefore is not an inferior Agent, but the same God with the Father; and to create by him is to create by himself, in opposition to created Agents. Compare Chap. III. No 2, and 4.

2. *If our Lord had not mention'd him that binds the strong Man, (Mat. xii. 29.) and spoils his Goods, and had only call'd him the mighty One, he must have been supposed to be an invincible strong one. But he added a Conqueror; for he who binds, conquers; and he is overcome, who is bound. And this he did without any Comparison, left an apostate Servant should be compared with his Lord: For neither he, (Satan,) nor any of those Beings "that

m iii. 8. 2, 3. — Si igitur non signifìcasset eum qui alligat, & diripit eìus Vafa, hoc autem solùm eum fortem dixissèt, effet fortis invictus. Sed & adjecit * obìtentem; tenet enim qui alligat, tenetur autem qui alligatus est. Et hoc fine comparatione fecit, ut non comparetur Domino servus apostata existens: non enim tantùm hic, sed nec quidquam ex his quæ conßituta sunt, & in subiectìone sunt, com-

* Gr. forte, pràtòs, seu pràtòs òia, pravii páro & dìnas, praviùs òi & pràtòs, i.e. sed adjecit & viòtorem; vincit enim qui ligat (Captivum) & vincitur qui vinculis constìngitur,

parabitur
that are created, and in Subjection, shall be compared with the Word of God, by whom all things were made, who is our Lord Jesus Christ. For whether they be Angels, or Archangels, or Thrones, or Dominions, that they were created by the God over all, and made by his Word, John has intimated. For when he said, that the Word was in the Father, he added: All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made, John i. 3. And David likewise, having enumerated the things that praise him, namely, all the Beings already mention’d, and the Heavens, and all their Hosts, or Powers, he adds: For he commanded, and they were created: he spake, and they were made, Psal. cxlviii. 5. comp. xxxiii. 9.

Whom did he command? without doubt the Word: by which, faith he, the Heavens were made, and all their Host by the Spirit of his Mouth, v. 6.—Now created things are different from the Creator, and made Beings from him who made them. For he is uncreated, without beginning or end, independent, self-sufficient, and moreover gives their very Being parabitur Verbo Dei, per quem facta sunt omnia, qui est Dominus nofter Jesus Christus. Quoniam enim five Angeli, five Archangeli, five Throni, five Dominationes, ab eo qui super omnes est Deus, & confituta sunt, & facta per Verbum ejus, Joannes quidem fìc significavit: Cum enim dixifet de Verbo Dei, quoniam erat in Patre, adjecit: omnia per cum facta sunt, & sine eo factum est nilb, Joan. i. 3. David quoque cum laudationes enumerafett, nominatim universa quæcunque diximus, & Coelos, & omnes Virtutes eorum, adjecit: Quoniam ipse praefectit, & creata sunt: ipse dixit, & facta sunt, Psal. cxlviii. 5. & xxxiii. 9. Cui ergo præcepit? Verbo ficiicit: per quod, inquit, Coeli firmati sunt, & Spiritu oris ejus omnis Virtus eorum, Ib. v. 6.——Altera autem funt, quæ confituta sunt, ab eo qui confituit, & quæ facta sunt, ab
"Being to all things besides. But things that were made by him, had a beginning: and whatever Beings had a beginning, are also capable of Dissolution, and in Subjection, and depend on him, who made them. So that 'tis absolutely necessary, they should have a different Appellation with them, that have never so little Skill to judge of such Matters: So that he who made all things, may, together with his Word, justly be stiled God and Lord alone; but made Beings must not share in the same Title, nor can they righteously assume that Appellation, which belongs to the Creator."

The Reader, by consulting the Place, will find, that after Irenæus had asserted, that none is stiled God or Lord absolutely, but the Father and Son, who are so in the fullest Sense, he comes here to consider an Instance opposed to this Assertion, viz. that the Devil is called & ignex, the strong one, Mat. xii. 29. This Passage is his Answer to this Objection; wherein he shews, the Title of the mighty One is not taken in the absolute Sense, because our Saviour speaks of one mightier, who overcomes, binds and spoils him. Nor is he stiled strong in respect of our

eo qui fecit. Ipse enim infectus, & fine initio, & fine fine, & nullius indigens, ipse fibi sufficiens, & adhuc reliquis omnibus, ut sint, hoc ipsum praestans; Quæ vero ab eo sunt facta, initium sumperunt: Quæcunque autem initium sumperunt, & dissolutionem poßunt percipere, & subjiccta sunt, & indigent ejus qui fe fecit; necesse est omni modo, uti differens Vocabulum habeant apud eos etiam, qui vel modicum fenum in discernendo talia habent: ita ut is quidem, qui omnia fecerit, cum Verbo suo justè dicatur Deus & Dominus solus; quæ autem facta sunt, non jam ejudem vocabuli participabilia esse, neque justè id Vocabulum sumere debere, quod est Creatoris.
Lord, but of weak Men, oppressed by him. And he shews the Absurdity of an apostate Serv-
vant's coming under the same common Appel-
lation with the Lord Christ, because he (Satan) is a Creature and in a State of Subjection; but Christ is the Creator and Lord of all. "Nei-
ther he, nor any other of those Beings that "were created, faith he, and are in Subjection," shall be compared to the Word of God, by "whom all things were made." So that the Word is the Creator, expressly distinguiish'd from all Creatures, and Beings subject to God. He proves him to be the Creator of all things, even of Angels, Archangels, Thrones and Do-
minions, i. e. the highest Orders of Creatures: And then observes, there must be a vast Distance between the Creator and his Creatures, how ex-
cellent foever they be, in order to shew, that one common Name cannot fit both. 'Tis man-
ifest, that the Son is not only comprehended in the Creator, in opposition to made Beings, but principally intended, as his Scope does un-
doubtedly require.

'Tis plain, the Son is not rank'd with the Creatures; for they all had a beginning, and may have an end; and are in a State of Sub-
jectation and Dependence; all which are incon-
sistent with the Character and Perfections of the Creator: And if the creating Word were a Cre-
ture, he could not be styled God, Lord, or the mighty One in the absolute Sense, as he afferts and proves he is. It would be Robbery for a Creature and Subject to assume the Titles of his Creator and Sovereign. So that Irenæus here afferts, that the Son, as Creator of all things, is uncreated and self-existent, eternal, without be-
ginning or end, independent and self-sufficient.
See this Passage fully consider'd and vindicated in the Dissertation on the Word αὐτῶν τῷ. Several Corollaries might be infer'd from this Primitive Doctrine; as,

1. That Independence is not a personal Character of the Father, but common both to Father and Son.

2. That as Subjection to, and infinite Distance from the Creator is a necessary Consequence of being a Creature; so Irenæus knew nothing of the Father's Supremacy over the Son, as a Being in a State of Subjection and Dependence; for he ranks him with the Father, as Creator, God, and Lord with him, and consequently posses'd of the same infinite Perfections; and contra-distinguishes him from all Beings so derived, as to be in a State of Subjection to God. So that he manifestly destroys the Arian Supremacy of the Father, and Subordination of the Son; he always refers to the Supremacy of God the Creator, in which Character the Son and Spirit are included, over the Creatures; all which, and only which are in a State of Subjection to God: And this is one remarkable Difference between the Creator and Creatures; he is independent, self-sufficient, and the Author of their Being, and consequently has supreme Dominion over 'em: but they depend entirely upon him, and so are necessarily subject to his Rule. They are in Subjection, faith he, and depend on him who gave 'em a Being. And elsewhere: n God has the Pre-eminence in all things, who also is alone unmade, the First of all things, and the Author of Being to all: but all other Be-

---

\[ n \text{ iii. 38. 3. Καὶ εἰς τὸν θεόν, ὁ \text{ πάντων.} \]

---

ings
ings continue in Subjection to God. A Creature and a Being in Subjection to God were convertible Terms with him; a creating Creature, and a Creator subject to the supreme Dominion of a Superior, were Monsters not heard of in his Days, except in the Dreams of the several Sects of the Gnostics.

3. That the Son's Concern in the Creation of the World was such, that his Divine Attributes, his Dignity and Excellency above all Creatures may be inferred from it. He knew of no Agency in this glorious Work, but what was a Demonstration of the Godhead, i. e. the Supremacy, Self-existence, Independence, Self-sufficiency, and other Perfections of the Creator. For he makes use of Creation as a Medium to prove the infinite Perfections of the Creator, even when speaking of the creating Word, and with a View to apply his Argument to him. See the like Reasoning in the Appendix concerning the Spirit, second Passage.

II. The no less Divine Work of Providence, or the Preservation and Government of the whole World is ascribed also to the Son.

"The Word of God is truly the Maker of the World; and this is our Lord, who in the last Times became Man, being in this World, and in an invisible manner contains and upholds all things that are made, and per-

* v. 18. 3. Mundi enim factus est Verbum Dei est: hic autem est Dominus nostrae, qui in novissimis temporibus homo factus est, in hoc mundo existens, & secundum invisibilitem continet quae facta sunt omnia, & in universa conditione infixus, quoniam Verbum Dei gubernans & disponens omnia: & propter hoc in sua invisibilitate (lege, visibiliter) venit, & caro factum est. — Q 2 " vades
"vades and is present in the whole Creation, 
"because he is the Word of God governing 
"and disposing all things; and therefore he 
"came visibly into his own World, and was 
"made Flesh, &c.

p "The Lord came visibly into his own 
"World, and his own Creation, which is up-
"held by him, bore himself."—

Observe here, i. The Government and Pre-
servation of the whole Creation, here ascribed 
to the Son, was to Irenæus no less a peculiar 
Work of God, than Creation, of which no 
Creature is capable: "For the Creation, says he 
"elsewhere, is not under Satan's Power; since 
"he is one of the Creatures himself!". See 
Chap. I. Princ. VI.

2. The Son, as the eternal Word of God, is 
not concern'd in this divine Work, as an A-
gent for another; but has a natural Propriety in 
the World by Right of Creation: And he came 
into it, not as a Steward, or Viceroy to over-
see what was not his own, but as a Master into 
his own House, and a King into his own King-
dom.

3. He supports and governs the whole Cre-
tion, which is a Work of Divine and Almighty 
Power, by way of invisible Omnipresence: He 
pervades and fills all things, is present and ope-
rates every where: And this is an incommuni-
cable Attribute of the infinite Being, whose im-
mensite Essence fills all things.

p Ibid. 19. 1. Manifæstè itaque in sua propria venientem 
Dominum, & sua propria eum bajulante conditione, quæ ba-
julatur ab ipso, &c.

9 v. 24. 2. Neque enim conditio sub ejus (Satanæ) po-
teslale cìt : quandoquidem & ipse unus de Creaturis eff.
4. When the Creation is said to bear (portare, bajulare) the Son, and the Father is elsewhere said to bear the Creation, and his Word too; these Expressions imply nothing injurious to the Honour of the Divine Nature of Christ. The Creation contain'd and bore his human Nature, as the Virgin Mary bore God, when our Saviour was in her Womb; and holy Men are said to bear, i.e. to have in them the Spirit of God. And thus Irenæus supposes the Creation to have born both the Father and Son, because the Father is in the Son. When therefore he says, the Father bears his Word, as well as the whole Creation, the meaning is not, that the Son is sustained in Being by the Power of the Father, as Creatures are; but only, that the Son is in the Father.

N.B. It may easily be inferred from Irenæus's Belief of Christ's Divinity, that he allow'd of his Worship and Invocation.

w "The Catholic Church does nothing by " Invocations of Angels, or by Inchantments; —" but in a holy, pure and open manner addressing Prayers to the Lord, who made all things, " and calling on the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, " works Miracles for the Benefit of Men, and " not to deceive and seduce them." —

r v. 18. 2. Pater conditionem fimul & Verbum suum portans, & Verbum portatum à Patre, præstat Spiritum—

f Ibid. 19. 1. —Hæc (Virgo Maria) —evangelizata est, ut portaret Deum.—

i v. 20. 6. —Videbitur Deus ab hominibus, qui portant Spiritum ejus.—

u v. 18. 1. —Cum dixerit Dominus: quoniam ego in Patre, & Pater in me est; quomodo Patrem & Filium simul fabricat Angelorum portare sufinuit? —

w ii. 32. 5. Nee invocationibus Angelicis facit aliquid, nec incantationibus,—Sed mundè, & pure, & manifestè operationes dirigens ad Dominum, qui omnia fecit, & nomen Domenici nostri Jesu Christi invocans, Virtutes ad utilitates hominum, sed non ad seductionem perficit.

CHAP.
CHAP. IX.

The Passages pleaded by the Arians.

I. God the Father is said to be the only God, above whom there is no God.

a "Consider, all you that invent such things, since he alone is styled God the Father, and is truly so, whom you call the Creator; and since the Scriptures own him alone to be God, and our Lord confesseth him only to be his Father, and knows no other:—Consider, I say, how greatly you blaspheme him, who is truly God.—

b "— O Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,—who art the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,—who art the only and true God, above whom there is no other God:—Grant to every one that reads this Writing, to know thee, that thou art God alone."—

The Fact not to be controverted here is, that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ alone is said to be God, or to be the only God: nor is there in the Places any express Intimation, that the

a ii. 28. 4. Cogitate enim, Ơ omnes qui talia adinvenitis, cùm ipfè solus Pater Deus dicatur, qui & verè est, quem vos Deiurum dicitis; sed & cùm Scripturæ hunc solum sciant Deum, sed & cùm Dominus hunc solum confitetur proprium Patrem, & aliterum ne↵ciat: considerate magnitudinem blasphemiae in eum, qui verè est Deus.

b iii. 6. 4. — Domine Deus Abraham, & Deus Iſaac, & Deus Jacob, qui es Pater Domini noffri Jesu Chrifti, qui es solus & verus Deus, super quem alius Deus non est:—da omni legenti hanc Scripturam agnoscre te, quia solus Deus es.
Son is comprehended with the Father; but he is mention'd as contra-distinctly from him.

And the Point to be debated is, Whether the exclusive Term, *Alone*, or *Only*, is intended to reach the Son, and deny his being God, at least in some exalted Sense, in which the Father alone is God.

Now to enable the judicious Reader to determine this Point, I shall observe,

I. That 'tis certain, that the exclusive Terms don't always exert their force universally, but are often used respectively according to the Author's Scope. This is what every body knows, except a few Persons, who love to step out of the common road, and are for new Schemes in Grammar as well as in Divinity: but they come too late to teach old Authors the use of Terms and Phrases. So that, I think, we must endeavour to find out their Sense by parallel Expressions and Modes of Speaking authorized by ancient Usage. *Josephus* says, "Noe alone was saved in the Deluge:" and elsewhere, that *Abraham alone came out of Mesopotamia into Canaan*: where the Families of these Patriarchs are not excluded. And *Christ* himself is said to be God with the exclusive Terms, and other Expressions of the same Import; and yet the Father's Deity is not deny'd. *Sozomen*, in his Account of the Conversion of the Iberians, says, They were all astonished at a Miracle wrought by the Power of our Lord, and confessed Christ alone to be the true God. And in another Place

---


he supposes, that the Emperor Constantine, by using the Sign of the Cross in the Imperial Standard, intended to teach the Romans to forget their antient Religion, and believe him alone to be God, whom the Emperor worship'd. And Laclantius applies to our Saviour Passages that speak of the true God, besides whom there is no other God. 8 Esaias witnesseth, faith he, that Christ is God in these Words: Egypt is weary, and the Nation of the Ethiopians and Sabeans; tall Men shall come over to thee, and be thy Servants; and shall follow thee, bound with Chains; and they shall worship thee, and pray to thee; because God is in thee, and there is no other God besides thee. For thou art God, and we knew it not, O God of Israel, the Saviour, Isa. xlv. 14, 15.—

The Prophet Jeremym also faith thus: This is our God, and no other shall be so accounted besides him, who found out all the way of Prudence, and gave it to Jacob his Servant, and to Israel his beloved. After this he was seen on Earth, and conversed with Men, Baruch iii. 37, 38.

It would be easy to add innumerable Instances of the like Nature. But these may suffice to shew, that even when the Term Alone, or Only,

f L. i. 4. p. 13. —Μένον ἄντον οὐ γένεται Θεὸς, ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἰσαίας Ἀφεὶ.


h V. Grot. in Joh. viii. 9.
is added to a human Person, as Noe, or Abraham, it does not exclude those that must be sup-
posed to be taken in with him upon the account of some Alliance or moral Union: much more, 
that the Belief of the Antients concerning the ineffable Union of the Father and Son in the 
same Godhead was such, that they apprehended, when the Father alone, or Christ alone was 
said to be the true God, besides whom there is no other God; the other Person (and for the 
same reason the Holy Ghost too) was necessarily understood to be included. This their Scheme 
of the blessed Trinity did require; by which we may judge, how different it was from that of 
the Arians, antient, or modern.

2. Irenæus neither did, nor, according to his 
own Principles, could exclude the Son, when 
he calls the Father the only true God. For, 

1. His Scope was not to degrade our blessed Saviour, but to assert the Divinity of the Fa-
ther and the Creator, in opposition to Mar-
cion's two Gods, and the Bythus, and many 
Æons of the Valentinians, &c. And so he calls 
him the Father of Christ, to distinguish him 
from all these pretended Deities set up in oppo-
sition to him, and not to exclude his own etern-
al Son from Communion in the same God-
head 1. Tho' the aptest Simile taken from earth-
ly things must be very imperfect, yet perhaps 
the Expressions under Consideration may admit 
of the following Illustration.— Let us sup-
pose, that in the Reign of Theodosius the Great, 
there were many Pretenders, as there were some; 
and that Authors writing in Defense of his 
Right in Opposition to 'em, had maintain'd, 
that Theodosius was the only true Emperor; no

1 See above, Ch. III. of this Collection, N° 34, and Notes.  
R.
body would have suspected them to deny the Title of his Son Arcadius, on Supposition of his being then cloth’d with the Imperial Purple. And, to carry the Simile a little farther, let us also suppose, that those Traitors had, together with their Pretensions to the Imperial Dignity, assum’d each of ’em the Name of Theodosius: And so the Defenders of the Emperor’s Right had express’d their Position thus: Theodosius, the Father of Arcadius, is the only rightful Emperor; I hardly think, they had been liable to an Impeachment for High-Treason, as denying the Son’s Title. ’Tis true, they would contra-distinguish the Father from the Son; but yet by proving the Father’s Title directly, they would consequentially establish the Son’s.

2. But the Case of God the Father and Son is very different from that of the Individuals of the human Species, how nearly forever ally’d: For they are really, and in the Opinion of Irenæus, so ineffably one in Nature and Godhead, that the Son cannot be excluded by the forementioned Expressions. He is always considered, as being in, and with the Father: He can never be conceived to be separate from him, no more than a Man’s Mind, or Reason, or his Hands can be excluded, when himself is spoken of. “The Word of God, faith he, or rather God himself, who is the Word.” Again: “The living God, together with his Word, is the God of the Living.” And again: “Christ himself with the Father is the God of the Living.” And therefore, according to the

k See all these Passages above, Chap. V. Prop. II.—Dei Verbum, immo magis ipse Deus, cum sit Verbum.—Et ib. No 2.—Deus vivus, hic eit vivorum Deus, & Verbum ejus.—Ipse igitur Christus cum Patre vivorum eft Deus.—And compare Chap. III. No 3 and 4, with the Notes.
Primitive Scheme of the ever-blessed Trinity, to exclude the Son, when the Father is spoken of, as God, would be to exclude the Father himself, that is, one that is the self-same God with him. So that when Irenæus speaks of the one only true God, it is indifferent to him to subjoin either, This is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; or, This is our Lord, the Word of God. For after he had said, that the Harmony of the moral Precepts of both Testaments, shew’d one and the same God, he adds: "Now This is our Lord the Word of God."

3. And hence I farther observe, 'tis our Author's way to include the Son in the only true God, and that not consequentially only, but expressly: So that when all seem to be excluded, he is not. As when he says of the Father, That he comprehends all things, but himself alone can be comprehended by none. The Consequences of this, according to the Arian Scheme, would be, that the Son is not incomprehensible, nor is capable to comprehend the Father: both which are false, and never intended, but expressly disclaim'd by Irenæus. As where he says, that the Son incomprehensible in his pre-existent Nature, became comprehensible by his Incarnation: And that the Son comprehends, and, as it were, contains the immense Father. And when the Apostle cries out, Who hath known the Mind of the Lord? &c. Rom. xi. 34. Irenæus

---

1 iv. 13. 4. —Quæcunque——Communia utrisque sunt, unum & eundem offendunt Deum. Hic autem est Dominus nostr, Verbum Dei.— See above, Chap. IV. No. 9.

m ii. 30. 9. —— Omnia capiens, solus autem a nemine capi potest. See Chap. III. No. 3, above.

n iii. 16. 6. —— Incomprehensibilis factus Comprehensibilis.—— iv. 4. 2. —— Mensura enim Patris Filius, quoniam & capit cum.
takes it for granted, that the Son is not excluded; for thus he paraphraseth the Words: *Who else has known the Mind of the Lord? Who else has been his Counsellor?*

But that which is full to the Purpose, and precludes all Evasion, is, that he expressly includes the Son in the *only God*: We have had the Passages already. "He who made all things, faith he, "may, together with his Word, justly "be stiled the only God and Lord." And again: "It has been plainly demonstrated, that neither "the Prophets, nor Apostles ever gave any Title "of God or Lord, but the true and only God." But as 'tis Fact, that according to Irenæus, the Prophets and Apostles often stile Christ God and Lord, and that absolutely too; so 'tis the very Point he had been making out by many Instances. I add only one Place more, where he sets the same Conclusion in this Light: "*We "have plainly shewn, faith he, that neither the "Prophets, nor Apostles, nor the Lord Christ ever "confess'd in their own Person, any other to be God "or Lord, but him that is primarily God and Lord: "The Prophets and Apostles confessed the Father and

* v. 1.1. Neque enim alius poterat enarrare nobis quae sunt Patris, nisi proprium ipsum Verbum. *Quis enim alius cognovit sensum Domini? aut quis alius ejus Consiliarius factus est?*

† iii. 8. 3. ——Ita ut is quidem, qui omnia fecerit, cum Verbo suo justè dicitur Deus & Dominus solus.

‡ Ibid. 1. ——Manifestè ostensum est, quoniam nuncquam neque Prophetæ, neque Apostoli alium Deum nominaverunt, vel Dominum appellaverunt, praeter verum & solum Deum.

§ iii. 9. 1. Ostenso hoc igitur planè—neminem alterum Dominum vel Deum, neque Prophetas, neque Apostolos, neque Dominum Christum confessum esse ex sua Personâ, sed præcipue Deum & Dominum: Prophetis quidem & Apostolis Patrem & Filium conscientibus; alterum autem neminem,
“the Son; without owning any other God or Lord besides. And the Lord himself taught his Disciples, that the Father only is that God and Lord, 'who is the alone God and Ruler of all things.'”

Here 'tis as plain as Words can make it, that none are stiled God or Lord absolutely in Scripture, but the only true God, he that is so in the only proper and primary Sense: And this is not the Father only, but both the Father and Son. --And let it be observed, that if the exclusive Terms in the later part of the last Passage should be understood, as urged by the Arians, Irenæus must be supposed to have believ'd, that our blessed Lord contradicted the Doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles. For if he taught, that the Father alone, in Exclusion of himself, is the true God; and they owned both the Father and Son as such, there is a plain Contradiction in their Doctrine. But the Truth is, the Father's being the only God and Lord, did not exclude the Son; who yet was not, in our Author's Opinion, explicitely to teach this in his own Person, because he was not to glorify himself. And consequently, according to Irenæus's Scheme of the Trinity, the Son's Godhead is not deny'd, when the Father is said to be the only true God: which is a Demonstration, that it was vastly different from the Arian Doctrine; for by its Principles and Maxims Irenæus can never be reconciled to himself. And I think, Dr. Clarke has shewn, that the same Maxims and Rules of Interpretation, that oblige the Ante-nicene Fathers to declare for Ariusfian, will equally exert

minem, neque Deum nominantibus, neque Dominum confertentibus: Et ipso Domino Patrem tantum Deum & Dominum eum, qui solus est Deus & Dominator omnium, tradente Discipulis.
their Influence, when apply'd to the Poffonicenes also, from Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, &c. down to the Compilers of the English Liturgy, Bishop Bull, and other Orthodox Moderns, all zealous Opposers of Arianism. And this may help the Reader to judge, whether the Antients have not been injur'd by the Arts of the modern Arians.

If the Reader would rather hear an Antenicene Father give his Sense of this Point, I shall refer him to Tertullian, in his Answer to an Objection of Praxeas, who argued against the Personality of the Son from the Father's being said to be God alone, besides whom there is no God; and his stretching out the Heavens alone. The Argument of the old Noetians, or Sabellians, as afterwards they were called, and of the later Arians, is the same; and the same Answer may serve. The Passage is long: I shall only translate Part of it, and refer the learned Reader to Tertullian himself. The Principle these early Heretics built upon, was, That one God is one Person, viz. the Father, and more Persons in the Godhead would make more Gods than one. But not having Assurance enough to deny the Son's proper and supreme Godhead, they were obliged, by the force of their heretical Principle, to make him the same Person with the Father. Their Argument from the exclusive Terms, Tertullian thus answers.

"There is then but one God the Father, and there is no other besides him: which when he affirms, he does not exclude the "

f Adv. Prax. C. 18, 19. —— Igitur unus Deus Pater, & alius absque eo non est. Quod ipse inferens non Filium negat, sed alium Deum. Ceterum, alius à Patre Filius non est.
"Son, but another God. Now the Son is not another God besides the Father. And then, if you consider the Sequel of such Assertions, you will find them mostly levelled against Idolaters; that the Unity of the Godhead might exclude a multitude of false Gods: but so as that Unity should still comprehend the Son, who is always to be understood to be included in the Father, even tho' not expressly mentioned, as he is ever undivided and inseparable from the Father: Nay, it would rather have supposed his being separate, if he had named him: as if he had said; There is no other besides me, but my Son. For by excepting him from others, he would have really made him another. Suppose the Sun should say, I am the Sun, and there is no other besides me, except my Rays; you would observe a needless Expence of Words, since the Rays are included in the Sun. Therefore he denied, that there was any other God besides him, because of the Idolatry both of the Heathen and of Israel: as also in Opposition to the Heretics, who made Idols by their
"their Doctrine, as the Nations did with their "Hands, viz. another God, and another Christ. "When therefore he asserted his Unity, the "Father acted for the Son, lest Christ should "be supposed to come from any other God, "but him who had before said: I am God, "and there is not another besides me; who de- "clares himself to be the only one, but togeth- "er with the Son, with whom he stretched "out the Heavens alone. And even this Ex- "pression they will lay hold on, as an Argu- "ment for one Person only in the Godhead. "I stretched out, faith he, the Heavens alone, "Hai. xlv. 24. i.e. in respect of other Powers "alone, guarding against the Conjectures of "Heretics, who suppose the World to have "been created by Angels and different Pow- "ers."— And again: "Thus by presently "mentioning the Son, he has explain'd, in what "Sense he stretched out the Heavens alone, viz. "alone with the Son, as he is one with the "Son. And consequently, it was the Son al- "so, who said, I stretched out the Heavens "alone; for by the Word the Heavens were "framed, &c."

cut Nationes manibus, ita & ipsi verbis Idola fabricantur, id eft, alium Deum & alium Christum. Igitur & cum fè uni- cum pronuntiabat, Filio Pater procurabat; ne ab alio Deo Christus veniffe credatur, fèd ab illo qui praediterat, Ego Deus, & alius abfque me non eft; qui fè unicum, fèd cum Filio offendit, cum quo Cœlum Solus extendit. Quin & hoc dìctum ejus, in argumentum Singularitatis arripient: Exten- di, inquit, Cœlum folus. Quantum ad cæteras Virtutes, fo- lus, praeftruenus adversus Conjecturas Haereticorum, qui mun- dum ab Angellis & potestatibus diversis volent ftructum— Et poff fata,—ita Filium subjugens ipfe interpretator eft, quomodo Cœlum folus extenderit, feiicet cum Filio folus; ficut cum Filio unum. Proinde & Filii eft Vox, extendi Cœlum folus; quia Sermone Cæli confirmati sunt. — II. Ano-
II. Another Passage, which the Arians lay great Stress on, is that famous one, wherein they suppose Irenæus ascribes to the Son Ignorance of the Day of Judgment.

"But you are unreasonably puffed up, and boldly give out, that you know the ineffable Mysteries of God; whereas even the Lord himself, the Son of God, own'd that the Father alone knew the Day and Hour of the Judgment, plainly saying: But of that Day and Hour knoweth no Man, neither the Son, but the Father alone, Mark xiii. 32. Now if the Son was not ashamed to refer the Knowledge of that Day to the Father, but spoke what was true, neither let us be ashamed to leave to God those Enquiries that are too hard for us: for no Man is above his Master.

And a little lower: "If any one enquire into the Reason why the Father, who in all things communicates to the Son, is declared by our Lord alone to know that Hour and Day; he cannot at present find a more fit, or decent, or indeed any other safe Account of it, than this: That we might learn by him, (since

---

ii. 28. 6. Irrationabiliter autem inflati, audaciter inennarrabilia Dei mysteria scire vos dicitis: quandoquidem & Dominus, ipse Filius Dei, ipsum Judicij diem & horam concepsit scire solum Patrem, manifestè dicens; de die autem illa & hora nemo seït, neque Filius, nisi Pater solus. Si igitur scientiam dici illius non erubuit referre ad Patrem, sed dixit quod verum est; neque nos erubescamus, quæ sunt in quaestionibus majora secundum nos, reservare Deo. Nemo enim super magistrum est.

u Ibid. Sect. 8. Etenim quis exquirat causam, propter quam in omnibus Pater communices Filio, solus scire horam & diem à Domino manifestatus est; neque aptabilem magis, neque decentiorem, nec fine periculo alteram quam hanc inveniat in præsenti; (quoniam enim solus verax Magister
"(since our Lord is the only true Teacher) that the Father is over all: for the Father, faith he, is greater than I, Joh. xiv. 28. The Father then is declared by our Lord to have the Preference in Knowledge also, to the End, that we likewise, as long as we live in this World, may leave perfect Knowledge, and such hard Questions to God."

These Passages must refer either to Christ's divine, or human Nature.

I. Tho' we should suppose that Irenæus speaks of the Son, as God, yet 'tis certain he does not impute Ignorance to him. This will appear by considering the Place it self, and comparing others with it.

1. To make out this from the Passages themselves, I would observe that his Scope is not to degrade the Son, or to deny his Godhead, which is not consistent with the least degree of Ignorance; but to expose the assuming Pretensions of the Heretics to a perfect Knowledge of the deep Things of God: To make them blush, if possible, he sets before them the Humility of Christ, who did not come into the World to glorify himself, but the Father, and so refer'd to him the Knowledge of the Day and Hour of Judgment. For he never says, that the Son was ignorant of that Day, but that the Father is set forth by our Saviour, as alone knowing it, i. e. He refers the Knowledge of it to the Father, and the Father is declared to have the Preference in

'Pater, ait, major me effe. Et secundum agnitionem itaque præpositus effe Pater annuntiatus est à Domino nostro ad hoc, ut & nos, in quantum in figurâ hujus mundi sumus, perfectam Scientiam, & tales quæstiones concedamus Deo.'
Knowledge, which is original in him, and derived in the Son, as begotten of him from all Eternity.

This must be plain to every one, that impartially considers his Expressions. Had he believ’d the Son to have been really ignorant of this great Secret, he would have framed his Argument in a different manner, and with greater Advantage, to this Purpose: “Was our Lord himself ignorant of that Day? Did the Father with-hold from his own Son the Knowledge of it? What insupportable Arrogance is it in you to pretend to be intimately acquainted with far more abstruse and ineffable Mysteries?”

Besides, ’tis observable, with what Caution he expresseth himself, how he qualifies the seeming Harshness of the Expressions, as sensible of the Difficulty of the Subject, and the Danger of Error and Impiety in ascribing any degree of Ignorance to the Son. The Text cited by him (Mark xiii. 32.) appeared to him to contain a Difficulty, that it was not easy to find a Solution of, and in which an Error is very dangerous, for no other reason, but because our Lord seems to decline assuming to himself, in some respect or other, the Knowledge of one Secret, and refers it to the Father. Now had he supposed the Logos capable of Ignorance, why should not the Place seem as plain and easy to him, as to our modern Arians?

’Tis plain, our Saviour is not consider’d here, as an Instance of Ignorance in the least degree, but as an excellent Pattern of Humility and Self-abasement in not exalting himself, but referring all to the Father. And hence in this very Place he
he speaks of him, as omniscient. w "The Fa-
ther, faith he, in all things communicates to
"the Son." Again: x "These things we
"must leave to God and to his Word." Again:
"w The Spirit of our Saviour, which is in him,
"searches all things, even the deep things of God."
This, without doubt, is meant of Christ’s di-
vine Nature; for to That the Fathers often re-
fer this Text of the Apostle, i Cor. ii. 10, 11.
which is ignorantly, and without ground de-
y’d by Dr. Whitby." See the Passages refer’d
to in the Margin a.
2. ’Tis demonstrably certain from other Places,
that Irenæus did not believe the λόγος, or di-
vine Nature to be capable of Ignorance. For
he everywhere supposes him to be perfect in
Knowledge, to comprehend the immense Fa-
ther, &c. as has been shewn above.
But he had a very direct Occasion to shew
his Abhorrence of such a blasphemous Tenet,
by so often exposing the Folly, Impiety and
Inconsistency of the Valentinians in ascribing
Ignorance to the Word and Wisdom of God,
which they divided into two distinct Æons. He
proves from the Generation and Nature of the
Logos, that he is not capable of any Ignorance,
which cannot be imputed to him, without
consequentially charging the Father with it.

w ii. 28. 8. —In omnibus Pater communicans Filio.
V. supra.

x Ibid. Seft. —Cedere oportet Deo & Verbo ejus.

y Ibid. Etsi enim Spiritus Salvatoris, qui in eo est, Servi-
tatur omnia, & Altitudines Dei, &c.

z Disquisit. Mod. p. 119.

a Tertullian. adv. Hermogen. c. 18. Quis enim scit, quæ
sunt Dei, & quæ in ipso, nisi Spiritus qui in ipso? Sophia
autem Spiritus.—V. etiam adv. Prax. c. 8. necnon, c. 19.

b "If
If it be impious to impute Ignorance and Passion to the Father of all, how can they say, that a passible Æon was generated by him? And even tho' they fallly ascribe the same Impiety to the very Wisdom of God, will they still call themselves Religious?

Again: They (the Heretics) fallly impute Ignorance and Blindness to the Word of God.” And a little lower: O you vain Sophistors! How could the Father’s Mind, or rather the Father himself, since he is Mind and perfect in all things, beget his Logos an imperfect and blind Æon?” And again: How silly and absurd is it, that they say, that even the Wisdom of God was in Ignorance?—For this is altogether inconsistent with the Nature of Wisdom.”

Now can any one suppose, that all the while Irenæus was conscious of his holding the same Opinion himself, which he represents as impious and absurd in them? No certainly: According to his Principles the Son’s Ignorance of any of the Father’s Counsels, would be like the Spirit of a Man’s being ignorant of the things

b ii. 17. 6. Si autem impium est Patri omnium ignorantiam & Passionem as fingere, quomodo ab eo emis sit dicunt Æonem passibilem, hoc igitur Sophiæ Dei eandum impietatem affingentes, semetipfos religiosos esse dicent?

c Ibid.—9. Ignorantiam & cæcitatem commentientes Verbo Dei.

d Ibid.—10. Et quemadmodum, quos illissimi Sophistæ! Nus Patris, inmo etiam ipse Pater, cum sit Nus & perfectus in omnibus, imperfectum & cæcum Æonem emisit suum Lōgoν?

e ii. 18. 1. Quomodo autem non vanum est, quod etiam Sophiam ejus dicunt in ignorantia, & in deminoratione, & in passione suisse? Hæc enim aliena sunt à Sophia, & contraria.
of a Man, or not knowing itself, and its own Counsels and Purposes. " For, faith he, " It is absolutely impossible for the Logos not to " know the Father; for if he knows, as ex- " erting in the Father, he is not ignorant of " him in whom he is, that is, of himself."

I think therefore 'tis plain, even upon Sup- position, that his superior Nature is here meant, that Irenæus did not impute real Ignorance to the Logos. So that I cannot help being amaz'd at the Boldness of our Arians, who strive to outdo all their Predecessors in talking with so much Assurance and Indecency on this Topic. Dr. Clarke is so candid, as to own that Irenæus meant no more, than that this Knowledge was originally in the Father, and to be referred up to him as the Fountain. And many of the rigid- eft Sort of the antient Arians, I mean the Euno- mians, went this way in expounding the con- troverted Text, Mark xiii. 32. For there hap- pened once to be a Conteff among them con- cerning this Point: One Eutychius aver'd, That the Son was not ignorant of that Day, as having derived all things from the Father, so as to want nothing. And upon his meeting with Oppo- fition from others, he went to their Patriarch Eunomius, then in Exile, who approved of his Tenet.

"ii. 17. 8. — In Logo autem Patria omnimodo impossi- bile eft. Si enim existitens in Patre cognoscit, hunc in quo eft, hoc eft, femetipsum non ignorat.

II. But upon a close Consideration of this Point, I am fully convinced that Irenæus supposed our Saviour refer'd to his human Nature and his State of Abasement, when he spoke of the Son's not knowing the Day of Judgment.

For,

1. From what has been observed, it is undeniable, that Irenæus thought it impossible for the divine Nature of Christ to have any Secret with-held from it; he never speaks of the Logos, as such, having any Revelation made to him; and held, that the Spirit, by which all such Discoveries are made, was not communicated to his divine Nature, which did not need it, but to him, as Man. The Text of Mark refers plainly to that Knowledge that is granted by way of Vouchsafement and a divine Favour, that is, revealed Knowledge: And therefore the Fathers could not suppose the Logos, as such, to have any Concern in this, as being essentially and necessarily acquainted with all the Father's Counsels, as a Man's Spirit knows the things of a Man, not by voluntary Communication, but by intimate Consciousness.

2. He considers Christ, as condescending to be our Pattern, and instructing us by his Behaviour and Deportment, as well as his Doctrine. We might have been taught the same thing by a Voice from Heaven, or several other ways; but this good Father conceiv'd it to be a more excellent and effectual way to learn this Truth, and the Influence it should have upon our Spirits and humble Deportment toward God, by the Son of God's assuming the Form of a Servant, and accommodating himself to that Nature and

\(^{b}\) See above, Chap. II. Sect. 1.
State by his exemplary Humility; particularly in his Deportment toward the Father, carrying it toward him, as one far below him, emptying himself, and referring all to the Father's Glory. This is plainly the Meaning of these Words, *ut discamus per ipsum*, i.e. That we might learn by him, not only as inculcating the Instruction in Words, but as condescending to appear in such a servile Form, as we do, and shewing us by his abasing himself, and glorifying the Father in that Condition, how we ought to give God the Glory of his unrival'd Excellencies. In like manner, our blessed Lord says, *in effeæt*, in the Gospel to his Followers, who are naturally backward to Suffering: "Your Lord and Master is obliged to bear a Cross: God spares not his own Son: And do you expect to be excusèd? are you above your Master?"

That *this* Instance of Humility refer'd wholly to our Saviour's abased State in our Nature, appears farther from Irenæus's hinting, that it was intended for our Instruction only in the present imperfect State.——*Ut & nos, in quantum in figurâ bujus mundi sumus, &c. To the end, that we also, as long as we live in this World, may have perfect Knowledge to God.*

3. Besides, it is well known, that the Fathers refer'd such Expressions, as *this*, to the Incarnation and the voluntary Oeconomy Christ submitted to for our Salvation. As he came not into the World to exalt himself, but rather to hide his Glory under a Veil of Humanity; so he suited his Behaviour and Expressions to this State of Exinanition. No wonder then, that oeconomical Expressions frequently dropt from him: He generally called himself the *Son of Man*, forbidding his Disciples to publish his being the Christ, the
the Son of the Living God, and his glorious Appearance on the Mount. *Irenæus supposes, as we have already observed, that tho’ he was truly God and Lord, yet he taught his Disciples only, that the Father was so.* Thus in Psalm xxii. 6. as understood by the Fathers, he says, *I am a Worm, and no Man:*—which is an Instance of his emptying himself, but not of denying the Truth of his human Nature. *Justin Martyr’s Comment on that Psalm is highly worth the learned Reader’s Notice:* It gives us a just Idea of the way of Thinking the Antients fell into, concerning this Matter. It contains, in their Opinion, a mournful Complaint of our Lord in great Distress, in which he conceals his divine Power, and expresses his Dependence upon the Father for all the Aids he needed. This they took to be an Instance, not of his want of Power, but of his Piety toward the Father, whom he came to glorify. k “I would even recite the whole Psalm, faith this Christian Philosopher, that you may perceive his Piety toward the Father, and how he refers all unto him, and prays to be saved even from Death by him.—And again: “And intimation, that he should be saved himself by the same God, but not boasting of doing any thing by his own Counsel or Strength. For in-

---

1 iii. 9. 1. V. supra.


1 Ibid. p. 328. A. —Καὶ ἰστες ὑψηθέται ἑπ’ τὸν ἰστες ὑπομονάς, ἅλλ’ ἐ’ τῇ ἰστες βεβλη’ ἤ ἰροὶ πράτεις τι καύξαμεν; καὶ ὑπ’ εἰς της τοῦ αὐτῶ ἐπάθετε, λέγετο· αὐτῶ τίνες, Διδάσκαλε ἰστες, ἀπεκφίλαι, τι μοι λέγεις ἰστες τίς ἐγὼ ἰστες, ὃ πατὴς μοι ὁ ἐν τοῖς ἰστες τοῖς ἰστες. T "deed
"deed he did the same on Earth; when one
"said to him, Good Master! he an\swer'd, Why
"called thou me good? there is one good, even
"my Father, who is in Heaven."

The Expression now under Consideration is very parallel to this: Our Saviour, in his low Estate, refers the Knowledge of the Day of Judgment to the Father, and takes no Notice of his own divine Knowledge: which therefore was no Intimation of his absolute Ignorance, but an Instance of his exemplary Self-abasement and Piety toward the Father. We might as well conclude from the Expressions already produced, that Christ was not good, that the Creator of Heaven and Earth had no Power to save himself from his Persecutors, that he was not a true Man, &c. as from the disputed Text, that he was absolutely ignorant of that Day.

They who object against this, his being called the Son, seem not to be well acquainted with Scripture-language: I own, the Denomination is here taken from his Godhead and his Relation to the Father, and an Emphasis is laid on it. But we ought not therefore to conclude, that what is said of him, under that Denomination, belongs to that Nature from whence it is taken. Irenæus often asserts, that the Word of God became visible, passible, &c. \(^m\) That he was crucify'd, ipsum Verbum Dei incarnatum suspensus est super lignum; that is, the incarnate Word of God was himself hang'd on the Tree\(^a\). But did not mean that his superior Nature was visible, passible, or actually suffer'd. The Virgin is said

\(^m\) See above, Chap. VII. 4. as also the last part of this Chapter.

\(^a\) V. 18. 1.
portare Deum, to carry, or to be big with God o;
i.e. him who is both God and Man; and not
that, as God, he was conceived or born of her.

The Son of Man is said to be, or to have been,
in Heaven, and to come down from Heaven, Joh.
iii. 13. Yet it was a great Error in Apollinaris
to infer from hence, that Christ's human Flesh
pre-existed to his Birth of the Virgin, and came
down from Heaven p; and in the Socinians to
conclude, that the Man Christ Jesus had been
lately caught up to Heaven.

But there is a particular Beauty and Energy
in the Expression now under Consideration: The
Disciples had, it seems, a great desire to
know the time of Christ's second Coming: The
Words contain an Argument to check this Cur-
iosity, and to make 'em content to have this
Secret concealed from them. "This is reveal-
ed to none in Heaven, or Earth, no, not to
" the Son, as dear as he is to the Father." The
Son, even as Man, is the most dignify'd of all
Creatures, and the Father's greatest Favourite:
So that it is like these Expressions: God spared
not his own Son, but deliver'd him up, Rom. viii.
32. The Son of God gave himself for me, Gal. ii.
20. They crucify to themselves the Son of God, &c.
Heb. vi. 6. The Meaning is not, that that Na-
ture, which was begotten of the Father, suffer'd:
But the mentioning of his highest Nature and
Relation to the Father puts an Emphasis on his
Dignity, and gives Life and Beauty to the Ex-

\[ V. 19. 1. \text{ Hec (Virgo Maria) per Angelicum Ser-}
\text{monem evangelizata est, ut portaret Deum.} \]

\[ p \text{ V. Nazianzeni Epitpholam ad Nestarium apud Sozomen.} \]

\[ E. H. 6. 27. p. 255. \text{ Ed. Cant.} \]

\[ \text{Ως και πέιν κατηχισθήν \]
\[ ἐκτενεῖ, ἵνα καταλήγῃ ἑαυτῷ, καὶ κατελθῇ ἑαυτῷ ἐπιφανείᾳ σάλα ἐκείνῳ, ὡς ἡμών ἐκ τῇ ἁρματικῇ ἑυπάρχῃ.} \]

\[ T 2 \]

\[ \text{pressio.} \]
pression: The Sense is the same, as Heb. v. 8. Καὶ πρὸς ὑμῖν ἦταν. Tho' he were a Son, yet he suf-
fer'd, viz. in his human Nature.

And it may be observed, that some things are
deny'd of Christ without any Limitation in the
Words, which yet must be understood only of
his human Nature; as he is said not to be in the
World after his Ascension, John xvii. 11. And
yet the Scripture plainly afferts, and the Arians
would not seem to deny, his being ever present
with his People on Earth, in respect of his di-
vine Nature. But I am not to vindicate the
Text it self, but Irenæus, from the false Glosses
of the Arians.—In a Word, let the Reader
observe, that, according to Irenæus and other
Fathers, when the Father is mention'd even with
the exclusive Term solus, alone, the Son is to
be understood as included. And when our Sa-
vior spake in his abased State on Earth, par-
ticularly when he would be our Pattern of an
humble, submissive Behaviour toward God, he
had the Oeconomy in his Eye, and adapted his
Speech to his Circumstances.

III. There are many Passages in Irenæus, in
which the Father is represented as ordering and
commanding, and the Son as ministering to him,
and executing his Orders, as in the Creation of
the World: From whence the Arians infer,
that the Son is in Nature inferior to the Father.

a "The Son ministering to the Father does
all things from the beginning to the end, and
without him none can know God.

a iv. 6, 7. Omnia autem Filii administrans Patri, per-
fectab ab initio usque ad finem, & sine illo nemo potest cognoscre Deum.
Our Lord, that form'd the Eye, is the "fame that made the whole Man, ministerially "executing the Father's Will."

The Question grounded on these, and the like Expressions is, Whether we may infer from them, that the Son is in Nature inferior to the Father?

That I may open the way to the Decision of this Point, I would observe,

1. That acting a ministerial Part, and executing the Counsels and Orders of others does not always fix a servile, or inferior Character upon Persons. The doing any any good Office in compliance with the Desires, or only for the Benefit of others, is expressed by Terms of this Import; as Pliny calls the Divine Providence, Triste Ministerium, a Ministry, or Attendance full of Care. The Master in the Gospel is supposed, διακονεῖν, to serve, Luke xii. 37. or wait on his own Servants: And our Lord himself came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, Mat. xx. 28. and condescended to do the Office of the meanest Servant in washing his Disciples Feet; and yet was still their Lord and Master, Job. xiii. The Words used to express the Son's ministering to the Father, are ὑπηρετῶ, ὑπεργεῖ, ministerare, servire, de-
servire, &c. I shall endeavour to demonstrate by the frequent Use of them in other Cases, that no solid Argument can be drawn from them, to

1 V. 15. 3. Qui enim visionem formavit Dominus, hic est qui universum hominem formavit, voluntati Patris deserviens. Conf. V. 5. 2. ———Manus Dei————deserviens voluntati Patris. Gr. ———τεῦ Θεοῦ χεις————ὑπηργοῦσα τῷ Θείῳ νικα πατρεῖ.

2 N. H. L. 2. C. 7. Irridendum vero agere curam rerum humanarum illud quicquid est summum. Anne tam trifli atque multiplianti ministerio non pollui credamus dubitemusve?
determine the Nature, or the Condition of Agents.

Josephus says, "Balaam order’d King Balac to build seven Altars, and prepare the same Number of Bullocks and Rams; and he executed his Orders, &c. where Balaam is said καλέων, to command, and the King to minister, ὑπερευθ. And so Hiram, a sovereign Prince, is represented by the same Historian, as ministering to King Solomon, or serving him by helping him to Timber for building the Temple."}

Helena, Mother of Constantine the Great, is celebrated by the ecclesiastical Historians for condescending to wait on the sacred Virgins her self at a great Entertainment she provided for them, when she was at Jerusalem. Compare the Accounts of this in the Margin w, and you’ll find a great Personage acted the ministerial Part to her inferiors, and so is said λειτερεύειν, διακοινεῖν, ὑπερευθ, ὑπερευθ γίνεσθαι, &c. i.e. to minister, wait, or serve, and to become a Servant.

And this leads us to an obvious and easy Method to reconcile a seeming Contradiction among the Antients. 'Tis common with them to con-

---


u L. viii. c. 2. 7. p. 340. Ἔγω ἦν καί ταλία ὑπέρευθος τῷ ἐπισταμένῳ.


flied Christ, as ministering to the Father in the Creation of the World, and the Instruction of Mankind: He may therefore, in a qualify’d Sense, from the condescending part he acts, be called ἐπιστρέφω, ὑπηρέτης, &c. And yet Justin Martyr denies him to be ὑπηρέτης, a Servant or Minister. "God sends his Word, faith he, not, as some "may guess, dispatching a Minister, or Angel "to Men."" And Tatian has the like Thought, when he argues against the Worship of the Sun and Moon, because they are only Servants. "How can I worship ministering Creatures?" He apprehended, it seems, that Christ was not a ministering Servant, else he would not have adored him, for fear of Idolatry.

Now, as the Empress Helen did act the ministerial Part, by Condescension; and so is said ἐπιστρεφω, and ὑπηρέτης γίνεσθαι, to serve, and to become a Servant: And yet if any one should call her a Servant, that is, a Person in a servile Condition, he might very justly be censured for injuriously degrading her. So the Son of God is not to be accounted a mere Servant, or inferior Agent, because he ministered to the Father. And hence the Eunomians were censur’d, because they could without Horror preach, that the Son is the Father’s Servant and Minister, and the Spirit the Son’s. And Macedonius degraded and blasphemed the Holy Ghost, by calling him (ἐλαχίστον καὶ ὑπηρέτων) a Servant and ministering Spirit. Ire-

---

x Epift. ad Diognet. p. 498. — — Οὐ, καλάπτη ἢν τις ἐπιστρέφω, ὑπηρέτης γίνεσθαι τιμή πέμψαι, ἢ ἀγγελον. x. v. l.


**neus** himself, in his Application of the Parable of the Husbandman, plainly distinguishes the Son from Servants. "The same Houholder sent at one time Servants, at another his own Son.—Now the Son coming from him as a Father with princely Authority, said; But I say unto you: But the Servants came from him as a Lord in a servile way, and therefore said: Thus faith the Lord."

Thus the Son is often called an Angel in Scripture, according to the Fathers, because he descended to carry Messages, and appear as an Angel: But yet was not of the same Nature and Order with those ministering Spirits. Hence *Justin Martyr* says of two of the three Angels that appeared to Abraham, that they were really Angels; implying, that the first, whom he supposed to be the Son himself, was not so. And *Tertullian* is very full to this Purpose; "The Son of God, faith he, is called the Angel, that is, the Messenger of the great Counsel; an Appellation implying Office, not Nature.—But is not therefore to be understood to be an Angel in the same Sense, as a Gabriel or Michael: For the Son, as well as...

---


d. De Carne Chrifti, C. 14. Dictus est quidem magni Cons-filii Angelus, id est Nuntius; Officii, non Naturæ vocabulo. -----Non ideo tamen sic Angelus intelligendus, ut aliqui Ga-briel aut Michael. Nam & Filius à Domino vineæ mittitur ad
as the Servants, is sent by the Lord of the Vineyard to the Husbandmen, to demand the Fruits: But the Son is not therefore to be reckoned one of the Servants, because he submitted to do the Office of Servants."

But to return from this Digression; it appears, that when Persons do any thing for others, as executing their Counsels, they are commonly said ἐπηγεῖν, ἐπηγεῖν, &c. and sometimes are termed ἐπηγεῖται, ἐπηγεῖοι, &c. tho’ they be their Equals, or even Superiors. As Theodoret calls Philip, prime Minister (Prefectus praetorio) to the Emperor Constantius, the Minister of the wicked Counsels of the Arians e, τῶν πονηρῶν βομβισμάτων ὑπερέται. That is, he executed all their unrighteous Counsels and Projects. And of another great Man under Valens, Peter of Alexandria lays, γα ήπατον τον Μιελον των Καρδιών Στοιείας, &c. he was the Instrument of their Cruelty, ἐξεργάζειτο ἑαυτόσαμον.

And even doing good Offices for our Friends, is express’d by Words of the like Import; as we commonly speak of serving a Friend.

But left I should tire the Reader with the multitude of References, I shall only add a few more Expressions of this sort in the Margin.

2. Now,

ad cultores, sicut & famuli, de fructibus petitum. Sed non propter ea unus ex famulis deputabitur Filius, quia famularum succedet Officio.

g Isocrat. ad Demon. Ποιότετες μὲν εἰς, ἀφάνις τοῖς φίλοις ὑπενεχοῦσίς.

Sophoc. in Ajace, p. 35 — εἰς τῶν φίλων. ἐκ τ. 2.

Τεσσαλιβού ὑπηγεῖον ἀφίλει γαλήνηαμ. at

"Ως οἰκεῖον ὑπηγεῖον.

Opusc. Mytholog. p. 747: ἔδρας ἦ τὰς ἀταξίας, τὸ σεῖ προ-

τεν, οὗ το οἰκεῖαι συμφέρον, ἐχομένης τουλάχιστον.

U

Sozomen.
2. Now, for ought I see, it is plain, that these Expressions concerning the Son and Spirit leave the Matter just where it was; for they don't necessarily infer any Superiority, much less a Difference in Nature. But we are to regulate our Conceptions of that Matter according to the Subjects spoken of. If a Superior executes the Counsels of, or does a good Office to one of a lower Station, he does it not by Constraint, but by voluntary Condescension. The like may be said proportionably of Equals. If an Equality in Nature and Perfections be consistent with a Subordination, as in the ever-blessed Trinity, the several Persons may act their distinct Parts in a voluntary Oconomy, and the Son and Spirit may undertake the ministerial Part; and this Oconomy may have its Foundation in the mutual Relations of the Persons too: And yet we cannot from hence conclude, that they are not of the same Nature and Perfections with the Father. As in the produced Instances we are not presently to reduce to an inferior or servile State great Personages, who are said to serve, or minister to others, &c. but consider their Character, and suit our Conceptions to that. So when Christ is represented as ministering to the

Theodor. L. i. C. 5. de Marciano Imp.—Ταῖς χειλαίς ἀπάντας προβίμως ὁπιστίματε.

Father,
Father, or executing his Pleasure, we should not forget his Character and Relation to the Father, viz. that he is his own Son, his Word and Wisdom, of the same Nature and Perfections with him; and understand his acting the ministerial Part in a Sense suitable to his Dignity. Nor should I at all wonder, to find something in the incomprehensible God, that has no parallel among Creatures, and can scarcely be illustrated by a Comparison with them. Surely 'tis too assuming to think, that our Ideas represent, or Words express the deep Things of God, but in a very imperfect Manner.

And what if the Fathers meant no more by the Son's ministering, than to express the Force of the Preposition (ἐν) by, or thro', viz. that the Father did these things by the Son in a way becoming himself, without presuming to determine the Modus? as God is sometimes said to be his own Place, ἵνα ἐν πάση ἐπίσκηψιν, not to turn him into mere Space, but to express his not being circumscribed by Place, but being ἐν πάσῃ ἐπίσκηψιν.

Were I to enlarge, I could easily demonstrate, that there is no Stress to be laid on that Criticism concerning the Import of the Prepositions ἐν and ἐν, the one signifying the principal Efficient, the other only the instrumental Cause, or ministerial Agent. It had its rise, I suppose, in the Schools of the Philosophers, who express'd the Agency of several sorts of Causes by different Prepositions, ἐν ὑπὲρ, εἰ ὑπὲρ, ἐν ὑπὲρ. Philo first borrow'd it from them, and finds Fault with Scripture-expressions, wherein this

Virg. Æneid. 7. v. 616, &c.
Hoc & tum Æneadis indicere bella Latinus
More jubebatur, triliique recludere portas.
Abstinuit taetu Pater, averufque refugit
Fæda Minifteria.
Accuracy is not observed. He was follow'd by Origen, and Eusebius of Caesarea, &c. To shew the Weakness of it I shall only observe, that when the same Effect is ascribed to two concurring Agents, the Preposition (διὰ) is indifferently used to denote either the Principal or the Instrumental, according as the one or the other was the Subject of Discourse, or happen'd to be first spoken of. As in giving forth Prophecies the Holy Ghost is certainly the principal Agent, and the Prophets only (διὰ) Instruments. And yet, as it is usual to say, The Holy Ghost spake by them; Acts xxviii. 25. Well spake the Holy Ghost, διὰ ο isNaN τοῦ πρεφίτου, by the Prophet Esaias: So are they said to speak—— By the Holy Ghost. As in Justin Martyr, πρεφίτου επονθἡ διὰ τοῦ πρεφητεου πνεύματος. And in Iren.——χαλευτον διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. Let the learned Reader cast his Eye on some more Instances of the like Import at the bottom of the Page, and he'll see there must be a great Defect somewhere, when Men think such Stress may be laid on a weak Criticism, as to raise an Argument from it to determine the Nature of Things, and assign to them their proper Places in the Scale of Causes and Beings.

---

Hof. viii. 4.  μαυςτων, εβαστηντων, και ου δι’ εμων.  
Gen. iv. 1.  εκπαθμην ανθρωπον δια του Θεου.  
Heb. vii. 21.  ου [ινεος γεγονε]——δια του λεγοντος, κ. θ. i  
Eth. viii. 10.  εγκαθη δια του βασιλεως——


If they suppose, that the Word Ordering or Commanding will bear an Argument, we have already seen in the Case of Balaam and Balak, that it does not always imply Authority, or the Exercise of Dominion; but the Sense of it is accommodated to the Character and Relations of the Persons spoken of. If History inform us, that the Augurs order'd the Romans to offer such and such Sacrifices, &c. or that a Physician order'd his Prince to take Medicines for recovering his Health; we should not from hence infer, that the sovereign Power was lodged in the College of Augurs, or that the Prince was a Subject to his Physician. The Margin contains two Instances of this Nature, which might easily be multiply'd.

Thus, I think, it is plain, that straining innocent Words, beyond the Author's Scope and Intention, is not the way to come at the Truth in any Case. But, in this Instance, it is great Injustice to draw from our Author's Expressions, Consequences that he does not allow, and asser them upon him, as his real Sentiments, tho' it appears, from the whole Tenor of his Doctrine, that he did not hold 'em, but has rather expressly disclaim'd them. For he abundantly explains his Meaning elsewhere, and teaches, as has been shewn, that God's creating

Philo de Mundi Opific. p. 16. Τῶ ἡ πάντων πατέρ Θεό, τὰ μὴ σποδαία δι’ αὐτοῦ μένει τοῖς εἰκονισταῖς ἐν.
'Oi Αποστόλοι δὲ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκεῖνοι,
Sozom. E. H. Praef. p. 3. Πάσα προσωπικός αὑτῆς δὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ,
all Things by his Word and Spirit was not employing Servants, Creatures, Instruments, &c. but doing this Work by himself, by his own Wisdom and Power, or with his own Hands. According to him to make use of an inferior Agent, is inconsistent with the divine All-sufficiency. He manifestly opposes the Son and Spirit to created Attendants and Instruments, and to all that are in a State of Subjection. "The Father, faith he, needed not Angels to create the World by:——Nor did he need any to minister to him in the creating of his Creatures, or ordering the Affairs of Men. But he has a sufficient and ineffable Ministry: For his own Offspring and his Image minister to him in all things, that is, the Son and Holy Spirit, his Word and his Wisdom, whom all the Angels serve and are subject to."  

4. Besides, the Son was not a mere Instrument in the Creation according to Irenæus, for that would not make him Lord and Proprietor of the World, any more than a General's Conquest of a Country for his Sovereign would make him rightful King of it, or a Servant's building a House by his Master's Order, would give him a Title to the House. But it has been shewn above, that Irenæus held Christ to be by the right of Creation, sovereign Lord of the World, which he could not be by acting a purely mini-

\[\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\text{ iv. 7. ad Fin. Non indigente Patre Angelis uti faceret Conditionem, & formaret hominem.—Neque rursus indigente ministeria ad fabricationem eorum, que facta sunt, ad dispositionem eorum negotiorum, quae secundum hominem erant; sed habente copiosum & inexprimabile ministerium, ministret enim ei ad omnia sua Progenies & Figuratio sua, i. e. Filius & Spiritus Sanctus, Verbum & Sapientia, quibus serviant, & subjecti sunt omnes Angeli.}\]
Afterial Part. "Plainly shewing, faith he, that "there is one God the Father over all, and one "Word of God, which is thro' all, by which "all things were made; and that this World is "his own, and was made by him according to "the Father's Will."

And this leads me to another Observation, that tends to illustrate this Subject, viz. that when our Author so often inculcates, that the Son in creating the World, minister'd to the Father, and executed his Will, he had no Design to lessen or depress the Son, but only to oppose the Heretics, who held, that the World was created without the Consent of the Father of all. He would maintain the Father's Concern in the Work of Creation and Providence; and that he expresses by his willing and ordering it, which belongs to him as the first Person in the Trinity. And deservire voluntati Patris, Gr. ὕποκεισθαι τῷ θείῳ τοῦ πατρός, signifies no more than to execute the Father's Will, in Opposition to doing it of himself, without the Father's having any Concern in it. For he lays no Emphasis upon commanding and ministering, as inferring Supremacy and Inferiority; nor seems to have had any Speculations about these; simply meaning, that the World was made by the Father's Will, and 'tis his Work, as he had that Concern in it, that properly belong'd to him, as the Father; and supposing, that there is a natural Order in the Trinity, and an Oeconomy of the Persons in all divine Works.

Manifeštō ostendens quoniam unus Deus Pater super omnes, & unum Verbum Dei, quod per omnes, per quem omnia facta sunt. Et quoniam hic mundus proprius iphus, & per ipsum factus est voluntate Patris.
IV. The last Expression that seems to favour the Arians is, the Son's being represented as visible and comprehensible; whereas the Father can be comprehended by none, but is the invisible God, whom no Man hath seen, or can see.

P. "God, faith Irenæus, in the last Days gives (these Blessings) to Mankind by his Son, the "incomprehensible by one that is comprehensible, "the invisible by him that is visible."

There is nothing in our Author, or perhaps in any Ante-nicene Writer, more express in favour of the Arian Scheme, than this may seem to be to those that follow the mere Sound of Words. Here there seems to be no need of doubtful Reasoning, or foreign Principles to force a Consequence from the Words never intended by the Author: In comparing the Father and Son, a difference of Nature and Perfections seems to be plainly express'd: The Father is the invisible and incomprehensible God; but the Son is both visible and comprehensible.

And if we should attempt to assuage this Difficulty, by replying, that the Author meant no more, but that the Son, who in his divine Nature is equally invisible and incomprehensible with the Father, did by Condescension accommodate himself to our Capacity, so as to become visible and comprehensible to us, as in assuming a visible Species, and at last true human Nature, in order to converse with Men; this, I doubt, would encrease their Triumphs, and occasion, perhaps, some severe Invectives against their Adversaries, for straining plain Expressions, that need no Commentary.

P. iii. 11. 5. Deus——& benedictionem ecæ & gratiam potus, in novissimis temporibus per Filium suum donat humano generi, incomprehensibilis per comprehensibilem, & invisibilis per visibilem.

But
But it has happen'd well, that *Irenæus* had frequent Occasion to touch upon this Subject; I don't desire the Reader to regard what I say, but only to hear our Author guarding his Expressions, and fully explaining himself on this Head.

q "Our Lord Jesus Christ,— sum'd up "Man also in himself, the invisible being made "visible, the incomprehensible becoming comprehensible, the impassible passible, and the *Word* *Man*.

r "The Father revealed himself to all, making his Word visible to all.—And by the "Word himself made visible and palpable, the "Father is shewn.

f "The Word of God, tho' naturally invisible, became palpable and visible among Men. 

r "And for this Reason the Son of God, tho' "he was perfect, became an Infant, and ac-
" commodated himself to the Infancy and weak "Capacity of Man; not upon his own Ac-
"count, but because of Man's Incapacity be-
"coming thus comprehensible, as Man was able "to take in the Knowledge of him. For there

---

\[ \text{iii. 16. 6. — Christus Jesus Dominus noftri,---& homi}-\n\text{inem---in femetipsum recapitulans eft, invisibilis visibilis factus, & incomprehensibilis factus comprehensibilis, & impa}-\n\text{bilis passibilis, & Verbum Homo.-----}
\]

\[ \text{iv. 6. 5, 6. Omnibus igitur revelavit se Pater, omnibus Verbum fuum visibile faciens.-----Et per ipsum Verbum vi}-\n\text{ibilem & palpabilem factum, Pater offendebatur.----}
\]

\[ \text{iv. 24. 2. Et hujus [Dei] Verbum naturaliter quidem invisibilem, palpabilem & visibilem in hominibus factum, &c.}
\]

\[ \text{iv. 38. 2. Και διὰ τούτο συνεπτιμῆσαι ὅσον τῷ Θεῷ, τῇ Ἰουνίας, τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ εἰς εἰκόνα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἑπτάν} \]
\[ \text{τῶν χαράμεων, ὡς ἀνθρωποτρόπως ἀντί θεοῦ χαρίζετο οὔ πειράτω τῷ Ἐνων ὑπὲρ τοῦ καθιστητος καὶ νοείν, ἀλλὰ πειράτω τῷ νεοτίμῳ γεγονεῖ ἀνθρωποτρόπως, ὡς μοι ἄγγειλητὰ ἦν.}
\]

\[ \text{X is} \]
is no Weakness or Indigence on God's part,
but on Man's, who but lately came into being, and that because he is not unmade.

Again: "Wherefore our Lord, in the latter Days—came unto us, not as he might have done, but as we were able to behold him. For he might have come to us in his own ineffable (Gr. incorruptible) Glory, but we were not able to bear the Greatness of his Glory.—

w "In Times past, it was indeed said, that Man was made after the Image of God, but no sensible Demonstration of it was given; for the Word was yet invisible.—But when the Word of God was made Flesh,—he made Man like to the invisible Father by the visible Word."

And that we might understand, that the Father, or Son's being visible or invisible, comprehensible or incomprehensible, in his Sense, was not the necessary Result of their Nature, but purely a Matter of voluntary Economy, he shews how far the Father himself condescends to be seen and comprehended both here and hereafter, and why he so far keeps himself invisible.

The Heretics, it seems, argued from the Invisibility of God the Father asserted in the New

u Ibid. Sect. 1. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἦμαῖν ἐπὶ ἡχάτων τῶν καιρῶν,------υλῆ πρὸς ἡμᾶς, αὐχὶ ὡς ἄντες ἐδόνατο, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἡμῖν ἀντε ἡδίν ἡμαλίδους Ἀντε μὲν ἂν ἐν τῷ ἀφράστῳ (Int. Lat. Inenarrabilis, quasi legisset, κατ' ἕξος vel ἀφράστῳ) ἀντε ὥζη πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἡδίν ἐδόνατο, ἀλλ᾽ ἡμῖν ὡς ἐδοκιμάσαντο το μέγεθος κατε ἡμῖν κατε ἡμαλίδους ἡμαλίδους.

w ν. 16. 2. Ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις χρόνοις ἐλέγετο μὲν κατ᾽ ἐκάκω Θεοῦ γεγενεῖται ἀνθρώπον, εἰς ἡδίκημα ἧ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἡμῖν ἐλεήθη· ἀλλ᾽ ἡμῖν ὡς ἐδοκιμάσας ἠδοκιμάσας κατέ τοῦ ἑλέγξας τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ ἡγατίῳ πατρί,—per visible Verbum. Lat. Interp.
Testament, against his being the same with the God of the Jews, who variously appeared to the Fathers, and spake to Moses Face to Face.—

In answer to this he says.—

"God shall be seen of Men, as our Lord faith: Blessed are the pure in Heart, for they shall see God, Mat. v. 8. And yet in respect of his Greatness and wonderful Glory, no Man shall see God, and live, Exod. xxxiii. 20. For the Father is incomprehensible. But in regard of his Love, Kindness and Almighty Power, he grants even this to them that love him, that is, the Vision of God.

Again: "The Word of God was made the Steward and Dispenser of the Father's Grace for the Benefit of Men,—shewing God to Men, and presenting Man to God: Both keeping the Father invisible, left Man should contemn God, and that there might be room for progressive Knowledge; and again, by many Dispenfations discovering God, and making him visible to Men, left Man should wholly revolt from God, and lose his Being.

x iv. 20. 5. Videbitur Deus ab hominibus; quemadmodum & Dominus ait: Beati mundo Corde, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt, Mat. v. 8. Sed secundum magnitudinem quidem ejus, & mirabilem Gloriam, nemo videbit Deum, & vivat, Exod. xxxiii. 20. incapable enim Pater: Secundum autem dilectionem & humanitatem, & quod omnia positi, etiam hoc concedit iis qui se diligunt, id est, videre Deum.

y Ibid. Sect. 7. Verbum Dispensator paternæ gratiae factus est ad utilitatem hominum,—hominibus quidem offendens Deum, Deo autem exhibens hominem: Et invisibilitatem quidem Patris custodiens, ne quando homo fieret contemptor Dei, & ut semper haberet ad quod proficeret; visiblem autem rursus hominibus per multas dispositiones offendens Deum, ne in totum deficiens à Deo homo, cessaret esse.

X 2 Again:
Again: “They receive Life, who see God.
And therefore the inconceivable, incomprehensible and invisible God condescends to be seen, understood and comprehended by the faithful.

And in the same Chapter, where he professedly handles this Argument, he expressly says, it was the Word, whose Glory Moses desired to see, and who said, No Man shall see my Face, and live.

“...The Word, faith he, spake to Moses Face...”—and Moses desired plainly to see him that talked with him, and it was said to him: Stand in the high Place of the Rock, &c. 

Intimating, both that Man is incapable to see God, and yet that, by the Wisdom of God in the last Days, Man should see him on “the top of the Rock; that is, in his Incarnation.”

Now it would be an Affront to the Reader’s Understanding, to suppose, that he needs be told, that according to Irenæus, the Son was not naturally visible or comprehensible, but only became so in his Sense by his Incarnation, and often appearing and conversing with Men in an assumed Species, which was generally Symboli-
cal and Prophetical; and that by the like Con-
descension the Father himself has been, or at
least will be seen and comprehended by the faith-
ful for their compleat Blessedness.

And let him frame as good an Excuse as he
can, for those who can allow themselves to pro-
duce such a Passage, and let it before their Rea-
ders, as meant absolutely; whereas, if they have
read Irenæus, they could not but know his own
Explication of it, which leaves no room for
the Consequence they would draw from it.
A N
APPENDIX
Concerning the Holy Ghost.

So much has been already said concerning the Holy Spirit in the third Chapter of this Collection, that might satisfy any impartial Person, that Irenæus believ'd his Divinity; and consequently, that it was an Article of the Catholic Faith. He is everywhere distinguish'd from the Father and Son, as a third divine Person, in whom the Church believed; and yet is joined with 'em, as having Communion in the same Nature. He was ever in, and with the Father, as his Wisdom: He is distinguish'd from all Creatures, as the Object of Faith, and Creator of all Things: And when God made all Things by this glorious Spirit, he did not work by an Instrument, inferior Agent, or Power separate from himself; that would have been inconsistent with his Self-sufficiency, and discover'd Impedance and Indigence, like that of the Creatures: But he did it by himself, by his Wisdom, with his own Hands, which he never was, nor could be without a.

And several other Expressions and Arguments of the same Tendency have already occur'd, that if all were laid together and review'd, it would hardly be possible to mistake his Sense. For tho' Men may quibble and explain away parti-

a See above, Chap. III. N° 1, 2, 3, 4, and Notes on them.
cular Expressions, be they never so clear and strong, yet upon comparing his Principles and Reasonings with them, they will find themselves so hem'd in on every side, that there is left no room for Evasion. However I cannot satisfy myself to conclude this Collection without adding a few Passages more concerning the eternal Spirit.

1. b "Now that the Word, that is, the Son was ever with the Father, we have shewn at large. And that Wisdom also, which is the Spirit, was with him before any thing was created, he says by Solomon; God by Wisdom founded the Earth, be prepared the Heavens by Prudence.—— And again: The Lord created me the beginning of his Ways to his Works; he founded me before the Ages, or from everlasting, in the beginning before he made the Earth.—— He begat me before all the Hills. And again: When he prepared the Heavens, I was with him, &c."

This Passage expresses the Coeternity of the Spirit, for he plainly ascribes the same Eternity to the Spirit, as to the Son: Having largely prov'd the one, he proceeds to the Proof of the other; and when he a little before says, c His Son and Spirit are ever with him, if absolute

b iv. 20. 3. Et quoniam Verbum, id est, Filius, semper cum Patre erat, per multa demonstravimus. Quoniam autem & Sapientia, quae est Spiritus, erat apud eum ante omnem Constitutionem, per Salomonem ait: Deus Sapientia fundavit terram, paravit autem Caelum Prudentia.—— Et rursus: Dominus creavit me Principium viarum suarum in opera sua, ante secula fundavit me, in initio antequam terram faceret——. Ante omnes autem colles genuit me. Et iterum: Cum pararet Caelum, eram cum illo, &c.

c iv. 20. 1. Adept enim ei semper Verbum & Sapientia, Filius & Spiritus,
Eternity is contained in that Expression, it is equally ascribed to both: But it has been fully shewn, that beginningless Duration is asserted concerning the Son; I think, therefore, there can be no rational Doubt, but he intended to prove in these Words the Eternity of the Spirit. Besides, Irenæus, as has also been noted, knew of no Creatures pre-existing to the Creation and Beginning of all Things: He distinguishes the Spirit from all created Beings by his existing, *ante omnem Constitutionem*, before any Thing was created, and by his being the Creator of all Things. To say, *there was a Creature before all Creation*, sounds very like a Contradiction. And by his inferring the Eternity of the Spirit from his being said to have existed with the Father before the Heavens, the Earth, the Hills and Fountains were made, we may with some Certainty suppose, that he understood that Passage, *Psal. xc. 2.* to be expressive of the absolute Eternity of God, and that to have existed before the beginning of the World, and to be without beginning, or eternal, are with him Expressions of the same Import.

2. *f* "The Breath of Life, which made Man a living Soul, (Gr. Animal) is one thing, and "the quickning Spirit, that makes him spiritual, is another. And therefore *Esaias* saith: "Thus saith the Lord, that made Heaven, and "established

---

d See Chap. IV. No 2.—Chap. V. Prop. II.—Chap. VII. No 11. & passim.

e See the Text, *Prov. viii. 22.* consider'd in a Dissertation at the end of this Appendix.

f v. 5. 2. *Aliud enim est afflatus Vite, qui & animalem efficit hominem: Et aliud Spiritus vivificans, qui & spiritalem efficit eum. Et propter hoc Esaias ait: Sic dicit Dominus, qui fecit Coelum, & fixit illud, qui firmavit terram,*
"established it, that fixed the Earth, and the "things that are in it, and gave Breath to the "People upon it, and the Spirit to them that "tread on it, Isa. xlii. 5: Intimating, that the "Breath was given in common to all People "upon Earth; but the Spirit peculiarly to those "that trample upon earthly Lusts. Where- "fore the same Esaias, distinguishing the things "already mentioned, faith: For the Spirit shall "proceed from me, and I have made the Breath "of all, Isa. lvii. 16. speaking of the Spirit as "peculiarly belonging to God, and ranking it "with him, who in the last Days poured it out "upon Mankind by the Adoption; but reckon- "ing the Breath in common to the Creation, and "declaring it to be a made Being. Now what "was made, must be different from the Ma- "ker. Therefore the Breath is temporary; "but the Spirit is eternal."

If any one that understands Words will con-
consider this Passage with tolerable Attention, he "will find, there is hardly any Possibility of mist-
taking the Sense, or evading the Force of it. Our

\& que in ea sunt: Et dedit afflatum populo, qui super eam est; \& Spiritum hii qui calcant illum. Afflatum quidem communitur omni qui super terram est populo dicens datum: Spiritum autem propriè his, qui in culcunt terrenas coneeptias. Propter quod rursus ipse Esaias distinguens quæ prædicta sunt, ait: Spiritus enim a me exiet, \& afflatum omnem ego feci, Isa. lvii. 16. Spiritum quidem propriè in Deo deputans, quem in novissimis temporibus effudit per adoptionem filiorum in genus humanum: afflatum autem communitur in conditionem, \& facturam extendens illum. Aliud autem est quod factum est, ab eo qui fecit. Afflatus igitur temporalis: Spiritus autem sempiternus, &c. Gr. ἐστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ὑπογεγραμμένος τὸ Ἱσαῖας καὶ ἀγαθόν πνεύμα ἔχοντος, το καὶ πνευματικὸν ἔστων ἀποτελοῦν καὶ διὸ τρίτο Ἑσαίας φησίν: ἐτώ λέγει Καρυίς, &c. λ. πινειν υπὸ τῆς τοῖον τοῦ ποτήρι
Our Author shews the Difference between the Breath of Life, and the Holy Spirit of God: By the former, I suppose, he means the human Spirit, by the breathing of which into Man at his Creation, he became a living Soul, Gen. ii. 7. And hence the natural or animal Man (ψυχικὸς ψυχος) is denominated. And there is no room to doubt, but that the quickning Spirit is the Holy Ghost, by whose sanctifying Influences Men are made spiritual.

He states the Difference between these two, in these Particulars.

1. The Afflatus, or Breath is given indifferently to all, but the Holy Spirit only to the Children of God, who have the Earth under their Feet.

2. The Spirit came forth from God, and is God, but the Afflatus is a Creature. This he infers from that Text, Isa. lvii. 16. which, according to the Version of the LXX, runs thus: The Spirit shall proceed from me, and I have made the Breath of all. His Reasoning on this Passage of the Prophet, is plainly to this Purpose. "The Spirit is here spoken of, not as created, "but as proceeding forth from God, and opposed to the Spirit of Man, which God made. "There are but two Orders of Being, God "and the Creature: The Spirit belongs not to "the later, but to the former; he is included "in God, the uncreated Being, and ranked..."
"with him:" For that is the Sense of the Greek Phrase, ἵν τὸ Θεός ταῦτα ἔχει, which, when different Orders of Beings are consider'd, as here, is of the same Import with asserting him to be God: As ἵν κληρον τηταλμενς is one of the Clergy, and ἵν λαοὶ ταῦτα ἔχον, is to be a Lay-man. So τὰ τέλεσι γεωργίας ταῦτα ἔχον, signifies to be an Husbandman. The Latin Phrase used by the Interpreter, carries also the same Sense, in Deo depustari, is to be included in God, or spoken of as comprehended in God, and one with him. As Tertullian illustrating the Unity of the Father and Son as God, by the Simile of the Sun and its Rays, says, Radius in Sole depugatur, The Rays are included in the Sun; so that, when the Sun is spoken of, they are to be understood as comprehended in, and belonging to it. We may therefore, according to Tertullian, say, Filius, or Spiritus Sanctus in Deo depustatur, meaning, that the Son and Spirit are so in God, as to be of the same Nature, and to make but one God with him. Besides, what is said of the Afflatus or Breath, in opposition to the Spirit, fully determines the Sense: For τὸν ὄνομα καλώς [ταῦτα] ἵν τὴς κλῆσις, signifies undeniably to make a Creature of it, or to rank it with Creatures, which is explain'd by declaring it to be a made Thing; Gr. ὧν τοιμα ἀναγεννήσας αὐτὴν. The Greek found in a Catena on Genesis, shews, that the Latin should be read Fastuam, which the Sense also requires, as it is published in the Benedictine Edition from the Clermont MS.

---

8 Max. Tyr. Dissert. 15. V. eundem Dissert. 1. in poecis ὑς τὸν φόντους τῶν (Sc. τῶν ὑποτης ἀπερετῶν) τῶν Θεος ταῦτας.

The Occasion of the Mistake was the Copyist's inadvertently supposing the Word to be joined in Construction with the Ablative going before; thus: \textit{Conditione \& facturâ}. And I would observe by the \textit{bye}, that the former should not have been alter'd by the Editor, but left, \textit{in conditionem}, which is the proper rendering of, \textit{\delta\iota \tau\iota \varepsilon \chi\iota\sigma\varsigma \omega\varsigma}, as above, \textit{\iota \tau\iota \varepsilon \Theta\varsigma}, is render'd \textit{in Deo} as in the vulgar Editions, For \textit{τε\varsigma\varsigma} \textit{as} to be here repeated \textit{\alpha\nu\rho\omicron \nu\omicron\upsilon}, as I have represented it above: The Construction does not depend upon the Verb \textit{Effudit}, which would require, \textit{\iota \tau\iota \nu \chi\iota\sigma\varsigma \nu \omicron\upsilon}, \textit{in conditionem}. He plainly asserts then, that the Spirit is not a Creature, but God, or a divine Person, included in the uncreated Being. This is confirmed by what follows.

3. The Spirit, as the Creator is eternal, but the \textit{Aphlatus}, being a Creature, is temporary. After \textit{Irenæus} had proved the Spirit to be God, to shew the vast Difference between him, and the Spirit breathed into Man, he considers him as the \textit{Creator}, and the other as a \textit{made Being}: "The Creature, faith he, must be very different from the Creator:" And then concludes one remarkable Difference between them suited to his Scope, \textit{viz.} the Breath, by which Man lives the animal Life, is only \textit{temporary}; it animates the Body a-while, and then leaves it breathless and dead: But the Spirit of God is \textit{eternal}, and so never fails, but abides for ever in his living Temples, and the spiritual is changed into eternal Life.

As this is plainly the Sense and Argument of this Place, so it agrees with his known Doctrine of the Spirit’s being \textit{Creator} of the World. And he seems to refer to several Scriptures of
that Import; as Psal. xxxiii. 6. Job xxxiii. 4. The Spirit of God hath made me. And Psal. civ. 30. Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, and they are created, &c.

And let it be noted, that he applies the same Reasoning to the Spirit here, that he uses concerning the Son elsewhere. And according to it, the Spirit also is unmade and necessarily-existent, is eternal without beginning or end, is independent, self-sufficient, &c.

What Dr. Whitby says of this Passage k, I chuse for his sake to answer with Silence; there is no body so stupid, as not to see, that he rather deserves Pity, than needs an Answer.

To the same Purpose Irenæus elsewhere speaks of the Spirit, as uncreated.

3. 1 “—The Word that is, in the Father, “gives the Spirit unto all, according to the “Father’s Pleasure; to some by Creation, and “that is a made Thing: And to some by Adoption “and that is of God, which is their Re “generation. And thus it is made out, that “there is one God the Father, who is over all, “and thro’ all, and in all. The Father is over “all,—the Word is thro’ all,— and the “Spirit in us all.” —

1 See above, Chap. VIII. Prop. IV. No 3. Paff. 2. and the same consider’d in the Dissertation concerning δύνατον. k Difquif. Mod. p. 129.

1 v. 18. 2. — Et Verbum portatum à Patre, præstat Spiritum omnibus, quemadmodum vult Pater: quibufdam quidem secundum conditionem, quod eft factum: quibufdam autem secundum Adoptionem, quod eft ex Deo, quod eft generatio. Et sic unus Deus Pater ostenditur, qui eft super omnia, & per omniam, & in omnibus. Super omniam quidem Pater:—per omniam autem Verbum:—in omnibus autem nobis Spiritus.
Here is the same Distinction of the Spirit, or Afflatus, that is indifferently given to all, and of the Holy Spirit communicated only to the Children of God in their Regeneration. The former is a Creature, or made Thing; but the later is contra-distinguishing from it, by being said to be of God; which Expression, borrow’d from the Apostle, 1 Cor. ii. 12. τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, must here signify his being God, and uncreated, as appears by the Opposition between a made Being, and that which is of God. So that the Preposition (ἐν) has the same Force and Emphasis here, as in the Nicene Creed, Θεός ἐν Θεῷ, God of God, that is, ἐν τῷ Θεῷ θεὸς τῷ Θεῷ, of the Essence of God, which is the Meaning of the Word ὁμοοιότατος, Consubstantial. Irenæus therefore can mean no less than that the Spirit is not a made Being, but uncreated and Consubstantial with God the Father. And afterwards he shews, that the Spirit, as well as the Word, is one God with the Father, in which he follows the Apostle in the Context referr’d to, who represents the Spirit, as being in God, and intimately conscious of all his Secrets, as the Spirit of a Man is in a Man, and knows the things of Man, 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11.

The divine Works of Creation, Preservation, and Government of all Things ascribed to the Spirit, prove his Belief of his Godhead.

4. * There is one God, who by his Word made and order’d all Things.* —

Let the Reader see more Passages to the same Purpose in the Chapter concerning the Father, Son and Spirit; and compare them with Irenæi

---

*m 4. Unus igitur Deus, qui Verbo & Sapientia fecit & aptavit omnia.*
Reus's Doctrine of the Creation of the World, and it will evidently appear, that the creating Spirit can be no Creature, but uncreated, independent, self-sufficient, absolutely eternal, &c. i.e. truly and properly God.

5. "When a Grain of Wheat falls into the Earth, and is dissolved, it springs up with great Increase thro' the Spirit, which contains and upholds all Things.

6. P "There is one Spirit, that disposeth all Things."

One Thing is opposed to all this, viz. that Irenaeus says, That the Father and Son only are styled God and Lord in Scripture. "No one, faith he, is called God and Lord by the Spirit, but the God, who rules all, together with his Word."

And in several other Passages produced above, he applies these Titles only to the two first Persons, but not to the Spirit. And this, I suppose, is the only Reason, that some, who were no Enemies to the Doctrine of the Trinity, have blamed our Author for not plainly declaring his Belief of the Divinity of the Spirit. Concerning this, I observe,

n See above, Chap. VIII.

6 v. 2. 3. 'O ἀνωτέρως τέκνων ἔις τὴν γῆν, καὶ διαλογίζεται, πολλασθεὶς ἐξετάζῃ διᾶ ὧν πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ πνεύματος πάνω. —V. Interp. Granum tritici decidens in terram, & dissolutum, multiplex surgit per Spiritum Dei, qui continet omnia.

p iv. 36. 7. —Et unus Dispenfator; unus enim Spiritus Dei, qui disponit omnia. Gr. Καὶ τὸ εἰκόνισμα, ἰὸν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ δίπλωμα τὰ ψυχῆν.

 Vide Whitby's Disquis. Mod. p. 128.

1. That
1. That he had not occasion to say so much of the Holy Spirit, as of the Son; for he contented himself to consider and confute the first Rank of imaginary *Æons*, which contain'd the eight primary ones, as being the Basis and Foundation of the whole *Pleròma*. In this he met with two Denominations of the second Person, viz. the *Only-begotten*, and the *Word*; but none of the Holy Ghost. And yet, tho' it was not his purpose to establish and explain the Christian Scheme, but as he was led to it by opposing his Adversaries, enough has been said to shew, that he has fully express'd his Belief of the Deity of the Sacred Spirit.

2. He is not inconsistent with himself, when he proves the *Father and Son* only to be called *God and Lord*; for he uses that Argument only affirmatively, to shew, that the Father and his Word are *God and Lord* in the proper and primary Sense; but not to deny and disprove the Deity of the Holy Ghost: nor can he be excluded according to the Primitive Scheme, when the Father as God is spoken of; for by comparing him and Tertullian, we have observed, that the Spirit is included in God, as the Rays in the Sun, (*Spiritus in Deo deputatur, sicut Radius in Sole.*)

3. But one single Observation will, I think, fully solve this Difficulty: And it arises from a Consideration of the Economy of Persons in the ever-blessed Trinity, as understood by our Author. The Son is sent into the World by the Father; and his Business is not to glorify himself, but the Father; agreeably to this Design he taught his Disciples, that the *Father only is God and Lord*; as has been observed. In

---

*i. 9.* 1. *Et ipso Domino Patrem tantum Deum & Dominum eum, qui solus est Deus, & Dominator omnium, tradente discipulis.*
like manner the Holy Spirit is sent forth by the Father and Son to glorify them, not himself, Job. xvi. 14. He (the Spirit) shall glorify me; faith our Saviour, who had veiled his own Glory. Now there is an exact Parallel in the Case: The Son teaches, that the Father only is God and Lord; and none is filled to by the Spirit, but the Father and Son. As therefore it is certain, from Irenæus, that the Son abstain'd from these Titles, not because they did not belong to him, but because he was not to seek his own Glory; but his who sent him, Job. vii. 18. So the Spirit is not filled God and Lord, according to him, by himself; not because he is not truly God and Lord, but because he was not to witness of himself, but of the Father and Son. And it is the Spirit that inspired the Prophets and Apostles, and is the Author of the Scripture. And this seems to be the Reason, according to this Father, that the Holy Ghost is so seldom expressly and personally filled God in Sacred Writ.
A DISSERTATION

On P R O V. VIII. 22.

Read by the Fathers in the Version of the LXX. κύριον ἐξείσθη με τῷ Θεῷ εἰς αὐτῷ, τ.τ.τ. That is, The Lord created me the beginning of his Ways, &c.

This celebrated Text, generally understood by the Antients of the Son, is by Irenæus apply’d to the Holy Spirit; wherein, tho’ he differs from most others, he is very consistent with himself: for he often styles the Spirit the Wisdom of God, as contra-distinguish’d from the Word of God.

The original Hebrew, which alone is authentic, has no Difficulty in it. "יִהוּדָה בְּנֵי רַשֵׁים רָשָׁי רַחֲמֵי " This is, Jehovah possessed me the beginning of his Way, &c. It has been well observed by some, that the Word (יִהוּדָה) signifies to acquire by Price, Industry, or even by Generation; for so it is used by our common Mother, Gen. iv. 1. יִהוּדָה I have gotten, (viz. by Generation) a Man from the Lord. And the same Word (in Hiphil) is render’d to beget by the LXX themselves, Zech xiii. 5. —"οτι αὐτοῖς ζητούσε με ἐκ νεότητος μου, For a Man begat me (יִהוּדָה) from my Youth. However, the Expression must here signify the Son’s eternal Co-existence and ineffable Union with the Father: The Lord possessed me, that
that is, he had me in, and with himself as his Wisdom, which he never could be without.

But the Greek Version, ascribed to the LXX Interpreters, has a harsh Expression here, that the Arians made much use of: ἐγὼ ἐξ ἥσαυτός με. as represented above: The Lord created me the beginning of his Ways. This rendering has occasion'd all the Difficulty; for this Translation was in common Use and greatest Repute among the Fathers in the Greek Church; and the old Italic Version, and others used by the Latines before Jerome's Time were taken from it.

Now considering, that the Word ἥσαυτός is not expressive of the true Sense of the Hebrew; that these celebrated Interpreters almost every where else render it otherwise; that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion agree in rendering it, ἔξ ἥσαυτος,—possessed; and that the Subject here spoken of, and Circumstances of the Place could not possibly tempt the LXX to depart from the Propriety of the Word, and their usual rendering of it; for the creating of Wisdom is at least an uncouth Expression, especially in speaking of that Wisdom, which was with the Father before the Creation, and by which he made the World: Considering all this, I say, I am inclin'd to suspect an Interpolation or Mistake of Transcribers here; and suppose the antient Interpreters left, ἔξ ἥσαυτός με, in their Copy; but that it was first changed into ἔξ ἥσαυτό, as it is found in Philo to this very Day. If he wrote it ἔξ ἥσαυτό, he probably found it so at least in some Copies of the LXX; for being an Alexandrian Jew, 'tis most probable, he took it from that Version,

a Philo Jud. de Temulent. p. 244. ὁ Θεὸς ἔξ ἥσαυτός με πρωτίστων τῶν Ιαντήν ἴγων, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ ἄλφα τίμησεν ἔξ ἥσαυτός με.
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which was of greatest Authority among his Countrymen, or rather the only one then extant: And had he chose to render it by the Verb ἐκλίσω, I am persuaded he would have used the active Voice, ἐκλίσεως, and not ἐκλίσατο in an unusual Form. Or if he really left it, as it is now read, which I hardly believe, it is not not likely that he did it without the Authority of some Copies. On the former Supposition, it is a probable direct Proof from the earliest Citation of the Text, that it was originally ἐκλίσατο in the LXX Version; and at the same time affords an Instance of the easy interchange of ἐκλίσατο and ἐκλίσατο; which later was, perhaps, presum'd to be right, because conformable to the modern Text of the LXX. And the later Supposition shews, how early ἐκλίσατο, (put, no doubt, for ἐκλίσατο) by an easy slip crept into the Copies. And ἐκλίσατο, as unusual, would of course be changed into ἐκλίσεως, as it appears at this Day. However, the two Words have been interchanged elsewhere by a manifest Error of Copyists: An Instance of which we have; Jer. xxxii. 15. οὐ κυρίων οὐ κυρίων α'γάπη. ν. τ. ε. (Heb. "יְהוָה יְהוָה") without all doubt, it should be κυρίων οὐ κυρίων, Fields shall be purchased, or possessed, as appears by the Alexandrian Copy, and the 43d Verfe of the same Chapter. And in Psal. civ. 24. it is observable, that ἐκλίσεως is put for ἐκλίσεως, as the Hebrew Word signifies, and is render'd in the following Psal. cv. 21. And yet this Error is so antient, that it is got into several old Versions from the LXX. Indeed, the Word (תָּם) Gen. xiv. 19 and 22, is paraphrased, in our modern Copies, by as ἐκλίσεως, who created Heaven and Earth; and it is by Creation that God is become the Owner or Possessor of all
all Things. But 'tis very possible, this might have been ὄς ἐκλήσατο at first, as the Word is almost constantly render'd in other Places: For often the Sense of the Places, as well as the Affinity of the Words, has occasion'd their being interchanged by Copyists, ignorant of the Hebrew. He that purchased, or posseffed Heaven and Earth, is an uncommon Expression; and consequently would be apt to be changed into, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, by which God is commonly describ'd. Philo indeed has it now, ὃς ἐκλήσε; but by his Paraphrafe of the Words one would be apt to suppose, that he had ὄς ἐκλήσατο in his Eye: For thus he makes Abraham speak; I will take nothing from you, but from God, who is Posseffor of all Things. He says, Χήματα, not Χίσματα.

However, if this Version of Prov. viii. 22. be corrupted, it was done very early. And, perhaps, this Change was owing to the Hellenistical Jews of Alexandria, who were tinctur'd with some Speculations of the Platonic School, and soon began to speak of divine Things in the Dialect of Plato. Hence the Son of Sirach has these bold Expressions concerning Wisdom:

b So the Greek Word ὄν, in Psal. xvii. 14. was changed into ὄν or ὄνοι, because being filled with Children, was an Expression odd and unusual among the Greeks; and by a very small Alteration it was made to signify being filled with Swine's Flesh or Pork, which is an obvious expression, and represented the Perfons described, as impious and abominable to the Jews. So this Reading is follow'd by both the Arabic Versions and the Roman Psalter. Thus also, Σαλίς ardore, was changed into Σαλίς ardore in the vulgar Latin, Deut. xxix. 23.

c Philo Jud. de Temulent. p. 255. — Ἐκτενὼ τὴν χίησα μω πρὸς τὸν Θεόν τὸν ὑψίστον, ὃς ἐκτίσε τὸν ἔρευν. κτ. τ. i.

Et poft paucâ: p. 256. B. — Πᾶρ ὑμῶν μοι οὖν, παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ λήψομαι, ὥσ τα πάντα κτήματα. κτ. τ. i.
Wisdom was created before all Things, Ecclus. i. 4. And again:

Before all Ages, even from the beginning he created me, faith Wisdom, chap. xxiv. 14. And yet they did not mean proper Creation by these Expressions, as may be observed hereafter.

But whatever was the Original rendering of this Verse, it is certain most of the Fathers read ἔκλισεν in their Copies. For tho' Origen once has this Passage according to the Original e, the Lord possessed me, &c. And it is certain, he does not cite the Words from any of the other famous Greek Versions, as may be observed by comparing them in the Margin f: Yet we cannot, perhaps, with any Certainty infer from hence, that he found it so in any Copies of the LXX. He might correct the vulgar Translation from the Original, and by comparing the other Versions with it. And yet I think it not improbable, that this learned and industrious Father, who was qualify'd to be the Author of that laborious Work, called Hexapla and Oxyapla, might have found it, as cited by him, in some antient and more correct MSS. But be this as it will, I shall demonstrate, that the Fathers did not understand this Verse in the Arian Sense by two Observations.

1. They did not take the Word ἔκλισε in its proper Sense for creating.

---

e Orig. Comment. in Mat. p. 470. Ed. Huet. 'O Θεὸς ἐκλίσατο μὲ ἀγέχων ἀδών ἀντίς ἐστι ἐν ἁγία ἀντί, πρὸ τοῦ τι παύσω, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνα ἐθεμελιώσε μὲ ἐν αέρι πρὸ τοῦ τιν γίνειν πείσειν.

f Aquila. Κύσσε ἐκτίσατο μὲ ἀγέχων κατεγορομάτων αὐτοῦ. Sym. ἀγέχων ἄδων ἀντίς πρὸ τῆς ἁγίας ἀντί, ἐθεμελιώσε μὲ ἐν αέρι πρὸ τοῦ τιν γίνειν πείσειν. They
They might take it as expressive of the mysterious Generation of the Son; which they were led to, not only by the Nature of the Subject, but by the Context itself; for as it would be a Contradiction to say, Wisdom was created before any thing was made; so the Word is explained by begetting, v. 25. before all the Hills, he begat me. And Origen, who was so much suspected of favouring the Notions afterwards embraced by the Arians, tho’ unjustly, does yet explain this Expression of Begetting of eternal Generation; and compares it to the necessary Emanation of the Light or Brightness of the Sun.

And left any should wonder, that this Expression of Creating, and others of the like Import, should seem tolerable, and capable of an Orthodox Meaning to the good Fathers, I would desire the Reader to observe,

1. That Generation in the common Acceptation is often expressed in Words much to the same Purpose. As τεκνοποιεῖν, creare, procreare, facere, &c. We make Children, faith Tertullian, even tho’ we beget them. The Instances are innumerable, and known even to School-boys; so that one would wonder what the Author of the Disquisitiones Modestae meant by producing

Comment. in Joh. p. 31. A. οτι το ιδιος μω ει σω, έγώ σώμεν γεγενήσα σε, λέγεται πρός αυτόν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ο ἂν ἐστι τὸ σώμασι, εἰκ. ην τῆς ἑσπέρας Θεοῦ, εγώ η γεννήσα στο σώμα, αλλ’ ο συμπαρεκκλησίας τῇ αγγελίῳ καὶ αιδων αυτοῦ ξων, ι. ετέρους ἵππους, χειροῦ, γέροντα ἐν αυτῷ σώμασι, ει η γεγενήσα το ιδιος αγγελίας αυτοῦ εὑρετισκομένος, ἐς οὖν τῇ γένεσι.

Confer eundem Hom. 9. in Jerem. p. 106.

Ibid.

1 Adv. Hermog. C. 32. — Ut credas abyssum quoque genitain, id est factam, quia & filios facimus, licet generemus.
this Sentence out of Laëntantius, in favour of Arianism, viz. Deus creatus sine opere Genitoris\(^k\); Words utterly uncapable of the false Meaning, he intended his inadvertent Reader should suppose, they carry'd in them; for he put them in another Character, and in his Reply to Dr. Waterland without blushing sets down these Words, Deus Creatus\(^1\), as an Instance of the Son's being called a Creature, with respect to his divine Nature. But I am persuaded, there is not an Arian in the World so stupid, as to refer this Expression, either to the Generation of the Logos, or to his being made God in their Sense; for they suppose both to be done by the Father; and so not sine opere Genitoris, without a Father. As the very mention of a Father carries a reference to some Birth; so 'tis impossible the Words should refer to any thing, but his being born of the Virgin, in respect of which he was \(\alpha\pi\alpha\tau\omega\), without Father.

2. The Fathers were accustomed to the Language of the Philosophers and others, who express'd the operation of necessary Causes by Words of the like Import. Some of the Philosophers held, that there were several Beings, among which some reckon'd the World itself, that necessarily, and eternally co-existed with God, and are therefore said to be \(\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\tau\alpha\), of whose Existence God is the Fountain: And yet he is minded their Cause, Author, Maker, &c. \(\alpha\nu\tau\iota\alpha\), \(\alpha\nu\tau\iota\alpha\), \(\omega\omicron\eta\omicron\tau\iota\zeta\). And is said \(\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\tau\alpha\), \(\varphi\aleph\beta\iota\gamma\epsilon\nu\), \(\tau\omega\epsilon\iota\iota\nu\), &c. to beget, produce, make them, &c.\(^m\) And, which is still more surprising, they

\(^k\) Disquis. Mod. p. 101.
\(^1\) P. 74.
\(^m\) Sallust. de Diis & mundo. C. 13. p. 266. —Δινάρμενον

\(\mu\omicron\nu\iota\nu\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha\) \(\pi\omega\iota\alpha\iota\nu\iota\ \iota\nu\eta\tau\iota\sigma\nu\phi\iota\iota\sigma\iota\) \(\pi\omega\iota\alpha\).
they fluck not to use the fame Words concerning the self-existent Being, laying that he was the Cause of his own Being, self produced, that he made himself, &c. Concerning this, the Reader may consult Plotinus n, and the Author of the Questions ad Gracos, among Justin Martyr's Works o. I should have inclined to put a favourable Construction upon this odd Speculation, which in its obvious Meaning is a downright Contradiction: I have query'd, whether they might not conceive of the Necessity of the Existence of God, as Prior in order of Nature, not of Duration, to the Being of God, exerting it self eternally in the actual Existence of God. And because every thing in God is God himself, they might consider this Necessity, as God himself acting upon himself, and by an eternal Act necessitating his own Existence p. But Candor it self can hardly frame an Excuse for them.—And, perhaps, this Speculation might origin—

Kat' άσιαν ικανόν λέγεται ποιήσεως, κ. τ. τ. 


p This, I think, is countenanc'd by Simplicius's Definition of self-existent Beings, viz. such as have the Cause or Ground of
originally arise from the Jewish Tradition of Generation in God deliver’d obfcurly, and misunderstood by the Philosophers. However that be, I mention this here only to shew, that the Harfness of such Expressions was much soften’d, and qualify’d to those Fathers that were accustomed to the Language of the Schools in their Day: And having an Author or Cause, and being produced, was not in some Sense apprehended to be inconsistent with the Idea of a necessary Being: And since they consider’d the Generation of the Logos as an eternal and necessary Emanation of the Son from the Father, ’tis a Wonder they did not often use these Terms to express it. If it was commonly said, that the self-existent God was ἐν 

*Comment. in Epif. p. 202.*

So that, perhaps, the Philosophers might mean no more than Dr. Clarke does in his Demonstration a priori, tho’ they express’d themselves more unsafely. Besides, ’tis possible, that the Terms, ἐν 

And certainly Lañantius did not take the Opinion of the Philosophers right, who grofsly adds to it, that God had a beginning. De falsa Relig. L. 1. p. 18. Ed. Cant.

* Work,
Work, and Plotinus said, that the All of Willing is from God, and as it were his Work, * "έξ ἐκ

σας αὐτῷ, καὶ διὸν ἠγοῦν αὐτῷ; we need not won-

der, that Tatian, a Philosopher also, should call the

Work, an eternal Emanation of the infinite Mind, or his being sent forth to create the

World, ἡ ἠγοῦν πρωτότοκον τοῦ πατρός, or τοῦ πατρός,

as it is commonly read. And yet, when

Origen ventur'd to use the Word ὑλή, in this

Cafe, he was so sensible of the Impropriety and

Harshness of it, that he qualifies it by putting in, If I may so speak a.

3. But, I suppose, the Fathers generally took

the Sense of the Word ἔσος, in Proverbs, from

the Hellenistical Greek, as signifying to appoint

or constitute. That it was commonly used in

this Sense, appears from several Passages in Sia-

racides, Hæte not laborious Work, faith he, and

Husbandry created, (i.e. appointed) by the most

high. Again: Give place to the Physician, for

God hath created (ordained) him. And the

Apostle Peter's αὐθων πόσις must be taken in

the same Sense for an human Ordinance or Con-

stitution. Eusebius of Cesarea, a Person well

vers'd in the Writings of the Ante-nicene Fa-

2 Conf. Damaf. de Fid. Orth. L. 1. C. viii. p. 133. η μὴ

WISENTILKEXO καὶ άδικος, Φόσος ἠγοῦν εὑσας, καὶ εἰ τῆς σαλίας

πρεσβύειας, &c.
4 Comment. in Johan. p. 19. Καὶ λεκέεν ὅτι κόσμος (L. κτίς),

ἐν ὑπάτες τοῖς, (L. ὑπάτος) ἡμοὺς ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, ἀείτητητε, &c.
5 pet. i. 7.
6 Ecclus. vii. 17. Μὴ μωρόντος ἐπίτοπος ἐσειαν, καὶ γεωρ-

γίων ὅσα ὑπέρ ἐκτισμένων.
7 Cap. 38. 12. Καὶ ἠτέρει δές τόποι, καὶ ὃ ἀυτῶν ἐκτος

κόρα. Conf. v. i.
8 1 Pet. ii. 13.
thers, and never suspected of Partiality to the Orthodox in this Point, has, I think, truly represented the Sense of the Antients in his Exposition of this Text in his Books against Marcellus 2. "Tho' he (the Son) says, he was created, faith he, speaking of this Text, he does not mean, as if he had come into Being out of a State of Non-existence, or as if he also had been made out of nothing, like the other Creatures, as some have erroneously imagin'd: But that having a Subsistence and Life, and being pre-existent to the Creation of the whole World, he was constituted by the Lord his own Father, the Governor of the Universe; creating being here put for constituting and appointing, &c. Athenagoras also plainly applies this Text to the Son's coming forth to create, to which he was pre-existent, and expressly guards against the Error of his being made, or having a beginning of Existence a.

2. 'Tis obvious to observe from this Account of the Text, that the Ante-nicene Writers did not refer the force of the Verb ἐκλήσε, to the Efection or Existence of Wisdom, or the Logos, but to what immediately follows, viz. what the Son was made or appointed to be by the Father. For they did not stop at, the Lord created me, or


a Legat. pp. 38, 41. Ed. Oxon. Πρῶτον γένηται εἰς τὸν πατέρα, ὡς ὡς γενόμενο, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ προελεθὼν συνάδει ὡς τὸ λέγον κἀκεῖ τὸ προφητικὸν ἀνεύμα, κυριως θεός, ὅτι ἐκτίσει με ἄξων σώμα ἐαυτοῦ. κ. λ. read
read the Verse, the Lord created me in the beginning, &c. But they carry'd on the Sense thus: The Lord created me the beginning, or the Prince and Governor, &c. There is as much Difference between these two Expressions, as between saying, The King created the Honourable Mr. Bridges; and this Expression; The King created Mr. Bridges a Peer of Great Britain, or Duke of Chandois. 'Αρχή was understood to be a Title of Honour belonging to the Son, as the Head and Governor of the whole Creation: Thus Philo stiles the first of the two supreme Powers, the Beginning, or Principality. It is plain therefore, that the Meaning of the Text, according to the Fathers, was, that the Son by the Father's Will went forth to create the World, or the Father made and constituted him, who was ever with him, the Creator and Lord of the Universe: So Eusebius expounds it, as we have seen. Thus Christ is said to be made unto us Wisdom, &c. 1 Cor. i. 30. And Hierocles says, that the good Man makes his Soul an Image of God, and frames his Mind to be a Temple for the Reception of the divine Light.
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