

assertion of our Lord, "I and My Father are One" (S. John x. 30). The Word never existed apart from the Father, and God was never destitute of His own Word. The Word, therefore, is God, and was always in the nature of the Father; and on this account He says, "I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me" (S. John xiv. 11).

3. That Christ is the Word of God is certain. Did He, then, give Himself being, and after subsisting was He joined to the Father? Or, did the Father create Him, and then call Him His Word? If the first is true, that is, if He gave Himself being and is God, then He is a Deity by Himself; not properly the Son of the Father, but the Son of Himself; and then there will be two self-existing Principles. Again, if His substance is foreign to the Father's, and made of nothing, He must be a creature. And it is impossible to avoid these two absurdities, except by confessing Him to be the Son of the Divine substance; and this confession forces us to distinguish between the Son which is of or from that substance, and that substance which He is of or from. And this is the distinction of the Divine Personalities. If you deny that there is more than one Person in the Godhead, and if those personal characters and affections which are attributed to the Son, do truly belong to the Person of the Father, then the same Person is His own cause and effect; He that is begotten is the same as He who begets. And this is the blasphemous doctrine of Sabellius. For if you will say that He gave Himself being, and yet He who gave the being is the Person to whom the giver gave it, then the same Person must be the origin or cause of this being, and yet not so. He must be so, because He gives it Himself, and He must not be so, because He is the very same Person with Himself. And if the Father and the Son are so, that is, One Person, considered only under two different characters, then the union between them is not substantial or essential, but merely speculative and ideal. But if this be unseemly and unfitting to say, then the Father and the Son are truly and distinctly two Persons, and, moreover, these two Persons are united in One essence, because the Son is not from without, but He is begotten of God. But if anyone shrinks from that expression "Offspring," and would rather have it said that the Word exists with God, let such who take exception to this and similar phrases remember, that these terms are constantly used in the Scriptures, and let them fear lest they fall into any heretical doctrine, and make God a being of double nature. For if this co-existence implies an essential Unity of the persons

co-existing, then it is exactly the same thing as consubstantiality. But if the meaning of it is only this, that both exist together from everlasting, but not in one essence or nature, then it supposes the two co-existing persons to have two distinct and separate essences, and neither of them the Father or Son of the other. And exactly the same thing will hold good with regard to the term "Power." And we may see this more clearly, if we consider it with reference to the Father. For as the Father can be but one Person, so He can have but one essence or nature, and consequently the Son must be of that one essence or nature. And, therefore, as there are not two Fathers, but one Father; so there are not two Eternal Principles, but one; and the Son is of and in that. Now, then, the Arians must be questioned from an opposite point of view. To insist upon that propriety of person which is implied in the name and relation of a Son is the way to confute the Sabellians; but the effectual method of dealing with the Arians is to explain what is the true and proper meaning of the word Father.

4. Let us then proceed. Either it is true that God is wise, and has His Word in His nature, or it is false. If you say it is false, you deny, in other words, that God is God. But if it is true, we are then to enquire what is the proper meaning of God's having His Wisdom and His Word in His nature? Does He possess the Word and the Wisdom from without, or from Himself. If from without, there must be some one who first gave it to Him, and before He obtained it His nature lacked His Wisdom and His Word. But if His Word was from Himself, then it must be false that His Word arose out of nothing, and that there was a time when He was not. For we must remember that this Word is the Son of God, the express Image of His Father's Person, which He could not be, if He had not existed eternally with the Father, because otherwise He could not have represented or expressed the Father in His attribute of being Eternal. But if they should reply that the Deity is indeed Wise and not without His Word, and this always was so, that is to say, that He has and ever had His essential Wisdom and Word in Himself; but still that this Wisdom and Word is not Christ, but that by which God created Christ; then our adversaries must allow, that the Word by which Christ was created is He who brought all things into being, that is to say, that He is that Word, as S. John declares, "by whom all things were made" (S. John i. 3), and to whom the Psalmist refers in the words, "In Wisdom hast Thou made them all" (Ps. civ. 24). And then Christ Himself will be

found guilty of untruth, when He says, "I am in the Father" (S. John xiv. 10), if there is another Word who is in the Father. And that assertion of S. John, "The Word was made flesh" (S. John i. 14), will, according to this belief, be false as well. For if that Word which was Incarnate was that Word in the Essence of the Father which made all things, and Christ is not that Essential Word; then Christ was not made flesh, and is but a nominal, not a real Word of God. And, if so, then these results are inevitable, first, that Christ is not properly and truly what He has expressly declared Himself to be; and secondly, that He is so far from being the Person that made all things, that all things were made by another Word, and Himself among the rest. But if they say that Wisdom is in the Father as a quality, or that the Father is His own Word or Wisdom, what ridiculous absurdities will follow, as we have already observed. If the first were true, the Father's essence must be a compounded one; and if the latter were true, then the Father would be Father to Himself, and the Son Son to Himself. Moreover, we must confute them and put them to silence on this ground, that the Word which is essential to God cannot have been created, and cannot have had a beginning of existence. That such a Word Christ is, His own words, "I am in the Father and the Father is in Me," abundantly testify. And that there is no other Word but Himself in God appears from His being the Only-begotten of the Father. The Son of God, the Word, the Wisdom, and the Power, are all one Person under different names; and this Son is the one and only Son of God. He is the proper Offspring of God, and these names are not so many parts or elements of which God is compounded. Of His own nature God begets the Word, and by the agency of that Word He creates and disposes and governs all things. This was that Word and Wisdom from whom all creatures derive their being, and "according to whose ordinance they continue to this day" (*cf.* Ps. cxviii. 91). And as this Word is that Son "without whom was not anything made that was made," so is it certain that if God did not beget this Son, He neither makes nor ever did make anything. And so it is plain that our reckless adversaries must allow that we have overwhelmed them with convincing proofs to their objections, or else they must be utterly confounded with the frightful consequences of their error.

5. In Deuteronomy we find these words, "But ye that did cleave unto the Lord your God are alive every one of you this day" (Deut. iv. 4). This passage compared with our Lord's

assertions, "I and the Father are One," and "I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me," shows us the difference there is between the Son of God and His creatures, and proves His existence from eternity. The Word is in the Father, but the creatures only cleave unto the Lord; they subsist and increase by cleaving to Him, that is, depending entirely upon His Power. Their nature and His are widely separated, and entirely dissimilar. They may, indeed, be united to God in the conformity of their wills to His; but the Word is united to Him in essence. He, who is the very Son of His Father's nature, derives His very nature and substance from His Father, whereas adopted children come from another stock, and are not born or begotten, but are simply attached to the family. And so the Prophet says, "What nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them?" (Deut. iv. 7). And elsewhere we read this question, "Am I a God at hand?" (Jer. xxiii. 23). His creatures are in their nature very remote from and inferior to His; and, therefore, to them He only descends or approaches. But He does not come to His Son, nor His Son to Him, for the Son co-exists with the Father. And, therefore, Moses says afterwards in the same Book of Deuteronomy, "Ye shall obey His voice, and cleave unto Him" (Deut. xiii. 4). Now that which cleaves to a thing is without the substance of that which it cleaves to.

6. And in answer to that impious conclusion which the Arians pretend to draw from those expressions in Scripture where we read of our Saviour having "all power given unto Him" (S. Matt. xxviii. 18), of His being "highly exalted" (Philip. ii. 9), and of His "sitting at the right hand of God" (Col. iii. 1); for they infer from these passages that our Lord is just such another dependent and needy creature as we are ourselves; we shall here confute them from a consideration of the nature, extent, and end of His office as Mediator. The Divine assumed our human nature in order that our Lord, being both the Word and Son of God, might interpose between God and man for the glory of the former and the benefit of the latter; that from God, He might dispense to us His blessings, and that from man, He might represent our needs and recommend our interests to God. When, therefore, He is said to be hungry, and to weep, and to feel weariness, and when He cries out that God has forsaken Him, these are all our human affections. He receives these from us and offers them to the Father, and He intercedes for us that our human woes and weaknesses may be remedied and redressed. And when it is said, "All power is given unto Me,"

and that He "received," and that "God hath highly exalted Him," these are our privileges and gifts which are given to us from God through His intercession. For as the Word never did nor could want anything, so man always did and could not but want; and man was not able, by his own strength, to procure those things which he needed. The things which are necessary for us are conferred upon us in and by the Person of the Son. They are said to be given to Him, because He takes or receives them to give them to us. For this was the very end and purpose of His Incarnation, that our human nature might in His Person obtain and receive whatever it could not otherwise have obtained, and that we might be partakers both of the same nature and of the same blessings with Him. A mere man could never have merited, and God, not made man, could never have wanted any of these graces and gifts. It was necessary, therefore, that God and man should be personally united, in order that human nature might be invested with power and exalted to glory. The Divine exalted the human nature, which it had taken into itself; and the human nature, being assumed into the Divine, received from that its glory and power. Our nature neither had, nor could have, any other title to these blessings, but by virtue and in consequence of its personal union with God. And as "the Word was made flesh" (S. John i. 14), so also man received the gifts which came through the Word. For all that man has received, the Word is said to have received; that we might thereby understand, that man himself being unworthy to receive, as far as his own nature is concerned, yet has received because of the Word thus uniting Himself to man. Wherefore, whenever we find the Scripture speaking of our Lord as receiving, needing, or the like, we must consider that it is not given to the Word in His own nature, or because He needs anything, but it is given to our human nature through Him. When one person intercedes for another, only the person interceded for is supposed to want a favour bestowed upon him, and no reference is implied to the intercessor himself.

7. As He, who had no infirmities of His own, transferred ours to Himself; and as He, who was incapable of hunger, yet felt the pangs of hunger, that He might make our case and condition His, and might offer up our sufferings to the Father that they might be done away; so He receives of the Father those advantages and blessings which His intercession procures for us, instead of our weaknesses and infirmities, in order that man, being united to Him, may be able to partake of them. And this is the

meaning of our Lord's words, "All things whatsoever Thou hast given Me I have given them," and again, "I pray for them" (S. John xvii. 7-9). For He prayed for us, having taken on Him our nature and condition, and then He gave to us those things which He received in answer to His prayers. It was entirely for the sake of the Word that the Father was so merciful and gracious to our human nature, as to exalt and glorify it when it was assumed by the Word, as to invest it with all power, and the like. And, therefore, those privileges are said to be given to the Word, because, indeed, the Father does immediately bestow them upon Him, and from Him they descend to us. He humbled Himself for our sakes, and we are exalted for His sake. And He may very fairly and properly be said to be exalted for our sakes, by the means of whose humiliation our nature is exalted and glorified in Him. And when we read that God "gave to Him," we must understand that God gave to us for His sake; and when we are told that God "highly exalted Him," we are to understand that God exalted our nature and ourselves in Him. And so the Word Himself, when we are exalted, and receive, and are succoured, just if He Himself were exalted, and received, and were succoured, gives thanks unto the Father, and He refers what is ours to Himself, and says, "All things whatsoever Thou hast given Me, I have given them" (S. John xvii. 7, 8).

8. Those of the Arians who are specially called Eusebians deny that the Son had a beginning of kingly power, although they affirm that His nature and existence had a beginning. But this is ridiculous, for it is self-evident that He could not reign from everlasting, if He did not exist from everlasting. This is confessing and denying the same thing at the same time, and shows the men to be both foolish and blind. Again, those amongst the Arians, in whose opinion the Son of God has nothing of essence or substance, but is only a name or appellation, pretend to be angry with others of their party for asserting the doctrine that there was a time when the Son of God was not. And this is ridiculous also; for they who deny that the Son of God has or ever had any being at all, are angry with those who at least grant that He had a beginning in time. Thus, in quarrelling with their brethren, they confute and contradict themselves. Again, the Eusebians are divided amongst themselves into those who admit of the name or title of the Son, but deny the Son to be the Word of God, or anything but a title arbitrarily attached to Him by the Father. And then there are others who grant Him the name and title of the Word of God, but deny

Him to be the Son, or anything but a mere title assigned by the Father to the Son. And both thus equally find themselves striving to no purpose in darkness and obscurity.

9. Our Blessed Lord says, "I and My Father are One" (S. John x. 30). That two are one, you will say, means either that one has two names, or that one is divided into two. Now, if one is divided into two, that which is divided must undoubtedly be a body, and neither of the two perfect, for each is a part and not a whole. But if one thing has two names to it, this is the expedient of Sabellius, which has been long since condemned. He would have it that the Father and the Son are one Person. And this made it impossible that either of them should be a person at all, unless the Father could be His own Son, and the Son His own Father. But if one thing in one respect, one may be two in another; then the nature and essence of the Deity may be one, and yet the Persons in that nature more, the Son a Person consubstantial with the Father, and the Word begotten of and in the Father. Thus God is One, the Father is One, the Son or Word is One, and yet the Father and the Son are two in that One. Had they been two, He would not have said, "I and the Father *are* One," but "*I am* the Father," or "I and the Father *am*;" whereas the Persons here are distinguished by the known and common significations of the terms. The word "I" declares the Person of the Son, and the word "Father," as evidently expresses Him who begat the Son, and the word "One" the one Godhead and His consubstantiality. And it must be observed that the heathen entirely mistake us, when they charge us with the absurdity of making two things one and the same thing, of making God and His Son or Wisdom, the Father and the Word, one and the same Person. Nothing, indeed, can be more repugnant to reason and nature than that the same person should be His own Father and His own Son. But this is a doctrine which the Christian religion has nothing to do with. We acknowledge a distinction of persons, the Father and the Son, the Wise and His Wisdom, God and His Word, and we are most careful to explain that the nature of God in all things is indivisible and inseparable and indissoluble.

10. But sometimes when people hear that we maintain that the Father and the Son are two distinct Persons, they misrepresent us by saying that we assert that there are two Gods. This is what we have often been reproached with, and so we have been held up to scorn as defenders of polytheism. But to all those who raise this objection, we make this reply, If to confess

that there are two Persons, the Father and the Son, is to assert in other words that there are two Gods, and therefore the Son must no longer be considered to be a Divine Person, then Sabellius was in the right when he asserted the doctrine of one Person. For if to speak of two Persons is heathenish; on the other hand, to say that there is but one is Sabellianism. But this is no part of our belief, and God forbid that it should be! We assert the Unity of the Godhead, as expressly as the diversity of the Persons. We believe the Father and the Son to be two, perfectly distinct from one another in their relative and personal characters; but still we believe these two to be but One God, One Infinite Essence or Nature, and that the Son or Word begotten of the Father is indissoluble and indivisible and inseparable from Him. And that illustration which we have made use of before explains this very well in the way of example, for fire and the brightness which comes from it are truly distinct; they are two in being and in appearance, and yet they are both one as to substance and general properties; and brightness cannot exist without fire.

II. The men that cast these objections against us ought to know that they are falling into the same folly as the Arians. There is only the difference of a word between them, which is that of "Emission," instead of their original word "Creation." They both suppose that the Son had a beginning of existence, and that God gave it to Him in order that we might be created, and consequently at some convenient time before it. The Arians, then, attribute a much higher excellence to us, God's creatures, than to His Only-begotten Son. Both must own that if God produced Him that He might produce us, then He was made for us, and not we for Him. And this second party, who are even more irreligious than the Arians themselves, seem to think that God is more imperfect and more feeble than we are. For very often we are able by thought and meditation, even when we are silent, to execute our purposes and projects, and to shape and frame our productions and compositions. But these men represent the Deity as incapable of acting in any other manner, except by the emission of His Word and Voice. When He is silent, they say, nothing is done or made; it is only when He speaks that He begins to create. Moreover, we will proceed to ask them whether they think the Word of God was something so real and perfect in God, before His emission, as to be able to make or create? If He was not so before, and our creation was the end of His emission, then are we the cause of His per-

fection, for had it not been for God's purpose of creating us, He had not been qualified to create at all. But if He was perfect in God, so as to be able to make, then His generation is altogether superfluous; since He, even when He was in the Father, could frame the world. The consequence of which reasoning will be, either that He was not begotten at all, or that He was not begotten on our account, and that He might make us; but that He was everlastingly begotten of the nature and substance of the Father. For His generation proves, not that we were created, but that He is from God; for He was in God before that, even from everlasting.

12. And all this offers as great indignity to the Father as to the Son. For if, when silent, He was incapable of creating, then it follows that by begetting His Son, He has acquired a new power He did not possess before, that is, by emitting His Word or Speech. Now, how did He acquire this capability? For what purpose did He receive it? If, when He had the Word within Him, He could create; then the generation of the Word was wholly unnecessary, because He might have created the world as well without it. Again, if the Word was in God before He was begotten, then He was not properly begotten of God, but subsisted out of Him and separate from His nature. But how does this agree with His assertion, "I am in the Father and the Father is in Me"? (S. John xiv. 10). If He is now in the Father, certainly He was always so. He is not one thing at one time, and another thing at another; and so it is absurd to say that He was begotten on purpose for creating us, and then that He reverts into the Person of the Father afterwards, that He may be as He was before. He never was what He is not now, and what He is now, He always was. The properties of His essence, and the manner of His existence were always the same; or else His Nature must be strangely defective and variable. If at first He was one thing, and then another, and then again the thing which He was at first, then He is not now what once He was, and what again He will be. Let me explain this further. If He formerly was, and will hereafter be again, in God, it plainly follows that the Word is not now in God. And how shall we account for that positive and express declaration of our Lord, "I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me"? If this be true, then He is now the same that He always was; and if He is now the same that He always was, it cannot be true that once He was unbegotten, and that afterwards He was begotten; nor that the Deity was first in a state of silence and inactivity, and afterwards uttered

or sent forth His Voice or Word. On the contrary, the Father and the Son and Word always co-existed, the latter in Unity of nature and substance with the former, not a mere Word in name alone, or a Son by appointment or decree, and not begotten simply on purpose to create us, for we were created for His honour and glory. For, if He were begotten for us, and in His begetting we were created, and in His generation all creatures were brought into being, and then He returned into the same state in which He was before, it cannot be denied but that He would have been first begotten, and then again unbegotten. He would be begotten by His emission, and unbegotten by His recession; and after that God's state of silence would re-commence, and consequently that former state of inactivity, and then there would have been an end of the world. For if the emission of the Word was the cause of the being of all creatures, His retreat and silence must put a stop to their existence. For what purpose, then, were they created, if they were to be thus soon annihilated? Why did God send forth His Word, if He were to recall it so soon? Why did He speak once, and then utter His Voice no more? Why did He beget a Son, who was to continue with Him so short a time? Again, we do not know, nor can we imagine, what the future will bring forth. Either God will ever be silent, or He will again beget and create another universe, for it is not to be supposed that He will revive the old one, else that which was already made would have remained. And then in due course He will bring that also to a close, and will create another world, and so on without end.

13. It is very likely that this wild theory is borrowed from the Stoics. It is one of their peculiar fancies that there is an eternal inactivity in the essence of God, and that His creating consists in the expansion of His nature, and then He enjoys a continuous rest. The substance expanded and the substance contracted is the same; only the Deity, according to this notion, is in a different state at one time from what it is at another, and undergoes various modifications and alterations. If, therefore, the Unity of the Divine nature thus expanded makes the Trinity; if the Person of the Father is the Unity, and the Trinity is the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in the expansion of that Unity; first, it is certain that the Divine essence sustains a change of condition, and is shaped or changed into another form; for it was expanded, whereas before it was contracted. Next, if the Unity is thus expanded into a Trinity, and the Trinity consists of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the consequence will be that the Father

becomes the Son and the Holy Spirit, as Sabellius taught. Unless, indeed, he supposed that the Unity which he speaks of is something besides the Father; and then he ought not to speak of expansion, since the Unity would produce three Persons out of itself, and would turn itself into what it was not before, even into a Trinity of Persons. Its expansion of itself neither takes from, nor adds to, its substance or essence; it must itself be that which was originally expanded. A Trinity, when it is expanded, is no longer a Unity, and when there is a Unity, there is not yet a Trinity. While the Father was not expanded, He was not the Son and the Holy Ghost; and after He was expanded and turned into these, He was no longer the Father. Now these are such hateful conceptions of God, that no one can entertain who has any worthy notions whatever of His glorious character. For what is this but circumscribing that Blessed Being within narrow and confined limits, and making no more of Him than passive matter? Expansion implies an impression or force upon the thing expanded, and that which is distended keeps its substance and only changes the situation of its parts. It may be larger at one time than at another, and change its outward appearance and form, but the matter or substance of it neither increases nor decreases.

14. And this S. Paul knew very well, for he thus writes to the Corinthians, "Ye are not straitened in us, be ye also enlarged" (2 Cor. vi. 12, 13). S. Paul exhorts his readers to change from straitness to enlargement and expansion. Now, in either of these states, the Corinthians were, or would have been, the same men. And so if the Trinity only consisted of the expansion of the Father, then the Trinity would be only the Father. And the Apostle says the same thing in the verse before, "Our heart is enlarged" (2 Cor. vi. 11); and Noah says, "God shall enlarge Japheth" (Gen. ix. 27). Now, the Apostle's heart, and no other person's, in the former verse is to be enlarged, and Japheth, and no other person, in the latter verse is to be enlarged likewise. Either, therefore, the object of the expansion of the Unity was not itself, but some thing or things out of itself; or if the Unity expanded itself, then it was the same before its expansion as after it; that is to say, it was the Son and Holy Ghost before, as well as after, the Father's expansion. And I should like to be informed, when speaking about these matters, what authority is there for supposing that this principle of expansion exists in the Deity, and what is the motive or cause of it all? For certainly we cannot suppose that God would effect such a change in the

Divine nature for no end or purpose at all. If, then, it was in order that the Word and Spirit should be with Him, it is unnecessary to speak first of the Unity, and then to say it was expanded; for the Word and Spirit did not come into being afterwards, but they always existed, or else, as the Arians says, God was at some time without His Word. For so it was, if this doctrine of the expansion be true, until such time as the Unity expanded itself. Or, was the purpose of this expansion the assumption of our human nature? Did the Incarnation bring forth the Trinity? If so, then there was no Trinity before the Incarnation. Besides, this view would make the Father to be Incarnate; for the Father was that Unity, which expanded itself for the assumption of our nature; and then the Son will be out of the Trinity, and the Trinity will consist of the Father, the flesh, and the Holy Ghost. And thus, again, the Trinity will be only three names or titles. Or, was this expansion necessary for the creation of the world? But this is a most absurd thing to imagine. For the Unity in its original state was able very easily to create and make all things, and it is gross blasphemy to fancy that the Deity could not work or create without this expansion. And another extravagance also would result here. If this expansion was necessary for the sake of the creation; and if, while there was only a Unity, there was not a single creature in existence; and, if this expansion was to be followed, after the creatures were once made, by a return to the state of Unity, then when that state began to be, the creation, too, will come to nought. For if this expansion was necessary, in order that creation should take place, then it follows, that when the expansion ceased, the creation will cease also.

15. These and such like are the absurdities which attend this doctrine of the expansion. And there is another great error which those who hold this doctrine fall into as well as this, namely, that the Word and the Son are two distinct beings, that the Word was first in existence, and the Son afterwards. And this is such a wicked invention that we ought not to let it pass unnoticed. Now, the asserters of this doctrine are divided among themselves in the explanation of it. Some of them say that the Son was the human nature, which our Saviour assumed; and others say that the Word and the human nature were made the Son upon their being united. Others, again, hold that the Word Himself then became the Son when He was made man; for from being the Word, they say, He became the Son, and that He was not the Son before this, but merely the Word. Now,

for both these doctrines our adversaries are indebted to the Stoics, both for the doctrine of the Son's distinction from the Word, as well as for that of the expansion. To confess the being of the Word, and to distinguish Him as a Person by that very title, and yet to deny that the Word is the Son is very ridiculous indeed. For if the Word were not from God, then they might reasonably deny Him to be the Son; but if He is from God, then certainly it is but right to confess Him to be the Son of the Divine Nature. For what is a son, but a substance or person, resulting out of the nature and substance of his father? Now, since God is properly and truly a Father, whom can we suppose to be the Son of this Father, but the Word, that is confessedly of the Divine substance? A father is said and known to be a father with regard to that person who bears the name of his son; and a son is said and known to be a son with regard to that person who is called his father. If, therefore, God is not the Father of Christ, then the Word is not the Son of God; but if He is His Father, then there can be no doubt but that the Word is His Son. There is, however, another Arian doctrine which comes in here. Some of these wicked men say that the Father was God first, and that He only became the Father afterwards. But then this makes the Divine nature corporeal, and it is, besides, a terrible sin to say that God is liable to change and alteration. But if they reply to this, "How is it, then, that God could be first God, and afterwards a Creator?" Then I would answer them thus, "Creation implies no change at all in the nature of the Creator, and any change that took place had only regard to the things which were afterwards made."

16. If, therefore, the Son were a creature, then, indeed, His Father would be only such in a temporary or improper sense. But if the Son is not a creature, then the Father is the Father, and the Son is the Son, from everlasting. And if the Son is from everlasting, then certainly He must be the Word. And if anyone has the presumption to deny this, then he will be obliged to affirm, either that the Son is the Father Himself, or that the Son is a more excellent being than the Word. Now, we read that the Son is "in the bosom of the Father" (S. John i. 18). Either, therefore, the Father is not before the Son, for nothing can be before Him who is in the Father, or if the Word is distinct from the Son, then who can He be but the Father Himself, in whose bosom the Son is? Or, if the Word is not the Father, but the Word in contradistinction to the Father, then the Word must be external to the Father, since it is the Son "who is in the

bosom of the Father." For we nowhere find that both the Word and the Son are in the bosom of the Father, and therefore they must be one and the same Person, even the Only-begotten Son of God. Again, if the Word is not the Son, we are sure, from another reason, that the Son is a more excellent being than the Word. For He tells us Himself that "no man knoweth the Father save the Son" (S. Matt. xi. 27), and consequently the Word does not know the Father, unless He is the Son. Either, then, the Word does not know the Father, or if He knows Him, then our Lord's words are not true that no one knows Him but the Son. And the same arguments are equally applicable to the texts, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father" (S. John xiv. 9), and "I and My Father are One" (S. John x. 30). The Person here speaking of Himself was not the Word as opposed to the Son, but the Son. And though our adversaries deny this, the context very plainly proves it. For, according to S. John, when the Lord said, "I and My Father are one," "Then the Jews took up stones again to stone Him." "Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shown you from my Father, for which of those works do ye stone Me? The Jews answered Him, saying, For a good work we stone Thee not, but for blasphemy, and because that Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If He called them gods unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken, say ye of Him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God? If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not. But if I do, though ye believe not Me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in Me, and I in Him" (S. John x. 30-38). Our Saviour's words, which so enraged the Jews, were, "I and My Father are One," although He did not actually say either "I am God," or "I am the Son of God."

17. The Jews, then, when they heard the word "One," thought, as Sabellius did afterwards, that He said He was the Father Himself. But our Saviour shows them what a mistake they had made by this argument, "Although I said God, you should have remembered what is written in the Old Testament, I said, ye are gods." And then to explain the words, "I and the Father are One," He shows them what is the unity that exists between the Son and the Father in those words in which He gives them to understand that He is the Son of God. For although He does not expressly declare this to them, yet by comparing His

statements it is very clear that this is their sense and meaning. For as He said at first that He was one with the Father, so a little after we find how He was thus one with Him, even as being His Son. For nothing can be co-essential with the Father, which is not of the same substance with the Father, and who is that who partakes by generation of the substance of the Father, but His Only-begotten Son? And it is on this account that He adds, "That ye may know that I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me." He does not say, in explaining the Divine Unity, that He is in that Person which is numerically in Himself; but that He is in that nature, which is common to the Father and the Son, and in which they are substantially, eternally, and inseparably united. And thus He confutes and condemns the opinion of Sabellius, who imagines that Christ was the Father, by saying, "I am the Son of God." And He also convicts Arius when He says, "I and the Father are One." If, then, the Son and Word are distinct and separate Persons, then the Son, and not the Word, is One with the Father; and "He that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father," but not He that hath seen the Word. And from this it follows, either that the Son is greater than the Word, or that the Word is co-equal with the Son. For what can express greater excellency or a higher state of perfection than those assertions, "I and the Father are One;" "I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me;" and "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father"? Now all these assertions and declarations are uttered by the Son. And in the same way we can understand the following passages of Scripture, "He that seeth Me seeth Him that sent Me" (S. John xii. 45); "He that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me" (S. Matt. x. 40); "I am come a Light into the world, that whosoever believeth on Me should not abide in darkness. And if any man hear My words and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth Me and receiveth not My words hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day" (S. John xii. 46-48), "because I go unto My Father" (S. John xiv. 12). The word that I have spoken, our Lord says, shall judge him who has not observed My commandments; "For if," He says, "I had not come and spoken unto them they had not had sin, but now have they no cloke for their sin" (S. John xv. 22). He here tells us that those who have heard His words and make a right use of them, shall not fail, by that observance, to obtain eternal salvation.

18. Perhaps these impious men will have so little shame as to say that it is the Word, and not the Son, who uttered these sayings. But from what preceded these passages it plainly appears that the speaker is the Son. For He who here says, "I came not to judge the world, but to save the world," is shown to be none other but the Only-begotten Son of God, because the same S. John says of Him before, "For God so loved the world that He gave His Only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. He that believeth on Him is not condemned, but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the Name of the Only-begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness better than light, because their deeds were evil" (S. John iii. 16-19). If He who says, "I came not to judge the world, but to save the world," is the same who says, "He that seeth Me seeth Him that sent Me" (S. John xii. 45); and if He who came to save the world, and not to judge it, is expressly declared to be the Only-begotten Son of God, it is plain that it is the same Son who says, "He that seeth Me, seeth Him that sent Me." For He who said, "He that believeth on Me," and "If anyone hear my words, I judge him not," is the Son Himself, of whom Scripture says, "He that believeth on Him is not condemned already, because He hath not believed in the Name of the Only-begotten Son of God" (S. John iii. 18, 19). And again we read, "And this is the condemnation, that Light is come into the world" (S. John iii. 19); and men did not believe this Light, that is, in the Son of God; for He is "the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (S. John i. 9). As long as our Lord was upon earth in that human nature which He had assumed He was a Light in the world. And so He said to all men, "While ye have Light, believe in the Light, that ye may be the children of Light" (S. John xii. 36). And He says in another place, "I am come a Light into the world" (S. John xii. 46).

19. All this, then, abundantly proves that the Son and the Word are one and the same Person. But if the Son is the Light which has come into the world, it cannot be disputed that this world was made by the Son. For in the beginning of the Gospel, the Evangelist, speaking of S. John the Baptist says, "He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light" (S. John i. 8). For, as we observed before, Christ Himself

was "the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." For if "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him" (S. John i. 10), then of necessity He must be the Word of God, concerning whom also the Evangelist testifies that "all things were made by Him" (S. John i. 3). For either our adversaries will be obliged to speak of two worlds, one created by the Son, and the other by the Word, or, if the world was all of it created by one person called sometimes the Word and sometimes the Son, then the Son and the Word are certainly one and the same Person. Therefore, if the Word is that Son which created the universe, it will not be contradictory, but just the same for the Evangelist to say, for instance, "In the beginning was the Word," or "In the beginning was the Son." And if these two phrases are the same, then the one does not exclude the propriety and truth of the other, as our adversaries would tell us they do. And if they will perversely deny that what is here affirmed of the Word is to be understood of the Son, because the Word, and not the Son, was the subject of that first assertion, "In the beginning was the Word;" then by analogy of reason they must affirm that what is declared of the Son cannot have reference to the Word, and ought not to be ascribed to Him. But, as we have already demonstrated, those words, "I and the Father are One," refer to the Son, and also the words, "Which is in the bosom of the Father," and "He that seeth Me seeth Him that sent Me," are spoken of the Son; and the creation of all things is ascribed as expressly to the Son as to the Word; all this incontestably proves that the Son was in being before the world, for of necessity the Creator must exist before the things He brings into being. And, again, what is said to S. Philip must have reference to the Son, and not to the Word, as our adversaries would tell us. For, as the Evangelist narrates, "Jesus saith unto him, have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou, then, show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? The words that I speak unto you I speak not of Myself; but the Father that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works. Believe Me that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me, or else believe Me for the very work's sake. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto My Father. And whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My Name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in

the Son" (S. John xiv. 9-13). Therefore, if the Father be glorified in the Son, the Son must be He who said, "I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me," and He who said, "He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father;" for the Person who spoke to S. Philip declares Himself to be the Son in those very words, "That the Father may be glorified in the Son."

20. But if our adversaries bring forward that other opinion that the human nature of Christ, and not the Word, is the Only-begotten Son of God, then He that is in the Father, and in whom the Father is, would be only a mere man. He that declares Himself to be One with the Father, who lives in the bosom of the Father, and who is the True Light, even this Person, according to this theory would be simply a man. And these wicked men will be compelled to say that it was a man, like one of themselves, who created the world, and that it was but a man, who came not to judge the world but to save it; and that this man, too, was in being before Abraham was born. But how ridiculous it is to suppose that this could be true of a descendant of Abraham, born two-and-forty generations after him? How could the creation be the work of a man that was not in being, until He was conceived of the Virgin Mary? The same Evangelist had said before that "He was in the world," that is to say, that He existed before His Incarnation, for that is the meaning of these words. Again, how could the Son, if He were not the Word, but only a man, redeem or save the world, Himself being a part of it? And if this does not put these men to shame, let them tell us where the Word is, whether it is not He, but the Man, that is in the Father? How can the Word be one with the Father, if not the Father and the Word, but the Father and the Man are one? If the Man is the Only-begotten, then what becomes of the Word? They must either say that He is second and inferior; or if He is above the Only-begotten, that He is the Father Himself. For as the Father is One, so the Only-begotten of the Father is One. Again, if the Word is not the Son, what has the Word more than the Man? The Scripture informs us that the Son and the Word made the world. Creation is equally ascribed to Him under both names. But, then, as to seeing the Father and saving the world, these two things are attributed in Scripture, not to the Word, but to the Only-begotten Son. For our Saviour Himself says, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father" (S. John xiv. 9). It is not said that the Word, but that the "Only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father," knows and sees the Father.

21. If the Son is one Person and the Word another, as these men would have us believe, let me ask what does the Word do more for our salvation than the Son? We are commanded to believe in the Son, and not in the Word, for S. John says, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and He that believeth not the Son shall not see life" (S. John iii. 36). And Holy Baptism, in which is the very foundation of our Christianity, is not administered in the Name of the Word, but in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. If, therefore, the Word is not the Son, but a Person distinct from the Son, then the Word has no connection whatever with Baptism. And if, as they hold, the Word is with the Father, how is it that He is not joined with Him in the administration of Baptism? But perhaps they will tell us that the Word is comprehended under the Name of the Father? Then why should not the Holy Ghost be so too? Or does the Holy Ghost exist out of, and separate from, the Father? Moreover, if the Word is not the Son, but the Manhood, then the Man should be named after the Father, and the Spirit after the Man; and thus the Unity will no longer be expanded into Three Persons, but into Four—the Father, the Word, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. But being vanquished on this point, they have recourse to another argument, and they say now that the Man alone is no longer the Son, but the Word and Man united make up the Son; for both joined together are named Son, they tell us. Which, then, was the cause of the other? Did the Word make the Man the Son? Or, did the Man make the Word the Son? To speak more clearly, Did the Word become the Son in consequence of the Man being united to Him? Or, did the Man become the Son in consequence of the Word being united to Him? Or, did neither of them give the other this new character, but does it wholly consist in the abstract in their union? If they answer, that the Word became the Son in consequence of the Man being united to Him, then they must return to their old assertion that the Man is really the Son, and then all those ridiculous absurdities follow which we have seen must happen from saying such a thing as this. Or, if they say the Man became the Son in consequence of the Word being united to Him, then they must confess that the Word was the Son before the Incarnation. For, how could He, who is Himself not a Son, make others the Sons of God, and especially when the Father was existing at the same time? If He makes Sons for Himself, then He must Himself be a Father; but if He makes Sons for the Father, then He Himself must be the Son of the

Father, or rather that particular Son, for whose sake the rest are made Sons.

22. For if our Lord is not the proper Son of God, and if we are truly sons, it follows that God is our Father, and not His. Why, then, does He assert His Sonship in such plain and emphatic terms, saying, "My Father" (S. John v. 17), and "I came forth from the Father" (S. John xvi. 28). If God is the common Father of us all, He is not His Father only, nor did He only come forth from the Father. He tells us, it is true, that God is sometimes called our Father, because He has Himself become a partaker of our human nature. For on this account the Word was Incarnate, that, since the Word is God's Son, therefore, because of the Son dwelling in our nature, we might become God's adopted sons. And so the Apostle says, "God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Gal. iv. 6). Therefore the Son, who is in our nature, gives us the privilege of calling His Father our Father as well; and whosoever has not the Son in his heart cannot call upon God as His Father. Now, it is plain that long before our Lord's Incarnation, there were those that were called the sons of God. And this alone proves the Word was the Son before that time; for Scripture says, "I have nourished and brought up children" (Isa. i. 2); and in Noah's time we read, "The sons of God saw the daughters of men" (Gen. vi. 2); and in Moses' song we find the words, "Is not He thy Father?" (Deut. xxxii. 6). There must, therefore, have been at that time that proper and true Son of God, for whose sake these persons were also called God's sons. But if these men will insist upon it, that neither the Word nor the Man is the Son, but the conjunction and union of both, then the cause of Sonship must lie in something else that united and joined them; and this cause must be prior to the union; and consequently the Sonship must be so. When this argument is put to silence, then these men take refuge in another pretext, saying that neither the Man is the Son, nor the conjunction of the Man and the Word, but that the Word, which in the beginning was only such, came to be called the Son when it had assumed our human nature. Until then, they say, this was not the Son, but only the Word; and therefore as the Word was in time made flesh, which it was not before, so it was also in time made the Son, which it had not been before. Such are the foolish notions in which our adversaries indulge, but they can be refuted without much trouble.

23. If it was the Incarnation that caused the Word to become

the Son, then His Sonship is the result of His connection with our nature; and, therefore, if the Man or the Union of the Word with the Man be said to be the cause of the Word's Sonship then the same absurdities we have noticed before will take place. And, moreover, if the Word existed first and the Son afterwards, then it will appear that He knew the Father afterwards, not before, for He does not know Him as being the Word, but as being the Son; for "no one knoweth the Father, save the Son" (S. Matt. xi. 27). And this too will follow, that He was afterwards "in the bosom of the Father" (S. John i. 18), and afterwards He and the Father became one, and it is to some time afterwards that those words have reference, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father" (S. John xiv. 9). For all these things are said of the Son. The consequence of all this will be, as they cannot but confess, that the Word was nothing but a name. For it is not the Word but the Son that is said to be in us with the Father; and it is not the Word, but the Son in whom the Father was and is to be seen. Nor, if this were so, could the Father, who makes Himself known through the Son, be known to anyone until the Incarnation, for so it is written, "And he, to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him" (S. Matt. xi. 27), for the Word, since He was not yet the Son, did not yet know the Father. How then does it come to pass that He was seen by Moses and the Fathers? for He tells us that He was so seen in the following words, "Did I plainly appear unto the house of thy father?" (1 Sam. ii. 27). But if God was thus revealed, then there must have been a Son to reveal Him; even as our Lord plainly tells us that God appears, or reveals Himself to no one but by the Son. It is then very wicked and foolish thus to divide the Word from the Son, and the Son from the Word. What pretext can our adversaries have for putting forth such a shocking opinion? They answer, Because they find that no mention is made in the Old Testament of the Son, but only the Word; and so they conclude that the Son came later than the Word, because He is only spoken of in the New Testament, and not in the Old. This is what they have the wickedness to say, but what is this separating between the Testaments, and saying that one does not agree with the other, but the device of Manichees and Jews, the former of whom oppose the Old Testament, and the latter the New? Moreover, if, as they say, what is contained in the Old Testament is of more ancient date, and what in the New of later, and times depend upon the date of the writing, then it follows that the phrases, "I and the Father are one," and

“Only-begotten,” and “He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father,” are of later date, because these testimonies are not to be met with in the Old Testament but in the New.

24. But as a matter of fact the statement itself is not true, for the Son is frequently mentioned in the Books of the Old Testament. For instance, in the second Psalm we read, “Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee” (Ps. ii. 7); and in the ninth Psalm the title, “Unto the end, concerning the hidden things of the Son, a Psalm of David” (Sept.); and in the forty-fourth Psalm the title, “Unto the end, concerning those that shall be changed, to the Sons of Core, for understanding a song about the Well-beloved.” And in like manner the Prophet Isaiah says, “Now will I sing to My Well-beloved a song of My Beloved touching His vineyard. My Well-beloved hath a vineyard” (Isa. v. 1). Who is this Well-beloved but the Only-begotten Son; even He of whom God declares that begat Him “from the womb of the morning,” and “before the morning star” (Ps. cx. 3, Sept.), of which we shall have occasion to speak afterwards. And so, again, we read in the Proverbs, “Before the hills was I brought forth” (Prov. viii. 25); and in the Book of Daniel, “And the form of the Fourth is like the Son of God” (Dan. iii. 25); besides many other places. If, then, the antiquity of the Old Testament implies the antiquity and age of the person mentioned in it, then our adversaries must confess that the Son of God must be a much more ancient Person than they suppose Him to be; for we frequently read clear descriptions of Him in many passages of the Old Testament. To meet this objection, they tell us that these passages in the Old Testament concerning the Son are only prophetic. And we answer again, that we may as reasonably say, that all the texts in the Old Testament, where mention is made of the Word, are only prophetic too. The expressions relating to the one must be considered in exactly the same way as those relating to the other. For if the words “Thou art My Son” are a prophecy, then the following words must be one too, “By the Word of the Lord were the heavens established” (Ps. xxxiii. 6, Sept.); for the word here is “established,” and He does not say that the heavens were “created by the Word.” And that the word “established” may have reference to the future appears from other passages, such as “The Lord reigneth; He hath so established the earth that it can never be moved” (Ps. xciii. 1). And if the title of the forty-fourth Psalm, which we lately quoted, is a prediction of the future, so the words that follow them are also predictions, “My heart

has given forth a good Word" (Ps. xlv. 1). And if it may be argued that the Son is only a mere man from the words "from the womb" in the Psalm before referred to, then the same thing may be inferred of the Word from these words concerning the heart. He only implies a body as much as the other. But if the Word who proceeds from the heart is eternal, then it must be granted that He is born of the womb is eternal too. And if it is not denied that the "Only-begotten" is in the bosom of the Father, neither can it be denied that the "Well-beloved" is in that bosom too. For that the "Only-begotten" and the "Well-beloved" are one and the same Person, those words of the Father Himself declare to us, "This is My Well-beloved Son" (S. Matt. iii. 17). In calling Him His "Well-beloved Son," He did only wish to tell us what there could not be any doubt of, that God loved His Son, or to make it be believed that He hated everything besides His Son; but it was simply that He might thereby proclaim Him to be the Only-begotten Son, and that He might show us that He alone was from Him. And thus when the Divine Word commanded Abraham to offer up his only-begotten son, He bade him take his "only son Isaac whom he loved" (Gen. xxii. 2); and it is plain to anyone that Isaac was the only son that Abraham had by Sarah. The conclusion, then, at which we arrive from all this is, that the Word is truly the Son; that He is neither a novel nor a nominal Son, but that He is the proper Son of God from eternity. For if He is not truly and properly God's Son, then neither is He His Word; as, on the other hand, if He is not God's Word, neither can He be His Son. For he is a son that is of the substance of his father; and undoubtedly He is of the substance of the Father, who is the Word that went forth from the heart, and was born from the womb. For we are sure that the Father Himself is not the Word, nor the Word the Father; but the Father is one Person, and the Son another; the Father begets, the Son is begotten.

25. Here, then, we see the insanity of Arius on the one hand, and of Sabellius on the other. We see the folly of Arius, who says that the Word is from nothing, and that there was a time when He was not. We see also the madness of Sabellius, who says that the Father is the Son, and that the Son is the Father, Two in name, but personally One. Sabellius, to support his ridiculous notion, brings forward S. Paul's account of the grace of the Holy Ghost as an example of his meaning, "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 4). He says that so also the Father is the same, but is expanded into Son

and Spirit. But this is utterly absurd; for if the parallel holds good, then the Father must be in One Person Himself the Word and the Holy Ghost; and not always all these together, but at one time the Father, and at another time the Son, and at another time the Holy Ghost; that is, in plainer words, He will be in Nature and Person only the Father, and but in name the Son and Holy Ghost; and upon commencing to be the Son in name He must lose His title of Father, at least for a time. And then it will follow that it was not a Person, but only a name and title that was made man; and that the Son did not come down from heaven, but that only a title descended upon earth; and that the Son spoke what was untrue in saying, "I and My Father," being, indeed, according to this doctrine, not another Person, but the Father Himself. It is, in fact, impossible to enumerate all the impossible absurdities which are involved in the heresy of Sabellius. According to him, even the very names of the Son and the Holy Ghost must necessarily cease, when there is no occasion or need for the use of them; and all the things which have been transacted, according to the accounts in the Scriptures, will seem to have been but visionary and imaginary. And when the Name of the Son ceases to be, as they hold, then the grace of Baptism will cease too, for it is administered in the Name of the Son. And, further, what must follow but the annihilation of creation? For if the Word came forth that we might be created, and when He came forth all things were given their being; it is plain that when He goes back into the Father, as they say, we shall no longer exist. He will be then in the state He was in before; and we shall be so too, that is to say, in nothing. And thus there could be no world, until He was pleased to come forth and exert Himself a second time.

26. But these, indeed, are most fanciful and most ridiculous absurdities. Could S. John affirm in plainer words that the Son had no beginning of existence, but that He abode with and in the Father before His assumption of our nature, and indeed from everlasting, than in those with which he begins his first Epistle? He writes thus, "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life; for the Life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that Eternal Life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us" (1 S. John i. 1, 2). And then in the conclusion of his Epistle, he tells us that the Son is that Life, which here, in the beginning of it, he says was

not made, but was Eternal and with the Father. He writes, "And we are in Him that is True, even in His Son, Jesus Christ; this is the True God and Eternal Life" (1 S. John v. 20). But if the Son is the Life, and the Life was with the Father, and if the Son was with the Father, and the same Evangelist says, "And the Word was with God" (S. John i. 1), then it is plain that the Son must be that Word which was everlastingly with and in the Father. And as this Son is the Word, so God must be the Father. Moreover, the Son, according to S. John, is not merely "God," but "Very God." And, therefore, the Word, which he tells us elsewhere was God, is doubtless properly so too. And the Son Himself declares Himself to be that Life, which the Apostle tells us is eternally with the Father. Thus, then, we see that the Son, the Word, and the Life, are all declared to be with and in the Father. And, again, another evidence and proof of the Son's being from eternity, the same Apostle exhibits where he styles Him "the Only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father" (S. John i. 18). This Son is the Person whom the Psalmist calls the "Hand of God," saying, "Why pluckest Thou not Thy Right Hand out of Thy bosom" (Ps. lxxiv. 12)? Here the Hand is in the bosom, as the Son was said to be before, and therefore we infer that the Son is this Hand, and this Hand the Son, by whom the Father made all things. For, says the Lord, "All those things hath Mine Hand made" (Isa. lxvi. 2); and "The Lord hath brought you out with a mighty Hand," that is, by His Son (Deut. vii. 8). Compare those words of the Psalmist, "This is the change of the Right Hand of the Most Highest" (Ps. lxxvii. 11, Sept.), with the title of the forty-fourth Psalm, "Unto the end, concerning the things that shall be changed, a song for My Well-beloved." Now, the "Well-beloved" in the latter text is plainly the "Hand that has been changed" in the former, concerning whom the Divine Voice also says, "This is My beloved Son" (S. Mat. iii. 17). And this clearly shows that the "Son" and the "Hand" are equivalent terms.

27. The text we lately produced and argued from, "I begat Thee from the womb before the morning" (Ps. cx. 3, Sept.), is by no means conclusive and satisfactory to many ignorant and inconsiderate men. They say that this cannot possibly refer to the Divine essence; that the womb must be interpreted of the Blessed Virgin, affirming that Christ was conceived of her before the morning star arose in its ordinary course. Let me explain their error in a few words. If they think the expression used in the text is unworthy of the Deity, they ought also to find fault

with the mention of the heart, for this part also belongs to the human body. And therefore, since both are human, we must either deny both, or seek to give an explanation of both. Now, as a word issues from the heart, so an offspring proceeds from the womb. The Scriptural metaphor of the Heart of God the Father does not mislead us into a notion of His being a body, or having one; why, then, should we take the words "from the womb" in any other but a metaphorical sense? In treating of Divine and supernatural persons and things, Holy Scripture explains itself by descriptions and ideas borrowed from various parts of the natural world, particularly from the frame and constitution of human nature. Thus, speaking of the creation, it says, "Thy hands have made me, and fashioned me" (Ps. cxix. 73); and "All those things hath Mine Hand made" (Isa. lxvi. 2); and, "He commanded and they were created" (Ps. cxlviii. 5). These are familiar images, which serve as illustrations to express the work or act of creation, just as those others signify the propriety of the Divine Sonship. For some things God makes and creates, but He begets the Son from Himself, as His Word and Wisdom. That the Son is of the Father's genuine and proper substance is plainly manifest from His issuing out of the heart, and being born from the womb; for thus it is with our nature, from which these allusions are taken. What we beget is the issue of our nature, but what we make is the work of our hands.

28. But, these objectors reply, what does that part of the text mean which speaks of His being begotten "before the morning star?" I answer that this very thing should be enough to convince them that this passage is not to be considered of our Lord's birth from the Virgin Mary. For many others besides our Lord have been born before the rising of that star. There is no extraordinary or singular circumstance involved here, for this is common to very many. We must observe further that "begetting" is one thing and "production" another, and that the former is antecedent to the latter; and therefore this passage cannot relate to Christ's human nature, which was not conceived at that time when the Angels appeared to the shepherds in the night, and brought to them the glad tidings of His birth, but before this, at the time of the Annunciation, which we do not find took place in the night, as the Scripture tells us His birth did. Thus His being begotten before the morning star is plainly distinguished in Scripture from His conception and birth, the latter of which the Psalmist expresses by the figure of His

proceeding from the womb, as when He says, "Thou art He that took Me out of My mother's womb" (Ps. xxii. 9). Besides the words are not "Before the rising of the morning star," but, "Before the morning star," that is, before its existence. And if the being, and not the motion or course of the star, is meant in these words, then it is plain that the passage has no relation to the Saviour's being born of the Virgin. For if it had, then the body born of the Virgin must have had a being before Adam; for all the stars were in being before him. But let us look out elsewhere for a passage of Scripture to explain the sense of this. Let us turn to the Book of the Revelation of S. John, where we read this, "I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last. Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie. I, Jesus, have sent Mine Angel to testify these things in the Churches. I am the Root and Offspring of David, and the Bright and Morning Star. And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely" (Rev. xxii. 13-17). If, then, the Offspring of David is the Bright or Morning Star, then it is plain that our Saviour here styles Himself the Morning Star as man, or as He was of the seed of David, and not as the Son of God, of the substance of the Father, which He had from all eternity. And thus the sense of the passage in the Psalm will be this, "I have begotten Thee from Myself before Thy appearance in the flesh;" and so "Before the Morning Star" will signify "before the Incarnation of the Word."

29. We have seen that the Old Testament makes very explicit statements concerning the Son. But we need not lay any very great stress upon this after all, for we have another very troublesome argument which will puzzle the most perverse and obstinate of our adversaries to deal with. Let me proceed to ask, then, if what is not stated in the Old Testament is of later date, where in the Old Testament is any mention made of the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, or Comforter? Mention is made, no doubt, of the Holy Spirit, but there is not the least intimation anywhere of the existence of the Paraclete. Now, will our adversaries also make two Persons of the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete? and will they venture to affirm that the Paraclete is the later because He is not mentioned in the Old Testament? But God

forbid that anyone should say such a thing as this, either that the Comforter began to exist but lately, or that the Holy Ghost is one Person, and the Comforter another. For undoubtedly He is that one and the same Blessed Spirit, who then did, and still does, both sanctify and comfort those that are worthy and qualified to receive Him. And so is the Word and the Son that one and the same Blessed Person, by whom as many as were, or are now, worthy, were then, and are still, adopted. For it appears that God had His sons in the times of the Old Covenant, and these were made such only by the operation of His Son. For unless there was a Son who was of God, even before the Son was born of the Virgin Mary, how can He be said to be before all, when there were sons before Him? And how, again, can He be said to be the First-born, if He comes second after many? But neither is the Paraclete second, for He was before all, nor is the Son later; as it is written, "In the beginning was the Word" (S. John i. 1). And as the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete are the same, so are the Son and the Word the same. Our Saviour expressly declares the Holy Ghost and the Comforter to be one and the same Person, for He says, "The Comforter" (or the Paraclete) "which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name" (S. John xiv. 26). And S. John as fully asserts the same of the Son and the Word, when he says, "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father" (S. John i. 14). Here He does not distinguish between the Word as one Person, and the Only-begotten of the Father as another; for this is a direct and clear affirmation that they are both One Person. It is therefore evident that as the Paraclete is not one person and the Holy Ghost another, but both are one and the same; so neither is the Word one Person and the Son another, but both are the Only-begotten Son. For the glory of the Only-begotten in this passage is not the glory of the flesh or man, but it is the glory of the Word. If, therefore, these men are not afraid of dividing the Paraclete from the Holy Ghost, then indeed there will be no wonder in their presuming to divide the Son from the Word. But if the Paraclete and the Holy Ghost must not be separated, neither must the Word be parted from the Son, who is also the Wisdom and the Power of God. Moreover, even those heathens who are versed in grammatical knowledge and classical writings know very well that "Well-beloved" is a very proper equivalent for "Only-begotten." And this is that epithet, which Homer in the second book of

the *Odyssey* gives Telemachus, who was the only-begotten son of Ulysses :

“ O'er the wide earth, dear youth, why seek to run,
An only child, a well-beloved son ?
He whom you mourn, divine Ulysses, fell,
Far from his country, where the strangers dwell.”

Here, then, we see an instance of one who was the only son of his father, being called well-beloved.

30. But there are those who belong to the heresy of Paul of Samosata, who also divide the Word from the Son, affirming that the Son is the Person called Christ, and that the Word is quite another Person. And for this view they appeal to those words of S. Peter in the Acts of the Apostles, which are in themselves most edifying, but which are lamentably misapplied by these men. The words are these, “ The Word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ : He is Lord of all ” (Acts x. 36). For, they say, that since the Word spoke through Christ, as the Prophets tell us He formerly did by them, in their usual form, “ Thus saith the Lord,” the Prophet was one person, and the Lord who made use of him, was another. Now, to refute this notion it will be well to turn to those words of S. Paul's, which we find recorded in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, namely, “ Waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ ” (1 Cor. i. 7, 8). One Christ does not confirm or establish the day of another Christ, but the One and Only Christ confirms those that wait for Him, at His own day. Thus likewise the Father sent the Word made flesh, that being made man He might preach Himself to the children of Israel. He that is here declared Lord of all is Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ, therefore, is the Word, for the Word is Lord of all.

31. “ And Moses said unto Aaron, Go unto the altar, and offer thy sin-offering and thy burnt-offering, and make an atonement for thyself and for the people ; and offer the offering of the people, and make an atonement for them ; as the Lord commanded Moses ” (Levit. ix. 7). Here Moses is named twice, but certainly it is the same man ; yet Moses is called so by Moses, as if he were another. So in that passage of the Acts, S. Peter says that “ the Word is sent to the children of Israel by Jesus Christ, although it is no more a distinct person from Christ, than Moses is from Moses, but He is one and the same Person, Divine as well as human, because of His

gracious and merciful assumption of our nature into His Person. And although our Lord's natures may and ought to be distinguished, yet this ought not to be done so as to divide the Word; for no division of the Word can be reconciled with the statement of S. John, "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us" (S. John i. 14). What, then, is said in a proper and right manner by S. Peter, the disciples of Paul of Samosata put such a perverse and misleading construction upon, that it is altogether wide of the truth. For in Holy Scripture Christ is spoken of under two titles, as when we read that Christ is "the Power of God, and the Wisdom of God" (1 Cor. i. 24). If, then, S. Peter says that the Word was sent through Jesus Christ unto the children of Israel, let him be understood to mean that the Word Incarnate has manifested and revealed Himself to His people; for this will then correspond to S. John's words, "And the Word was made flesh." Now, if these men confess the Divinity of the Word, and then separate the human nature from it, affirming that the Divine Person of the Word sent the human Person of Jesus Christ, then they are, without knowing it, contradicting themselves. For those who in this place separate the Divine Word from the Divine Incarnation, have, it seems, a base and low notion of the doctrine of the Incarnation, imagining that this was simply a change or alteration of the Word. And this is an opinion in which the very heathens will agree with them.

32. But this is not so. God forbid it should be. For as S. John here asserts that mysterious union, "the mortal being swallowed up of life" (2 Cor. v. 4), and that this takes place by Him who is the Principle of life and being, even as He Himself said to Martha, "I am the Life" (S. John xi. 25); so when S. Peter says that the Word was sent through Jesus Christ, he implies the Divine Unity also. It is a wicked thing to say, and we have proved it so, for anyone to infer from the words, "The Word was made flesh," that our Lord ceased to be the Word on assuming our flesh. And in like manner when anyone hears of the Word which has been united to the flesh, let him understand that this Divine mystery is one and simple. But the answer of the Archangel to the Mother of God supersedes all our disputing and reasoning upon this point, and shows us plainly the unity of the Divine Word and Man. For He says, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (S. Luke i. 35). Very foolishly

then, do these Samosatenes seek to separate the Word, who is here clearly declared to be united to that human nature which was conceived of the Virgin Mary. And, therefore, the Word was not sent by Christ, but He did indeed send others in and by Christ; for He commissioned and commanded the Apostles to "go and teach all nations" (S. Matt. xxviii. 19.)

33. Moreover, it is customary for Holy Scripture to express itself in plain and simple terms. So, for example, in the Book of Numbers we read as follows, "And Moses said to Hobab, the son of Raguel the Midianite, Moses' father-in-law" (Num. x. 29). The Moses who spoke, and the Moses whose father-in-law was Raguel, were but one Moses. The Word of God has many names; He is called God's Wisdom, His Power, His Right Hand, His Arm, and the like, and all these very justly and properly, without being supposed to be so many different Words. Why, then, after He has taken our nature into His own, and has made Himself the first-fruits of our immortality by uniting Himself with us, must the two natures be thus divided into two persons? The nature of man which was assumed was the work of the God who assumed it. It was one of those things which were made by that Word, who was in the beginning with God, and who was God Himself, and without whom was not anything made that was made. And if it pleased the Word of God to take our human nature upon Himself, even when it was corrupted, and to rescue it from destruction, and to renew it in Himself, in order that it might eternally enjoy His attributes and glory; and for this purpose He made it indeed Himself, a part of His own person, that within Him it might obtain this blessed state; how shall we possibly persuade ourselves to imagine that this human nature, which was born of the Virgin Mary, sent or commissioned the Word? Shall the Lord and Master, who sent the Apostles and Prophets, be at last enrolled amongst those who were sent by Him? And again, is it not simply impossible that a mere man should be called Christ? But when even a man is united to the Word, then there is no wonder that He should be called Christ and the Son of God. And this exactly corresponds with that prophecy which so clearly asserts His consubstantiality with the Father, which says, "I will send My Son Christ" (*cf.* Isa. xix. 20. Also, *cf.* Acts iii. 20), and with that testimony of the Father at the river Jordan, "This is My beloved Son" (S. Matt. iii. 17). For when the promises and predictions which concerned Him were fulfilled; then He shewed, as was fitting,

that the words spoken referred to Him of whom it was said that He was sent.

34. Thus we see that our Blessed Lord has two natures in One Person, the Divine Word, and the human nature which is united to it, even that which was born of the Blessed Virgin Mary. For in the Virgin's womb the Word formed Himself His house, as it were; just as at the beginning He formed Adam from the dust of the earth. I had better say, however, that our Lord did this in a more glorious manner altogether, which is well described by Solomon, who rightly understood that the Word was also called Wisdom, for he says, "Wisdom hath builded Her house" (Prov. ix. 1), the meaning of which the Apostle explains when he says, "whose house are we" (Heb. iii. 6). Elsewhere S. Paul calls us "the temple of God" (1 Cor. iii. 16), as much as to say, that we are a habitation not unworthy of God, the material type of which Solomon was commanded to build of stone. This was the resemblance or type, which was to disappear when the reality was manifested. The wicked men of that time were so blind and obstinate that they mistook the shadow for the substance, the type for the person typified. They sought to destroy that true and living Temple which He was, that Habitation which was made by His union with ourselves. And we must notice, that instead of warning the Jews of the evil consequences of their mistake, since He knew they were but bringing calamities upon themselves, He says to them, "Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (S. John ii. 19). And our Saviour also intimated in these words that all those things in which men interest themselves must very soon perish and come to nought, according to those words of the Psalmist, "Except the Lord build the house, their labour is but lost that build it. Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain" (Ps. cxxvii. 1). And so the works of the Jews are now lost and gone, because they were only a shadow and a type of things to come. But the Church stands firm and immovable, for it is "founded on a rock," and "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (S. Matt. xvi. 18). The Jews found fault with our Lord, and asked Him "Why dost Thou, being a man, make Thyself God" (S. John x. 33)? Paul of Samosata is their willing disciple, and he is continually teaching his heresy to those who are foolish enough to be taught by him. But "we have not so learned Christ, if so be that we have heard Him, and have been taught by Him; that we put off the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and that we put on the new man, which after God is

created in righteousness and true holiness" (Ephes. iv. 20-24). We conclude then, that we ought to believe in Christ as both God the Divine Word, and man personally united to that Word.

35. Moreover, Holy Scripture often calls only the human nature by the name of Christ. S. Peter tells Cornelius "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost" (Acts x. 38); and again, he says to the Jews, "Jesus of Nazareth, a Man approved of God among you" (Acts ii. 22); and again, S. Paul tells the Athenians that God will judge the world "by that Man, whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead" (Acts xvii. 31). Our Saviour's mission and manifestation of Himself are often expressed by His unction; and any one may at once see from this that there is no disagreement among the sacred writers. There is no dissension among them as to the thing itself, that is, the personal union of God the Word with the Man born of the Virgin Mary; only they use various terms about it, sometimes calling it an unction, sometimes a mission, and sometimes a manifestation. And so it follows that what S. Peter says agrees very well with all this, and so far from separating the person of God the Word from the human nature, which God forbid anyone should try to do, it is a plain declaration and testimony of the propriety of our Lord's Divinity as the Only-begotten Son of God. How could He say otherwise, who had so frequently had the words brought before Him, "I and My Father are one" (S. John x. 30), and "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father" (S. John xiv. 9)? After our Lord's Resurrection His body entered the room, where His Apostles were assembled, although the doors were shut, and to satisfy them that it was really His body, which otherwise they might have found it hard to believe, He removes all their doubts by saying, "Handle Me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have" (S. Luke xxiv. 39). And we must observe here that He does not say "Handle this body or this human nature, which I have assumed," but "handle Me." And so it is nothing but perverseness and obstinacy on the part of Paul of Samosata and his followers, that notwithstanding they find themselves overpowered by so many arguments to the contrary, yet they will not confess the proper union of the two natures. They will not be convinced by God the Word Himself, who so clearly expressed and asserted Himself to all His Apostles after His Resurrection, assuring them of the reality of His union with our human nature by eating before their eyes, and by allowing them to handle His body,

which they did. There is no question but that at least He touched their hands with His, and they touched His with theirs, when He supplied them with food; for the words of Scripture are, "And they gave Him a piece of a broiled fish and of an honeycomb. And when He had eaten before them, He took what remained and gave unto them" (S. Luke xxiv. 42, 43). This satisfied them of the truth and reality of His Resurrection, since He was actually touched by them, and we may now pass on to see how S. Thomas was convinced, although it was not quite in the same manner. But if nothing less than examining our Lord's sacred wounds will give faith to these men, let them learn the truth from S. Thomas. God the Word said to him, "Reach hither thy finger and behold My Hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into My Side" (S. John xx. 27). He calls that Side and those Hands a part of His Person, and thus He declares Himself to be a Person consisting of the Divine and human nature. Another evidence and proof of which was His entering the room when the doors were shut, and presenting His body before His disciples, and demonstrating its reality to their senses. These reasonings and arguments may very well suffice for establishing the faithful in sound doctrine, and for convincing and reclaiming the unbelieving.

36. And so let Paul of Samosata renounce his error, and listen to the Divine voice of our Saviour, who said, "This is My Body" (S. Matt. xxvi. 26); and not, "This is Christ, a Person distinct from Me, who am the Word," but "This is My Body, one in Person with Me, and I one with that." For I the Word am the anointing oil, and the Man that belongs to Me is anointed by Me; and, therefore, the Christ is not to be imagined as separated from Me, but belongs to My Person, and I am in Him. Therefore, the mention of the mission of the Word signifies its union with Jesus born of Mary, which is interpreted Saviour, because He was personally united with God the Word, but not because of anything else. This is that mission mentioned in those passages of S. John, "The Father that sent Me" (S. John viii. 10), and "I came not of Myself, but the Father sent Me" (S. John viii. 42). For He has given the name of "mission" to His assumption of our body, by whose visible nature He made known to us His invisible nature. Not that God changes His place, as we finite beings do, who are in various places at different times; for nothing of this kind must be inferred from the small dimensions of our poor mortal bodies, in one of which He was pleased to appear during His sojourn in

our human nature. How could He, who fills heaven and earth, be thus contracted? The word "mission," therefore, is only metaphorical for the word "Incarnation."

Therefore, Christ is God the Word, and is both God and Man, born of the Virgin Mary. He is not some other Christ, but the Word and the Man are one and the same Person. He was begotten of His Father before all worlds, and born of the Blessed Virgin in these last days. He was before invisible in heaven even to the celestial powers themselves, but now by the union of His invisible nature with His visible, made visible to all. He is visible, I say, not in His invisible Godhead, but by those manifestations of the Divinity, which are exhibited in the acts and operations of His human nature; and this human nature He has entirely renewed by receiving it into a personal union with Himself. All honour and adoration be therefore ascribed to Him, who was in the beginning, and is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.



Turnbull & Spears, Printers, Edinburgh.



