



150
Person Literary Society.
"EVER ONWARD."

Library of
The Pennsylvania State College.

Class No. 238.1 2-7
Book No. P31e
C 1830
Accession No. 12980

AN EXPOSITION

OF THE

CREED.

BY JOHN PEARSON, D.D.
BISHOP OF CHESTER.

A NEW EDITION.

EDITED BY THE REV. C. BRADLEY,
VICAR OF GLASBURY.

WITH A

Biographical Sketch of the Author, and a List of his Works.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR L. B. SEELEY AND SON, FLEET STREET :
REPRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG, 73, CHEAPSIDE ;
R. GRIFFIN AND CO., GLASGOW ; AND J. CUMMING, DUBLIN.

1830.

238.1
P31e
1830

J. Haddon, Printer,
Castle Street, Finsbury.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

OF

BISHOP PEARSON.

JOHN PEARSON was born at Snoring in 1613. After his education, at Eton and Cambridge, he entered into holy orders in 1639; and was the same year collated to the prebend of Netherhaven, in the church of Sarum. In 1640 he was appointed chaplain to the lord-keeper Finch, and by him presented to the living of Torrington in Suffolk. In 1650 he was made minister of St. Clement's, Eastcheap, in London. Some time afterwards he published in London an Exposition of the Creed, in folio, dedicated to his parishioners of St. Clement's, Eastcheap, to whom the substance of this excellent work had been preached several years before, and by whom he had been desired to make it public. The same year he likewise published, "The Golden Remains of the ever memorable Mr. John Hales, of Eton." Soon after the restoration he was presented by Juxon, then bishop of London, to the rectory of St. Christopher's, in that city; created doctor of divinity at Cambridge, in pursuance of the king's letters mandatory; installed prebendary of Ely, archdeacon of Surrey; and made master of Jesus college in Cambridge; all before the end of the year 1668. March 25, 1661, he was appointed Margaret professor of divinity

in that university; and, the first day of the ensuing year, was nominated one of the commissioners for the review of the liturgy in the conference at the Savoy. April 14, 1662, he was admitted master of Trinity College in Cambridge; and, in August, resigned his rectory of St. Christopher's and prebend of Sarum. In 1667 he was admitted a fellow of the Royal Society. In 1672 he published at Cambridge "Vindiciæ Epistolarum Ignatii," in answer to Mons. Daillé; to which is subjoined, "Isaaci Vossii Epistolæ duæ adversus Davidem Blondellum." Upon the death of the celebrated Wilkins, Pearson was appointed his successor in the see of Chester, to which he was consecrated February 9th, 1672. In 1682 his "Annales Cyprianici, sive tredecim annorum, quibus Cyprianus inter Christianos versatus est, historia chronologica," was published at Oxford, with Fell's edition of that father's works. Pearson was disabled from all public service, by ill health, a considerable time before his death, which happened at Chester, July 16, 1686. The present Edition of his great work is printed from the Oxford Edition of 1820, with the omission of the Notes.

PREFACE.

I have in this book undertaken an exposition of the Creed, and think it necessary in this Preface to give a brief account of the work, lest any should either expect to find that here which was never intended, or conceive that which they meet with such as they expected not.

The Creed, without controversy, is a brief comprehension of the objects of our Christian faith, and is generally taken to contain all things necessary to be believed. Now, whether all things necessary be contained there, concerneth not an Expositor to dispute, who is obliged to take notice of what is in it, but not to inquire into what is not: whether all truths comprehended in the same be of equal and absolute necessity we are no way forced to declare; it being sufficient, as to the design of an Exposition, to interpret the words, and so deliver the sense, to demonstrate the truth of the sense delivered, and to manifest the proper necessity of each truth, how far, and in what degree, and to what purposes, it is necessary.

This therefore is the method which I proposed to myself, and have prosecuted in every article; first, to settle the words of each article according to their antiquity and generality of reception in the Creed;—se-

condly, to explicate and unfold the terms, and to endeavour a right notion and conception of them as they are to be understood in the same;—thirdly, to show what are those truths which are naturally contained in those terms so explicated, and to make it appear that they are truths indeed, by such arguments and reasons as are respectively proper to evidence the verity of them;—fourthly, to declare what is the necessity of believing those truths, what efficacy and influence they have in the soul, and upon the life of a believer;—lastly, by a re-collection of all, briefly to deliver the sum of every particular truth, so that every one, when he pronounceth the Creed, may know what he ought to intend, and what he is understood to profess, when he so pronounceth it.

In the prosecution of the whole, according to this method, I have considered, that a work of so general a concernment must be exposed to two kinds of readers, which though they may agree in judgment, yet must differ much in their capacities. Some there are who understand the original languages of the holy Scripture, the discourses and tractates of the ancient fathers, the determinations of the councils, and history of the church of God, the constant profession of settled truths, the rise and increase of schisms and heresies. Others there are unacquainted with such conceptions, and incapable of such instructions; who understand the Scriptures as they are translated; who are capable of the knowledge of the truths themselves, and of the proofs drawn from thence; who can apprehend the nature of the Christian faith, with the power and efficacy of the same, when it is delivered unto

them out of the word of God, and in a language which they know. When I make this difference and distinction of readers, I do not intend thereby, that, because one of these is learned, the other is ignorant; for he who hath no skill of the learned languages may notwithstanding be very knowing in the principles of the Christian religion, and the reason and efficacy of them.

According to this distinction I have contrived my Exposition, so that the body of it containeth fully what can be delivered and made intelligible in the English tongue, without inserting the least sentence or phrase of any learned language; by which he who is not acquainted with it might be disturbed in his reading, or interrupted in his understanding. Not that I have selected only such notions as are common, easy, and familiar of themselves, but have endeavoured to deliver the most material conceptions in the most plain and perspicuous manner; as desirous to comprise the whole strength of the work, as far as it is possible, in the body of it. The other part I have placed in the margin, in which is contained whatsoever is necessary for the illustration of any part of the Creed, as to them who have any knowledge of the Latin, Greek, and Oriental languages, of the writings of the ancient fathers, the doctrines of the Jews, and the history of the church; those great advantages toward a right perception of the Christian religion.

Now, seeing the Creed comprehendeth the principles of our religion, it must contain those truths which belong unto it as it is a religion, and those which

concern it as it is ours. As it is a religion it delivereth such principles as are to be acknowledged in natural theology, such as no man who worshippeth a God can deny; and therefore, in the proof of these, I have made use of such arguments and reasons as are most proper to oppose the atheists, who deny there is a God to be worshipped, a religion to be professed. As it is our religion, it is Christian and Catholic. As Christian it containeth such truths as were delivered by Christ and his apostles, and those especially concerning Christ himself, which I have prosecuted constantly with an eye to the Jews, who obstinately deny them, expecting still another Messias to come; wherefore I show out of the law and the prophets which they acknowledge, what was foretold in every particular concerning the Messias, and prove all those to be completed by that Christ in whom we believe. As our religion is Catholic, it holdeth fast that "faith which was once delivered to the saints," and since preserved in the church; and therefore I expound such verities, in opposition to the heretics arising in all ages, especially against the Photinians, who of all the rest have most perverted the articles of our Creed, and found out followers in these latter ages, who have erected a new body of divinity in opposition to the Catholic theology. Against these I proceed upon such principles as they themselves allow, that is, upon the word of God delivered in the Old and New Testament, alleged according to the true sense, and applied by right reason; not urging the authority of the church which they reject, but only giving in the margin the sense of the primitive fathers, for the

satisfaction of such as have any respect left for antiquity, and are persuaded that Christ had a true church on the earth before these times.

In that part, which, after the demonstration of each truth, teacheth the necessity of the believing it, and the peculiar efficacy which it hath upon the life of a Christian, I have not thought fit to expatiate or enlarge myself, but only to mention such effects as flow naturally and immediately from the doctrine; especially such as are delivered in the Scriptures; which I have endeavoured to set forth with all possible plainness and perspicuity. And indeed in the whole work, as I have laid the foundation upon the written word of God, so I have with much diligence collected such places of Scripture as are pertinent to each doctrine, and with great faithfulness delivered them as they lie in the writings of those holy penmen; not referring the reader to places named in the margin (which too often I find in many books multiplied to little purpose), but producing and interweaving the sentences of Scripture into the body of my Exposition, so that the reader may understand the strength of all my reason, without any farther inquiry or consultation; for, if those words which I have produced prove not what I have intended, I desire not any to think there is more in the places named to maintain it.

At the conclusion of every distinct and several notion, I have re-collected briefly and plainly the sum of what hath been delivered in the explication of it, and put it, as it were, into the mouth of every Christian, thereby to express more fully his faith, and to declare his profession. So that if the reader please

to put those collections together, he may at once see and perceive what he is in the whole obliged to believe, and what he is by the church of God understood to profess, when he maketh this public, ancient, and orthodox confession of faith.

I have nothing more to add ; but only to pray that the Lord would give you and me a good understanding in all things.

I be

As
tion t
monly
imagin
to be
for al
we c
articl
Almi
Jesus
the E
Neith
but w
hensiv
part c
exam
God
migh
of h
rightl
doubl
twent

AN
EXPOSITION
OF THE
CREED.

ARTICLE I.

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.

As the first word *credo, I believe*, giveth a denomination to the whole confession of faith, from thence commonly called the Creed; so is the same word to be imagined not to stand only where it is expressed, but to be carried through the whole body of the confession; for although it be but twice actually rehearsed, yet must we conceive it virtually prefixed to the head of every article; that as we say, *I believe in God the Father Almighty*, so we are also understood to say, *I believe in Jesus Christ his only Son, our Lord*; as *I believe in the Holy Ghost*, so also *I believe the catholic church*. Neither is it to be joined with every complete article only; but where any article is not a single verity, but comprehensive, there it is to be looked upon as affixed to every part or single truth contained in that article; as, for example, in the first, *I believe in God, I believe that God to be the Father, I believe that Father to be almighty, I believe that Father almighty to be the Maker of heaven and earth*. So that this *credo, I believe*, rightly considered, multiplieth itself to no less than a double number of the articles, and will be found at least twenty-four times contained in the Creed. Wherefore,

being a word so pregnant and diffusive, so necessary and essential to every part of our confession of faith, that without it we can neither have creed nor confession, it will require a more exact consideration, and more ample explication, and that in such a notion as is properly applicable to so many and so various truths.

Now by this previous expression *I believe*, thus considered, every particular Christian is first taught, and then imagined to make confession of his faith; and consequently this word, so used, admits a threefold consideration; first, as it supposeth belief or faith, which is confessed; secondly, as it is a confession or external expression of that faith so supposed; thirdly, as both the faith and confession are of necessary and particular obligation. When therefore we shall have clearly delivered, first, what is the true nature and notion of belief; secondly, what the duty of confessing of our faith; thirdly, what obligation lies upon every particular person to believe and confess; then may we be conceived to have sufficiently explicated the first word of the Creed; then may every one understand what it is he says, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he professeth, *I believe*.

For the right understanding of the true nature of Christian faith, it will be no less than necessary to begin with the general notion of belief; which being first truly stated and defined, then by degrees deduced into its several kinds, will at last make the nature of Christian faith intelligible: a design, if I mistake not, not so ordinary and usual, as useful and necessary.

Belief in general I define to be an assent to that which is credible, as credible. By the word *assent* is expressed that act or habit of the understanding by which it receiveth, acknowledgeth, and embraceth any thing as a truth; it being the nature of the soul so to embrace whatsoever appeareth true unto it, and so far as it so appeareth. Now this assent, or judgment of any thing to be true, being a general act of the understanding, and so applicable to other habits thereof as well as to faith, must be specified by its proper object, and so limited and determined to its proper act, which is the other part left to complete the definition.

This object of faith is expressed by that which is credible; for every one who believeth any thing doth thereby without question assent unto it as to that which is credible; and therefore all belief whatsoever is such a kind of assent. But, though all belief be an assent to that which is credible, yet every such assent may not be properly faith; and therefore those words make not the definition complete. For he who sees an action done, knows it to be done, and therefore assents unto the truth of the performance of it because he sees it; but another person, to whom he relates it, may assent unto the performance of the same action, not because himself sees it, but because the other relates it; in which case that which is credible is the object of faith in one, of evident knowledge in the other. To make the definition therefore full, besides the material object or thing believed, we have added the formal object, or that whereby it is properly believed, expressed in the last term *as credible*; which, being taken in, it then appears that, first, whosoever believeth any thing, assenteth to something which is to him credible, and that as it is credible; and again, whosoever assenteth to any thing which is credible, as it is credible, believeth something by so assenting; which is sufficient to show the definition complete.

But, for the explication of the same, farther observations will be necessary; for if that which we believe be something which is credible, and the notion under which we believe be the credibility of it, then must we first declare what it is to be credible, and in what credibility doth consist, before we can understand what is the nature of belief.

Now that is properly credible which is not apparent of itself, nor certainly to be collected, either antecedently by its cause, or reversely by its effect; and yet, though by none of these ways, hath the attestation of a truth. For those things which are apparent of themselves are either so in respect of our sense, as that snow is white and fire is hot; or in respect of our understanding, as that the whole of any thing is greater than any one part of the whole, that every thing imaginable either is, or is not. The first kind of which being propounded to our

sense, one to the sight, the other to the touch, appear of themselves immediately true, and therefore are not termed credible, but evident to sense; as the latter kind, propounded to the understanding, are immediately embraced and acknowledged as truths apparent in themselves, and therefore are not called credible, but evident to the understanding. And so those things which are apparent are not said properly to be believed, but to be known.

Again: other things, though not immediately apparent in themselves, may yet appear most certain and evidently true, by an immediate and necessary connection with something formerly known; for as every natural cause actually applied doth necessarily produce its own natural effect, and every natural effect wholly dependeth upon and absolutely presupposeth its own proper cause; therefore there must be an immediate connection between the cause and its effect. From whence it follows, that, if the connection be once clearly perceived, the effect will be known in the cause, and the cause by the effect. And by these ways, proceeding from principles evidently known by consequences certainly concluding, we come to the knowledge of propositions in mathematics, and conclusions in other sciences: which propositions and conclusions are not said to be credible, but scientific; and the comprehension of them is not faith, but science.

Besides, some things there are, which, though not evident of themselves, nor seen by any necessary connection to their causes or effects, appear notwithstanding to most as true by some external relations to other truths; but yet so, as the appearing truth still leaves a possibility of falsehood with it, and therefore doth but incline to an assent. In which case, whatsoever is thus apprehended, if it depend upon real arguments, is not yet called credible, but probable; and an assent to such a truth is not properly faith, but opinion.

But when any thing propounded to us is neither apparent to our sense, nor evident to our understanding, in and of itself; neither certainly to be collected from any clear and necessary connexion with the cause from which

it proceedeth, or the effects which it naturally produceth; nor is taken up upon any real arguments, or reference to other acknowledged truths; and yet notwithstanding appeareth to us true, not by a manifestation but attestation of the truth, and so moveth us to assent not of itself, but by virtue of the testimony given to it; this is said properly to be credible; and an assent unto this, upon such credibility, is in the proper notion faith or belief.

Having thus defined and illustrated the nature of faith in general, so far as it agreeth to all kinds of belief whatsoever, our method will lead us on to descend, by way of division, to the several kinds thereof, till at last we come to the proper notion of faith in the Christian's confession, the design of our present disquisition; and, since we have placed the formality of the object of all belief in credibility, it will clearly follow that diversity of credibility in the object will proportionably cause a distinction of assent in the understanding, and consequently a several kind of faith, which we have supposed to be nothing else but such an assent.

Now the credibility of objects, by which they appear fit to be believed, is distinguishable according to the diversities of its foundation, that is, according to the different authority of the testimony on which it depends; for we having no other certain means of assuring ourselves of the truth, and consequently no other motives of our assent in matters of mere belief, than the testimony upon which we believe; if there be any fundamental distinction in the authority of the testimony, it will cause the like difference in the assent, which must needs bear a proportion to the authority of the testimony, as being originally and essentially founded upon it. It is therefore necessary next to consider in what the authority of a testimony consisteth, and so to descend to the several kinds of testimonies founded upon several authorities.

The strength and validity of every testimony must bear proportion with the authority of the testifier; and the authority of the testifier is founded upon his ability and integrity, his ability in the knowledge of that which he

delivereth and asserteth, his integrity in delivering and asserting according to his knowledge; for two several ways he which relateth or testifieth any thing may deceive us; one, by being ignorant of the truth, and so upon that ignorance mistaking, he may think that to be true which is not so, and consequently deliver that for truth which in itself is false, and so deceive himself and us; or if he be not ignorant, yet if he be dishonest or unfaithful, that which he knows to be false he may propound and assert to be a truth, and so, though himself be not deceived, he may deceive us. And by each of these ways, for want either of ability or integrity in the testifier, whoso grounds his assent unto any thing as a truth upon the testimony of another may equally be deceived.

But whosoever is so able as certainly to know the truth of that which he delivereth, and so faithful as to deliver nothing but what and as he knoweth, he, as he is not deceived, so deceiveth no man. So far therefore as any person testifying appeareth to be knowing of the thing he testifies, and to be faithful in the relation of what he knows, so far his testimony is acceptable, so far that which he testifieth is properly credible. And thus the authority of every testifier or relater is grounded upon these two foundations, his ability and integrity.

Now there is in this case, so far as it concerns our present design, a double testimony; the testimony of man to man, relying upon human authority; and the testimony of God to man, founded upon divine authority: which two kinds of testimony are respective grounds of two kinds of credibility, human and divine; and consequently there is a twofold faith distinguished by this double object, a human and a divine faith.

Human faith is an assent unto any thing as credible merely upon the testimony of man. Such is the belief we have of the words and affections one of another. And upon this kind of faith we proceed in the ordinary affairs of our life; according to the opinion we have of the ability and fidelity of him who relates or asserts any thing, we believe or disbelieve. By this a friend assureth himself of the affection of his friend: by this

the son acknowledgeth his father, and upon this is his obedience wrought. By virtue of this human faith it is that we doubt not at all of those things which we never saw, by reason of their distance from us, either by time or place. Who doubts whether there be such a country as Italy, or such a city as Constantinople, though he never passed any of our four seas? Who questions now whether there were such a man as Alexander in the east, or Cæsar in the west? and yet the latest of these hath been beyond the possibility of the knowledge of man these sixteen hundred years. There is no science taught without original belief; there are no letters learnt without preceding faith. There is no justice executed, no commerce maintained, no business prosecuted without this. All secular affairs are transacted, all great achievements are attempted, all hopes, desires, and inclinations are preserved, by this human faith, grounded upon the testimony of man.

In which case we all by easy experience may observe the nature, generation, and progress of belief; for, in any thing which belongeth to more than ordinary knowledge, we believe not him whom we think to be ignorant, nor do we assent the more for his assertion, though never so confidently delivered; but, if we have a strong opinion of the knowledge and skill of any person, what he affirmeth within the compass of his knowledge, that we readily assent unto; and, while we have no other ground but his affirmation, this assent is properly belief. Whereas, if it be any matter of concernment in which the interest of him that relateth or affirmeth any thing to us is considerable, there it is not the skill or knowledge of the relater which will satisfy us, except we have as strong an opinion of his fidelity and integrity; but if we think him so just and honest that he hath no design upon us, nor will affirm any thing contrary to his knowledge for any gain or advantage, then we readily assent unto his affirmations; and this assent is our belief. Seeing then our belief relies upon the ability and integrity of the relater, and since the knowledge of all men is imperfect, and the hearts of all men are deceitful, and so their in-

tegrity liable to be suspected, there can be no infallible universal ground of human faith.

But what satisfaction we cannot find in the testimony of man, we may receive in the testimony of God. "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater," 1 John. v, 9. Yea, "let God be true," the ground of our divine, "and every man a liar," the ground of our human faith.

As for the other member of the division, we may now plainly perceive that it is thus to be defined—divine faith is an assent unto something as credible upon the testimony of God. This assent is the highest kind of faith, because the object hath the highest credibility, because grounded upon the testimony of God, which is infallible. Balaam could tell Balak thus much, "God is not a man, that he should lie;" and a better prophet confirmed the same truth to Saul, "The strength of Israel will not lie;" and because he will not, because he cannot, he is the strength of Israel, even "my God, my strength, in whom I will trust."

For, first, God is of infinite knowledge and wisdom, as Hannah hath taught us, 1 Sam. ii. 3, "The Lord is a God of knowledge," or rather, if our language will bear it, "of knowledges," which are so plural, or rather infinite in their plurality, that the psalmist hath said, "Of his understanding there is no number," Ps. cxlvii. 5. He knoweth therefore all things, neither can any truth be hid from his knowledge, who is essentially truth, and essentially knowledge, and, as such, the cause of all other truth and knowledge. Thus the understanding of God is infinite in respect of comprehension, and not so only, but of certainty also and evidence. Some things we are said to know which are but obscurely known; we see them but as in a glass or through a cloud: but "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." He seeth without any obscurity, and whatsoever is propounded to his understanding is most clear and evident; "neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and open unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do," Heb. iv. 13. Wherefore, since all things are within the

compass of his knowledge, since all things which are so are most clear and evident unto him, since the knowledge he hath of them is most certain and infallible, it inevitably followeth that he cannot be deceived in any thing.

Secondly : the justice of God is equal to his knowledge, nor is his holiness inferior to his wisdom. "A God of truth," saith Moses, "and without iniquity, just and right is he," Deut. xxxii. 4. From which internal, essential, and infinite rectitude, goodness, and holiness, followeth an impossibility to declare or deliver that for truth which he knoweth not to be true ; for if it be against that finite purity and integrity which is required of man, to lie, and therefore sinful, then must we conceive it absolutely inconsistent with that transcendent purity and infinite integrity which is essential unto God. Although therefore the power of God be infinite, though he can do all things, yet we may safely say, without any prejudice to his omnipotency ; that he cannot speak that for truth which he knoweth to be otherwise ; for the perfections of his will are as necessarily infinite as those of his understanding ; neither can he be unholy or unjust any more than he can be ignorant or unwise. "If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful ; he cannot deny himself," 2 Tim. ii. 13. Which words of the apostle, though properly belonging to the promises of God, yet are as true in respect of his assertions ; neither should he more *deny himself* in violating his fidelity than in contradicting his veracity. It is true that "God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath ; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have strong consolation," Heb. vi. 17. 18 : but it is as true that all this confirmation is only for our consolation ; otherwise it is as impossible for God to lie without an oath as with one ; for, because he can swear by no greater, he sweareth only by himself, and so the strength, even of the oath of God relieth upon the veracity of God. Wherefore seeing God, as God, is of infinite rectitude, goodness, and holiness ; seeing it is manifestly repugnant to his purity, and inconsistent with his integrity, to deliver any thing contrary to his knowledge, it clearly followeth that he cannot deceive any man.

It is therefore most infallibly certain that God, being infinitely wise, cannot be deceived; being infinitely good, cannot deceive: and upon these two immovable pillars standeth the authority of the testimony of God; for since we cannot doubt of the witness of any one but by questioning his ability, as one who may be ignorant of that which he affirmeth, and so deceived; or by excepting against his integrity, as one who may affirm that which he knoweth to be false, and so have a purpose to deceive us: where there is no place for either of these exceptions, there can be no doubt of the truth of the testimony. But where there is an intrinsical repugnancy of being deceived in the understanding, and of deceiving in the will, as there certainly is in the understanding and will of God, there can be no place for either of those exceptions, and consequently there can be no doubt of the truth of that which God testifieth. And whosoever thinketh any thing comes from him, and assenteth not unto it, must necessarily deny him to be wise or holy. "He that believeth not God," saith the apostle, "hath made him a liar." That truth then which is testified by God hath a divine credibility; and an assent unto it, as so credible, is divine faith, in which the material object is the doctrine which God delivereth, the formal object is that credibility founded on the authority of the deliverer. And this I conceive to be the true nature of divine faith in general.

Now, since the credibility of all which we believe is founded upon the testimony of God, we can never be sufficiently instructed in the notion of faith, till we first understand how this testimony is given to those truths which we now believe. To this end it will be necessary to give notice that the testimony of God is not given unto truths before questioned or debated; nor are they such things as are first propounded and doubted of by man, and then resolved and confirmed by interposing the authority of God; but he is then said to witness when he doth propound, and his testimony is given by way of revelation, which is nothing else but the delivery or speech of God unto his creatures. And therefore upon a diversity of delivery must follow a difference, though not of faith itself, yet of the means and manner of assent.

Wherefore it will be farther necessary to observe, that divine revelation is of two kinds, either immediate or mediate. An immediate revelation is that by which God delivereth himself to man by himself, without the intervention of man. A mediate revelation is the conveyance of the counsel of God unto man by man. By the first he spake unto the prophets; by the second in the prophets, and by them unto us. Seeing then there is this difference between the revealing of God unto the prophets and to others, seeing the faith both of prophets and others relieth wholly upon divine revelation, the difference of the manner of assent in these several kinds of believers will be very observable for the explanation of the nature of our faith.

Those then to whom God did immediately speak himself, or by an angel representing God, and so being in his stead, and bearing his name (of which I need here make no distinction); those persons, I say, to whom God did so reveal himself, did by virtue of the same revelation perceive, know, and assure themselves, that he which spake to them was God; so that, at the same time, they clearly understood both what was delivered, and by whom: otherwise we cannot imagine that Abraham would have slain his son, or have been commended for such a resolution, had he not been most assured that it was God who, by an immediate revelation of his will, clearly commanded it. Thus "by faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark, to the saving of his house:" which warning of God was a clear revelation of God's determination to drown the world, of his will to save him and his family, and of his command for that end to build an ark. And this Noah so received from God, as that he knew it to be an oracle of God, and was as well assured of the author as informed of the command. Thus the judgments hanging over Judah were revealed in the ears of Isaiah by the Lord of Hosts. Thus the Lord revealed himself to Samuel in Shiloh: at first indeed he knew him not; that is, when the Lord spake, he knew 'it not to be the voice of God; "Now Samuel did not yet know the Lord, neither was the word of the Lord yet revealed unto him," 1 Sam. iii. 7.

but after that he knew him, and was assured that it was he which spake unto him, the Scripture teaching us that the ears of Samuel were revealed, and the word of God revealed, and God himself revealed to him. By all which we can understand no less, than that Samuel was so illuminated in his prophecies, that he fully understood the words or things themselves which were delivered, and as certainly knew that the deliverer was God. So Samuel the seer, so the rest of those prophets, believed those truths revealed to them by such a faith as was a firm assent unto an object credible upon the immediate testimony of God.

But those faithful people to whom the prophets spake believed the same truths, and upon the testimony of the same God, delivered unto them not by God, but by those prophets, whose words they therefore assented unto as certain truths, because they were assured that what the prophets spake was immediately revealed to them by God himself, without which assurance no faith could be expected from them. When God appeared unto Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush, and there immediately revealed to him first himself, saying, "I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," and then his will to bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, Moses clearly believed God both in the revelation of himself and of his will, and was fully satisfied that the Israelites should be delivered, because he was assured it was God who promised their deliverance: yet notwithstanding still he doubted whether the Israelites would believe the same truth, when it should be delivered to them, not immediately by God, but by Moses: "And Moses answered and said, But behold they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice; for they will say, 'The Lord hath not appeared unto thee,'" Exod. iv. 1; which words of his first suppose, that if they had heard the voice of God, as he had, they would have assented to the truth upon a testimony divine; and then as rationally affirm that it was improbable they should believe, except they were assured it was God who promised, or think that God had promised by Moses, only because Moses said so; which ra-

tional objection was clearly taken away, when God endowed Moses with power of evident and undoubted miracles: for then the rod which he carried in his hand was as infallible a sign to the Israelites that God had appeared unto him, as the flaming bush was to himself; and therefore they which saw in his hand God's omnipotency could not suspect in his tongue God's veracity; insomuch as when Aaron became to Moses "instead of a mouth," and Moses to Aaron "instead of God, Aaron spake all the words which the Lord had spoken unto Moses, and did the signs in the sight of the people, and the people believed, Exod. iv. 30, 31. For being persuaded by a lively and active presence of omnipotency that God had appeared unto Moses, and what was delivered to them by him came to him from God, and being sufficiently assured, out of the very sense and notion of a Deity, that whatsoever God should speak must of necessity be true, they presently assented, "*and believed the Lord, and his servant Moses;*" Moses, as the immediate propounder; God, as the original revealer. They believed Moses that God had revealed it, and they believed the promise, because God had revealed it. So that the faith both of Moses and the Israelites was grounded upon the same testimony or revelation of God, and differed only in the proposition or application of the testimony: Moses receiving it immediately from God himself, the Israelites mediately by the ministry of Moses.

In the like manner the succeeding prophets were the instruments of divine revelation, which they first believed as revealed to them, and then the people as revealed by them; for what they delivered was not the testimony of man, but the testimony of God delivered by man. It was he who "spake by the mouth of his holy prophets which have been since the world began," Luke i. 10: the mouth, the instrument, the articulation was theirs; but the words were God's. "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me," saith David, "and his word was in my tongue," 2 Sam. xxiii. 2. It was the word of the Lord, which he "spake by the hand of Moses, and by the hand of his servant Ahijah the prophet;" the hand the general instrument of man, the mouth the particular instrument of speech, both attributed to the pro-

phets as merely instrumental in their prophecies. The words which Balaam's ass spake were as much the ass's words as those which Balaam spake were his; for "the Lord opened the mouth of the ass, and the Lord put a word in Balaam's mouth;" and, not only so, but a bridle with that word, "Only the word that I shall speak unto thee, that thou shalt speak," Numb. xxii. 35. The prophets, as they did not frame the notions or conceptions themselves of those truths which they delivered from God, so did they not loosen their own tongues of their own instinct or upon their own motion, but as moved, impelled, and acted by God. So we may in correspondence to the antecedent and subsequent words interpret those words of St. Peter, that "no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation;" that is, that no prophecy which is written did so proceed from the prophet which spake or wrote it that he of himself, or by his own instinct, did open his mouth to prophesy; but that all prophetic revelations came from God alone, and that whosoever first delivered them was antecedently inspired by him, as it followeth, "for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." That therefore which they delivered was the word, the revelation of God; which they assented unto as to a certain and infallible truth, credible upon the immediate testimony of God, and to which the rest of the believers assented upon the same testimony of God, mediately delivered by the hands of the prophets.

Thus God, "who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets," and by so speaking propounded the object of faith both to the prophets and the fathers, "hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son," and by so speaking hath enlarged the object of faith to us by him, by which means it comes to be the "faith of Jesus." Thus "the only-begotten Son, who was in the bosom of the father, the express image of his person," he "in whom it pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell," he "in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," revealed the will of God to the apostles, who being assured that he "knew all things," and convinced that he came "forth

from God," gave a full and clear assent unto those things which he delivered, and grounded their faith upon his words as upon the immediate testimony of God. "I have given unto them," saith Christ unto his Father, "the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me," John xvii. 8. Besides this delivery of these words by Christ to the apostles, they received the promise of the Spirit of truth, which should "guide them into all truth," and "teach them all things, and bring all things into their remembrance whatsoever Christ had said unto them," John xiv. 26. So clearly, so fully, so constantly were they furnished with divine illuminations and revelations from God, upon which they grounded their own faith, that each of them might well make that profession of St. Paul, "I know whom I have believed," 2 Tim. i. 12. Thus the faith of the apostles, as of Moses and the prophets, was grounded upon the immediate revelations of God.

But those believers to whom the apostles preached, and whom they converted to the faith, believed the same truths which were revealed to the apostles, though they were not so revealed to them as they were unto the apostles, that is, immediately from God. But, as the Israelites believed those truths which Moses spake to come from God, being convinced by the constant supply of miracles wrought by the rod which he carried in his hand; so the blessed apostles, being so plentifully endowed from above with the power of miracles, gave sufficient testimony that it was God which spake by their mouths, who so evidently wrought by their hands. They which heard St. Peter call a lame man unto his legs, speak a dead man alive, and strike a living man to death with his tongue, as he did Ananias and Sapphira, might easily be persuaded that it was God who spake by his mouth, and conclude that where they found him in his omnipotency, they might well expect him in his veracity. These were the persons for whom our Saviour next to the apostles prayed, because by a way next to that of the apostles they believed. "Neither pray I for these alone," saith Christ, "but for them also which shall believe on

me through their word," John xvii. 20. Thus the apostles believed on Christ through his own word, and the primitive Christians believed on the same Christ through the apostles' word; and this distinction our Saviour himself hath clearly made; not that the word of the apostles was really distinct from the word of Christ, but only it was called theirs, because delivered by their ministry, otherwise it was the same word which they had heard from him, and upon which they themselves believed: "That which was from the beginning," saith St. John, "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, that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you," John i. 1, 3. And this was the true foundation of faith in all them which believed, that they took not the words which they heard from the apostles to be the words of the men who spake them, no more than they did the power of healing the sick, or raising the dead, and the rest of the miracles, to be the power of them that wrought them; but, as they attributed those miraculous works to God working by them, so did they also that saving word to the same God speaking by them. When St. Paul preached at Antioch, "almost the whole city came together to hear the word of God," Acts xiii. 44; so they esteemed it, though they knew him to be a man whom they came to hear speak it. This the apostle commendeth in the Thessalonians, that when they "*received the word of God, which they heard of him, they received it not as the word of man, but, as it is in truth, the word of God,*" 1 Thess. ii. 13; and, receiving it so, they embraced it as coming from him who could neither deceive nor be deceived, and consequently as infallibly true; and, by so embracing it, they assented unto it; by so assenting to it, they believed it, ultimately upon the testimony of God, immediately upon the testimony of St. Paul, as he speaks himself: "*because our testimony among you was believed,*" 2 Thess. i. 10. Thus the faith of those which were converted by the apostles was an assent unto the word as credible upon the testimony of God, delivered to them by a testimony apostolical:—which being thus clearly stated, we

may at last descend into our own condition, and so describe the nature of our own faith, that every one may know what it is to believe.

Although Moses was endued with the power of miracles, and conversed with God in the mount, and spake with him face to face at the door of the tabernacle; although upon these grounds the Israelites believed what he delivered to them as the word of God, yet neither the miracles nor Moses did for ever continue with them; and, notwithstanding his death, they and their posterity to all generations were obliged to believe the same truths. Wherefore what Stephens says is observable: "He received the lively oracles to give unto them," Acts vii. 38; the decalogue he received from the hand of God, written with the finger of God; the rest of the divine patefactions he wrote himself, and so delivered them not a mortal word to die with him, but living oracles, to be in force when he was dead, and oblige the people to a belief when his rod had ceased to broach the rocks and divide the seas. Neither did he only tie them to a belief of what he wrote himself, but, by foretelling and describing the prophets who should be raised in future ages, he put a farther obligation upon them to believe their prophecies as the revelations of the same God. Thus all the Israelites, in all ages, believed Moses; while he lived, by believing his words; after his death, by believing his writings. "Had ye believed Moses," saith our Saviour, "*ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But, if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?*" John v. 46, 47. Wherefore the faith of the Israelites in the land of Canaan was an assent unto the truths of the law as credible upon the testimony of God, delivered unto them in the writings of Moses and the prophets.

In the like manner is it now with us; for although Christ first published the gospel to those "who beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father;" although the apostles first converted those unto the faith who heard them speak with tongues they never learned, they never heard before, and discover the thoughts of men they never saw before; who saw the lame to walk,

the blind to see, the dead to revive, and the living to expire at their command: yet did not these apostles prolong their lives by virtue of that power which gave such testimony to their doctrine, but rather shortened them by their constant attestation to the truth of that doctrine farther confirmed by their death. Nor did that power of frequent and ordinary miraculous operations long survive them; and yet they left as great an obligation upon the church in all succeeding ages, to believe all the truths which they delivered, as they had put upon those persons who heard their words and saw their works; because they wrote the same truths which they spake, were assisted in writing by the same Spirit by which they spake, and therefore they require the same readiness of assent so long as the same truths shall be preserved by those writings. While Moses lived and spake as a mediator between God and the Israelites, they believed his words, and so the prophets while they preached. When Moses was gone up to Mount Nebo, and there died, when the rest of the prophets were gathered to their fathers, they believed their writings, and the whole object of their faith was contained in them. When the Son of God came into the world to reveal the will of his Father, when he made known unto the apostles, as his friends, "all things that he had heard of the Father," then did the apostles believe the writings of Moses and the prophets, and the words of Christ, and in these taken together was contained the entire object of their faith; and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said," John ii. 22. When Christ was ascended up into heaven, and the Holy Ghost came down, when the words which Christ had taught the apostles were preached by them, and many thousand souls converted to the faith, they believed the writings of the prophets and the words of the apostles; and in these two was comprised the complete object of their faith. When the apostles themselves departed out of this life, and confirmed the truth of the gospel preached by the last of sufferings, their death, they left the sum of what they had received, in writing, for the continuation of the faith in the churches which they had planted, and the

propagation thereof in other places, by those who succeeded them in their ordinary function, but were not to come near them in their extraordinary gifts. "These things were written," saith St. John, the longest liver, and the latest writer, "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name. John xx. 31.

Those Christians then who have lived since the apostles' death, and never obtained the wish of St. Augustin, to see either Christ upon earth, or St. Paul in the pulpit, have believed the writings of Moses and the prophets, of the apostles and evangelists, in which together is fully comprehended whatsoever may properly be termed matter of divine faith; and so "the household of God is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets," who are continued unto us only in their writings, and by them alone convey unto us the truths which they received from God, upon whose testimony we believe. And therefore he who put their writings into the definition of faith, considering faith as now it stands with us, is none of the smallest of the school-men. From whence we may at last conclude, that the true nature of the faith of a Christian, as the state of Christ's church now stands and shall continue to the end of the world, consists in this, that it is an assent unto truths credible upon the testimony of God delivered unto us in the writings of the apostles and prophets.

To believe therefore as the word stands in the front of the *Creed*, and not only so, but is diffused through every article and proposition of it, is to assent to the whole and every part of it, as to a certain and infallible truth revealed by God (who by reason of his infinite knowledge cannot be deceived, and by reason of his transcendent holiness cannot deceive), and delivered unto us in the writings of the blessed apostles and prophets immediately inspired, moved, and acted by God, out of whose writings this brief sum of necessary points of faith was first collected. And as this is properly to believe, which was our first consideration; so to say *I believe* is to make a confession or external expression of the faith, which is the second consideration propounded.

Faith is a habit of the intellectual part of a man, and therefore of itself invisible; and to believe is a spiritual act, and consequently inmanent and internal, and known to no man but him who believeth: "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him?" 1 Cor. ii. 11. Wherefore Christ being not only the great apostle, sent to deliver these revealed truths, and so the author of our faith, but also the head of the church, whose body consisteth of faithful members, and so the author of union and communion, which principally hath relation to the unity of faith, he must needs be imagined to have appointed some external expression and communication of it; especially considering that the sound of the apostles was to go forth upon the ends of the world, and all nations to be called to the profession of the gospel, and gathered into the church of Christ; which cannot be performed without an acknowledgment of the truth, and a profession of faith, without which no entrance into the church, no admittance to baptism. "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" saith the eunuch. "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God," Acts viii. 37. So believing with all his heart, as Philip required, and making profession of that faith, he was admitted. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation," Rom. x. 10. The belief of the heart is the internal habit residing in the soul, and act of faith proceeding from it, but terminated in the same. The confession of the mouth is an external signification of the inward habit or act of faith, by words expressing an acknowledgment of those truths which we believe or assent to in our souls. The ear receiveth the word: "faith cometh by hearing;" the ear conveyeth it to the heart, which being opened receiveth it, receiving believeth it; and then "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." In the heart faith is seated; with the tongue confession is made; between these two salvation is completed. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God

hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved," Rom. x. 9. This faith of the heart every one ought, and is presumed to have; this confession of the mouth every one is known to make, when he pronounceth these words of the *Creed, I believe*; and, if true, he may with comfort say, "*The word of faith is nigh me, even in my mouth and in my heart*;" first in my heart really assenting, then in my mouth clearly and sincerely professing with the prophet David, "I have believed, therefore have I spoken," Psalm cxi. 10. Thus briefly from the second consideration concerning confession, implied in the first words *I believe*, we shall pass unto the third consideration, of the necessity and particular obligation to such a confession.

If there were no other argument, yet seeing the object of faith is supposed infallibly true, and acknowledged to be so by every one that believeth, seeing it is the nature of truth not to hide itself, but rather to desire the light that it may appear; this were sufficient to move us to a confession of our faith. But, besides the nature of the thing, we shall find many arguments obliging, pressing, urging us to such a profession. For, first, from the same God, and by the same means by which we have received the object of our faith, by which we came under a possibility of faith, we have also received an express command to make a confession of the same; "Be ready," saith St. Peter, "always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you," 1 Pet. iii. 15; and there can be no reason of hope but what is grounded on faith, nor can there be an answer given unto that without an acknowledgment of this. Secondly: it is true indeed that the great promises of the gospel are made unto faith, and glorious things are spoken of it; but the same promises are made to the confession of faith together with it; and we know who it is hath said, "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven," Mat. x. 32. Besides, the profession of the faith of one Christian confirmeth and edifieth another in his, and the mutual benefit of all layeth an obligation upon every particular. Again: the matters of faith

contain so much purity of doctrine, persuade such holiness of life, describe God so infinitely glorious, so transcendently gracious, so loving in himself, so merciful in his Son, so wonderful in all his works, that the sole confession of it glorifieth God; and how can we expect to enter into that glory which is none of ours, if we deny God that glory which is his? Lastly: the concealing of those truths which he hath revealed, the not acknowledging of that faith which we are thought to believe, is so far from giving God that glory which is due unto him, that it dishonoreth the faith which it refuseth or neglecteth to profess, and casteth a kind of contumely upon the author of it, as if God had revealed that which man should be ashamed to acknowledge. Wherefore he that came to save us hath also said unto us, "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels," Luke ix. 26. Such a necessity there is of confession of faith, in respect of God, who commanded it and is glorified in it; in respect of ourselves, who shall be rewarded for it; and in respect of our brethren, who are edified and confirmed by it. Which necessity the wisdom of the church in former ages hath thought a sufficient ground to command the recitation of the *Creed* at the first initiation into the church by baptism (for which purpose it was taught and expounded to those which were to be baptised, immediately before the great solemnity of Easter), and to require a particular repetition of it publicly, as often as the sacrament of the eucharist was administered, and a constant and perpetual inculcation of the same by the clergy to the people.

And as this necessity is great, as the practice is useful and advantageous, so is the obligation of believing and confessing particular, binding every single Christian, observable in the number and person expressed, *I believe*. As if Christ did question every one in particular, as he did him who was born blind, after he had restored to him his sight (and we are all in his condition), "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" every single Christian is taught to make the same answer which he made, "Lord,

I believe," Joh. ix. 38. As if the Son of God did promise to every one of them which are gathered together in his name, what he promised to one of the multitude, whose son had a dumb spirit; "If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth;" each one for himself returneth his answer, "Lord, I believe; Lord, help my unbelief," Mar. ix. 24. Not that it is unlawful or unfit to use another number, and, instead of *I*, to say, *We believe*; for, taking in of others, we exclude not ourselves: and addition of charity can be no disparagement to confession of faith. St. Peter answered for the twelve, "We believe, and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God," Joh. vi. 69. For, though Christ immediately replied that one of them had a devil, yet is not St. Peter blamed, who knew it not. But every one is taught to express his own faith, because by that he is to stand or fall. "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much" for the benefit of his brother, but his faith availeth nothing for the justification of another. And it is otherwise very fit that our faith should be manifested by a particular confession, because it is effectual by particular application; therefore must it needs be proper for me to say, *I believe*, and to make profession of my faith in the Son of God, "who loved me, and gave himself for me."

Seeing then I have described the true nature and notion of belief, the duty of confessing our faith, and the obligation of every particular Christian to believe and confess; seeing in these three explications all which can be imaginably contained in the first word of the Creed must necessarily be included; it will now be easy for me to deliver, and for every particular person to understand, what it is he says, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he begins his confession with these words, *I believe*, which I conceive may in this manner be fitly expressed:—

Although those things which I am ready to affirm be not apparent to my sense, so that I cannot say I see them; although they be not evident to my understanding of themselves, nor appear unto me true by the virtue of any natural and necessary cause, so that I cannot say I have any proper knowledge or science of them; yet seeing

they are certainly contained in the Scriptures, the writings of the blessed apostles and prophets; seeing those apostles and prophets were endued with miraculous power from above, and immediately inspired with the Holy Ghost, and consequently what they delivered was not the word of man, but of God himself; seeing God is of that universal knowledge and infinite wisdom, that it is impossible he should be deceived; of that indefectible holiness and transcendant rectitude, that it is not imaginable he should intend to deceive any man, and consequently whatsoever he hath delivered for a truth must be necessarily and infallibly true; I readily and stedfastly assent unto them as most certain truths, and am as fully, and absolutely, and more concerningly persuaded of them than of any thing I see or know. And because that God who hath revealed them hath done it, not for my benefit only, but for the advantage of others, not for that alone, but also for the manifestation of his own glory; seeing for those ends he has commanded me to profess them, and hath promised an eternal reward upon my profession of them; seeing every particular person is to expect the justification of himself and the salvation of his soul upon the condition of his own faith; as with a certain and full persuasion I assent unto them, so with a fixed and undaunted resolution I will profess them; and with this faith in my heart, and confession in my mouth, in respect of the whole body of the *Creed*, and every article and particle in it, I sincerely, readily, resolvedly say, *I believe*.

I believe in God.

HAVING delivered the nature of faith, and the act of belief common to all the articles of the Creed, that we may understand what it is to believe; we shall proceed to the explication of the articles themselves, as the most necessary objects of our faith, that we may know what is chiefly to be believed. Where immediately we meet with another word as general as the former, and as universally concerned in every article, which is *God*; for if to believe be to assent upon the testimony of God, as we have before declared, then wheresoever belief is expressed or implied,

there is also the name of *God* understood, upon whose testimony we believe. He therefore whose authority is the ground and foundation of the whole, his existence begins the *Creed*, as the foundation of that authority. For if there can be no divine faith without the attestation of God, by which alone it becomes divine, and there can be no such attestation except there was an existence of the testifier, then must it needs be proper to begin the confession of our faith with the agnition of our God. If his name were thought fit to be expressed in the front of every action, even by the heathen, because they thought no action prospered but by his approbation, much more ought we to fix it before our confession, because without him to believe as we profess is no less than a contradiction.

Now these words, *I believe in God*, will require a double consideration; one, of the phrase or manner of speech; another, of the thing or nature of the truth in that manner expressed. For to *believe*, with an addition of the preposition *in*, is a phrase or expression ordinarily conceived fit to be given to none but to God himself, as always implying, beside a bare act of faith, an addition of hope, love, and affiance—an observation, as I conceive, prevailing especially in the Latin church, grounded principally upon the authority of St. Augustin. Whereas among the Greeks, in whose language the New Testament was penned, I perceive no such constant distinction in their deliveries of the *Creed*; and in the Hebrew language of the Old, from which the Jewish and Christian Greeks received that phrase of *believing in*, it hath no such peculiar and accumulative signification. For it is sometimes attributed to God, the author and original cause; sometimes to the prophets, the immediate revealers of the faith; sometimes it is spoken of miracles, the motives to believe; sometimes of the law of God, the material object of our faith. Among all which varieties of that phrase of speech it is sufficiently apparent that in this confession of faith it is most proper to admit it in the last acceptation, by which it is attributed to the material object of belief; for, the *Creed* being nothing else but a brief comprehension of the most necessary

matters of faith, whatsoever is contained in it beside the first word *I believe*, by which we make confession of our faith, can be nothing else but part of those verities to be believed, and the act of belief in respect to them nothing but an assent unto them as divinely credible and infallible truths. Neither can we conceive that the ancient Greek fathers of the church could have any farther meaning in it, who make the whole body of the *Creed* to be of the same nature, as so many truths to be believed, acknowledged, and confessed; insomuch as sometimes they use not *believing in*, neither for the Father, Son, nor Holy Ghost; sometimes using it as to them, they continue the same to the following Articles of, the *catholic church, the communion of saints, &c.*, and generally speak of the *Creed* as of nothing but mere matter of faith, without any intimation of hope, love, or any such notion included in it. So that *believing in*, by virtue of the phrase or manner of speech, whether we look upon the original use of it in the Hebrew, or the derivative in the Greek, or the sense of it among the first Christians in the Latin church, can be of no farther real importance in the *Creed* in respect of God who immediately follows, than to acknowledge and assert his being or existence. Nor ought this to be imagined a slender notion or small part of the first article of our faith, when it really is the foundation of this and all the rest; that as the *Creed* is fundamental in respect of other truths, this is the foundation even of the fundamentals; for "*he that cometh to God must believe that he is,*" Heb. xi. 6. And this I take for a sufficient explication of the phrase, *I believe in God*, that is, *I believe that God is*.

As for the matter or truth contained in these words so explained, it admits a threefold consideration: first, of the notion of God, what is here understood by that name; secondly, of the existence of God, how we know or believe that he is; thirdly, the unity of God, in that though there be gods many, and lords many, yet in our *Creed* we mention him as but one. When therefore we shall have clearly delivered what is the true notion of God in whom we believe, how and by what means we come to assure ourselves of the existence of such a Deity, and

upon what grounds we apprehend him of such a transcendent nature that he can admit no competitor; then may we be conceived to have sufficiently explicated the former part of the first article; then may every one understand what he says, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he professeth, *I believe in God.*

The name of God is attributed unto many, but here is to be understood of him who by way of eminency and excellency bears that name, and therefore is styled "God of gods;" "The Lord your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords," Deut. x. 17; and in the same respect he is called "The most high God" (others being but inferior or under him), and "God over" or above "all." This eminency and excellency, by which these titles become proper unto him, and incommunicable to any other, is grounded upon the divine nature or essence, which all other who are called gods have not, and therefore are not by nature gods. "Then when ye knew not God," saith St. Paul, "ye did service to them which by nature are not gods," Gal. iv. 8. There is then a God by nature, and others which are called gods, but by nature are not so; for either they have no power at all, because no being, but only in the false opinions of deceived men, as the gods of the heathen; or if they have any real power or authority, from whence some are called gods in the Scripture, yet have they it not from themselves or of their own nature, but from him who only hath immortality, and consequently only divinity, and therefore is the only true God. So that the notion of a Deity doth at last expressly signify a being or nature of infinite perfection; and the infinite perfection of a nature or being consisteth in this, that it be absolutely and essentially necessary, an actual being of itself; and potential or causative of all beings beside itself; independent from any other, upon which all things else depend, and by which all things else are governed. It is true, indeed, that to give a perfect definition of God is impossible, neither can our finite reason hold any proportion with infinity; but yet a sense of this Divinity we have, and the first and common notion of it consists in these three particulars, that it is a Being of itself, and independent from any other; that it is that upon which all

things which are made depend; that it governs all things. And this I conceive sufficient as to the first consideration, in reference to the notion of a God.

As for the existence of such a Being, how it comes to be known unto us, or by what means we are assured of it, is not so unanimously agreed upon, as that it is; for although some have imagined that the knowledge of a Deity is connatural to the soul of man, so that every man hath a connate inbred notion of a God; yet I rather conceive the soul of man to have no connatural knowledge at all, no particular notion of any thing in it from the beginning; but, seeing we can have no assurance of its pre-existence, we may more rationally judge it to receive the first apprehensions of things by sense, and by them to make all rational collections. If then the soul of man be at the first like a fair smooth table, without any actual characters or knowledge imprinted in it; if all the knowledge which we have comes successively by sensation, instruction, and rational collection; then must we not refer the apprehension of a Deity to any connate notion or inbred opinion; at least we are assured God never chargeth us with the knowledge of him upon that account.

Again: although others do affirm that the existence of God is a truth evident of itself, so that whosoever hears but these terms once named, that God is, cannot choose but acknowledge it for a certain and infallible truth upon the first apprehension;—that as no man can deny that the whole is greater than any part, who knoweth only what is meant by whole, and what by part; so no man can possibly deny or doubt of the existence of God, who knows but what is meant by God, and what it is to be; yet can we not ground our knowledge of God's existence upon any such clear and immediate evidence; nor were it safe to lay it upon such a ground, because whosoever should deny it, could not by this means be convinced; it being a very irrational way of instruction to tell a man that doubts of this truth, that he must believe it because it is evident unto him, when he knows that he therefore only doubts of it, because it is not evident unto him.

Although therefore that God is, be of itself an imme-

diate, certain, necessary truth, yet must it be evidenced and made apparent unto us by its connection with other truths ; so that the being of the Creator may appear unto us by his creature, and the dependency of inferior entities may lead us to a clear acknowledgment of the supreme and independent Being. The wisdom of the Jews thought this method proper; for "by the greatness and beauty of the creatures, proportionably the Maker of them is seen," Wisd. xiii. 5: and not only they, but St. Paul hath taught us, that "the invisible things of God, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead," Rom. i. 20 For if Phidias could so contrive a piece of his own work as in it to preserve the memory of himself, never to be obliterated without the destruction of the work, well may we read the great Artificer of the world in the works of his own hands, and by the existence of any thing demonstrate the first cause of all things.

We find, by the experience of ourselves, that some things in this world have a beginning, before which they were not. The account of the years of our age sufficiently infer our nativities, and they our conceptions, before which we had no being. Now, if there be any thing which had a beginning, there must necessarily be something which had no beginning, because nothing can be a beginning to itself. Whatsoever is must of necessity either have been made, or not made; and something there must needs be which was never made, because all things cannot be made; for whatsoever is made is made by another, neither can any thing produce itself; otherwise it would follow that the same thing is and is not, at the same instant, in the same respect: it is, because a producer; it is not, because to be produced; it is therefore in being, and is not in being; which is a manifest contradiction. If then all things which are made were made by some other, that other which produced them either was itself produced, or was not; and, if not, then have we already an independent Being; if it were, we must at last come to something which was never made, or else admit either a circle of pro-

ductions, in which the effect shall make its own cause, or an infinite succession in causalities, by which nothing will be made : both which are equally impossible. Something then we must confess was never made ; something which never had beginning. And although these effects or dependent beings, singly considered by themselves, do not infer one supreme cause and maker of them all, yet the admirable order and connexion of things show as much ; and this one supreme Cause is God. For all things which we see or know have their existence for some end, which no man who considereth the uses and utilities of every species can deny. Now whatsoever is and hath its being for some end, of that the end for which it is must be thought the cause ; and a final cause is no otherwise the cause of any thing than as it moves the efficient cause to work : from whence we cannot but collect a prime efficient Cause of all things, endued with infinite wisdom, who having a full comprehension of the ends of all, designed, produced, and disposed all things to those ends.

Again : as all things have their existence, so have they also their operations for some end ; and, whatsoever worketh so, must needs be directed to it. Although then those creatures which are endued with reason can thereby apprehend the goodness of the end for which they work, and make choice of such means as are proportionable and proper for the obtaining of it, and so by their own counsel direct themselves unto it ; yet can we not conceive that other natural agents, whose operations flow from a bare instinct, can be directed in their actions by any counsel of their own. The stone doth not deliberate whether it shall descend, nor doth the wheat take counsel whether it shall grow or not. Even men in natural actions use no act of deliberation. We do not advise how our heart shall beat, though without that pulse we cannot live. When we have provided nutriment for our stomach, we take no counsel how it shall be digested there, or how the chyle is distributed to every part for the reparation of the whole. The mother who conceives takes no care how that *conceptus* shall be framed, how all the parts shall be distinguished, and by what means or ways the child shall grow within her womb. And yet all these operations are

directed to their proper ends, and that with a greater reason, and therefore by a greater wisdom, than what proceeds from any thing of human understanding. What then can be more clear than that those natural agents, which work constantly for those ends which they themselves cannot perceive, must be directed by some high and over-ruling wisdom? And who can be their director in all their operations tending to those ends, but he who gave them their beings for those ends? And who is that but the great Artificer who works in all of them? For art is so far the imitation of nature, that if it were not in the artificer, but in the thing itself which by art is framed, the works of art and nature would be the same. Were that which frames a watch within it, and all those curious wheels wrought without the hand of man, it would seem to grow into that form: nor would there be any distinction between the making of that watch and the growing of a plant. Now what the artificer is to works of art, who orders and disposes them to other ends than by nature they were made, that is the Maker of all things to all natural agents, directing all their operations to ends which they cannot apprehend; and thus appears the Maker to be the Ruler of the world, the Steerer of this great Ship, the Law of this universal commonwealth, the General of all the hosts of heaven and earth. By these ways, as by the testimony of the creature, we come to find an eternal and independent Being, upon whom all things else depend, and by whom all things else are governed; and this we have before supposed to be the first notion of God.

Neither is this any private collection or particular ratiocination, but the public and universal reason of the world. No age so distant, no country so remote, no people so barbarous, but gives a sufficient testimony of this truth. When the Roman eagle flew over most parts of the habitable world, they met with atheism no where, but rather by their miscellany deities at Rome, which grew together with their victories, they showed no nation was without its God. And since the later art of navigation improved hath discovered another part of the world, with which no former commerce hath been known, although the

customs of the people be much different, and their manner of religion hold small correspondency with any in these parts of the world professed, yet in this all agree, that some religious observances they retain, and a Divinity they acknowledge. Or if any nation be discovered which maketh no profession of piety, and exerciseth no religious observances, it followeth not from thence that they acknowledge no God; for they may only deny his providence, as the Epicureans did; or, if any go farther, their numbers are so few, that they must be inconsiderable in respect of mankind. And therefore so much of the *Creed* hath been the general confession of all nations, *I believe in God*; which, were it not a most certain truth grounded upon principles obvious unto all, what reason could be given of so universal a consent? or how can it be imagined that all men should conspire to deceive themselves and their posterity?

Nor is this the reason only general, and the consent unto it universal, but God hath still preserved and quickened the worship due unto his name, by the patefaction of himself. Things which are to come are so beyond our knowledge that the wisest man can but conjecture: and seeing we are assured of the contingency of future things, and our ignorance of the concurrence of several free causes to the production of an effect, we may be sure that certain and infallible predictions are clear divine patefactions; for none but he who made all things, and gave them power to work; none but he who ruleth all things, and ordereth and directeth all their operations to their ends; none but he upon whose will the actions of all things depend, can possibly be imagined to foresee the effects depending merely on those causes. And therefore by what means we may be assured of a prophecy, by the same we may be secured of a Divinity. Except then all the annals of the world were forgeries, and all remarks of history designed to put a cheat upon posterity, we can have no pretence to suspect God's existence, having such ample testimonies of his influence.

The works of nature appear by observation uniform, and there is a certain sphere of every body's power and activity. If then any action be performed which is not

within the compass of the power of any natural agent ; if any thing be wrought by the intervention of a body which beareth no proportion to it, or hath no natural aptitude so to work ; it must be ascribed to a cause transcending all natural causes, and disposing all their operations. Thus every miracle proves its author, and every act of omnipotency is a sufficient demonstration of a Deity. And that man must be possessed with a strange opinion of the weakness of our fathers, and the testimony of all former ages, who shall deny that ever any miracle was wrought. "We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us what works thou didst in their days, in the times of old," Psal. xliv. 1. "Blessed be the Lord God, who only doth wondrous works," Psal. lxxii. 18.

Nor are we only informed by the necessary dependency of all things on God, as effects upon their universal cause, or his external patefactions unto others, and the consentient acknowledgment of mankind ; but every particular person hath a particular remembrancer in himself as a sufficient testimony of his Creator, Lord, and Judge. We know there is a great force of conscience in all men, by which their thoughts are ever accusing, or excusing them. They feel a comfort in those virtuous actions which they find themselves to have wrought according to their rule, a sting and secret remorse for all vicious acts and impious machinations. Nay, those who strive most to deny a God, and to obliterate all sense of Divinity out of their own souls, have not been least sensible of this remembrancer in their breasts. It is true, indeed, that a false opinion of God, and a superstitious persuasion which hath nothing of the true God in it, may breed a remorse of conscience in those who think it true ; and therefore some may hence collect that the force of conscience is only grounded upon an opinion of a Deity, and that opinion may be false ; but if it be a truth, as the testimonies of the wisest writers of most different persuasions, and the experience of all sorts of persons of most various inclinations do agree, that the remorse of conscience can never be obliterated, then it rather proveth than supposeth

an opinion of a Divinity; and that man who most pe-remptorily denieth God's existence is the greatest argument himself that there is a God. Let Caligula profess himself an atheist, and with that profession hide his head or run under his bed, when the thunder strikes his ears and the lightning flashes in his eyes; those terrible works of nature put him in mind of the power, and his own guilt of the justice of God; whom, while in his wilful opinion he weakly denieth, in his involuntary action he strongly asserteth; so that a Deity will either be granted or extorted, and where it is not acknowledged it will be manifested. Only unhappy is that man who denies him to himself, and proves him to others; who will not acknowledge his existence, of whose power he cannot be ignorant; "God is not far from every one of us," Acts xvii. 27. The proper discourse of St. Paul to the philosophers of Athens was, that "they might feel after him and find him." Some children have been so ungracious as to refuse to give the honor due unto their parent, but never any so irrational as to deny they had a father. As for those who have dishonored God, it may stand most with their interest, and therefore they may wish there were none; but it cannot consist with their reason to assert there is none, when even the very poets of the heathen have taught us that "we are his offspring."

It is necessary thus to believe there is a God, first, because there can be no divine faith without this belief; for all faith is therefore only divine, because it relieth upon the authority of God giving testimony to the object of it; but that which hath no being can have no authority, can give no testimony. The ground of his authority is his veracity, the foundations of his veracity are his omniscience and sanctity, both which suppose his essence and existence, because what is not is neither knowing nor holy.

Secondly: it is necessary to believe a Deity, that thereby we may acknowledge such a nature extant as is worthy of, and may justly challenge from us, the highest worship and adoration. For it were vain to be religious and to exercise devotion, except there were a Being to

whom all such holy applications were most justly due. Adoration implies submission and dejection, so that while we worship we cast down ourselves; there must be therefore some great eminence in the object worshipped, or else we should dishonor our own nature in the worship of it. But when a Being is presented of that intrinsical and necessary perfection that it depends on nothing, and all things else depend on it, and are wholly governed and disposed by it, this worthily calls us to our knees, and shows the humblest of our devotions to be but just and loyal retributions.

This necessary truth hath been so universally received, that we shall always find all nations of the world more prone unto idolatry than to atheism, and readier to multiply than deny the Deity. But our faith teacheth us equally to deny them both, and each of them is renounced in these words, *I believe in God*; *First, in God* affirmatively, *I believe* he is, against Atheism; secondly, *in God* exclusively, not in Gods, against polytheism and idolatry. Although therefore the existence and unity of God be two distinct truths, yet are they of so necessary dependence and intimate coherence, that both may be expressed by one word, and included in one article.

And that the unity of the Godhead is concluded in this article is apparent, not only because the Nicene council so expressed it by way of exposition, but also because this *Creed* in the churches of the East, before the council of Nice, had that addition in it, *I believe in one God*. We begin our *Creed* then as Plato did his chief and prime epistles, who gave this distinction to his friends, that the name of God was prefixed before those that were more serious and remarkable, but of Gods, in the plural, to such as were more vulgar and trivial. "Unto thee it was showed," saith Moses to Israel, "that thou mightest know that the Lord he is God; there is none else beside him," Deut. iv. 35. And as the law, so the gospel teacheth us the same: "We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and there is none other God but one," 1 Cor. viii. 4. This unity of the Godhead will easily appear as necessary as the existence, so that it must be as impossible there should be more Gods than

one, as that there should be none : which will clearly be demonstrated, first, out of the nature of God, to which multiplication is repugnant; and, secondly, from the government of God as he is Lord, in which we must not admit confusion. For, first, the nature of God consists in this, that he is the prime and original cause of all things, as an independent Being upon whom all things else depend, and likewise the ultimate end or final cause of all; but in this sense two prime causes are unimaginable, and for all things to depend on one, and to be more independent beings than one, is a clear contradiction. This primity God requires to be attributed to himself: "Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called; I am he, I am the first, I also am the last," Isai. xlviii. 12. And from this primity he challengeth his unity: "Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of Hosts; I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God," Isai. xlv. 6.

Again: if there were more Gods than one, then were not all perfections in one, neither formally, by reason of their distinction, nor eminently and virtually; for then one should have power to produce the other, and that nature which is producible is not divine. But all acknowledge God to be absolutely and infinitely perfect, in whom all perfections imaginable which are simply such must be contained formally, and all others, which imply any mixture of imperfection, virtually.

But were no arguments brought from the infinite perfections of the divine nature able to convince us, yet were the consideration of his supreme dominion sufficient to persuade us. The will of God is infinitely free, and by that freedom doth he govern and dispose of all things: "He doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth," said Nebuchadnezzar out of his experience, Dan. iv. 35; and St. Paul expresseth him as "working all things after the counsel of his own will." If then there were more supreme Governors of the world than one, each of them absolute and free, they might have contrary determinations concerning the same thing, than which nothing can be more prejudicial unto government. God is a God of

order, not confusion ; and therefore of unity, not admitting multiplication. If it be better that the universe should be governed by one than many, we may be assured that it is so, because nothing must be conceived of God but what is best. He therefore who made all things by that right is Lord of all, and, because all power is his, he alone ruleth over all.

Now God is not only one, but hath a unity peculiar to himself, by which he is the only God ; and that not only by way of actuality, but also of possibility. Every individual man is one, but so that there is a second and a third, and consequently every one is part of a number, and concurring to a multitude. The sun indeed is one ; so that there is neither third nor second sun, at least within the same vortex ; but though there be not, yet there might have been. Neither in the unity of the solar nature is there any repugnancy to plurality ; for that God who made this world, and in this the sun to rule the day, might have made another world by the same fecundity of his omnipotency, and another sun to rule in that. Whereas in the divine nature there is an intrinsical and essential singularity, because no other being can have any existence but from that ; and whatsoever essence hath its existence from another is not God. "I am the Lord," saith he, "and there is none else, there is no God besides me." "That they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none besides me." "I am the Lord, and there is none else." Isai. xlv. 5, 6 ; Deut. iv. 35 ; Psal. xviii. 31. He who hath infinite knowledge, knoweth no other God beside himself : "Is there a God besides me ? yea, there is no God ; I know not any," Isai. xlv. 18. And we who believe in him, and desire to enjoy him, need for that end to know no other God but him : "*This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God,*" John xvii. 3 ; as certainly one, as God.

It is necessary thus to believe the unity of the Godhead, that being assured there is a nature worthy of our devotions, and challenging our religious subjection, we may learn to know whose that nature is to which we owe our adorations, lest our minds should wander and fluctuate in our worship about various and uncertain objects. If

we should apprehend more Gods than one, I know not what could determine us in any instant to the actual adoration of any one; for where no difference doth appear (as, if there were many and all by nature Gods, there could be none,) what inclination could we have, what reason could we imagine, to prefer or elect any one before the rest for the object of our devotions? Thus is it necessary to believe the unity of God in respect of us who are obliged to worship him.

Secondly: it is necessary to believe the unity of God in respect of him who is to be worshipped. Without this acknowledgment we cannot give unto God the things which are God's, it being part of the worship and honor due unto God to accept of no co-partner with him. When the law was given, in the observance whereof the religion of the Israelites consisted, the first precept was this prohibition: "*Thou shalt have no other Gods before me,*" Exod. xx. 3; and whosoever violateth this, denieth the foundation on which all the rest depend, as the Jews observe. This is the true reason of that strict precept by which all are commanded to give divine worship to God only: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve;" because he alone is God; him only shalt thou fear, because he alone hath infinite power; in him only shalt thou trust, because "he only is our rock and our salvation;" to him alone shalt thou direct thy devotions, because "he only knoweth the hearts of the children of men." Upon this foundation the whole heart of man is entirely required of him, and engaged to him: "Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one God: and," or rather therefore, "thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might," Deut. vi. 4. Whosoever were truly and by nature God, could not choose but challenge our love upon the ground of an infinite excellency, and transcendent beauty of holiness; and therefore, if there were more Gods than one, our love must necessarily be terminated unto more than one, and consequently divided between them; and as our love, so also the proper effect thereof, our cheerful and ready obedience, which, like the child propounded to the judgment of Solomon, as soon as it is divided, is destroy-

ed; "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other: or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other," Matth. vi. 24.

Having thus described the first notion of a God, having demonstrated the existence and unity of that God, and having in these three particulars comprised all which can be contained in this part of the article, we may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian understand, what it is he says when he makes his confession in these words, *I believe in God*; which in correspondence with the precedent discourse may be thus expressed:—Forasmuch as by all things created is made known the eternal power and Godhead, and the dependency of all limited beings infers an infinite and independent essence; whereas all things are for some end, and all their operations directed to it, although they cannot apprehend that end for which they are, and in prosecution of which they work, and therefore must be guided by some universal and over-ruling wisdom; seeing this collection is so evident that all the nations of the earth have made it; seeing God hath not only written himself in the lively characters of his creatures, but hath also made frequent paterfactions of his Deity by most infallible predictions and supernatural operations; therefore I fully assent unto, freely acknowledge, and clearly profess this truth, that *there is a God*.

Again: seeing a prime and independent Being supposeth all other to depend, and consequently no other to be God; seeing the entire fountain of all perfections is incapable of a double head, and the most perfect government of the universe speaks the supreme dominion of one absolute Lord; hence do I acknowledge that God to be but one, and in this unity, or rather singularity of the Godhead, excluding all actual or possible multiplication of a Deity, *I believe in God*.

I believe in God the Father.

AFTER the confession of a Deity, and assertion of the divine unity, the next consideration is concerning God's Paternity; for this "one God is Father of all," and "to us there is but one God, the Father."

Now, although the Christian notion of the divine paternity be some way peculiar to the evangelical patefaction, yet wheresoever God hath been acknowledged, he hath been understood and worshipped as a Father: the very heathen poets so describe their Gods, and their vulgar names did carry Father in them, as the most popular and universal notion.

This name of Father is a relative; and the proper foundation of paternity, as of a relation, is generation. As therefore the phrase of generation is diversely attributed unto several acts of the same nature with generation properly taken, or by consequence attending on it; so the title of Father is given unto divers persons or things, and for several reasons under the same God. "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth, when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens," saith Moses, Gen. ii. 4. So that the creation or production of any thing by which it is and before was not is a kind of generation, and consequently the creator or producer of it a kind of father: "Hath the rain a father? or who hath begotten the drops of dew?" Job xxxviii. 28;—by which words Job signifies, that as there is no other cause assignable of the rain but God, so may he as the cause be called the Father of it, though not in the most proper sense, as he is the Father of his Son: and so the philosophers of old, who thought that God did make the world, called him expressly, as the Maker, so the Father of it. And "thus to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things;" to which the words following in *the Creed* may seem to have relation, *the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth*. But in this mass of creatures, and body of the universe, some works of the creation more properly call him Father, as being more rightly sons: such are all the rational and intellectual offspring of the Deity. Of merely natural beings and irrational agents he is the Creator; of rational, as so, the Father also; they are his creatures, these his sons. Hence he is styled the "Father of spirits," and the blessed angels, when he laid the foundations of the earth, his sons: "When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy,"

Job xxxviii. 7. Hence man, whom he created after his own image, is called his offspring, and Adam, the immediate work of his hands, the son of God: hence may we all cry out with the Israelites taught by the prophet so to speak, "*Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?*" Malac. ii. 10. Thus the first and most universal notion of God's paternity, in a borrowed or metaphorical sense, is founded rather upon creation than procreation.

Unto this act of creation is annexed that of conservation, by which God doth uphold and preserve in being that which at first he made, and to which he gave its being. As therefore it is the duty of the parent to educate and preserve the child, as that which had its being from him; so this paternal education doth give the name of father unto man, and conservation gives the same to God.

Again: redemption from a state of misery, by which a people hath become worse than nothing, unto a happy condition, is a kind of generation, which joined with love, care, and indulgence in the Redeemer, is sufficient to found a new paternity, and give him another title of a Father. Well might Moses tell the people of Israel, now brought out of the land of Egypt from their brick and straw, unto their quails and manna, unto their milk and honey, "Is not he thy Father that hath bought thee? hath he not made thee, and established thee?" Deut. xxxii. 6. Well might God speak unto the same people as to "his son, even his first-born." "Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb." "Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel, which are born by me from the belly, which are carried from the womb," Exod. iv. 2; Isai. xlv. 24, xlvi. 3. And just is the acknowledgment made by that people instructed by the prophet, "Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not; thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer, from everlasting is thy name," Isai. lxiii. 16. And thus another kind of paternal relation of God unto the sons of men is founded on a restitution or temporal redemption.

Besides, if to be born causeth a relation to a father, then to be born again maketh an addition of another; and if to generate foundeth, then to regenerate addeth a pater-

nity. Now though we cannot enter the second time into our mother's womb, nor pass through the same door into the scene of life again, yet we believe and are persuaded, that "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." A double birth there is, and the world consists of two, the first and the second man. And though the incorruptible seed be the word of God, and the dispensers of it in some sense may say, as St. Paul spake unto the Corinthians, "I have begotten you through the gospel;" yet he is the true Father whose word it is, and that is God, even "the Father of lights, who of his own will begat us with the word of truth," Jam. i. 17. Thus "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God;" which regeneration is as it were a second creation, for "we are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works," Ephes. ii. 10. And he alone who did create us out of nothing, can beget us again, and make us of the new creation. When Rachael called to Jacob, "Give me children or I die;" he answered her sufficiently with this question, "*Am I in God's stead?*" Gen. xxx. 1. And if he only openeth the womb, who else can make the soul to bear? Hence hath he the name of Father, and they of sons who are born of him; and so from that internal act of spiritual regeneration another title of Paternity roundeth unto the Divinity.

Nor is this the only second birth or sole regeneration in a Christian sense: the soul, which after its natural being requires a birth into the life of grace, is also after that born again into a life of glory. Our Saviour puts us in mind of the regeneration, "when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory." The resurrection of our bodies is a kind of coming out of the womb of the earth, and entering upon immortality is a nativity into another life; for "they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, are the sons of God, being the sons of the resurrection," Luke xx. 35; and then as sons "they become heirs; co-heirs with Christ," "receiving the promise and reward of eternal inheritance." "*Beloved, now we are the sons of God,*" saith St. John, even in this life by regeneration, "and it doth not yet appear," or, "it hath not been yet made mani-

fest, what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him," 1 Joh. iii. 2; the manifestation of the Father being a sufficient declaration of the condition of the sons, when the sonship itself consisteth in a similitude of the Father. And, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us," 1 Pet. i. 3. Why may not then a second kind of regeneration be thought a fit addition of this paternal relation?

Neither is there only a natural, but also a voluntary and civil foundation of paternity; for the laws have found a way by which a man may become a father without procreation; and this imitation of nature is called adoption, taken in the general signification. Although therefore in many ways God is a Father, yet, lest any way might seem to exclude us from being his sons, he hath made us so also by adoption. Others are wont to fly to this, as to a comfort of their solitary condition, when either nature hath denied them, or death bereft them of their offspring. Whereas God doth it not for his own, but for our sakes; nor is the advantage his, but ours. "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God," 1 Joh. iii. 1; that we, the sons of disobedient and condemned Adam by natural generation, should be translated into the glorious liberty of the sons of God by adoption; that we, who were aliens, strangers, and enemies, should be assumed "unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom all the family of heaven and earth is named," and be made partakers of "the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints." For as, in the legal adoption, the father hath as full and absolute power over his adopted son as over his own issue, so in the spiritual, the adopted sons have a clear and undoubted right of inheritance. He then who hath "predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself," hath thereby another kind of paternal relation, and so we receive the "Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father."

The necessity of this faith in God, as in our Father, appeareth, first, in that it is the ground of all our filial fear, honor, and obedience due unto him upon this relation. "Honor thy Father" is the first commandment with promise, written in tables of stone with the finger of God; and "Children, obey your parents in the Lord," is an evangelical precept, but founded upon principles of reason and justice; "*for this is right,*" saith St. Paul. And, if there be such a rational and legal obligation of honor and obedience to the fathers of our flesh, how much more must we think ourselves obliged to him whom we believe to be our heavenly and everlasting Father? "A son honoreth his father, and a servant his master. If then I be a father, where is my honor? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts," Malac. i. 6. If we be heirs, we must be co-heirs with Christ; if sons, we must be brethren to the only-begotten; but seeing he came not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him, he acknowledgeth no fraternity but with such as do the same; as he hath said, "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother," Matt. xii. 50. If it be required of a bishop in the church of God to be "one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity;" what obedience must be due, what subjection must be paid, unto the Father of the family?

The same relation in the object of our faith is the life of our devotions, the expectation of all our petitions. Christ, who taught his disciples, and us in them, how to pray, propounded not the knowledge of God, though without that he could not hear us; neither represented he his power, though without that he cannot help us; but comprehended all in this relation: "When ye pray, say, Our Father." This prevents all vain repetitions of our most earnest desires, and gives us full security to cut off all tautology; for "our Father knoweth what things we have need of before we ask him." This creates a clear assurance of a grant without mistake of our petition: "What man is there of us, who, if his son ask bread, will give him a stone? or, if he ask a fish, will give him a serpent? If we then who are evil know how

to give good gifts unto our children, how much more shall our Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" Matt. vii. 9.

Again: this paternity is the proper foundation of our Christian patience, sweetening all our afflictions with the name and nature of fatherly corrections: "We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live?" Heb. xii. 9; especially considering that "they chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness;" they, as an argument of their authority; he, as an assurance of his love: they, that we might acknowledge them to be our parents; he, that he may persuade us that we are his sons; for "whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." And what greater incitement unto the exercise of patience is imaginable, unto a suffering soul, than to see in every stroke the hand of a Father, in every affliction a demonstration of his love? Or how canst thou repine, or be guilty of the least degree of impatience, even in the sharpest corrections, if "thou shalt know with thine heart, that as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee?" Deut. viii. 5. How canst thou not be comforted, and even rejoice in the midst of thy greatest sufferings, when thou knowest that he who striketh pitieth, he who afflicteth is as it were afflicted with it? for "like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him," Psal. ciii. 13.

Lastly: the same relation strongly inferreth an absolute necessity of our imitation; it being clearly vain to assume the title of son without any similitude of the father. What is the general notion of generation but the production of the like; nature, ambitious of perpetuity, striving to preserve the species in the multiplication and succession of individuals? And this similitude consisteth partly in essentials, or the likeness of nature; partly in accidentals, or the likeness in figure or affections. "Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image;" and can we imagine those the sons of God who are no way like him? A similitude of nature we must not, of figure we cannot

pretend unto ; it remains then only that we bear some likeness in our actions and affections. "Be ye therefore followers," saith the apostle, or rather "imitators of God, as dear children," Eph. v. 1. What he hath revealed of himself, that we must express within ourselves. Thus God spake unto the children of Israel, whom he styled his son, *Ye shall be holy, for I am holy.* And the apostle upon the same ground speaketh unto us, as to obedient children, "As he that hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation," 1 Pet. i. 15. It is part of the general beneficence and universal goodness of our God, that "he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." These impartial beams and undistinguishing showers are but to show us what we ought to do, and to make us fruitful in the works of God : for no other reason Christ hath given us this command, "Love your enemies, bless them them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, that ye may be the children of your father which is in heaven." No other command did he give upon this ground, but, "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father is merciful."

So necessary is this faith in God, as in our Father, both for direction to the best of actions, and for consolation in the worst of conditions.

But, although this be very necessary, yet is it not the principal or most proper explication of God's paternity ; for, as we find one person in a more peculiar manner the Son of God, so must we look upon God as in a more peculiar manner the Father of that Son. "I ascend unto my Father and your Father," saith our Saviour ; the same of both, but in a different manner, denoted by the article prefixed before the one and not the other ; which distinction in the original we may preserve by this translation, "I ascend unto the Father of me, and Father of you ;" first *of me*, and then *of you* ; not therefore his, because ours ; but therefore ours, because his. So far we are the sons of God, as we are like unto him ; and our similitude unto God consisteth in our conformity to the likeness of his Son ; for "whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren," Rom. viii.

29; he the first born, and we sons, as brethren unto him; he "appointed heir of all things," and we "heirs of God, as joint heirs with him." Thus God "sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption of sons," and, "because we are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father," Gal. iv. 4. By his mission are we adopted, and by his Spirit call we God our Father. So are we no longer servants, but now sons; and, if sons, then "heirs of God," but still "through Christ." It is true, indeed, that "both he that sanctifieth," that is Christ, "and they who are sanctified," that is faithful Christians, "are all of one," the same Father, the same God; "for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren," Heb. ii. 11; yet are they not all of him after the same manner, not the "many sons" like the "Captain of their salvation;" but Christ the beloved, the first-born, the only-begotten, the Son after a more peculiar and more excellent manner; the rest with relation unto, and dependence on his sonship; as given unto him; "Behold I, and the children which God hath given me," Isai. viii. 18; as being so by faith in him; for "we are all the children of God by faith of Christ Jesus;" as receiving the right of sonship from him; for "as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God," Joh. i. 12. Among all the sons of God there is none like to that one Son of God.

And, if there be so great a disparity in the filiation, we must make as great a difference in the correspondent relation. There is one degree of sonship founded on creation, and that is the lowest, as belonging unto all, both good and bad; another degree above that there is grounded upon regeneration or adoption, belonging only to the truly faithful in this life: and a third above the rest founded on the resurrection, or collation of the eternal inheritance, and the similitude of God, appertaining to the saints alone in the world to come; for "we are now the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him," 1 Joh. iii. 2. And there is yet another degree of filiation, of a greater eminency and a different nature, appertaining properly to none of these, but to the true Son of God alone;

who amongst all his brethren hath only received the title of "his own Son," and a singular testimony from heaven, "This is my beloved Son," even in the presence of John the Baptist, even in the midst of Moses and Elias (who are certainly the sons of God by all the other three degrees of filiation); and therefore he hath called God after a peculiar way his own father. And so at last we come unto the most singular and eminent paternal relation, "unto the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore;" the Father of him, and of us, but not the Father of us as of him. Christ hath taught us to say, "Our Father;" a form of speech which he never used himself; sometimes he calls him "The Father;" sometimes "My Father," sometimes "Your," but never "Our Father;" he makes no such conjunction of us to himself, as to make no distinction between us and himself; so conjoining us as to distinguish, though so distinguishing as not to separate us.

Indeed I conceive this, as the most eminent notion of God's paternity, so the original and proper explication of this Article of the *Creed*: and that not only because the ancient fathers deliver no other exposition of it, but also because that which I conceive to be the first occasion, rise, and original of the *Creed* itself, requireth this as the proper interpretation. Immediately before the ascension of our Saviour, he said unto his apostles, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Matt. xxviii. 18. From this sacred form of baptism did the Church derive the rule of faith, requiring the profession of belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, before they could be baptized in their name. When the eunuch asked Philip, "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" Philip said, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest:" and when the eunuch replied, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God;" he baptized him; Acts viii. 36. And, before that, the Samaritans, "when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, were baptized, both men and women." For as in the Acts of the Apostles

there is no more expressed than that they baptized "in the name of Jesus Christ;" so is no more expressed of the faith required in them who were to be baptized, than to believe in the same name. But seeing the Father and the Holy Ghost were likewise mentioned in the first institution, seeing the expressing of one doth not exclude the other, seeing it is certain that from the apostles' times the names of all three were used; hence upon the same ground was required faith, and a profession of belief in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Again, as the eunuch said not simply, "I believe in the Son," but "I believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God," as a brief explication of that part of the institution which he had learned before of Philip: so they who were converted unto Christianity were first taught, not the bare names, but the explications and descriptions of them in a brief, easy, and familiar way; which when they had rendered, acknowledged, and professed, they were baptized in them. And these, being regularly and constantly used, made up the rule of faith, that is, the *Creed*. The truth of which may sufficiently be made apparent to any who shall seriously consider the constant practice of the church, from the first age unto this present, of delivering the rule of faith to those who were to be baptized, and so requiring of themselves or their sureties an express recitation, profession, or acknowledgment of the *Creed*. From whence this observation is properly deducible—that in what sense the name of *Father* is taken in the form of baptism, in the same it also ought to be taken in this article. And seeing nothing can be more clear than that, when it is said, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son," the notion of Father hath in this particular no other relation but to that Son whose name is joined with his; and as we are baptized into no other Son of that Father, but that only-begotten Christ Jesus, so into no other Father, but the Father of that only-begotten; it followeth, that the proper explication of the first words of the *Creed* is this—*I believe in God the Father of Christ Jesus.*

In vain then is that vulgar distinction applied unto the explication of the *Creed*, whereby the Father is considered both personally and essentially; personally, as the first in

the glorious Trinity, with relation and opposition to the Son; essentially, as comprehending the whole Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For that the Son is not here comprehended in the Father is evident, not only out of the original or occasion, but also from the very letter of the *Creed*, which teacheth us *to believe in God the Father, and in his Son*; for if the Son were included in the Father, then were the Son the father of himself. As therefore when I say, *I believe in Jesus Christ his Son*, I must necessarily understand the Son of that Father whom I mentioned in the first article; so when I said, *I believe in God the Father*, I must as necessarily be understood of the Father of him whom I call *his Son* in the second article.

Now as it cannot be denied that God may several ways be said to be the Father of Christ; first, as he was begotten by the Holy Ghost of the virgin Mary; secondly, as he was sent by him with special authority, as the King of Israel; thirdly, as he was raised from the dead out of the womb of the earth unto immortal life, and made heir of all things in his Father's house; so must we not doubt but, beside all these, God is the Father of that Son in a more eminent and peculiar manner, as he is and ever was with God, and God: which shall be demonstrated fully in the second article, when we come to show how Christ is the only-begotten Son. And according unto this paternity by way of generation totally divine, in which he who begetteth is God, and he which is begotten the same God, do we believe in God, as the eternal Father of an eternal Son; which relation is coeval with his essence; so that we are not to imagine one without the other; but, as we profess him always God, so must we acknowledge him always Father, and that in a far more proper manner than the same title can be given to any creature. Such is the fluctuant condition of human generation, and of those relations which arise from thence, that he who is this day a son, the next may prove a father, and within the space of one day more, without any real alteration in himself, become neither son nor father, losing one relation by the death of him that begot him, and the other by the departure of him that was begotten by him. But in the Godhead these re-

lations are more proper, because fixed, the Father having never been a Son, the Son never becoming Father, in reference to the same kind of generation.

A farther reason of the propriety of God's paternity appears from this that he hath begotten a Son of the same nature and essence with himself, not only specifically, but individually, as I shall also demonstrate in the exposition of the second article; for generation being the production of the like, and that likeness being the similitude of substance, where there is the nearest identity of nature, there must be also the most proper generation, and consequently he who generateth, the most proper Father. If therefore man, who by the benediction of God given unto him at his first creation in these words, "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth," begetteth a son in his own likeness, after his image, that is, of the same human nature, of the same substance with him (which if he did not, he should not according to the benediction multiply himself or man at all), with which similitude of nature many accidental disparities may consist—if by this act of generation he obtaineth the name of father, because, and in regard of his similitude of his nature in the son, how much more properly must that name belong unto God himself, who hath begotten a Son of a nature and essence so totally like, so totally the same, that no accidental disparity can imaginably consist with that identity!

That God is the proper and eternal Father of his own eternal Son is now declared: what is the eminency or excellency of this relation followeth to be considered. In general then we may safely observe, that in the very name of Father there is something of eminence which is not in that of Son; and some kind of priority we must ascribe unto him whom we call the first, in respect of him whom we term the second Person; and, as we cannot but ascribe it, so must we endeavour to preserve it.

Now that privilege or priority consisteth not in this, that the essence or attributes of the one are greater than the essence or attributes of the other; for we shall hereafter demonstrate them to be the same in both; but only in this, that the Father hath that essence of himself, the Son by communication from the Father. From whence he ac-

knowledgeth that he is "from him," that he "liveth by him," that the "Father gave him to have life in himself," and generally referreth all things to him, as received from him. Wherefore in this sense some of the ancients have not stuck to interpret those words, "The Father is greater than I," of Christ as the Son of God, as the second Person in the blessed Trinity; but still with reference not unto his essence, but his generation, by which he is understood to have his being from the Father, who only hath it of himself, and is the original of all power and essence in the Son. "I can of mine own self do nothing," saith our Saviour, because he is not of himself; and who-soever receives his being, must receive his power from another, especially where the essence and the power are undeniably the same, as in God they are. "The Son" then "can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do," because he hath no power of himself, but what the Father gave: and seeing he gave him all the power, as communicating his entire and undivided essence, therefore "what things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise," by the same power by which the Father worketh, because he had received the same Godhead in which the Father subsisteth. There is nothing more intimate and essential to any thing than the life thereof, and that in nothing so conspicuous as in the Godhead, where life and truth are so inseparable that there can be no living God but the true, no true God but the living. "The Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting King," saith the prophet Jeremy, Jer. x. 10; and St. Paul putteth the Thessalonians in mind, how they "turned from idols, to serve the living and true God." Now life is otherwise in God than in the creatures; in him originally, in them derivatively; in him, as in the fountain of absolute perfection, in them by way of dependence and participation; our life is in him, but his is in himself; and as "the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;" both the same life, both in themselves, both in the same degree, as the one, so the other; but only with this difference, the Father giveth it, and the Son receiveth it. From whence he professeth of himself, that "the living Father sent him, and that he liveth by the Father," John vi. 57.

We must not therefore so far endeavour to involve ourselves in the darkness of this mystery as to deny that glory which is clearly due unto the Father, whose pre-eminence undeniably consisteth in this, that he is God not of any other, but of himself, and that there is no other person who is God, but is God of him. It is no diminution to the Son, to say he is from another, for his very name imports as much; but it were a diminution to the Father to speak so of him: and there must be some pre-eminence, where there is place for derogation. What the Father is, he is from none; what the Son is, he is from him: what the first is, he giveth; what the second is he receiveth. The first is a Father indeed by reason of his Son, but he is not God by reason of him; whereas the Son is not so only in regard of the Father, but also God by reason of the same.

Upon this pre-eminence, as I conceive, may safely be grounded the congruity of the divine mission. We often read that Christ was sent, from whence he bears the name of an apostle himself, as well as those whom he therefore named so, because as the "Father sent him, so sent he them." The Holy Ghost is also said to be sent, sometimes by the Father, sometimes by the Son. But we never read that the Father was sent at all, there being an authority in that name which seems inconsistent with this mission. In the parable "a certain householder which planted a vineyard," first "sent his servants to the husbandmen, and again other servants; but last of all he sent unto them his son." It had been inconsistent even with the literal sense of an historical parable, as not at all consonant to the rational customs of men, to have said, that last of all the Son sent his Father to them. So God, placing man in the vineyard of his church, first sent his servants the prophets, by whom he "spake at sundry times and in divers manners;" but "in the last days he sent his Son:" and it were as incongruous and inconsistent with the divine generation, that the Son should send the Father into the world. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father," saith our Saviour; intimating that by whom he lived, by him he was sent, and therefore sent by him because he lived by him, laying his generation as the

proper ground of his mission. Thus he that begetteth sendeth, and he that is begotten is sent. "For I am from him, and he hath sent me," saith the Son: from whom I received my essence by communication, from him also received I this commission. As therefore it is more worthy to give than to receive, to send than to be sent, so in respect of the sonship there is some priority in the divine paternity: from whence divers of the ancients read that place of St. John with this addition, "The Father, which sent me, is greater than I," John xiv. 28. He then is that "God who sent forth his Son made of a woman," that "God who hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father." So that the authority of sending is in the Father; which therefore ought to be acknowledged, because upon this mission is founded the highest testimony of his love to man; for "herein is love," saith St. John, "not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

Again: the dignity of the Father will farther yet appear from the order of the Persons in the blessed Trinity, of which he is undoubtedly the first; for although in some passages of the apostolical discourses the Son may first be named (as in that of St. Paul, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all," 2 Cor. xiii. 14; the latter part of which is nothing but an addition unto his constant benediction), and in others the Holy Ghost precedes the Son (as, "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all," 1 Cor. xii. 4); yet where the three Persons are barely enumerated, and delivered unto us as the rule of faith, there that order is observed which is proper to them; witness the form of baptism, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" which order hath been perpetuated in all confessions of faith, and is for ever inviolably to be observed. For that which is not instituted or invented by the will or design of man, but founded in the nature of things themselves, is not to be altered at the pleasure of man. Now this priority doth properly and

naturally result from the divine Paternity; so that the Son must necessarily be second unto the Father, from whom he receiveth his origination, and the Holy Ghost unto the Son. Neither can we be thought to want a sufficient foundation for this priority of the first Person of the Trinity, if we look upon the numerous testimonies of the ancient doctors of the church, who have not stuck to call the Father, the origin, the cause, the author, the root, the fountain, and the head of the Son, or the whole Divinity. For by these titles it appeareth clearly, first, that they made a considerable difference between the Person of the Father, "of whom are all things," and the Person of the Son, "by whom are all things;"—secondly, that the difference consisteth properly in this, that as the branch is from the root, and the river from the fountain, and by their origination from them receive that being which they have, whereas the root receiveth nothing from the branch, or fountain from the river; so the Son is from the Father, receiving his subsistence by generation from him; the Father is not from the Son, as being what he is from none.

Some indeed of the ancients may seem to have made yet a farther difference between the Persons of the Father and the Son, laying upon that relation terms of greater opposition: As if, because the Son hath not his essence from himself, the Father had; because he was not begotten of himself, the Father had been so: because he is not the cause of himself, the Father were. Whereas, if we speak properly, God the Father hath neither his being from another, nor from himself; not from another, that were repugnant to his paternity; not from himself, that were a contradiction in itself. And therefore those expressions are not to be understood positively and affirmatively, but negatively and exclusively, that he hath his essence from none, that he is not begotten of any, nor hath he any cause of his existence. So that the proper notion of the Father in whom we believe is this, that he is a person subsisting eternally in the one infinite essence of the Godhead; which essence or subsistence he hath received from no other person, but hath communicated the same essence, in which himself subsisteth, by generation to another person, who by that generation is the Son.

Howsoever, it is most reasonable to assert that there is but one person who is from none; and the very generation of the Son and procession of the Holy Ghost undeniably prove, that neither of those two can be that person. For whosoever is generated is from him which is the genitor, and whosoever proceedeth is from him from whom he proceedeth, whatsoever the nature of the generation or procession be. It followeth therefore that this person is the Father, which name speaks nothing of dependence, nor supposeth any kind of priority in another.

From hence it is observed that the name of God, taken absolutely, is often in the Scriptures spoken of the Father; as when we read of "God sending his own Son;" of "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God;" and generally wheresoever Christ is called the Son of God, or the Word of God, the name of God is to be taken particularly for the Father, because he is no Son but of the Father. From hence he is styled "One God;" "The true God;" "The only true God;" "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Which, as it is most true and so fit to be believed, is also a most necessary truth, and therefore to be acknowledged, for the avoiding multiplication and plurality of Gods. For, if there were more than one which were from none, it could not be denied but there were more Gods than one. Wherefore this origination in the divine paternity hath anciently been looked upon as the assertion of the unity; and therefore the Son and Holy Ghost have been believed to be but one God with the Father, because both are from the Father, who is one, and so the union of them.

Secondly: it is necessary thus to believe in the Father, because our salvation is propounded to us by an access unto the Father. We are all gone away and fallen from God, and we must be brought to him again. There is no other notion under which we can be brought to God as to be saved, but the notion of the Father; and there is no other person can bring us to the Father, but the Son of that Father; for, as the apostle teacheth us, "through him we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father," Eph. ii. 18.

Having thus described the true nature and notion of the

divine paternity, in all the several degrees and eminencies belonging to it, I may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian understand, what it is he speaks, when he makes his confession in these words, *I believe in God the Father* : by which I conceive him to express thus much—As I am assured that there is an infinite and independent Being, whom we call a *God*, and that it is impossible there should be more infinities than one ; so I assure myself that this one God is the Father of all things, especially of all men and angels, so far as the mere act of creation may be styled generation ; that he is farther yet, and in a more peculiar manner, the Father of all those whom he regenerateth by his Spirit, whom he adopteth in his Son, as heirs and co-heirs with him, whom he crowneth with the reward of an eternal inheritance in the heavens. But beyond and far above all this, besides his general offspring and peculiar people, “ to whom he hath given power to become the sons of God,” I believe him the Father, in a more eminent and transcendent manner, of one singular and proper Son, his own, his beloved, his only-begotten Son ; whom he hath not only begotten of the blessed virgin, by the coming of the Holy Ghost, and the overshadowing of his power ; not only sent with special authority as the King of Israel ; not only raised from the dead, and made Heir of all things in his house ; but, antecedently to all this, hath begotten him by way of eternal generation in the same Divinity, and Majesty with himself ; by which paternity, coeval to the Deity, I acknowledge him always Father, as much as always God. And, in this relation, I profess that eminency and priority, that as he is the original cause of all things as created by him, so is he the fountain of the Son begotten of him, and of the Holy Ghost proceeding from him.

I believe in God the Father Almighty.

AFTER the relation of God's paternity, immediately followeth the glorious attribute of his Omnipotency ; that as those in heaven in their devotions, so we on earth in our confessions, might acknowledge that “ Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come,” Rev. iv. 8 ; that in our solemn meetings of the church of

God, with the joint expression and concurring language of the congregation, we might some way imitate that "voice of a great multitude, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Allelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth," Rev. xix. 6.

This notion of *almighty* in the Creed must certainly be interpreted according to the sense which the original word beareth in the New Testament; and that cannot be better understood than by the Greek writers or interpreters of the old, especially when the notion itself belongs unto the gospel and the law indifferently. Now the word which we translate *almighty*, the most ancient Greek interpreters used sometimes for the title of God, the "Lord of Hosts," sometimes for his name "Shaddai," as generally in the book of Job: by the first they seem to signify the rule and dominion which God hath over all; by the second, the strength, force, or power, by which he is able to perform all things. "The heavens and the earth were finished," saith Moses, "and all the host of them," Gen. ii. 7; and he who began them, he who finished them, is the Ruler and Commander of them. Upon the right of creation doth he justly challenge his dominion: "I have made the earth and created man upon it; I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded," Isai. xlv. 12. And on this dominion or command doth he raise the title of "The Lord of Hosts:" which, though preserved in the original language both by St. Paul and St. James, yet by St. John is turned into that word which we translate *almighty*. Wherefore from the use of the sacred writers, from the notation of the word in Greek, and from the testimony of the ancient fathers, we may well ascribe unto God the Father, in the explication of this article, the dominion over all, and the rule and government of all.

This authority or power properly potestative is attributed unto God in the sacred Scriptures; from whence those names or titles which most aptly and fully express dominion are frequently given unto him; and the rule, empire or government of the world is acknowledged to be wholly in him, as necessarily following that natural and eternal right of dominion.

What the nature of this authoritative power is, we shall the more clearly understand, if we first divide it into three degrees or branches of it; the first whereof we may conceive a right of making and framing any thing which he willeth, in any manner as it pleaseth him, according to the absolute freedom of his own will; the second, a right of having and possessing all things so made and framed by him, as his own, properly belonging to him, as to the Lord and Master of them, by virtue of direct dominion; the third, a right of using and disposing all things so in his possession, according to his own pleasure. The first of these we mention only for the necessity of it, and the dependence of the other two upon it, God's actual dominion being no otherways necessary, than upon supposition of a precedent act of creation; because nothing, before it hath a being, can belong to any one, neither can any propriety be imagined in that which hath no entity.

But the second branch, or absolute dominion of this Almighty, is farther to be considered in the independency and infinity of it. First, it is independent in a double respect, in reference both to the original and the use thereof; for God hath received no authority from any, because he hath all power originally in himself, and hath produced all things by the act of his own will, without any commander, counsellor, or coadjutor. Neither doth the use or exercise of this dominion depend upon any one, so as to receive any direction or regulation, or to render any account of the administration of it, it being illimited, absolute, and supreme, and so the fountain from whence all dominion in any other is derived. Wherefore he being the "God of gods" is also the "Lord of lords, and King of kings, the only Potentate;" because he alone hath all the power of himself, and whosoever else hath any, hath it from him, either by donation or permission.

The infinity of God's dominion, if we respect the object, appears in the amplitude or extension; if we look upon the manner, in the plenitude or perfection; if we consider the time, in the eternity of duration. The amplitude of the object is sufficiently evidenced by those appellations which the holy writ ascribeth unto the Almighty, calling

him "The Lord of heaven; the Lord of the whole earth; the Lord of heaven and earth;" under which two are comprehended all things both in heaven and earth. This Moses taught the distrusting Israelites in the wilderness: "Behold, the heaven and the heaven of heavens is the Lord's thy God; the earth also with all that is therein," Deut. x. 14. With these words David glorifieth God: "The heavens are thine, the earth also is thine"—thus acknowledging his dominion; "as for the world and the fulness thereof, thou hast founded them"—thus expressing the foundation or ground of that dominion, Psal. lxxxix. 11. And yet more fully at the dedication of the offerings for the building of the temple, to show that what they gave was of his own, he saith, "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine. Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honor come of thee, and thou reignest over all," 1 Chron. xxix. 11. If then we look upon the object of God's dominion, it is of that amplitude and extension, that it includeth and comprehendeth all things; so that nothing can be imagined which is not his, belonging to him as the true Owner and Proprietor, and subject wholly to his will as the sole Governor and Disposer: in respect of which universal power we must confess him to be Almighty.

If we consider the manner and nature of this power, the plenitude thereof or perfection will appear; for as, in regard of the extension, he hath power over all things, so, in respect of the intention, he hath all power over every thing, as being absolute and supreme. This God challenged to himself, when he catechized the Prophet Jeremy in a potter's house, saying, "O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in my hand, O house of Israel," Jer. xviii. 6; that is, God hath as absolute power and dominion over every person, over every nation and kingdom on the earth, as the potter hath over the pot he maketh, or the clay he mouldeth. Thus are we wholly at the disposal of his will, and our present and future condition framed and ordered by his free, but wise

and just, decrees. "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?" Rom. ix. 21. And can that earth-artificer have a freer power over his brother potsherd (both being made of the same metal) than God hath over him, who, by the strange fecundity of his omnipotent power, first made the clay out of nothing, and then him out of that.

The duration of God's dominion must likewise necessarily be eternal, if any thing which is to be immortal; for seeing every thing is therefore his because it received its being from him, and the continuation of the creature is as much from him as the first production, it followeth that so long as it is continued it must be his; and consequently, seeing some of his creatures are immortal, his dominion must be eternal. Wherefore St. Paul expressly calleth God, "The King eternal," with reference to that of David, "Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations," Psal. cxlv. 13. And Moses in his song hath told us, "The Lord shall reign for ever and ever:" which phrase "for ever and ever" in the original signifieth thus much, that there is no time to come, assignable or imaginable, but after and beyond that God shall reign.

The third branch of God's authoritative or potestative power consisteth in the use of all things in his possession, by virtue of his absolute dominion; for it is the general dictate of reason that the use, benefit, and utility of any thing, redoundeth unto him whose it is, and to whom as to the proprietor it belongeth. It is true, indeed, that God, who is all-sufficient and infinitely happy in and of himself, so that no accession ever could or can be made to his original felicity, cannot receive any real benefit and utility from the creature. "Thou art my Lord," saith David, "my goodness extendeth not to thee;" Psalm xvi. 2: and therefore our only and absolute Lord, because his goodness extendeth unto us, and not ours to him, because his dominion is for our benefit, not for his own; for us who want, and therefore may receive; not for himself, who cannot receive, because he wanteth

nothing, whose honor standeth not in his own, but in our receiving.

But though the universal Cause made all things for the benefit of some creatures framed by him, yet hath he made them ultimately for himself; and God is as universally the final as the efficient cause of his operations. The apostle hath taught us, that not only "of him," and "by him," as the first Author, but also "to him," and "for him" as the ultimate end, "are all things," Rom. xi. 36. And it is one of the proverbial sentences of Solomon, "The Lord hath made all things for himself, yea even the wicked for the day of evil," Prov. xvi. 4. For though he cannot receive any real benefit or utility from the creature, yet he can and doth in a manner receive that which hath some similitude or affinity with it. Thus God rejoiceth at the effects of his wisdom, power, and goodness, and taketh delight in the works of his hands, Psal. civ. 31. Thus doth he order and dispose of all things unto his own glory, which redoundeth from the demonstration of his attributes.

An explicit belief of this authoritative power and absolute dominion of the Almighty is necessary; first for the breeding in us an awful reverence of his majesty, and entire subjection to his will; for to the highest excellency the greatest honor, to the supreme authority the most exact obedience, is no more than duty. If God be our absolute Lord, we his servants and vassals, then is there a right in him to require of us whatsoever we can perform, and an obligation upon us to perform whatsoever he commandeth. Whosoever doth otherwise, while he confesseth, denieth him; while he acknowledgeth him with his tongue, he sets his hand against him. "Why call ye me Lord, Lord," saith our Saviour, "and do not the things which I say?"

Secondly: this belief is also necessary to breed in us equanimity and patience in our sufferings, to prevent all murmuring, repining, and objecting against the actions or determinations of God, as knowing that he who is absolute Lord, cannot abuse his power; he whose will is a law to us, cannot do any thing unwisely or unjustly. "Let the potsherd strive with the potsherds of the earth: shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou?" Isai. xlv. 9. But let the man after God's own heart rather

teach us humble and religious silence: "I was dumb," saith he, "and opened not my mouth, because thou didst it," Psal. xxxix. 9. When Shimei cast stones at him and cursed him, let us learn to speak as he then spake: "The Lord hath said unto him, Curse David; who shall then say, Wherefore hast thou done so?" 2 Sam. xvi. 10.

Thirdly: the belief of God's absolute dominion is yet farther necessary to make us truly and sufficiently sensible of the benefits we receive from him, so as by a right value and estimation of them to understand how far we stand obliged to him. No man can duly prize the blessings of heaven, but he who acknowledgeth they might justly have been denied him; nor can any be sufficiently thankful for them, except it be confessed that he owed him nothing who bestowed them.

But as the original word for *almighty* is not put only for the "Lord of Hosts," but often also for the "Lord Shaddai:" so we must not restrain the signification to the power authoritative, but extend it also to that power which is properly operative and executive. In the title of "The Lord of Sabaoth" we understand the rule and dominion of God, by which he hath a right of governing all: in the name "Shaddai" we apprehend an infinite force and strength, by which he is able to work and perform all things. For whether we take this word in composition, as signifying "The All-sufficient," whosoever is able to suppeditate all things to the sufficing all, must have an infinite power; or whether we deduce it from the root denoting *vastation* or *destruction*, whosoever can destroy the being of all things, and reduce them unto nothing, must have the same power which originally produced all things out of nothing, and that is infinite. Howsoever, the first notion of *almighty* necessarily inferreth the second, and the infinity of God's dominion speaketh him infinitely powerful in operation. Indeed, in earthly dominions, the strength of the governor is not in himself, but in those whom he governeth; and he is a powerful prince whose subjects are numerous. But the King of kings hath in himself all power of execution, as well as right of dominion. Were all the force and strength of a nation in the person of the king, as the authority is, obedience would not be arbitrary, nor could

rebellion be successful; whereas experience teacheth us that the most puissant prince is compelled actually to submit, when the stronger part of his own people have taken the boldness to put a force upon him. But we must not imagine that the Governor of the world ruleth only over them who are willing to obey, or that any of his creatures may dispute his commands with safety, or cast off his yoke with impunity. And, if his dominion be uncontrollable, it is because his power is irresistible; for man is not more inclinable to obey God than man, but God is more powerful to exact subjection, and to vindicate rebellion. In respect of the infinity, and irresistibility of which active power we must acknowledge him Almighty: and so, according to the most vulgar acceptation, give the second explication of his omnipotency.

But because this word *almighty* is twice repeated in the Creed, once in the first article, and again in the sixth, where Christ is represented *sitting at the right hand of God the Father Almighty*; and although in our English and the Latin the same word be expressed in both places, yet in the ancient Greek copies there is a manifest distinction; seeing the word in the first Article may equally comprehend God's power in operation, as well as authority in dominion, whereas that in the sixth speaketh only infinity of power, without relation to authority or dominion: I shall therefore reserve the explication of the latter unto its proper place, designing to treat particularly of God's infinite power where it is most peculiarly expressed; and so conclude briefly with two other interpretations which some of the ancients have made of the original word, belonging rather to philosophy than divinity, though true in both. For some have stretched this word *almighty*, according to the Greek notation, to signify that God holdeth, encircleth, and containing all things: "Who hath gathered the wind in his fists; who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth?" Who but God? "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure?" Who but he? Thus then may he be called *almighty*, as holding, containing, and comprehending all things.

Others extend it farther yet, beyond that of containing or comprehension, to a more immediate influence of sustaining or preservation. For the same power which first gave Being unto all things, continueth the same Being unto all: "God giveth to all life, and breath, and all things. In him we live, move, and have our being," saith the strangest philosopher that ever entered Athens, the first expositor of that blind inscription, "To the unknown God." How could any thing have endured, if it had not been thy will? or been preserved, if not called by thee? as the wisdom of the Jews confesseth. Thus did the *Levites* stand and bless: "Thou, even thou, art Lord alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth and all things that are therein, the sea and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all." Where the continual conservation of the creature is in an equal latitude attributed unto God with their first production. Because there is as absolute a necessity of preserving us from returning unto nothing by annihilation, as there was for first bestowing an existence on us by creation. And in this sense God is undoubtedly *almighty*, in that he doth sustain, uphold, and constantly preserve all things in that being which they have.

From whence we may at last declare what is couched under this attribute of God, how far this Omnipotency extends itself, and what every Christian is thought to profess, when he addeth this part of the first Article of his Creed, *I believe in God the Father Almighty.*

As I am persuaded of an infinite and independent essence, which I term a God, and of the mystery of an eternal generation by which that God is a Father: so I assure myself that Father is not subject to infirmities of age, nor is there any weakness attending on the Ancient of days; but, on the contrary, I believe Omnipotency to be an essential attribute of his Deity, and that not only in respect of operative and active power (concerning which I shall have occasion to express my faith hereafter), but also in regard of power authoritative, in which I must acknowledge his antecedent and eternal right of making what, and when, and how he pleased, of possessing whatsoever he maketh by direct dominion, of using and

disposing as he pleaseth all things which he so possesseth. This dominion I believe most absolute in respect of its independency, both in the original and the use or exercise thereof: this I acknowledge infinite for amplitude or extension, as being a power over all things without exception; for plenitude or perfection, as being all power over every thing without limitation; for continuance or duration, as being eternal without end or conclusion. Thus *I believe in God the Father Almighty.*

Maker of Heaven and Earth.

ALTHOUGH this last part of the first article was not expressed in the ancient creeds, yet the sense thereof was delivered in the first rules of faith, and at last these particular words inserted both in the Greek and Latin confessions. And indeed the work of creation most properly followeth the attribute of omnipotency, as being the foundation of the first, and the demonstration of the second explication of it. As then we believe there is a *God*, and that *God Almighty*; as we acknowledge that same *God* to be the *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in him of us; so we also confess that the same *God the Father made both heaven and earth.* For the full explication of which operation, it will be sufficient, first, to declare the latitude of the object, what is comprehended under the terms of *heaven and earth*; secondly, to express the nature of the action, the true notion of creation, by which they were made; and, thirdly, to demonstrate the Person to whom this operation is ascribed.

For the first, I suppose it cannot be denied, as the sense of the *Creed*, that under the terms of *heaven and earth* are comprehended all things; because the first rules of faith did so express it, and the most ancient creeds had either, instead of these words, or together with them, *the Maker of all things visible and invisible*, which, being terms of immediate contradiction, must consequently be of universal comprehension; nor is there any thing imaginable which is not visible, or invisible. Seeing then these were the words of the Nicene Creed; seeing the addition of *heaven and earth* in the Constantinopolitan could be no

diminution to the former, which they still retained together with them, saying, *I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible*; it followeth that they, who in the Latin church made use only of this last addition, could not choose but take it in the full latitude of the first expression.

And well may this be taken as the undoubted sense of the *Creed*, because it is the known language of the sacred Scriptures: "In six days," saith Moses, "the Lord made heaven and earth," Exod. xxxi. 17; in the same time, saith God himself, "The Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is," Exod. xx. 11. So that all things by those two must be understood which are contained in them; and we know no being which is made or placed without them. When God would call a general rendezvous, and make up a universal auditory, the prophet cries out, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth," Isai. i. 2. When he would express the full splendor of his majesty, and utmost extent of his actual dominion, "Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool," Isai. lxvi. 1. When he would challenge unto himself those glorious attributes of immensity, and omnipresence, "Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord," Jer. xxiii. 24. These two then taken together signify the universe, or that which is called the world. St. Paul hath given a clear exposition of these words in his explication of the Athenian altar: "God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands," Acts. xvii. 24. For seeing God is necessarily the Lord of all things which he made (the right of his direct dominion being clearly grounded upon the first creation) except we should conceive the apostle to exempt some creature from the authoritative power of God, and so take some work of his hands out of the reach of his arm; we must confess that *heaven and earth* are of as large extent and ample signification as the "world and all things therein." Where it is yet farther observable that the apostle hath conjoined the speech of both testaments together; for the ancient Hebrews seem to have had no word in use among them which singly of itself did signify the world,

as the Greeks had, in whose language St. Paul did speak ; and therefore they used in conjunction the *heaven and earth*, as the grand extremities within which all things are contained. Nay, if we take the exposition of the later writers in that language, those two words will not only as extremities comprehend between them, but in the extension of their own significations contain all things in them ; for when they divide the universe into three worlds, the inferior, superior, and the middle world, the lower is wholly contained in the name of *earth*, the other two under the name of *heaven*. Nor do the Hebrews only use this manner of expression, but even the Greeks themselves ; and that not only before, but after Pythagoras had accustomed them to one name. As therefore under the single name of world or universe, so also under the conjunctive expression of *heaven and earth*, are contained all things material and immaterial, visible and invisible.

But, as the apostle hath taught us to reason, “ when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him,” 1 Cor. xv. 27 ; so, when we say all things were made by God, it is as manifest that he is excepted who made all things. And then the proposition is clearly thus delivered—all beings whatsoever beside God were made : as we read in St. John concerning the Word, that “ the world was made by him ;” and, in more plain and express words before, “ All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made,” Joh. i. 3. Which is yet farther illustrated by St. Paul : “ By him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers ; all things were created by him,” Col. i. 16. If then there be nothing imaginable which is not either in heaven or in earth, nothing which is not either visible or invisible, then is there nothing beside God which was not made by God.

This then is the unquestionable doctrine of the Christian faith, that the vast capacious frame of the world, and every thing any way contained and existing in it, hath not its essence from or of itself, nor is of existence absolutely necessary ; but what it is, it hath not been, and that being which

it hath was made, framed, and constituted by another. And as "every house is builded by some man;" for we see the earth bears no such creature of itself; stones do not grow into a wall, or first hew and square, then unite and fasten themselves together in their generation; trees sprout not across like dry and sapless beams, nor do spars and tiles spring with a natural uniformity into a roof, and that out of stone and mortar—these are not the works of Nature, but superstructions and additions to her, as the supplies of art, and the testimonies of the understanding of man, the great artificer on earth: so, if the world itself be but a house, if the earth which "hangeth upon nothing" be the foundation, and the glorious spheres of heaven the roof (which hath been delivered as the most universal hypothesis), if this be the habitation of an infinite Intelligence, the temple of God, then must we acknowledge the world was built by him, and, consequently, that "he which built all things is God."

From hence appears the truth of that distinction—Whatsoever hath any being is either made or not made: whatsoever is not made is God; whatsoever is not God is made. One uncreated and independent Essence; all other depending on it, and created by it. One of eternal and necessary existence; all other indifferent, in respect of actual existing, either to be or not to be, and that indifference determined only by the free and voluntary act of the first Cause.

Now because to be thus made includes some imperfection, and among the parts of the world some are more glorious than others, if those which are most perfect presuppose a Maker, then can we not doubt of a creation where we find far less perfection. This house of God, though uniform, yet is not all of the same materials; the footstool and the throne are not of the same mould; there is a vast difference between the heavenly expansions. This first aerial heaven, where God setteth up his pavilion, where "he maketh the clouds his chariot, and walketh upon the wings of the wind," is not so far inferior in place as it is in glory to the next, the seat of the sun and moon, the two great lights, and stars innumerable, far greater than the one of them. And yet that second heaven is not

so far above the first as beneath the third, into which St. Paul was caught. The brightness of the sun doth not so far surpass the blackness of a wandering cloud, as the glory of that heaven of presence surmounts the fading beauty of the starry firmament. For in this great temple of the world, in which the Son of God is the High Priest, the heaven which we see is but the veil, and that which is above, the holy of holies. This veil indeed is rich and glorious, but one day to be rent, and then to admit us into a far greater glory, even to the mercy seat and cherubim. For this third heaven is the proper habitation of the blessed angels, who constantly attend upon the throne. And if those most glorious and happy spirits, those morning stars which sang together, those sons of God which shouted for joy when the foundations of the earth were laid, Job xxxviii. 7, 4; if they and their habitation were made, then can we no ways doubt of the production of all other creatures, so much inferior unto them.

Forasmuch then as the angels are termed the "sons of God," it sufficiently denoteth that they are from him, not of themselves; all filiation inferring some kind of production; and seeing God hath but one proper and only-begotten Son, whose propriety and singularity consisteth in this, that he is of the same uncreated essence with the Father, all other offspring must be made, and consequently even the angels created sons: of whom the Scripture speaking saith, "Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire," Psal. civ. 4; for although those words, as first spoken by the psalmist, do rather express the nature of the wind and lightning, yet, seeing the author of the epistle to the Hebrews hath applied the same to the angels properly so called, we cannot but conclude upon his authority that the same God who created the wind, and "made a way for the lightning of the thunder," hath also produced those glorious spirits; and as he furnished them with that activity, there expressed, so did he frame the subject of it, their immaterial and immortal essence.

If then the angels and their proper habitation, the far most eminent and illustrious parts of the world, were made; if only to be made be one character of imperfection; much more must we acknowledge all things of inferior nature to

have dependence on their universal Cause, and consequently this great universe, or all things, to be made, beside that one who made them.

This is the first part of our Christian faith, against some of the ancient philosophers, who were so wildly fond of those things they see, that they imagined the universe to be infinite and eternal, and, what will follow from it, to be even God himself. It is true that the most ancient of the heathen were not of this opinion, but all the philosophy for many ages delivered the world to have been made.

When this tradition of the creation of the world was delivered in all places down successively by those who seriously considered the frame of all things, and the difference of the most ancient poets and philosophers from Moses was only in the manner of expressing it, those who in after ages first denied it made use of very frivolous and inconcluding arguments, grounding their new opinion upon weak foundations. For that which in the first place they take for granted, as an axiom of undoubted truth, that "whatsoever hath a beginning must have an end," and consequently, "whatsoever shall have no end had no beginning," is grounded upon no general reason, but only upon particular observation of such things here below, as from the ordinary way of generation tend in some space of time unto corruption. From whence, seeing no tendency to corruption in several parts of the world, they conclude that it was never generated, nor had any cause or original of its being. Whereas, if we would speak properly, future existence or non-existence hath no such relation unto the first production. Neither is there any contradiction that at the same time one thing may begin to be, and last but for an hour, another continue for a thousand years, a third beginning at the same instant remain for ever; the difference being either in the nature of the things so made, or in the determinations of the will of him that made them. Notwithstanding then their universal rules, which are not true but in some limited particulars, it is most certain the whole world was made, and of it part shall perish, part continue unto all eternity; by which something which had a beginning shall have an end, and something not.

The second fallacy which led them to this novelty was the very name of *universe*, which comprehended in it all things; from whence they reasoned thus—If the world or universe were made, then were all things made; and, if the world shall be dissolved, then all things shall come to nothing; which is impossible. For if all things were made, then must either all, or at least something, have made itself, and so have been the cause of itself as of the effect, and the effect of itself as of the cause, and consequently in the same instant both have been and not been; which is a contradiction. But this fallacy is easily discovered; for when we say the universe, or all things, were made, we must be always understood to except him who made all things, neither can we by that name be supposed to comprehend more than the frame of heaven and earth, and all things contained in them; and so Ocellus, who first devised this argument, hath himself acknowledged.

Far more gross was that third conceit, that if the world were ever made, it must be after the vulgar way of ordinary natural generations: in which two mutations are observable, the first from less to greater, or from worse to better; the second from greater to less, or from better to worse (the beginning of the first mutation is called generation, the end of it perfection; the beginning of the second is from the same perfection, but concludeth in corruption or dissolution). But none hath ever yet observed that this frame of the world did ever grow up from less to greater, or improve itself from worse to better; nor can we now perceive that it becomes worse or less than it was, by which decretion we might guess at a former increase, and from a tendency to corruption collect its original generation. This conceit, I say, is far more gross. For certainly the argument so managed proves nothing at all, but only this (if yet it prove so much) that the whole frame of the world, and the parts thereof which are of greater perfection, were not generated in that manner in which we see some other parts of it are; which no man denies. But that there can be no other way of production beside these petty generations, or that the world was not some other way actually produced, this argument doth not endeavour to infer, nor can any other prove it.

The next foundation upon which they cast off the constant doctrine of their predecessors was that general assertion, that it is impossible for any thing to be produced out of nothing, or to be reduced unto nothing; from whence it will inevitably follow that the matter of this world hath always been, and must always be. The clear refutation of which difficulty requires an explication of the manner how the world was made; the second part before propounded for the exposition of this article.

Now that the true nature and manner of this action may be so far understood as to declare the Christian faith, and refute the errors of all opposers, it will be necessary to consider it, first, with reference to the object or effect; secondly, in relation to the cause or agent; thirdly, with respect unto the time or origination of it.

The action by which the Heaven and Earth were made, considered in reference to the effect, I conceive to be the production of their total being; so that whatsoever entity they had when made, had no real existence before they were so made. And this manner of production we usually term *creation*, as excluding all concurrence of any material cause, and all dependence of any kind of subject, as presupposing no privation, as including no motion, as signifying a production out of nothing; that is, by which something is made, and not any thing preceding out of which it is made. This is the proper and peculiar sense of the word *creation*: not that it signifies so much by virtue of its origination or vulgar use in the Latin tongue; nor that the Hebrew word used by Moses, "In the beginning God *created* the heaven and the earth," hath of itself any such peculiar acceptation; for it is often used synonymously with words which signify any kind of production or formation, and by itself it seldom denotes a production out of nothing or proper creation, but most frequently the making of one substance out of another pre-existing, as the fishes of the water, and man of the dust of the earth; the renovating or restoring any thing to its former perfection, for want of Hebrew words in composition, Psal. li. 10; Isai. lxxv. 17; or, lastly, the doing some new or wonderful work, the producing some strange and admirable effect, as the

opening the mouth of the earth, and the signal judgments on the people of Israel, Numb. xvi. 30; Isai. xlv. 7.

We must not therefore weakly collect the true nature of creation from the force of any word which by some may be thought to express so much; but we must collect it from the testimony of God the Creator in his word, and of the world created, in our reason. The opinion of the church of the Jews will sufficiently appear in that zealous mother to her seventh and youngest son: "I beseech thee, my son, look upon the heaven and the earth, and all that is therein, and consider that God made them of things that were not, 2 Mac. vii. 28; which is a clear description of creation, that is, production out of nothing. But, because this is not by all received as canonical, we shall therefore evince it by the undoubted testimony of St. Paul, who, expressing the nature of Abraham's faith, propoundeth "him whom he believed as God who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were;" for as *to be called* in the language of the Scripture is *to be* ("behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God," saith St. John in his epistle, who in his gospel told us, "he had given us power to become the sons of God"), so *to call* is *to make*, or *cause to be*. As where the prophet Jeremy saith, "Thou hast caused all this evil to come upon them," Jer. xxxii. 23, the original may be thought to speak no more than this, "Thou hast called this evil to them." He therefore "calleth those things which be not, as though they were," who maketh those things to be which were not, and produceth that which hath a being out of that which had not, that is, out of nothing. This reason, generally persuasive unto faith, is more peculiarly applied by the apostle to the belief of the creation; for "through faith," saith he, "we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear," Hebrew xi. 3. Not as if the earth which we see were made of air, or any more subtile body which we see not; nor as if those "things which are seen" were in equal latitude commensurable with the worlds which were framed; but that those "things

which are seen," that is, which are, were made of those "which did not appear," that is, which were not.

Vain therefore was that opinion of a real matter coeval with God as necessary for production of the world by way of subject, as the eternal and almighty God by way of efficient; for if some real and material being must be presupposed by indispensable necessity, without which God could not cause any thing to be, then is not he independent in his actions, nor of infinite power and absolute activity, which is contradictory to the divine perfection. Nor can any reason be alleged why he should be dependent in his operation, who is confessedly independent in his being.

And as this coeternity of matter opposeth God's independency, the proper notion of the Deity, so doth it also contradict his all-sufficiency; for if, without the production of something beside himself, he cannot make a demonstration of his attributes, or cause any sensibility of his power and will for the illustration of his own glory; and if, without something distinct wholly from himself, he cannot produce any thing, then must he want something external; and whosoever wanteth any thing is not all-sufficient. And certainly he must have a low opinion and poor conception of the infinite and eternal God who thinks he is no otherwise known to be omnipotent than by the benefit of another. Nor were the framers of the *Creed* so wise in prefixing the *Almighty* before *Maker of heaven and earth*, if, out of a necessity of material concurrence, the making of them left a mark of impotency rather than omnipotency.

The supposition then of an eternal matter is so unnecessary where God works, and so derogatory to the infinity of his power and all-sufficiency of himself, that the later philosophers, something acquainted with the truth which we profess, though rejecting Christianity, have reprov'd those of the school of Plato, who delivered, as the doctrine of their master, an eternal companion, so injurious to the Father and Maker of all things.

Wherefore to give an answer to that general position, that out of nothing nothing can be produced, which Aristotle pretends to be the opinion of all natural philosophers, I must first observe that this universal proposition was first framed out of particular considerations of the works of

art and nature ; for, if we look upon all kinds of artificers, we find they cannot give any specimen of their art without materials. Seeing then the beauty and uniformity of the world shows it to be a piece of art most exquisite, hence they concluded that the Maker of it was the most exact Artificer, and consequently had his matter from all eternity prepared for him. Again : considering the works of nature and all parts of the world subject to generation and corruption, they also observed that nothing is ever generated but out of something pre-existent, nor is there any mutation wrought but in a subject, and with a presupposed capability of alteration. From hence they presently collected, that, if the whole world were ever generated, it must have been produced out of some subject, and consequently there must be a matter eternally pre-existing.

Now what can be more irrational than from the weakness of some creature to infer the same imbecility in the Creator, and to measure the arm of God by the finger of man ? Whatsoever speaketh any kind of excellency or perfection in the artificer may be attributed unto God ; whatsoever signifieth any infirmity, or involveth any imperfection, must be excluded from the notion of him. That wisdom, prescience, and preconception, that order and beauty of operation which is required in an artist, is most eminently contained in him, who hath " ordered all things in measure, and number, and weight ; " but if the most absolute idea in the artificer's understanding be not sufficient to produce his design without hands to work, and materials to make use of, it will follow no more that God is necessarily tied unto pre-existing matter, than that he is really compounded of corporeal parts.

Again : it is as incongruous to judge of the production of the world by those parts thereof which we see subject to generation and corruption ; and thence to conclude, that, if it ever had a cause of the being which it hath, it must have been generated in the same manner which they are ; and, if that cannot be, it must never have been made at all ; for nothing is more certain than that this manner of generation cannot possibly have been the first production even of those things which are now generated. We see the plants grow from a seed ; that is their ordinary way of ge-

neration ; but the first plant could not be so generated, because all seed in the same course of nature is from the pre-existing plant. We see from spawn the fishes, and from eggs the fowls, receive now the original of their being ; but this could not at first be so, because both spawn and egg are as naturally from precedent fish and fowl. Indeed because the seed is separable from the body of the plant, and in that separation may long contain within itself a power of germination ; because the spawn and egg are sejungeable from the fish and fowl, and yet still retain the prolific power of generation ; therefore some might possibly conceive that these seminal bodies might be originally scattered on the earth, out of which the first of all those creatures should arise. But in viviparous animals, whose offspring is generated within themselves, whose seed by separation from them loseth all its seminal or prolific power, this is not only improbable but inconceivable. And therefore, seeing the philosophers themselves confess that whereas now all animals are generated by the means of seed, and that the animals themselves must be at first before the seed proceeding from them ; it followeth that there was some way of production antecedent to and differing from the common way of generation ; and, consequently, what we see done in this generation can be no certain rule to understand the first production. Seeing then that universal maxim, that nothing can be made of nothing, is merely calculated for the meridian of natural causes, raised solely out of observation of continuing creatures by successive generation, which could not have been so continued without a being antecedent to all such succession ; it is most evident, it can have no place in the production of that antecedent or first being, which we call creation.

Now when we thus describe the nature of creation, and under the name of *heaven and earth* comprehend all things contained in them, we must distinguish between things created ; for some were made immediately out of nothing by a proper, some only mediately, as out of something formerly made out of nothing, by an improper kind of creation. By the first were made all immaterial substances, all the orders of angels, and the souls of men, the heavens, and the simple or elemental bodies, as the earth, the

water, and the air: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;" so "in the beginning" as without any pre-existing or antecedent matter; this earth, when so "in the beginning" made, was "without form and void," covered with waters likewise made, not out of it but with it, the same which, "when the waters were gathered together unto one place, appeared as dry land." By the second, all "the hosts of the earth," the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea were made: "Let the earth," said God, "bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind. Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth;" and, more expressly yet, "Out of the ground God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air." And well may we grant these plants and animals to have their origination from such principles, when we read, "God formed man of the dust of the ground;" and said unto him whom he created in his own image, "Dust thou art."

Having thus declared the notion of creation in respect of those things which were created, the next consideration is of that action in reference to the Agent who created all things. Him therefore we may look upon first as moved: secondly, as free under that motion: thirdly, as determining under that freedom, and so performing that action. In the first we may see his goodness, in the second his will, in the third his power.

I do not here introduce any external impulsive cause, as moving God unto the creation of the world; for I have presupposed all things distinct from him to have been produced out of nothing by him, and consequently to be posterior not only to the motion, but the actuation, of his will. Seeing then nothing can be antecedent to the creature beside God himself, neither can any thing be a cause of any of his actions but what is in him; we must not look for any thing extrinsical unto him, but wholly acquiesce in his infinite goodness, as the only moving and impelling cause. "There is none good but one, that is God," saith our Saviour; none originally, essentially, infinitely, independently good, but he. Whatsoever goodness is found in any creature is but by way of emanation from that fountain

whose very being is diffusive, whose nature consists in the communication of itself. In the end of the sixth day "God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good:" which shows the end of creating all things thus good was the communication of that by which they were and appeared so.

The ancient heathens have acknowledged this truth, but with such disadvantage that from thence they gathered an undoubted error; for from the goodness of God, which they did not unfitly conceive necessary, infinite, and eternal, they collected that whatsoever dependeth on it must be as necessary and eternal, even as light must be as ancient as the sun, and a shadow as an opacous body in that light. If then there be no instant imaginable before which God was not infinitely good, then can there likewise be none conceivable before which the world was not made. And thus they thought the goodness of the Creator must stand or fall with the eternity of the creature.

For the clearing of which ancient mistake, we must observe, that as God is essentially and infinitely good without any mixture of deficiency, so is he in respect of all external actions or emanations absolutely free without the least necessity. Those bodies which do act without understanding or preconception of what they do, as the sun and fire give light and heat, work always to the utmost of their power, nor are they able at any time to suspend their action. To conceive any such necessity in the divine operations were to deny all knowledge in God, to reduce him into a condition inferior to some of the works of his own hands, and to fall under the censure contained in the psalmist's question, "He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see? he that teacheth man knowledge, shall he not know?" Psal. xciv. 9. Those creatures which are endued with understanding, and consequently with a will, may not only be necessitated in their actions by a greater power, but also as necessarily be determined by the proposal of an infinite good; whereas neither of these necessities can be acknowledged in God's actions, without supposing a power beside and above omnipotency, or a real happiness beside and above all-sufficiency. Indeed, if God were a necessary

Agent in the works of creation, the creatures would be of as necessary a being as he is : whereas the necessity of being is the undoubted prerogative of the first Cause. " He worketh all things after the counsel of his will," saith the apostle ; and, wheresoever counsel is, there is election, or else it is vain ; where a will is there must be freedom, or else it is weak. We cannot imagine that the all-wise God should act or produce any thing but what he determineth to produce ; and all his determinations must flow from the immediate principle of his will. If then his determinations be free, as they must be coming from that principle, then must the actions which follow them be also free. Seeing then the goodness of God is absolutely perfect of itself, seeing he is in himself infinitely and eternally happy, and this happiness as little capable of augmentation as of diminution, he cannot be thought to look upon any thing without himself as determining his will to the desire, and necessitating to the production of it. If then we consider God's goodness, he was moved : if his all-sufficiency, he was not necessitated : if we look upon his will, he freely determined ; if on his power, by that determination he created the world.

Wherefore that ancient conceit of a necessary emanation of God's goodness in the eternal creation of the world will now easily be refuted, if we make a distinction in the equivocal notion of goodness ; for if we take it as it signifieth a rectitude and excellency of all virtue and holiness, with a negation of all things morally evil, vicious, or unholy, so God is absolutely and necessarily good ; but if we take it in another sense, as indeed they did who made this argument, that is, rather for beneficence, or communicativeness of some good to others, then God is not necessarily, but freely, good, that is to say, profitable and beneficial. For he had not been in the least degree evil or unjust, if he had never made the world or any part thereof, if he had never communicated any of his perfections by framing any thing beside himself. Every proprietary therefore being accounted master of his own, and thought freely to bestow whatever he gives, much more must that one eternal and independent being be wholly free in communicating his own perfections without any necessity or obligation. We must

then look no farther than the determination of God's will in the creation of the world.

For this is the admirable power of God, that with him to will is to effect, to determine is to perform. So the elders speak before him that sitteth on the throne: "Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure" (that is, by thy will) "they are and were created," Rev. iv. 11. Where there is no resistance in the object, where no need of preparation, application, or instrumental advantage in the agent, there the actual determination of the will is a sufficient production. Thus God did make the heavens and the earth by willing them to be. This was his first command unto the creatures, and their existence was their first obedience. "Let there be light," this is the injunction; "and there was light," that is the creation: which two are so intimately and immediately the same, though in our and other translations those words, "Let there be," which express the command of God, differ from the other, "there was," which denote the present existence of the creature; yet in the original there is no difference at all, neither in point nor letter. And yet even in the diversity of the translation the phrase seems so expressive of God's infinite power, and immediate efficacy of his will, that it hath raised some admiration of Moses in the enemies of the religion both of the Jews and Christians. "God is in the heavens, he hath done whatsoever he pleased," saith David; yea in the making of the heavens, he therefore created them, because he pleased; nay more, he thereby created them, even by willing their creation.

Now although some may conceive the creature might have been produced from all eternity by the free determination of God's will, and it is so far certainly true that there is no instant assignable before which God could not have made the world; yet, as this is an article of our faith, we are bound to believe the heavens and earth are not eternal: "Through faith we understand the worlds were framed by the word of God," Heb. xi. 3. And by that faith we are assured that, whatsoever possibility of an eternal existence of the creature may be imagined, actually it had a temporal beginning; and therefore all the arguments for this world's eternity are nothing but so many erroneous

misconceptions. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways before his works of old," saith Wisdom. "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was," Prov. viii. 22. And the same Wisdom of God being made man reflecteth upon the same priority, saying, "Now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was," John xvii. 5. Yea, in the same Christ are we "blessed with all spiritual blessings, according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world." The impossibility of the origination of a circular motion, which we are sure is either in the heaven or earth, and the impropriety of the beginning of time, are such poor exceptions, that they deserve not the least labor of refutation. The actual eternity of this world is so far from being necessary, that it is of itself most improbable; and, without the infallible certainty of faith, there is no single person carries more evidences of his youth, than the world of its novelty.

It is true, indeed, some ancient accounts there are which would persuade us to imagine a strange antiquity of the world, far beyond the annals of Moses, and account of the same Spirit which made it. The Egyptian priests pretended an exact chronology for some myriads of years, and the Chaldeans or Assyrians far out-reckon them, in which they delivered not only a catalogue of their kings, but also a table of the eclipses of the sun and moon.

But for their number of years, nothing is more certain than their forgery; for the Egyptians did preserve the antiquities of other nations as well as their own, and by the evident fallacy in others have betrayed their own vanity. When Alexander entered Egypt with his victorious army, the priests could show him out of their sacred histories an account of the Persian empire which he gained by conquest, and the Macedonian which he received by birth, of each for 8000 years; whereas nothing can be more certain, out of the best historical account, than that the Persian empire, whether begun in Cyrus or in Medus, was not then 300 years old, and the Macedonian, begun in Corunnus, not 500. They then who made such large additions to advance the antiquity of other nations, and were so bold as to present them to those who

so easily might refute them (had they not delighted to be deceived to their own advantage, and took much pleasure in an honorable cheat), may without any breach of charity be suspected to have extended the account much higher for the honor of their own country. Besides, their catalogues must needs be ridiculously incredible, when the Egyptians make their first kings' reigns above 1200 years apiece, and the Assyrians theirs above 40,000; except we take the Egyptian years for months, the Assyrians for days; and then the account will not seem so formidable.

Again: for the calculation of eclipses, as it may be made for many thousand years to come, and be exactly true, and yet the world may end to-morrow; because the calculation must be made with this tacit condition, if the bodies of the earth, and sun, and moon, do continue in their substance and constant motion so long; so may it also be made for many millions of years past, and all be true, if the world have been so old; which the calculating doth not prove, but suppose. He then who should in the Egyptian temples see the description of so many eclipses of the sun and moon, could not be assured that they were all taken from real observation, when they might be as well described out of proleptical supposition.

Besides, the motions of the sun, which they mention together and with authority equal to that of their other observations, are so incredible and palpably fabulous, that they take off all credit and esteem from the rest of their narrations; for with this wild account of years, and seemingly accurate observations of the heavens, they left it written to posterity that the whole course of the celestial motions was four times changed; so that the sun hath twice risen in the east, and set in the west, as now it does; and, on the contrary, twice risen in the west, and set in the east. And thus these prodigious antiquaries confute themselves.

What then are these feigned observations and fabulous descriptions for the world's antiquity, in respect not only of the infallible annals of the Spirit of God, but even of the constant testimonies of more sober men, and the real appearances and face of things, which speak them of a far shorter date?

If we look into the historians who give account of ancient times, nay, if we peruse the fictions of the poets, we shall find the first to have no footsteps, the last to feign no actions, of so great antiquity. If the race of men had been eternal, or as old as the Egyptians and the Chaldees fancy it, how should it come to pass that the poetical inventions should find no actions worthy their heroic verse before the Trojan or the Theban war, or that great adventure of the Argonauts? For whatsoever all the Muses, the daughters of Memory, could rehearse before those times, is nothing but the creation of the world, and the nativity of their Gods.

If we consider the necessaries of life, the ways of freedom and commerce amongst men, and the inventions of all arts and sciences, the letters which we use, and languages which we speak, they have all known originals, and may be traced to their first authors. The first beginnings were then so known and acknowledged by all that the inventors and authors of them were reckoned amongst their gods, and worshipped by those to whom they had been so highly beneficial; which honor and adoration they could not have obtained, but from such as were really sensible of their former want, and had experience of a present advantage by their means.

If we search into the nations themselves, we shall see none without some original; and, were those authors extant who have written of the first plantations and migrations of people, the foundations and inhabiting of cities and countries, their first rudiments would appear as evident as their later growth and present condition. We know what ways within 2000 years people have made through vast and thick woods for their habitations, now as fertile, as populous as any. The Hercynian trees, in the time of the Cæsars, occupying so great a space as to take up a journey of sixty days, were thought even then coeval with the world. We read, without any show of contradiction, how this western part of the world hath been peopled from the east; and all the pretence of the Babylonian antiquity is nothing else but that we all came from thence. Those eight persons saved in the ark, descending from the Gordiæan mountains, and multiplying to a large collection in

the plain of Sinaar, made their first division at that place; and that dispersion, or rather dissemination, hath peopled all other parts of the world, either never before inhabited, or dispeopled by the flood.

These arguments have always seemed so clear and undeniable that they have put not only those who make the world eternal, but them also who confess it made, but far more ancient than we believe it, to a strange answer, to themselves uncertain, to us irrational. For to this they replied, that this world hath suffered many alterations, by the utter destructions of nations and depopulations of countries, by which all monuments of antiquity were defaced, all arts and sciences utterly lost, all fair and stately fabrics ruined, and so mankind reduced to paucity, and the world often again returned into its infancy. This they conceived to have been done oftentimes in several ages, sometimes by a deluge of water, sometimes by a torrent of fire; and, lest any of the elements might be thought not to conspire to the destruction of mankind, the air must sweep away whole empires at once with infectious plagues, and earthquakes swallow up all ancient cities, and bury even the very ruins of them. By which answer of theirs they plainly afford two great advantages to the Christian faith; first, because they manifestly show that they had a universal tradition of Noah's flood, and the overthrow of the old world; secondly, because it was evident to them that there was no way to salve the eternity or antiquity of the world, or to answer this argument drawn from history and the appearances of things themselves, but by supposing innumerable deluges and deflagrations; which being merely feigned in themselves, not proved (and that first by them who say they are not subject themselves unto them, as the Egyptians, who, by the advantage of their peculiar situation, feared neither perishing by fire nor water), serve only for a confirmation of Noah's flood so many ages past, and the surer expectation of St. Peter's fire, we know not how soon to come.

It remaineth then that we stedfastly believe, not only that the "heavens, and earth, and all the host of them," were made, and so acknowledge a creation, or an actual and immediate dependence of all things on God, but also

that all things were created by the hand of God, in the same manner, and at the same time, which are delivered unto us in the books of Moses by the Spirit of God, and so acknowledge a novelty, or no long existence of the creature.

Neither will the novelty of the world appear more plainly unto our conceptions, than if we look upon our own successions. The vulgar accounts which exhibit about 5600 years, though sufficiently refuting an eternity, and allaying all conceits of any great antiquity, are not yet so properly and nearly operative on the thoughts of men, as a reflection upon our own generations. The first of men was but six days younger than the being, not so many than the appearance, of the earth; and if any particular person would consider how many degrees in a direct line he probably is removed from that single person Adam, who bare together the name of man and of the earth from whence he came, he could not choose but think himself so near the original fountain of mankind, as not to conceive any great antiquity of the world; for though the ancient heathens did imagine innumerable ages and generations of men past, though Origen did fondly seem to collect so much by some misinterpretations of the Scriptures, yet if we take a sober view, and make but rational collections from the chronology of the sacred writ, we shall find no man's pedigree very exorbitant, or in his line of generation descent of many score.

When the age of man was long, in the infancy of the world, we find ten generations extend to 1656 years, according to the shortest, which is thought, because the Hebrew, therefore the best account; according to the longest, which, because the Septuagint's, is not to be contemned, 2262, or rather 2256. From the flood brought at that time upon the earth for the sins of men which polluted it, upon the birth of Abraham, the father of the faithful, not above ten generations, if so many, took up 292 years, according to the least; 1132, according to the largest account. Since which time the ages of men have been very much alike proportionably long; and it is agreed by all that there have not passed since the birth of Abraham 3700 years. Now by the experience of our families, which

for their honor and greatness have been preserved, by the genealogies delivered in the sacred Scriptures, and thought necessary to be presented to us by the blessed evangelists, by the observation and concurrent judgment of former ages, three generations usually take up 100 years. If then it be not yet 3700 years since the birth of Abraham, as certainly it is not ; if all men who are or have been since have descended from Noah, as undoubtedly they have ; if Abraham was but the tenth from Noah, as Noah from Adam, which Moses hath assured us ; then it is not probable that any person now alive is above 130 generations removed from Adam. And indeed thus admitting but the Greek account of less than 5000 years since the flood, we may easily bring all sober or probable accounts of the Egyptians, Babylonians, and Chinese, to begin since the dispersion at Babel. Thus having expressed at last the time, so far as it is necessary to be known, I shall conclude this second consideration of the nature and notion of creation.

Now seeing under the terms of *heaven and earth* we have proved all things beside God to be contained, and that the making of all these things was a clear production of them out of nothing, the third part of the explication must of necessity follow, that he who made all things is God. This truth is so evident in itself, and so confessed by all men, that none did ever assert the world was made, but withal affirmed that it was God who made it. There remaineth therefore nothing more in this particular, than to assert God so the Creator of the world as he is described in this article.

Seeing then we *believe in God the Father, maker of heaven and earth*, and by that God we expressed already a singularity of the Deity, our first assertion which we must make good is, that the one God did create the world. Again : seeing whosoever is that God cannot be excluded from this act of creation, as being an emanation of the Divinity, and we seem by these words to appropriate it to the Father, beside whom we shall hereafter show that we believe some other persons to be the same God ; it will be likewise necessary to declare the reason why the creation of the world is thus signally attributed to God the Father.

The first of these deserves no explication of itself, it is

so obvious to all who have any true conception of God. But because it hath been formerly denied (as there is nothing so senseless but some kind of heretics have embraced), and may be yet taken up in times of which we have no reason to presume better than of the former, I shall briefly declare the creation of the world to have been performed by that one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

As for the first, there is no such difference between things of the world as to infer a diversity of makers of them, nor is the least or worst of creatures in their original any way derogatory to the Creator: "God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good," and consequently like to come from the fountain of all goodness, and fit always to be ascribed to the same. Whatsoever is evil is not so by the Creator's action, but by the creature's defection.

In vain then did the heretics of old, to remove a seeming inconvenience, renounce a certain truth; and, while they feared to make their own God evil, they made him partial, or but half the Deity, and so a companion at least with an evil God; for dividing all things of this world into natures substantially evil and substantially good, and apprehending a necessity of an origination conformable to so different a condition, they imagined one God essentially good, as the first principle of the one, another God essentially evil, as the original of the other. And this strange heresy began upon the first spreading of the gospel; as if the greatest light could not appear without a shadow. Whereas there is no nature originally sinful, no substance in itself evil, and therefore no being who may not come from the same fountain of goodness: "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace and create evil; I the Lord do all these things," saith he who also said, "I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no god besides me," Isai. xlv. 7, 5. Vain then is that conceit which framed two gods, one of them called light, the other darkness; one good, the other evil; refuted in the first words of the Creed, *I believe in God, Maker of heaven and earth.*

But, as we have already proved that one God to be the Father, so must we yet farther show that one God the Father to be the Maker of the world. In which there is no

difficulty at all: the whole church at Jerusalem hath sufficiently declared this truth in their devotions: "Lord thou art God which hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is: against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together." Jesus then was the child of that God who made the heaven and the earth, and consequently the Father of Christ is the Creator of the world.

We know that Christ is the light of the Gentiles, by his own interpretation; we are assured likewise that his Father gave him, by his frequent assertion; we may then as certainly conclude that the Father of Christ is the Creator of the world, by the prophet's express prediction: "For thus saith God the Lord, he that created the heavens and stretched them out, he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles," Isa. xlii. 5, 6.

And now this great facility may seem to create the greater difficulty; for seeing the apostles teach us that the Son made all things, and the prophets that by the Spirit they were produced, how can we attribute that peculiarly in the *Creed* unto the Father which in the Scriptures is assigned indifferently to the Son and to the Spirit? Two reasons may particularly be rendered of this peculiar attributing the work of the creation to the Father. First: in respect of those heresies arising in the infancy of the church, which endeavoured to destroy this truth, and to introduce another Creator of the world, distinguished from the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—an error so destructive to the Christian religion, that it razeth even the foundations of the gospel, which refers itself wholly to the promises in the law, and pretends to no other God but the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; acknowledgeth no other speaker by the Son, than him that spake by the prophets; and therefore whom Moses and the prophets call "Lord of heaven and earth," of him our blessed Saviour signifies himself to be the Son, rejoicing in Spirit, and saying, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth,"

Luke x. 21. Secondly: in respect of the paternal priority in the Deity, by reason whereof that which is common to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, may be rather attributed to the Father, as the first person in the Trinity. In which respect the apostle hath made a distinction in the phrase of emanation or production: "To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him," 1 Cor. viii. 6. And our Saviour hath acknowledged, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do," which speaketh some kind of priority in action, according to that of the person. And in this sense the church did always profess to believe in God the Father, Creator of heaven and earth.

The great necessity of professing our faith in this particular appeareth several ways, as indispensably tending to the illustration of God's glory, the humiliation of mankind, the provocation to obedience, the aversion from iniquity, and all consolation in our duty.

God is of himself infinitely glorious, because his perfections are absolute, his excellencies indefective; and the splendor of this glory appeareth unto us in and through the works of his hands: "The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead," Rom. i. 20; "He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion," Jer. x. 12; li. 15. After a long enumeration of the wonderful works of the creation, the psalmist breaketh forth into this pious meditation: "O Lord how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all," Psal. civ. 24. If then the glory of God be made apparent by the creation; if he have "made all things for himself," that is, for the manifestation of his glorious attributes; if the "Lord rejoiceth in his works," because "his glory shall endure for ever," then is it absolutely necessary we should confess him *Maker of heaven and earth*, that we may sufficiently praise and glorify him. "Let them praise the name of the Lord," saith David; "for his name alone is excellent, his glory is above the earth and heaven." Thus

did the Levites teach the children of Israel to glorify God: "Stand up and bless the Lord your God for ever and ever; and blessed be thy glorious name, which is exalted above all blessing and praise. Thou, even thou, art Lord alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their hosts, the earth and all things that are therein," Neh. ix. 5. And the same hath St. Paul taught us: "For of him, and through him, and to him are all things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen." Furthermore, that we may be assured that he who made both heaven and earth will be glorified in both, the prophet calls upon all those celestial hosts to bear their part in this hymn: "Praise ye him all his angels, praise ye him all his hosts. Praise ye him sun and moon, praise him all ye stars of light. Praise him ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens. Let them praise the name of the Lord; for he commanded, and they were created," Psal. cxlviii. 2. And the twenty-four elders in the Revelation of St. John "fall down before him that sitteth on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns," the emblems of their borrowed and derived glories, "before the throne," the seat of infinite and eternal Majesty, saying, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created," Rev. iv. 10. Wherefore, if the heavens declare the glory of God, and all his works praise him, then "shall his saints bless him; they shall speak of the glory of his kingdom, and talk of his power," Psal. cxlv. 10. And, if man be silent, God will speak. While we through ingratitude will not celebrate, he himself will declare it, and promulgate: "I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm," Jer. xxvii. 5.

Secondly: the doctrine of the world's creation is most properly effectual towards man's humiliation. As there is nothing more destructive to humanity than pride, and yet not any thing to which we are more prone than that, so nothing can be more properly applied to abate the swelling of our proud conceptions, than a due consideration of the other works of God, with a sober reflection upon our own

original. "When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained;" when I view those glorious apparent bodies with my eye, and by the advantage of a glass find great numbers, before beyond the power of my sight, and from thence judge there may be many millions more, which neither eye nor instrument can reach; when I contemplate those far more glorious spirits, the inhabitants of the heavens, and attendants on thy throne; I cannot but break forth into that admiration of the prophet, "What is man, that thou art mindful of him?" What is that offspring of the earth, that dust and ashes? "What is that son of man, that thou visitest him?" What is there in the progeny of an ejected and condemned father, that thou shouldest look down from heaven, the place of thy dwelling, and take care or notice of him?

But if our original ought so far to humble us, how should our fall abase us! that, of all the creatures which God made, we should comply with him who first opposed his Maker, and would be equal unto him from whom he received his being! All other works of God, which we think inferior to us, because not furnished with the light of understanding, or endued with the power of election, are in a happy impossibility of sinning, and so offending their Maker. The glorious spirits which attend upon the throne of God, once in a condition of themselves to fall, now by the grace of God preserved and placed beyond all possibility of sinning, are entered upon the greatest happiness of which the workmanship of God is capable: but men, the sons of fallen Adam, and sinners after the similitude of him, of all the creatures are the only companions of those angels "who left their own habitations," and are "delivered into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." How should a serious apprehension of our own corruption, mingled with the thoughts of our creation, humble us in the sight of him, whom we alone of all the creatures by our unrepented sins drew unto repentance! How can we look without confusion of face upon that monument of our infamy, recorded by Moses, who first penned the original of humanity: "It repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart!" Gen. vi. 6.

Thirdly: this doctrine is properly efficacious and pro-

ductive of most cheerful and universal obedience. It made the prophet call for the commandments of God, and earnestly desire to know what he should obey: "Thy hands have made me and fashioned me; give me understanding, that I may learn thy commandments," Psal cxix. 73. By virtue of our first production, God hath undeniably absolute dominion over us, and consequently there must be due unto him the most exact and complete obedience from us. Which reason will appear more convincing, if we consider, of all the creatures which have been derived from the same fountain of God's goodness, none ever disobeyed his voice but the Devil and man. "Mine hand," saith he, "hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens; when I call unto them, they stand up together," Isai. xlviii. 13. The most loyal and obedient servants who stand continually before the most illustrious prince are not so ready to receive and execute the commands of their sovereign lord, as the hosts of heaven and earth to attend upon the will of their Creator. "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their hosts by number: he calleth them all by names, by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power, not one faileth," but every one maketh his appearance, ready pressed to observe the designs of their commander in chief; Isai. xl. 26. Thus the Lord commanded, and "they fought from heaven, the stars in their courses fought against Sisera," Judg. v. 20. He commanded the ravens to feed Elias, "and they brought him bread and flesh in the morning, and bread and flesh in the evening," 1 Kings xvii. 4; and so one prophet lived merely upon the obedience of the fowls of the air. He spake to the devouring whale, and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land; and so another prophet was delivered from the jaws of death by the obedience of the fishes of the sea. Do we not read of "fire and hail, snow and vapor, stormy wind, fulfilling his word?" Shall there be a greater coldness in man than in the snow? more vanity in us than in a vapor? more inconstancy than in the wind? If the universal obedience of the creature to the will of the Creator cannot move us to the same affection and desire to serve and please him, they will all conspire to testify against us,

and condemn us, when God shall call unto them; saying, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken: I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me," Isai. i. 2.

Lastly: the creation of the world is of most necessary meditation for the consolation of the servants of God in all the variety of their conditions: "Happy is he whose hope is in the Lord his God, which made heaven and earth, the sea and all that therein is," Psal. cxlvi. 5. This happiness consisteth partly in a full assurance of his power to secure us, his ability to satisfy us: "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein. For he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods," Psal. xxiv. 1. By virtue of the first production he hath a perpetual right unto, and power to dispose of all things: and he who can order and dispose of all, must necessarily be esteemed able to secure and satisfy any creature: "Hast thou not known, hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?" Isai. xl. 28. There is no external resistance or opposition where omnipotency worketh, no internal weakness or defection of power where the Almighty is the agent; and consequently there remaineth a full and firm persuasion of his ability in all conditions to preserve us. Again: this happiness consisteth partly in a comfortable assurance, arising from this meditation, of the will of God to protect and succour us, of his desire to preserve and bless us: "My help cometh from the Lord, who made heaven and earth: he will not suffer thy foot to be moved," saith the prophet David; at once expressing the foundation of his own expectancy and our security; Psal. cxxi. 2. God "will not despise the work of his hands," neither will he suffer the rest of his creatures to do the least injury to his own image: "Behold," saith he, "I have created the smith that bloweth the coals in the fire, and that bringeth forth an instrument for his work. No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord," Isai. liv. 16.

Wherefore to conclude our explication of the first article, and to render a clear account of the last part thereof; that

every one may understand what it is I intend, when I make confession of my faith in the *Maker of heaven and earth*, I do truly profess that I really believe, and am fully persuaded, that both heaven and earth and all things contained in them have not their being of themselves, but were made in the beginning; that the manner by which all things were made was by mediate or immediate creation; so that, antecedently to all things beside, there was at first nothing but God, who produced most part of the world merely out of nothing, and the rest out of that which was formerly made out of nothing. This I believe was done by the most free and voluntary act of the will of God, of which no reason can be alleged, no motive assigned, but his goodness; performed by the determination of his will at that time which pleased him, most probably within 130 generations of men, most certainly within not more than 6000 or at farthest 7000 years. I acknowledge this God Creator of the world to be the same God who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and, in this full latitude, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.*

ARTICLE II.

And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord.

THE second article of the Creed presents unto us, as the object of our faith, the second Person of the blessed Trinity; that as in the Divinity there is nothing intervening between the Father and Son, so that immediate union might be perpetually expressed by a constant conjunction in our Christian confession. And that upon no less authority than of "the Author and finisher of our faith," who in the persons of the apostles gave this command to us: "Ye believe in God, believe also in me," Joh. xiv. 1. Nor speaketh he this of himself, but from the Father which sent him; for "this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ," 1 Joh. iii. 23. According therefore to the Son's prescription, the Father's injunction, and the sacramental institution, as we are bap-

tized, so do we believe in the name of the Father and the Son.

Our blessed Saviour is here represented under a three-fold description; first, by his nomination, as *Jesus Christ*; secondly, by his generation, as the *only Son* of God; thirdly, by his dominion, as *our Lord*.

But when I refer *Jesus Christ* to the nomination of our Saviour, because he is in the Scriptures promiscuously and indifferently sometimes called Jesus, sometimes Christ, I would be understood so as not to make each of them equally, or in like propriety, his name. "His name was called Jesus, which was so named of the angel before he was conceived in the womb," Luke ii. 21; "who is also called Christ," not by name, but by office and title," Mat. i. 16. Which observation, seemingly trivial, is necessary for the full explication of this part of the article; for by this distinction we are led unto a double notion, and so resolve our faith into these two propositions—I believe there was and is a man, whose name was actually, and is truly in the most high importance, Jesus, the Saviour of the world—I believe the man who bare that name to be the Christ, that is, the Messiah, promised of old by God, and expected by the Jews.

For the first, it is undoubtedly the proper name of our Saviour, given unto him, according to the custom of the Jews, at his circumcision; and, as the Baptist was called John, even so the Christ was called Jesus. Besides, as the imposition was after the vulgar manner, so was the name itself of ordinary use. We read in the Scriptures of "Jesus which was called Justus," a fellow worker with St. Paul, and of "a certain sorcerer, a Jew, whose name was Bar-jesus," that is, the son of Jesus. Josephus in his history mentioneth one Jesus, the son of Ananus, another the son of Saphates, a third the son of Judas, slain in the temple: and many of the high priests or priests were called by that name; as the son of Damnæus, of Gamaliel, of Onias, of Phabes, and of Thebus. Ecclesiasticus is called the wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, and that Sirach the son of another Jesus. St. Stephen speaks of the "tabernacle of witness brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles," Acts vii. 45; and the apostle in

his explication of those words of David, "To day if you will hear his voice," observeth that, "if *Jesus* had given them rest, then would he not afterwards have spoken of another day," Heb. iv. 8. Which two Scriptures being undoubtedly understood of *Joshua*, the son of *Nun*, teach us infallibly that *Jesus* is the same name with *Joshua*. Which being at the first imposition in the full extent of pronunciation *Jehoshuah*, in process of time contracted to *Jeshuah*, by the omission of the last letter (strange and difficult to other languages), and the addition of the Greek termination, became *Jesus*.

Wherefore it will be necessary, for the proper interpretation of *Jesus*, to look back upon the first that bare that name, who was the son of *Nun*, of the tribe of *Ephraim*, the successor of *Moses*, and so named by him, as it is written, "And *Moses* called *Oshea*, the son of *Nun*, *Jehoshua*," Num. xiii. 16. His first name then imposed at his circumcision was *Oshea* or *Hoshea*; the same with the name of the son of *Azaziah*, ruler of *Ephraim*, of the son of *Elah*, king of *Israel*, of the son of *Beer*, the prophet: and the interpretation of this first name, *Hoshea*, is *Saviour*; 1 Chron. xxvii. 20; 2 Kings xvii. 1; Hos. i. 1. Now we must not imagine this to be no mutation, neither must we look upon it as a total alteration, but observe it as a change not trivial or inconsiderable. And seeing *Hoshea* was a name afterwards used by some, and *Jehoshua*, as distinct, by others, it will necessarily follow, there was some difference between these two names; and it will be fit to enquire what was the addition, and in what the force of the alteration doth consist.

First, therefore, we observe that all the original letters in the name *Hoshea* are preserved in that of *Joshua*; from whence it is evident that this alteration was not made by a verbal mutation, as when *Jacob* was called *Israel*, nor by any literal change, as when *Sarai* was named *Sarah*, nor yet by diminution or mutilation; but by addition, as when *Abram* was called *Abraham*. Secondly: it must be confessed that there is but one literal addition, and that of that letter which is most frequent in the Hebrew names; but being thus solemnly added by *Moses*, upon so remarkable an occasion as the viewing of the land of *Canaan* was, and

that unto a name already known and after used, it cannot be thought to give any less than a present designation of his person to be a Saviour of his people, and future certainty of salvation included in his name unto the Israelites by his means. Thirdly: though the number of the letters be augmented actually but to one, yet it is not improbable that another may be virtually added, and in the signification understood; for seeing the first letter of Hoshea will not endure a duplication, and if the same letter were to be added one of them must be absorbed; it is possible another of the same might be by Moses intended, and one of them suppressed. If then unto the name Hoshea we join one of the titles of God, which is *Jah*, there will result from both, by the custom of that Hebrew tongue, Jehoshua; and so not only the instrumental, but also the original cause of the Jews' deliverance will be found expressed in one word: as if Moses had said, "This is the person by whom God will save his people from their enemies."

Now seeing we have thus declared that Jesus is the same name with Joshua; seeing the name of Joshua was first imposed by Divine designation, as a certain prediction of the fulfilling to the Israelites (by the person who bare the name) of all that was signified by the name; seeing Jesus was likewise named by a more immediate imposition from heaven, even by the ministrations of an angel, it followeth that we believe he was infallibly designed by God to perform unto the sons of men whatsoever is implied in his nomination. As therefore in Hoshea there was expressed salvation, in Joshua at least was added the designation of that single person to save, with certainty of preservation, and probably even the name of God, by whose appointment and power he was made a Saviour; so shall we find the same in Jesus. In the first salutation, the angel Gabriel told the blessed Virgin, she should "conceive in her womb, and bring forth a Son, and should call his name *Jesus*." In the dream of Joseph, the angel of the Lord informed him not only of the nomination, but of the interpretation or etymology: "Thou shalt call his name *Jesus*; for he shall save his people from their sins." In which words is clearly expressed the designation of the person,

He, and the futurity of salvation certain by him, *He shall save*. Besides, that other addition of the name of God, propounded in Joshua as probable, appeareth here in some degree above probability, and that for two reasons—first, because it is not barely said that *He*, but as the original raiseth it, *He himself shall save*. Joshua saved Israel not by his own power, not of himself, but God by him; neither saved he his own people, but the people of God; whereas Jesus himself, by his own power, the power of God, shall save his own people, the people of God. Well therefore may we understand the interpretation of his name to be *God the Saviour*. Secondly: immediately upon the prediction of the name of Jesus, and the interpretation given by the angel, the evangelist expressly observeth, “All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is God with us,” Matt. :i. 22. Several ways have been invented to show the fulfilling of that prophecy, notwithstanding our Saviour was not called Emmanuel; but none can certainly appear more proper than that the sense of *Emmanuel* should be comprehended in the name of *Jesus*: and what else is “God with us,” than “God our Saviour?” Well therefore hath the evangelist conjoined the prophet and the angel, asserting Christ was therefore named Jesus, because it was foretold he should be called Emmanuel, the angelical “God the Saviour” being in the highest propriety the prophetic “God with us.”

However, the constant Scripture-interpretation of this name is *Saviour*. So said the angel of the Lord to the amazed shepherds: “Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord,” Luke ii. 11. So St. Paul to the Jews and Gentile proselytes at Antioch: “Of this man’s seed hath God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus,” Acts xiii. 23. Which explication of this sacred name was not more new or strange unto the world than was the name itself, so often used before; for the ancient Grecians usually gave it at first as a title to their gods, whom after any remarkable preservations they stiled Saviours, and under that notion built

temples, and consecrated altars to them. Nor did they rest with their mistaken piety, but made it stoop under their baser flattery, calling those men their Saviours for whom they seemed to have as great respect and honor as for their gods.

Nor does it always signify so much as that it may not be attributed to man; for even in the Scriptures the judges of Israel were called no less than their Saviours: "When the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised up a deliverer to the children of Israel, who delivered them, even Othniel the son of Kenaz;" and again: "When they cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised them up a deliverer, Ehud the son of Gera," Judg. iii. 9, 15. Where, though in our translation we call Othniel and Ehud *deliverers*, yet in the original they are plainly termed *Saviours*.

Now what the full import and ultimate sense of the title of Saviour might be, seemed not easy to the ancients; and the best of the Latins thought the Greek word so pregnant and comprehensive that the Latin tongue had no single word able to express it.

But, whatsoever notion the heathen had of their gods or men whom they styled Saviours, we know this name becometh unto Christ in a more sublime and peculiar manner. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved," Acts iv. 12.

It remaineth therefore that we should explain how and for what reasons Christ truly is, and properly is called, our Saviour. First, then, I conceive one sufficient cause of that appellation to consist in this, that he hath opened and declared unto us the only true way for the obtaining eternal salvation, and by such patefaction can deserve no less than the name of Saviour; for if those apostles and preachers of the gospel, who received the way of salvation from him, which they delivered unto others, may be said to save those persons who were converted by their preaching; in a far more eminent and excellent manner must he be said to save them, who first revealed all those truths unto them. St. Paul "*provoked to emulation them which were his flesh, that he might save some of them,*" Rom. xi. 14; and was made all things to all men, that he might by all means save some," 1 Cor. ix. 22. He exhorteth Timothy, "to

take heed unto himself, and unto the doctrine, and continue in them; for, in doing this, he should both save himself and them that heard him," 1 Tim. iv. 16. And St. James speaks in more general terms: "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death," Jam. v. 19. Now if these are so expressly said to save the souls of them who are converted by the doctrine which they deliver, with much more reason must Christ be said to save them, whose ministers they are, and in whose name they speak. For it was he who "came and preached peace to them which were afar off, and to them that were nigh," Eph. ii. 17. The will of God concerning the salvation of man was revealed by him: "No man hath seen God at any time: the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him, Joh. i. 18. Seeing then "the gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth;" seeing they who preach it at the command of Christ are said to save the souls of such as believe their word; seeing it was Christ alone "who brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel;" therefore he must in a most eminent and singular manner be acknowledged thereby to save, and consequently must not be denied, even in this first respect, the title of Saviour.

Secondly: this Jesus hath not only revealed, but also procured the way of salvation; not only delivered it to us, but also wrought it out for us; and so "God sent his Son into the world, that the world through him might be saved," John iii. 17. We were all concluded under sin, and, seeing the wages of sin is death, we were obliged to eternal punishment, from which it was impossible to be freed, except the sin were first remitted. Now this is the constant rule, that "without shedding of blood is no remission. It was, therefore necessary that Christ should appear to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," Heb. ix. 22. And so he did; for he "shed his blood for many, for the remission of sins," as himself professeth in the sacramental institution, Matt. xxvi. 28. "He bare our sins in his own body on the tree," as St. Peter speaks; and so in him "we have redemption through his blood, even

the forgiveness of sins," Col. i. 14. And if, "while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us, much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath by him," Rom. v. 8.

Again: we were all enemies unto God, and, having offended him, there was no possible way of salvation but by being reconciled to him. If then we ask the question, as once the Philistines did concerning David, "Wherewith should we reconcile ourselves unto our master?" we have no other name to answer it but Jesus; for "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them," 2 Cor. v. 19. And as under the law "the blood of the sin offering was brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile withal in the holy place," so it pleased the Father through the Son, "having made peace by the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself," Col. i. 20. And thus it comes to pass that "us who were enemies in our mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death." And upon this reconciliation of our persons must necessarily follow the salvation of our souls; for "if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life," Rom. v. 10.

Furthermore, we were all at first enslaved by sin, and brought into captivity by Satan, neither was there any possibility of escape but by way of redemption. Now it was the law of Moses, that "if any were able, he might redeem himself;" but this to us was impossible, because absolute obedience in all our actions is due unto God, and therefore no act of ours can make any satisfaction for the least offence. Another law gave yet more liberty, that he who "was sold might be redeemed again; one of his brethren might redeem him," Lev. xxv. 48; but this in respect of all the mere sons of men was equally impossible, because they were all under the same captivity. Nor could they satisfy for others, who were wholly unable to redeem themselves. Wherefore there was no other brother but that Son of man who is the Son of God, who was like unto us in all things, sin only excepted, that could work this redemption for us. And what he only could, that he

freely did perform ; for “ the Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many ;” and, as he came to give, so “ he gave himself a ransom for all.” So that in him “ we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins,” Eph. i. 7 ; for we are “ bought with a price ;” for we are “ redeemed, not with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot,” 1 Pet. i. 18. He then who hath obtained for us remission of sins, he who through himself hath reconciled us unto God, he who hath given himself as a ransom to redeem us, he who hath thus wrought out the way of salvation for us, must necessarily have a second and a far higher right unto the name of Jesus, unto the title of our Saviour.

Thirdly : besides the promulging and procuring, there is yet a farther act, which is, conferring of salvation on us. All that we mentioned before was wrought by virtue of his death, and his appearance in the holy of holies ; but we must still believe, “ he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them,” Heb. vii. 25 ; for now, being set down at the right hand of God, he hath received all power both in heaven and earth ; and the end of this power which he hath received is to confer salvation upon those who believe in him. For the Father gave the Son “ this power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as he hath given him ;” that he should raise our bodies out of the dust, and cause our corruptible to put on incorruption, and our mortal to put on immortality : and upon this power we are to expect salvation from him. For we must “ look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, from heaven, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself,” Phil. iii. 20. And “ unto them that” thus “ look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation,” Heb. ix. 28. Seeing then we are all to endeavour that our “ spirits may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus ;” seeing St. Peter hath taught us that “ God hath exalted Christ with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour ;” seeing the conferring of that upon

us which he promised to us, and obtained for us, is the reward of what he suffered; therefore we must acknowledge that the actual giving of salvation to us is the ultimate and conclusive ground of the title, Saviour.

Thus, by the virtue of his precious blood, Christ hath obtained remission of our sins, by the power of his grace hath taken away the dominion of sin, in the life to come will free us from all possibility of sinning, and utterly abolish death the wages of sin; wherefore well said the angel of the Lord, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins;" well did Zacharias call him "A Horn of salvation;" Simeon, "The Salvation of God;" St. Paul, "The Captain and Author of eternal salvation;" St. Peter, "a Prince and a Saviour," correspondent to those judges of Israel, raised up by God himself to deliver his people from the hands of their enemies, and for that reason called saviours: "In the time of their trouble," say the Levites, "when they cried unto thee, thou heardest them from heaven, and according to thy manifold mercies thou gavest them saviours, who saved them out of the hand of their enemies," Neh. ix. 27.

The correspondency of Jesus unto those temporal saviours will best appear if we consider it particularly in Joshua, who bare that salvation in his name, and approved it in his actions; for, as the son of Sirach saith, "Jesus, the son of Nave, was valiant in the wars, and was the successor of Moses in prophecies, who, according to his name, was made great for the saving of the elect of God," Ecclus. xlvi. 1. Although therefore Moses was truly and really a ruler and deliverer, which is the same with Saviour; although the rest of the judges were also by their office rulers and deliverers, and therefore styled saviours, as expressly Othniel and Ehud are; yet Joshua, far more particularly and exactly than the rest, is represented as a type of our Jesus, and that typical singularity is manifested in his name. For first he it was alone of all who passed out of Egypt, who was designed to lead the children of Israel into Canaan, the land of promise flowing with milk and honey; which land, as it was a type of the heaven of heavens, the inheritance of the saints, and eternal joys flowing from the right hand of God, so is the person who

brought the Israelites into that place of rest a type of him who only can bring us into the presence of God, and there prepare our mansions for us, and assign them to us, as Joshua divided the land for an inheritance to the tribes. Besides, it is farther observable, not only what Joshua did, but what Moses could not do. The hand of Moses and Aaron brought them out of Egypt, but left them in the wilderness, and could not seat them in Canaan. Joshua, the successor, only could effect that in which Moses failed. Now nothing is more frequent, in the phrase of the Holy Ghost, than to take Moses for the doctrine delivered, or the books written by him, that is, the law; from whence it followeth, that the death of Moses and the succession of Joshua presignifieth the continuance of the law till Jesus came, "by whom all that believe are justified from all things, from which we could not be justified by the law of Moses," Acts xiii. 39. "The law and the prophets were until John; since that the kingdom of God is preached," Luke xvi. 16. Moses must die, that Joshua may succeed. "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified (for by the law is the knowledge of sin); but the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe," Rom. iii. 20. Moses indeed seems to have taken Joshua with him up into the mount; but, if he did, surely it was to enter the cloud which covered the mount where the glory of the Lord abode: for without Jesus, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," there is no looking into the secrets of heaven, no approaching to the presence of God. The command of circumcision was not given unto Moses, but to Joshua; nor were the Israelites circumcised in the wilderness, under the conduct of Moses and Aaron, but in the land of Canaan, under their successor; for at that time the Lord said unto Joshua, "Make thee sharp knives, and circumcise again the children of Israel the second time," Josh. v. 2; which speaketh Jesus to be the true circumciser, the author of another circumcision than that of the flesh commanded by the law, even "the circumcision of the heart in the spirit, and not in the letter;" that which is made without hands, in putting off the body

of the sins of the flesh, which is therefore called "the circumcision of Christ."

Thus if we look upon Joshua as the minister of Moses, he is even in that a type of Christ, "the minister of the circumcision for the truth of God." If we look on him as the successor of Moses, in that he representeth Jesus, inasmuch as "the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." If we look on him as now judge and ruler of Israel, there is scarcely an action which is not clearly predictive of our Saviour. He begins his office at the banks of Jordan, where Christ is baptized, and enters upon the public exercise of his prophetic office. He chooseth there twelve men out of the people, to carry twelve stones over with them; as our Jesus thence began to choose his twelve apostles, those foundation-stones in the church of God, whose "names are in the twelve foundations of the wall of the holy city, the new Jerusalem," Rev. xxi. 14. It hath been observed that the saving of Rahab the harlot alive, foretold what Jesus once should speak to the Jews;" "Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you," Matt. xxi. 31. "He said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon: and the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day," Jos. x. 12. Which great miracle was not only wrought by the power of him whose name he bare, but did also signify that in the latter days, toward the setting of the sun, when the light of the world was tending unto a night of darkness, "the Sun of Righteousness should arise with healing in his wings:" and, giving a check to the approaching night, become "the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

But, to pass by more particulars, Joshua smote the Amalekites, and subdued the Canaanites; by the first making way to enter the land, by the second giving possession of it. And Jesus our Prince and Saviour, whose kingdom was not of this world, in a spiritual manner goeth in and out before us against our spiritual enemies, subduing sin and Satan, and so opening and clearing our way to heaven; destroying the last enemy, Death, so giving us possession of eternal life. Thus do we believe the man called Jesus

to have fulfilled, in the highest degree imaginable, all which was but typified in him who first bare the name, and in all the rest who succeeded in his office, and so to be the Saviour of the world; "whom God hath raised up, an horn of salvation for us, in the house of his servant David, that we should be saved from our enemies, and the hands of all that hate us," Luke i. 69.

The necessity of the belief of this part of the article is not only certain, but evident; because there is no end of faith without a Saviour, and no other name but this by which we can be saved, and no way to be saved by him but by believing in him; for "this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ; and he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him and he in him," 1 John iii. 23. From him then, and from him alone, must we expect salvation, acknowledging and confessing freely there is nothing in ourselves which can effect it or deserve it from us, nothing in any other creature which can promerit or procure it to us; for "there is but one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus," 1 Tim. ii. 5. It is only the beloved Son, in whom God is well pleased. He is clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: "he hath trod the wine-press alone." "We like sheep have gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all," Isai. liii. 6. "By him God hath reconciled all things to himself, by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven," Col. i. 20. By him alone is our salvation wrought; for his sake then only can we ask it, from him alone expect it.

Secondly: this belief is necessary, that we may delight and rejoice in the name of Jesus, as that in which all our happiness is involved. At his nativity an angel from heaven thus taught the shepherds, the first witnesses of the blessed incarnation: "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord," Luke ii. 10. And what the angel delivered at present, that the prophet Isaiah, that old evangelist, foretold at distance. When "the people which walked in darkness should see a great light; when unto us a child should be born, unto us a son should be given;" then

“ should they joy before God according to the joy of harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil,” Isai. ix. 2, 6, 3. When “ God shall come with recompense,” when “ he shall come and save us ;” then “ the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads,” Isai. xxxv. 4, 10.

Thirdly : the belief in Jesus ought to inflame our affection, to kindle our love toward him, engaging us to hate all things in respect of him, that is, so far as they are in opposition to him, or pretend to equal share of affection with him : “ He that loveth father or more than me is not worthy of me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me,” saith our Saviour, Matt. x. 37 ; so forbidding all prelation of any natural affection, because our spiritual union is far beyond all such relations. Nor is a higher degree of love only debarred us, but any equal pretension is as much forbidden : “ If any man come to me,” saith the same Christ, “ and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple,” Luke xiv. 26. Is it not this Jesus in whom the love of God is demonstrated to us, and that in so high a degree as is not expressible by the pen of man ? “ God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son,” John iii. 16. Is it not he who showed his own love to us far beyond all possibility of parallel ? for “ greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends ;” but “ while we were yet sinners,” that is, enemies, “ Christ died for us,” and so became our Jesus. Shall thus the Father show his love in his Son ? shall thus the Son show his love in himself ; and shall we no way study a requital ? or is there any proper return of love but love ? The voice of the church, in the language of Solomon, is, “ My love :” nor was that only the expression of a spouse, but of Ignatius, a man, after the apostles, most remarkable. And whosoever considereth the infinite benefits to the sons of men flowing from the actions and sufferings of their Saviour, cannot choose but conclude with St. Paul, “ If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha.” 1 Cor. xvi. 22.

Lastly : the confession of faith in Jesus is necessary to

breed in us a correspondent esteem of him, and an absolute obedience to him, that we may be raised to the true temper of St. Paul, who "counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord, for whom he suffered the loss of all things, and accounted them but dung, that he might win Christ," Phil. iii. 8. Nor can we pretend to any true love of Jesus, except we be sensible of the readiness of our obedience to him; as knowing what language he used to his disciples, "If ye love me, keep my commandments;" and what the apostle of his bosom spake, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments," 1 John v. 3. His own disciples once marvelled, and said, "What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?" Matt. viii. 27. How much more should we wonder at all disobedient Christians, saying, What manner of men are these, who refuse obedience unto him whom the senseless creatures, the winds and the sea, obeyed? Was the name of Jesus at first sufficient to cast out devils? and shall man be more refractory than they? Shall the exorcist say to the evil spirit, "I adjure thee by the name of Jesus," Acts xix. 13, and the Devil give place? Shall an apostle speak unto us in the same name, and we refuse? Shall they obey that name, which signifieth nothing unto them? for "he took not on him the nature of angels," and so is not their Saviour; and can we deny obedience unto him, who "took on him the seed of Abraham, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross," for us, that he might be raised to full power and absolute dominion over us, and by that power be enabled at last to save us, and in the mean time to rule and govern us, and exact the highest veneration from us? For "God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every other name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth," Phil. ii. 9.

Having thus declared the original of the name Jesus, the means and ways by which he who bare it expressed fully the utmost signification of it; we may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian easily understand what it is he says, when he makes his confession in these words,

I believe in Jesus: which may be not unfitly in this manner described—I believe not only that there is a God who made the world; but I acknowledge and profess that I am fully persuaded of this, as of a certain and infallible truth, that there was and is a man, whose name by the ministry of an angel was called Jesus, of whom, particularly Joshua, the first of that name, and all the rest of the judges and saviours of Israel, were but types. I believe that Jesus, in the highest and utmost importance of that name, to be the Saviour of the world; inasmuch as he hath revealed to the sons of men the only way for the salvation of their souls, and wrought the same way out for them by the virtue of his blood, obtaining remission for sinners, making reconciliation for enemies, paying the price of redemption for captives; and shall at last himself actually confer the same salvation, which he hath promulged and procured, upon all those who unfeignedly and stedfastly believe in him. I acknowledge there is no other way to heaven beside that which he hath shown us, there is no other means which can procure it for us but his blood, there is no other person who shall confer it on us but himself. And, with this full acknowledgment, *I believe in Jesus*.

And in Jesus Christ.

HAVING thus explained the proper name of our Saviour, *Jesus*, we come unto that title of his office usually joined with his name, which is therefore the more diligently to be examined because the Jews, who always acknowledged him to be Jesus, ever denied him to be Christ, “and agreed together that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue,” John ix. 22.

For the full explication of this title, it will be necessary, first, to deliver the signification of the word; secondly, to show upon what grounds the Jews always expected a Christ or Messiah; thirdly, to prove that the Messiah promised to the Jews is already come; fourthly, to demonstrate that our Jesus is that Messiah; and fifthly, to declare in what that unction, by which Jesus is Christ, doth consist, and what are the proper effects thereof. Which five particulars

being clearly discussed, I cannot see what should be wanting for a perfect understanding that Jesus is Christ.

For the first, we find in the Scriptures two several names, *Messias* and *Christ*, but both of the same signification; as appeareth by the speech of the woman of Samaria: "I know that *Messias* cometh, which is called *Christ*," John iv. 25; and more plainly by what Andrew spake unto his brother Simon: "We have found the *Messias*, which is, being interpreted, the *Christ*," John i. 41; *Messias* in the Hebrew tongue, *Christ* in the Greek; *Messias*, the language of Andrew and the woman of Samaria, who spake in Syriac; *Christ*, the interpretation of St. John, who wrote his gospel in the Greek, as the most general language in those days; and the signification of them both is, the *Anointed*. St. Paul and the rest of the apostles, writing in that language, used the Greek name, which the Latins did retain, calling him constantly *Christus*; and we in English have retained the same, as universally naming him *Christ*.

Nor is this yet the full interpretation of the word, which is to be understood not simply according to the action only, but as it involveth the design in the custom of anointing; for in the law whatsoever was anointed was thereby set apart, as ordained to some special use or office; and therefore under the notion of unction we must understand that promotion and ordination. "Jacob poured oil on the top of a pillar," and that anointing was the consecration of it, Gen. xxviii. 18. Moses anointed the tabernacle and all the vessels, and this anointing was their dedication. Hence *the priest that is anointed* signifieth, in the phrase of Moses, the high priest, because he was invested in that office at and by his unction. When therefore Jesus is called the *Messias* or *Christ*, and that so long after the anointing oil had ceased, it signified no less than a person set apart by God, anointed with most sacred oil, advanced to the highest office, of which all those employments under the law, in the obtaining of which oil was used, were but types and shadows. And this may suffice for the signification of the word.

That there was among the Jews an expectation of such a Christ to come is most evident. The woman of Samaria could speak with confidence: "I know that *Messias*

cometh." And the unbelieving Jews, who will not acknowledge that he is already come, expect him still. Thus we find "all men musing in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not," Luke iii. 15. When Jesus taught in the temple, those who doubted said "When Christ cometh no man knoweth whence he is;" those who believed said, "When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done?" Joh. vii. 27, 31. Whether therefore they doubted, or whether they believed in Jesus, they all expected a Christ to come; and the greater their opinion was of him, the more they believed he was that Messias. "Many of the people said, Of a truth this is the prophet; others said, This is the Christ." As soon as John began to baptize, "the Jews sent Priests and Levites from Jerusalem, to ask him, Who art thou?" that is, whether he were the Christ or no, as appeareth out of his answer, "And he confessed and denied not, but confessed, I am not the Christ," Joh. i. 19; for as they asked him afterwards, "What then, art thou Elias? and he said, I am not: Art thou that Prophet? and he answered, No;" so without question their first demand was, "Art thou the Christ?" and he answered, "I am not;" from whence it clearly appeareth that there was a general expectation among the Jews of a Messias to come; nor only so, but it was always counted among them an article of their faith, which all were obliged to believe who professed the law of Moses, and whosoever denied that, was thereby interpreted to deny the law and the prophets. Wherefore it will be worth our enquiry to look into the grounds upon which they built that expectation.

It is most certain that the Messias was promised by God, both before and under the law. God said unto Abraham, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called," Gen. xxi. 12; and we know that was a promise of a Messias to come, because St. Paul hath taught us, "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not unto seeds, as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ," Gal. iii. 16. The Lord said unto Moses, "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, Acts iii. 22; and St. Peter hath sufficiently satisfied us that this prophet, promised to Moses, is Jesus, the

Christ. Many are the prophecies which concern him, many the promises which are made of him ; but yet some of them very obscure ; others, though plainer, yet have relation only to the person, not to the notion, or the word *Messias*.

Wheresoever he is spoken of as the Anointed, it may well be first understood of some other person ; except one place in Daniel, where Messiah is foretold " to be cut off," Dan. ix. 26 ; and yet even there the Greek translation hath not the *Messias*, but the *Uction*. It may therefore seem something strange, how so universal an expectation of a Redeemer under the name of the *Messias* should be spread through the church of the Jews.

But if we consider that in the space of seventy years of the Babylonish captivity the ordinary Jews had lost the exact understanding of the old Hebrew language before spoken in Judea, and therefore when the Scriptures were read unto them they found it necessary to interpret them to the people in the Chaldee language, which they had lately learned ; as, when Ezra the Scribe brought the book of the law of Moses before the congregation, the Levites are said to have caused the people to understand the law, because " they read in the book, in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading," Neh. viii. 8. Which constant interpretation begat at last a Chaldee translation of the Old Testament to be read every sabbath in the synagogues ; and that being not exactly made word for word with the Hebrew, but with a liberty of a brief exposition by the way, took in, together with the text, the general opinion of the learned Jews. By which means it came to pass that not only the doctrine, but the name also, of the *Messias* was very frequent and familiar with them. Insomuch that even in the Chaldee paraphrase now extant there is express mention of the *Messias* in above seventy places, besides that of Daniel. The Jews then informed by the plain words of Daniel, instructed by a constant interpretation of the law and the prophets read in their synagogues every sabbath-day, relying upon the infallible predictions and promises of God, did all unanimously expect out of their own nation, of the tribe of Judah, of the family of David, a *Messias*, or a Christ, to come.

Now this being granted, as it cannot be denied, our next consideration is of the time in which this promise was to be fulfilled; which we shall demonstrate out of the Scriptures to be past, and consequently that the promised Messiah is already come. The prediction of Jacob on his death-bed is clear and pregnant: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and to him shall the gathering of the people be," Gen. xlix. 10; but the sceptre is departed from Judah, neither is there one law-giver left between his feet; therefore Shiloh, that is, the Messiah, is already come. That the Jewish government hath totally failed is not without the greatest folly to be denied; and therefore that Shiloh is already come, except we should deny the truth of divine predictions, must be granted. There remains then nothing to be proved, but that by Shiloh is to be understood the Messiah; which is sufficiently manifest both from the consent of the ancient Jews, and from the description immediately added to the name. For all the old paraphrasts call him expressly the Messiah, and the words which follow, "to him shall the gathering of the people be," speak no less; as giving an explication of his person, office, or condition, who was but darkly described in the name of Shiloh. For this is the same character by which he was signified unto Abraham: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;" by which he is deciphered in Isaiah: "In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious," Isai. xi. 10; and in Micah: "The mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established on the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and people shall flow unto it," Mic. iv. 1. And thus the blessing of Judah is plainly intelligible: "Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies, thy father's children shall bow down before thee," Gen. xlix. 8. Thou shalt obtain the primogeniture of thy brother Reuben, and by virtue thereof shalt rule over the rest of the tribes: the government shall be upon thy shoulders, and all thy brethren shall be subject unto thee. And, that you may understand this blessing is not to expire until it make way for

a greater, know that this government shall not fail, until there come a son out of your loins, who shall be far greater than yourself: for whereas your dominion reacheth only over your brethren, and so is confined unto the tribes of Israel; his kingdom shall be universal, and all nations of the earth shall serve him. Seeing then this Shiloh is so described in the text, and acknowledged by the ancient Jews to be the Messias; seeing God hath promised by Jacob the government of Israel should not fail until Shiloh came; seeing that government is visibly and undeniably already failed; it followeth, inevitably, that the Messias is already come.

In the same manner the prophet Malachi hath given an express signification of the coming of the Messias while the temple stood: "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in," Mal. iii. 1. And Haggai yet more clearly: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Yet once it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations; and the desire of all nations shall come; and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than the glory of the former, saith the Lord of hosts," Hag. ii. 6. It is then most evident, from these predictions, that the Messias was to come while the second temple stood. It is as certain that the second temple is not now standing. Therefore, except we contradict the veracity of God, it cannot be denied but the Messias is already come. Nothing can be objected to enervate this argument, but that these prophecies concern not the Messias; and yet the ancient Jews confessed they did, and that they do so cannot be denied; for, first, those titles, "The Angel of the covenant," "The Delight of the Israelites," "The Desire of all nations," are certain and known characters of the Christ to come. And, secondly, it cannot be conceived how the glory of the second temple should be greater than the glory of the first, without the coming of the Messias to it; For the Jews themselves have observed that five signs of the divine glory were in the first temple, which were want-

ing to the second ; as the Urim and Thummim, by which the high priest was miraculously instructed of the will of God ; the ark of the covenant, from whence God gave his answers by a clear and audible voice ; the fire upon the altar, which came down from heaven, and immediately consumed the sacrifice ; the divine presence or habitation with them, represented by a visible appearance, or given, as it were, to the king and high priest by anointing with the oil of unction : and, lastly, the spirit of prophecy, with which those especially who were called to the prophetic office were endued. And there was no comparison between the beauty and glory of the structure or building of it, as appeared by the tears dropped from those eyes which had beheld the former : “ For many of the priests and Levites, and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice,” Ezra iii. 12 ; and by those words which God commanded Haggai to speak to the people for the introducing of this prophecy : “ Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory ? and how do you see it now ? is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing ? ” Hag. ii. 3. Seeing then the structure of the second temple was so far inferior to the first ; seeing all those signs of the divine glory were wanting in it with which the former was adorned ; the glory of it can no other way be imagined greater, than by the coming of him into it in whom all those signs of the divine glory were far more eminently contained ; and this person alone is the Messiah ; for he was to be the glory of the people Israel, yea, even of the God of Israel ; he the Urim and Thummim, by whom the will of God, as by a greater oracle, was revealed ; he the true ark of the covenant, the only propitiatory by his blood ; he who was to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire, the true fire which came down from heaven ; he who was to take up his habitation in our flesh, and to dwell among us that we might behold his glory ; he who received the Spirit without measure, and from whose fulness we do all receive. In him were all those signs of the divine glory united, which were thus divided in the first temple ; in him they were all more eminently contained than in those ; therefore his coming to the

second temple was, as the sufficient, so the only means by which the glory of it could be greater than the glory of the first. If then the Messiah was to come while the second temple stood, as appeareth by God's prediction and promise; if that temple many ages since hath ceased to be, there being not one stone left upon a stone; if it certainly was, before the destruction of it, in greater glory than ever the former was; if no such glory could accrue unto it but by the coming of the Messiah; then is that Messiah already come.

Having thus demonstrated, out of the promises given to the Jews, that the Messiah who was so promised unto them must be already come, because those events which were foretold to follow his coming are already past, we shall proceed unto the next particular, and prove that the man Jesus, in whom we believe, is that Messiah who was promised.

First: it is acknowledged, both by the Jew and Gentile, that this Jesus was born in Judea, and lived and died there, before the commonwealth of Israel was dispersed, before the second temple was destroyed, that is, at the very time when the prophets foretold the Messiah should come. And there was no other beside him that did with any show of probability pretend to be, or was accepted as the Messiah. Therefore we must confess he was, and only he could be, the Christ.

Secondly: all other prophecies belonging to the Messiah were fulfilled in Jesus, whether we look upon the family, the place, or the manner of his birth; neither were they ever fulfilled in any person beside him: he then is, and no other can be, the Messiah. That he was to come out of the tribe of Judah and family of David is every where manifest. The Jews, who mention Messiah as a son of Joseph or of Ephraim, do not deny, but rather dignify, the son of David or of Judah, whom they confess to be the greater Christ. "There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots, and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him," saith the prophet Isaiah. And again: "In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be

glorious," Isai. xi. 1, 10. Now who was it but Jesus of whom the elders spake, "Behold the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David?" Rev. v. 5. Who but he said, "I am the root and offspring of David, and the bright and morning star?" Rev. xxii. 16. The Jews did all acknowledge it, as appears by the question of our Saviour, "How say the scribes that Christ is the Son of David? What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, the son of David;" and that of the people, amazed at the seeing of the blind and speaking of the dumb, "Is not this the son of David?" the blind cried out unto him, "Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on us;" and the multitude cried, "Hosanna to the son of David." The genealogy of Jesus shows his family; the first words of the gospel are, "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David." The prophecy therefore was certainly fulfilled in respect of his lineage; "for it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah," Heb. vii. 14.

Besides, if we look upon the place where the Messiah was to be born, we shall find that Jesus by a particular act of providence was born there: "When Herod gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. And they said unto him, in Bethlehem of Judea," Matt. ii. 4. The people doubted whether Jesus was the Christ, because they thought he had been born in Galilee, where Joseph and Mary lived; wherefore they said, "Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?" John vii. 41. That place of Scripture which they meant was cited by the scribes to Herod, according to the interpretation then current among the Jews, and still preserved in the Chaldee paraphrase: "For thus it is written in the prophet, And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Judah; for out of thee shall come a governor that shall rule my people Israel, Matt. ii. 5. This prediction was most manifestly and remarkably fulfilled in the birth of Jesus, when by the providence of God it was so ordered that Augustus should then tax the world, to which end every one should go up into his own city. Whereupon

Joseph, and Mary his espoused wife, left Nazareth of Galilee, their habitation, and went into Bethlehem of Judea, the city of David, there to be taxed, "*because they were of the house and lineage of David.*" And while they were there, as the days of the virgin Mary were accomplished, so the prophecy was fulfilled; for there she brought forth her first-born son; and so unto us was born that day "in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord."

But if we add unto the family and place the manner of his birth, also foretold, the argument must necessarily appear conclusive. The prophet Isaiah spake thus unto the house of David: "The Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel," Isa. vii. 14. What nativity could be more congruous to the greatness of a Messiah than that of a virgin, which is most miraculous? what name can be thought fitter for him than that of Immanuel, "God with us," whose land Judea is said to be? The Immanuel then thus born of a virgin was without question the true Messiah. And we know Jesus was thus born of the blessed virgin Mary, "that it might be fulfilled which was thus spoken of the Lord by the prophet." Wherefore seeing all the prophecies concerning the family, place, and manner of the birth of the Messiah, were fulfilled in Jesus, and not so much as pretended to be accomplished in any other; it is again from hence apparent that this Jesus is the Christ.

Thirdly: he who taught what the Messiah was to teach, did what the Messiah was to do, suffered what the Messiah was to suffer, and by suffering obtained all which a Messiah could obtain, must be acknowledged of necessity to be the true Messiah. But all this is manifestly true of Jesus; therefore we must confess he is the Christ. For, first, it cannot be denied but the Messiah was promised as a prophet and teacher of the people. So God promised him to Moses: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee." So Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Hosea have expressed him, as we shall hereafter have farther occasion to show. And not only so, but as a greater prophet, and more perfect doctor, than ever any was who preceded him, more universal than they all: "I

have put my spirit upon him," saith God; "he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles, and the isles shall wait for his law," Isai. xlii. 1, 4. Now it is as evident that Jesus of Nazareth was the most perfect prophet, the prince and Lord of all the prophets, doctors, and pastors, who either preceded or succeeded him; for he hath revealed unto us the most perfect will of God both in his precepts and his promises. He hath delivered the same after the most perfect manner, with the greatest authority; not like Moses and the prophets, saying, "Thus saith the Lord," but "I say unto you;" nor like the interpreters of Moses, for "he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes"—with the greatest perspicuity, not as those before him, under types and shadows, but plainly and clearly; from whence both he and his doctrine are frequently called "Light"—with the greatest universality, as preaching that gospel which is to unite all the nations of the earth into one church, that there might be one Shepherd and one flock. Whatsoever then that great prophet the Messiah was to teach, that Jesus taught; and whatsoever works he was to do, those Jesus did.

When John the Baptist had heard "the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples" with this message to him, "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" And Jesus returned this answer unto him, showing that the ground of that message, "the works of Christ," was a sufficient resolution of the question sent: "Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see; the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up," Matt. xi. 4. And as Jesus alleged the works which he wrought to be a sufficient testimony that he was the Messiah, so did those Jews acknowledge it who said, "When Christ cometh will he do more miracles than these which this man doth?" Joh. vii. 31. And Nicodemus, a ruler among them, confessed little less; "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him," Joh. iii. 2. Great and many were the miracles which Moses and the rest of the prophets wrought for the ratification of the law, and the demonstration of God's constant

presence with his people; and yet all those wrought by so many several persons, in the space of above 3000 years, are far short of those which this one Jesus did perform within the compass of three years. The ambitious diligence of the Jews hath reckoned up seventy-six miracles for Moses, and seventy-four for all the rest of the prophets; and, supposing that they were so many (though indeed they were not), how few are they in respect of those which are written of our Saviour! how inconsiderable, if compared with all that he wrought! when St. John testifieth, with as great certainty of truth as height of hyperbole, that "there are many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, he supposed that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written," Joh. xxi. 25. Nor did our Saviour excel all others in the number of his miracles only, but in the power of working. Whatsoever miracle Moses wrought, he either obtained by his prayers, or else, consulting with God, received it by command from him; so that the power of miracles cannot be conceived as immanent or inhering in him. Whereas this power must of necessity be in Jesus, "in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," and "to whom the Father had given to have life in himself." This he sufficiently showed by working with a word, by commanding the winds to be still, the devils to fly, and the dead to rise; by working without a word or any intervenient sign; as when the woman who "had an issue of blood twelve years touched his garment, and straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up" by the virtue which flowed out from the greater fountain of his power, Mark v. 25. And, lest this example should be single, we find that "the men of Gennesaret, the people out of all Judea and Jerusalem, and from the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, even the whole multitude sought to touch him; for there went virtue out of him and healed them all," Luke vi. 17. Once indeed Christ seemed to have prayed before he raised Lazarus from the grave, but even that was done "because of the people which stood by," not that he had not power within himself to raise up Lazarus, who was afterward to raise himself, but "that they might believe the Father had sent him," Joh. xi. 42. The immanency and

inherency of this power in Jesus is evident in this, that he was able to communicate it to whom he pleased, and actually did confer it upon his disciples: "Behold I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy," Luke x. 19—upon the apostles: "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give," Matt. x. 8—upon the first believers: "These signs shall follow them that believe; in my name they shall cast out devils," Mark xvi. 17; "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do," Joh. xiv. 12. He then who did more actions divine and powerful than Moses and all the prophets ever did, he who performed them in a manner far more divine than that by which they wrought, hath done all which can be expected the Messias, foretold by them, should do.

Nor hath our Jesus only done, but suffered, all which the Messias was to suffer; for we must not with the Jews deny a suffering Christ, or fondly of our own invention make a double Messias, one to suffer, and another to reign. It is clear enough by the prophet Isaias what his condition was to be, whom he calls the "Servant of God;" and the later Jews cannot deny but their fathers constantly understood that place of the Messias.

Now the sufferings of Christ spoken of by the prophet may be reduced to two parts; one in respect of contempt, by which he was despised of men; the other in respect of his death, and all those indignities and pains which preceded and led unto it. For the first, the prophet hath punctually described his condition, saying, "He hath no form nor comeliness, and, when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men," Isa. liii. 2. He seems to describe a personage no way amiable, an aspect indeed rather uncomely; and so the most ancient writers have interpreted Isaias, and confessed the fulfilling of it in the body of our Saviour. But what the aspect of his outward appearance was, because the Scriptures are silent, we cannot now know: and it is enough that we are assured, the state and condition of his life was in the eye of the Jews without honor and inglorious; for though, "being in the form of God, he

thought it not robbery to be equal with God ; yet he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant," Phil. ii. 6. For thirty years he lived with his mother Mary, and Joseph his reputed father, of a mean profession, and was subject to them. When he left his mother's house, and entered on his prophetic office, he passed from place to place, sometimes received into a house, other times lodging in the fields; for while "the foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, the Son of Man had not where to lay his head." From this low estate of life and condition, seemingly inglorious, arose in the Jews a neglect of his works, and contempt of his doctrine. "Is not this the carpenter's son?" nay, farther, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary? And they were offended at him," Mar. vi. 3. Thus was it fulfilled in him; "he was despised and rejected of men, and they esteemed him not."

This contempt of his personage, condition, doctrine, and works, was by degrees raised to hatred, detestation, and persecution, to a cruel and ignominious death. All which if we look upon in the gross, we must acknowledge it fulfilled in him to the highest degree imaginable, that he was "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." But if we compare the particular predictions with the historical passages of his sufferings; if we join the prophets and evangelists together, it will most manifestly appear that the Messiah was to suffer nothing which Christ hath not suffered. If Zachary say, "They weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver," Zach. xi. 12; St. Matthew will show that Judas sold Jesus at the same rate: for the chief priests "covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver." If Isaiah say that "he was wounded;" if Zachary, "they shall look upon me whom they have pierced:" if the prophet David, yet more *particularly*, "They pierced my hands and my feet;" the evangelists will show how he was fastened to the cross, and Jesus himself the print of the nails, Isa. liii. 5; Zach. xii. 10; Psal. xxii. 16. If the psalmist tells us, they should laugh him to scorn, and shake their head saying, "*He trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him, let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him,*" Psal. xxii. 7; St. Matthew will describe the same action, and the

same expression ; for “ they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads, and saying, he trusted in God, let him deliver him now, if he will have him ; for he said, I am the Son of God,” Matt. xxvii. 39. Let David say, “ My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me ? ” Psal. xxii. 1, and the son of David will show in whose person the father spake it, “ Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani.” Let Isaiah foretel, “ He was numbered with the transgressors,” Isa. liii. 12 ; and you shall find him “ crucified between two thieves, one on his right hand, the other on his left.” Read in the psalmist, “ In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink,” Psal. lxix. 21 ; and you shall find in the evangelist, “ Jesus, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, said, I thirst ; and they took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink,” Joh. xix. 28. Read farther yet, “ They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture,” Psal. xxii. 18 ; and, to fulfil the prediction, the soldiers shall make good the distinction, “ who took his garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part, and also his coat : now the coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout. They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it whose it shall be,” Joh. xix. 23, 24. Lastly : let the prophets teach us, that “ he shall be brought like a lamb to the slaughter,” and be “ cut off out of the land of the living,” Isa. liii. 7, 8 ; all the evangelists will declare how like a lamb he suffered, and the very Jews will acknowledge that he was cut off. And now may we well conclude, “ thus it is written, and thus it behoved the Christ to suffer ; ” and what it so behoved him to suffer, that he suffered.

Neither only in his passion, but after his death all things were fulfilled in Jesus, which were prophesied concerning the Messiah : “ He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death,” saith the prophet of the Christ to come, Isa. liii. 9 ; and as the thieves were buried with whom he was crucified, so was Jesus, but laid in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, an honorable counsellor. “ After two days will he revive us, in the third day he will raise us up,” saith Hosea of the people of Israel : in whose language they were the type of Christ ; and the third day

Jesus rose from the dead. "The Lord said unto my Lord," saith David, "Sit thou at my right hand," Psal. cx. 1. Now "David is not ascended into the heavens, and consequently cannot be set at the right hand of God; but Jesus is already ascended, and set down at the right hand of God; and so "all the house of Israel might know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom they crucified, both Lord and Christ," Acts ii. 36. For he who taught whatsoever the Messiah—promised by God, foretold by the prophets, expected by the people of God—was to teach; he who did all which that Messiah was by virtue of that office to do; he who suffered all those pains and indignities which that Messiah was to suffer; he to whom all things happened after his death, the period of his sufferings, which were according to the divine predictions to come to pass; he, I say, must infallibly be the true Messiah. But Jesus alone taught, did, suffered, and obtained all these things, as we have showed. Therefore we may again infallibly conclude that our Jesus is the Christ.

Fourthly: if it were the proper note and character of the Messiah that all nations should come in to serve him; if the doctrine of Jesus hath been preached and received in all parts of the world, according to that character so long before delivered; if it were absolutely impossible that the doctrine revealed by Jesus should have been so propagated as it hath been, had it not been divine; then must this Jesus be the Messiah: and, when we have proved these three particulars, we may safely conclude he is the Christ.

That all nations were to come in to the Messiah, and so the distinction between the Jew and Gentile to cease at his coming, is the most universal description in all the prophecies. God speaks to him thus as to his son: "Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession," Psal. ii. 8. It was one greater than Solomon of whom these words were spoken, "All kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him," Psal. lxxii. 11. "It shall come to pass in the last days," saith Isaiah, "that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it." And again, "In

that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek," Isa. ii. 2; xi. 10. And in general all the prophets were but instruments to deliver the same message, which Malachi concludes, from God: "From the rising of the sun, even to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts," Mal. i. 11. Now seeing the bounds of Judea were settled; seeing the promise of God was to bring all nations in at the coming of the Messias; seeing ~~this was~~ it which the Jews so much opposed, as loath to part from their ancient and peculiar privilege; he who actually wrought this work must certainly be the Messias: and that Jesus did it is most evident.

That all nations did thus come in to the doctrine preached by Jesus cannot be denied; for although he "were not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel;" although of those many Israelites who believed on him while he lived, very few were left immediately after his death; yet when the apostles had received their commission from him to go teach all nations, and were endued with power from on high, by the plentiful effusion of the Holy Ghost; the first day there was an accession of 3000 souls; immediately after we find the number of the men, beside women, was about 5000; and still "believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women," Acts v. 14. Upon the persecution at Jerusalem, they went through the regions of Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, and so the gospel spread; insomuch that St. James, the bishop of Jerusalem, spake thus unto St. Paul, "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands," or rather, "how many myriads," that is, ten thousands, "of the Jews there are which believe," Acts xxi. 20. Besides, how great was the number of the believing Jews, strangers scattered through Pontus, Galacia, Capadocia, Asia, Bithynia, and the rest of the Roman provinces, will appear out of the epistles of St. Peter, St. James, and St. John. And yet all these are nothing to the fulness of the Gentiles which came after: first, those who

were before Gentile worshippers, acknowledging the same God with the Jews, but not receiving the law; who had before abandoned their old idolatry, and already embraced the true doctrine of one God, and did confess the Deity which the Jews did worship to be that only true God; but yet refused to be circumcised, and so to oblige themselves to the keeping of the whole law. Now the apostles preaching the same God with Moses, whom they all acknowledged, and teaching that circumcision and the rest of the legal ceremonies were now abrogated, which those men would never admit, they were with the greatest facility converted to the Christian faith; for being present at the synagogues of the Jews, and understanding much of the law, they were of all the Gentiles readiest to hear, and most capable of the arguments which the apostles produced out of the Scriptures to prove that Jesus was the Christ. Thus many of "the Greeks which came up to worship at Jerusalem, devout men out of every nation under heaven," not men of Israel, but yet "fearing God," did first embrace the Christian faith, Acts ii. 5. After them the rest of the Gentiles left the idolatrous worship of their heathen Gods, and in a short time in infinite multitudes received the gospel. How much did Jesus work by one St. Paul to "the obedience of the Gentiles by word and deed!" How did he pass from Jerusalem round about through Phœnice, Syria, and Arabia, through Asia, Achaia, and Macedonia, even to Illyricum, "fully preaching the gospel of Christ!" Rom. xv. 18, 19. How far did others pass beside St. Paul, that he should speak even of his time, that "the gospel was preached to every creature under heaven?" Many were the nations, innumerable the people, who received the faith in the apostles' days; and in not many years after, notwithstanding millions were cut off in their bloody persecutions, yet did their numbers equalize half the Roman empire; and, little above two ages after the death of the last apostle, the emperors of the world gave in their names to Christ, and submitted their sceptres to his laws, that the Gentiles might "come to his light and kings to the brightness of his rising;" that kings might become the nursing fathers, and queens the nursing mothers, of the church.

From hence it came to pass, that, according to all the predictions of the prophets, the one God of Israel, the maker of heaven and earth, was acknowledged through the world for the only true God; that the law given to Israel was taken for the true law of God, but as given to that people, and so to cease when they ceased to be a people; except the moral part thereof, which, as a universal rule common to all people, is still acknowledged for the law of God, given unto all, and obliging every man; that all the oracles of the heathen Gods, in all places where Christianity was received, did presently cease, and all the idols or the gods themselves were rejected and condemned as spurious. For the Lord of Hosts had spoken concerning those times expressly: "It shall come to pass in that day that I will cut off the names of the idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembered; also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of the land," Zech. xiii. 2.

Now seeing this general reception of the gospel was so anciently, so frequently foretold; seeing the same was so clearly and universally performed; even this might seem sufficient to persuade that Jesus is Christ. But, lest any should not yet be fully satisfied, we shall farther show, that it is impossible Jesus should have been so received for the true Messias, had he not been so; or that his doctrine, which teacheth him to be the Christ, should be admitted by all nations for divine, had it not been such; for whether we look upon the nature of the doctrine taught, the condition of the teachers of it, or the manner in which it was taught, it can no way seem probable that it should have had any such success, without the immediate working of the hand of God, acknowledging Jesus for his Son, the doctrine for his own, and the fulfilling by the hands of the apostles of what he had foretold by the prophets.

As for the nature of the doctrine, it was no way likely to have any such success; for first, it absolutely condemned all other religions, settled and corroborated by a constant succession of many ages, under which many nations and kingdoms, and especially at that time the Roman, had signally flourished. Secondly, it contained precepts far more ungrateful and troublesome to flesh and blood, and con-

triant to the general inclination of mankind ; as the abnegation of ourselves, the mortifying of the flesh, the love of our enemies, and the bearing of the cross. Thirdly, it enforced those precepts seemingly unreasonable, by such promises as were seemingly incredible and unperceivable ; for they were not of the good things of this world, or such as afford any complacency to our sense, but of such as cannot be obtained till after this life, and necessarily presuppose that which then seemed as absolutely impossible, the resurrection. Fourthly, it delivered certain predictions which were to be fulfilled in the persons of such as should embrace it, which seem sufficient to have kept most part of the world from listening to it, as dangers, losses, afflictions, tribulations, and, in sum, "all that would live godly in Christ Jesus should suffer persecution."

If we look upon the teachers of this doctrine, there appeared nothing in them which could promise any success. The first revealer and promulger bred in the house of a carpenter, brought up at the feet of no professor, despised by the high priests, the scribes and pharisees, and all the learned in the religion of his nation ; in the time of his preaching apprehended, bound, buffeted, spit upon, condemned, crucified ; betrayed in his life by one disciple, denied by another ; at his death distrusted by all. What advantage can we perceive toward the propagation of the gospel in this Author of it, "Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness?" What in those who followed him, sent by him, and thence called apostles, men by birth obscure, by education illiterate, by profession low and inglorious ? How can we conceive that all the schools and universities of the world should give way to them, and the kingdoms and empires should at last come in to them, except their doctrine were indeed divine, except that Jesus, whom they testified to be the Christ, were truly so ?

If we consider the manner in which they delivered this doctrine to the world, it will add no advantage to their persons, or advance the probability of success ; for in their delivery they used no such rhetorical expressions, or ornaments of eloquence, to allure or entice the world ; they affected no such subtilty of wit, or strength of argumenta-

tion, as thereby to persuade and convince men; they made use of no force or violence to compel, no corporal menaces to affright mankind, unto a compliance. But in a plain simplicity of words they nakedly delivered what they had seen and heard, "preaching, not with the enticing words of man's wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit," 1 Cor. ii. 4. It is not then rationally imaginable that so many nations should forsake their own religions, so many ages professed, and brand them all as damnable, only that they might embrace such precepts as were most unacceptable to their natural inclinations, and that upon such promises as seemed not probable to their reason, nor could have any influence on their sense, and notwithstanding those predictions which did assure them, upon the receiving of that doctrine, to be exposed to all kind of misery; that they should do this upon the authority of him who for the same was condemned and crucified, and by the persuasion of them who were both illiterate and obscure; that they should be enticed with words without eloquence, convinced without the least subtilty, constrained without any force;—I say, it is no way imaginable how this should come to pass, had not the doctrine of the gospel, which did thus prevail, been certainly divine; had not the light of the word, which thus dispelled the clouds of all former religions, come from heaven; had not that "Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith," been the true Messias.

To conclude this discourse. He who was in the world at the time when the Messias was to come, and no other at that time or since pretended; he who was born of the same family, in the same place, after the same manner, which the prophets foretold of the birth of the Messias; he who taught all those truths, wrought all those miracles, suffered all those indignities, received all that glory, which the Messias was to teach, do, suffer, and receive; he whose doctrine was received in all nations, according to the character of the Messias; he was certainly the true Messias. But we have already sufficiently showed that all these things are exactly fulfilled in Jesus, and in him alone. We must therefore acknowledge and profess that this Jesus is the promised Messias, that is, the Christ.

Having thus manifested the truth of this proposition, *Je-*

us is the Christ, and showed the interpretation of the word *Christ* to be *anointed*; we find it yet necessary, for the explication of this article, to enquire what was the end or immediate effect of his unction, and how or in what manner he was anointed to that end.

For the first, as the *Messias* was foretold, so was he typified; nor were the actions prescribed under the law less predictive than the words of the prophets. Nay, whosoever were then anointed, were therefore so, because he was to be anointed. Now it is evident that among the Jews they were wont to anoint those who were appointed as kings over them. So Samuel said unto Saul, "The Lord sent me to anoint thee to be king over his people, over Israel," 1 Sam. xv. 1. When Saul was rejected, and David produced before Samuel, the Lord said, "Arise, anoint him, for this is he," 1 Sam. xvi. 12. And some may have contented themselves with this, that the *Messias* was to be a King. But not only the kings, but, beside and long before them, the high priests were also anointed; insomuch as the anointed, in their common language, signified their high priest. And, because these two were most constantly anointed, therefore divers have thought it sufficient to assert that the *Messias* was to be a King and a Priest. But seeing not only the high priests and kings were actually anointed (though they principally and most frequently), for the Lord said unto Elias, "Go anoint Hazael to be king over Syria, and Jehu the son of Nimshi shalt thou anoint to be king over Israel, and Elisha the son of Shaphat shalt thou anoint to be prophet in thy room," 1 Kings xix. 15; therefore hence it hath been concluded that the three offices of Prophet, Priest, and King, belonged to Jesus as the Christ, and that upon good reason; for the commonwealth of Israel was totally ordered and disposed, both in the constitution and administration of it, for and with respect unto the *Messias*. The constitution of that people was made by a sejunction and separation of them from all other nations on the earth; and this began in Abraham, with a peculiar promise of a seed in whom all the nations should be blessed, and be united into one religion. That promised seed was the *Messias*, the type of whom was Isaac. This separation was continued by the admi-

nistration of that commonwealth, which was "a royal priesthood;" and that administration of the people did consist in three functions, prophetic, regal, sacerdotal; all which had respect unto the Messias, as the scope of all the prophets, and the complement of their prophecies, as the Lord of the temple, and the end of all the sacrifices for which the temple was erected, as the heir of an eternal priesthood "after the order of Melchizedec," and of the throne of David, or an everlasting kingdom. Seeing then the separation was to cease at the coming of the Messias; seeing that could not cease so long as the administration of that people stood; seeing that administration did consist in those three functions, it followeth that those three were to be united in the person of the Messias, who was to make all one, and consequently that the Christ was to be Prophet, Priest, and King.

Again: the redemption or salvation which the Messias was to bring, consisteth in the freeing of a sinner from the state of sin and eternal death into a state of righteousness and eternal life. Now a freedom from sin in respect of the guilt could not be wrought without a sacrifice propitiatory, and therefore there was a necessity of a Priest: a freedom from sin in respect of the dominion could not be obtained without a revelation of the will of God, and of his wrath against all ungodliness; therefore there was also need of a prophet: a translation from the state of death into eternal life is not to be effected without absolute authority and irresistible power; therefore a King was also necessary. The Messias then, the Redeemer of Israel, was certainly anointed for that end, that he might become Prophet, Priest, and King. And if we believe him whom we call Jesus, that is our Saviour and Redeemer, to be Christ, we must assert him by his unction sent to perform all these three offices.

That Jesus was anointed to the prophetic office, though we need no more to prove it than the prediction of Isaiah, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor;" the explication of our Saviour, "This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears;" and the confession of the synagogue at Nazareth, "who all bare him witness, and wondered at

the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth:” yet we are furnished with more ample and plentiful demonstrations; for whether we consider his preparation, his mission, or his administration, all of them speak him fully to have performed it. To Jeremiah indeed God said, “Before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations;” Jer. i. 5; and of John the Baptist, “He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother’s womb.” And, if these became singular prophets by their preparative sanctification, how much more eminent must his prophetic preparation be, to whose mother it is said, “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee?” If the Levites must be “thirty years old, every one that came to do the service of the ministry,” Jesus will not enter upon the public administration of this office “till he begin to be about thirty years of age.” Then doth the “Holy Ghost descend in a bodily shape like a dove upon him.” Then must “a voice come from heaven, saying, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.” Never such preparations, never such an inauguration of a Prophet.

As for his mission, never any was confirmed with such letters of credence, such irrefragable testimonials, as the formal testimony of John the Baptist, and the more virtual testimony of his miracles. “Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord,” saith God by Malachi, Mal. iv. 5. And John went “before him in the spirit of Elias,” saith another Malachi, even an angel from heaven, Luke i. 17. This John, or Elias, saw the Spirit descend on Jesus, “and bare record that this is the Son of God,” John i. 34. The Jews took notice of this testimony, who “said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come unto him,” John iii. 26; and Jesus himself puts them in mind of it, “Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth,” John v. 33; nay, they themselves confessed his testimony to be undeniable: “John did no miracle, but all things that John spake of this man were true,” John x. 41. But though the witness of John was thus cogent, yet the

testimony of miracles was far more irrefragable. "I have greater witness than that of John," saith our Saviour; "for the works which my Father hath given me to finish; the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me," John v. 36. Notwithstanding the precedent record of John, Jesus requireth not an absolute assent unto his doctrine without his miracles: "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not." But upon them he challengeth belief: "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," John x. 37. If then Moses and other prophets, to whom God gave the power of miracles, did assert their mission to be from God by the divine works which they wrought, much more efficacious to this purpose must the miracles of Jesus appear, who wrought more wonders than they all. Never therefore was there so manifest a mission of a prophet.

Now the prophetic function consisteth in the promulgation, confirmation, and perpetuation of the doctrine containing the will of God for the salvation of man. And the perfect administration of the office must be attributed unto Jesus; for "no man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him," John i. 18. He gave unto the Apostles "the words which his Father gave him," John xvii. 8, 14. Therefore he hath revealed the perfect will of God. The confirmation of this doctrine cannot be denied him, who lived a most innocent and holy life to persuade it, for "he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth;" who wrought most powerful and divine works to confirm it, and was thereby known to be "a teacher from God;" who died a most painful and shameful death to ratify it, "witnessing a good profession before Pontius Pilate," which, in itself unto that purpose efficacious, was made more evidently operative in the raising of himself from death. The propagation and perpetual succession of this doctrine must likewise be attributed unto Jesus, as to no temporary or accidental prophet, but as to him who instituted and instructed all who have any relation to that function; for "the spirit of Christ was in the prophets." And "when he ascended up on high, he gave gifts unto men;" "for he

gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, Eph. iv. 8. It is then most apparent that Jesus was so far Christ, as that he was anointed to the prophetic office, because his preparation for that office was most remarkable, his mission unto that office was undeniable, his administration of that office was infallible.

Now as Jesus was anointed with the unction of Elizeus to the prophetic, so was he also with the unction of Aaron to the sacerdotal office. Not that he was called after the order of Aaron; "for it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood," Heb. vii. 14, 21; but after a more ancient order, according to the prediction of the psalmist, "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." But though he were of another order, yet whatsoever Aaron did as a priest was wholly typical, and consequently to be fulfilled by the Messias, as he was a Priest; for the priesthood did not begin in Aaron, but was translated and conferred upon his family before his consecration. We read of "the priests which came near to the Lord:" of "young men of the children of Israel which offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord," Exod. xix. 22, xxiv. 5; who without question were no other than the first-born, to whom the priesthood did belong. Jesus therefore, as the first-begotten of God, was by right a Priest, and, being anointed unto that office, performed every function, by way of oblation, intercession, and benediction. "Every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is of necessity that this man," Jesus, if he be a High Priest, "have somewhat also to offer," Heb. viii. 3. Not that he had any thing beside himself, or that there was any peculiar sacrifice allowed to this Priest by God; to whom, "when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me," Heb. x. 5; and, by the offering of this body of Jesus Christ are we sanctified," Heb. x. 10; for he who is our Priest hath "given himself an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savor." Eph. v. 2.

Now when Jesus had thus given himself a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, he ascended up on high, and entered into the holy of holies not made with hands, and there appeared before God as an atonement for our sin. Nor is he prevalent only in his own oblation once offered, but in his constant intercession. "Who is he that condemneth?" saith the apostle; "it is Christ that died, ye rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God; who also maketh intercession for us," Rom. viii. 34. Upon this foundation he buildeth our persuasion, that "he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them," Heb. vii. 25. Nor must we look upon this as a servile or precarious, but rather as an efficacious and glorious intercession, as being his to whom all power is given both in heaven and earth. Besides these offerings and intercedings, there was something more required of the priest, and that is blessing: "Aaron was separated, that he should sanctify the most holy things, he and his sons for ever, to burn incense before the Lord, to minister unto him, and to bless in his name for ever." 1 Chron. xxiii. 13. We read of no other sacerdotal act performed by Melchizedek the priest of the most high God, but only that of blessing, and that in respect both of God and man; first, he blessed man, and said, "Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth;" then, "Blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thine hand," Gen. xiv. 19. Now it is observable what the rabbin have delivered, that at the morning-sacrifice the priests under the law did bless the people with a solemn form of benediction, but at the evening-sacrifice they blessed them not; to show that in the evening of the world, the last days, which are the days of the Messias, the benediction of the law should cease, and the blessing of the Christ take place. When Zacharias the priest, the father of John the Baptist, the forerunner of our Saviour, "executed his office before God in the order of his course," and the whole multitude of the people waited for him, to receive his benediction, he could not speak unto them, for he was dumb; showing the power of benediction was now passing to another and far greater Priest, even to Jesus,

whose doctrine in the mount begins with "Blessed;" who, when he left his disciples, "lift up his hands and blessed them." And yet this function is principally performed after his resurrection, as it is written, "Unto you first, God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning every one of you from his iniquities." It cannot then be denied that Jesus, who offered up himself a most perfect sacrifice and oblation for sin, who still maketh continual intercession for us, who was raised from the dead, that he might bless us with an everlasting benediction, is a most true and most perfect Priest.

The third office belonging to the Messias was the regal, as appeareth by the most ancient tradition of the Jews, and by the express predictions of the prophets: "Yet have I set my King," saith the psalmist, "upon my holy hill of Sion," Psal. ii. 6. Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder," saith the prophet Isaiah, who calleth him the "Prince of peace," showing the perpetuity of his power, and particularity of his seat. "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever," Isai. ix. 7. All which most certainly belongs unto our Jesus, by the unnerving interpretation of the angel Gabriel, who promised the blessed virgin that the Lord God should give unto her Son the throne of his father David, "and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke i. 32. He acknowledgeth himself this office, though by a strange and unlikely representation of it, the riding on an ass; but by that it was fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, "Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold thy King cometh unto thee, meek; and sitting on an ass," Matt. xxi. 4. He made as strange a confession of it unto Pilate; for when he said unto him, "Art thou a King then?" Jesus answered, "Thou sayest that I am a King. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth," John xviii. 37. The solemn inauguration into this office was at his ascension into heaven, and his session at the right hand of God; not

but that he was by right a King before, but the full and public execution was deferred till then, "when God raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion," Eph. i. 20. Then he, whose "name is called the Word of God, had on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords," Rev. xix. 13, 16.

This regal office of our Saviour consisteth partly in the ruling, protecting, and rewarding of his people; partly in the coercing, condemning, and destroying of his enemies. First, he ruleth in his own people, by delivering them a law by which they walk: by furnishing them with his grace by which they are enabled to walk in it. Secondly, he protecteth the same, by helping them to subdue their lusts, which reign in their mortal bodies; by preserving them from the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil; by supporting them in all their afflictions; by delivering them from all their enemies. Thirdly, whom he thus rules and protects here, he rewards hereafter in a most royal manner, making them "kings and priests unto God and his Father." On the contrary he showeth his regal dominion in the destruction of his enemies, whether they were temporal or spiritual enemies—temporal, as the Jews and Romans, who joined together in his crucifixion. While he was on earth he told his disciples, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom," Matt. xvi. 28; and in that kingdom he was then seen to come, when he brought utter destruction on the Jews by the Roman armies, not long after to be destroyed themselves. But, beside these visible enemies, there are other spiritual, those who hinder the bringing in of his own people into his Father's kingdom, those who refuse to be subject unto him, and consequently deny him to be their King; as all wicked and ungodly men, of whom he hath said, "These mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me," Luke xix. 27. Thus sin, satan, and death, being the enemies to his kingdom, shall all be destroyed in their order; for "he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet: and the last enemy that shall be

destroyed is Death, 1 Cor. xv. 25. Thus is our Jesus become "the Prince of the kings of the earth;" thus is the Lamb acknowledged to be "Lord of lords, and King of kings."

Wherefore seeing we have already showed that the prophetic, sacerdotal, and regal offices were to belong unto the promised Messias, as the proper end and immediate effect of his unction; seeing we have likewise declared how Jesus was anointed to these offices, and hath and doth actually perform the same in all the functions belonging to them: there remaineth nothing for the full explication of this particular concerning the Christ, but only to show the manner of this unction, which is very necessary to be explained. For how they were anointed under the law, who were the types of the Messias, is plain and evident, because the manner was prescribed, and the materials were visible; God appointed an oil to be made, and appropriated it to that use; and the pouring that oil upon the body of any person was his anointing to that office for which he was designed. But seeing that oil so appropriated to this use was lost many hundred years before our Saviour's birth; seeing the custom of anointing in this manner had a long time ceased; seeing howsoever we never read that Jesus was at all anointed with oil; it remaineth still worthy our enquiry, how he was anointed, so as to answer to the former unctions; and what it was which answered to that oil which then was lost, and was at the first but as a type of this which now we search for.

The Jews tell us that the anointing oil was hid in the days of Josiah, and that it shall be found and produced again when the Messias comes, that he may be anointed with it, and the kings and high priests of his days. But though the loss of that oil bespake the destruction of that nation, yet the Christ who was to come needed no such unction for his consecration; there being as great a difference between the typical and correspondent oil, as between the representing and represented Christ. The prophet David calleth it not by the vulgar name of oil of unction, but "the oil of gladness," Psal. xlv. 7; for though that place may in the first sense be understood of Solomon, whom when Zadoc the priest anointed, "they blew the trumpet,

and all the people said, God save King Solomon. And all the people came up after him, and the people piped with pipes, and rejoiced with great joy, so that the earth rent with the sound of them," 1 Kings i. 39; though from thence it might be said of him, "Thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows;" yet seeing those words are spoken unto God, as well as of God ("therefore God, thy God"), the oil with which that God is anointed must in the ultimate and highest sense signify a far greater gladness than that at Solomon's coronation was, even the fountain of all joy and felicity in the church of God.

The ancients tell us that this oil is the Divinity itself, and in the language of the Scriptures it is the Holy Ghost. St. Peter teacheth us "how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power." Now, though there can be no question but the spirit is the oil, yet there is some doubt when Jesus was anointed with it; for we know the angel said unto the blessed virgin, "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," Luke i. 35. From whence it appeareth that from the conception, or at the incarnation, Jesus was sanctified by the Holy Ghost and the power of the highest, and so consequently, as St. Peter spake, he was "anointed then with the Holy Ghost and with power." Again: seeing we read that after he was thirty years of age, "the Spirit like a dove descended and lighted upon him," and he, descending in the power of the Spirit into Galilee, said unto them of Nazareth, "This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears," meaning that of Isaiah, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel;" hence hath it been also collected, that his unction was performed at his baptism. Nor need we to contend which of these two was the true time of our Saviour's unction, since neither is destructive of the other, and consequently both may well consist together. David, the most undoubted type of the Messiah, was anointed at Bethlehem; for there "Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren; and the Spirit

of the Lord came upon David, from that day forward," 1 Sam. xvi. 13. Of which unction these words of God must necessarily be understood, "I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him," Psal. lxxxix. 20. And yet he was again anointed at Hebron, first, over the house of Judah; then over all the tribes of Israel; 2 Sam. ii. 4; v. 3. As therefore David at his first unction received the Spirit of God, and a full right unto the throne of Israel, which yet he was not to exercise till the death of Saul and acceptance of the tribes, and therefore when the time was come that he should actually enter upon his regal office he was again anointed; so our Jesus, the son of David, was first sanctified and anointed with the Holy Ghost at his conception, and thereby received a right unto, and was prepared for, all those offices which belonged to the Redeemer of the world; but, when he was to enter upon the actual and full performance of all those functions which belonged to him, then doth the same Spirit which had sanctified him at his conception visibly descend upon him at his inauguration. And that most properly upon his baptism, because, according to the customs of those ancient nations, washing was wont to precede their unctions; wherefore "Jesus, when he was baptised, went up straightway out of the water; and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove," Matt. iii. 16; as David sent Solomon to be anointed at Gihon; from whence arose that ancient observation of the rabbin, that kings were not to be anointed but by a fountain.

Now, as we have showed that Jesus was anointed with the Holy Ghost, lest any should deny any such descension to be a proper or sufficient unction, we shall farther make it appear that the effusion or action of the Spirit eminently containeth whatsoever the Jews have imagined to be performed or signified by those legal anointings. Two very good reasons they render why God did command the use of such anointing oil, as in respect of the action; first, that it might signify the divine election of that person, and designation to that office, from whence it was necessary that it should be performed by a prophet, who understood the will of God; secondly, that by it the person anointed

might be made fit to receive the divine influx. For the first, it is evident there could be no such infallible sign of the divine designation of Jesus to his offices, as the visible descent of the Spirit, attended with a voice from *heaven*, instead of the hand of a prophet, saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." For the second, this spiritual unction was so far from giving less than an aptitude to receive the divine influx, that it was that divine influx, nay, the Divinity itself, the Godhead dwelling in him bodily.

In respect of the matter, they give two causes why it was oil, and not any other liquor; first, because of all other it signifies the greatest glory and excellency. The olive was the first of trees mentioned as fit for sovereignty, in regard of its fatness, "wherewith they honor God and man," Judg. ix. 9. Therefore it was fit that those persons who were called to a greater dignity than the rest of the Jews, should be consecrated by oil, as the best sign of election to honor. And can there be a greater honor than to be the Son of God, the beloved Son, as Jesus was proclaimed at this unction, by which he was consecrated to such an office as will obtain him a name far above all names? Secondly, they tell us that oil continueth uncorrupted longer than any other liquor. And indeed it hath been observed to preserve not only itself, but other things, from corruption; hence they conclude it fit that their kings and priests, whose succession was to continue for ever, should be anointed with oil, the most proper emblem of eternity. But, even by this reason of their own, their unction is ceased, seeing the succession of their kings and priests is long since cut off, and their eternal and eternizing oil lost long before, and only that one Jesus, who was anointed with the most spiritual oil, "continueth for ever;" and therefore "hath an unchangeable priesthood, as being made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life," Heb. vii. 16.

Besides, they observe that simple oil, without any mixture, was sufficient for the candlestick; but that which was designed for unction must be compounded with principal spices, which signify a good name, always to be acquired by those in places of greatest dignity by the most laudable

and honorable actions. And certainly never was such an admixtion of spices as in the unction of our Saviour, by which he was endued with all variety of the graces of God, by which he was enabled to "offer himself a sacrifice for a sweet smelling savor." For as "he was full of grace and truth," so "of his fulness have we all received, grace for grace;" and as "we have received anointing of him," so "we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ."

Again: it was sufficient to anoint the vessels of the sanctuary in any part; but it was particularly commanded that the oil should be poured upon the head of the kings and priests, as the seat of all the animal faculties, the fountain of all dignity, and original of all the members of the body. This was more eminently fulfilled in Jesus, who by his unction, or as Christ, became "the Head of the church;" nay "the Head of all principality and power, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God," Col. ii. 10, 19.

Lastly: they observe, that though in the vessels nothing but a single unction was required, yet in the kings and priests there was commanded, or at least practised, both unction and affusion (as it is written, "He poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him to sanctify him," Lev. viii. 12), the first to signify their separation, the second to assure them of the falling of the Spirit upon them. Now what more clear than that our Christ was anointed by affusion, whether we look upon his conception, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee;" or his inauguration, "The Spirit descended and lighted upon him?" And thus, according unto all particulars required by the Jews themselves to complete their legal unctions, we have sufficiently showed that Jesus was, as most eminently, so most properly, anointed with the Spirit of God.

Wherefore seeing we have shown that a Messiah was to come into the world; seeing we have proved that he is already come, by the same predictions by which we believe he was to come; seeing we have demonstrated that Jesus, born in the days of Herod, was, and is, that promised Messiah; seeing we have farther declared that he was

anointed to those offices which belonged to the Messias, and actually did and doth still perform them all: and that his anointing was by the immediate effusion of the Spirit, which answereth fully to all things required in the legal and typical unction; I cannot see what farther can be expected for explication or confirmation of this truth, that *Jesus is the Christ*.

The necessity of believing this part of the article is most apparent, because it were impossible he should be our Jesus, except he were the Christ; for he could not reveal the way of salvation, except he were a prophet; he could not work out that salvation revealed except he were a priest; he could not confer that salvation upon us, except he were a king; he could not be prophet, priest, and king, except he were the Christ. This was the fundamental doctrine which the apostles not only testified, as they did that of the resurrection, but argued, proved, and demonstrated out of the law and the prophets. We find St. Paul at Thessalonica "three sabbath-days, reasoning with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ," Acts xvii. 2. We find him again at Corinth, "pressed in Spirit, and testifying to the Jews, that Jesus was Christ," Acts xviii. 5. Thus Apollos, by birth a Jew, but instructed in the Christian faith by Aquila and Priscilla, "mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures, that Jesus was Christ." This was the touchstone by which all men at first were tried whether they were Christian or Antichristian. "For whosoever believeth," saith St. John, "that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." What greater commendation of the assertion of this truth? "Who is a liar," saith the same apostle, "but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This man is the Antichrist, as denying the Father and the Son." What higher condemnation of the negation of it?

Secondly: as it is necessary to be believed as a most fundamental truth, so it hath as necessary an influence upon our conversations; because, except it hath so, it cannot clearly be maintained. Nothing can be more absurd in a disputant than to pretend to demonstrate a truth as

infallible, and at the same time to show it impossible. And yet so doth every one who professeth faith in Christ already come, and liveth not according to that profession; for thereby he proveth, as far as he is able, that the true Christ is not yet come, at least that Jesus is not he. We sufficiently demonstrate to the Jews that our Saviour, who did and suffered so much, is the true Messias; but by our lives we recal our arguments, and strengthen their wilful opposition; for there was certainly a promise, that, when Christ should come, "the wolf should dwell with the lamb, and the leopard should lie down with the kid, and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling together, and a little child should them," Isa. xi. 6; that is, there should be so much love, unanimity, and brotherly kindness in the kingdom of Christ, that, all ferity and inhumanity being laid aside, the most different natures and inclinations should come to the sweetest harmony and agreement. Whereas, if we look upon ourselves, we must confess there was never more bitterness of spirit, more rancor of malice, more heat of contention, more manifest symptoms of envy, hatred, and all uncharitableness, than in those who make profession of the Christian faith. It was infallibly foretold, that "when the law should go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, they should beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation should not lift up sword against nation, neither should they learn war any more," Isa. ii. 3: whereas there is no other art so much studied, so much applauded, so violently asserted, not only as lawful, but as necessary. Look upon the face of Christendom, divided into several kingdoms and principalities; what are all these but so many public enemies, either exercising or designing war? The church was not more famous, or did more increase by the first blood which was shed in the primitive times through the external violence of ten persecutions, than now it is infamous, and declines through constant violence, fraud, and rapine, through public engagements of the greatest empires in arms, through civil and intestine wars, and, lest any way of shedding Christian blood should be unassayed, even by massacres. It was likewise prophesied of the days of the Messias, that all idolatry should totally cease,

that all false teachers should be cut off, and unclean spirits restrained, Zech. xiii. 2. And can we think that the Jews, who really abhor the thoughts of worshipping an image, can ever be persuaded there is no idolatry committed in the Christian church? Or can we excuse ourselves in the least degree from the plague of the locusts of Egypt, the false teachers? Can so many schisms and sects arise and spread, can so many heresies be acknowledged and countenanced, without false prophets and unclean spirits? If then we would return to the bond of true Christian love and charity, if we would appear true lovers of peace and tranquillity, if we would truly hate the abominations of idolatry, false doctrine, and heresy, let us often remember, what we ever profess in our Creed, that Jesus is the Christ, that the kingdom of the Messias cannot consist with these impieties.

Thirdly : the necessity of this belief appeareth in respect of those offices which belong to Jesus as he is the Christ. We must look upon him as upon the prophet anointed by God to preach the gospel, that we may be incited to hear and embrace his doctrine. Though Moses and Elias be together with him in the mount, yet the voice from heaven speaketh of none but Jesus, "Hear ye him." He is that Wisdom, the delight of God, crying in the proverbs, "Blessed is the man that heareth me, watching daily at my gates, waiting at the posts of my doors," Prov. viii. 34. "There is one thing needful," saith our Saviour, and Mary chose that good part, who sat at Jesus' feet, and heard his word; which devout posture teacheth us, as a willingness to hear, so a readiness to obey; and the proper effect which the belief of this prophetic office worketh in us is our obedience of faith. We must farther consider him as our High Priest, that we may thereby add confidence to that obedience; for we have "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus; yea, having an High Priest over the house of God, we may draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith," Heb. x. 19. And as this breedeth an adherence and assurance in us, so it requireth a resignation of us; for if Christ have redeemed us, we are his; if he died for us, it was that we should live to him; if we be "bought with a price," we are no longer our own, but we

must "glorify God in our body and in our spirit, which are God's," 1 Cor. vi. 20. Again: an apprehension of him as a king is necessary for the performance of our true and entire allegiance to him. "Send ye the lamb to the Ruler of the earth," do him homage, acknowledge him your king, show yourselves faithful and obedient subjects. We can pretend, and he hath required, no less. As soon as he let the apostles understand that "all power was given unto him in heaven and in earth," he charged them "to teach all nations, to observe all things whatsoever he commanded them," Matt. xxviii. 18. Can we imagine he should so strictly enjoin subjection to higher powers, the highest of whom are here below, and that he doth not expect exact obedience to him who is exalted "far above all principalities and powers, and is set down at the right hand of God?" It is observable that, in the description of the coming of the Son of Man, it is said, "The King shall say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you;" which title, as it secures hope, in respect of his power, as it magnifies our reward by the excellency of our inheritance, so also it teacheth us the indispensable condition of obedience.

Fourthly: the belief of Jesus the Christ is necessary to instruct us what it is to be a Christian, and how far we stand obliged by owning that name. Those who did first embrace the faith were styled "disciples" (as when "the number of the disciples was multiplied," Acts vi. 1, 7), or "believers," or "brethren," or "men of the church," or "callers upon the name of Christ," or "men of the way;" or, by their enemies, "Nazarenes" and "Galileans." But in a short time they gained a name derived from their Saviour, though not from that name of his which signifieth salvation; for from Christ they were called "Christians"—a title so honorable, and of such concernment, that St. Luke hath thought fit to mention the city in which that name was first heard:—"And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch," as the Scriptures assure us; so named by Euodius, the bishop of that place, as ecclesiastical history informs us—a name no sooner invented, but embraced by all believers, as bearing the most proper signification of their profession, and relation to the Author and Master

whom they served. In which the primitive Christians so much delighted, that before the face of their enemies they would acknowledge no other title but that, though hated, reviled, tormented, martyred for it. Nor is this name of greater honor to us, than obligation. There are two parts of the seal of the foundation of God, and one of them is this—"Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity," 2 Tim. ii. 19. It was a common answer of the ancient martyrs, "I am a Christian, and with us no evil is done." The very name was thought to speak something of emendation; and whosoever put it on, became the better man. Except such reformation accompany our profession, there is no advantage in the appellation; nor can we be honored by that title, while we dishonor him that gives it, If he be therefore called Christ, because anointed, as we derive the name of Christian, so do we receive our unction from him; for as "the precious ointment upon the head ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, and went down to the skirts of his garments" (Ps. cxxxiii. 2), so the Spirit, which without measure was poured upon Christ our Head, is by him diffused through all the members of his body; for "God hath established and anointed us in Christ;" "We have an unction from the Holy One, and the anointing which we have received from him abideth in us," 1 Joh. ii. 20, 27. Necessary then it cannot choose but be, that we should know Jesus to be the Christ; because as he is Jesus, that is, our Saviour, by being Christ, that is, anointed: so we can have no share in him as Jesus, except we become truly Christians, and so be in him as Christ anointed with that unction from the Holy One.

Thus having run through all the particulars at first designed for the explication of the title, Christ, we may at last clearly express, and every Christian easily understand, what it is we say when we make our confession in these words, *I believe in Jesus Christ*. I do assent unto this as a certain truth, that there was a man promised by God, foretold by the prophets to be the Messiah, the Redeemer of Israel, and the expectation of the nations. I am fully assured by all those predictions that the Messiah so promised is already come. I am as certainly persuaded that

the Man born in the days of Herod of the virgin Mary, by an angel from heaven called Jesus, is that true Messias, so long, so often promised; that, as the Messias, he was anointed to three special offices, belonging to him as the mediator between God and man; that he was a Prophet, revealing unto us the whole will of God for the salvation of man: that he was a Priest, and hath given himself a sacrifice for sin, and so hath made an atonement for us; that he is a King, set down at the right hand of God, "far above all principalities and powers," whereby, when he hath subdued all our enemies, he will confer actual, perfect, and eternal happiness upon us. I believe this unction by which he became the true Messias was not performed by any material oil, but by the Spirit of God, which he received as the Head, and conveyeth to his members. And, in this full acknowledgment, *I believe in Jesus Christ.*

His only Son.

AFTER our Saviour's nomination immediately followeth his filiation; and justly after we have acknowledged him to be the Christ, do we confess him to be "the Son of God;" because these two were ever inseparable, and even by the Jews themselves accounted equivalent. Thus Nathanael, that true Israelite, maketh his confession of the Messias: "Rabbi thou art the Son of God, thou art the king of Israel," John i. 49. Thus Martha makes expression of her faith: "I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world," John xi. 27. Thus the high priest maketh his inquisition: "I adjure thee, by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God," Matt. xxvi. 63. This was the famous confession of St. Peter: "We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God," John vi. 69. And the Gospel of St. John was therefore written, that "we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," John xx. 31. Certain then it is that all the Jews, as they looked for a Messias to come, so they believed that Messias to be the Son of God (although since the coming of our Saviour they have denied it), and that by reason of a constant in-

terpretation of the second psalm, as appropriated unto him. And the primitive Christians did at the very beginning include this filial title of our Saviour, together with his names, into the compass of one word, Well therefore, after we have expressed our faith in Jesus Christ, is added that which always had so great affinity with it, *the only Son of God*.

In these words there is little variety to be observed, except that what we translate the *only Son*, is, in the phrase of the Scripture and the Greek church, the *only-begotten*. It is then sufficient, for the explication of these words, to show how Christ is the Son of God, and what is the peculiarity of his generation; that when others are also the sons of God, he alone should so be his Son as no other is or can be so; and therefore he alone should have the name of the *only-begotten*.

First, then, it cannot be denied that Christ is the Son of God, for this reason, because he was by the Spirit of God born of the virgin Mary; for that which is conceived, or begotten, in her, by the testimony of an angel, is of the Holy Ghost; and, because of him, therefore the Son of God; for so spake the angel to the virgin: "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 (or, which is begotten of thee) shall be called the Son of God." And the reason is clear, because that the Holy Ghost is God. For were he any creature, and not God himself, by whom our Saviour was thus born of the virgin, he must have been the Son of a creature, not of God.

Secondly: it is as undoubtedly true that the same Christ, thus born of the virgin by the Spirit of God, was designed to so high an office by the special and immediate will of God, that by virtue thereof he must be acknowledged the Son of God. He urgeth this argument himself against the Jews: "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?" Are not these the very words of the eighty-second psalm? "If he called them gods," if God himself so spake, or the psalmist from him, if this be the language of the Scripture, if they be called gods "unto whom the word of God came (and the Scripture cannot be broken,"

nor the authority thereof in any particular denied), "say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world," whom he hath consecrated and commissioned to the most eminent and extraordinary office, "say ye of him, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?" John x. 34—36.

Thirdly: Christ must therefore be acknowledged the Son of God, because he is raised immediately by God out of the earth unto immortal life; for "God hath fulfilled the promise unto us, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." Acts xiii. 36. The grave is as the womb of the earth; Christ, who is raised from thence, is, as it were, begotten to another life: and God, who raised him, is his Father. So true it must needs be of him, which is spoken of others, who are "the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Thus was he defined or constituted, and appointed "the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead:" neither is he called simply the first that rose, but with a note of generation, "The first-born from the dead," Col. i. 18.

Fourthly: Christ, after his resurrection from the dead, is made actually heir of all things in his Father's house, and Lord of all the spirits which minister unto him, from whence he also hath the title of the Son of God. "He is set down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?" Heb. i. 3. From all which testimonies of the Scriptures it is evident that Christ hath this fourfold right unto the title of the Son of God: by generation, as begotten of God; by commission, as sent by him; by resurrection, as the first-born; by actual possession, as heir of all.

But, beside these four, we must find yet a more peculiar ground of our Saviour's filiation, totally distinct from any which belongs unto the rest of the sons of God, that he may be clearly and fully acknowledged the only-begotten Son; for although to be born of a virgin be in itself miracu-

lous, and justly entitles Christ unto the name of the Son of God; yet it is not so far above the production of all mankind as to place him in that singular eminence which must be attributed to the only-begotten. We read of Adam "the son of God," as well as Seth the son of Adam; and surely the framing Christ out of a woman cannot so far transcend the making of Adam out of the earth, as to cause so great a distance as we must believe between the first and second Adam. Besides, there were many while our Saviour preached on earth who did believe his doctrine, and did confess him to be the Son of God, who in all probability understood nothing of his being born of a virgin; much less did they foresee his rising from the dead or inheriting of all things. Wherefore, supposing all these ways by which Christ is represented to us as the Son of God, we shall find out one more yet, far more proper in itself and more peculiar unto him, in which no other son can have the least pretence of share or of similitude, and consequently in respect of which we must confess him the only-begotten.

To which purpose I observe, that the actual possession of his inheritance, which was our fourth title to his Sonship, presupposes his resurrection, which was the third; and his commission to his office, which was the second, presupposeth his generation of a virgin, as the first. But I shall now endeavour to find another generation, by which the same Christ was begotten, and consequently a Son, before he was conceived in the virgin's womb. Which that I may be able to evince, I shall proceed in this following method, as not only most facile and perspicuous, but also most convincing and conclusive:—First, I will clearly prove out of the holy Scriptures that Jesus Christ, born of the virgin Mary, had an actual being or subsistence before the Holy Ghost did come upon the virgin, or the power of the Highest did overshadow her; secondly, I will demonstrate, from the same Scriptures, that the being which he had antecedently to his conception in the virgin's womb was not any created being, but essentially divine; thirdly, we will show that the divine essence which he had he received as communicated to him by the Father; fourthly, we will declare this communication of the divine nature to be a proper generation, by which he that communicateth is a proper Father, and he to whom

it is communicated, a proper Son ; lastly, we will manifest that the divine essence was never communicated in that manner to any person but to him, that never any was so begotten besides himself, and consequently, in respect of that divine generation, he is most properly and perfectly *the only-begotten Son of the Father.*

As for the first, that Jesus Christ had a real being or existence, by which he truly was, before he was conceived of the virgin Mary, I thus demonstrate :—He who was really in heaven, and truly descended from thence, and came into the world from the Father, before that which was begotten of the virgin ascended into heaven or went unto the Father, had a real being or existence before he was conceived in the virgin, and distinct from that being which was conceived in her. This is most clear and evident, upon these three suppositions not to be denied—first, that Christ did receive no other being or nature after his conception, before his ascension, than what was begotten of the virgin ; secondly, that what was begotten of the virgin had its first being here on earth, and therefore could not really be in heaven till he ascended thither ; thirdly, that what was really in heaven, really was ; because nothing can be present in any place, which is not. Upon these suppositions, certainly true, the first proposition cannot be denied. Wherefore I assume—Jesus Christ was really in heaven, and truly descended from thence, and came into the world from the Father, before that which was begotten of the virgin ascended into heaven, or went unto the Father ; as I shall particularly prove by the express words of the Scripture. Therefore I conclude that Jesus Christ had a real being or existence before he was conceived in the virgin ; and distinct from that being which was conceived in her. Now that he was really in heaven before he ascended thither appeareth by his own words to his disciple : “ What and if you shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before ? ” John vi. 62. For he speaketh of a real ascension, such as was to be seen or looked upon, such as they might view as spectators. The place to which that ascension tended was truly and really the heaven of heavens. The verb substantive, not otherwise used, sufficiently testifieth, not a figurative, but a real being, espe-

cially considering the opposition in the word *before*. Whether we look upon the time of speaking, then present, or the time of his ascension, then to come, his being or existing in heaven was *before*. Nor is this now at last denied, that he was in heaven before the ascension mentioned in these words, but that he was there before he ascended at all. We shall therefore farther show that this ascension was the first; that what was born of the virgin was never in heaven before this time of which he speaks; and, being in heaven before this ascension, he must be acknowledged to have been there before he ascended at all. If Christ had ascended into heaven before his death, and descended from thence, it had been the most remarkable action in all his life, and the proof thereof of the greatest efficacy toward the disseminating of the gospel. And can we imagine so divine an action of so high concernment could have passed, and none of the evangelists ever make mention of it? Those who are so diligent in the description of his nativity and circumcision, his oblation in the temple, his reception by Simeon, his adoration by the wise men; those who have described his descent into Egypt—would they have omitted his ascent into heaven? Do they tell us of the wisdom which he showed when he disputed with the doctors? and were it not worthy our knowledge whether it were before he was in heaven or after? The diligent seeking of Joseph and Mary, and her words when they found him, “Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us?” show that he had not been missing from them till then, and consequently not ascended into heaven. After that, he went down to Nazareth, and was “subject unto them;” and I understand not how he should ascend into heaven, and at the same time be subject to them; or there receive his commission and instructions as the great legate of God, or ambassador from heaven, and return again unto his old subjection; and afterwards to go to John to be baptized of him, and to expect the descent of the Spirit for his inauguration. Immediately from Jordan he is carried into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil; and it were strange if any time could then be found for his ascension; for “he was forty days in the wilderness,” and certainly heaven is no such kind of place; he was all that time “with the beasts,” who un-

doubtedly are none of the celestial hierarchy; and "tempted of Satan," whose dominion reacheth no higher than the air. Wherefore in those forty days Christ ascended not into heaven, but rather heaven descended unto him; for "the angels ministered unto him." After this "he returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee," and there exercised his prophetic office: after which there is not the least pretence of any reason for his ascension. Besides, the whole frame of this antecedent or preparatory ascension of Christ is not only raised without any written testimony of the word, or unwritten testimony of tradition, but is without any reason in itself, and contrary to the revealed way of our redemption. For what reason should Christ ascend into heaven to know the will of God, and not be known to ascend thither? Certainly the Father could reveal his will unto the Son as well on earth as in heaven. And, if men must be ignorant of his ascension, to what purpose should they say he ascended, except they imagine either an impotency in the Father, or dissatisfaction in the Son?

Nor is this only asserted without reason, but also against that rule to be observed by Christ as he was anointed to the sacerdotal office. For the holy of holies made with hands was "the figure of the true" (that is, heaven itself), into which "the high priest alone went once every year:" and Christ, as our High Priest, "entered in once into the holy place," Heb. ix. 7, 12. If then they deny Christ was a priest before he preached the gospel, then did he not enter into heaven, because the high priest alone went into the type thereof, the holy of holies. If they confess he was, then did he not ascend till after his death, because he was to enter in but once, and that not without blood. Wherefore seeing Christ ascended not into heaven till after his death, seeing he certainly was in heaven before that ascension, we have sufficiently made good that part of our argument, that Jesus Christ was in heaven before that which was begotten of the virgin ascended thither.

Now that which followeth will both illustrate and confirm it; for as he was there, so he descended from thence before he ascended thither. This he often testifieth and inculcateth of himself: "The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven;" and "I am the living bread which

came down from heaven," John vi. 33, 51. He opposeth himself unto the manna in the wilderness, which never was really in heaven, or had its original from thence. "Moses gave you not that bread from heaven," but the Father gave Christ really from thence. Wherefore he saith, "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." Now never any person upon any occasion is said to descend from heaven, but such as were really there before they appeared on earth, as the Father, the Holy Ghost, and the angels: but no man, however born, however sanctified, sent, or dignified, is said thereby to descend from thence; but rather, when any is opposed to Christ, the opposition is placed in this very origination. John the Baptist was "filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb;" born of an aged father and a barren mother, by the power of God; and yet he distinguisheth himself from Christ in this:—"He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthy, and speaketh of the earth; he that cometh from heaven is above all," John iii. 31. Adam was framed immediately by God, without the intervention of man or woman; and yet he is so far from being thereby from heaven, that even in that he is distinguished from the second Adam; for "the first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven," 1 Cor. xv. 47. Wherefore the descent of Christ from heaven doth really presuppose his being there, and that antecedently to any ascent thither; for "that he ascended, what is it, but that he also descended first?" Eph. iv. 9. So St. Paul, asserting a descent as necessarily preceding his ascension, teacheth us never to imagine an ascent of Christ as his first motion between heaven and earth; and, consequently, that the first being or existence which Christ had, was not what he received by his conception here on earth, but what he had before in heaven, in respect whereof he was with the Father, from whom he came. His disciples believed that he came out from God; and he commended that faith, and confirmed the object of it by this assertion: "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father," John xvi. 27. Thus having, by undoubted testimonies, made good the latter part of the argument, I

may safely conclude that seeing Christ was really in heaven, and descended from thence, and came forth from the Father, before that which was conceived of the Holy Ghost ascended thither; it cannot with any show of reason be denied that Christ had a real being and existence antecedent unto his conception here on earth, and distinct from the being which he received here.

Secondly : we shall prove not only a bare priority of existence, but a pre-existence of some certain and acknowledged space of duration. For whosoever was before John the Baptist, and before Abraham, was some space of time before Christ was man. This no man can deny, because all must confess the blessed virgin was first saluted by the angel six months after Elizabeth conceived, and many hundred years after Abraham died. But Jesus Christ was really existent before John the Baptist and before Abraham, as we shall make good by the testimony of the Scriptures. Therefore it cannot be denied but Christ had a real being and existence some space of time before he was made man. For the first, it is the express testimony of John himself : "This is he of whom I spake, he that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me," John i. 15. In which words, first, he taketh to himself a priority of time speaking of Christ, "he that cometh after me:" for so he came after him into the womb, at his conception; into the world at his nativity; unto his office, at his baptism; always after John, and at the same distance. Secondly : he attributeth unto Christ a priority of dignity, saying, "he is preferred before me," as appeareth by the reiteration of these words—"He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose," John i. 27. The addition of which expression of his own unworthiness showeth that "to be preferred before him" is the same with being "worthier than he;" to which the same expression is constantly added by all the other three evangelists. Thirdly : he rendereth the reason or cause of that great dignity which belonged to Christ, saying "for", or rather, "because, he was before me." And seeing the cause must be supposed different and distinct from the effect, therefore the priority last mentioned cannot be that of dignity. For to assign any thing as the cause or reason of

itself is a great absurdity, and the expression of it a vain tautology. Wherefore that priority must have relation to time or duration, as the very tense, "he *was* before me," sufficiently signifieth; and so be placed in opposition to his coming after him. As if John the Baptist had thus spoken at large: "This man Christ Jesus, who came into the world, and entered on his prophetic office six months after me, is notwithstanding of far more worth and greater dignity than I am; even so much greater, that I must acknowledge myself unworthy to stoop down and unloose the latchet of his shoes: and the reason of this transcendent dignity is from the excellency of that nature which he had before I was; for though he cometh after me, yet he was before me."

Now as Christ was before John, which speaks a small, so was he also before Abraham, which speaks a larger time. Jesus himself hath asserted this pre-existence to the Jews: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am," John viii. 58. Which words, plainly and literally expounded, must evidently contain this truth. For, first, Abraham in all the Scriptures never hath any other signification than such as denotes the person called by that name; and the question to which these words are directed by way of answer, without controversy, spake of the same person. Beside, Abraham must be the subject of that proposition, "Abraham was;" because a proposition cannot be without a subject, and, if Abraham be the predicate, there is none. Again: as we translate "Abraham was;" in a tense signifying the time past, so it is most certainly to be understood; because that which he speaks unto is the pre-existence of Abraham, and that of long duration; so that whatsoever had concerned his present estate or future condition had been wholly impertinent to the precedent question. Lastly: the expression, "I am," seeming something unusual or improper to signify a priority in respect of any thing past, because no present instant is before that which precedeth, but that which followeth, yet the use of it sufficiently maintaineth, and the nature of the place absolutely requireth, that it should not here denote a present being, but a priority of existence, together with a continuation of it till the present time. And then

the words will plainly signify thus much : “ Do you question how I could see Abraham, who am not yet fifty years old ? Verily, verily, I say unto you, before ever Abraham, the person whom ye speak of, was born, I had a real being and existence, by which I was capable of the sight of him ; in which I have continued until now.” In this sense certainly the Jews understood our Saviour’s answer, as pertinent to their question, but in their opinion blasphemous ; and therefore “ they took up stones to cast at him.”

This literal and plain explication is yet farther necessary ; because those who once recede from it, do not only wrest and pervert the place, but also invent and suggest an answer unworthy of and wholly misbecoming him that spake it. For (setting aside the addition of “ the light of the world,” which there can be no show of reason to admit) whether they interpret the former part, “ before Abraham was,” of something to come, as the calling of the Gentiles, or the latter, “ I am,” of a pre-existence in the divine foreknowledge and appointment ; they represent Christ with a great asseveration highly and strongly asserting that which is nothing to the purpose to which he speaks, nothing to any other purpose at all ; and they propound the Jews senselessly offended and foolishly exasperated with those words which any of them might have spoken as well as he. For the first interpretation makes our Saviour thus to speak : “ Do ye so much wonder how I should have seen Abraham, who am not yet fifty years old ? Do ye imagine so great a contradiction in this ? I tell you, and be ye most assured that what I speak unto you at this time is most certainly and infallibly true, and most worthy of your observation, which moves me not to deliver it without this solemn asseveration “ Verily, verily, I say unto you,” before Abraham shall perfectly become that which was signified in his name, the father of many nations, before the Gentiles shall come in, *I am*, Nor be ye troubled at this answer, or think in this I magnify myself ; for what I speak is as true of you as it is of me ; before Abraham be thus made Abraham, ye are. Doubt ye not therefore, as ye did, nor ever make that question again, whether I have seen Abraham.”

The second explication makes a sense of another nature,

but with the same impertinency: "Do ye continue still to question, and that with so much admiration? Do ye look upon my age, and ask, 'Hast thou seen Abraham?' I confess it is more than eighteen hundred years since that patriarch died, and less than forty since I was born at Bethlehem: but look not on this computation; for, before Abraham was born, I was. But mistake me not, I mean in the foreknowledge and decree of God. Nor do I magnify myself in this, for ye were so."

How either of these answers should give any reasonable satisfaction to the question, or the least occasion of the Jews' exasperation, is not to be understood. And that our Saviour should speak any such impertinencies as these interpretations bring forth is not by a Christian to be conceived. Wherefore seeing the plain and most obvious sense is a proper and full answer to the question, and most likely to exasperate the unbelieving Jews; seeing those strained explications render the words of Christ, not only impertinent to the occasion, but vain and useless to the hearers of them; seeing our Saviour gave this answer in words of another language, most probably incapable of any such interpretations; we must adhere to that literal sense already delivered, by which it appeareth Christ had a being, as before John, so also before Abraham, not only before Abram became Abraham, but before Abraham was Abram; and consequently that he did exist two thousand years before he was born, or conceived by the virgin.

Thirdly: we shall extend this pre-existence to a far longer space of time, to the end of the first world, nay to the beginning of it. For he who was before the flood, and at the creation of the world, had a being before he was conceived by the virgin. But Christ was really before the flood, for he preached to them that lived before it; and at the creation of the world, for he created it. That he preached to those before the flood is evident by the words of St. Peter, who saith that "Christ was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing," 1 Pet. iii. 18. From which words it appeareth,

that Christ preached by the same Spirit by the virtue of which he was raised from the dead; but that Spirit was not his soul, but something of a greater power; secondly, that those to whom he preached were such as were disobedient; thirdly, that the time when they were disobedient was the time before the flood, while the ark was preparing. It is certain then that Christ did preach unto those persons who in the days of Noah were disobedient all that time "the long-suffering of God waited," and consequently so long as repentance was offered. And it is as certain that he never preached to them after they died; which I shall not need here to prove, because those against whom I bring this argument deny it not. It followeth, therefore, that he preached to them while they lived, and were disobedient; for in the refusing of that mercy which was offered to them by the preaching of Christ did their disobedience principally consist. In vain then are we taught to understand St. Peter of the promulgation of the gospel to the Gentiles after the Holy Ghost descended upon the apostles, when the words themselves refuse all relation to any such times or persons. For all those of whom St. Peter speaks were disobedient in the days of Noah. But none of those to whom the apostles preached were ever disobedient in the days of Noah. Therefore none of those to whom the apostles preached were any of those of whom St. Peter speaks. It remaineth therefore that the plain interpretation be acknowledged for the true, that Christ did preach unto those men who lived before the flood, even while they lived, and consequently that he was before it. For though this was not done by an immediate act of the Son of God, as if he personally had appeared on earth, and actually preached to that old world; but by the ministry of a prophet, by the sending of Noah, the eighth preacher of righteousness; yet to do any thing by another, not able to perform it without him, as much demonstrates the existence of the principal cause, as if he did it of himself without any intervening instrument.

The second part of the argument, that Christ made this world, and consequently had a real being at the beginning of it, the Scriptures manifestly and plentifully assure us. For the same "Son, by whom in these last days God spake

unto us, is he, by whom also he made the worlds," Heb. i. 2. So that as "through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God," so must we also believe that they were made by the Son of God; which the apostle doth not only in the entrance of his epistle deliver, but in the sequel prove. For showing greater things have been spoken of him than ever were attributed to any of the angels, the most glorious of all the creatures of God; amongst the rest he saith, the Scripture spake unto the Son, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." And not only so, but also, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail," Heb. i. 8. Now, whosoever the person be to whom these words were spoken, it cannot be denied but he was the Creator of the world. For he must be acknowledged the Maker of the earth who laid the foundation of it; and he may justly challenge to himself the making of the heavens who can say they are the work of his hands. But these words were spoken to the Son of God as the apostle himself acknowledgeth, and it appeareth out of the order and series of the chapter; the design of which is to declare the super-eminent excellency of our Saviour Christ. Nay, the conjunction "and" refers this place of the psalmist plainly to the former, of which he hath said expressly, "but unto the Son he saith." As sure then as "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," was said unto the Son; so certain it is, "Thou, Lord, hast laid the foundation of the earth," was said unto the same. Nor is it possible to avoid the apostle's connexion by attributing the destruction of the heavens, out of the last words, to the Son, and denying the creation of them, out of the first, to the same. For it is most evident that there is but one person spoken to, and that the destruction and the creation of the heavens are both attributed to the same. Whosoever therefore shall grant that the apostle produced this Scripture to show that the Son of God shall destroy the heavens, must withal acknowledge that he created them :

whosoever denieth him to be here spoken of as the Creator, must also deny him to be understood as the destroyer. Wherefore seeing the words of the psalmist were undoubtedly spoken of and to our Saviour (or else the apostle hath attributed that unto him which never belonged to him, and consequently the spirit of St. Paul mistook the spirit of David); seeing to whomsoever any part of them belongs, the whole is applicable, because they are delivered unto one; seeing the literal exposition is so clear that no man hath ever pretended to a metaphorical; it remaineth as an undeniable truth, grounded upon the profession of the psalmist, and the interpretation of an apostle, that the Son of God created the world.

Nor needed we so long to have insisted upon this testimony, because there are so many which testify as much, but only that this is of a peculiar nature and different from the rest. For they who deny this truth of the creation of the world by the Son of God, notwithstanding all those Scriptures produced to confirm it, have found two ways to avoid or decline the force of them. If they speak so plainly and literally of the work of creation, that they will no tendure any figurative interpretation, then they endeavour to show that they are not spoken of the Son of God. If they speak so expressly of our Saviour Christ, as that by no machination they can be applied to any other person, then their whole design is to make the creation attributed unto him appear to be merely metaphorical. The place before alleged is of the first kind, which speaketh so clearly of the creation or real production of the world, that they never denied it; and I have so manifestly showed it spoken to the Son of God, that it is beyond all possibility of gain-saying.

Thus having asserted the creation acknowledged real unto Christ, we shall the easier persuade that likewise to be such which is pretended to be metaphorical. In the epistle to the Colossians we read of the Son of God, "in whom we have redemption through his blood;" and we are sure those words can be spoken of none other than Jesus Christ. He therefore it must be who was thus described by the apostle:—"Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature. For by him were

all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible ; whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers : all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist," Col. i., 15. In which words our Saviour is expressly styled the "first born of every creature," that is, begotten by God, as the Son of his love, antecedently to all other emanations, before any thing proceeded from him, or was framed and created by him. And that precedency is presently proved by this undeniable argument, that all other emanations or productions came from him, and whatsoever received its being by creation was by him created. Which assertion is delivered in the most proper, full, and pregnant expressions imaginable ; first, in the vulgar phrase of Moses, as most consonant to his description ; "for by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth ;" signifying thereby, that he speaketh of the same creation ; secondly, by a division which Moses never used, as describing the production only of corporeal substances : lest therefore those immaterial beings might seem exempted from the Son's creation, because omitted by Moses in his description, he addeth "visible and invisible ;" and lest in that invisible world, among the many degrees of the celestial hierarchy, any order might seem exempted from an essential dependence upon him, he nameth those which are of greatest eminence, "whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers," and under them comprehendeth all the rest. Nor doth it yet suffice, thus to extend the object of his power by asserting all things to be made by him, except it be so understood as to acknowledge the sovereignty of his person, and the authority of his action. For lest we should conceive the Son of God framing the world as a mere instrumental cause, which worketh by and for another, he showeth him as well the final as the efficient cause ; for "all things were created by him and for him." Lastly : whereas all things receive their being by creation, and when they have received it continue in the same by virtue of God's conservation, "in whom we live, and move, and have our being ;" lest in any thing we should be thought not to depend immediately upon the Son of God, he is described as the Conserver, as well as the Creator ; for "he is before all things, and

by him all things consist." If then we consider the last two cited verses by themselves, we cannot deny but they are a most complete description of the Creator of the world; and, if they were spoken of God the Father, could be no way injurious to his majesty, who is no where more plainly or fully set forth unto us as the Maker of the world.

Now although this were sufficient to persuade us to interpret this place of the making of the world, yet it will not be unfit to make use of another reason, which will compel us so to understand it. For undoubtedly there are but two kinds of creation in the language of the Scriptures, the one literal, the other metaphorical; one old, the other new; one by way of formation, the other by way of reformation. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature," saith St. Paul; and again, "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." Instead of which words he had before, "faith working by love. For we are the workmanship of God, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them," Ephes. ii. 10. From whence it is evident that a new creature is such a person as truly believeth in Christ, and manifesteth that faith by the exercise of good works; and the new creation is the reforming or bringing of man into this new condition, which by nature and his first creation he was not in. And therefore he that is so created is called a new man, in opposition to "the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts:" from whence the Apostle charges us to be "renewed in the spirit of our mind," and to "put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness;" and "which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him." The new creation then is described to us as consisting wholly in renovation, or a translation from a worse unto a better condition by way of reformation; by which those who have lost the image of God, in which the first man was created, are restored to the image of the same God again, by a real change, though not substantial, wrought with them. Now this being the notion of the new creation in all those places which undoubtedly and confessedly speak of it, it will be necessary to apply it unto such Scriptures as are pretended to require the same interpretation. Thus therefore I proceed.

If the second or new creation cannot be meant by the Apostle in the place produced out of the Epistle to the Colossians, then it must be interpreted of the first. For there are but two kinds of creation mentioned in the Scriptures, and one of them is there expressly named. But the place of the apostle can no way admit an interpretation by the new creation, as will thus appear:—the object of the creation, mentioned in this place, is of as great latitude and universality as the object of the first creation, not only expressed, but implied by Moses. But the object of the new creation is not of the same latitude with that of the old. Therefore that which is mentioned here cannot be the new creation. For certainly if we reflect upon the true notion of the new creation, it necessarily and essentially includes an opposition to a former worse condition, as the new man is always opposed to the old; and, if Adam had continued still in innocence, there could have been no such distinction between the old man and the new, or the old and the new creation. Seeing then all men become not new; seeing there is no new creature but such whose faith worketh by love; seeing so many millions of men have neither faith nor love; it cannot be said that by “Christ all things were created anew that are in heaven, and that are in earth,” when the greatest part of mankind have no share in the new creation. Again: we cannot imagine that the apostle should speak of the creation in a general word, intending thereby only the new, and, while he doth so, express particularly and especially those parts of the old creation which are incapable of the new, or at least have no relation to it. The angels are all either good or bad; but whether they be bad, they can never be good again, nor did Christ come to redeem the devils; or whether they be good, they were always such, nor were they so by the virtue of Christ’s incarnation, for “he took not on him the nature of angels.” We acknowledge in mankind a new creation, because an old man becomes a new; but there is no such notion in the celestial hierarchy, because no old and new angels; they who fell are fallen for eternity; they who stand always stood, and shall stand for ever. Where then are the regenerated “thrones and dominions?” Where are the recreated “principalities and powers?” All those angels of whatsoever degrees were created by the Son of God,

as the apostle expressly affirms. But they were never created by a new creation "unto true holiness and righteousness," because they always were truly righteous and holy ever since their first creation. Therefore except we could yet invent another creation, which were neither the old nor the new, we must conclude that all the angels were at first created by the Son of God; and as they, so all things else, especially man, whose creation all the first writers of the church of God expressly attribute unto the Son, asserting that those words, "Let us make man," were spoken as by the Father unto him.

Nor need we doubt of this interpretation, or the doctrine arising from it, seeing it is so clearly delivered by St. John: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made," John i. 1. Whereas we have proved Christ had a being before he was conceived by the virgin Mary, because he was at the beginning of the world; and have also proved that he was at the beginning of the world, because he made it; this place of St. John gives a sufficient testimony to the truth of both the last together. "In the beginning was the word;" and that Word made flesh is Christ: therefore Christ was in the beginning. "All things were made by him;" therefore he created the world. Indeed nothing can be more clearly penned, to give full satisfaction in this point, than these words of St. John, which seem with a strange brevity designed to take off all objections, and remove all prejudice, before they teach so strange a truth. Christ was born of the virgin Mary, and his age was known to them for whom this gospel was penned. St. John would teach that this Christ did make the world, which was created at least 4000 years before his birth: the name of Jesus was given him since at his circumcision; the title of Christ belonged unto his office, which he exercised not till thirty years after. Neither of these with any show of probability will reach to the creation of the world. Wherefore he produceth a name of his, as yet unknown to the world, or rather not taken notice of, though in frequent use among the Jews, which belonged unto him who was made man, but before he was so. Under

that name he shows, at first, that he had a being in the beginning; when all things were to be created, and consequently were not yet, then "in the beginning was the Word," and so not created. This is the first step: the Word was not created when the world was made. The next is, that the same Word which then was, and was not made, at the same time "was with God," when he made all things; and therefore well may we conceive it is he to whom God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness;" and of whom those words may be understood, "Behold, the man is become as one of us." After this, lest any should conceive the creation of the world too great and divine a work to be attributed to the Word; lest any should object, that none can produce any thing out of nothing but God himself; he addeth, that the "Word, as he was with God, so was he also God." Again, lest any should divide the Deity, or frame a false conception of different Gods, he returns unto the second assertion and joins it with the first, "The same was in the beginning with God;" and then delivers that which at the first seemed strange, but now, after those three propositions, may easily be accepted: "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." For now this is no new doctrine, but only an interpretation of those Scriptures which told us, God made all things by his word before, For "God said, Let there be light: and there was light." And so, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth," Psal. xxxiii. 6. From whence "we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God," Heb. xi. 3. Neither was it a new interpretation, but that which was most familiar to the Jews, who in their synagogues, by the reading of the paraphrase or the interpretation of the Hebrew text in the Chaldee language, were constantly taught that the Word of God was the same with God, and that by that Word all things were made. Which undoubtedly was the cause why St. John delivered so great a mystery in so few words, as speaking unto them who at the first apprehension understood him. Only that which as yet they knew not was that this Word was made flesh, and that this Word made flesh was Jesus Christ. Wherefore this exposition being so literally clear in itself, so consonant to

the notion of the Word and the apprehension of the Jews it is infinitely to be preferred before any such interpretation as shall restrain the most universals to a few particulars, change the plainest expressions into figurative phrases, and make of a sublime truth a weak, useless, false discourse. For who will grant that "in the beginning" must be the same with that in St. John's Epistle, "from the beginning," especially when the very interpretation involves in itself a contradiction. For "the beginning" in St. John's Epistle is that in which the apostles saw, and heard, and touched the Word," 1 John i. 1: "the beginning" in his gospel was that in which "the Word was with God," that is, not seen nor heard by the apostles, but known as yet to God alone, as the new exposition will have it. Who will conceive it worthy of the Apostle's assertion, to teach that the Word had a being in the beginning of the gospel, at what time John the Baptist began to preach, when we know the Baptist taught as much, who therefore "came baptizing with water, that he might be made manifest unto Israel?" when we are sure that St. Matthew and St. Luke, who wrote before him, taught us more than this, that he had a being thirty years before? when we are assured, it was as true of any other then living as of the Word, even of Judas who betrayed him, even of Pilate who condemned him?

Again: who can imagine the apostle should assert that the Word was, that is, had an actual being, when as yet he was not actually the Word? For if "the beginning" be, when John the Baptist began to preach, and the Word, as they say, be nothing else but he who speaketh and so revealeth the will of God; Christ had not then revealed the will of God, and consequently was not then actually the Word, but only potentially or by designation.

Secondly: it is a strange figurative speech, "the Word was with God," that is, was known to God, especially in this apostle's method. "In the beginning was the Word;" there "was" must signify an actual existence; and, if so, why in the next sentence, "the Word was with God," shall the same verb signify an objective being only? Certainly though to be in the beginning be one thing, and to be with God another; yet "to be" in either of them is the same. But if we should imagine this *being* understood of the knowledge of

God, why we should grant that thereby is signified, he was known to God alone, I cannot conceive. For the proposition of itself is plainly affirmative, and the exclusive particle *only* added to the exposition maketh it clearly negative. Nay more, the affirmative sense is certainly true, the negative as certainly false. For except Gabriel be God who came to the Virgin; except every one of the heavenly host who appeared to the shepherds be God; except Zacharias and Elizabeth, except Simeon and Anna, except Joseph and Mary, be God; it cannot be true that he was known to God only, for to all these he was certainly known.

Thirdly: to pass by the third attribute, "and the Word was God," as having occasion suddenly after to handle it; seeing the apostle hath again repeated the circumstance of time as most material, "the same was in the beginning with God," and immediately subjoined those words, "all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made; how can we receive any exposition which referreth not the making of all these things to him in the beginning? But if we understand the latter part of the apostles, who after the ascension of our Saviour did nothing but what they were commanded and empowered to do by Christ, it will bear no relation to the beginning. If we interpret the former of all which Jesus said and did in the promulgation of the Gospel, we cannot yet reach to the beginning assigned by the new expositors; for while John the Baptist only preached, while in their sense the Word was with God, they will not affirm that Jesus did any of these things that are here spoken of. And consequently, according to their grounds, it will be true to say, "In the beginning was the Word, and that Word in the beginning was with God, insomuch as in the beginning nothing was done by him, but without him were all things done which were done in the beginning." Wherefore in all reason we should stick to the known interpretation, in which every word receiveth its own proper signification without any figurative distortion, and is preserved in its due latitude and extension without any curtailing restriction. And therefore I conclude, from the undeniable testimony of St. John, that in the beginning, when the heavens and the earth and all the host of them were created, all things were made by the Word,

who is Christ Jesus being made flesh; and consequently, by the method of argument, as the apostle antecedently by the method of nature, that in the beginning Christ was. He then who was in heaven and descended from thence, before that which was begotten of the virgin ascended thither; he who was before John the Baptist and before Abraham; he who was at the end of the first world, and at the beginning of the same; he had a real being and existence before Christ was conceived by the virgin Mary. But all these we have already showed belong unto the Son of God. Therefore we must acknowledge that Jesus Christ had a real being and existence before he was begotten by the Holy Ghost: which is our first assertion, properly opposed to the Photinians.

The second assertion, next to be made good, is that the being which Christ had before he was conceived by the virgin was not any created, but the divine essence, by which he always was truly, really, and properly God. This will evidently and necessarily follow from the last demonstration of the first assertion, the creating all things by the Son of God, from whence we inferred his pre-existence, "in the beginning," assuring us as much that he was God, as that he was: "For he that built all things was God." And the same apostle who assures us "all things were made by him," at the same time tells us, "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the word was God." Where "in the beginning" must not be denied unto the third proposition, because it cannot be denied unto the second. Therefore "in the beginning, or ever the earth was, the Word was God," the same God with whom he was, Prov. viii. 23. For we cannot with any show of reason either imagine that he was with one God, and was another, because there can be no more supreme Gods than one; or conceive that the apostle should speak of one kind of God in the second, and of another in the third proposition; in the second of a God eternal and independent, in the third of a made and depending God. Especially, first considering that the eternal God was so constantly among the Jews called the Word, the only reason which we can conceive why the apostle should thus use this phrase; and then observing the manner of St.

John's writing, who rises strangely by degrees, making the last word of the former sentence the first of that which followeth: As, "In him was life, and the life was the light of men; and the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not," so, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word which so was in the beginning was with God, and the Word was God;" that is, the same God with whom the Word was in the beginning. But he could not be the same God with him any other way than by having the same divine essence. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was conceived by the virgin was the divine nature, by which he was properly and really God.

Secondly: he who was subsisting in the form of God, and thought himself to be equal with God (in which thought he could not be deceived, nor be injurious to God), must of necessity be truly and essentially God; because there can be no equality between the divine essence, which is infinite, and any other whatsoever, which must be finite. But this is true of Christ, and that antecedently to his conception in the virgin's womb, and existence in his human nature: For "being," or rather "subsisting, in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men," Phil. ii. 6, 7. Out of which words naturally result three propositions fully demonstrating our assertion; first, that Christ was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man; secondly, that he was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant; thirdly, that he was in the form of God, that is, did as truly and really subsist in the divine nature, as in the form of a servant, or in the nature of man. It is a vain imagination, that our Saviour then first appeared as a servant when he was apprehended, bound, scourged, crucified. For they were not all slaves who ever suffered such indignities, or died that death; and, when they did, their death did not make, but find them, or suppose them servants. Besides, our Saviour in all the degrees of his humiliation never lived as a servant unto any master on earth. It is true, at first he was subject, but as a son, to his reputed father and undoubted

mother. When he appeared in public he lived after the manner of a prophet and a doctor sent from God, accompanied with a family, as it were, of his apostles," whose master he professed himself, subject to the commands of no man in that office, and obedient only unto God. The form then of a servant, which he took upon him, must consist in something distinct from his sufferings, or submission unto men; as the condition in which he was when he so submitted and so suffered; in that he was "made flesh," sent "in the likeness of sinful flesh," subject unto all infirmities and miseries" of this life, attending on the sons of men fallen by the sin of Adam: in that he was "made of a woman, made under the law," and so obliged to perform the same; which law did so handle the children of God, as that they differed nothing from servants: in that he was born, bred, and lived in a mean, low, and abject condition; "as a root out of a dry ground, he had no form nor comeliness, and when they saw him, there was no beauty that they should desire him; but was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief," Isa. lii. 2: in that he was thus made man, "he took upon him the form of a servant." Which is not mine, but the apostle's explication; as adding it not by way of conjunction, in which there might be some diversity, but by way of apposition, which signifieth a clear identity. And therefore it is necessary to observe, that our translation of that verse is not only not exact, but very disadvantageous to that truth which is contained in it. For we read it thus: "He made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." Where we have two copulative conjunctions, neither of which is in the original text, and three distinct propositions, without any dependence of one upon the other; whereas all the words together are but an expression of Christ's exinication, with an explication showing in what it consisteth; which will clearly appear by this literal translation: "But emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men." Where if any doubt how Christ emptied himself, the text will satisfy him, by "taking the form of a servant;" if any still question how he took the form of a servant, he hath the apostle's resolution, by

“being made in the likeness of men.” Indeed, after the expression of this exinanition, he goes on with a conjunction, to add another act of Christ’s humiliation; “And being found in fashion as a man,” being already by his exinanition in the form of a servant, or the likeness of men, “he humbled himself, and became,” or rather “becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.” As therefore his humiliation consisted in his obedience unto death, so his exinanition consisted in the assumption of the form of a servant, and that in the nature of man. All which is very fitly expressed by a strange interpretation in the Epistle to the Hebrews. For whereas these words are clearly in the psalmist, “Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, mine ears hast thou opened,” Psal. xl. 6; the apostle appropriateth the sentence to Christ: “When he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me,” Heb. x. 5. Now seeing the boring of the ear under the law was a note of perpetual servitude, seeing this was expressed in the words of the psalmist, and changed by the apostle into the preparing of a body; it followeth that when Christ’s body first was framed, even then did he assume the form of a servant.

Again: it appeareth out of the same text, that Christ was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, and consequently before he was made man. For he who is presupposed to be, and to think of that being which he hath, and upon that thought to assume, must have that being before that assumption: but Christ is first expressly said to be in the form of God, and, being so, to think it no robbery to be equal with God, and, notwithstanding that equality, to take upon him the form of a servant; therefore it cannot be denied but he was before in the form of God. Besides, he was not in the form of a servant, but by the emptying himself, and all exinanition necessarily presupposeth a precedent plenitude; it being as impossible to empty any thing which hath no fulness, as to fill any thing which hath no emptiness. But the fulness which Christ had, in respect whereof assuming the form of a servant he is said to empty himself, could be in nothing else but in the form of God, in which he was before.

Wherefore, if the assumption of the form of a servant be contemporary with his exinanition; if that exinanition necessarily presupposeth a plenitude as indispensably antecedent to it; if the form of God be so coeval with that precedent plenitude; then must we confess, Christ was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant: which is the second proposition.

Again: it is as evident from the same Scripture, that Christ was as much in the form of God as the form of a servant, and did as really subsist in the divine nature as in the nature of man. For he was so in the form of God as thereby to be equal with God. But no other form beside the essential, which is the divine nature itself, could infer an equality with God. "To whom will ye liken me and make me equal, saith the Holy One?" Isa. xl. 25. There can be but one infinite, eternal, and independent Being; and there can be no comparison between that and whatsoever is finite, temporal, and depending. He therefore who did truly think himself equal with God, as being in the form of God, must be conceived to subsist in that one infinite, eternal, and independent nature of God.

Again: the phrase, "in the form of God," not elsewhere mentioned, is used by the apostle with a respect unto that other, of "the form of a servant," exegetically continued, "in the likeness of man;" and the respect of one unto the other is so necessary, that if the form of God be not as real and essential as the form of a servant, or the likeness of man, there is no force in the apostle's words, nor will his argument be fit to work any great degree of humiliation upon the consideration of Christ's exinanition. But by "the form" is certainly understood the true condition of a servant, and by "the likeness" is infallibly meant the real nature of man: nor doth "the fashion," in which he was found, destroy, but rather assert, the truth of his humanity. And therefore, as sure as Christ was really and essentially man, of the same nature with us, in whose similitude he was made; so certainly was he also really and essentially God, of the same nature and being with him, in whose form he did subsist. Seeing then we have clearly evinced, from the express words of St. Paul, that Christ was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man,

that he was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, that the form of God in which he subsisted doth as truly signify the divine, as the likeness of man the human nature ; it necessarily followeth, that Christ had a real existence before he was begotten of the virgin, and that the being which he had was the divine essence, by which he was truly, really, and properly God.

Thirdly : he who is expressly styled "Alpha and Omega," the first and the last, without any restriction or limitation, as he is after, so he was before, any time assignable, truly and essentially God. For by this title God describeth his own being, and distinguisheth it from all other : "I the Lord, the first, and with the last, I am he. I am he, I am the first, I also am the last. I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God." Isa. xli. 4 ; xlviii. 12 ; xlv. 6. But Christ is expressly called "Alpha and Omega," the first and the last. He so proclaimed himself "by a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last," Rev. i. 11. Which answereth to that solemn call and proclamation in the prophet, "Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called," Isa. xlviii. 12. He comforteth St. John with the majesty of this title, "Fear not, I am the first and the last," Rev. i. 17. Which words were spoken by "one like unto the Son of Man," by him "that liveth, and was dead, and is alive for evermore;" that is, undoubtedly, by Christ. He upholdeth the church of Smyrna in her tribulation by virtue of the same description : "These things saith the first and the last, which was dead and is alive," Rev. ii. 8. He ascertaineth his coming unto judgment with the same assertion, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last," Rev. xxii. 13. And in all these places, this title is attributed unto Christ absolutely and universally, without any kind of restriction or limitation, without any assignation of any particular in respect of which he is the first or last ; in the same latitude and eminence of expression in which it is or can be attributed to the supreme God. There is yet another Scripture in which the same description may seem of a more dubious interpretation : "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and

which was, and which is to come, the Almighty," Rev. i. 8. For seeing it is the Lord who so calls himself, which title belongeth to the Father and the Son, it may be doubted whether it be spoken by the Father or the Son; but whether it be understood of the one or of the other, it will sufficiently make good what we intend to prove. For if they be understood of Christ, as the precedent and the following words imply, then he is certainly that "Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty;" that is, the supreme eternal God, of the same divine essence with the Father, who was before described by "him which is, and which was, and which is to come," to whom the six-winged beasts continually cry, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come," Rev. iv. 8; as the familiar explication of that name which God revealed to Moses, Exod. iii. 14. If they belong unto the supreme God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, then did he so describe himself unto St. John, and express his supreme Deity, that by those words, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending," he might be known to be the one almighty and eternal God; and consequently, whosoever should assume that title must attribute as much unto himself. Wherefore seeing Christ hath so immediately, and with so great solemnity and frequency, taken the same style upon him by which the Father did express his Godhead; it followeth, that he hath declared himself to be the supreme, almighty, and eternal God. And being thus the Alpha and the first, he was before any time assignable, and consequently before he was conceived of the virgin; and the being which then he had was the divine essence, by which he was truly and properly the almighty and eternal God.

Fourthly: he whose glory Isaiah saw, in the year that king Uzziah died, had a being before Christ was begotten of the virgin, and that being was the divine essence, by which he was naturally and essentially God: for he is expressly called "the Lord; holy, holy, holy; the Lord of hosts, whose glory filleth the whole earth," Isa. vi. 1; which titles can belong to none beside the one and only God. But Christ was he whose glory Isaiah saw, as St. John doth testify, saying, "These things said Esaias, when he saw his

glory, and spake of him," John xii. 41; and he whose glory he saw, and of whom he spake, was certainly Christ; for of him the apostle treateth in that place, and of none but him. "These things spake Jesus and departed. But though he," that is, Jesus, "had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him," that is, on Christ who wrought those miracles. The reason why they believed not on him was, "that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report?" and as they did not, "so they could not believe in Christ, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their hearts; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their hearts, and be converted, and I should heal them." For those who God foresaw, and the prophet foretold, should not believe, could not do it without contradicting the prescience of the one and the predictions of the other. But the Jews refusing to assent unto the doctrine of our Saviour, were those of whom the prophet spake; for "these things said Esaias when he saw his glory, and spake of him." Now if the glory which Esaias saw were the glory of Christ, and he of whom Esaias in that chapter spake were Christ himself; then must those blinded eyes and hardened hearts belong unto these Jews, and then their infidelity was so long since foretold. Thus doth the fixing of that prophecy upon that people, which saw our Saviour's miracles, depend upon Isaiah's vision, and the appropriation of it unto Christ. Wherefore St. John hath infallibly taught us that the prophet saw the glory of Christ, and the prophet hath as undoubtedly assured us that he whose glory then he saw was the one omnipotent and eternal God; and consequently both together have sealed this truth, that Christ did then subsist in that glorious majesty of the eternal Godhead.

Lastly: he who, being man, is frequently in the Scriptures called God, and that in such a manner as by that name no other can be understood but the one only and eternal God, he had an existence before he was made man, and the being which then he had was no other than the divine essence; because all novelty is repugnant to the Deity, nor can any be that one God who was not so from all eternity. But Jesus Christ, being in the nature of man, is frequently in the

sacred Scriptures called God ; and that name is attributed unto him in such a manner as by it no other can be understood but the one almighty and eternal God.

Which may be thus demonstrated. It hath been already proved, and we all agree in this, that there can be but one divine essence, and so but one supreme God. Wherefore, were it not said in the Scriptures, there are many gods ; did not he himself who is supreme call others so ; we durst not give that name to any but to him alone, nor could we think any called God to be any other but that one. It had been then enough to have alleged that Christ is God, to prove his supreme and eternal Deity ; whereas now we are answered that there are gods many, and therefore it followeth not from that name that he is the one eternal God. But if Christ be none of those many gods, and yet be God ; then can he be no other but that one. And that he is not to be numbered with them is certain ; because he is clearly distinguished from them, and opposed to them. We read in the psalmist, "I have said ye are gods, and all of you are children of the most High," Psal. lxxxii. 6. But we must not reckon Christ among those gods, we must not number the only-begotten Son among those children ; for "they knew not, neither would they understand, they walked on in darkness : " and whosoever were gods only as they were, either did or might do so. Whereas Christ, "in whom alone dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," is not only distinguished from, but opposed to, such gods as those, by his disciples, saying, "Now we are sure that thou knowest all things," by himself proclaiming, "I am the light of the world : he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness." St. Paul hath told us, "there be gods many, and lords many ;" but withal hath taught us, that "to us there is but one God, the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ." In which words as the Father is opposed as much unto the many lords as many gods, so is the Son as much unto the many gods as many lords ; the Father being as much Lord as God, and the Son as much God as Lord. Wherefore seeing we find in Scripture frequent mention of one God, and beside that one an intimation of many gods, and whosoever is called God must either be that one, or one of those many ; seeing we find our blessed Saviour to be wholly opposed to the many gods, and conse-

quently to be none of them, and yet we read him often styled God, it followeth that that name is attributed unto him in such a manner as by it no other can be understood but the one almighty and eternal God.

Again: those who deny our Saviour to be the same God with the Father, have invented rules to be the touchstone of the eternal power and godhead. First: where the name of God is taken absolutely, as the subject of any proposition, it always signifies the supreme power and majesty, excluding all others from that Deity. Secondly: where the same name is any way used with an article, by way of excellency, it likewise signifieth the same supreme godhead as admitting others to a communion of Deity, but excluding them from the supremacy. Upon these two rules they have raised unto themselves this observation, that whensoever the name of God absolutely taken is placed as the subject of any proposition, it is not to be understood of Christ: and wheresoever the same name is spoken of our Saviour, by way of predicate, it never hath an article denoting excellency annexed to it; and consequently leaves him in the number of those gods who are excluded from the majesty of the eternal Deity.

Now though there can be no kind of certainty in any such observations of the articles, because the Greeks promiscuously often use them or omit them, without any reason of their usurpation or omission, whereof examples are innumerable; though, if those rules were granted, yet would not their conclusion follow, because the supreme God is often named (as they confess) without an article, and therefore the same name may signify the same God when spoken of Christ, as well as when of the Father, so far as can concern the omission of the article: yet, to complete my demonstration, I shall show, first, that the name of God taken subjectively is to be understood of Christ; secondly, that the same name with the article affixed is attributed unto him; thirdly, that if it were not so, yet, where the article is wanting, there is that added to the predicate which hath as great a virtue to signify that excellency as the article could have.

St. Paul, unfolding the mystery of godliness, hath delivered six propositions together, and the subject of all and each of them is God. "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh, jus-

tified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory," 1 Tim. iii. 16. And this God who is the subject of all these propositions must be understood of Christ, because of him each one is true, and all are so of none but him; he was the Word which was God, and was made flesh, and consequently "God manifested in the flesh." Upon him the Spirit descended at his baptism, and after his ascension was poured upon his apostles, ratifying his commission and confirming the doctrine which they received from him: wherefore he was "God justified in the Spirit." His nativity the angels celebrated, in the discharge of his office they ministered unto him, at his resurrection and ascension they were present, always ready to confess and adore him: he was therefore "God seen of angels." The apostles preached unto all nations, and he whom they preached was Jesus Christ. The Father separated St. Paul "from his mother's womb, and called him by his grace, to reveal his Son unto him, that he might preach him among the heathen;" therefore he was "God preached unto the Gentiles." John the Baptist "spake unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." "We have believed in Christ Jesus," saith St. Paul, who so taught the gaoler trembling at his feet, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved: he therefore was "God believed on in the world." When he had been forty days on earth after his resurrection, he was taken visibly up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father: wherefore he was "God received up into glory." and thus all these six propositions, according to the plain and familiar language of the Scriptures, are infallibly true of Christ, and so of God, as he is taken by St. John, when he speaks those words, "the Word was God." But all these cannot be understood of any other, who either is, or is called God. For, though we grant the divine perfections and attributes to be the same with the divine essence, yet are they never in the Scriptures called God; nor can any of them with the least show of probability be pretended as the subject of these propositions, or afford any tolerable interpretation. When they tell us that God, that is the will of God, "was manifested in the flesh," that is, was revealed by frail

and mortal men, and “received up into glory,” that is, was received gloriously on earth, they teach a language which the Scriptures know not, and the Holy Ghost never used; and as no attribute, so no person but the Son can be here understood under the name of God; not the Holy Ghost, for he is distinguished from him, as being “justified by the Spirit;” not the Father, who was not manifest in the flesh, nor received up into glory. It remaineth therefore that, whereas the Son is the only person to whom all these clearly and undoubtedly belong, which are here jointly attributed unto God, as sure as the name of God is expressed uniuersally in the copies of the original language, so thus absolutely and subjectively taken must it be understood of Christ.

Again: St. Paul speaketh thus to the elders of the Church of Ephesus: “Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood,” Acts xx. 28. In these words this doctrinal proposition is clearly contained—God hath purchased the Church with his own blood. For there is no other word either in or near the text which can by any grammatical construction be joined with the verb, except the Holy Ghost, to whom the predicate is repugnant, both in respect of the act, or our redemption, and of the means, the blood. If then the Holy Ghost hath not purchased the Church; if he hath not blood to shed for our redemption, and “without bloodshed there is no remission;” if there be no other word to which, according to the literal construction, the act of purchasing can be applied; if the name of God, most frequently joined to his church, be immediately and properly applicable by all rules of syntax to the verb which followeth it: then is it of necessity to be received as the subject of this proposition, then is this to be embraced as infallible Scripture truth, God hath purchased the church with his own blood. But this God may and must be understood of Christ: it may, because he hath; it must, because no other person who is called God hath so purchased the church. “We were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ,” 1. Pet. i. 18. With this price were we bought; and therefore it may well be said that Christ our God “hath purchased us with his

own blood." But no other person who is, or is called God, can be said so to have purchased us, because it is an act belonging properly to the Mediatorship; and "there is but one Mediator between God and men; and the church is "sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all," Heb. x. 10. Nor can the expression of this act, peculiar to the Son, be attributed to the Father, because this blood signifieth death: and though the Father be omnipotent, and can do all things, yet he cannot die. And though it might be said that he purchased us, because he gave his Son to be a ransom for us, yet it cannot be said that he did it by his own blood; for then it would follow that he gave not his Son, or that the Son and the Father were the same person. Besides, it is very observable that this particular phrase, of "his own blood," is in the Scripture put by way of opposition to the blood of another: and howsoever we may attribute the acts of the Son unto the Father, because sent by him; yet we cannot but acknowledge that the blood and death was of another than the Father. "Not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place;" and whereas "the high priest entered every year with the blood of others, Christ appeared once to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Heb. ix. 12, 25. He then who purchased us wrought it by his own blood, as a high priest opposed to the Aaronical, who made atonement by the blood of others. But the Father taketh no priestly office, neither could he be opposed to the legal priest, as not dying himself, but giving another. Wherefore, wheresoever the Father and the Son are described together as working the salvation of man, the blood by which it is wrought is attributed to the Son, not to the Father; as when St. Paul speaketh of the "redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness;" "his," that is, "his own righteousness," hath reference to God the Father, but "his," that is, "his own blood," must be referred to Christ the Son, Rom iii. 25. When he glorifieth the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, attributing unto him, that he hath blessed, elected, predestinated, adopted, accepted us, made known unto us the mystery of his will, and gathered us together in one; in the

midst of this acknowledgment he brings in "the Beloved in whom we have redemption through his blood," as that which cannot be attributed to the Father, Eph. i. 6. Christ hath blessed us; and the apostle saith, the Father hath blessed us; which is true, "because he sent his Son to bless us," Acts. iii. 26. Christ hath made known unto us the will of his Father; and the apostle saith, the Father, "hath made known unto us the mystery of his will;" because he sent his Son to reveal it, Eph. i. 9. Christ hath delivered us; and the Father is said to "deliver us from the power of darkness: not that we are twice delivered, but because the Father delivereth us by his Son, Col. i. 13. And thus these general acts are familiarly attributed to them both; but still a difference must be observed and acknowledged in the means and manner of the performance of these acts. For, though it is true that the Father and the Son revealed to us the will of God, yet it is not true that the Father revealed it by himself to us; but that the Son did so, it is. They both deliver us from sin and death: but the Son "gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us;" the Father is not, cannot be, said to have given himself, but his Son: and therefore the apostle giveth thanks unto the Father, "who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood," Col. i. 13. Now this blood is not only the blood of the new covenant, and consequently of the Mediator, but the nature of this covenant is such that it is also a testament, and therefore the blood must be the blood of the Testator; "for where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the Testator, Heb. ix. 16. But the Testator who died is not, cannot be, the Father, but the Son; and consequently the blood is the blood of the Son, not of the Father. It remaineth therefore that "God, who purchased the church with his own blood," is not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, or any other who is called God, but only Jesus Christ the Son of God, and God. And thus have I proved the first of the three assertions, that the name of God, absolutely taken and placed subjectiely, is sometimes to be understood of Christ.

The second, that the name of God invested by way of excellency with an article is attributed in the Scriptures unto Christ, may be thus made good:—He who is called Emmanuel is named God by way of excellency; for that name, saith St. Matthew, "*being interpreted, is God with us,*" and in that interpretation the Greek article is prefixed, Mat. i. 23. But Christ is called Emmanuel; "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel." Therefore he is that "God with us," which is expressed by way of excellency, and distinguished from all other who are any way honored with that name; for it is a vain imagination to think that Christ is called Emmanuel, but that he is not what he is called; as "Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah Nissi," and Gideon another called "Jehovah Shalom," and yet neither altar was Jehovah; as Jerusalem was called "The Lord our righteousness," and yet that city was not the Lord; because these two notions, which are conjoined in the name Emmanuel, are severally true of Christ. First he is "Emmanu," that is, "with us;" for he hath "dwelt among us," and, when he parted from the earth, he said to his disciples, "I am with you always, even to the end of the world;"—secondly, he is "El," and that name was given him, as the same prophet testifieth: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God," Isa. ix. 6. He then who is both properly called "El," that is "God," and is also really "Emmanu," that is, "with us," he must infallibly be that "Emmanuel" who is "God with us." Indeed if the name Emmanuel were to be interpreted by way of a proposition, "God is with us," as "the Lord our righteousness," and "the Lord is there," must be understood where they are the names of Jerusalem, then should it have been the name not of Christ, but of his church; and, if we under the gospel had been called so, it could have received no other interpretation in reference to us. But seeing it is not ours, but our Saviour's name, it bears no kind of similitude with those objected appellations, and is as properly and directly to be attributed to the Messiah as the name of

Jesus. Wherefore it remaineth that Christ be acknowledged God with us, according to the evangelical interpretation, with an expression of that excellency which belongeth to the supreme Deity.

Again: he to whom St. Thomas said, "My Lord and my God," or rather, "The Lord of me, and the God of me," he is that God before whose name the Greek article is prefixed, which they require, by way of excellency. But St. Thomas spake these words to Christ. For Jesus spake unto Thomas, and "Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God." And in these words he made confession of his faith; for our Saviour replied, "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed." And let him be the Lord of me, and the God of me, who was the Lord and the God of an apostle.

Nor have we only their required testimony of Christ's supreme divinity, but also an addition of verity asserting that supremacy. For he is not only termed "the God," but, for a farther certainty, "the true God;" and the same apostle, who said the Word was God, lest any cavil should arise by any omission of an article, though so frequently neglected by all, even the most accurate authors, hath also assured us that he is the true God. For "We know," saith he, "that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life," 1 John v. 20. As therefore we read in the Acts of "the word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; he is Lord of all:" where it is acknowledged that the Lord of all is by the pronoun *he* joined unto *Jesus Christ*, the immediate, not unto God, the remote antecedent; so likewise here "*the true God*" is to be referred unto *Christ*, who stands next unto it, not unto the Father, spoken of indeed in the text, but at a distance. There is no reason alleged why these last words should not be referred to the Son of God, but only this, that in grammatical construction they may be ascribed to the Father: as, when "another king arose which knew not Joseph, the same dealt subtilly with our kindred;" *the same* referreth us not to Joseph, but to the king of Egypt: whereas, if

nothing else can be objected but a possibility in respect of the grammatical construction, we may as well say that Joseph dealt subtilly with his kindred as the king of Egypt; for, whatsoever the incongruity be in history, it makes no solecism in the syntax. Wherefore seeing Jesus Christ is the immediate antecedent to which the relative may properly be referred; seeing the Son of God is he of whom the apostle chiefly speaketh; seeing this is rendered as a reason why we are in him that is true, by being in his Son, to wit, because that Son is the true God; seeing in the language of St. John the constant title of our Saviour is "eternal life;" seeing all these reasons may be drawn out of the text itself, why the title of the true God should be attributed to the Son, and no one reason can be raised from thence why it should be referred to the Father; I can conclude no less than that our Saviour is the true God, so styled in the Scriptures by way of eminency, with an article prefixed, as the first Christian writers who immediately followed the apostles did both speak and write.

But, thirdly, were there no such particular place in which the article were expressed, yet shall we find such adjuncts fixed to the name of God when attributed unto Christ as will prove equivalent to an article, or whatsoever may express the supreme Majesty. As when St. Paul doth magnify the Jews, "out of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen," Rom. ix. 5. First: it is evident that Christ is called God, even he who came of the Jews, though not as he came of them, that is, according to the flesh, which is here distinguished from his godhead. Secondly: he is so called God as not to be any of the many gods, but the one supreme or most high God; for he is "God over all." Thirdly: he hath also added the title of "blessed," which of itself elsewhere signifieth the supreme God, and was always used by the Jews to express that one God of Israel. Wherefore it cannot be conceived St. Paul should write unto the Christians, most of whom were then converted Jews, or proselytes, and give unto our Saviour not only the name of God, but also add that title which they always gave unto the one God of Israel, and to none but him; except he did intend they should believe him to be the

same God whom they always in that manner, and under that notion, had adored. As therefore the apostle speaketh of "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore, of the Creator, who is blessed for ever, Amen;" and thereby doth signify the supreme Deity, which was so glorified by the Israelites; and doth also testify that we worship the same God under the gospel which they did under the law; so doth he speak of Christ in as sublime a style, "who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen;" and thereby doth testify the equality, or rather identity, of his Deity. If we consider the scope of the apostle, which is to magnify the Israelites by the enumeration of such privileges as belonged peculiarly to that chosen nation (the most eminent of which was contained in the genealogy of our Saviour), we shall find their glory did not consist in this, that Christ at first was born of them a man, and afterwards made a God; for what great honor could accrue to them by the nativity of a man, whose godhead is referred not to his birth, but to his death? whereas this is truly honorable, and the peculiar glory of that nation, that the most high God, blessed for ever, should "take on him the seed of Abraham," and come out of the Israelites "as concerning the flesh." Thus every way it doth appear that the apostle spake of Christ as of the one eternal God.

He then who was "the Word, which in the beginning was with God, and was God;" he whose glory Isaiah saw as the glory of the God of Israel; he who is styled Alpha and Omega without any restriction or limitation; he who was truly subsisting in the form of God, and equal with him before he was in the nature of man; he who being man is frequently called God, and that in all those ways by which the supreme deity is expressed; he had a being before Christ was conceived by the virgin Mary, and the being which he had was the one eternal and indivisible divine essence, by which he always was truly, really, and properly God:—but all these are certainly true of him in whom we believe, Jesus Christ, as hath been proved by clear testimonies of the sacred Scriptures. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was conceived of the virgin was not any created, but the divine essence; nor was he any creature, but the true eter-

nal God: which was our second assertion, particularly opposed to the Arian heresy.

The third assertion, next to be demonstrated, is, that the divine essence which Christ had as the Word, before he was conceived by the virgin Mary, he had not of himself, but by communication from God the Father. For this is not to be denied, that there can be but one essence properly divine, and so but one God of infinite wisdom, power, and majesty; that there can be but one person originally of himself subsisting in that infinite Being, because a plurality of more persons so subsisting would necessarily infer a multiplicity of Gods; that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is originally God, as not receiving his eternal being from any other. Wherefore it necessarily followeth that Jesus Christ, who is certainly not the Father, cannot be a person subsisting in the divine nature originally of himself, and consequently, seeing we have already proved that he is truly and properly the eternal God, he must be understood to have the Godhead communicated to him by the Father, who is not only eternally, but originally God. "All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine," saith Christ; because in him is the same fulness of the Godhead, and more than that the Father cannot have: but yet in that perfect and absolute equality there is notwithstanding this disparity, that the Father hath the Godhead not from the Son, or any other, whereas the Son hath it from the Father: Christ "is the true God and eternal life;" but that he is so is from the Father; "for as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself," not by participation, but by communication, John v. 26. It is true, our Saviour was so in the form of God that he thought it no robbery to be equal with God: but, when the Jews sought to kill him because he made himself equal with God, he answered them, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do:" by that connection of his operations showing the reception of his essence; and, by the acknowledgment of his power, professing his substance from the Father, John v. 18. From whence he who was equal, even in that equality confesseth a priority, saying, "The Father is greater than I;" the Son equal in respect of his nature, the Father greater in

reference to the communication of the Godhead. "I know him," saith Christ, "for I am from him," John vii. 29. And, because he is from the Father, therefore he is called by those of the Nicene Council, in their Creed, "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God." The Father is God, but not of God, Light, but not of Light; Christ is God, but of God, Light, but of Light. There is no difference or inequality in the nature or essence, because the same in both; but the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ hath that essence of himself, from none; Christ hath the same not of himself, but from him.

And seeing the divine nature, as it is absolutely immaterial and incorporeal, is also indivisible, Christ cannot have any part of it only communicated unto him, but the whole, by which he must be acknowledged co-essential, of the same substance with the Father; as the Council of Nice determined, and the ancient fathers before them taught. Hence appeareth the truth of those words of our Saviour, which raised a second motion in the Jews to stone him: "I and the Father are one:" where the plurality of the verb, and the neutrality of the noun, with the distinction of their persons, speak a perfect identity of their essence. And though Christ say, "The Father is in me, and I in him;" yet withal he saith, "I came out from the Father:" by the former showing the divinity of his essence, by the latter the origination of himself. We must not look upon the divine nature as sterile, but rather acknowledge and admire the fecundity and communicability of itself, upon which the creation of the world dependeth; God making all things by his Word, to whom he first communicated that omnipotency which is the cause of all things. And this may suffice for the illustration of our third assertion, that the Father hath communicated the divine essence to the Word, who is that Jesus who is the Christ.

The fourth assertion followeth, that the communication of the divine essence by the Father is the generation of the Son; and Christ, who was eternally God, not from himself, but from the Father, is the eternal Son of God. That God always had a Son, appeareth by Agur's question in the proverbs of Solomon: "Who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his name? and what is his Son's name, if

thou canst tell?" Prov. xxx. 4. And it was the chief design of Mahomet to deny this truth, because he knew it was not otherwise possible to prefer himself before our Saviour. One prophet may be greater than another, and Mahomet might persuade his credulous disciples that he was greater than any of the sons of men; but, while any one was believed to be the eternal Son of God, he knew it wholly impossible to prefer himself before him. Wherefore he frequently inculcates that blasphemy in his Alcoran, that God hath no such Son, nor any equal with him: and his disciples have corrupted the psalm of David, reading, instead of "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," "Thou art my prophet; I have educated thee." The later Jews, acknowledging the words, and the proper literal reading of them, apply them so unto David as that they deny them to belong to Christ; and that upon no other ground than that by such an exposition they may avoid the Christians' confession. But by the consent of the ancient Jews, by the interpretation of the blessed apostles, we know these words belong to Christ, and in the most proper sense to him alone; "for unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?" as the apostle argues, Heb. i. 5. And if he had spoken them unto any other man, as they were spoken unto him, the apostle's argument had been none at all.

Now that the communication of the divine essence by the Father (which we have already proved) was the true and proper generation by which he hath begotten the Son, will thus appear; because the most proper generation which we know is nothing else but a vital production of another in the same nature, with a full representation of him from whom he is produced. Thus man begetteth a son, that is produceth another man of the same human nature with himself; and this production, as a perfect generation, becomes the foundation of the relation of paternity in him that produceth, and of filiation in him that is produced. Thus after the prolific benediction, "Be fruitful and multiply," Adam begat in his own likeness, after his image: and, by the continuation of the same blessing, the succession of human generations hath been continued. This then is the known confession of all men, that a son is nothing but an-

other produced by his Father in the same nature with him. But God the Father hath communicated to the Word the same divine essence by which he is God; and consequently he is of the same nature with him, and thereby the perfect image and similitude of him, and therefore his proper Son. In human generations we may conceive two kinds of similitude; one in respect of the internal nature, the other in reference to the external form or figure. The former similitude is essential and necessary; it being impossible a man should beget a son, and that son not be by nature a man; the latter accidental; not only sometimes the child representing this, sometimes the other parent, but also oftentimes neither. The similitude then, in which the propriety of generation is preserved, is that which consisteth in the identity of nature: and this communication of the Divine essence by the Father to the Word is evidently a sufficient foundation of such similitude: from whence Christ is called "the image of God, the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person."

Nor is this communication of the divine essence only the proper generation of the Son, but we must acknowledge it far more proper than any natural generation of the creature, not only because it is in a more perfect manner, but also because the identity of nature is most perfect. As in the divine essence we acknowledge all the perfections of the creatures, subtracting all the imperfections which adhere unto them here in things below; so in the communication we must look upon the reality without any kind of defect, blemish, or impurity. In human generation the son is begotten in the same nature with the father, which is performed by derivation, or decision of part of the substance of the parent; but this decision includeth imperfection, because it supposeth a substance divisible, and consequently corporeal: whereas the essence of God is incorporeal, spiritual, and indivisible; and therefore his nature is really communicated, not by derivation or decision, but by a total and plenary communication. In natural conceptions the father necessarily precedeth the son, and begetteth one younger than himself; for seeing generation is for the perpetuity of the species, where the individuals successively fail, it is sufficient if the parent can produce another to live after him, and

continue the existence of his nature, when his person is dissolved. But this presupposeth the imperfection of mortality, wholly to be removed when we speak of him who inhabiteth eternity : the essence which God always had without beginning, without beginning he did communicate ; being always Father, as always God. Animals, when they come to the perfection of nature, then become prolific ; in God eternal perfection showeth his eternal fecundity. And that which is most remarkable, in human generations, the son is of the same nature with the father, and yet is not the same man ; because, though he hath an essence of the same kind, yet he hath not the same essence ; the power of generation depending on the first prolific benediction, "Increase and multiply," it must be made by way of multiplication, and thus every son becomes another man. But the divine essence, being by reason of its simplicity not subject to division, and in respect of its infinity incapable of multiplication, is so communicated as not to be multiplied ; insomuch that he who proceedeth by that communication hath not only the same nature but is also the same God. The Father God, and the Word God ; Abraham man, and Isaac man ; but Abraham one man, Isaac another man ; not so the Father one God, and the Word another, but the Father and the Word both the same God. Seeing then the propriety of generation is founded in the essential similitude of the Son unto the Father, by reason of the same which he receiveth from him ; seeing the full perfect nature of God is communicated unto the Word, and that more intimately and with a greater unity or identity than can be found in human generations ; it followeth that this communication of the divine nature is the proper generation by which Christ is, and is called the true and proper Son of God. This was the foundation of St. Peter's confession, "Thou art the Son of the living God ;" this is the ground of our Saviour's distinction, "I go unto my Father, and to your Father." Hence did St. John raise a verity more than only a negation of falsity, when he said, "we are in the true Son ;" for we who are in him are true, not false sons, but such sons we are not as the true Son. Hence did St. Paul draw an argument of the infinite love of God toward man in that he spared not his own proper Son. Thus have we sufficiently showed that the eternal

communication of the divine essence by the Father to the Word was a proper generation, by which Christ Jesus always was the true and proper Son of God : which was our fourth assertion.

The fifth and last assertion followeth, that the divine essence was so peculiarly communicated to the Word that there was never any other naturally begotten by the Father ; and in that respect Christ is the only-begotten Son of God. For the clearing of which truth, it will first be necessary to inquire into the true notion of the only-begotten ; and then show how it belongs particularly to Christ, by reason of the divine nature communicated by way of generation to him alone. First, therefore, we must avoid the vain interpretation of the ancient heretics, who would have the restraining term “only” to belong not to the Son, but to the Father ; as if “the only-begotten” were no more than begotten of the Father only. Which is both contrary to the language of the Scriptures, and the common custom of men, who use it not for him who is begotten of one, but for him who alone is begotten of any.

Secondly : we must by no means admit the exposition of the later heretics, who take “the only-begotten” to be nothing else but the most beloved of all the sons ; because Isaac was called the only son of Abraham, when we know that he had Ishmael beside ; and Solomon said to be the only-begotten before his mother, when David had other children even by the mother of Solomon. For “the only-begotten” and “the most beloved” are not the same : the one having the nature of a cause in respect of the other, and the same cannot be cause and effect to itself. For though it be true that the only son is the beloved son ; yet with this order, that he is therefore beloved, because the only, not therefore the only, because beloved. Although therefore Christ be the only-begotten and the beloved Son of God, yet we must not look upon these two attributes as synonymous or equally significant of the same thing, but as one depending on the other ; unigeniture being the foundation of his singular love. Beside, Isaac was called the only son of Abraham for some other reason than because he was singularly beloved of Abraham ; for he was the only son of the free-woman, the only son of the promise made to Abra-

ham, which was first this, "Sarah shall have a son," and then, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called," Gen. xviii. 14; xxi. 12, So that Isaac may well be called the only son of Abraham in reference to the promise, as the apostle speaks expressly: "By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac, and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son," Heb. xi. 17. Avoiding therefore these two expositions, as far short of the true notion of "the only-begotten;" we must look upon it in the most proper, full, and significant sense, as signifying a Son so begotten as none other is, was, or can be: so as the restrictive term only shall have relation not only to the Father generating, but also to the Son begotten, and to the manner of the generation. It is true, the Father spake from heaven saying, "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;" and thereby we are to understand that whosoever of us are beloved by the Father are so beloved in and through the Son. In the same manner Christ is the only-begotten Son of God; and as many of us as God hath bestowed his love upon, "that we should be called the sons of God," are all brought into that near relation by our fellowship with him, who is by a far more near relation the natural and eternal Son.

Having thus declared the interpretation of the Word, that, properly, as primogeniture consisteth in prelation, so unigeniture in exclusion; and that none can be strictly called the only-begotten but he who alone was so begotten; we shall proceed to make good our assertion, showing that the divine essence was peculiarly communicated to the Word, by which he was begotten the Son of God, and never any was so begotten beside the Son.

And here we meet with two difficulties: one showing that there were other sons of God said to be begotten of him, to whom either the divine essence was communicated, and then the communication of that to the Word made him not the only begotten; or it was not communicated, and then there is no such communication necessary to found such a filiation: the other alleging that the same divine essence may be communicated to another beside the Word, and not only that it may, but that it is so, to the person of the Holy Ghost; whence either the Holy Ghost must be the Son of

God, and then the Word is not the only-begotten ; or, if he be not the Son, then is not the communication of the divine essence a sufficient foundation of the relation of sonship. These two objections being answered, nothing will remain farther to demonstrate the last assertion.

For the first, we acknowledge that others are frequently called the sons of God, and that we call the same God our Father whom Christ called his ; that “both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call us brethren,” Heb. ii. 11. We confess that those whom St. Paul “hath begotten through the gospel” may well be termed the “begotten of God, whose seed remaineth in them :” but withal, we affirm that this our regeneration is of a nature wholly different from the generation of the Son. We are first generated, and have our natural being ; after that regenerated, and so receive a spiritual renovation, and by virtue thereof an inheritance incorruptible ; whereas the generation of Christ admits no regeneration, he becoming at once thereby God and Son and Heir of all. The state of sonship which we come into is but of adoption, showing the generation by which we are begotten to be but metaphorical ; whereas Christ is so truly begotten, so properly the natural Son of God, that his generation clearly excludeth the name of adoption : and not only so, but when he becometh the Son of Man, even in his humanity refuseth the name of an adopted Son. For “when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law,” not that *he* but “that *we* might receive the adoption of sons,” Gal. iv. 4. He then whose generation is totally different from ours whom he calleth brethren ; he whom in the sacred Scriptures the Spirit nameth the true Son, the Father sometimes his own, sometimes his beloved, but never his adopted Son ; he who by those proper and peculiar appellations is distinguished from us, who can claim no higher filiation than that which we receive by the privilege of adoption ; he is truly the only-begotten Son of God, notwithstanding the same God hath begotten us by his word ; and the reason why he is so is, because the divine essence was communicated unto him in his natural and eternal generation, whereas only the grace

of God is conveyed unto us in our adoption. Indeed if we were begotten of the essence of God as Christ was, or he were only by the grace of God adopted as we are, then could he by no propriety of speech be called the only Son, by reason of so many brethren; but seeing we cannot aspire unto the first, nor he descend unto the latter, it remaineth that we acknowledge him, notwithstanding the first difficulty, by virtue of his natural and peculiar generation, to be the only-begotten Son.

But though neither men nor angels be begotten of the substance of God, or by virtue of any such natural generation be called sons; yet one person we know, to whom the divine essence is as truly and really communicated by the Father as to the Son, who is the third person in the blessed Trinity, the Holy Ghost. Why then should the Word by that communication of the divine essence become the Son and not the Holy Ghost by the same? or if, by receiving the same nature, he also be the Son of God, how is the Word the only Son? To this I answer, that the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence from the Father which the Word receiveth, and thereby becometh the same God with the Father and the Word; but though the essence be the same which is communicated, yet there is a difference in the communication; the Word being God by generation, the Holy Ghost by procession: and though every thing which is begotten proceedeth, yet every thing which proceedeth is not begotten. Wherefore, in the language of the Sacred Scriptures and the Church, the Holy Ghost is never said to be begotten, but to proceed from the Father; nor is he ever called the Son, but the gift of God. Eve was produced out of Adam, and in the same nature with him, and yet was not born of him, nor was she truly the daughter of Adam; whereas Seth, proceeding from the same person in the similitude of the same nature, was truly and properly the son of Adam. And this difference was not in the nature produced, but in the manner of production; Eve descending not from Adam as Seth did, by way of generation, that is, by natural fecundity. The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father in the same nature with him, the Word proceedeth from the same person in the same similitude of nature also; but the Word proceeding is the Son, the

Holy Ghost is not, because the first procession is by way of generation, the other is not. As therefore the regeneration and adoption of man, so the procession of the Holy Ghost doth no way prejudice the eternal generation, as pertaining solely to the Son of God.

Seeing then our Saviour Jesus Christ had a real being and existence before he was conceived by the virgin Mary; seeing the being which he had antecedently to that conception was not any created, but the one and indivisible divine essence; seeing he had not that divinity of himself originally, as the Father, but by communication from him; seeing the communication of the same essence unto him was a proper generation; we cannot but believe that the same Jesus Christ is the begotten Son of God: and, seeing the same essence was never so by way of generation communicated unto any, we must also acknowledge him the only-begotten, distinguished from the Holy Ghost, as Son; from the adopted children, as the natural Son.

The necessity of the belief of this part of the article, that Jesus Christ is the proper and natural Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father, and by that singular way of generation the only Son, appeareth first in the confirmation of our faith concerning the redemption of mankind. For this doth show such an excellency and dignity in the person of the Mediator as will assure us of an infinite efficacy in his actions, and value in his sufferings. We know "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins;" and we may very well doubt how the blood of him, who hath no other nature than that of man, can take away the sins of other men: there appearing no such difference as will show a certainty in the one, and an impossibility in the other. But since we may be "bought with a price," well may we believe the blood of Christ sufficiently precious, when we are assured that it is the blood of God: nor can we question the efficacy of it in "purging our conscience from dead works," if we believe "Christ offered up himself through the eternal Spirit." If we be truly sensible of our sins, we must acknowledge that in every one we have offended God; and the gravity of every offence must needs increase proportionably to the dignity of the party offended in respect of the offender; because the

more worthy any person is, the more reverence is due unto him, and every injury tendeth to his dishonor; but between God and man there is an infinite disproportion; and therefore every offence committed against him must be esteemed as in the highest degree of injury. Again: as the gravity of the offence beareth proportion to the person offended, so the value of reparation ariseth from the dignity of the person satisfying; because the satisfaction consisteth in a reparation of that honor which by the injury was eclipsed: and all honor doth increase proportionably as the person yielding it is honorable. If then by every sin we have offended God, who is of infinite eminency, according unto which the injury is aggravated; how shall we ever be secure of our reconciliation unto God, except the person who hath undertaken to make the reparation be of the same infinite dignity; so as the honor rendered by his obedience may prove proportionable to the offence and that dishonor which arose from our disobedience? This scruple is no otherwise to be satisfied than by a belief in such a Mediator as is the only-begotten Son of God, of the same substance with the Father, and consequently of the same power and dignity with the God whom by our sins we have offended.

Secondly: the belief of the eternal generation of the Son, by which he is the same God with the Father, is necessary for the confirming and encouraging a Christian in ascribing that honor and glory unto Christ which is due unto him. For we are commanded to give that worship unto the Son which is truly and properly divine; the same which we give unto God the Father, who "hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father," John v. 22, as it was represented to St. John in a vision, when "he heard every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, saying, Blessing, honor, glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever, Rev. v. 13. Again: we are commanded "to fear the Lord our God, and to serve him;" and that with such an emphasis, as by him we are to understand him alone, because "the Lord our God is one Lord." From whence if any one arose among the Jews teaching under the title of a prophet to

worship any other beside him for God, the judgment of the Rabbin was, that notwithstanding all the miracles which he could work, though they were as great as Moses wrought, he ought immediately to be strangled, because the evidence of this truth, that one God only must be worshipped, is above all evidence of sense. Nor must we look upon this precept as valid only under the law, as if then there were only one God to be worshipped, but since the gospel we had another; for our Saviour hath commended it to our observation, by making use of it against the Devil in his temptation, saying, "Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve," Matt. iv. 10. If then we be obliged to worship the God of Israel only; if we be also commanded to give the same worship to the Son which we give to him; it is necessary that we should believe that the Son is the God of Israel. When the Scripture "bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, it saith, Let all the angels of God worship him;" but then the same Scripture calleth that first-begotten "Jehovah," and "the Lord of the whole earth," Psal. xcvi. 5. For a man to worship that for God which is not God, knowing that it is not God, is affected and gross idolatry; to worship that as God which is not God, thinking that it is God, is not in the same degree, but it is the same sin; to worship him as God who is God, thinking that he is not God, cannot be thought an act in the formality void of idolatry. Lest therefore, while we are obliged to give unto him divine worship, we should fall into that sin which of all others we ought most to abhor, it is no less necessary that we should believe that Son to be that eternal God, whom we are bound to worship, and whom only we should serve.

Thirdly: our belief in Christ as the eternal Son of God is necessary to raise us unto a thankful acknowledgment of the infinite love of God, appearing in the sending of his only-begotten Son into the world to die for sinners. This love of God is frequently extolled and admired by the apostles: "God so loved the world," saith St. John, "that he gave his only-begotten Son," John iii. 16. "God commendeth his love towards us," saith St. Paul, "in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us;" in that "he

spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all," Rom. v. 8; viii. 32. "In this," saith St. John again, "was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins," 1 John iv. 9, 10. If we look upon all this as nothing else but that God should cause a man to be born after another manner than other men, and, when he was so born after a peculiar manner, yet a mortal man should deliver him to die for the sins of the world; I see no such great expression of his love in this way of redemption, more than would have appeared if he had redeemed us any other way. It is true, indeed, that the reparation of lapsed man is no act of absolute necessity in respect of God, but that he hath as freely designed our redemption as our creation; considering the misery from which we are redeemed, and the happiness to which we are invited, we cannot but acknowledge the singular love of God, even in the act of redemption itself; but yet the apostles have raised that consideration higher, and placed the choicest mark of the love of God in the choosing such means and performing in that manner our reparation, by sending his only-begotten into the world; by not sparing his own Son, by giving and delivering him up to be scourged and crucified for us: and the estimation of this act of God's love must necessarily increase proportionably to the dignity of the Son so sent into the world; because the more worthy the person of Christ before he suffered, the greater his condescension unto such a suffering condition; and the nearer his relation to the Father, the greater his love to us for whose sakes he sent him so to suffer. Wherefore to derogate any way from the person and nature of our Saviour before he suffered is so far to undervalue the love of God, and consequently to come short of that acknowledgment and thanksgiving which is due unto him for it. If then the sending of Christ into the world were the highest act of the love of God which could be expressed; if we be obliged unto a return of thankfulness some way correspondent to such infinite love; if such a return can never be made without a true sense of that infinity, and a sense of that

infinity of love cannot consist without an apprehension of an infinite dignity of nature in the person sent; then it is absolutely necessary to believe that Christ is so the only-begotten Son of the Father, as to be of the same substance with him, of glory equal, of majesty co-eternal.

By this discourse in way of explication every Christian may understand what it is he says, and express his mind how he would be understood, when he maketh this brief confession, "I believe in Christ the only Son of God." For by these words he must be thought to intend no less than this—I do profess to be fully assured of this assertion as of a most certain, infallible, and necessary truth, that Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Messias, is the true, proper, and natural Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father, which, being incapable of division or multiplication, is so really and totally communicated to him that he is of the same essence with him, "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God." And, as I assert him to be the Son, so do I also exclude all other persons from that kind of sonship, acknowledging none but him to be begotten of God by that proper and natural generation; and thereby excluding all that are not begotten, as it is a generation; all who are said to be begotten, and are called sons, but are so only by adoption, as it is natural. And thus I believe in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his only Son.

Our Lord.

After our Saviour's relation, founded upon his eternal generation, followeth his dominion in all ancient creeds, as the necessary consequent of his filiation. For as we believe him to be the Son of God, so must we acknowledge him to be "*our Lord*," because the only Son must of necessity be heir and Lord of all in his Father's house; and all others who bear the name of sons, whether they be men or angels, if compared to him, must not be looked upon as sons of God, but as servants of Christ.

Three things are necessary, and more cannot be, for a plenary explication of this part of the article—first, the proper notation of the word *Lord* in the Scripture phrase, or language of the Holy Ghost; secondly, the full signifi-

cation of the same in the adequate latitude of the sense as it belongs to Christ; thirdly, the application of it to the person making confession of his faith, and all others whom he involves in the same condition with himself, as saying, not *my*, nor *their*, but *our Lord*.

First, then, we must observe that not only Christ is *the Lord*, but that this title doth so properly belong unto him that *the Lord* alone absolutely taken is frequently used by the evangelists and apostles determinately for Christ, inso-much that the angels observe that dialect, "Come, see the place where the Lord lay," Matth. xxviii. 6. Now for the true notation of the word, it will not be so necessary to inquire into the use or origination of the Greek, much less into the etymology of the correspondent Latin, as to search into the notion of the Jews, and the language of the Scriptures, according unto which the evangelists and apostles spake and wrote.

And, first, it cannot be denied but that the word which we translate *the Lord* was used by the interpreters of the Old Testament sometimes for men, with no relation unto any other than human dominion. And, as it was by the translators of the Old, so it is also by the penmen of the New. But it is most certain that Christ is called Lord, in another notion than that which signifies any kind of human dominion; because, as so, there are many lords, but he is in that notion Lord which admits of no more than one. They are only "masters according to the flesh;" he "the Lord of glory, the Lord from heaven, king of Kings, and Lord of all other lords." 1 Cor. viii. 5; ib. ver. 6, and Eph. iv. 5; Col. iii. 22; 1 Cor. ii. 8 and xv. 47; Rev. xix. 16.

Nor is it difficult to find that name amongst the books of the law in the most high and full signification; for it is most frequently used as the name of the supreme God, sometimes for "El" or "Elohim," sometimes for "Shaddai" or "the Rock," often for "Adonai," and most universally for "Jehovah," the undoubted proper name of God; and that to which the Greek translators, long before our Saviour's birth, had most appropriated the name of Lord, not only by way of explication, but distinction and particular expression. As when we read, "Thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high in all the earth; and when

God so expresseth himself, "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty: but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them," Psalm lxxxiii. 18, Exod. vi. 3. In both these places, for the name Jehovah, the Greek translation, which the apostles followed, hath no other name but Lord; and therefore undoubtedly by that word which we translate "the Lord" did they understand the proper name of God, Jehovah. And, had they placed it there as the exposition of any other name of God, they had made an interpretation contrary to the manifest intention of the Spirit; for it cannot be denied but God was known to Abraham by the true importance of the title Adonai, as much as by the name of Shaddai; as much by his dominion and sovereignty, as by his power and all-sufficiency; but by any experimental and personal sense of the fulfilling of his promises his name Jehovah was not known unto him; for though God spake expressly unto Abraham, "All the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever;" yet the history teacheth us, and St. Stephen confirmeth us, that "he gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on, though he promised that he would give it to him for a possession," Acts vii. 5. Wherefore, when God saith he was not known to Abraham by his name Jehovah, the interpretation of no other name can make good that expression: and therefore we have reason to believe the word which the first Greek translators, and after them the apostles, used, may be appropriated to that notion which the original requires; as indeed it may, being derived from a verb of the same signification with the Hebrew root, and so denoting the essence or existence of God; and whatsoever else may be deduced from thence, as revealed by him to be signified thereby.

Seeing then this title Lord thus signifieth the proper name of God, Jehovah; seeing the same is certainly attributed unto Christ in a notion far surpassing all other lords, which are rather to be looked upon as servants unto him; it will be worth our inquiry next, whether, as it is the translation of the name Jehovah, it belong to Christ; or whether though he be Lord of all other lords, as subjected under his authority, yet he be so inferior unto him whose name alone is Jehovah, as that in that propriety and eminency in

which it belongs unto the supreme God it may not be attributed unto Christ.

This doubt will easily be satisfied, if we can show the name Jehovah itself to be given unto our Saviour; it being against all reason to acknowledge the original name, and to deny the interpretation in the sense and full importance of that original. Wherefore if Christ be the Jehovah, as so called by the Spirit of God; then is he so the Lord, in the same propriety and eminency in which Jehovah is. Now whatsoever did belong to the Messias, that may and must be attributed unto Jesus, as being the true and only Christ. But the Jews themselves acknowledge that Jehovah shall be known clearly in the days of the Messias, and not only so, but that it is the name which properly belongeth to him. And if they cannot but confess so much who only read the prophecies, as the eunuch did, without an interpreter; how can we be ignorant of so plain and necessary a truth, whose eyes have seen the full completion, and read the infallible interpretation of them? If they could see "Jehovah the Lord of hosts" to be the name of the Messias, who was to them "for a stone of stumbling and rock of offence," how can we possibly be ignorant of it, who are taught by St. Paul that in Christ this prophecy was fulfilled, "As it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a stumbling-stone, and rock of offence, and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed?" Rom. ix. 33. It was no other than Jehovah who spake those words, "I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the Lord (Jehovah) their God, and will not save them by bow nor sword;" where not only he who is described as the original and principal cause, that is, the Father who gave his Son, but also he who is the immediate efficient of our salvation, and that in opposition to all other means or instrumental causes is called Jehovah; who can be no other than our Jesus, because "there is no other name under heaven given unto men whereby we must be saved," Acts iv. 12. As in another place he speaketh, "I will strengthen them in the Lord (Jehovah); and they shall walk up and down in his name, saith the Lord" (Jehovah), Zech. x. 12; where he who strengtheneth is one, and he by whom he strengtheneth is another, clearly distinguished from him by the personal pro-

noun, and yet each of them is Jehovah, and "Jehovah our God is one Jehovah," Deut. vi. 4. Whatsoever objections may be framed against us, we know Christ is "the righteous branch raised unto David, the King that shall reign and prosper, in whose days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely;" we are assured that "this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness;" "the Lord," that is, Jehovah, the expression of his supremacy; and the addition of "our Righteousness" can be no diminution to his majesty, Jer. xxiii. 5, 6. If those words in the prophet, "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Sion; for lo, I come, and I dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord" (Jehovah), did not sufficiently of themselves denote our Saviour who dwelt amongst us, as they certainly do; yet the words which follow would evince as much, "And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people; and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee," Zech. ii. 10; for what other Lord can we conceive dwelling in the midst of us, and sent unto us by the Lord of hosts, but Christ?

And as the original Jehovah was spoken of Christ by the holy prophets, so the title of Lord, as the usual interpretation of that name, was attributed unto him by the apostles. In that signal prediction of the first age of the gospel, God promised by Joel that "whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord (Jehovah) shall be delivered; and St. Paul hath assured us that Christ is that Lord, by proving from thence that "whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed;" and inferring from that, "if we confess with our mouth the Lord Jesus, we shall be saved," Joel ii. 32; Rom. x. 9. For if it be a certain truth that whosoever confesseth the Lord Jesus shall be saved; and the certainty of this truth depend upon that foundation, that "whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed; and the certainty of that in relation to Christ depend upon that other promise, "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved;" then must the Lord in the thirteenth verse of the tenth chapter to the Romans be the same with the Lord Jesus in the ninth verse; or else St. Paul's argument must be invalid and fallacious, as containing that in the conclusion which was not comprehended in the premises.

But the Lord in the ninth verse is no other than Jehovah, as appeareth by the prophet Joel, from whom that Scripture is taken. Therefore our Saviour in the New Testament is called Lord, as that name or title is the interpretation of Jehovah.

If we consider the office of John the Baptist peculiar unto him, we know it was he of whom it is written in the prophet Malachi, "I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me;" we are sure he that spake those words was Jehovah, the Lord of hosts; and we are as sure that Christ is that Lord before whose face John the Baptist prepared the way. "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness," saith Isaiah, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord" (Jehovah): and "this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Isaiah," saith St. Matthew; this is he of whom his father Zacharias did divinely presage, "Thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest, for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways," Luke i. 76. Where Christ is certainly the Lord, and the Lord undeniably Jehovah.

Nor is this the only notion of the name or title Lord taken in a sense divine, above the expression of all mere human power and dominion; for as it is often used as the interpretation of the name Jehovah, so it is also for that of Adon or Adonai. "The Lord said unto my Lord," saith David, that is, in the original, "Jehovah unto Adon;" and that Adon is the Word, that Lord is Christ. We know the temple at Jerusalem was the temple of the most high God, and the Lord of that temple in the emphasis of a Hebrew article was Christ, as appeareth by that prophecy: "The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in."

Now this notion, as it is the interpretation of Adon, signifieth immediately and properly dominion, implying a right of possession and power of disposing; which doth not only agree with that other notion of Jehovah, but presupposes it, as following and flowing from it. For he who alone hath a being or existence of himself, and thereby is the fountain of all things beside himself, must be acknowledged to have full power and dominion over all; because every thing must necessarily belong to him from whom it hath received what it is. Wherefore seeing Christ is the

Lord, as that title is taken for Jehovah, the name of God, expressing the necessary existence and independence of his single Being, and consequently the dependency of all others upon him; it followeth that he be acknowledged also the Lord, as that name expresseth Adon, signifying power authoritative and proper dominion. Thus having explained the notion of the word Lord, which we propounded as the first part of our exposition, we come next to the second, which is, to declare the nature of this dominion, and to show how and in what respect Christ is the Lord.

Now for the full and exact understanding of the dominion seated or invested in Christ as the Lord, it will be necessary to distinguish it according to that diversity which the Scriptures represent unto us. As therefore we have observed two natures united in his person, so must we also consider two kinds of dominion belonging respectively to those natures; one inherent in his divinity, the other bestowed upon his humanity; one, as he is the Lord the Maker of all things, the other as he is made Lord of all things.

For the first, we are assured that the "Word was God," that by the same Word "all things were made, and without him was not any thing made that was made;" we must acknowledge that whosoever is the Creator of all things must have a direct dominion over all, as belonging to the possession of the Creator, who made all things. Therefore the Word, that is, Christ as God, hath the supreme and universal dominion of the world. Which was well expressed by that famous confession of no longer doubting, but believing Thomas, "My Lord and my God."

For the second, it is also certain that there was some kind of lordship given or bestowed on Christ, whose very unction proves no less than an imparted dominion; as St. Peter tells us, that "he was made both Lord and Christ." What David spake of man, the apostle hath applied peculiarly unto him, "Thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet," Heb. ii. 7.

Now a dominion thus imparted, given, derived, or bestowed, cannot be that which belongeth unto God as God, founded in the divine nature, because whatsoever is such is absolute and independent. Wherefore this lordship thus

imparted or acquired appertaineth to the human nature, and belongeth to our Saviour as the Son of Man. The right of judicature is part of this power; and Christ himself hath told us that the Father "hath given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man," John v. 27; and, by virtue of this delegated authority, the "Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and reward every man according to his works," Matt. xvi. 27. Part of the same dominion is the power of forgiving sins; as pardoning, no less than punishing, is a branch of the supreme magistracy; and Christ did therefore say to the sick of the palsy, "Thy sins be forgiven thee, that we might know that the Son of Man had power on earth to forgive sins," Matt. ix. 2. Another branch of that power is the alteration of the law, there being the same authority required to abrogate or alter which is to make a law: and Christ asserted himself to be "greater than the temple," showing that the "Son of Man was Lord even of the sabbath day," Matt. xiii. 6.

This dominion thus given unto Christ in his human nature was a direct and plenary power over all things, but was not actually given him at once, but part while he lived on earth, part after his death and resurrection. For though it be true that Jesus knew, before his death, that "the Father had given all things into his hands," yet it is observable that in the same place it is written, that he likewise knew "that he was come from God, and went to God;" and part of that power he received when he came from God, with part he was invested when he went to God; the first to enable him, the second, not only so, but also to reward him; for "to this end Christ both died, rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living," Rom. xiv. 9. After his resurrection he said to his disciples, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," Mat. xxviii. 18. "He drunk of the brook in the way, therefore he hath lift up his head," Psal. cx. 7. Because "he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, therefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under

the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father," Phil. ii. 8. Thus for and after his death he was instated in a full power and dominion over all things, even as the Son of Man, but exalted by the Father, "who raised him from the dead, and set him at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church," Eph. i. 20.

Now as all the power given unto Christ as man had not the same beginning in respect of the use or possession, so neither, when begun, shall it all have the same duration. For part of it being merely economical, aiming at a certain end, shall then cease and terminate, when that end for which it was given shall be accomplished; part being either due upon the union of the human nature with the divine, or upon covenant, as a reward for the sufferings endured in that nature, must be coeval with that union and that nature which so suffered, and consequently must be eternal.

Of the first part of this dominion did David speak, when by the spirit of prophecy he called his Son his Lord: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool," Psal. cx. 1; where the continuation of Christ's dominion over his enemies is promised to be prolonged until their final and total subjection; "for he must reign till he hath put all things under his feet," 1 Cor. xv. 25. And as we are sure of the continuation of that kingdom till that time, so are we assured of the resignation at that time. For "when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power, then shall he deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father. And, when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all," 1 Cor. xv. 25. Thus he who was appointed to rule in the midst of his enemies during their rebellion shall resign up his commission after their subjection.

But we must not look upon Christ only in the nature of a general who hath received a commission, or of an ambas-

sador with perfect instructions, but of the only Son of God, empowered and employed to destroy the enemies of his Father's kingdom: and though thus empowered and commissioned, though resigning that authority which hath already had its perfect work, yet still the only Son and Heir of all things in his Father's house, never to relinquish his dominion over those whom he hath purchased with his own blood, never to be deprived of that reward which was assigned him for his sufferings; for if the prize which we expect in the race of our imperfect obedience be an immarcescible crown, if the weight of glory which we look for from him be eternal; then cannot his perfect and absolute obedience be crowned with a fading power, or he cease ruling over us, who hath always reigned in us. We shall for ever reign with him, and he will make us priests and kings; but so that he continue still for ever High Priest and King of kings.

The certainty of this eternal dominion of Christ, as man, we may well ground upon the promise made to David, because by reason of that promise Christ himself is called David. For so God speaketh concerning his people: "I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their Shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them. I the Lord have spoken it," Ez. xxxiv. 23. Now the promise was thus made expressly to David: "Thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee; thy throne shall be established for ever," 2 Sam. vii. 16. And although that term "for ever" in the Hebrew language may signify oftentimes no more than a certain duration so long as the nature of the thing is durable, or at the utmost but to the end of all things; and so the economical dominion or kingdom of Christ may be thought sufficiently to fulfil that promise, because it shall certainly continue so long as the nature of that economy requireth, till all things be performed for which Christ was sent, and that continuation will infallibly extend unto the end of all things; yet sometimes also the same term "for ever" signifieth that absolute eternity of future duration which shall have no end at all; and that it is so far to be extended particularly in that promise made to David, and to be fulfilled in his Son,

is as certain as the promise; for the angel Gabriel did give that clear exposition to the blessed virgin, when in this manner he foretold the glory of him who was then to be conceived in her womb: "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke i. 32. Nor is this clearer in Gabriel's explication of the promise than in Daniel's provision of the performance, who "saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed," Dan. vii. 13.

Thus Christ is Lord both by a natural and independent dominion, as God the Creator, and consequently the Owner of the works of his hands; and by a derived, imparted, and dependent right, as man, sent, anointed, raised, and exalted, and so made Lord and Christ; which authority so given and bestowed upon him is partly economical, and therefore to be resigned into the hands of the Father, when all those ends for which it was imparted are accomplished: partly so proper to the union, or due unto the passion of the human nature, that it must be coeval with it, that is, of eternal duration.

The third part of our explication is, the due consideration of the object of Christ's dominion, enquiring whose Lord he is, and how ours. To which purpose first observe the latitude, extent, or rather universality of his power, under which all things are comprehended, as subjected to it. For "he is Lord of all," saith St. Peter, of all things, and of all persons; and he must be so, who made all things as God, and to whom all power is given as man. To him then all things are subjected, whose subjection implieth not a contradiction. "For he hath put all things under his feet: but when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him," 1 Cor. xv. 27. God only then excepted, whose original dominion is repugnant to the least subjection, all things are subject unto Christ, whether they be

things in heaven, or things on earth. In heaven he is far above all principalities and powers, and "all the angels of God worship him;" on earth "all nations are his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth are his possession." Thus Christ is certainly our Lord, because he is the Lord of all; and, when all things were subjected to him, we were not excepted.

But, in the midst of this universality of Christ's regal authority, it will be farther necessary to find some propriety of dominion, by which he may be said to be peculiarly *our* Lord. It is true, he made us, and not we ourselves; we are the work of his hands; but the lowest of his creatures can speak as much. We are still preserved by his power, and as he made us, so doth he maintain us; but at the same time he feedeth the ravens and clotheth the lilies of the field. Wherefore beside his original right of creation, and his continued right of preservation, we shall find a more peculiar right of redemption, belonging properly to the sons of men. And in this redemption, though a single word, we shall find a double title to a most just dominion, one of conquest, another of purchase.

We were first servants of the enemy of God; for him we obeyed, "and his servants we are to whom we obey:" when "Christ through death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil, and delivered us, he spoiled principalities and powers, and made a show of them openly, triumphing over them," Heb. ii. 14; Col. ii. 15. But contrary to the custom of triumphing conquerors, he did not sell, but buy us; because, while he saved us, he died for us, and that death was the price by which he purchased us; even so this dying Victor gave us life: upon the cross, as his triumphant chariot, he shed that precious blood which bought us, and thereby became our Lord by right of redemption, both as to conquest and to purchase.

Beside, he hath not only bought us, but provideth for us; whatever we have, we receive from him as the Master of the family; we hold of him all temporal and eternal blessings, which we enjoy in this or hope for in another life. He is the "Prince of life," and by him we live; he is "the Lord of glory," and we are "called by

his gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord." Wherefore he hath us under his dominion ; and becomes our Lord by right of promotion.

Lastly : men were not anciently sold always by others, but sometimes by themselves ; and whosoever of us truly believe in Christ, have given up our names unto him. In our baptismal vow we bind ourselves unto his service, " that henceforth we will not serve sin ; but yield ourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and our members as instruments of righteousness unto God : " that, " as we have yielded our members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity ; even so we should yield our members servants to righteousness unto holiness," Rom. vi. 6, 13, 19. And thus the same dominion is acknowledged by compact, and confirmed by covenant ; and so Christ becomes our Lord by right of obligation.

The necessity of believing and professing our faith in this part of the article appeareth, first, in the discovery of our condition ; for by this we know that we are not our own, neither our persons nor our actions. " Know ye not," saith St. Paul, " that ye are not your own ? for ye are bought with a price," 1 Cor. vi. 19. And ancient servitude, to which the Scriptures relate, put the servants wholly in the possession of their master ; so that their persons were as properly his as the rest of his goods. And, if we be so in respect of Christ, then may we not live to ourselves, but to him ; for in this the difference of service and freedom doth properly consist : we cannot do our own wills, but the will of him whose we are. Christ took upon him the form of a servant ; and, to give us a proper and perfect example of that condition, he tells us, " I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me," John vi. 38. First therefore we must conclude with the apostle, reflecting upon Christ's dominion and our obligation, that " none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself ; for whether we live, we live unto the Lord : or whether we die, we die unto the Lord : whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's," Rom. xiv. 7.

Secondly : the same is necessary both to enforce and invite us to obedience ; to enforce us, as he is the Lord, to invite us, as Christ the Lord. If we acknowledge our-

selves to be his servants, we must "bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." He who therefore died, and rose, and revived, that he might become the Lord both of the dead and living, maketh not that death and resurrection efficacious to any but such as by their service acknowledge that dominion which he purchased. He, "though he were a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and, being made perfect, he is become the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him," Heb. v. 8. Thus the consideration of the power invested in him, and the necessity of the service due unto him, should force us to obedience; while the consideration of him whom we are thus obliged to serve should allure and invite us. When God gave the law, with fire and thunder, the affrighted Israelites desired to receive it from Moses, and upon that receipt promised obedience. "Go thou near," said they to him, "and hear all that the Lord our God shall say; and speak thou unto us, and we will hear it and do it," Deut. v. 27. If they interpreted it so great a favor to receive the law by the hands of Moses; if they made so ready and cheerful a promise of exact obedience to the law so given; how should we be invited to the same promise, and a better performance, who have received the whole will of God revealed to us by the Son of Man? who are to give an account of our performance to the same Man set down at the right hand of the Father? He first took our nature to become our brother, that with so near a relation he might be made our Lord. If then the patriarchs did cheerfully live in the land of Goshen, subject to the power and command of Egypt, because that power was in the hand of Joseph their exalted brother; shall not we with all readiness of mind submit ourselves to the divine dominion now given to him who gave himself for us? shall all the angels worship him, and all the archangels bow down before him, and shall not we be proud to join with them?

Thirdly: the belief of Christ's dominion is necessary for the regulation of all power, authority, and dominion on earth, both in respect of those who rule, and in relation to those that obey. From hence the most absolute monarchs learn that the people whom they rule are not their own, but the subjects of a greater Prince, by him committed to their charge. Upon this St. Paul doth ground his admo-

nition to masters, "Give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven," Col. iv. 1. God gave a power to the Israelites to make hired servants of their brethren, but not slaves; and gives this reason of the interdiction, "For they are my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen," Lev. xxv. 42. What tenderness then should be used towards those who are the servants of that Lord who redeemed them from a greater bondage, who bought them with a higher price? From hence those who are subject learn to obey the powers which are of human ordination, because in them they obey the Lord of all. Subjects bear the same proportion, and stand in the same relation to their governors, with servants to their masters: and St. Paul hath given them this charge, "Obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ," Col. iii. 22. Neither do we learn from hence only whom, but also how, to obey. For while we look upon one Lord in heaven, while we consider him as the Lord of lords, we regulate our obedience to them by our service due to him, and so are always ready to obey, but "in the Lord."

Lastly: this title of our Saviour is of necessary belief for our comfort and encouragement. For, being Lord of all, he is able to dispose of all things for the benefit of those who serve him. He who commanded the unconstant winds and stilled the raging seas, he who multiplied the loaves and fishes, and created wine with the word of his mouth, hath all creatures now under exact obedience, and therefore none can want whom he undertaketh to provide for; for "the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him." Many are the enemies of those persons who dedicate themselves unto his service; but our enemies are his, and part of his dominion is therefore given him, and to continue in him until all his enemies be made his footstool. Great is the power of the lusts of our flesh, which war in our members; but his grace is sufficient for us, and the power of that Spirit by which he ruleth in us. Heavy are the afflictions which we are called to undergo for his sake; but, if we suffer with him, we shall reign together with him: and

blessed be that dominion which makes us all kings, that he may be for ever Lord of lords, and King of kings.

After this explication, every Christian may perceive what he is to believe in this part of the article, and express himself how he would be understood when he maketh this profession of his faith, "I believe in Christ our Lord." For thereby we may and ought to intend thus much:—I do assent unto this as a certain and infallible truth, taught me by God himself, that Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, is the true Jehovah, who hath that Being which is originally and eternally of itself, and on which all other beings do essentially depend: that, by the right of emanation of all things from him, he hath an absolute, supreme, and universal dominion over all things as God: that as the Son of Man he is invested with all power in heaven and earth; partly economical, for the completing our redemption and the destruction of our enemies, to continue to the end of all things, and then to be resigned to the Father; partly consequent unto the union, or due unto the obedience of his passion, and so eternal, as belonging to that kingdom which shall have no end. And though he be thus Lord of all things by right of the first creation and constant preservation of them, yet he is more peculiarly the Lord of us who by faith are consecrated to his service; for through the work of our redemption he becomes our Lord both by the right of conquest and of purchase; and making us the sons of God, and providing heavenly mansions for us, he acquires a farther right of promotion, which, considering the covenant we all make to serve him, is at last completed in the right of a voluntary obligation. And thus I believe in Christ *our Lord*.

ARTICLE III.

Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary.

THESE words, as they now stand, clearly distinguish the conception of Jesus from his nativity, attributing the first to the Holy Ghost, the second to the blessed virgin: where-

as the ancient creeds made no such distinction; but, without any particular express mention of the conception, had it only in this manner, "who was born by the Holy Ghost of the virgin Mary," or "of the Holy Ghost and the virgin Mary;" understanding by the word *born*, not only the nativity, but also the conception and generation. This is very necessary to be observed, because otherwise the addition of a word will prove the diminution of the sense of the article. For they who speak only of the operation of the Holy Ghost in Christ's conception, and of the manner of his birth, leave out most part of that which was anciently understood under that one term of being born of the Holy Ghost and of the virgin Mary.

That therefore nothing may be omitted which is pertinent to express the full intent, and to comprehend the utmost signification of this article, we shall consider three Persons mentioned, so far as they are concerned in it. The first is he who was conceived and born; the second, he by whose energy or operation he was conceived; the third she who did conceive and bear him.

For the first, the relative in the front of this carries us clearly back to the former article, and tells us that he who was thus conceived and born was Jesus Christ, the only Son of God. And seeing we have already demonstrated that this only Son is therefore called so, because he was begotten by the Father from all eternity, and so of the same substance with him; it followeth that this article at the first beginning, or by virtue of its connexion, can import no less than this most certain, but miraculous truth, that he who was begotten by the Father before all worlds was now in the fulness of time *conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the virgin Mary*. Again: seeing by the conception and birth is to be understood whatsoever was done toward the production of the human nature of our Saviour; therefore the same relative, considered with the words which follow it, can speak no less than the incarnation of that person. And thus even in the entry of the article we meet with the incarnation of the Son of God, that great mystery wrapt up in that short sentence of St. John, "the Word was made flesh."

Indeed the pronoun hath relation not only unto this but

to the following articles, which have their necessary connexion with and foundation in this third; for he who was conceived and born, and so made man, did in that human nature suffer, die, and rise again. Now when we say this was the Word, and that Word was God, seeing whosoever is God cannot cease to be so; it must necessarily follow that he was made man by joining the human nature with the divine. But then we must take heed lest we conceive, because the divine nature belongeth to the Father, to which the human is conjoined, that therefore the Father should be incarnate, or conceived and born. For as certainly as the Son was crucified, and the Son alone; so certainly the same Son was incarnate, and that Son alone. Although the human nature was conjoined with the divinity, which is the nature common to the Father and the Son; yet was that union made only in the person of the Son. Which doctrine is to be observed against the heresy of the Patripassians, which was both very ancient and far diffused, making the Father to be incarnate, and becoming man to be crucified. But this very Creed was always thought to be a sufficient confutation of that fond opinion, in that the incarnation is not subjoined to the first, but to the second article; we do not say, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, which was conceived*, but *in his only Son, our Lord, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost*.

First, then, we believe that he who was made flesh was the Word, that he who took upon him the nature of man was not the Father, nor the Holy Ghost, nor any other person but the only-begotten Son. And, when we say that person was *conceived* and *born*, we declare he was made really and truly man, of the same human nature which is in all other men who by the ordinary way of generation are conceived and born. For the "Mediator between God and man is the Man Christ Jesus;" that, since "by man came death, by man also should come the resurrection of the dead." As sure then as the first Adam and we who are redeemed are men, so certainly is the second Adam and our Mediator man. He is therefore frequently called the Son of Man, and in that nature he was always promised: first to Eve, as her seed, and consequently her Son: then to Abraham, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth

be blessed:" and that seed is Christ, and so the Son of Abraham: next to David, as his "Son to sit upon his throne;" and so "he is made of the seed of David, according to the flesh, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham," and consequently of the same nature with David and with Abraham. And, as he was their son, so are we his brethren, as descending from the same father Adam; "and therefore it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren." For he laid not hold on the angels, but on the seed of Abraham; and so became not an angel, but a man.

As then man consisteth of two different parts, body and soul, so doth Christ. He assumed a body, at his conception, of the blessed virgin. "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same," Heb. ii. 14. The verity of his body stands upon the truth of his nativity; and the actions and passions of his life show the nature of his flesh.

He was first born with a body which was prepared for him, of the same appearance with those of other infants; he grew up by degrees, and was so far from being sustained without the accustomed nutrition of our bodies that he was observed even by his enemies to "come eating and drinking," and, when he did not so, he suffered hunger and thirst. Those ploughers never doubted of the true nature of his flesh, who "ploughed upon his back and made long furrows." The thorns which pricked his sacred temples, the nails which penetrated through his hands and feet, the spear which pierced his sacred side, give sufficient testimony of the natural tenderness and frailty of his flesh. And lest his fasting forty days together, lest his walking on the waters and traversing the seas, lest his sudden standing in the midst of his disciples when the doors were shut, should raise an opinion that his body was not true and proper flesh; he confirmed first his own disciples, "Feel and see, that a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me to have," Luke xxiv. 39. As therefore we believe the coming of Christ, so must we confess him to have come in the verity of our human nature, even in true and proper flesh. With this determinate expression was it always necessary to acknowledge him; for "every spirit that confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh is of God; and every

spirit that confesseth not Jesus Christ come in the flesh is not of God," 1 John iv. 2. This spirit appeared early in opposition to the apostolical doctrine; and Christ, who is both God and man, was as soon denied to be man as God, Simon Magus, the arch-heretic, first began, and many after followed him.

And certainly, if the Son of God would vouchsafe to take the frailty of our flesh, he would not omit the nobler part, our soul, without which he could not be man. For "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature;" one in respect of his body, the other of his soul. Wisdom belongeth not to the flesh, nor can the knowledge of God, which is infinite, increase: he then whose knowledge did improve together with his years must have a subject proper for it, which was no other than a human soul. This was the seat of his finite understanding and directed will, distinct from the will of his Father, and consequently of his divine nature; as appeareth by that known submission, "Not my will, but thine be done." This was the subject of those affections and passions which so manifestly appeared in him; nor spake he any other than a proper language, when before his suffering he said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." This was it which on the cross, before the departure from the body, he recommended to the Father, teaching us in whose hands the souls of the departed are; for "when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father into thy hands I commend my spirit; and having said thus, he gave up the ghost." Luke xxiii. 46. And as his death was nothing else but the separation of the soul from his body; so the life of Christ as Man did consist in the conjunction and vital union of that soul with the body. So that he who was perfect God, was also perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting. Which is to be observed and asserted against the ancient heretics, who taught that Christ assumed human flesh, but that the Word or his divinity was unto that body in the place of an informing soul.

Thus the whole perfect and complete nature of man was assumed by the Word, by him who was conceived and born of a woman, and so made a Man. And seeing the divine nature which he had before could never cease to be what

before it was, nor ever become what before it was not; therefore he who was God before, by the divine nature which he had, was in this incarnation made man by that human nature which he then assumed; and so really and truly was both God and man. And thus this third article, from the conjunction with the second, teacheth us no less than the two natures really distinct in Christ incarnate.

For, if both natures were not preserved complete and distinct in Christ, it must be either by the conversion and transubstantiation of one into the other, or by commixtion and confusion of both into one. But neither of these ways can consist with the person of our Saviour, or the office of our Mediator. For, if we should conceive such a mixtion and confusion of substances as to make a union of natures, we should be so far from acknowledging him to be both God and man that thereby we should profess him to be neither God nor man, but a person of a nature as different from both as all mixed bodies are distinct from each element which concurs unto their composition. Besides, we know that there were in Christ the affections proper to the nature of man, and all those infirmities which belong to us, and cannot be conceived to belong to that nature of which the Divine was but a part. Nor could our humanity be so commixed or confounded with the divinity of our Saviour, but that the Father had been made man as much as the Son, because the Divine nature is the same both of the Father and the Son. Nor ought we to have so low an esteem of that infinite and independent Being as to think it so commixed with, or immersed in, the creature.

Again: as the confusion, so the conversion of natures, is impossible. For, first, we cannot with the least show of probability conceive the divine nature of Christ to be transubstantiated into the human nature; as those whom they call "Flandrian anabaptists," in the Low Countries, at this day maintain. There is a plain repugnancy even in the supposition; for the nature of man must be made, the nature of God cannot be made, and consequently cannot become the nature of man. The immaterial, indivisible, and immortal Godhead cannot be divided into a spiritual and incorruptible soul and a carnal and corruptible body, of which two humanity consisteth. There is no other

Deity of the Father than of the Son : and therefore, if this was converted into that humanity, then was the Father also that man, and grew in knowledge, suffered, and died. We must not therefore so far stand upon the propriety of speech, when it is written, "The Word was made flesh," as to destroy the propriety both of the Word and of the flesh.

Secondly : we must not, on the contrary, invent a conversion of the human nature into the divine, as the Eutychians of old did fancy. For surely the incarnation could not at first consist in such a conversion, it being unimaginable how that which had no being should be made by being turned into something else. Therefore the humanity of Christ could not at the first be made by being the divinity of the Word. Nor is the incarnation so preposterously expressed, as if the flesh were made the Word, but that the Word was made flesh. And if the manhood were not in the first act of incarnation converted into the divine nature, as we see it could not be, then is there no pretence of any time or manner in or by which it was afterwards so transubstantiated. Vain therefore was that old conceit of Eutyches, who thought the union to be made so in the natures that the humanity was absorbed and wholly turned into the divinity, so that by that transubstantiation the human nature had no longer being. And well did the ancient Fathers, who opposed this heresy, make use of the sacramental union between the bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ, and thereby showed that the human nature of Christ is no more really converted into the divinity, and so ceaseth to be the human nature, than the substance of the bread and wine is really converted into the substance of the body and blood, and thereby ceaseth to be both bread and wine. From whence it is by the way observable that the church in those days understood no such doctrine as that of transubstantiation.

Seeing then he that is *conceived* was the *only Son of God*, and that *only Son* begotten of the substance of the Father, and so always subsisted in the divine nature ; seeing by the same conception he was made truly man, and consequently assumed a human nature ; seeing these two natures cannot be made one either by commixtion or conversion, and yet there can be but one Christ subsisting in

them both, because that only Son was he that is conceived and born; it followeth that the union which was not made in the nature was made in the person of the Word; that is, it was not so made that out of both natures one only should result, but only so that to one person no other should be added.

Nor is this union only a scholastic speculation, but a certain and necessary truth, without which we cannot have one Christ, but two Christs, one Mediator, but two Mediators; without which we cannot join the second article of our Creed with the third, making them equally belong to the same person; without which we cannot interpret the sacred Scriptures, or understand the history of our Saviour. For certainly he who was before Abraham was in the days of Herod born of a woman; he who preached in the days of Noah began to preach in the reign of Tiberius, being at that time about thirty years of age; he was demonstrated the Son of God with power, who was the seed of David according to the flesh; he who died on the cross raised him from the dead who died so, being "put to death through the flesh, and quickened by the spirit;" he was "of the fathers according to the flesh," who was "God over all blessed for ever." Seeing these and the like actions and affections cannot come from the same nature, and yet must be attributed to the same person; as we must acknowledge a diversity of natures united, so must we confess the identity of the person in whom they are conjoined, against the ancient heresy of the Nestorians, condemned in the council of Ephesus.

By the Holy Ghost.

HAVING thus despatched the consideration of the first person concerned in this article, and the actions contained in it so far as distinctly from the rest they belong to him, we descend unto the other two concerned in the same; and first to him whose operation did precede in the conception, the Holy Ghost. Which second part some may think to require a threefold consideration; first of the conception; secondly, of the person; thirdly, of the operation. But for the person or existence of the Holy Ghost, that is

here only mentioned obliquely, and therefore to be reserved for another Article, where it is propounded directly. And, for the conception itself, that belongeth not so properly to the Holy Ghost, of whom the act cannot be predicated. For though Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost, yet the Holy Ghost did not conceive him, but said unto the virgin, thou shalt conceive. There remaineth therefore nothing proper and peculiar to this second part, but that operation of the Holy Ghost in Christ's conception whereby the virgin was enabled to conceive, and by virtue whereof Christ is said to be conceived by him.

Now when we say the conception of our Saviour was wrought by the operation of the Spirit, it will be necessary to observe, first, what is excluded by that attribution to the Spirit; secondly, what is included in that operation of the Spirit.

For the first of these, we may take notice in the salutation of the angel, when he told the blessed virgin she should conceive and bring forth a son, she said, how shall this be, seeing I know not a man? Luke i. 34: by which words she excludeth first all men and then herself: all men, by that assertion, I know not a man; herself by the question, How shall this be, seeing it is so? First, our Melchizedek had no father on earth in general; not any man in particular; not Joseph. It is true his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph; but it is as true, before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. We read in St. Luke that the parents brought up the child Jesus into the temple; but these parents were not the father and the mother, but, as it followeth, Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him. It is true, Philip calleth him Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph; and, which is more, his mother said unto him, "Behold thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing;" but this must be only the reputed father of Christ, he being only, as was supposed, the son of Joseph, which was the son of Eli. Whence they must needs appear without all excuse who therefore affirm our Saviour to have been the proper son of Joseph, because the genealogy belongs to him: whereas, in that very place where the genealogy begins, Joseph is called the supposed father.

How can it then therefore be necessary Christ should be the true son of Joseph, that he may be known to be the son of David, when, in the same place where it is proved that Joseph came from David, it is denied that Christ came from Joseph? And that not only in St. Luke, where Joseph begins, but also in St. Matthew, where he ends the genealogy. Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ. Howsoever then the genealogies are described, whether one belong to Joseph, the other to Mary, or both to Joseph, it is from other parts of the Scriptures infallibly certain, not only that Christ descended lineally from David according to the flesh, but also that the same Christ was begotten of the virgin Mary, and not by Joseph.

Secondly, as the blessed virgin excluded all mankind, and particularly Joseph, to whom she was then espoused, by her assertion; so did she exclude herself by the manner of the question, showing that of herself she could not cause any such conception. Although she may be thought the root of Jesse, yet could she not germinate of herself; though Eve were the mother of all living, yet generation was founded on the Divine benediction, which was given to both together: for "God blessed them, and said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth." Though Christ was promised as the seed of the woman, yet we must not imagine that it was in the power of woman to conceive him. When the virgin thinks it impossible she should conceive because she knew not a man, at the same time she confesseth it otherwise as impossible; and the angel acknowledgeth as much in the satisfaction of his answer, For with God nothing shall be impossible. God then it was who immediately and miraculously enabled the blessed virgin to conceive our Saviour; and while Mary, Joseph, and all men are denied, no person who is that God can be excluded from that operation.

But what is included in the conception by the Holy Ghost, or how his operation is to be distinguished from the conception of the virgin, is not so easily determined. The words by which it is expressed in Scripture are very general; first, as they are delivered by way of promise, prediction, or satisfaction, to Mary: "the Holy Ghost shall

come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee;" secondly, as they suppose the conception already past ("When his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost"), and give satisfaction unto Joseph, "Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost." Now, seeing the expressions in the Scriptures are so general that from thence the operation of the Spirit cannot precisely be distinguished from the concurrence of the virgin, much less shall we be able exactly to conclude it by that late distinction made in this article, *conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin*; because it is certain that the same virgin also conceived him according to the prophecy, "Thou shalt conceive and bear a Son;" and therefore, notwithstanding that distinction, the difficulty still remains, how he was conceived by the Spirit, how by the virgin. Neither will any difference of propositions be sufficient rightly to distinguish these operations. Wherefore there is no other way to bound or determine the action of the Holy Ghost, but by that concurrence of the virgin which must be acknowledged with it. For if she were truly the mother of Christ (as certainly she was, and we shall hereafter prove), then is there no reason to deny to her in respect of him whatsoever is given to other mothers in relation to the fruit of their womb; and consequently no more is left to be attributed to the Spirit than what is necessary to cause the virgin to perform the actions of a mother. When the Scripture speaketh of regeneration, or the second birth, it denieth all which belongeth to natural procreation, describing "the sons of God as begotten not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God;" John i. 13; and in the incarnation of our Saviour we remove all will or lust of the flesh, we deny all will of man concurring; but as "the blood," in the language of the Hebrews, did signify that substance of which the flesh was formed in the womb, so we acknowledge in the generation of Jesus Christ that he was made of the substance of his mother.

But as he was so made of the substance of the virgin, so was he not made of the substance of the Holy Ghost,

whose essence cannot at all be made. And, because the Holy Ghost did not beget him by any communication of his essence, therefore he is not the father of him, though he were conceived by him. And if at any time I have said Christ was begotten by the Holy Ghost of the virgin Mary, if the ancients speak as if he generated the Son, it is not so to be understood as if the Spirit did perform any proper act of generation, such as is the foundation of pater-
 nity.

Again: as the Holy Ghost did not frame the human nature of Christ out of his own substance, so must we not believe that he formed any part of his flesh of any other substance than of the virgin. For certainly he was of the fathers according to the flesh, and was as to that truly and totally the Son of David and of Abraham. The Socinians, who will acknowledge no other way before Christ's conception by which he could be the only begotten son of God, have been forced to invent a strange conjunction in the nature of Christ; one part received from the virgin, and so consequently from David and from Abraham, from whom that virgin did descend; another framed by the Spirit, and conjoined with it; by the one part of which humanity he was the Son of Man, as by the other part he was the Son of God.

The belief of this is necessary to prevent all fear or suspicion of spot in this Lamb, of sin in this Jesus. Whatsoever our original corruption is, however displeasing unto God, we may be from hence assured there was none in him, in whom alone God hath declared himself to be well pleased. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" saith Job; a clean and undefiled Redeemer out of an unclean and defiled nature? He whose name is Holiness, whose operation is to sanctify, the Holy Ghost. Our Jesus was like unto us in all things as born of a woman, sin only excepted, *as conceived by the Holy Ghost*. This original and total sanctification of the human nature was first necessary, to fit it for the personal union with the Word, who, out of his infinite love, humbled himself to become flesh, and at the same time, out of his infinite purity, could not defile himself by becoming sinful flesh. Secondly: the same sanctification was as necessary in

respect of the end for which he was made man, the redemption of mankind; that as the first Adam was the fountain of our impurity, so the second Adam should also be the pure fountain of our righteousness. "God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, condemned sin in the flesh;" which he could not have condemned, had he been sent in sinful flesh, Rom. viii. 3. "The Father made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him;" which we could not have been made in him, but that he did no sin and knew no sin, 2 Cor. v. 21. For whosoever is sinful wanteth a Redeemer; and he could have redeemed none who stood in need of his own redemption. We are redeemed "with the precious blood of Christ;" therefore precious, because "of a Lamb without blemish, and without spot," 1 Pet. i. 19. Our atonement can be made by no other High Priest than by him who "is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," Heb. vii. 26. We cannot know that he was manifested to take away our sins, except we also know that in him is no sin. Wherefore, seeing it is so necessary to believe the original holiness of our human nature in the person of our Saviour, it is as necessary to acknowledge that way by which we may be fully assured of that sanctity, his conception by the Holy Ghost.

Again: it hath been observed that by this manner of Christ's conception is declared the freedom of the grace of God. For as the Holy Ghost is God, so is he also called the gift of God: and therefore the human nature in its first original, without any precedent merit, was formed by the Spirit, and in its formation sanctified, and in its sanctification united to the Word; so that the grace was co-existent, and in a manner connatural with it. The mystery of the incarnation is frequently attributed in the Scriptures to the love, mercy, and goodness of God. "Through the tender mercy of our God the day-spring from on high hath visited us;" in this "the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared," Luke i. 78; Tit. iii. 4. And though these and such other Scriptures speak properly of the love and mercy of God to man alone, offered unto him

in the incarnation of our Saviour, and so directly exclude the merits of other men only; yet, because they speak so generally with reference to God's mercy, they may well be thought to exclude all universally. Especially considering the impossibility of merit in Christ's humanity, in respect of his conception; because all desert necessarily precedeth its reward, and Christ was not man before he was conceived, nor can that merit which is not.

Thirdly: whereas we are commanded to be holy, and that even as he is holy; by this we learn from what fountain this holiness must flow. We bring no such purity into the world, nor are we sanctified in the womb; but, as he was sanctified at his conception, so are we at our regeneration. He was conceived not by man, but by the Holy Ghost; and we are "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God," The same overshadowing power which formed his human nature reformeth ours; and the same Spirit assureth us of a remission of our sins which caused in him an exemption from all sin. He who was born for us upon his incarnation is born within us upon our regeneration.

All which considered, we may now render a clear explication of this part of the article, whereby every person may understand what he is to profess, and express what is the object of his faith, when he saith, I believe in Jesus Christ, *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost*. For hereby he ought to intend thus much:—I assent unto this, as a most necessary and infallible truth, that the only-begotten Son of God, begotten by the Father before all worlds, very God of very God, was conceived and born, and so made man, taking to himself the human nature, consisting of a soul and body, and conjoining it with the divine in the unity of his Person. I am fully assured that the Word was in this manner made flesh, that he was really and truly conceived in the womb of a woman, but not after the manner of men; not by the common way of human propagation, but by the singular, powerful, invisible, immediate operation of the Holy Ghost, whereby a virgin was beyond the law of nature enabled to conceive, and that which was conceived in her was originally and completely sanctified. And in this lat-

itude I profess to believe in Jesus Christ, *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost.*

Born of the Virgin Mary.

THE third person considerable in this third article is represented under a threefold description, of her name, condition, and action. The first telleth us who it was, it was Mary; the second informeth us what she was, a virgin; the third teacheth us what she did, she conceived and bare our Saviour, and brought forth the Son of God, which was *born of the Virgin Mary.*

The evangelist, relating the annunciation, takes particular notice of this name; for showing how an angel was sent unto a "virgin espoused to a man," he first observeth that "his name was Joseph," and then that "the virgin's name was Mary," Luke i. 27; not for any peculiar excellency in the name itself, or any particular application to the virgin arising from the origination of it, as some have conceived; but only to denote that singular person, who was then so well known to all men, being espoused unto Joseph, as appeareth by the question of his admiring countrymen, "Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary?" Otherwise the name was common even at that time to many; to the sister of Lazarus, to the mother of James and Joses, to the wife of Cleophas, to the mother of John, whose surname was Mark, to her who was of Magdala in Galilee, to her who bestowed much labor on St. Paul: nor is there any original distinction between the name of these and of the mother of our Lord. For, as the name of Jesus was the same with Joshua, so this of Mary was the same with Miriam. The first of which name recorded was the daughter of Amram, the sister of Moses and Aaron, a prophetess; to whom the bringing of Israel out of Egypt is attributed as well as to her brethren. "For I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt," saith the Lord, "and redeemed thee out of the house of servants; and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam," Mic. vi. 4. As she was exalted to be one of them who brought the people of God out of the Egyptian bondage; so was this Mary exalted to become the mother of that Saviour who through the Red Sea of

his blood hath wrought a plenteous redemption for us, of which that was but a type; and even with the confession of the lowliness of a handmaid she seems to bear that exaltation in her name.

Beside this name of the blessed virgin, little hath been discovered to us. Christ, who commended the faith of the centurion, the love of Mary Magdalen, the excellencies of John the Baptist, hath left not the least encomium of his mother. The evangelists, who have so punctually described the city, family, and genealogy of Joseph, make no express mention of her relations, only of her cousin Elizabeth, who was of the tribe of Levi, "of the daughters of Aaron." Although it be of absolute necessity to believe that he who was born of her descended from the tribe of Judah, and the family of David; yet hath not the Scripture clearly expressed so much of her, nor have we any more than an obscure tradition of her parents, Joacim and Anna.

Wherefore the title added to that name maketh the distinction; for as divers characters are given to several persons by which they are distinguished from all others of the same common nomination, as Jacob is called Israel, and Abraham the Friend of God, or Father of the faithful; so is this Mary sufficiently characterised by that inseparable companion of her name, "the virgin." For the full explication whereof more cannot be required than that we show, first that the Messias was to be born of a virgin, according to the prediction of the prophets; secondly, that this Mary, of whom Christ was born, was really a virgin when she bare him, according to the relations of the evangelists; thirdly, that being at once the mother of the Son of God, and yet a virgin, she continued for ever in the same virginity according to the tradition of the Fathers, and the constant doctrine of the church.

The obdurate Jew, that he might more easily avoid the truth of the second, hath most irrationally denied the first; resolved rather not to understand Moses and the prophets than to acknowledge the interpretation of the apostles. It will therefore be necessary, from those oracles which were committed unto them, to show the promised Messias was to be born after a miraculous manner, to be the son of a woman, not of a man. The first promise of him seems to

speaking no less: "The Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head;" for as the name of "seed" is not generally or collectively to be taken for the generation of mankind, but determinately and individually for that one seed, which is Christ; so the woman is not to be understood with relation unto man, but particularly and determinately to that sex from which alone immediately that seed should come.

According to this first evangelical promise followed that prediction of the prophet, "The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, A woman shall compass a man," Jer. xxxi. 22. That new creation of a man is therefore new, and therefore a creation, because wrought in a woman only, without a man, compassing a man; which interpretation of the prophet is ancient, literal, and clear; and whatsoever the Jews have invented to elude it is frivolous and forced. For while they force the phrase of "compassing a man," in the latter part of the prediction, to any thing else than a conception, they do not only wrest the Scripture, but contradict the former part of the promise, making the new creation, neither new, as being often done, nor a creation, as being easy to perform.

But, if this prophecy of Jeremy seem obscure, it will be sufficiently cleared by that of Isaiah, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his name Emmanuel," Isa. vii. 14. The ancient Jews, immediately upon the promulgation of the gospel, understanding well how near this place did press them, gave three several answers to this text: first, denying that it spake of a virgin at all; secondly, asserting that it could not belong to Jesus; thirdly, affirming that it was fully completed in the person of Hezekiah. Whereas the original word was translated "a virgin," by such interpreters as were Jews themselves, some hundred years before our Saviour's birth. And, did not the notation of the word and frequent use thereof in the Scriptures persuade it, the wonder of the sign given by the Lord himself would evince as much. But as for that conceit that all should be fulfilled in Hezekiah, it is so manifestly and undoubtedly false that nothing can make more for the confirmation of our faith. For this sign was given and this promise made, "a virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son," at some time in the reign of Ahaz, 2 Kings,

xvi. 2. This Ahaz reigned but sixteen years in Jerusalem ; and Hezekiah his son, who succeeded him, was twenty and five years old when he began to reign, and therefore born several years before Ahaz was king, and consequently not now to be conceived when this sign was given. Thus, while the ancient Jews name him only to fulfil the prophecy in whom it is impossible it should be fulfilled, they plainly show that, for any knowledge which they had, it was not fulfilled till our Saviour came: and therefore they cannot with any reason deny but that it belonged unto the Messias, as divers of the ancient Rabbin thought and confessed ; and is yet more evident by their monstrous error, who therefore expected no Messias in Israel, because they thought whatsoever was spoken of him to have been completed in Hezekiah. Which is abundantly enough for our present purpose, being only to prove that the Messias promised by God, and expected by the people of God before and under the law, was to be conceived and born of a virgin.

Secondly: as we are taught, by the predictions of the prophets, that a virgin was to be mother of the promised Messias ; so are we assured, by the infallible relations of the evangelists, that this Mary the mother of Jesus, whom we believe to be Christ, was a virgin when she bare him, when she brought forth her first-born son. That she was a virgin when and after she was espoused unto Joseph appeareth by the narration of St. Luke; for "the Angel Gabriel was sent from God to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph," Luke i. 27. After the salutation of that angel, that she was still so appeareth by her question, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" That she continued so after she conceived by the Holy Ghost is evident from the relation of St. Matthew; for when she was "espoused unto Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." Matt. i. 18. That she was a virgin not only while she was with child, but even when she had brought forth, is also evident out of his application of the prophecy: "Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son," Matt. i. 23. For by the same prediction it is as manifest that a virgin should bring forth, as conceive a Son. Neither was her act of

parturition more contradictory to virginity than that former of conception.

Thirdly : we believe the mother of our Lord to have been not only before and after his nativity, but also for ever, the most immaculate and blessed virgin. For although it may be thought sufficient, as to the mystery of the incarnation, that when our Saviour was conceived and born his mother was a virgin; though whatsoever should have followed after could have no reflective operation upon the first-fruit of her womb; though there be no farther mention in the Creed than that he was born of the virgin Mary; yet the peculiar eminency and unparalleled privilege of that mother, the special honor and reverence due unto that Son, and ever paid by her, the regard of that Holy Ghost who came upon her, and the power of the Highest which overshadowed her, the singular goodness and piety of Joseph, to whom she was espoused, have persuaded the Church of God in all ages to believe that she still continued in the same virginity, and therefore is to be acknowledged the *ever virgin Mary*. As if the gate of the sanctuary in the prophet Ezekiel were to be understood of her, "This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it: because the Lord the God of Israel hath entered in by it, therefore it shall be shut," Ezek. xliv. 2.

Many indeed have taken the boldness to deny this truth, because not recorded in the sacred writ; and not only so, but to assert the contrary as delivered in the Scriptures; but with no success. For though, as they object, St. Matthew testifieth that "Joseph knew not Mary until she had brought forth her first-born Son," from whence they would infer that afterwards he knew her; yet the manner of the Scripture-language produceth no such inference. When God said to Jacob, "I will not leave thee until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of," it followeth not that when that was done, the God of Jacob left him, Gen. xxviii. 15. When the conclusion of Deuteronomy was written, it was said of Moses, "No man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day;" but it were a weak argument to infer from thence that the sepulchre of Moses hath been known ever since; Deut. xxxiv. 6. When Samuel had delivered a severe prediction unto Saul, he

“came no more to see him until the day of his death; but it were a strange collection to infer that he therefore gave him a visit after he was dead; 1 Sam. xv. 25. Michal the daughter of Saul had no child until the day of her death; and yet it were a ridiculous stupidity to dream of any midwifery in the grave; 2 Sam. vi. 23. Christ promised his presence to the apostles until the end of the world; who ever made so unhappy a construction as to infer from thence that for ever after he would be absent from them?

Again: it is true that Christ is termed the “first-born Son of Mary,” from whence they infer she must needs have a second; but they might as well conclude that wheresoever there is one, there must be two. For in this particular the Scripture-notion of priority excludeth an antecedent, but inferreth not a consequent; it supposeth none to have gone before, but concludeth not any to follow after. “Sanctify unto me,” saith God, “all the first-born;” which was a firm and fixed law, immediately obliging upon the birth; whereas, if the first-born had included a relation to a second, there could have been no present certainty, but a suspension of obedience; nor had the first-born been sanctified of itself, but the second birth had sanctified the first. And well might any sacrilegious Jew have kept back the price of redemption due unto the priest, nor could it have been required of him, till a second offspring had appeared; and so no redemption at all had been required for an only son. Whereas all such pretences were unheard of in the law, because the original Hebrew word is not capable of any such construction; and in the law itself it carrieth with it a clear interpretation; “Sanctify unto me all the first-born: whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and beast, it is mine,” Exod. xiii. 2. The aperture of the womb determineth the first-born; and the law of redemption excludeth all such tergiversation: “Those that are redeemed, from a month old thou shalt redeem;” no staying to make up the relation, no expecting another birth to perfect the redemption; Num. xviii. 16. Seeing then they brought our Saviour “to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord; as it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male

that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord :” it is evident he was called the first-born of Mary according to the notion of the law of Moses, and consequently that title inferreth no succession, nor proveth the mother to have any other offspring.

Indeed, as they thirdly object, it cannot be denied but that we read expressly in the Scriptures of the brethren of our Lord : “ He went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren ;” and, “ While he talked unto the people, his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him,” John ii. 12 ; Matt. xii. 46. But although his mother and his brethren be named together, yet they are never called the sons of his mother ; and the question is not whether Christ had any brethren, but whether his mother brought forth any other children. It is possible Joseph might have children before Mary was espoused to him ; and then, as he was reputed and called our Saviour’s father, so might they well be accounted and called his brethren, as the ancient fathers, especially of the Greek church, have taught. Nor need we thus assert that Joseph had any offspring, because the language of the Jews includeth in the name of brethren not only the strict relation of fraternity, but also the larger of consanguinity ; and therefore it is sufficient satisfaction for that expression, that there were such persons allied unto the blessed virgin. “ We be brethren,” said Abraham unto Lot ; when Abraham was the son of Terar, Lot of Haran, and consequently not his brother, but his nephew, and as elsewhere properly styled “ the son of his brother.” “ Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel, the uncle of Aaron, and said unto them, Come near, carry your brethren from before the sanctuary ;” whereas those brethren were Nadab and Abihu, the sons, not of Uzziel, but of Aaron ; Gen. xii. 5 ; Lev. x. 4. “ Jacob told Rachael that he was her father’s brother, and that he was Rebecca’s son ; whereas Rebecca was the sister of Rachael’s father : Gen. xxix. 12. It is sufficient therefore that the evangelists, according to the constant language of the Jews, call the kindred of the blessed virgin the brethren and sisters of her only Son ; which indeed is something the latter, but the most generally approved, answer.

And yet this difficulty, though usually no farther considered, is not fully cleared; for they who impugned the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord urged it farther, pretending that as the Scriptures called them "the brethren of Christ," so they also show them to be the sons of Mary the mother of Christ. For first the Jews express them particularly by their names, "is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas?" Therefore James and Joses were undoubtedly the brethren of Christ, and the same were also as unquestionably the sons of Mary; for among the women at the cross we find "Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses." Again: this Mary they think can be no other than the mother of our Lord, because they find her early in the morning at the sepulchre with Mary Magdalene and Salome, and it is not probable that any should have more care of the body of the son than the mother. She then who was certainly present at the cross was not probably absent from the sepulchre; wherefore they conclude she was the mother of Christ who was the mother of James and Joses, the brethren of Christ.

And now the urging of this argument will produce a greater clearness in the solution of the question. For, if it appear that Mary the mother of James and Joses was different and distinguished from Mary the virgin, then will it also be apparent that the brethren of our Lord were the sons of another mother, for James and Joses were so called. But we read in St. John that "there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene." John xix. 25. In the rest of the Evangelists we find at the same place Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses; and again at the sepulchre, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary; wherefore that other Mary by the conjunction of these testimonies appeareth to be Mary the wife of Cleophas, and the mother of James and Joses; and consequently James and Joses, the brethren of our Lord, were not the sons of Mary his mother, but of the other Mary, and therefore called his brethren, according to the language of the Jews, because that the other Mary was the sister of his mother.

Notwithstanding therefore all these pretensions, there can be nothing found to raise the least suspicion of any interruption of the ever blessed Mary's perpetual virginity. For as she was a virgin when she conceived, and after she brought forth our Saviour; so did she continue in the same state and condition, and was commended by our Saviour to his beloved disciple as a mother only now of an adopted son.

The third consideration belonging to this part of the article is how this virgin was a mother, what the foundation was of her maternal relation to the Son of God, what is to be attributed unto her in this sacred nativity, beside the immediate work of the power of the highest, and the influence of the Holy Ghost. For we are here to remember again the most ancient form of this article briefly thus delivered, "Born of the Holy Ghost and the virgin Mary;" as also that the word "born" was not taken precisely for the nativity of our Saviour, but as comprehending in it whatsoever belonged to his human generation; and when afterward the conception was attributed to the Spirit, the nativity to the virgin, it was not so to be understood as if the Spirit had conceived him, but the blessed virgin by the power and operation of the Spirit.

First, therefore, we must acknowledge a true, real, and proper conception, by which the virgin did conceive of her own substance the true and real substance of our Saviour, according to the prediction of the prophet, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive," and the annunciation of the angel, "Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb." From whence our Saviour is expressly termed by Elizabeth, "the fruit of her womb."

Secondly: as she did at first really and properly conceive, so did she also nourish and increase the same body of our Saviour, once conceived, by the true substance of her own; by which "she was found with child of the Holy Ghost," and is described going with "Joseph to be taxed, being great with child," and pronounced happy by that loud cry of the woman in the gospel, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee," Luke xi. 27.

Thirdly: when Christ was thus conceived and grew in the womb of the blessed virgin, she truly and really did

bring forth her son by a true and proper parturition ; and Christ thereby was properly born by a true nativity. For as we read, " Elizabeth's full time came that she should be delivered, and she brought forth a son ;" so, in the like simplicity of expression and propriety of speech, the same evangelist speaks of Mary : " The days were accomplished that she should be delivered, and she brought forth her first-born son," Luke ii. 6.

Wherefore from these three, a true conception, nutrition, and parturition, we must acknowledge that the blessed virgin was truly and properly the mother of our Saviour. And so is she truly and frequently styled the mother of Jesus in the language of the evangelists, and by Elizabeth particularly " the mother of her Lord," as also by the general consent of the church (because he who was so born of her was God), " the Deipara ;" which being a compound title begun in the Greek church was resolved into its parts by the Latins, and so the virgin was plainly named " the mother of God."

The necessity of believing our Saviour thus to be *born of the virgin Mary* will appear both in respect of her who was the mother, and of him who was the Son.

In respect of her it was therefore necessary that we might perpetually preserve an esteem of her person proportionable to so high a dignity. It was her own prediction, " From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed ;" but the obligation is ours, to call her, to esteem her so. If Elizabeth cried out with so loud a voice, " Blessed art thou among women," when Christ was but newly conceived in her womb ; what expressions of honor and admiration can we think sufficient now that Christ is in heaven, and that mother with him ? Far be it from any Christian to derogate from that special privilege granted her, which is incommunicable to any other. We cannot bear too reverend a regard unto the mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord himself. Let us keep the language of the primitive church ; " Let her be honored and esteemed ; let him be worshipped and adored."

In respect of him it was necessary, first, that we might be assured he was made, or begotten of a woman, and

consequently that he had from her the true nature of man. "For he took not on him the nature of angels," and therefore saved none of them, who, for want of a redeemer, are "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." And man once fallen had been, as deservedly, so irrevocably condemned to the same condition, but that "he took upon him the seed of Abraham." For, seeing we are "partakers of flesh and blood," we could expect no redemption but by him who "likewise took part of the same;" we could look for no Redeemer, but such a one who by consanguinity was our brother. And, seeing there is but one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus, we cannot be assured that he was the Christ, or is our Jesus, except we be first assured that he was a man. Thus our Redeemer, the Man Christ Jesus, was born of a woman, that he might redeem both men and women, that both sexes might rely upon him who was of the one, and from the other.

Secondly: it was necessary we should believe our Saviour conceived and born of such a woman as was a most pure and immaculate virgin. For, as it behoved him in all things to be made like unto us, so in that great similitude a dissimilitude was as necessary, that he should be "without sin." Our Passover is slain, and "behold the Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world;" but the lamb of the passover must be without blemish. Whereas then we draw something of corruption and contamination by our seminal traduction from the first Adam, our Saviour hath received the same nature without any culpable inclination, because born of a virgin without any seminal traduction. Our High Priest is "separate from sinners," not only in the actions of his life, but in the production of his nature. For as Levi was in the loins of Abraham, and paid tithes in him, and yet Christ, though the Son of Abraham, did not pay tithes in him, but receive them in Melchizedec; so though we, being in the loins of Adam, may be all said to sin in him, yet Christ, who descended from the same Adam according to the flesh, was not partaker of that sin, but an expiation for it. For he who is contained in the seminal virtue of his parent is some way under his natural power, and therefore may be

in some manner concerned in his actions ; but he who is only from him by his natural substance, according to a passive or obediential power, and so receiveth not his propagation from him, cannot be so included in him as to be obliged by his actions, or obnoxious to his demerits.

Thirdly : it was necessary that we should believe Christ born of that person, that virgin Mary who was espoused unto Joseph, that thereby we might be assured that he was of the family of David. For whatsoever promises were made of the Messias were appropriated unto him. As the seed of the woman was first contracted to the seed of Abraham, so the seed of Abraham was next appropriated to the Son of David. He was "to be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God was to give unto him the throne of his father David," Luke i. 32. When Jesus asked the Pharisees, "What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? they said unto him, The son of David," Matt. xxii. 42. When Herod demanded of the chief priests and scribes where Christ should be born, "they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judea," because that was the city of David, whither Joseph went up with Mary his espoused wife, because he was of the house and lineage of David. After John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, was born, "Zacharias blessed the Lord God of Israel, who had raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David," Luke i. 69. The woman of Canaan, the blind men sitting by the way, and those other blind that followed him, cried out, "Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou Son of David." The very children, out of whose mouths God perfected praise, were "crying in the temple, and saying, Hosannah to the Son of David," Matt. xxi. 15. And, when the blind and dumb both spake and saw, "all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the Son of David?" Matt. xii. 23. Thus, by the public and concurrent testimonies of all the Jews, the promised Messias was to come of the house and lineage of David ; for "God had sworn with an oath to him, that, of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit upon his throne," Acts ii. 30. It was therefore necessary we should believe that our Saviour "was made of the seed of David according to the flesh ; of which we are assured,

because he was born of that virgin Mary who descended from him, and was espoused unto Joseph, who descended from the same, that thereby his genealogy might be known.

The consideration of all which will at last lead us to a clear explication of this latter branch of the article, whereby every Christian may inform himself what he is bound to profess, and, being informed, fully express what is the object of his faith in this particular when he saith, I believe in Jesus Christ, which *was born of the virgin Mary*. For hereby he is conceived to intend thus much:—I assent unto this, as a most certain and infallible truth, that there was a certain woman, known by the name of Mary, espoused unto Joseph of Nazareth, who before and after her espousals was a pure and unspotted virgin, and, being and continuing in the same virginity, did, by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost, conceive within her womb the only-begotten Son of God, and, after the natural time of other women, brought him forth as her first-born Son, continuing still a most pure and immaculate virgin; whereby the Saviour of the world was born of a woman under the law, without the least pretence of any original corruption, that he might deliver us from the guilt of sin; born of that virgin who was of the house and lineage of David, that he might sit upon his throne, and rule for evermore. And in this latitude I profess to believe in Jesus Christ, *born of the virgin Mary*.

ARTICLE IV.

Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried.

THIS article hath also received some accession in the particular expressions of Christ's humiliation; for the first word of it, now generally speaking of his passion, in the most ancient creeds was no way distinguished from his crucifixion; for as we say, suffered and crucified, they only "crucified under Pontius Pilate;" nor was his crucifixion distinguished from his death, but where we read, *crucified, dead, and buried*, they only "crucified and

buried." Because the chief of his sufferings were on the cross, and he gave up the ghost there, therefore his whole passion and his death were comprehended in his crucifixion.

But again: seeing he suffered not only on the cross; seeing it was possible he might have been affixed to that cursed tree, and not have died; therefore the church thought fit to add the rest of his sufferings, as antecedent, and his death, as consequent, to his crucifixion.

To begin then with his passion in general. In those words, *he suffered under Pontius Pilate*, we are to consider part as substantial, part as circumstantial. The substance of this part of the article consisteth in our Saviour's passion—he suffered; the circumstance of time is added, declared by the present governor—under Pontius Pilate.

Now for the explication of our Saviour's passion, as distinct from those particulars which follow in the article, more, I conceive, cannot be required than that we show who it was that suffered, how he suffered, what it was he suffered.

First: if we would clearly understand him that suffered, in his full relation to his passion, we must consider him both in his office, and his person; as Jesus Christ, and as the only begotten Son of God. In respect of his office, we believe that he who was the Christ did suffer; and so we make profession to be saved by faith in a suffering Messiah. Of which that we may give a just account, first, we must prove that the promised Messiah was to suffer; for, if he were not, then, by professing that our Jesus suffered, we should declare he was not Christ. Secondly, we must show that Jesus, whom we believe to be the Messiah, did really and truly suffer; for, if he did not, then, while we proved the true Messiah was to suffer, we should conclude our Jesus was not that Messiah. Thirdly, it will farther be advantageous, for the illustration of this truth, to manifest that the sufferings of the Messiah were determined and foretold, as those by which he should be known. And, fourthly, it will then be necessary to show that our Jesus did truly suffer whatsoever was determined and foretold. And more than this cannot be necessary to declare who it was that suffered, in relation to his office.

For the first of these, that the promised Messiah was to suffer, to all Christians it is unquestionable; because our Saviour did constantly instruct the Apostles in this truth, both before his death, that they might expect it, and after, that they might be confirmed by it. And one part of the doctrine which St. Paul disseminated through the world was this, "that the Christ must needs have suffered."

But because these testimonies will satisfy only such as believe in Jesus, and our Saviour himself did refer the disbelieving Jews to the law and the prophets, as those who testified of him; we will show from thence, even from the oracles committed to the Jews, "how it was written of the Son of Man, that he must suffer many things:" and "how the Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ." 1 Pet. i. 11.

The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah is beyond all question a sad, but clear, description of a suffering person: "A man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, oppressed and afflicted, wounded and bruised, brought to the slaughter, and cut off out of the land of the living." But the person of whom that chapter treateth was certainly the Messiah, as we have formerly proved by the confession of the most ancient Jews, and may farther be evidenced both from them and from the place itself. For surely no man's soul can be made an offering for our sins, but our Saviour's: nor hath God laid on any man the iniquity of us all, but on our Redeemer. Upon no person but the Messiah could the chastisement of our peace be; nor with any stripes could we be healed, but his. It is sufficiently then demonstrated by the prophet that the suffering Person whom he describes was to be the Christ, in that he bare our griefs and carried our sorrows.

This prediction is so clear, ever since the serpent was to bruise the heel of the woman's seed, that the Jews, who were resolved to expect a Messiah who should be only glorious, have been enforced to invent another who should suffer. And then they answer us with a distinction of their own invention—that a Messiah was to redeem us, and a Messiah was to suffer for us; but the same Messiah was not both to redeem us and to suffer for us. For they say that there are two several persons promised under the name of the Messiah; one of the tribe of Ephraim, the other of the

tribe of Judah; one the Son of Joseph, the other the Son of David; the one to precede, fight, and suffer death, the other to follow, conquer, reign, and never to die. If then our Saviour were a Christ, we must confess he was a suffering Messias, and consequently, according to their doctrine, not a Saviour. For if he were the son of David, then, say they, he was never to die; or, if he ever died, he was not that Messias who was promised to sit upon the throne of David. And while we confess our Saviour died, and withal assert his descent from the house of David, we do, in their opinion, involve ourselves in a contradiction.

But this distinction of a double Messias is far from prevailing over our belief; first, because it is in itself false, and therefore of no validity against us; secondly, because it was first invented to counterfeit the truth, and so very advantageous to us.

That it is in itself false will appear, because the Scriptures never mention any Messias of the tribe of Ephraim; neither was there ever any promise of that nature made to any of the sons or offspring of Joseph. Besides, as we acknowledge but one Mediator between God and man, so the Scriptures never mention any Messias but one. Under whatsoever title he is represented to us, there can be no pretence for a double person. Whether the seed of the woman, or the seed of Abraham; whether Shiloh or the Son of David, still one person promised; and the style of the ancient Jews before our Saviour was, not *they*, but *he* which is to come. The question which was asked him, when he professed himself to be Christ, was, whether it was he which "was to come," or whether they were to look for another? not that they could look for him and for another also. The objection then was that Elias was not yet come, and therefore they expected no Messias till Elias came. Nor can the difference of the Messias's condition be any true reason of imagining a double person, because in the same place the prophets, speaking of the same person, indifferently represent him in either condition. Seeing then, by the confession of all the Jews, one Messias was to be the Son of David, whom Elias was to precede; seeing by the tenor of the Scriptures there was never promise made of more Christs than one, and never the least men-

tion of the tribe of Ephraim with any such relation; it followeth that that distinction is in itself false.

Again: that the same distinction, framed and contrived against us, must needs be in any indifferent person's judgment advantageous to us, will appear because the very invention of a double person is a plain confession of a twofold condition; and the different relations which they prove not are a convincing argument for the distinct economies which they deny not. Why should they pretend to expect one to die and another to triumph, but that the true Messiah was born to triumph and to die, to be humbled and to be exalted, to put on the rags of our infirmity before the robe of majesty and immortality? Why should they tell us of one Mediator to be conquered, and the other to be victorious, but that the serpent was to bruise the heel of the seed of the woman, and the same seed to bruise his head? Thus, even while they endeavour to elude, they confirm our faith; and, as if they were still under the cloud, their error is but as a shadow to give a lustre to our truth. And so our first assertion remaineth firm,—the Messiah was to suffer.

Secondly: that Jesus, whom we believe to be Christ, did suffer, we shall not need to prove, because it is freely confessed by all his enemies. The Gentiles acknowledged it; the Jews triumphed at it. And we may well take that for granted, which is so far from being denied that it is objected. If hunger and thirst, if revilings and contempt, if sorrows and agonies, if stripes and buffetings, if condemnation and crucifixion, be sufferings, Jesus suffered. If the infirmities of our nature, if the weight of our sins, if the malice of man, if the machinations of Satan, if the hand of God could make him suffer, our Saviour suffered. If the annals of time, if the writings of his apostles, if the death of his martyrs, if the confession of the Gentiles, if the scoffs of the Jews be testimonies, Jesus suffered. Nor was there ever any who thought he did not really and truly suffer, but such as withal irrationally pretended he was not really and truly man.

Thirdly: to come yet nearer to the particular acknowledgment of this truth, we shall farther show that the promised Messiah was not only engaged to suffer for us,

but, by a certain and express agreement betwixt him and the Father, the measure and manner of his sufferings were determined, in order to the redemption itself, which was thereby to be wrought; and what was so resolved was before his coming in the flesh revealed to the prophets and written by them, in order to the reception of the Messias, and the acceptation of the benefits to be procured by his sufferings.

That what the Messias was to undergo for us was pre-determined, and decreed appeareth by the timely acknowledgment of the church unto the Father: "Of a truth, against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done," Acts iv. 27, 28. For as, when the two goats were presented before the Lord, that goat was to be offered for a sin offering upon which the lot of the Lord should fall; and that lot of the Lord was lift up on high in the hand of the high priest, and then laid upon the head of the goat which was to die; so the hand of God is said to have determined what should be done unto our Saviour, whose passion was typified by that sin-offering; Let. xvi. 8. And well may we say that the hand of God as well as his counsel determined his passion, because he was "delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," Acts ii. 23.

And this determination of God's counsel was thus made upon a covenant or agreement between the Father and the Son, in which it was concluded by them both what he should suffer, what he should receive. For beside the covenant made by God with man, confirmed by the blood of Christ, we must consider and acknowledge another covenant from eternity made by the Father with the Son: which partly is expressed by the prophet, "If he shall make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days," Isa. liii. 10; partly by the apostle, "Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God," Heb. x. 7. In the condition of making his soul an offering for sin, we see propounded whatsoever he suffered; in the acceptation,

“Lo, I come to do thy will, O God,” we see undertaken whatsoever was propounded. The determination therefore of our Saviour’s passion was made by covenant of the Father who sent, and the Son who suffered.

And as the sufferings of the Messiah were thus agreed on by consent, and determined by the counsel of God, so they were revealed by the Spirit of God unto the prophets, and by them delivered unto the church; they were involved in the types, and acted in the sacrifices. Whether therefore we consider the prophecies spoken by God in the mouths of men, they clearly relate unto his sufferings by proper prediction; or whether we look upon the ceremonial performances, they exhibit the same by an active representation. St. Paul’s apology was clear, that “he said none other things but those which the prophets and Moses did say should come, that Christ should suffer.” The prophets said in express terms that the Messiah, whom they foretold, should suffer; Moses said so in those ceremonies which were instituted by his ministry. When he caused the passover to be slain, he said that Shiloh was the Lamb slain before the foundations of the world. When he set the brazen serpent up in the wilderness, he said, the Son of Man should be lifted up upon the cross. When he commanded all the sacrifices for sin, he said, without effusion of blood there was no remission, and therefore the Son of God must die for the sins of men. When he appointed Aaron to go into the Holy of Holies on the day of atonement, he said, Christ, our High Priest, should never enter through the veil into the heavens, to make expiation for us, but by his own blood. If then we look upon the fountain, the eternal counsel of the will of God, if we look upon the revelation of that counsel, either in express predictions or ceremonial representations; we shall clearly see the truth of our third assertion, that the sufferings of the promised Messiah were predetermined and foretold.

Now all these sufferings which were thus agreed, determined, and revealed as belonging to the true Messiah, were undergone by that Jesus of Nazareth whom we believe to be the true Christ. Never was there any suffering type which he outwent not, never prediction of any passion

which he fulfilled not, never any expression of grief and sorrow which he felt not. When the appointed time of his death approached, he said to his apostles, "Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished," Luke xviii. 31. When he delivered them the blessed sacrament, the commemoration of his death, he said, "Truly the Son of Man goeth as it was determined," Luke xxii. 22. After his resurrection, he chastised the dulness of his disciples, who were so overwhelmed with his passion that they could not look back upon the antecedent predictions; saying unto them, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" Luke xxiv. 25. After his ascension St. Peter made this profession before the Jews, who had those prophecies and saw his sufferings; "Those things which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled," Acts iii. 18. Whatsoever therefore was determined by the counsel of God, whatsoever was revealed by the prophets concerning the sufferings of the Messiah, was all fulfilled by that Jesus whom we believe to be, and worship as, the Christ; which is the fourth and last assertion propounded to express our Saviour's passion in relation to his office.

Having considered him that suffered in his office, we are next to consider him in his person. And, seeing in all this article there is no person expressly named or described, we must look back upon the former, till we find his description and his name. The article immediately preceding leaves us in the same suspension; but for our satisfaction refers us to the former, where we find him named Jesus, and described as the only begotten Son of God.

Now this Son of God we have already showed to be therefore truly called "the only begotten," because he was from all eternity generated of the essence of the Father, and therefore is, as the eternal Son, so also the eternal God. Wherefore by the immediate coherence of the articles, and necessary consequence of the creed, it plainly appeareth that the eternal Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, *suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified,*

dead, and buried. For it was no other person who *suffered under Pontius Pilate* than he who was *born of the virgin Mary*; he who was *born of the virgin Mary* was no other person than he *who was conceived by the Holy Ghost*; he *who was conceived by the Holy Ghost* was no other person than *our Lord*, and that *our Lord* no other than the *only Son of God*: therefore, by the immediate coherence of the articles, it followeth that *the only Son of God, our Lord, suffered under Pontius Pilate.* That Word which was in the beginning, which then was with God and was God, in the fulness of time being made flesh, did suffer. For “the princes of this world crucified the Lord of glory;” and “God purchased his church with his own blood.” That Person who was begotten of the Father before all worlds, and so was really the Lord of glory and most truly God, took upon him the nature of man, and in that nature, being still the same Person which before he was, did suffer. When our Saviour fasted forty days, there was no other person hungry than that Son of God who made the world; when he sat down weary by the well, there was no other person felt that thirst but he who was eternally begotten of the Father, the fountain of the Deity; when he was buffeted and scourged, there was no other person sensible of those pains than that eternal Word which before all worlds was impassible; when he was crucified and died, there was no other person who gave up the ghost but the son of him, and so of the same nature with him, who only hath immortality. And thus we conclude our first consideration propounded, *viz.* who it was that suffered; affirming that, in respect of his office, it was the Messiah, in respect of his person, it was God the Son.

But the perfect probation and illustration of this truth requireth first a view of the second particular propounded—how, or in what he suffered. For, while we prove the Person suffering to be God, we may seem to deny the passion, of which the perfection of the godhead is incapable. The divine nature is of infinite and eternal happiness, never to be disturbed by the least degree of infelicity, and therefore subject to no sense of misery. Wherefore, while we profess that the Son of God did suffer for us, we must so far explain our assertion as to deny that the divine

nature of our Saviour suffered. For seeing the divine nature of the Son is common to the Father and the Spirit, if that had been the subject of his passion, then must the Father and the Spirit have suffered. Wherefore, as we ascribe the passion to the Son alone, so must we attribute it to that nature which is his alone, that is, the human. And then neither the Father nor the Spirit will appear to suffer, because neither the Father nor the Spirit, but the Son alone, is man, and so capable of suffering.

Whereas then the humanity of Christ consisted of a soul and body, these were the proper subjects of his passion; nor could he suffer any thing but in both or either of these two. For as the Word was made flesh, though the Word was never made (as being in the beginning God), but the flesh, that is, the humanity, was made, and the Word assuming it became flesh; so saith St. Peter, "Christ suffered for us in the flesh," in that nature of man which he took upon him; and so God the Son did suffer, not in that nature in which he was begotten of the Father before all worlds, but in that flesh which by his incarnation he became. For he was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit;" suffered in the weakness of his humanity, but rose by the power of his divinity. As "he was made of the seed of David according to the flesh," in the language of St. Paul, so was "he put to death in the flesh," in the language of St. Peter; and as he was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of Holiness," so was "he quickened by the Spirit." Thus the proper subject and recipient of our Saviour's passion, which he underwent for us, was that nature which he took from us.

Far be it therefore from us to think that the Deity, who is immutable, could suffer; who only hath immortality, could die. The conjunction with humanity could put no imperfection upon the divinity; nor can that infinite nature by any external acquisition be any way changed in its intrinsic and essential perfections. If the bright rays of the sun are thought to insinuate into the most noisome bodies without any pollution of themselves, how can that spiritual essence contract the least infirmity by any union with humanity? We must neither harbour so low an estimation of

the divine nature, as to conceive it capable of any diminution ; nor so mean esteem of the essence of the Word as to imagine it subject to the sufferings of the flesh he took ; nor yet so groundless an estimation of the great mystery of the incarnation as to make the properties of one nature mix in confusion with the other. These were the wild collections of the Arian and Apollinarian heretics, whom the church hath long since silenced by a sound and sober assertion, that all the sufferings of our Mediator were subjected in his human nature.

And now the only difficulty will consist in this, how we can reconcile the Person suffering with the subject of his passion ; how we can say that God did suffer, when we profess the godhead suffered not. But this seeming difficulty will admit an easy solution, if we consider the intimate conjunction of the divine and human nature, and their union in the person of the Son. For hereby those attributes which properly belong unto the one are given to the other ; and that upon good reason. For seeing the same individual Person is, by the conjunction, of the nature of God and the nature of man, really and truly both God and man ; it necessarily followeth that it is true to say, " God is man," and as true, " A man is God : " because in this particular he who is man is God, and he who is God is man.

Again : seeing by reason of the incarnation it is proper to say " God is man," it followeth unavoidably that whatsoever necessarily belongeth to the human nature may be spoken of God ; otherwise there would be a man to whom the nature of man did not belong, which were a contradiction. And seeing by virtue of the same incarnation it is also proper to say, A man is God, by the same necessity of consequence we must acknowledge that all the essential attributes of the Divine nature may truly be spoken of that man ; otherwise there would be one truly and properly God to whom the nature of God did not belong, which is a clear repugnancy.

Again : if the properties of the divine nature may be truly attributed to that man who is God, then may those actions which flow from those properties be attributed to the same. And seeing the properties of the human nature may be also attributed to the eternal Son of God, those

actions or passions which did proceed from those properties may be attributed to the same Son of God, or God the Son. Wherefore as God the Son is truly man, and as man truly passible and mortal; so God the Son did truly suffer, and did truly die. And this is the only true communication of properties.

Not that the essential properties of one nature are really communicated to the other nature, as if the divinity of Christ were passible and mortal, or his humanity of original omnipotence and omnipresence; but, because the same God the Son was also the Son of Man, he was at the same time both mortal and eternal; mortal, as the Son of Man, in respect of his humanity; eternal, as the Son of God, in respect of his divinity. The sufferings therefore of the Messiah were the sufferings of God the Son: not that they were the sufferings of his Deity, as of which that was incapable; but the sufferings of his humanity, as unto which that was inclinable. For, although the human nature was conjoined to the divine, yet it suffered as much as if it had been alone; and the divine as little suffered as if it had not been conjoined: because each kept their respective properties distinct, without the least confusion in their most intimate conjunction. From whence at last the person suffering is reconciled to the subject of his passion: for God the Son being not only God, but also man, suffered, though not in his Deity, by reason of which he is truly God; yet in his humanity, by which he who is truly God is as truly man. And thus we conclude our two first disquisitions; who it was that suffered; in respect of his office, the Messiah; in respect of his person, God the Son; how it was he suffered; not in his Deity, which is impassible, but in his humanity, which he assumed, clothed with our infirmities.

Our next inquiry is—what this God the Son did suffer as the Son of Man; not in the latitude of all his sufferings, but so far as they are comprehended in this article; which first prescindeth all the antecedent part by the expression of time, *under Pontius Pilate*, who was not governor of Judea long before our Saviour's baptism; and then takes off his concluding passion, by adding his crucifixion and his death. Looking then upon the sufferings of our Saviour in

the time of his preaching the gospel, and especially before his death, we shall best understand them by considering them in relation to the subject or recipient of them. And seeing we have already showed his passion was wholly subjected in his human nature, seeing that nature consisteth of two parts, the soul and body; it will be necessary to declare what he suffered in the body, what in the soul.

For the first, as we believe the Son of God took upon him the nature of man, of which the body is a part, so we acknowledge that he took a true and real body, so as to become flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone. This body of Christ, really and truly human, was also frail and mortal, as being accompanied with all those natural properties which necessarily flow from the condition of a frail and mortal body; and though now the same body, exalted above the highest heavens, by virtue of its glorification be put beyond all possibility of passion, yet in the time of his humiliation it was clothed with no such glorious perfection; but as it was subject unto, so it felt weariness, hunger, and thirst. Nor was it only liable to those internal weaknesses and natural infirmities, but to all outward injuries and violent impressions. As all our corporal pain consists in that sense which ariseth from the solution of that continuity which is connatural to the parts of our body, so no parts of his sacred body were injuriously violated by any outward impression, but he was truly and fully sensible of the pain arising from that violation. Deep was that sense and grievous was that pain which those scourges produced, "when the ploughers ploughed upon his back and made long their furrows;" the dilaceration of those nervous parts created a most sharp and dolorous sensation. The coronary thorns did not only express the scorn of the imposers, by that figure into which they were contrived; but did also pierce his tender and sacred temples to a multiplicity of pains, by their numerous acuminations. That spear directed by an impertinent malice which opened his side, though it brought forth water and blood, caused no dolorous sensation, because the body was then dead; but the nails which pierced his hands and feet made another kind of impression, while it was yet alive and highly sensible.

Thus did the body of the Son of Man truly suffer the bitterness of corporal pains and torments inflicted by violent external impressions.

And as our Saviour took upon him both parts of the nature of man, so he suffered in them both, that he might be a Saviour of the whole. In what sense the soul is capable of suffering, in that he was subject to animal passion. Evil apprehended to come tormented his soul with fear, which was as truly in him in respect of what he was to suffer, as hope in reference to the recompense of a reward to come after and for his sufferings. Evil apprehended as present tormented the same with sadness, sorrow, and anguish of mind. So that he was truly represented to us by the prophet, as "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" and the proper subject of that grief he hath fully expressed who alone felt it, saying unto his disciples, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death."

We ought not therefore to question whether he suffered in his soul or no; but rather to endeavour to reach, if it were possible, the knowledge how far and in what degree he suffered; how bitter that grief, how great that sorrow and that anguish was. Which though we can never fully and exactly measure, yet we may infallibly know thus much, both from the expressions of the Spirit of God, and from the occasion of his sufferings, that the griefs and sorrows which he felt, and the anguish which he underwent, were most incomparably far beyond all sorrows of which any person here was sensible or capable.

The evangelists have in such language expressed his agony as cannot but raise in us the highest admiration at the bitterness of that passion. "He began to be sorrowful," saith St. Matthew: "He began to be sore amazed," saith St. Mark; "and to be very heavy," say both: and yet these words in our translation come far short of the original expressions, which render him suddenly, upon a present and immediate apprehension, possessed with fear, horror, and amazement, encompassed with grief, and overwhelmed with sorrow, pressed down with consternation and dejection of mind, tormented with anxiety and disquietude of spirit.

This he first expressed to his disciples, saying "My soul is exceeding sorrowful;" and, lest they should not fully ap-

prehend the excess, adding, "even unto death;" as if the pangs of death had already encompassed him, and, as the psalmist speaks, the pains of hell had got hold upon him. He went but a little farther before he expressed the same to his Father, falling on his face and praying, even "with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death," Heb. v. 7. Nor were his cries or tears sufficient evidences of his inward sufferings, nor could the sorrows of his breast be poured forth either at his lips or eyes; the innumerable pores of all his body must give a passage to more lively representations of the bitter anguish of his soul; and therefore, while he prayed more earnestly, in that agony "his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground." As the psalmist had before declared, "I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels," Psal. xxii. 14. The heart of our Saviour was as it were melted with fear and astonishment, and all the parts of his body at the same time inflamed with anguish and agony; well then might that melting produce a sweat, and that inflamed and rarefied blood force a passage through the numerous pores.

And as the evangelist's expressions, so the occasion of the grief, will manifest the height and bitterness thereof. For God laid on his own Son "the iniquities of us all;" and as we are obliged to be sorry for our particular sins, so was he grieved for the sins of us all. If then we consider the perfection and latitude of his knowledge, he understood all the sins of men for which he suffered, all the evil and the guilt, all the offence against the Majesty, and ingratitude against the goodness of God, which was contained in all those sins. If we look upon his absolute conformity to the will of God, he was inflamed with most ardent love, he was most zealous of his glory, and most studious to preserve that right which was so highly violated by those sins. If we look upon his relation to the sons of men, he loved them all far more than any did themselves; he knew those sins were of themselves sufficient to bring eternal destruction on their souls and bodies, he considered them whom he so much loved as lying under the wrath of God whom he so truly worshipped. If we reflect upon

those graces which were without measure diffused through his soul, and caused him with the greatest habitual detestation to abhor all sin, if we consider all these circumstances, we cannot wonder at that grief and sorrow. For if the true contrition of one single sinner, bleeding under the sting of the law only for his own iniquities, all which notwithstanding he knoweth not, cannot be performed without great bitterness of sorrow and remorse; what bounds can we set unto that grief, what measures to that anguish, which proceedeth from a full apprehension of all the transgressions of so many millions of sinners?

Add unto all these present apprehensions the immediate hand of God pressing upon him all this load, laying on his shoulders at once a heap of all the sorrows which can happen unto any of the saints of God; that he, being "touched with the feeling of our infirmities," might become "a merciful High Priest," able and willing "to succor them that are tempted." Thus may we "behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto that sorrow which was done unto him, wherewith the Lord afflicted him in the day of his fierce anger," Lam. i. 12. And from hence we may and must conclude that the Saviour of man, as he took the whole nature of man, so he suffered in whatsoever he took; in his body, by internal infirmities and external injuries; in his soul, by fears and sorrows, by unknown and inexpressible anguishes. Which shows us fully (if it can be shown) the third particular propounded—what our Saviour suffered.

That our Saviour did thus suffer is most necessary to believe; first, that thereby we may be assured of the verity of his human nature. For, if he were not man, then could not man be redeemed by him; and, if that nature in which he appeared were not truly human, then could he not be truly man. But we may be well assured that he took on him our nature, when we see him subject unto our infirmities. We know the Godhead is of infinite perfection, and therefore is exalted far above all possibility of molestation. When therefore we see our Saviour truly suffer, we know his divine essence suffered not, and thence acknowledge the addition of his human nature, as the proper subject of his passion. And from hence we may infallibly conclude, surely that Mediator between God and man was truly man,

as we are men, who when he fasted was hungry, when he travelled was thirsty and weary as we are, who being grieved wept, being in an agony sweat, being scourged bled, and being crucified died.

Secondly : it was necessary Christ should suffer for the redemption of lapsed men, and their reconciliation unto God ; which was not otherwise to be performed than by a plenary satisfaction to his will. He therefore was by all his sufferings made an expiation, atonement, and propitiation for all our sins. For salvation is impossible unto sinners without remission of sin, and remission in the decree of God is impossible without effusion of blood. Our redemption therefore could not be wrought but by the blood of the Redeemer, but by a Lamb slain, but by a suffering Saviour.

Thirdly : it behoved Christ to suffer, that he might purchase thereby eternal happiness in the heavens both for himself the Head, and for the members of his body. "He drunk of the brook in the way, therefore hath he lift up his head," Ps. cx. 7. "Ought not Christ to suffer, and so to enter into his own glory?" Luke xxiv. 26. And doth he not, by the same right by which he entered into it, confer that glory upon us? The recompense of the reward was set before him, and through an intuition of it he cheerfully underwent whatsoever was laid upon him. He must therefore necessarily suffer to obtain that happiness, who is therefore happy because he suffered.

Fourthly : it was necessary Christ should suffer that we might be assured that he is truly affected with a most tender compassion of our afflictions. For this end was he subjected to misery, that he might become prone unto mercy : for this purpose was he made a sacrifice, that he might be a compassionate High Priest : and therefore was he most unmerciful to himself, that he might be most merciful unto us.

Fifthly : it was necessary the Son of Man should suffer, thereby to show us that we are to suffer, and to teach us how we are to suffer ; for, "if these things were done to the green tree, what shall be done to the dry?" Nay, if God spared not his natural, his eternal, his only-begotten Son ; how shall he spare his adopted sons, who are best known to be children because they are chastised, and appear to be

in his paternal affection because they lie under his fatherly correction? We are therefore heirs, only because coheirs with Christ; and we shall be kings, only because we shall reign together with him. It is a certain and infallible consequence, "If Christ be risen, then shall we also rise;" and we must look for as strong a coherence in this other—if Christ hath suffered, then must we expect to suffer. And as he taught the necessity of, so he left us the direction in our sufferings. Great was the example of Job, but far short of absolute perfection. The pattern beyond all exception is alone our Saviour, who hath taught us in all our afflictions the exercise of admirable humility, perfect patience, and absolute submission unto the will of God.

And now we may perceive the full importance of this part of the article, and every Christian may thereby understand what he is to believe, and what he is conceived to profess, when he makes this confession of his faith, *he suffered*. For hereby every one is obliged to intend thus much:—I am really persuaded within myself, and do make a sincere profession of this as a most necessary, certain, and infallible truth, that the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father, and of the same essence with the Father, did for the redemption of mankind really and truly suffer; not in his divinity, which was impassible, but in his humanity, which in the days of his humiliation was subject unto our infirmities: that, as he is a perfect Redeemer of the whole man, so he was a complete sufferer in the whole; in his body, by such dolorous infirmities as arise internally from human frailties, and by such pains as are inflicted by external injuries; in his soul, by fearful apprehensions, by unknown sorrows, by anguish inexpressible. And in this latitude and propriety I believe our Saviour *suffered*.

Under Pontius Pilate.

AFTER the substance of this part of the article, consisting in our Saviour's passion, *he suffered*, followeth the circumstance of time, declared by the present governor, *under Pontius Pilate*. Which, though the name of a stranger to the commonwealth of Israel and the church of Christ, is well preserved to eternal memory in the sacred articles of

our Creed. For, as the Son of God by his determinate counsel was sent into the world to die in the fulness of time, so it concerns the church to be assured of the time in which he died. And because the ancient custom of the world was to make their computations by their governors, and refer their historical relations to the respective times of their government; therefore, that we might be properly assured of the actions of our Saviour which he did, and of his sufferings (that is, the actions which others did to him), the present governor is named in that form of speech which is proper to such historical or chronological narrations, when we affirm that he suffered *under Pontius Pilate*.

And because he not only suffered under him as the present governor, but also was arraigned and condemned by him as a judge; therefore it will be necessary for the illustration of the manner, and confirmation of the truth, of our Saviour's sufferings, to declare what hath been left and delivered to our knowledge, both concerning his person and his office.

• For the first, we find him described by two names: nor is any other name of his extant, although, according to the general custom of the Romans, he should have three. The first of these two is *Pontius*, the name descending to him from the original of his family, which was very ancient; the second *Pilatus*, as a cognominal addition distinguishing from the rest descending from the same original.

He was by birth a Roman, by degree of the equestrian order, sent by Tiberius the emperor to be a governor in Judea. For about threescore years before our Saviour's birth, the Jews by Pompey the Great were made tributary to the Romans. And although during the life of Hircanus the High Priest, the reign of Herod, and his son Archelaus, the Roman state suffered the Jews to be ruled by their own laws and governors; yet, when Archelaus was banished by Augustus, they received their governors from the Roman emperor, being made a part of the province of Syria, belonging to his care. In the life of Augustus there was a succession of three, Coponius, Ambivius, and Rufus. At the beginning of the reign of Tiberius they were governed by Valerius Gracchus, and at his departure by Pontius Pilate.

The office which this Pilate bare was the procuratorship of Judea, as is most evident out of the history both of the Romans, from whom he received his authority, and of the Jews, over whom he exercised his dominion. But what was the office of a procurator in those times, though necessary for our present purpose, is not so easy to determine, because it was but newly introduced into the Roman government. For, before the dominion of that city was changed from a commonwealth into an empire, there was no such public office in any of the provinces, and particularly in Judea none till after the banishment of Archelaus, some years after our Saviour's birth. When Augustus divided the provinces of the empire into two parts, one of which he kept for his own care, and left the other to the inspection of the senate, he sent, together with the president of each province, as the governor in chief of the province, a procurator, whose office was to take an account of all the tribute, and whatsoever else was due to the emperor, and to order and dispose of the same for his advantage. Neither was there at the first institution of this office any other act belonging properly to their jurisdiction, but such a care and disposal of the imperial revenue; which they exercised as inferior and subordinate to the president, always supreme provincial officer.

Now Judea being made part of the province of Syria, and consequently under the care of the president of that province, according to this institution, a particular procurator was assigned unto it for the disposing of the emperor's revenue. And because the nation of the Jews were always suspected of a rebellious disposition against the Roman state, and the president of Syria, who had the power of the sword, was forced to attend upon the other parts of his province; therefore the procurator of Judea was furnished with power of life and death, and so administered all the power of the president, which was, as to the Jews, supreme. Which is very observable, as an eminent act of the providence of God, by which the full power of judicature in Judea was left in the hands of the resident procurator.

For by this means it came to pass that Christ, who by the determinate counsel of God was to die, and by the pre-

diction of the prophets was to suffer in a manner not prescribed by the law of Moses, should be delivered up to a foreign power, and so suffer death after the customs of that nation to whose power he was delivered. The malice of the obstinate Jews was high to accuse and prosecute him; but the power of the Jews was not so high as judicially to condemn him. For although the chief priests and the elders and the scribes condemned him to be guilty of death, yet they could not condemn him to die, or pronounce the sentence of death upon him, but delivered him up unto Pilate; and when he refusing said unto them, "Take ye him, and judge him according to your law;" they immediately returned, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death," John xviii. 30. The power of life and death was not in any court of the Jews, but in the Roman governor alone as supreme; and therefore they answered him, it was not lawful; not in respect of the law of Moses, which gave them both sufficient power and absolute command to punish divers offenders with death; but in relation to the Roman empire, which had taken all that dominion from them. Forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem the Jews themselves acknowledge that they lost their power; which is sufficient to show that they had it not when our Saviour suffered; and it is as true that they lost it twenty years before, at the relegation of Archelaus, and the coming of Coponius the procurator, with full power of life and death. Wherefore our Saviour was delivered unto Pilate as the supreme judge over the nation of the Jews, that he might pronounce the sentence of death upon him.

But how this judge could be persuaded to an act of so much injustice and impiety is not yet easy to be seen. The numerous controversies of the religion of the Jews did not concern the Roman governors, nor were they moved with the frequent quarrels arising from the different sects. Pilate knew well it was for envy that the chief priests delivered him; and when "he had examined him he found no fault touching those things whereof they accused him." Three times did he challenge the whole nation of the Jews, "Why? what evil hath he done?" Three times did he make that clear profession, "I have found no cause of death in him." His own wife, admonished in a dream, sent

unto him, saying, "Have thou nothing to do with that just man:" and, when he heard that "he made himself the Son of God, he was the more afraid;" and yet, notwithstanding these apprehensions and professions, he condemned and crucified him.

Here we must look upon the nature and disposition of Pilate, which inclined and betrayed him to so foul an act. He was a man of a high, rough, untractable, and irreconcilable spirit, as he is described by the Jews, and appeareth from the beginning of his government, when he brought the bucklers stampt with the pictures of Cæsar into Jerusalem, which was an abomination to the Jews; and could neither be moved by the blood of many, nor persuaded by the most humble applications and submissive entreaties of the whole nation, to remove them, till he received a sharp reprehension and severe command from the emperor Tiberius. After that, he seized on the corban, that sacred treasury, and spent it upon an aqueduct, nor could all their religious and importunate petitions divert his intentions, but his resolution went through their blood to bring in water. When the Galileans came up to Jerusalem to worship God, at his own temple, "he mingled their blood with their sacrifices," Luke xiii. 1. Add to this untractable and irreconcilable spirit, by which he had so often exasperated the Jews, an avaricious and rapacious disposition, which prompted him as much to please them, and we may easily perceive what moved him to condemn that Person to death whom he declared innocent. The evangelist telleth us that "Pilate, willing to content the people, released Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus to be crucified," Mark xv. 15. They accused him at Rome for all the insolences and rapines which he had committed, and by this act he thought to pacify them.

It was thus necessary to express the person under whom our Saviour suffered, first, that we might be for ever assured of the time in which he suffered. The enemies of Christianity began first to unsettle the time of his passion, that thereby they might at last deny the passion itself; and the rest of their falsehood was detected by the discovery of their false chronology. Some fixed it to the seventh year of the reign of Tiberius, whereas it is certain Pontius

Pilate was not then procurator in Judea; and as certain that our Saviour was baptized eight years after, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar. Some of the Jews, lest the destruction of Jerusalem might seem to follow upon, and for our Saviour's crucifixion, have removed it nearly threescore years more backward yet, placing his death in the beginning of Herod's reign, who was not born till toward the death of the same king. Others have removed it farther yet nearly twenty years, and so vainly tell us how he died under Aristobulus, above fifty years before his birth in Bethlehem. This they do teach their proselytes, to this end, that they may not believe so much as the least historical part of the blessed evangelists. As therefore they deny the time of our Saviour's passion, in design to destroy his doctrine; so, that we might establish the substance of the Gospel depending on his death, it was necessary we should retain a perfect remembrance of the time in which he died. Nor need we be ashamed that the Christian religion, which we profess, should have so known an epocha, and so late an original. Christ came not into the world at the beginning of it, but "in the fulness of time."

Secondly: it was thought necessary to include the name of Pilate in our Creed, as of one who gave a most powerful external testimony to the certainty of our Saviour's death, and the innocence of his life. He did not only profess, to the condemnation of the Jews, that he found nothing worthy of death in Christ; but left the same written to the Gentiles of the Roman empire. Two ways he is related to have given most ample testimony to the truth; first, by an express written to Tiberius, and by him presented to the senate; secondly, by records written in tables of all things of moment which were acted in his government.

Thirdly: it behoved us to take notice of the Roman governor, in the expression of our Saviour's passion, that thereby we might understand how it came to pass that Christ should suffer according to the Scriptures. The prophets had foretold his death, but after such a manner as was not to be performed by the Jews, according to whose law and custom no man among them ever so died. Seeing then so great a Prophet could not die but in Jerusalem,

seeing the death he was to suffer was not agreeable to the laws and customs of the Jews ; it was necessary a Roman governor should condemn him, that so the counsel of the will of God might be fulfilled, by the malice of the one and the customs of the other.

And, now the advantage of this circumstance is discovered, every one may express the importance of it in this manner :—I am fully persuaded of this truth, as beyond all possibility of contradiction, that in the fulness of time God sent his Son, and that the eternal Son of God, so sent by him, did suffer for the sins of men, after the fifteenth year of Tiberius the Roman emperor, and before his death, in the time of Pontius Pilate the Cæsarean procurator of Judea ; who, to please the nation of the Jews, did condemn him whom he pronounced innocent, and delivered him according to the custom of that empire, and in order to the fulfilling of the prophecies, to die a painful and shameful death upon the cross. And thus I believe in Christ that *suffered under Pontius Pilate.*

Was Crucified.

FROM the general consideration of our Saviour's passion, we proceed to the most remarkable particular, his crucifixion, standing between his passion, which it concludeth, and his death, which it introduceth. For the explication whereof it will be necessary, first, to prove that the promised Messiah was to be crucified, that he who was designed to die for our sins was to suffer upon the cross ; secondly, to show that our Jesus whom we worship was certainly and truly crucified, and did suffer, whatsoever was so foretold, upon the cross ; thirdly, to discover what is the nature of crucifixion, what peculiarities of suffering are contained in dying on the cross.

That the Messiah was to be crucified appeareth both by types which did apparently foreshow it, and by prophecies which did plainly foretell it. For, though all those representations and predictions which the forward zeal of some ancient fathers gathered out of the law and the prophets cannot be said to signify so much, yet in many types was the crucifixion of Christ represented, and by some proph-

cies foretold. This was the true and unremoveable stumbling-block to the Jews, nor could they ever be brought to confess the Messiah should die that death upon a tree to which the curse of the law belonged ; and yet we need no other oracles than such as were committed to those Jews to prove that Christ was so to suffer.

A clearer type can scarcely be conceived of the Saviour of the world, in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed, than Isaac was ; nor can God the Father, who gave his only-begotten Son, be better expressed than by that patriarch in his readiness to sacrifice his Son, " his only son Isaac, whom he loved." Now, when that grand act of obedience was to be performed, we find Isaac walking to the mountain of Moriah with the wood on his shoulders, and saying, " Here is the wood, but where is the sacrifice ?" while in the command of God, and the intention and resolution of Abraham, Isaac is the sacrifice who bears the wood. And the Christ, who was to be the most perfect sacrifice, the person in whom all nations were perfectly to be blessed, could die no other death in which the wood was to be carried ; and seeing to die upon the cross was, by the formal custom used in that kind of death, certainly to carry it. Therefore Isaac bearing the wood did presignify Christ bearing the cross.

When the fiery serpents bit the Israelites, and much people died, Moses, by the command of God, " made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole ; and it came to pass that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived," Numb. xxi. 9. Now if there were no more express promise of the Messiah than the seed of the woman, which should bruise the serpent's head ; if he were to perform that promise by the virtue of his death ; if no death could be so perfectly represented by the hanging on the pole as that of crucifixion ; then was that manifestly foretold which Christ himself informed Nicodemus, " As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up," John iii. 14.

The paschal lamb did plainly typify that Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world ; and the preparing of it did not only represent the cross, but the command or ordinance of the passover did foretel as much. For while

it is said, "Ye shall not break a bone thereof," *Exod. xii. 46*: it was thereby intimated that the Saviour of the world should suffer that death to which the breaking of the bones belonged (and that, according to the constant custom, was the punishment of crucifixion), but only in that death should by the providence of God be so particularly preserved as that not one bone of his should be touched. And thus the crucifixion of the *Messias* in several types was represented.

Nor was it only thus prefigured and involved in these typical resemblances, but also clearly spoken by the prophets in their particular and express predictions. Nor shall we need the accession of any lost or additional prophetic expressions, which some of the ancients have made use of: those which are still preserved, even among the Jews, will yield this truth sufficient testimonies.

When God foretels, by the Prophet *Zechariah*, what he should suffer from the sons of men, he says expressly, "They shall look upon me whom they have pierced," *Zech. xii. 10*; and therefore shows that he speaks of the Son of God, who was to be the Son of Man, and by our nature liable to vulneration; and withal foretells the piercing of his body: which being added to that prediction in the *Psalms*, "They pierced my hands and my feet," clearly representeth and foretellet to us the death upon the cross, to which the hands and feet of the person crucified were affixed with nails. And because these prophecies appeared so particular and clear, and were so properly applied by that disciple whom our Saviour loved, and to whom he made a singular application even upon the cross; therefore the Jews have used more than ordinary industry and artifice to elude these two predictions, but in vain. For these two prophets, *David* and *Zechariah*, manifestly did foretel the particular punishment of crucifixion.

It was therefore sufficiently adumbrated by types and promulgated by prophecies that the promised *Messias* was to be crucified. And it is as certain that our *Jesus*, the *Christ* whom we worship, and from whom we receive that honor to be named *Christians*, was really and truly crucified. It was the first wicked design of *Judas*, who betrayed him to that death; it was the malicious cry of the

obdurate Jews, "Crucify him, crucify him." He was actually condemned and delivered to that death by Pilate, "who gave sentence that it should be as they required." He was given into the hands of the soldiers, the instruments commonly used in inflicting that punishment, who "led him away to crucify him." He underwent those previous pains which customarily antecede that suffering, as flagellation, and bearing of the cross; for "Pilate, when he had scourged Jesus, delivered him to be crucified; and he bearing his cross went forth into Golgotha." They carried him forth out of the city, as by custom in that kind of death they were wont to do; and there between two malefactors, usually by the Romans condemned to that punishment, they crucified him. And that he was truly fastened to the cross appears by the satisfaction given to doubting Thomas, who said, "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, I will not believe; and our Saviour said unto him, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands," John xx. 25; whereby he satisfied the apostle that he was the Christ; and us that the Christ was truly crucified, against that fond heresy which made Simon the Cyrenean not only bear the cross, but endure crucifixion, for our Saviour. We therefore infer this second conclusion from the undoubted testimonies of his followers, and unfeigned confessions of his enemies, that our Jesus was certainly and truly crucified, and did really undergo those sufferings, which were pretypified and foretold, upon the cross.

Being thus fully assured that the Messiah was to be, and that our Christ was truly crucified, it, thirdly, concerns us to understand what was the nature of crucifixion, what the particularities of suffering which he endured on the cross. Nor is this now so easily understood as once it was; for, being a Roman punishment, it was continued in that empire while it remained heathen; but when the emperors themselves received Christianity, and the towering eagles resigned the flags unto the cross, this punishment was forbidden by the supreme authority, out of a due respect and pious honor to the death of Christ. From whence it came to pass that, since it hath been disused universally for so many hundred years, it hath not been so rightly conceived

as it was before, when the general practice of the world did so frequently represent it to the Christian's eyes. Indeed, if the word which is used to denote that punishment did sufficiently represent or express it, it were enough to say that Christ was *crucified*; but seeing the most usual or original word doth not of itself declare the figure of the tree, or manner of the suffering, it will be necessary to represent it by such expressions as we find partly in the evangelical relations, partly in such representations as are left us in those authors whose eyes were daily witnesses of such executions.

The form then of the cross on which our Saviour suffered was not a simple, but a compounded figure, according to the custom of the Romans, by whose procurator he was condemned to die. In which there was not only a straight and erected piece of wood fixed in the earth, but also a transverse beam fastened unto that towards the top thereof; and beside these two cutting each other transversely at right angles (so that the erected part extended itself above the transverse), there was also another piece of wood infixed into, and standing out from, that which was erected and straight up. To that erected piece was his body, being lifted up, applied, as Moses's serpent to the pole: and to the transverse beam his hands were nailed; upon the lower part coming out from the erected piece his sacred body rested, and his feet were transfix'd and fastened with nails; his head, being pressed with a crown of thorns, was applied to that part of the erect which stood above the transverse beam; and, above his head, to that was fastened the table on which was written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin characters, the accusation, according to the Roman custom; and the writing was, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews."

Thus by the propriety of the punishment, and the titular inscription, we know what crime was then objected to the immaculate Lamb, and upon what accusation Pilate did at last proceed to pass the sentence of death upon him. It was not any opposition to the law of Moses, not any danger threatened to the temple, but pretended sedition and affectation of the crown objected, which moved Pilate to condemn him. The Jews did thus accuse him:—"We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give

tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a king," Luke xxiii. 2. And, when Pilate sought to release him, they cried out, saying, "If thou let this man go thou art not Cæsar's friend; whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar," John xix. 12. This moved Pilate to pass sentence upon him, and, because that punishment of the cross was by the Roman custom used for that crime, to crucify him.

Two things are most observable in this cross—the acerbity, and the ignominy, of the punishment; for of all the Roman ways of execution it was most painful and most shameful. First, the exquisite pains and torments in that death are manifest, in that the hands and feet, which of all the parts of the body are most nervous and consequently most sensible, were pierced through with nails; which caused, not a sudden dispatch, but a lingering and tormenting death: insomuch that the Romans, who most used this punishment, did in their language deduce their expressions of pain and cruciation from the cross. And the acerbity of this punishment appears in that those who were of any merciful disposition would first cause such as were adjudged to the cross to be slain, and then to be crucified.

As this death was most dolorous and full of acerbity, so was it also most infamous and full of ignominy. The Romans themselves accounted it a servile punishment, and inflicted it upon their slaves and fugitives. It was a high crime to put that dishonor upon any free man, and the greatest indignity which the most undeserving Roman could possibly suffer in himself, or could be contrived to show their detestation to such creatures as were below human nature. And because, when a man is beyond possibility of suffering pain, he may still be subject to ignominy in his fame; when by other exquisite torments some men have tasted the bitterness of death, after that, they have in their breathless corpses, by virtue of this punishment, suffered a kind of surviving shame. And the exposing the bodies of the dead to the view of the people, on the cross, hath been thought a sufficient ignominy to those who died, and terror to those who lived to see it. Yea, where the bodies of the dead have been out of the reach of

their surviving enemies, they have thought it highly opprobrious to their ghosts to take their representations, preserved in their pictures, and affix them to the cross. Thus may we be made sensible of the two grand aggravations of our Saviour's sufferings, the bitterness of pain in the torments of his body, and the indignity of shame in the interpretation of his enemies.

It is necessary we should thus profess faith in Christ crucified, as that punishment which he chose to undergo, as that way which he was pleased to die; first, because by this kind of death we may be assured that he hath taken upon himself, and consequently from us, the malediction of the law. For we were all under the curse, because it is expressly written, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them;" and as it is certain none of us hath so continued—for the "Scripture hath concluded all under sin," which is nothing else but a breach of the law—therefore the curse must be acknowledged to remain upon all. But now "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us;" that is, he hath redeemed us from that general curse which lay upon all men, for the breach of any part of the law, by taking upon him that particular curse laid only upon them who underwent a certain punishment of the law; for it is written, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Not that suspension was any of the capital punishments prescribed by the law of Moses; not that by any tradition or custom of the Jews they were wont to punish malefactors with that death: but such as were punished with death, according to the law or custom of the Jews, were for the enormity of their fact oftentimes after death exposed to the ignominy of the gibbet; and those who being dead were so hanged on a tree were accursed by the law. Now though Christ was not to die by the sentence of the Jews, who had lost the supreme power in causes capital, and so not to be condemned to any death according to the law of Moses; yet the providence of God did so dispose it, that he might suffer that death which did contain in it that ignominious particularity to which the legal curse belonged, which is, the hanging on a tree. For he who is crucified, as he is affixed to, so he

hangeth on the cross : and therefore true and formal crucifixion is often named by the general word suspension ; and the Jews themselves do commonly call our blessed Saviour by that very name to which the curse is affixed by Moses ; and generally have objected that he died a cursed death.

Secondly : it was necessary to express our faith in Christ crucified, that we might be assured that he hath “abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments ;” which if he had not done, the strength and power of the whole law had still remained ; for all the people had said “Amen” to the curse upon every one that kept not the whole law ; “and entered into a curse and into an oath to walk in God’s law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord their God, and his judgments and his statutes ;” which was in the nature of a bill, bond, or obligation, perpetually standing in force against them, ready to bring a forfeiture or penalty upon them, in case of non-performance of the condition. But the strongest obligations may be cancelled : and one ancient custom of cancelling bonds was by striking a nail through the writing ; and thus God, by our crucified Saviour, “blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross,” Col. ii. 14.

Thirdly : hereby we are to testify the power of the death of Christ working in us after the manner of crucifixion. For we are to be “planted in the likeness of his death ;” and, that we may be so, we must acknowledge, and cause it to appear, that “our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed ;” we must confess that “they that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts ;” and they who have not, are not his, Rom. vi. 5 ; Gal. v. 24. We must not glory, “save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ : nor can we properly glory in that, except “by it the world be crucified unto us, and we unto the world,” Gal. vi. 14.

Fourthly : by the acerbity of this passion we are taught to meditate on that bitter cup which our Saviour drank ; and while we think on those nails which pierced his hands and feet, and never left that torturing activity till by their

dolorous impressions they forced a most painful death, to acknowledge the bitterness of his sufferings for us, and to assure ourselves that by the worst of deaths he hath overcome all kinds of death; and with patience and cheerfulness to endure whatsoever he shall think fit to lay upon us, who with all readiness and desire suffered far more for us.

Fifthly: by the ignominy of this punishment, and universal infamy of that death, we are taught how far our Saviour descended for us, that, while we were slaves and in bondage unto sin, he might redeem us by a servile death; for "he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant; and so he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;" teaching us the glorious doctrine of humility and patience in the most vile and abject condition which can befall us in this world, and encouraging us to imitate him "who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, [despising the shame;" and withal deterring us from that fearful sin of falling from him, lest we should "crucify unto ourselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame," and so become worse than the Jews themselves, who crucified the Lord of life without the walls of Jerusalem, and for that unparalleled sin were delivered into the hands of the Romans, into whose hands they delivered him, and at the same walls in such multitudes were crucified, till there wanted room for crosses, and crosses for their bodies.

Lastly: by the public visibility of this death, we are assured that our Saviour was truly dead, and that all his enemies were fully satisfied. He was crucified in the sight of all the Jews, who were made public witnesses that he gave up the ghost. There were many traditions among the heathen, of persons supposed for some time to be dead, to descend into hell, and afterwards to live again; but the death of these persons was never publicly seen or certainly known. It is easy for a man that liveth to say that he hath been dead; and, if he be of great authority, it is not difficult to persuade some credulous persons to believe it. But that which would make his present life truly miraculous must be the reality and certainty of his former death. The feigned histories of Pythagoras and Zamolxis, of Theseus and Hercules, of Orpheus and Protesilaus, made no certain

mention of their deaths, and therefore were ridiculous in the assertion of their resurrection from death. Christ, as he appeared to certain witnesses after his resurrection, so he died before his enemies visibly on the cross, and gave up the ghost conspicuously in the sight of the world.

And, now we have made this discovery of the true manner and nature of the cross on which our Saviour suffered, every one may understand what it is he professeth when he declareth his faith, and saith, I believe in Christ crucified. For thereby he is understood and obliged to speak thus much:—I am really persuaded, and fully satisfied, that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, Christ Jesus, that he might cancel the hand-writing which was against us, and take off the curse which was due unto us, did take upon him the form of a servant, and in that form did willingly and cheerfully submit himself unto the false accusation of the Jews, and unjust sentence of Pilate, by which he was condemned, according to the Roman custom, to the cross; and upon that did suffer that servile punishment of the greatest acerbity, enduring the pain; and of the greatest ignominy, despising the shame. And thus I believe in Christ *crucified*.

Dead.

THOUGH crucifixion of itself involveth not in it certain death, and he who is fastened to a cross is so leisurely to die as that he being taken from the same may live; though, when the insulting Jews in a malicious derision called to our Saviour to “save himself and come down from the cross,” he might have come down from thence, and in saving himself have never saved us; yet it is certain that he felt the extremity of that punishment, and fulfilled the utmost intention of crucifixion; so that, as we acknowledge him crucified, we believe him *dead*.

For the illustration of which part of the article it will be necessary first to show that the Messiah was to die; that no sufferings, howsoever shameful and painful, were sufficiently satisfactory to the determination and predictions divine, without a full dissolution and proper death; secondly, to prove that our Jesus, whom we believe to be

the true *Messias*, did not only suffer torments intolerable and inexpressible in this life, but upon and by the same did finish this life by a true and proper death; thirdly, to declare in what the nature and condition of the death of a person so totally singular did properly and peculiarly consist. And more than this cannot be necessary to show we believe that Christ was dead.

First, then, we must consider what St. Paul delivered to the Corinthians first of all, and what also he received, "how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures;" that the *Messias* was "the Lamb slain before the foundations of the world," and that his death was severally represented and foretold; 1 Cor. xv. 3. For though the sacrificing Isaac hath been acknowledged an express and lively type of the promised *Messias*; though, after he was bound and laid upon the wood, he was preserved from the fire, and rescued from the religious cruelty of his father's knife; though Abraham be said to have offered up his only-begotten son, when Isaac died not; though by all this it might seem foretold that the true and great promised seed, the Christ, should be made a sacrifice for sin, should be fastened to the cross, and offered up to the Father, but not suffer death; yet, seeing without effusion of blood there is no remission, without death no sacrifice for sin; seeing the saving of Isaac alive doth not deny the death of the antitype, but rather suppose and assert it as presignifying his resurrection from the dead, from whence Abraham received him in a figure; we may safely affirm the ancient and legal types did represent a Christ who was to die. It was an essential part of the Paschal law that the lamb should be slain; and, in the sacrifices for sin which presignified a Saviour to "sanctify the people with his own blood," the bodies of the beasts were burned without the camp, and their blood brought into the sanctuary, Heb. xiii. 11.

Nor did the types only require, but the prophecies also foretel his death. For "he was brought," saith Isaiah, "as a lamb to the slaughter:" "he was cut off out of the land of the living," saith the same prophet; and "made his soul an offering for sin," Isa. liii. 7: which are so plain and evident predictions, that the Jews show not the least appearance of probability in their evasions.

Seeing then the obstinate Jews themselves acknowledge one Messias was to die, and that a violent death; seeing we have already proved there is but one Messias foretold by the prophets, and showed by those places which they will not acknowledge that he was to be slain; it followeth by their unwilling confessions, and our plain probations, that the promised Messias was ordained to die; which is our first assertion.

Secondly: we affirm, correspondently to these types and prophecies, that "Christ our passover is slain;" that he whom we believe to be the true and only Messias did really and truly die. Which affirmation we may with confidence maintain, as being secure of any even the least denial. Jesus of Nazareth upon his crucifixion was so surely, so certainly dead, that they who wished, they who thirsted for his blood, they who obtained, who effected, who extorted his death, even they believed it, even they were satisfied with it; the chief priests, the scribes and the pharisees, the publicans and sinners, all were satisfied; the sadducees most of all, who hugged their old opinion, and loved their error the better, because they thought him sure from ever rising up. But, if they had denied or doubted of it, the very stones would cry out and confirm it. Why did the sun put on mourning? Why were the graves opened, but for a funeral? Why did the earth quake? Why were the rocks rent? Why did the frame of nature shake, but because the God of nature died? Why did all the people who came to see him crucified, and love to feed their eyes with such tragic spectacles, why did they beat their breasts and return, but that they were assured "it was finished;" there was no more to be seen; all was done? It was not out of compassion that the merciless soldiers brake not his legs, but because they found him dead whom they came to dispatch; and, being enraged that their cruelty should be thus prevented, with an impertinent villany they pierce his side, and with a foolish revenge endeavour to kill a dead man; thereby becoming stronger witnesses than they would, by being less the authors than they desired of his death. For out of his sacred but wounded side came blood and water, both as evident signs of his present death, as certain seals of our

future and eternal life. These are the two blessed sacraments of the spouse of Christ, each assuring her of the death of her beloved. The sacrament of baptism, the water through which we pass into the church of Christ, teacheth us that he died to whom we come. "For know you not," saith St. Paul, "that so many of us as are baptized into Jesus Christ, are baptized into his death?" Rom. vi. 3. The sacrament of the Lord's supper, the bread broken, and the wine poured forth, signify that he died who instituted it; and "as often as we eat this bread, and drink this cup, we show forth the Lord's death till he come," 1 Cor. xi. 26.

Dead then our blessed Saviour was upon the cross; and that not by a feigned or metaphorical, but by a true and proper death. As he was truly and properly man, in the same mortal nature which we the sons of Adam have, so did he undergo a true and proper death, in the same manner as we die. Our life appeareth principally in two particulars, motion and sensation; and, while both or either of these are perceived in a body, we pronounce it lives. Not that the life itself consisteth in either or both of these, but in that which is the original principle of them both, which we call the soul; and the intimate presence or union of that soul unto the body is the life thereof. The real distinction of which soul from the body in man, our blessed Saviour taught most clearly in that admonition; "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell," Matt. x. 28. Now seeing death is nothing else but the privation or recession of life, and we are then properly said to die when we cease to live; seeing life consisteth in the union of the soul unto the body, from whence, as from the fountain, flow motion, sensation, and whatsoever vital perfection; death can be nothing else but the solution of that vital union, or the actual separation of the soul, before united to the body. As therefore when the soul of man doth leave the habitation of its body, and being the sole fountain of vitality bereaves it of all vital activity, we say that body or that man is dead; so when we read that Christ our Saviour died, we must conceive that was a true and proper death,

and consequently that his body was bereft of his soul, and of all vital influence from the same.

Nor is this only our conception, or a doubtful truth ; but we are as much assured of the propriety of his death as of the death itself. For that the unspotted soul of our Jesus was really and actually separated from his body, that his flesh was bereft of natural life by the secession of that soul, appeareth by his own resignation, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit;" and by the evangelist's expression, "and, having said thus, he gave up the ghost." When he was to die, he resigned his soul ; when he gave it up, he died ; when it was delivered out of the body, then was the body dead : and so the eternal Son of God upon the cross did properly and truly die.

This reality and propriety of the death of Christ is yet farther illustrated from the cause immediately producing it, which was an external violence and cruciation, sufficient to dissolve that natural disposition of the body which is absolutely necessary to continue the vital union of the soul ; the torments which he endured on the cross did bring him to that state in which life could not longer be naturally conserved, and death, without intervention of supernatural power, must necessarily follow. For Christ, who took upon him all our infirmities, sin only excepted, had in his nature not only a possibility and aptitude, but also a necessity of dying ; and as to any extrinsecal violence, able, according to the common course of nature, to destroy and extinguish in the body such an aptitude as is indispensably required to continue in union with the soul, he had no natural preservative ; nor was it in the power of his soul to continue its vital conjunction unto his body bereft of a vital disposition.

It is true that Christ did voluntarily die, as he said of himself, "No man taketh away my life from me, but I lay it down of myself ; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again," John x. 18. For it was in his power whether he would come into the power of his enemies ; it was in his power to suffer or not to suffer the sentence of Pilate, and the nailing to the cross ; it was in his power to have come down from the cross, when he was nailed to it : but when by an act of his will he had sub-

mitted to that death, when he had accepted and embraced those torments to the last, it was not in the power of his soul to continue any longer vitality to the body, whose vigor was totally exhausted. So not by a necessary compulsion, but voluntary election, he took upon him a necessity of dying.

It is true that Pilate marvelled he was dead so soon, and the two thieves lived longer to have their legs broken, and to die by the accession of another pain : but we read not of such long furrows on their backs as were made on his, nor had they any such kind of agony as he was in the night before. What though he cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost? What though the centurion, when he saw it, said, " Truly this man was the Son of God?" The miracle was not in the death, but in the voice; the strangeness was not that he should die, but that at the point of death he should cry out so loud; he died not by, but with, a miracle.

Should we imagine Christ to anticipate the time of death, and to subtract his soul from future torments necessary to cause an expiration; we might rationally say the Jews and Gentiles were guilty of his death, but we could not properly say they slew him: guilty they must be, because they inflicted those torments on which in time death must necessarily follow; but slay him actually they did not, if his death proceeded from any other cause, and not from the wounds which they inflicted: whereas St. Peter expressly chargeth his enemies, " Him ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain;" and again, " The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree." Thus was the Lamb properly slain, and the Jews authors of his death, as well as of his crucifixion.

Wherefore seeing Christ took upon himself our mortality in the highest sense, as it includeth a necessity of dying; seeing he voluntarily submitted himself to that bloody agony in the garden, to the hands of the ploughers who made long their furrows, and to the nails which fastened him to the cross; seeing these torments thus inflicted and continued did cause his death, and in this condition he gave up the ghost; it followeth that the only-begotten Son

of God, the true Messias promised of old, did die a true and proper death. Which is the second conclusion in this explication.

But, thirdly, because Christ was not only man, but also God, and there was not only a union between his soul and body while he lived, but also a conjunction of both natures, and a union in his person ; it will be farther necessary, for the understanding of his death, to show what union was dissolved, what continued ; that we may not make that separation either less or greater than it was.

Whereas then there were two different substantial unions in Christ, one of the parts of his human nature each to other, in which his humanity did consist, and by which he was truly man ; the other of his natures, human and divine, by which it came to pass that God was man, and that man God : first, it is certain, as we have already showed, that the union of the parts of his human nature was dissolved on the cross, and a real separation made between his soul and body. As far then as humanity consists in the essential union of the parts of human nature, so far the humanity of Christ upon his death did cease to be, and consequently he ceased to be man. But, secondly, the union of the natures remained still as to the parts, nor was the soul or body separated from the divinity, but still subsisted as they did before, by the subsistence of the second Person of the Trinity.

The truth of this assertion appeareth, first, from the language of this very Creed. For, as we proved before, that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, was *conceived*, and *born*, and *suffered*, and that the truth of these propositions relied upon the communion of properties, grounded upon the hypostatical union ; so while the Creed in the same manner proceedeth speaking of the same Person, that he *was buried* and *descended into hell*, it sheweth that neither his body, in respect of which he was buried, nor his soul, in respect of which he was generally conceived to descend into hell, had lost that union.

Again : as we believe that God redeemed us by his own blood, so also it hath been the constant language of the Church, that God died for us : which cannot be true

except the soul and body in the instant of separation were united to the Deity.

Indeed, seeing all the gifts of God are without repentance, nor doth he ever subtract his grace from any without the abuse of it, and a sinful demerit in themselves; we cannot imagine the grace of union should be taken from Christ, who never offended, and that in the highest act of obedience, and the greatest satisfaction to the will of God.

It is true, Christ cried upon the cross with a loud voice, saying, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" But, if that dereliction should signify a solution of the former union of his natures, the separation had been made not at his death, but in his life. Whereas indeed those words infer no more than that he was bereft of such joys and comforts from the Deity as should assuage and mitigate the acerbity of his present torments.

It remaineth, therefore, that when our Saviour yielded up the ghost, he suffered only an external violence; and what was subject to such corporal force did yield unto those dolorous impressions. Seeing then such is the imbecility and frailty of our nature that life cannot long subsist in exquisite torments, the disposition of his body failed the soul, and the soul deserted his body. But seeing no power hath any force against omnipotency, nor could any corporal or finite agent work upon the union made with the Word, therefore that did still remain entire both to the soul and to the body. The Word was once indeed without either soul or body; but, after it was made flesh, it was never parted either from the one or from the other.

Thus Christ did really and truly die, according to the condition of death to which the nature of man is subject; but although he was more than man, yet he died no more than man can die; a separation was made between his soul and body, but no disunion of them and his Deity. They were disjoined one from another, but not from him that took them both together: rather by virtue of that remaining conjunction they were again united after their separation. And this I conceive sufficient for the third and last part of our explication.

The necessity of this part of the article is evident, in that the death of Christ is the most intimate and essential

part of the mediatorship, and that which most intrinsically concerns every office and function of the Mediator, as he was Prophet, Priest, and King.

First: it was necessary, as to the prophetic office, that Christ should die, to the end that the truth of all the doctrines which he delivered might be confirmed by his death. He was "the true and faithful witness, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession." "This is he that came by water and blood; and there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood." He preached unto us "a new and better covenant, which was established upon better promises," and that was to be ratified with his blood; which is therefore called by Christ himself the blood of the New Testament, or everlasting covenant: for that covenant was also a testament; and, "where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator." Besides, Christ, as a prophet, taught us not only by word, but by example: and though every action of his life, who came to fulfil the law, be most worthy of our imitation; yet the most eminent example was in his death, in which he taught us great variety of Christian virtues. What an example was that of faith in God, "to lay down his life, that he might take it again;" in the bitterness of his torments to "commend his spirit into the hands of his Father;" and, "for the joy that was set before him, to endure the cross, and despise the shame!" What a pattern of meekness, patience, and humility, for "the Son of Man to come not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many;" to be "led like a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before the shearer, not to open his mouth;" to "endure the contradictions of sinners against himself, and to humble himself unto death, even the death of the cross!" What a precedent of obedience, for the Son of God "to learn obedience by the things that he suffered," to be "made under the law," and, though he never broke the law, "to become obedient unto death;" to go with cheerfulness to the cross, upon this resolution, "As my Father gave me commandment, even so I do!" What exemplar of charity, to "die for us while we were yet sinners" and enemies, when "greater love hath no man

than this, to lay down his life for his friends;" to pray upon the cross for them that crucified him, and to apologize for such as barbarously slew him; "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!" Thus Christ did "suffer for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps;" that as "he suffered for us in the flesh," we should "arm ourselves likewise with the same mind. For he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin; that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God," 1 Pet. iv. 1, 2. And so his death was necessary for the confirmation and completion of his prophetic office.

Secondly: it was necessary that Christ should die, and by his death perform the sacerdotal office. "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins," Heb. v. i. But Christ had no other sacrifice to offer for our sins than himself. "For it was not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins:" and therefore, when "sacrifice and offering God would not, then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God;" then did Christ determine to offer up himself for us, Heb. x. 4. And because the sacrifices of old were to be slain, and generally "without shedding of blood there is no remission;" therefore, if he will offer sacrifice for sin, he must of necessity die, and so "make his soul an offering for sin." If Christ be our Passover, he must be sacrificed for us. We were sold under sin, and he who will redeem us must give his life for our redemption; for we could "not be redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but only with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot." We all had sinned, and so offended the justice of God, and by an act of that justice the sentence of death passed upon us; it was necessary therefore that Christ our Surety should die, to satisfy the justice of God, both for that iniquity, as the propitiation for our sins, and for that penalty, as he who was to bear our griefs. God was offended with us, and he must die who was to reconcile him to us. "For when we were enemies," saith St. Paul, "we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son," Rom. v. 10. "We were sometime alienated, and ene-

mies in our mind by our wicked works; yet now hath he reconciled us in the body of his flesh through death," Col. i. 21. Thus the death of Christ was necessary toward the great act of his priesthood, as the oblation, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and not only for the act itself, but also for our assurance of the power and efficacy of it ("for if the blood of bulls and goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge our conscience from dead works?" Heb. ix. 13), and of the happiness flowing from it; for "he that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" Rom. viii. 32. Upon this assurance, founded on his death, we have the freedom and "boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh," Heb. x. 19. Neither was the death of Christ necessary only in respect of us immediately for whom he died, but in reference to the priest himself who died, both in regard of the qualification of himself, and consummation of his office. "For in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren: that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest, and having suffered, being tempted, might be able to succor them that are tempted," Heb. ii. 17; so that passing through all the previous torments, and at last through the pains of death, having suffered all which man can suffer, and much more, he became, as an experimental Priest, most sensible of our infirmities, most compassionate of our miseries, most willing and ready to support us under, and to deliver us out of, our temptations. Thus being qualified by his utmost suffering, he was also fitted to perfect his offering. For as the high priest once every year for the atonement of the sins of the people entered into the Holy of Holies not without blood; so "Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, by his own blood entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," Heb. ix. 7. And this is the grand necessity of the death of Christ in respect of his sacerdotal office.

Thirdly : there was a necessity that Christ should die in reference to his regal office. "O king, live for ever," is either the loyal or the flattering vote for temporal princes ; either the expression of our desires, or the suggestion of their own ; whereas our Christ never showed more sovereign power than in his death, never obtained more than by his death. It was not for nothing that Pilate suddenly wrote, and resolutely maintained what he had written, "This is the King of the Jews." That title on the cross did signify no less than that his regal power was active even there ; for, "having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it ;" and through his death "destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil," Col. ii. 15 ; Heb. ii. 14. Nor was his death only necessary for the present execution, but also for the assecution of farther power and dominion, as the means and way to obtain it. The spirit of Christ in the prophets of old "testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow," 1 Pet. i. 11. "He shall drink of the brook in the way," saith the prophet David ; "therefore shall he lift up his head," Psal. cx. 7. "He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name," Phil. ii. 8, 9. "For to this end Christ both died and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord of the dead and living," Rom. xiv. 9.

Thus it is necessary to believe and profess our faith in Christ who died ; for by his blood and the virtue of his death was our redemption wrought, as by the price which was paid, as by the atonement which was made, as by the full satisfaction which was given, that God might be reconciled to us, who before was offended with us, as by the ratification of the covenant made between us, and the acquisition of full power to make it good unto us.

After which exposition, thus premised, every Christian is conceived to express thus much when he makes profession of faith in Christ Jesus which was *dead* :—I do really and truly assent unto this, as a most infallible and fundamental truth, that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, for the working out of our redemption, did in our nature,

which he took upon him, really and truly die, so as, by the force and violence of those torments which he felt, his soul was actually separated from his body; and although neither his soul nor body was separated from his divinity, yet the body bereft of his soul was left without the least vitality. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ, which was crucified and *dead*.

And Buried.

WHEN the most precious and immaculate soul of Christ was really separated from his flesh, and that union in which his natural life consisted was dissolved, his sacred body, as being truly dead, was laid up in the chambers of the grave; so that as we believe him dead, by the separation of his soul, we also believe him buried by the sepulture of his body.

And, because there is nothing mysterious or difficult in this part of the article, it will be sufficiently explicated when we have shown, first, that the promised Messiah was to be buried; and, secondly, that our Jesus was so buried as the Messiah was to be.

That the Messiah was to be buried could not possibly be denied by those who believed he was to die among the Jews; because it was the universal custom of that nation to bury their dead. We read most frequently of the sepulchres of their fathers: and though those that were condemned by their supreme power were not buried in their fathers' graves, yet public sepulchres there were appointed even for them to lie in; and not only they, but all the instruments which were used in the punishment were buried with them. And yet, besides the general consequence of death among the Jews, there was a perfect type in the person of Jonas: for, as that prophet "was three days and three nights in the whale's belly," so was the Messiah, or the Son of Man, to be "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Matt. xii. 40.

Nor was his burial only represented typically, but foretold prophetically, both by a suppositive intimation, and by an express prediction. The psalmist intimated and supposed no less, when, speaking in the person of the Christ, he said, "My flesh shall rest in hope: for thou wilt not leave

my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption," Psal. xvi. 9. That flesh is there supposed only such, that is, a body dead; and that body resting in the grave, the common habitation of the dead; yet resting there in hope that it should never see corruption, but rise from thence before the time in which bodies in their graves are wont to putrefy. Besides this intimation, there is yet a clear expression of the grave of the Messias in that eminent prediction of Isaiah: "He was cut off out of the land of the living, and he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death," Isa. liii. 8, 9. For whatsoever the true interpretation of the prophecy be (of which we shall speak hereafter), it is certain that he who was to be cut off was to have a grave: and, seeing we have already shown that he who was to be cut off was the Messias, it followeth that by virtue of this prediction the promised Messias was to be buried.

Secondly: that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, was thus buried, we shall also prove, although it seemed repugnant to the manner of his death. For those who were sentenced by the Romans to die upon the cross had not the favor of a sepulchre, but their bodies were exposed to the fowls of the air, and the beasts of the field; or, if they escaped their voracity, to the longer injury of the air and weather. A guard was also usually set about them, lest any pitying hand should take the body from the cursed tree, and cover it with earth.

Under that custom of the Roman law was now the body of our Saviour on the cross, and the guard was set; there was "the centurion and they that were with him, watching Jesus." The centurion returned as soon as Christ was dead, and gave testimony unto Pilate of his death; but the watch continued still. How then can the ancient predictions be fulfilled? How can this Jonas be conveyed into the belly of the whale? Where shall "he make his grave with the wicked, or with the rich, in his death" of crucifixion? By the providence of him who did foretel it, it shall be fulfilled. They who petitioned that he might be crucified, shall intercede that he may be interred. For the custom of the Jews required that whosoever suffered by the sentence of their law should be buried, and that the

same day he suffered. Particularly they could not but remember the express words of Moses, "If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree, his body shall not remain all night upon the tree; but thou shalt in anywise bury him that day," Deut. xxi. 22. Upon this general custom and particular law, especially considering the sanctity of the day approaching, "the Jews, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away." And this is the first step to the burial of our Saviour.

For though, by the common rule of the Roman law, those who were condemned to the cross were to lose both soul and body on the tree, as not being permitted either sepulture or mourning; yet it was in the power of the magistrate to indulge the leave of burial; and therefore Pilate, who crucified Christ only because the Jews desired it, could not possibly deny him burial when they requested it; he who professed to find no fault in him while he lived, could make no pretence for an accession of cruelty after his death.

Now though the Jews had obtained their request of Pilate, though Christ had been thereby certainly buried; yet had not the prediction been fulfilled, which expressly mentioned the rich in his death. For, as he was crucified between two thieves, so had he been buried with them, because by the Jews there was appointed a public place of burial for all such as suffered as malefactors.

Wherefore, to rescue the body of our blessed Saviour from the malicious hands of those that caused his crucifixion, "there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, an honorable counsellor, a good man and a just; who also himself waited for the kingdom of God, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews: this Joseph came and went in boldly unto Pilate, and besought him that he might take away the body of Jesus. And Pilate gave him leave, and commanded the body to be delivered: he came therefore and took the body of Jesus."

Besides, "there came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, a man of the Pharisees, a ruler of

the Jews, a master of Israel; this Nicodemus came and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pounds weight. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury."

And thus was the burial of the Son of God performed, according to the custom of the people of God. For the understanding of which there are three things considerable—first, what was done to the body, to prepare it for the grave; secondly, how the sepulchre was prepared to receive the body; thirdly, how the persons were fitted by the interring of our Saviour to fulfil the prophecy.

As for fulfilling the custom of the Jews as to the preparation in respect of his body, we find the spices and the linen clothes. When "there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard, very precious, and she brake the box and poured it on his head;" Christ made this interpretation of that action, "she is come beforehand to anoint my body to the burying," Mark xiv. 3. When Christ was risen, "Mary Magdalen and the other Mary brought he spices which they had prepared, that they might come and anoint him," Mark xvi. 1. Thus was there an interpreted and an intended unction of our Saviour, but really and actually he was interred with the spices which Nicodemus brought. The custom of wrapping in the linen clothes we see in Lazarus rising from the grave; for "he came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes, and his face was bound about with a napkin." In the same manner when our Saviour was risen, "Simon Peter went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself," John. xx. 6. Thus, according to the custom of the Jews, was the body of Christ bound in several linen clothes with an aromatical composition, and so prepared for the sepulchre.

As for the preparation of the sepulchre to receive the body of our Saviour, the custom of the Jews was also punctually observed in that. Joseph of Arimathea had prepared a place of burial for himself, and the manner of it is expressed: for "in the place where he was crucified

there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein never man was laid, which Joseph had hewn out of a rock for his own tomb: there laid they Jesus, and rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre." And so Christ was buried after the manner of the Jews, in a vault made by the excavation of the rocky firm part of the earth, and that vault secured from external injury by a great massy stone rolled to the mouth or door thereof. After which stone was once rolled thither, the whole funeral action was performed, and the sepulture completed; so that it was not lawful by the custom of the Jews any more to open the sepulchre, or disturb the interred body.

Thirdly: two eminent persons did concur unto the burial of our Saviour, a ruler and a counsellor, men of those orders among the Jews as were of greatest authority with the people; Joseph of Arimathea, rich and honorable, and yet inferior to Nicodemus, one of the great council of the Sanhedrim: these two, though fearful while he lived to acknowledge him, are brought by the hand of Providence to inter him; that so the prediction might be fulfilled which was delivered by Isaiah to this purpose. The counsel of his enemies, the design of the Jews, "made his grave with the wicked," that he might be buried with them who were crucified with him; but "because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth;" because he was no ways guilty of those crimes for which they justly suffered; that there might be a difference after their death, though there appeared little distinction in it; the counsel of his Father, the design of heaven, put him with the rich in his death, and caused a counsellor and a ruler of the Jews to bury him.

The necessity of this part of the article appeareth, first, in that it gives a testimony and assurance of the truth, both of Christ's death preceding, and of his resurrection following. Men are not put into the earth before they die. Pilate was very inquisitive whether our Saviour had been any while dead, and was fully satisfied by the centurion, before he would give the body to Joseph to be interred. Men cannot be said to rise who never died; nor can there be a true resurrection, where there hath not been a true dissolution. That therefore we might believe Christ truly

rose from the dead; we must be first assured that he died : and a greater assurance of his death than this we cannot have, that his body was delivered by his enemies from the cross, and laid by his disciples in the grave.

Secondly : a profession to believe that Christ was buried is necessary, to work within us a correspondence and similitude of his burial. For "we are buried with him in baptism, even buried with him by baptism unto death ; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life," Col. ii. 12 ; Rom. vi. 4 ; that nothing may be done or suffered by our Saviour in these great transactions of the Mediator, but may be acted in our souls, and represented in our spirits.

Thirdly : it was most convenient that those pious solemnities should be performed on the body of our Saviour, that his disciples might for ever learn what honor was fit to be received and given at their funerals. When Ananias died, though for his sin, yet they "wound him up, and carried him out, and buried him ;" when Stephen was stoned, "devout men carried him to his burial, and made great lamentation over him ;" and, when Dorcas died, "they washed her, and laid her in an upper chamber ;" so careful were the primitive Christians of the rites of burial ; Acts v. 6 ; Acts viii. 2 ; Acts ix. 37. Before, and at our Saviour's time, the Greeks did much, the Romans more, use the burning of the bodies of the dead, and reserved only their ashes in their urns : but, when Christianity began to increase, the funeral flames did cease, and, after a few emperors had received baptism, there was not a body burnt in all the Roman empire. For the first Christians wholly abstained from consuming of the dead bodies with fire, and followed the example of our Saviour's funeral, making use of precious ointments for the dead, which they refused while they lived, and spending the spices of Arabia in their graves. The description of the persons who interred Christ, and the enumeration of their virtues, and the everlasting commendation of her who brake the box of precious ointment for his burial, have been thought sufficient grounds and encouragements for the careful and decent sepulture of Christians. For as natural reason will teach us

to give some respect unto the bodies of men, though dead, in reference to the souls which formerly inhabited them; so, and much more, the followers of our Saviour, while they look upon our bodies as living temples of the Holy Ghost, and bought by Christ, to be made one day like unto his glorious body, they thought them no ways to be neglected after death, but carefully to be laid up in the wardrobe of the grave, with such due respect as might become the honor of the dead, and comfort of the living. And this decent custom of the primitive Christians was so acceptable unto God, that by his providence it proved most effectual in the conversion of the heathens and propagation of the gospel.

Thus I believe the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, for the confirmation of the truth of his death already past, and the verity of his resurrection from the dead suddenly to follow, had his body, according to the custom of the Jews, prepared for a funeral, bound up with linen clothes, and laid in spices; and, after that accustomed preparation, deposited in a sepulchre hewn out of a rock, in which never man was laid before, and, by the rolling of a stone unto the door thereof, entombed there. Thus I believe that Christ *was buried.*

ARTICLE V.

He descended into Hell; the third day he rose again from the dead.

THE former part of this article, of the descent into hell, hath not been so anciently in the Creed, or so universally, as the rest. The first place we find it used in was the church of Aquileia; and the time we are sure it was used in the creed of that church was less than 400 years after Christ. After that it came into the Roman creed, and others, and hath been acknowledged as a part of the apostles' creed ever since.

Indeed the descent into hell hath always been accepted, but with a various exposition; and the church of England at the reformation, as it received the three creeds, in two of which this article is contained, so did it also make this

one of the articles of religion, to which all who are admitted to any benefice, or received into holy orders, are obliged to subscribe. And, at the first reception it was propounded with a certain explication, and thus delivered in the fourth year of king Edward the sixth, with reference to an express place of Scripture interpreted of this descent; "That the body of Christ lay in the grave until his resurrection: but his spirit, which he gave up, was with the spirits which were detained in prison or in hell, and preached to them, as the place in St. Peter testifieth." So likewise after the same manner in the creed set forth in metre after the manner of a psalm, and still remaining at the end of the psalms, the same exposition is delivered in this staff:—

" And so he died in the flesh,
But quickened in the spirit:
His body then was buried,
As is our use and right.
His spirit did after this descend
Into the lower parts,
Of them that long in darkness were
The true light of their hearts."

But in the synod ten years after, in the days of queen Elizabeth, the articles, which continue still in force, deliver the same descent, but without any the least explication or reference to any particular place of Scripture, in these words:—"As Christ died for us and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell." Wherefore seeing our church hath not now imposed that interpretation of St. Peter's words, which before it intimated; seeing it hath not delivered that as the only place of Scripture to found the descent into hell upon; seeing it hath alleged no other place to ground it, and delivered no other explication to expound it; we may with the greater liberty pass on to find out the true meaning of this article, and to give our particular judgment in it, so far as a matter of so much obscurity and variety will permit.

First, then, it is to be observed, that as this article was first in the Aquileian creed, so it was delivered there not in the express and formal term of hell, but in such a word as may be capable of a greater latitude, "descendit in in-

ferna:" which words, as they were continued in other creeds, so did they find a double interpretation among the Greeks; some translating "inferna" *hell*; others, *the lower parts*: the first with relation to St. Peter's words of Christ, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell;" the second referring to that of St. Paul, "He descended into the lower parts of the earth."

Secondly: I observe that in the Aquileian creed, where this article was first expressed, there was no mention of Christ's burial; but the words of their confession ran thus, "crucified under Pontius Pilate, he descended in inferna." From whence there is no question but the observation of Ruffinus, who first expounded it, was most true, that though the Roman and Oriental creeds had not their words, yet they had the sense of them in the word *buried*. It appeareth, therefore, that the first intention of putting these words in the Creed was only to express the burial of our Saviour, or the descent of his body into the grave. But although they were first put in the Aquileian creed, to signify the burial of Christ; and those who had only the burial in their creed, did confess as much as those who without the burial did express the descent; yet since the Roman creed hath added the descent unto the burial, and expressed that descent by words signifying more-properly *hell*, it cannot be imagined that the Creed, as it now stands, should signify only the burial of Christ by his descent into *hell*. But rather, seeing the ancient church did certainly believe that Christ did some other way descend beside his burial; seeing Ruffinus himself, though he interpreted those words of the burial only, yet, in the relation of what was done at our Saviour's death, makes mention of his descent into *hell*, beside, and distinct from, his sepulture; seeing those who in after ages added it to the burial did actually believe that the soul of Christ descended; it followeth that, for the exposition of the Creed, it is most necessary to declare in what that descent consisteth.

Thirdly: I observe, again, that whatsoever is delivered in the Creed, we therefore believe because it is contained in the Scriptures, and consequently must so believe it as it is contained there; whence all this exposition of the whole is nothing else but an illustration and proof of every part

ticular part of the Creed by such Scriptures as deliver the same, according to the true interpretation of them and the general consent of the church of God. Now these words, as they lie in the Creed, *He descended into hell*, are no where formally and expressly delivered in the Scriptures; nor can we find any one place in which the Holy Ghost hath said, in express and plain terms, that Christ, as he died and was buried, so he descended into hell. Wherefore, seeing these words of the Creed are not formally expressed in the Scripture, our inquiry must be in what Scriptures they are contained virtually; that is, where the Holy Ghost doth deliver the same doctrine, in what words soever, which is contained, and to be understood in this expression, *He descended into hell*.

Now several places of Scripture have been produced by the ancients as delivering this truth, of which some without question prove it not; but three there are which have been always thought of greatest validity to confirm this article. First, that of St. Paul to the Ephesians seems to come very near the words themselves, and to express the same almost in terms: "Now that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" Eph. iv. 9. This many of the ancient fathers understood of the descent into hell, as placed in the lowest parts of the earth; and this exposition must be confessed so probable that there can be no argument to disprove it. Those "lower parts of the earth" may signify hell; and Christ's descending thither may be, that his soul went to that place when his body was carried to the grave. But that it was actually so, or that the apostle intended so much in those words, the place itself will not manifest; for we cannot be assured that the descent of Christ, which St. Paul speaks of, was performed after his death: or, if it were, we cannot be assured that the "lower parts of the earth" did signify hell, or the place where the souls of men were tormented after the separation from their bodies. For as it is written, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that descended from heaven;" so this may signify so much, and no more, "In that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first?" And for "the lower parts of the earth," they may possibly signify no more than the place beneath; as when

our Saviour said, "Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world:" or, as God spake by the prophet, "I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath," John viii. 23; Acts ii. 19. Nay, they may well refer to his incarnation, according to that of David, "My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth:" or to his burial, according to that of the same prophet, "Those that seek my soul, to destroy it, shall go into the lower parts of the earth:" and these two references have a great similitude according to that of Job, "Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither, Ps. cxxxix. 15; lxiii. 9; Job i. 21.

The next place of Scripture brought to confirm the descent is not so near in words, but thought to signify the end of that descent, and that part of his humanity by which he descended. For Christ, saith St. Peter, was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison;" where the *spirit* seems to be the soul of Christ; and the *spirits in prison*, the souls of them that were in hell, or in some place at least separated from the joys of heaven: whither, because we never read our Saviour went at any other time, we may conceive he went in spirit then when his soul departed from his body on the cross. This did our church first deliver as the proof and illustration of the descent, and the ancient fathers did apply the same in like manner to the proof of this article. But yet those words of St. Peter have no such power of probation; except we were certain that the spirit there spoken of were the soul of Christ, and that the time intended for that preaching were after his death, and before his resurrection. Whereas, if it were so interpreted, the difficulties are so many, that they staggered St. Augustin, and caused him at last to think that these words of St. Peter belonged not unto the doctrine of Christ's descending into hell. But indeed the *spirit* by which he is said to preach was not the soul of Christ, but that spirit by which he was *quickened*; as appeareth by the coherence of the words, "being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison." Now that spirit by which Christ was

quickenèd is that by which he was raised from the dead, that is the power of his divinity; as St. Paul expresseth it, "Though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God," 2 Cor. xiii. 4: in respect of which he preached to those who were disobedient in the days of Noah, as we have already shown.

The third, but principal text, is that of David, applied by St. Peter. "For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad: moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption," Acts ii. 25. Thus the apostle repeated the words of the psalmist, and then applied them: "He being a prophet, and seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption." Now from this place the article is clearly and infallibly deduced thus:—If the soul of Christ were not left in hell at his resurrection, then his soul was in hell before his resurrection; but it was not there before his death: therefore upon or after his death, and before his resurrection, the soul of Christ descended into hell; and consequently the Creed doth truly deliver that Christ, being *crucified*, was *dead, buried*, and descended into hell. For as his flesh did not see corruption by virtue of that promise and prophetic expression, and yet it was in the grave, the place of corruption, where it rested in hope until his resurrection; so his soul, which was not left in hell, by virtue of the like promise or prediction, was in that hell, where it was not left, until the time that it was to be united to the body for the performing of the resurrection. We must therefore confess from hence that the soul of Christ was in hell; and "no Christian can deny it," saith St. Augustin; "It is so clearly delivered in this prophecy of the psalmist and application of the apostle."

The only question then remains, not of the truth of the proposition, but the sense and meaning of it. It is most certain that Christ *descended into hell*; and as infallibly true as any other article of the Creed: but what that hell was, and how he descended thither, being once questioned,

is not easily determined. Different opinions there have been of old, and of late more different still, which I shall here examine after that manner which our subject will admit. Our present design is an exposition of the Creed as now it stands, and our endeavour is to expound it according to the Scriptures in which it is contained: I must therefore look for such an explication as may consist with the other parts of the Creed, and may withal be conformable unto that Scripture upon which the truth of the article doth rely; and consequently, whatsoever interpretation is either not true in itself, or not consistent with the body of the Creed, or not conformable to the doctrine of the apostle in this particular, the expositor of that Creed by the doctrine of the apostle must reject.

First, then, we shall consider the opinion of Durandus, who, as often, so in this is singular. He supposeth this descent to belong unto the soul, and the name of *hell* to signify the place where the souls of dead men were in custody; but he maketh a metaphor in the word *descended*, as not signifying any local motion, nor inferring any real presence of the soul of Christ in the place where the souls of dead men were; but only including a virtual motion, and inferring an efficacious presence, by which descent the effects of the death of Christ were wrought upon the souls in hell; and, because the merits of Christ's death did principally depend upon the act of his soul, therefore the effect of his death is attributed to his soul as the principal agent; and consequently Christ is truly said at the instant of his death to *descend into hell*, because his death was immediately efficacious upon the souls detained there. This is the opinion of Durandus, so far as it is distinct from others.

But although a virtual influence of the death of Christ may be well admitted in reference to the souls of the dead, yet this opinion cannot be accepted as the exposition of this article; seeing neither the Creed can be thought to speak a language of so great scholastic subtilty, nor the place of David, expounded by St. Peter, can possibly admit any such explication. For what can be the sense of those words, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell," if his being in hell was only virtually acting there? If the efficacy of

his death were his descent, then is he descended still, because the effect of his death still remaineth. The opinion therefore of Durandus, making the descent into hell to be nothing but the efficacy of the death of Christ upon the souls detained there, is to be rejected, as not expositive of the Creed's confession, nor consistent with the Scripture's expression.

The next opinion, later than that of Durandus, is, that the descent into hell is the suffering of the torments of hell; that the soul of Christ did really and truly suffer all those pains which are due unto the damned; that whatsoever is threatened by the law unto them who depart this life in their sins, and under the wrath of God, was fully undertaken and borne by Christ; that he died a true supernatural death, the second death, the death of Gehenna; and this dying the death of Gehenna was the *descending into hell*; that those who are now saved by virtue of his death should otherwise have endured the same torments in hell which now the damned do and shall endure; but that he, being their surety, did himself suffer the same for them, even all the torments which we should have felt, and the damned shall.

This interpretation is either taken in the strict sense of the words, or in a latitude of expression; but in neither to be admitted as the exposition of this article. Not if it be taken in a strict, rigorous, proper, and formal sense; for in that acceptation it is not true. It must not, it cannot, be admitted that Christ did suffer all those torments which the damned suffer; and therefore it is not, it cannot, be true, that by suffering them he descended into hell. There is a worm that never dieth, which could not lodge within his breast; that is, a remorse of conscience, seated in the soul, for what that soul hath done: but such a remorse of conscience could not be in Christ, who though he took upon himself the sins of those who otherwise had been damned, yet that act of his was a most virtuous, charitable, and most glorious act, highly conformable to the will of God, and consequently could not be the object of remorse. The grief and horror in the soul of Christ, which we have expressed in the explication of his sufferings antecedent to his crucifixion, had reference to the sins and

punishment of men, to the justice and wrath of God ; but clearly of a nature different from the sting of conscience in the souls condemned to eternal flames.

Again : an essential part of the torments of hell is a present and constant sense of the everlasting displeasure of God, and an impossibility of obtaining favor and avoiding pain ; an absolute and complete despair of any better condition, or the least relaxation : but Christ, we know, had never any such resentment, who looked upon the reward which was set before him, even upon the cross, and offered up himself a sweet-smelling sacrifice ; which could never be efficacious, except offered in faith. If we should imagine any damned soul to have received an express promise of God, that after ten thousand years he would release him from those torments, and make him everlastingly happy ; and to have a true faith in that promise, and a firm hope of receiving eternal life ; we could not say that man was in the same condition with the rest of the damned, or that he felt all that hell which they were sensible of, or all that pain which was due unto his sins : because hope and confidence, and relying upon God, would not only mitigate all other pains, but wholly take away the bitter anguish of despair. Christ then, who knew the beginning, continuance, and conclusion of his sufferings, who understood the determinate minute of his own death and resurrection, who had made a covenant with his Father for all the degrees of his passion, and was fully assured that he could suffer no more than he had freely and deliberately undertaken, and should continue no longer in his passion than he had himself determined, he who by those torments was assured to overcome all the powers of hell, cannot possibly be said to have been in the same condition with the damned, and strictly and properly to have endured the pains of hell.

Again : if we take the torments of hell in a metaphorical sense, for those terrors and horrors of soul which our Saviour felt, which may therefore be called infernal torments, because they are of greater extremity than any other tortures of this life, and because they were accompanied with a sense of the wrath of God against the unrighteousness of men ; yet this cannot be an interpretation of the descent into hell, as it is an article of the Creed, and as that

article is grounded upon the Scriptures. For all those pains which our Saviour felt (whether, as they pretend, properly infernal, or metaphorically such), were antecedent to his death; part of them in the garden, part on the cross; but all before he commended his spirit into the hands of his Father, and gave up the ghost. Whereas it is sufficiently evident that the descent into hell, as it now stands in the Creed, signifieth something commenced after his death, contradistinguished to his burial; and, as it is considered in the apostle's explication, is clearly to be understood of that which immediately preceded his resurrection; and that also grounded upon a confidence totally repugnant to infernal pains. For it is thus particularly expressed: "I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," Ps. xvi. 9. Where the faith, hope, confidence, and assurance of Christ is shown; and his flesh, though laid in the grave, the place of corruption, is said to rest in hope, for this very reason, because God would not leave his soul in hell. I conclude, therefore, that the descent into hell is not the enduring the torments of hell: because, if strictly taken, it is not true; if metaphorically taken, though it be true yet it is not pertinent.

The third opinion, which is also very late, at least in the manner of explication, is, that in those words, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," the soul of Christ is taken for his body, and hell for the grave, and consequently, in the Creed, *he descended into hell*, is no more than this, that Christ, in his body, was laid into the grave. This explication ordinarily is rejected, by denying that the soul is ever taken for the body, or hell for the grave: but in vain; for it must be acknowledged that sometimes the Scriptures are rightly so, and cannot otherwise be, understood. First, the same word in the Hebrew, which the psalmist used, and in the Greek, which the apostle used, and we translate *the soul*, is elsewhere used for the body of a dead man, and translated so. And when we read in Moses of a prohibition given to the High Priest or the Nazarite, of going to or coming near a dead body, and of the pollution by the

dead; the *dead body* in the Hebrew and the Greek is nothing else but that which elsewhere signifieth the soul. And Mr. Ainsworth, who translated the Pentateuch nearer the letter than the sense, hath so delivered it in compliance with the original phrase; and may be well interpreted thus by our translation, "Ye shall not make in your flesh any cutting for a soul," that is, "for the dead." "For a soul he shall not defile himself among his people," that is, "There shall none be defiled for the dead among his people." "He that toucheth any thing that is unclean by a soul," that is, "by the dead." "Every one defiled by a soul," that is, "by the dead." "He shall not come at a dead soul," that is, "He shall come at no dead body," Lev. xix. 28; xxi. 1; xxii. 4; Numb. v. 2; vi. 6. Thus Ainsworth's translation showeth that in all these places the original word is that which usually signifieth the soul; and our translation teacheth us that, though in other places it signifieth the soul, yet in these it must be taken for the body, and that body bereft of the soul.

Secondly: the word which the psalmist used in Hebrew, and the apostle in Greek, and which is translated *hell*, doth certainly in some other places signify no more than the grave, and is translated so: as where Mr. Ainsworth following the word, "For I will go down unto my son mourning to hell;" our translation, aiming at the sense, rendereth it, "For I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning," Gen. xxxvii. 35. So again he, "Ye shall bring down my gray hairs with sorrow unto hell," that is, "to the grave." And in this sense we say, "The Lord killeth, and maketh alive; he bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up," 1 Sam. ii. 6.

Now seeing the soul is sometimes taken for the body deserted by the soul, and hell is also sometimes taken for the grave, the receptacle of the body dead: therefore it is conceived that the prophet did intend these significations in those words, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell;" and consequently the article grounded on that Scripture must import no more than this—Christ in respect of his body bereft of his soul, which was recommended into, and deposited in the hands of his Father, *descended into* the grave. This exposition hath that great advantage, that he who

first mentioned this descent in the Creed, did interpret it of the burial; and, where this article was expressed, there that of the burial was omitted. But, notwithstanding those advantages, there is no certainty of this interpretation; first, because he who did so interpret it, at the same time, and in the tenor of that exposition, did acknowledge a descent of the soul of Christ into hell; and those other creeds which did likewise omit the burial, and express the descent, did show that by that descent they understood not that of the body, but of the soul. Secondly, because they who put these words into the Roman creed, in which the burial was expressed before, must certainly understand a descent distinct from that; and therefore, though it might perhaps be thought a probable interpretation of the words of David, especially taken as belonging to David, yet it cannot pretend to an exposition of the Creed, as it now stands.

The next opinion is, that the soul may well be understood either for the nobler part of man distinguished from the body, or else for the person of man consisting of both soul and body, as it often is, or for the living soul, as it is distinguished from the immortal spirit; but then the term *hell* shall signify no place, neither of the man, nor of the body, nor of the soul; but only the state or condition of men in death, during the separation of the soul from the body. So that the prophecy shall run thus, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell," that is, "Thou shalt not suffer me to remain in the common state of the dead, to be long deprived of my natural life, to continue without exercise, or power of exercising my vital faculty:" and then the Creed will have this sense, that Christ was crucified, dead, and buried, and *descended into hell*; that is, he went unto the dead, and remained for a time in the state of death, as other dead men do.

But this interpretation supposeth that which can never appear, that *hades* signifieth not death itself, nor the place where souls departed are, but the state and condition of the dead, or their permansion in death; which is a notion wholly new, and consequently cannot interpret that which representeth something known and believed of old, according to the notions and conceptions of those times.

And that this notion is wholly new will appear, because not any of the ancient fathers is produced to avow it, nor any of the heathen authors who are produced do affirm it: nay, it is evident that the Greeks did always by *hades* understand a place into which the souls of men were carried and conveyed, distinct and separate from that place in which we live; and that their different opinions show, placing it, some in the earth, some under it, some in one unknown place of it, some in another. But especially *hades*, in the judgment of the ancient Greeks, cannot consist with this notion of the state of death, and the permansion in that condition, because there were many whom they believed to be dead, and to continue in the state of death, whom yet they believed not to be in *hades*; as those who died before their time, and those whose bodies were unburied. Thus likewise the ancient fathers differed much concerning the place of the *infernus*; but never any doubted but that it signified some place or other: and if they had conceived any such notion as the state of death, and the permansion of the dead in that state, they needed not to have fallen into doubts or questions; the patriarchs and the prophets being as certainly in the state of death, and remaining so, as Corah, Dathan, and Abiram are, or any person who is certainly condemned to everlasting flames. Though therefore it be certainly true that Christ did truly and properly die, as other men are wont to do, and that after expiration he was in the state or condition of the dead, in deadlihood, as some have learned to speak; yet the Creed had spoken as much as this before, when it delivered that *he was dead*. And although it is true that he might have died, and in the next minute of time revived, and consequently his death doth not, precisely taken, signify any permansion or duration in the state of death, and therefore it might be added, *he descended into hell*, to signify farther a permansion or duration in that condition; yet if *hell* do signify nothing else but the state of the dead, as this opinion doth suppose, then to *descend into hell* is no more than to be dead; and so, notwithstanding any duration implied in that expression, Christ might have ascended the next minute after he descended thither, us well as he might be imagined to revive the next minute after he died.

Seeing then to descend into hell, according to this interpretation, is no more than to be dead ; seeing no man ever doubted but that person was dead who died ; seeing it was before delivered in the Creed that Christ died, or, as we render it, was dead ; we cannot imagine but they who did add this part of the article to the Creed did intend something more than this, and therefore we cannot admit this notion as a full or proper exposition.

There is yet left another interpretation grounded upon the general opinion of the church of Christ in all ages, and upon a probable exposition of the prophecy of the psalmist, taking the soul in the most proper sense, for the spirit or rational part of Christ ; that part of man which, according to our Saviour's doctrine, the Jews could not kill ; and looking upon hell as a place distinct from this part of the world where we live, and distinguished from those heavens whither Christ ascended, into which place the souls of men were conveyed after or upon their death ; and therefore thus expounding the words of the psalmist in the person of Christ : " Thou shalt not suffer that soul of mine which shall be forced from my body by the violence of pain upon the cross, but resigned into thy hands, when it shall go into that place below where the souls of men departed are detained : I say thou shalt not suffer that soul to continue there as theirs have done ; but shalt bring it shortly from thence, and reunite it to my body."

For the better understanding of this exposition, there are several things to be observed, both in respect to the matter of it, and in reference to the authority of the fathers. First, therefore, this must be laid down as a certain and necessary truth, that the soul of man, when he dieth, dieth not, but returneth unto him that gave it, to be disposed of at his will and pleasure ; according to the ground of our Saviour's counsel, " Fear not them which kill the body, but cannot kill the soul." That better part of us, therefore, in and after death doth exist and live, either by virtue of its spiritual and immortal nature, as we believe ; or at least by the will of God, and his power upholding and preserving it from dissolution, as many of the fathers thought. This soul thus existing after death, and separated from the body, though of a nature spiritual, is really and truly in

some place; if not by way of circumscription, as proper bodies are, yet by way of determination and indistancy; so that it is true to say, this soul is really and truly present here, and not elsewhere.

Again: the soul of man, which while he lived gave life to the body, and was the fountain of all vital actions, in that separate existence after death, must not be conceived to sleep, or be bereft and stripped of all vital operations, but still to exercise the powers of understanding and of willing, and to be subject to the affections of joy and sorrow. Upon which is grounded the different estate and condition of the souls of men during that time of separation; some of them by the mercy of God being placed in peace and rest, in joy and happiness; others by the justice of the same God left to sorrow, pains, and misery.

As there was this different state and condition before our Saviour's death, according to the different kinds of men in this life, the wicked and the just, the elect and reprobate; so there were two societies of souls after death; one of them who were happy in the presence of God, the other of those who were left in their sins and tormented for them. Thus we conceive the righteous Abel the first man placed in this happiness, and the souls of them that departed in the same faith to be gathered to him. Whosoever it was of the sons of Adam that first died in his sins was put into a place of torment; and the souls of all those who departed after with the wrath of God upon them were gathered into his sad society.

Now as the souls at the hour of death are really separated from the bodies; so the place where they are in rest or misery after death is certainly distinct from the place in which they lived. They continue not where they were at that instant when the body was left without life; they do not go together with the body to the grave; but, as the sepulchre is appointed for our flesh, so there is another receptacle, or habitation and mansion for our spirits. From whence it followeth that, in death, the soul doth certainly pass by a real motion from that place in which it did inform the body, and is translated to that place, and unto that society, which God of his mercy or justice hath allotted to it. And not at present to inquire into the difference and dis-

tance of those several habitations (but for method's sake to involve them all as yet under the notion of the infernal parts, or the mansions below), it will appear to have been the general judgment of the church that the soul of Christ, contradistinguished from his body, that better and more noble part of his humanity, his rational and intellectual soul, after a true and proper separation from his flesh, was really and truly carried into those parts below, where the souls of men before departed were detained; and that, by such a real translation of his soul, he was truly said to have descended into hell.

Many have been the interpretations of the opinion of the fathers made of late; and their differences are made to appear so great, as if they agreed in nothing which concerns this point: whereas there is nothing which they agree in more than this which I have already affirmed, a real descent of the soul of Christ unto the habitation of the souls departed. The persons to whom, and end for which, he descended, they differ in; but as to a local descent into the infernal parts, they all agree. Who were then in those parts, they could not certainly define; but whosoever were there, that Christ by the presence of his soul was with them, they all determined.

That this was the general opinion of the church will appear, not only by the testimonies of those ancient writers who lived successively, and wrote in several ages, and delivered this exposition in such express terms as are not capable of any other interpretation: but also because it was generally used as an argument against the Apollinarian heresy: than which nothing can show more the general opinion of the Catholics, and the heretics, and that not only of the present; but of the precedent ages. For it had been little less than ridiculous to have produced that for an argument to prove a point in controversy which had not been clearer than that which was controverted, and had not been some way acknowledged as a truth by both. Now the error of Apollinarius was, that Christ had no proper intellectual or rational soul, but that the Word was to him in the place of a soul: and the argument produced by the fathers for the conviction of this error was, that Christ descended into hell; which the Apollinarians could not deny:

and that this descent was not made by his divinity, or by his body, but by the motion and presence of his soul, and consequently that he had a soul distinct both from his flesh and from the Word. Whereas if it could have then been answered by the heretics, as now it is by many, that his descent into hell had no relation to his soul, but to his body only which descended into the grave; or that it was not a real, but only virtual, descent, by which his death extended to the destruction of the powers of hell: or that his soul was not his intellectual spirit, or immortal soul, but his living soul, which descended into hell, that is, continued in the state of death: I say, if any of these senses could have been affixed to this article, the Apollinarians' answer might have been sound, and the Catholics' argument of no validity. But seeing those heretics did all acknowledge this article; seeing the Catholic fathers did urge the same to prove the real distinction of the soul of Christ both from his divinity and from his body, because his body was really in the grave when his soul was really present with the souls below; it followeth that it was the general doctrine of the church, that Christ did descend into hell by a local motion of his soul, separated from his body, to the places below where the souls of men departed were.

Nor can it be reasonably objected that the argument of the fathers was of equal force against these heretics, if it be understood of the animal soul, as it would be if it were understood of the rational; as if those heretics had equally deprived Christ of the rational and animal soul. For it is most certain that they did not equally deprive Christ of both; but most of the Apollinarians denied a human soul to Christ, only in respect of the intellectual part, granting that the animal soul of Christ was of the same nature with the animal soul of other men. If therefore the fathers had proved only that the animal soul of Christ had descended into hell, they had brought no argument at all to prove that Christ had a human intellectual soul. It is therefore certain that the Catholic fathers, in their opposition to the Apollinarian heretics, did declare that the intellectual and immortal soul of Christ descended into hell.

The only question which admitted any variety of discrepancy among the ancients was—Who were the persons to

whose souls the soul of Christ descended? and that which dependeth on that question, What was the end and use of his descent? In this indeed they differed much, according to their several apprehensions of the condition of the dead, and the nature of the place into which the souls, before our Saviour's death, were gathered; some looking on that name which we translate now *hell*, *hades*, or *infernus*, as the common receptacle of the souls of all men, both the just and unjust, thought the soul of Christ descended unto those who departed in the true faith and fear of God, the souls of the patriarchs and the prophets, and the people of God.

But others there were who thought *hades* or *infernus* was never taken in the Scriptures for any place of happiness; and therefore they did not conceive the souls of the patriarchs or the prophets did pass into any such infernal place; and, consequently, that the descent into hell was not his going to the prophets or the patriarchs, who were not there. For as, if it had been only said that Christ had gone unto the bosom of Abraham, or to paradise, no man would ever have believed that he had descended into hell; so seeing it is only written, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell," it seems incongruous to think that he went then unto the patriarchs who were not there.

Now this being the diversity of opinions anciently in respect of the persons unto whose souls the soul of Christ descended at his death, the difference of the end or efficacy of that descent is next to be observed. Of those who did believe the name of *hades* to belong unto that general place which comprehended all the souls of men (as well those who died in the favor of God as those who departed in their sins), some of them thought that Christ descended to that place of *hades* where the souls of all the faithful, from the death of the righteous Abel to the death of Christ, were detained; and there, dissolving all the power by which they were detained below, translated them into a far more glorious place, and estated them in a condition far more happy in the heavens above.

Others of them understood no such translation of place, or alteration of condition there, conceiving that the souls of all men are detained below still, and shall not enter into

heaven until the general resurrection. They made no such distinction at the death of Christ, as if those who believed in a Saviour to come should be kept out from heaven till he came, and those who now believe in the same Saviour already come should be admitted thither immediately upon their expiration.

But such as thought the place in which the souls of the patriarchs did reside could not in propriety of speech be called hell, nor was ever so named in the Scriptures, conceived that as our Saviour went to those who were included in the proper hell, or place of torment, so the end of his descent was to deliver souls from those miseries which they felt, and to translate them to a place of happiness and a glorious condition. They who did think that hell was wholly emptied, that every soul was presently released from all the pains which before it suffered, were branded with the name of heretics: but to believe that many were delivered was both by them and many others counted orthodox.

The means by which they did conceive that Christ did free the souls of men from hell was the application of his death unto them, which was propounded to those souls by preaching of the gospel there: that as he revealed here on earth the will of God unto the sons of men, and propounded himself as the object of their faith, to the end that whosoever believed in him should never die; so after his death he showed himself unto the souls departed, that whosoever of them would yet accept of and acknowledge him should pass from death to life.

Thus did they think the soul of Christ descended into hell to preach the gospel to the spirits there, that they might receive him who before believed in him, or that they might believe in him who before rejected him. But this cannot be received as the end, or way to effect the end, of Christ's descent: nor can I look upon it as any illustration of this article, for many reasons. For, first, I have already showed that the place of St. Peter, so often mentioned for it, is not capable of that sense, nor hath it any relation to our Saviour after death. Secondly, the ancients seem upon no other reason to have interpreted this place of St. Peter in that manner, but because other apocryphal writings

led them to that interpretation, upon the authority whereof this opinion only can rely. A place of the prophet Jeremy was first produced, that "the Lord God of Israel remembered his dead, which slept in the land of the grave, and descended unto them, to preach unto them his salvation." But seeing there is no such verse extant in that prophet or any other, it was also delivered that it was once in the translation of the Septuagint, but rased out from thence by the Jews: which as it can scarcely be conceived true, so, if it were, it would be yet of doubtful authority, as being never yet found in the Hebrew text. And Hermes, in his book called the Pastor, was thought to give sufficient strength to this opinion; whereas the book itself is of no good authority, and in this particular is most extravagant; for he taught that not only the soul of Christ, but also the souls of the apostles, preached to the spirits below; that, as they followed his steps here, so did they also after their death, and therefore descended to preach in hell.

Nor is this only to be suspected in reference to those pretended authorities which first induced men to believe it, and to make forced interpretations of Scripture to maintain it; but also to be rejected in itself as false and inconsistent with the nature, scope, and end of the gospel (which is to be preached with such commands and ordinances as can concern those only who are in this life), and as incongruous to the state and condition of those souls to whom Christ is supposed to preach. For if we look upon the patriarchs, prophets, and all saints before departed, it is certain they were never "disobedient in the days of Noah;" nor could they need the publication of the gospel after the death of Christ, who by virtue of that death were accepted in him while they lived, and by that acceptance had received a reward long before. If we look upon them who died in disobedience, and were in torments for their sins, they cannot appear to be proper objects for the gospel preached. The rich man, whom we find in their condition, desired one might be sent from the dead to preach unto his brethren then alive, lest they also should come unto that place: but we find no hopes he had that any should come from them who were alive to preach to him. For if the living, who heard not Moses and the prophets,

would not be persuaded though one rose from the dead, surely those who had been disobedient unto the prophets should never be persuaded after they were dead.

Whether therefore we consider the authorities first introducing this opinion, which were apocryphal; or the testimonies of Scripture, forced and improbable; or the nature of this preaching, inconsistent with the gospel; or the persons to whom Christ should be thought to preach (who, if dead in the faith and fear of God, wanted no such instruction: if departed in infidelity and disobedience, were unworthy and incapable of such a dispensation); this preaching of Christ to the spirits in prison cannot be admitted either as the end, or as the means proper to effect the end, of his descent into hell.

Nor is this preaching only to be rejected as a means to produce the effect of Christ's descent; but the effect itself pretended to be wrought thereby, whether in reference to the just or unjust, is by no means to be admitted. For though some of the ancients thought, as is shown before, that Christ did therefore descend into hell that he might deliver the souls of some which were tormented in those flames, and translate them to a place of happiness; yet this opinion deserveth no acceptance, neither in respect of the ground or foundation on which it is built, nor in respect of the action or effect itself. The authority upon which the strength of this doctrine doth rely is that place of the Acts "whom God hath raised up, loosing the pains of hell," for so they read it; from whence the argument is thus deduced:—God did loose the pains of hell when Christ was raised: but those pains did not take hold of Christ himself, who was not to suffer any thing after death; and consequently he could not be loosed from or taken out of those pains in which he never was: in the same manner the patriarchs and the prophets, and the saints of old, if they should be granted to have been in a place sometimes called hell, yet were they there in happiness, and therefore the delivering them from thence could not be the loosing of the pains of hell: it followeth then that those alone who died in their sins were involved in those pains; and, when those pains were loosed, then were they released; and, seeing they were loosed when Christ was raised, the

consequence will be, that he, descending into hell, delivered some of the damned souls from their torments there.

But first, though the Latin translation render it so, "the pains of hell;" though some copies, and other translations, and divers of the fathers read it in the same manner; yet the original and authentic Greek acknowledgeth no such word as hell, but propounds it plainly thus, "whom God hath raised up, loosing the pains of death." Howsoever, if the words were so expressed in the original text, yet it would not follow that God delivered Christ out of those pains in which he was detained any time, much less that the soul of Christ delivered the souls of any other; but only that he was preserved from enduring them.

Again: as the authority is most uncertain, so is the doctrine most incongruous. The souls of men were never cast into infernal torments to be delivered from them. The days which follow after death were never made for opportunities to a better life. The angels had one instant either to stand or fall eternally; and what that instant was to them, that this life is unto us. We may as well believe the devils were saved, as those souls which were once tormented with them. For it is an "everlasting fire," an "everlasting punishment," a "worm that dieth not." Nor does this only belong to us who live after the death of Christ, as if the damnation of all sinners now were ineluctable and eternal, but before that death it were not so; as if faith and repentance were now indispensably necessary to salvation, but then were not. For thus the condition of mankind before the fulness of time, in which our Saviour came into the world, should have been far more happy and advantageous than it hath been since. But neither they nor we shall ever escape eternal flames, except we obtain the favor of God before we be swallowed by the jaws of death. "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body;" but if they be in a state of salvation now, by virtue of Christ's descent into hell, who were numbered among the damned before his death, at the day of the general judgment they must be returned into hell again; or, if they be received then into eternal happiness, it will follow either that they were not justly condemned to those flames at

first, according to the general dispensations of God, or else they did not receive the things done in their body at the last ; which all shall as certainly receive, as all appear. This life is given unto men to work out their salvation with fear and trembling, but after death cometh judgment, reflecting on the life that is past, not expecting amendment or conversion then. He that liveth and believeth in Christ shall never die; he that believeth, though he die, yet shall he live ; but he that dieth in unbelief shall neither believe nor live. And this is as true of those who went before, as of those who came after our Saviour, because he was the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world. I therefore conclude that the end for which the soul of Christ descended into hell was not to deliver any damned souls, or to translate them from the torments of hell unto the joys of heaven.

The next consideration is, whether by-virtue of his descent the souls of those who before believed in him, the patriarchs, prophets, and all the people of God, were delivered from that place and state in which they were before ; and whether Christ descended into hell to that end, that he might translate them into a place and state far more glorious and happy. This hath been in the later ages of the church the vulgar opinion of most men, and that as if it followed necessarily from the denial of the former ; he delivered not the souls of the damned, therefore he delivered the souls of them who believed, and of them alone ; till at last the schools have followed it so fully, that they deliver it as a point of faith and infallible certainty, that the soul of Christ by descending into hell did deliver from thence all the souls of the saints which were in the bosom of Abraham, and did confer upon them actual and essential beatitude, which before they enjoyed not. And this they lay upon two grounds ; first, that the souls of saints departed saw not God ; and secondly, that Christ by his death opened the gate of the kingdom of heaven.

But even this opinion, as general as it hath been, hath neither that consent of antiquity, nor such certainty as it pretendeth, but is rather built upon the improbabilities of a worse. The most ancient of all the fathers, whose writings

are extant, were so far from believing that the end of Christ's descent into hell was to translate the saints of old into heaven, that they thought them not to be in heaven yet, nor ever to be removed from that place in which they were before Christ's death, until the general resurrection. Others, as we have also shown, thought the bosom of Abraham was not in any place which could be termed hell; and consequently could not think that Christ should therefore descend into hell to deliver them who were not there. And others yet, who thought that Christ delivered the patriarchs from their infernal mansions, did not think so exclusively or in opposition to the disobedient and damned spirits, but conceived many of them to be saved as well as the patriarchs were, and doubted whether all were not so saved or no. Indeed I think there were very few, if any, for above 500 years after Christ, who did so believe Christ delivered the saints out of hell as to leave all the damned there; and therefore this opinion cannot be grounded upon the prime antiquity, when so many of the ancients believed not that they were removed at all, and so few acknowledged that they were removed alone.

And, if the authority of this opinion in respect of its antiquity be not great, the certainty of the truth of it will be less. For, first, if it be not certain that the souls of the patriarchs were in some place called hell after their own death, and until the death of Christ; if the bosom of Abraham were not some infernal mansion, then can it not be certain that Christ descended into hell to deliver them. But there is no certainty that the souls of the just, the patriarchs, and the rest of the people of God, were kept in any place below, which was, or may be called hell: the bosom of Abraham might well be in the heavens above, far from any region where the devil and his angels were; the Scriptures no where tell us that the spirits of just men went unto or did remain in hell; the place in which the rich man was in torments after death is called hell, but that into which the angels carried the poor man's soul is not termed so. There was a vast distance between them two, nor is it likely that the angels which see the face of God should be sent down from heaven to convey the souls of the just into that place where the face of God cannot be

seen. When God translated Enoch, and Elias was carried up in a chariot to heaven, they seem not to be conveyed to a place where there was no vision of God; and yet it is most probable that Moses was with Elias as well before as upon the mount: nor is there any reason to conceive that Abraham should be in any worse place or condition than Enoch was, having as great a testimony that he pleased God as Enoch had.

Secondly: it cannot be certain that the soul of Christ delivered the souls of the saints of old from hell, and imparted to them the beatifical vision, except it were certain that these souls are in another place and a better condition now than they were before. But there is no certainty that the patriarchs and the prophets are now in another place and a better condition than they were before our blessed Saviour died; there is no intimation of any such alteration of their state delivered in the Scriptures; there is no such place with any probability pretended to prove any actual accession of happiness and glory already past. "Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven," Matt. viii. 11; there then did the Gentiles, who came in to Christ, find the patriarchs, even in the kingdom of heaven: and we cannot perceive that they found them any where else than Lazarus did; for the description is the same, "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and ye yourselves thrust out," Luke xiii. 28. For as the rich man in hell lift up his eyes being in torments, and saw Abraham afar off, before the death of Christ; so those that were in weeping and gnashing of teeth, saw Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the prophets, when the Gentiles were brought in.

Thirdly: though it were certain that the souls of the saints had been in a place called hell, as they were not; though it were also certain that they were now in a better condition than they were before Christ's death, as it is not; yet it would not follow that Christ descended into hell to make this alteration; for it might not be performed before his resurrection, it might not be effected till his ascension, it might be attributed to the merit of his passion, it might

have no dependence on his descension. I conclude therefore that there is no certainty of truth in that proposition which the schoolmen take for a matter of faith, that Christ delivered the souls of the saints from that place of hell which they call "Limbus of the Fathers" into heaven; and for that purpose after his death descended into hell.

Wherefore seeing it is most infallibly certain that the death of Christ was as powerful and effectual for the redemption of the saints before him, as for those who follow him; seeing "they did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink;" seeing Abraham is the "father of us all," and we now after Christ's ascension are called but to walk in the steps of the faith of that father; seeing the bosom of Abraham is clearly propounded in the Scriptures as the place into which the blessed angels before the death of Christ conveyed the souls of those who departed in the favor of God, and is also promised to them who should believe in Christ after his death: seeing we can find no difference or translation of the bosom of Abraham, and yet it is a comfort still to us that we shall go to him, and, while we hope so, never fear that we shall go to hell; I cannot admit this as the end of Christ's descent into hell, to convey the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and those who were with them, from thence; nor can I think there was any reference to such an action in those words, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell."

Another opinion hath obtained, especially in our church, that the end for which our Saviour descended into hell was to triumph over Satan and all the powers below within their own dominions. And this hath been received as grounded on the Scriptures and consent of fathers. The Scriptures produced for the confirmation of it are these two: "Having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them:" and, "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" Col. ii. 15; Eph. iv. 8. By the conjunction of these two they conceive the triumph of Christ's descent clearly described in this manner. Ye were "buried with Christ in baptism,

with whom ye were also raised ; and, when ye were dead in sins, he quickened you together with him, forgiving your sins, and cancelling the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us ; and, spoiling powers and principalities, he made an open show of them, triumphing over them in himself," Col. ii. 12 ; that is, say they, ye died and were buried with Christ, who fastened the hand-writing of ordinances to the cross, that he might abolish it from having any right to tie or yoke his members. Ye likewise were quickened, and raised together with Christ, who rising spoiled powers and principalities, and triumphed over them in his own person. So that these words, " spoiling principalities and powers," are not referred to the cross, but to Christ's resurrection. This triumph over Satan and all his kingdom the same apostle to the Ephesians setteth down as a consequent to Christ's death, and pertinent to his resurrection, " Ascending on high he led captivity captive : " and this, " He ascended, what meaneth it, but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth ? " So that ascending from the lower parts of the earth " he led captivity captive," which is all one with, " he triumphed over powers and principalities." With this coherence and conjunction of the apostle's words, together with the interpretation of the ancient fathers, they conceive it sufficiently demonstrated that Christ after his death, and before his resurrection, in the lowermost parts of the earth, even in hell, did lead captivity captive, and triumphed over Satan.

But, notwithstanding, I cannot yet perceive either how this triumph in hell should be delivered as a certain truth in itself, or how it can have any consistency with the denial of those other ends which they who of late have embraced this opinion do ordinarily reject. First, I cannot see how the Scriptures mentioned are sufficient to found any such conclusion of themselves. Secondly, I cannot understand how they can embrace this as the interpretation of the fathers, who believe not that any of the souls of the damned were taken out of the torments of hell, or that the souls of the saints of old were removed from thence by Christ's descent ; which were the reasons why the fathers spake of such a triumphing in hell, and leading captivity captive there.

That the triumphing in the epistle to the Colossians is not referred to the cross, but to the resurrection, cannot be proved; the coherence cannot enforce so much: no logic can infer such a division, that the blotting out of the handwriting belongeth precisely to our burial with him; and the triumphing over principalities and powers particularly to our being quickened together with him; or that the blotting out was performed at one time, and the triumphing at another. Our present translation attributeth it expressly to the cross, rendering the last words, "triumphing over them in it," that is, in the cross mentioned in the former verse; and though anciently it have been read, "triumphing over them in himself," yet still there are these two great advantages on our side; first, that if we read "in it," it proves the triumph spoken of in this place performed upon the cross; and if we read "in himself," it proveth not that the triumph was performed in any other place, because he was himself upon the cross: secondly, the ancient fathers of the Greek church read it as we do, "in it," and interpret the triumph of his death; and those others of the Latin church, who did read it otherwise, did also acknowledge with the Greeks the cross not only to be the place in which the victory over Satan was obtained, but also to be the trophy of that victory, and the triumphal chariot.

This place then of St. Paul to the Colossians cannot prove that Christ descended into hell, to triumph over the devil there; and, if it be not proper for that purpose of itself, it will not be more effectual by the addition of that other to the Ephesians. For, first, we have already shown that the descending into the lower parts of the earth doth not necessarily signify his descent into hell, and consequently cannot prove that either those things which are spoken in the same place, or in any other, are to be attributed to that descent. Again: if it were granted that those words did signify hell, and this article of our Creed were contained in them, yet would it not follow from that Scripture that Christ triumphed over Satan while his soul was in hell; for the consequence would be only this, that the same Christ who led captivity captive, descended first into hell. "In that he ascended," and ascending led captivity

captive, "what is it but that he descended first?" The descent then, if it were to hell, did precede the triumphant ascent of the same person; and that is all which the apostle's words will evince. Nay, farther yet, the ascent mentioned by St. Paul cannot be that which immediately followed the descent into hell, for it evidently signifieth the ascension which followed forty days after his resurrection. It is not an ascent from the parts below to the surface of the earth, but to the heavens above, an ascending up on high, even "far above all heavens." Now the leading captivity captive belongeth clearly to this ascent, and not to any descent which did precede it. It is not said that he descended first to lead captivity captive; and yet it must be so, if Christ descended into hell to triumph there: it is not said, when he had led captivity captive, he ascended up on high; for then it might be supposed that the captives had been led before: but it is expressly said, "ascending up on high he led captivity captive;" and consequently that triumphant act was the immediate effect of his ascension. So that by these two Scriptures no more can be proved than this, that Christ triumphed over principalities and powers at his death upon the cross, and led captivity captive at his ascension into heaven; which is so far from proving that Christ descended into hell, to triumph there, that it is more proper to persuade the contrary. For why should he go to hell to triumph over them over whom he had triumphed on the cross? Why should he go to captivate that captivity then, which he was to captivate when he ascended into heaven?

As for the testimonies of the fathers, they will appear of small validity to confirm this triumphant descent as it is distinguished from the two former effects, the removal of the saints to heaven, and the delivering the damned from the torments of hell. In vain shall we pretend that Christ descended into hell to lead captivity captive, if we withal maintain that when he descended thither he brought none away who were captive there. This was the very notion which those fathers had, that the souls of men were conquered by Satan, and after death actually brought into captivity; and that the soul of Christ, descending to the place where they were, did actually release them from that bondage, and bring them out of the possession of the Devil.

by force. Thus did he conquer Satan, spoil hell, and lead captivity captive, according to their apprehension. But, if he had taken no souls from thence, he had not spoiled hell, he had not led captivity captive, he had not so triumphed in the fathers' sense. Wherefore, seeing the Scriptures teach us not that Christ triumphed in hell; seeing the triumph which the fathers mention was either in relation to the damned souls which Christ took out of those tormenting flames, as some imagined, or in reference to the spirits of the just, which he took out of those infernal habitations, as others did conceive; seeing we have already thought fit not to admit either of these two as the effect of Christ's descent, it followeth that we cannot acknowledge this as the proper end of the article.

Nor can we see how the prophet David could intend so much, as if, when he spake those words in the person of our Saviour, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell," he should have intended this, Thou shalt not leave my soul separated from my body, and conveyed into the regions of the damned spirits, amongst all the principalities and powers of hell; I say, thou shalt not leave me there, battering all the infernal strength, redeeming the prisoners, leading captivity captive, and victoriously triumphing over death, and hell, and Satan. In sum, those words of the prophet cannot admit any interpretation involving a glorious, triumphant, and victorious condition, which is not a subject capable of dereliction. For as the hope which he had of his body, that it should not see corruption, supposed that it was to be put in the grave, which could not of itself free the body from corruption; so the hope that his soul should not be left in hell, supposeth it not to be in such a state as was of itself contradictory to dereliction.

And this leads me to that end which I conceive most conformable to the words of the prophet, and least liable to question or objection. We have already shown the substance of the article to consist in this, that the soul of Christ, really separated from his body by death, did truly pass unto the places below, where the souls of men departed were. And I conceive the end for which he did so was that he might undergo the condition of a dead man as well as of a living. He appeared here in the similitude of sin-

ful flesh, and went into the other world in the similitude of a sinner. His body was laid in a grave, as ordinarily the bodies of dead men are; his soul was conveyed into such receptacles as the souls of other persons use to be. All that was necessary for our redemption, by way of satisfaction and merit, was already performed on the cross; and all that was necessary for the actual collation and exhibition of what was merited there was to be effected upon and after his resurrection: in the interim therefore there is nothing left, at least known to us, but to satisfy the law of death. This he undertook to do, and did: and though the ancient fathers by the several additions of other ends have something obscured this, yet it may be sufficiently observed in their writings, and is certainly most conformable to that prophetic expression, upon which we have hitherto grounded our explication, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption."

Secondly: by the descent of Christ into hell, all those who believe in him are secured from descending thither. He went unto those regions of darkness, that our souls might never come into those torments which are there. By his descent he freed us from our fears, as by his ascension he secured us of our hopes. He passed to those habitations where Satan hath taken up possession and exerciseth his dominion; that, having no power over him, we might be assured that he should never exercise any over our souls departed, as belonging unto him. "Through death he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;" and, by his actual descent into the dominions of him so destroyed, secured all that have an interest in him of the same freedom which he had. Which truth is also still preserved, though among many other strange conceptions, in the writings of the fathers. Having thus examined the several interpretations of this part of the article, we may now give a brief and safe account thereof, and teach every one how he may express his faith without any danger of mistake, saying—I give a full and undoubting assent unto this, as to a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of Christ were finished on the cross, and his soul was separated from his body, though his body were dead, yet his soul died not; and though it died not, yet it

underwent the condition of the souls of such as die; and, seeing he died in the similitude of a sinner, his soul went to the place where the souls of men are kept who died for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death: but because there was no sin in him, and he had fully satisfied for the sins of others which he took upon him, therefore as God suffered not his Holy One to see corruption, so he left not his soul in hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to Christ of never coming under the power of Satan, or suffering in the flames prepared for the devil and his angels. And thus, and for these purposes, may every Christian say, I believe that Christ *descended into hell*.

He rose again.

WHATSOEVER variations have appeared in any of the other articles, this part of Christ's resurrection, hath been constantly delivered without the least alteration, either by way of addition or diminution. The whole matter of it is so necessary and essential to the Christian faith that nothing of it could be omitted; and in these few expressions the whole doctrine is so clearly delivered that nothing needed to be added. At the first view we are presented with three particulars—first, the action itself, or the resurrection of Christ, *he rose again*—secondly, the verity, reality, and propriety of that resurrection, *he rose from the dead*—thirdly, the circumstance of time, or distance of his resurrection from his death, *he rose from the dead the third day*.

For the illustration of the first particular, and the justification of our belief in Christ's resurrection, it will be necessary, first, to show the promised Messiah was to rise from the dead; and secondly, that Jesus, whom we believe to be the true and only Messiah, did so rise as it was promised and foretold. As the Messiah was to be the Son of David, so was he particularly typified by him, and promised unto him. Great were the oppositions which David suffered both from his own people, and from the nations round about him; which he expressed of himself, and foretold of the Messiah in those words, "The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against

the Lord, and against his Anointed," that is, his Christ, Psal. ii. 2. From whence it came to pass that "against the holy child Jesus, whom God had anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together to do whatsoever the hand and the council of God determined before to be done," which which was to crucify and slay the Lord of life, Acts iv. 27, 28. But, notwithstanding all this opposition and persecution, it was spoken of David, and foretold of the Son of David, "Yet have I set mine anointed upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," Psal. ii. 6. As therefore the persecution in respect of David amounted only to a depression of him, and therefore his exaltation was a settling in the kingdom; so seeing the conspiracy against the Messiah amounted to a real crucifixion and death, therefore the exaltation must include a resurrection. And seeing he who rises from the dead, begins as it were to live another life, and the grave to him is in the manner of a womb to bring him forth, therefore when God said of his Anointed, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," he did foretel and promise that he would raise the Messiah from death to life.

But because this prediction was something obscured in the figurative expression, therefore the Spirit of God hath cleared it farther by the same prophet, speaking by the mouth of David, but such words as are agreeable not to the person, but the Son of David: "My flesh shall rest in hope; for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption," Psal. xvi. 10. As for the patriarch David, he is both dead and buried, and his flesh consumed in his sepulchre; but "being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption," Acts ii. 30. They were both to be separated by his death, and each to be disposed in that place which was respectively appointed for them; but neither long to continue there; the body not to be detained in the grave, the

soul not to be left in hell, but both to meet, and, being reunited, to rise again.

Again: lest any might imagine that the *Messias* dying once might rise from death, and, living after death, yet die again, there was a further prophecy to assure us of the excellency of that resurrection and the perpetuity of that life to which the *Messias* was to be raised. For God giving this promise to his people, "I will make an everlasting covenant with you" (of which the *Messias* was to be the Mediator, and to ratify it by his death), and adding this expression, "even the sure mercies of David," Isa. lv. 3, could signify no less than that the *Christ*, who was given first unto us in a frail and mortal condition, in which he was to die, should afterwards be given in an immutable state, and consequently that he being dead should rise unto eternal life. And thus, by virtue of these three predictions, we are assured that the *Messias* was to rise again, as also by those types which did represent and presignify the same. Joseph, who was ordained to save his brethren from death who would have slain him, did represent the Son of God who was slain by us, and yet dying saved us; and his being in the dungeon typified *Christ's* death; his being taken out from thence represented his resurrection; as his erection to the power of Egypt next to Pharaoh signified the session of *Christ* at the right hand of his Father. Isaac was sacrificed, and yet lived, to show that *Christ* should truly die, and truly live again. And Abraham offered him up, "accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead, from whence also he received him in a figure," Heb. xi. 19. In Abraham's intention Isaac died; in his expectation he was to rise from the dead; in his acceptance, being spared, he was received from the dead; and all this was acted to presignify that the only Son of God was really and truly to be sacrificed and die, and after death was really and truly to be raised to life. What was the intention of our Father Abraham not performed, that was the resolution of our heavenly Father and fulfilled. And thus the resurrection of the *Messias* was represented by types, and foretold by prophecies; and therefore the *Christ* was to rise from the dead.

That *Jesus*, whom we believe to be the true and only *Messias*, did rise from the dead according to the Scriptures

is a certain and infallible truth, delivered unto us, and confirmed by testimonies human, angelical, and divine. Those pious women who thought with sweet spices to anoint him dead, found him alive, held him by the feet, and worshipped him, and as the first preachers of his resurrection, with fear and great joy, ran to bring his disciples word. The blessed apostles follow them, "to whom also he showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs;" who with great power gave witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus; the principal part of whose office consisted in this testimony, as appeareth upon the election of Matthias into the place of Judas, grounded upon this necessity: "Wherefore of these men, which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out amongst us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection," Acts i. 21. The rest of the disciples testified the same, to whom he also appeared, even to five hundred brethren at once. These were the witnesses of his own family, of such as worshipped him, such as believed in him. And, because the testimony of an adversary is in such cases thought of greatest validity, we have not only his disciples, but even his enemies to confirm it. Those soldiers that watched at the sepulchre, and pretended to keep his body from the hands of his apostles; they who felt the earth trembling under them, and saw the countenance of an angel like lightning, and his raiment white as snow; they who upon that sight did shake and became as dead men, while he whom they kept became alive; even some of these "came into the city and showed unto the chief priests all the things that were done." Thus was the resurrection of Christ confirmed by the highest human testimonies, both of his friends and enemies, of his followers and revilers.

But so great, so necessary, so important a mystery had need of a more firm and higher testimony than that of man; and therefore an angel from heaven, who was ministerial in it, gave a present and infallible witness to it. He descended, "and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it." Nay, "two angels in white, sitting the one at the head, the other at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain," said unto the women, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen."

These were the witnesses sent from heaven ; this the angelical testimony of the resurrection.

And " if we receive the witness of men," or angels, " the witness of God is greater," who did sufficiently attest this resurrection ; not only because there was no other power but that of God which could effect it, but as our Saviour himself said, " The Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me ;" adding these words to his apostles, " and ye shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." The Spirit of God sent down upon the apostles did thereby testify that Christ was risen, because he sent that Spirit from the Father ; and the apostles witnessed together with that Spirit, because they were enlightened, comforted, confirmed, and strengthened in their testimony by the same Spirit. Thus God raised up Jesus, " and showed him openly ; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to those who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." And thus, as it was foretold of the Messias, did our Jesus rise ; which was the first part of our inquiry.

For the second, concerning the reality and propriety of Christ's resurrection, expressed in that term, *from the dead*, it will be necessary first to consider what are the essential characters and proprieties of a true resurrection ; and, secondly, to show how these proprieties do belong and are agreeable to the raising of Christ. The proper notion of the resurrection consists in this, that it is a substantial change by which that which was before, and was corrupted, is reproduced the same thing again. It is said to be a change, that it may be distinguished from a second or new creation. For if God should annihilate a man or angel, and make the same man or angel out of nothing, though it were a restitution of the same thing, yet were it not properly a resurrection, because it is not a change or proper mutation, but a pure and total production. This change is called a substantial change, to distinguish it from all accidental alterations : he who awaketh from his sleep ariseth from his bed, and there is a greater change from sickness to health ; but neither of these is a resurrection. It is called a change of that which was, and hath been corrupted, be-

cause things immaterial and incorruptible cannot be said to rise again ; resurrection implying a reproduction, and that which after it was, never was not, cannot be reproduced. Again : of those things which are material and corruptible, of some the forms continue and subsist after the corruption of the whole, of others not. The forms of inanimate bodies, and all irrational souls, when they are corrupted, cease to be ; and therefore if they should be produced out of the same matter, yet were not this a proper resurrection, because thereby there would not be the same individual which was before, but only a restitution of the species by another individual. But when a rational soul is separated from its body, which is the corruption of a man, that soul so separated doth exist, and consequently is capable of conjunction and reunion with the body ; and if these two be again united by an essential and vital union, from which life doth necessarily flow, then doth the same man live who lived before ; and consequently this reunion is a perfect and proper resurrection from death to life, because the same individual person, consisting of the same soul and body, which was dead, is now alive again.

Having thus delivered the true nature of a proper resurrection, we shall easily demonstrate that Christ did truly and properly rise from the dead. For, first, by a true though miraculous generation he was made flesh ; and lived in his human nature a true and proper life, producing vital actions as we do. Secondly : he suffered a true and proper dissolution by his death ; his soul being really separated, and his body left without the least vitality, as our dead bodies are. Thirdly : the same soul was re-united to the same body, and so he lived again the same man. For the truth of which, two things were necessary to be shown upon his appearing after death ; the one concerning the verity, the other concerning the identity, of his body. All the apostles doubted of the first ; for, when Christ stood in the midst of them, “ they were affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit,” Luke xxiv. 37. But he sufficiently assured them of the verity of his corporeity, saying, “ Handle me and see : for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” He convinced them all of the identity of his body, saying, “ Behold my hands and my feet, that

it is I myself;” especially unbelieving Thomas, “Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing.” The body then in which he rose must be the same in which he lived before, because it was the same with which he died.

And, that we might be assured of the soul as well as of the body, first, he gave an argument of the vegetative and nutritive faculty, saying unto them, “Have ye here any meat? and they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honey-comb; and he took it and did eat before them”—secondly, of the sensitive part, conversing with them, showing himself, seeing and hearing them—thirdly, he gave evidence of his rational and intellectual soul, by speaking to them and discoursing out of the Scriptures, concerning those things which he spake unto them while he was yet with them. Thus did he show that the body which they saw was truly and vitally informed with a human soul. And, that they might be yet farther assured that it was the same soul by which that body lived before, he gave a full testimony of his Divinity by the miracle which he wrought in the multitude of fishes caught, by breathing on the apostles the Holy Ghost, and by ascending into heaven in the sight of his disciples. For “seeing no man ascended into heaven but he which came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which was in heaven;” seeing the Divinity was never so united to any human soul but only in that person, it appeared to be the same soul with which he lived and wrought all the miracles before. To conclude; seeing Christ appeared after his death with the same body in which he died, and with the same soul united to it, it followeth that he rose from the dead by a true and proper resurrection.

Moreover, that the verity and propriety of Christ’s resurrection may farther appear, it will be necessary to consider the cause thereof, by what power and by whom it was effected. And, if we look upon the meritorious cause, we shall find it to be Christ himself; for he by his voluntary sufferings in his life, and exact obedience at his death, did truly deserve to be raised unto life again. Because “he drank of the brook in the way,” because he humbled himself unto death, even the death of the cross,” therefore was

it necessary that he should be exalted, and the first degree of his exaltation was his resurrection. Now seeing Christ humbled himself to the sufferings both of soul and body; seeing whatsoever suffered, the same by the virtue and merit of his passion was to be exalted; seeing all other degrees of exaltation supposed that of the resurrection; it followeth from the meritorious cause that Christ did truly rise from the dead with the same soul and the same body, with which he lived united, and died separated.

The efficient cause of the resurrection of Christ is to be considered either as principal or instrumental. The principal cause was God himself; for no other power but that which is omnipotent can raise the dead. It is an act beyond the activity of any creature, and unproportionate to the power of any finite agent. "This Jesus hath God raised up," saith the apostle, "whereof we all are witnesses," Acts ii. 32. And generally in the Scriptures as our, so Christ's, resurrection is attributed unto God; and as we cannot hope after death to rise to life again, without the activity of an infinite and irresistible power, no more did Christ himself, who was no otherwise raised than by an eminent act of God's omnipotency; which is excellently set forth by the apostle, in so high an exaggeration of expressions as I think is scarcely to be paralleled in any author; "that we may know what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of the might of his power which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him up from the dead." Seeing then omnipotency is a divine attribute, and infinite power belongs to God alone; seeing no less power than infinite could raise our Saviour from the dead; it followeth that, whatsoever instrumental action might concur, God must be acknowledged the principal agent.

And therefore in the Scriptures the raising of Christ is attributed to God the Father, according to those words of the apostle, "Paul an apostle not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father who raised him from the dead;" but it is not attributed to the Father alone. For to whomsoever that infinite power doth belong, by which Christ was raised, that person must be acknowledged to have raised him. And because we have already proved

that the eternal Son of God is of the same essence, and consequently of the same power with the Father, and shall hereafter show the same true also of the Holy Ghost, therefore we must likewise acknowledge that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, raised Christ from the dead. Nor is this only true by virtue of this ratiocination, but it is also delivered expressly of the Son, and that by himself, It is a weak fallacy used by the Socinians, who maintain that God the Father only raised Christ, and then say they teach as much as the apostles did, who attribute it always either generally unto God, or particularly to the Father. For if the apostles taught it only so, yet, if he who taught the apostles taught us something more, we must make that also part of our belief. They believe the Father raised Christ, because St. Paul hath taught them so, and we believe the same; they will not believe that Christ did raise himself, but we must also believe that, because he hath said so. These were his words unto the Jews, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." John ii. 19; and this is the explication of the apostle, "But he spake of the temple of his body," which he might very properly call a temple, because "the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily." And, "when he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he said this unto them, and they believed the Scripture and the word that Jesus had said," John ii. 22. Now if upon the resurrection of Christ the apostles believed those words of Christ, "Destroy this temple, and I will raise it up," then did they believe that Christ raised himself; for in those words there is a person mentioned who raised Christ, and no other person mentioned but himself.

A strange opposition they make to the evidence of this argument, saying that God the Father raised Christ to life, and Christ being raised to life did lift and raise his body out of the grave, as the man sick of the palsy raised himself from the bed, or as we shall raise ourselves out of the graves when the trump shall sound; and this was all which Christ did or could do. But if this were true, and nothing else were to be understood in those words of our Saviour, he might as well have said, "Destroy this temple, and in three days any one of you may raise it up;" for,

when life was restored unto it by God, any one of them might have lifted it up, and raised it out of the grave, and have shown it alive.

This answer therefore is a mere shift; for to raise a body which is dead, is, in the language of the Scriptures, to give life unto it, or to quicken a mortal body; "for as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will," John v. 21. He then who quickeneth the dead bodies of others when he raiseth them, he also quickened his own body when he raised that. The temple is supposed here to be dissolved, and being so to be raised again; therefore the suscitation must answer to the dissolution. But the temple of Christ's body was dissolved when his soul was separated, nor was it any other way dissolved than by that separation. God suffered not his Holy one to see corruption, and therefore the parts of his body, in respect of each to other, suffered no dissolution. Thus as the apostle desired to be dissolved and to be with Christ, so the temple of Christ's body was dissolved here by the separation of his soul; for the temple standing was the body living, and therefore the raising of the dissolved temple was the quickening of the body. If the body of Christ had been laid down in the sepulchre alive, the temple had not been dissolved; therefore to lift it up out of the sepulchre, when it was before quickened, was not to raise a dissolved temple, which our Saviour promised he would do, and the apostles believed he did.

Again: it is most certainly false that our Saviour had power only to lift up his body when it was revived, but had no power of himself to re-unite his soul unto his body, and thereby to revive it. For Christ speaketh expressly of himself, "I lay down my life (or soul) that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again," John x. 17. The laying down of Christ's life was to die, and the taking of it again was to revive; and by his taking of his life again he showed himself to be "the resurrection and the life;" for he who was "made of the seed of David according to the flesh was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead," Rom. i. 3.

But, if Christ had done no more in the resurrection than lifted up his body when it was revived, he had done that which any other person might have done, and so had not declared himself to be the Son of God with power. It remaineth therefore that Christ, by that power which he had within himself, did take his life again which he had laid down, did re-unite his soul unto his body, from which he separated it when he gave up the ghost, and so did quicken and revive himself; and so it is a certain truth, not only that God the Father raised the Son, but also that God the Son raised himself.

From this consideration of the efficient cause of Christ's resurrection, we are yet further assured that Christ did truly and properly rise from the dead in the same soul and in the same body. For if we look upon the Father, it is beyond all controversy that he raised his own Son; and as, while he was here alive, God spake from heaven, saying "This is my beloved Son;" so after his death it was the same person of whom he spake by the prophet, "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee." If we look upon Christ himself, and consider him with power to raise himself, there can be no greater assurance that he did totally and truly rise in soul and body, by that divinity which was never separated either from the body or from the soul. And thus we have sufficiently proved our second particular, the verity, reality, and propriety, of Christ's resurrection, contained in those words, *he rose from the dead*.

The third particular concerns the time of Christ's resurrection, which is expressed by *the third day*: and those words afford a double consideration; one in respect of the distance of time, as it was after three days; the other in respect of the day, which was the third day from his passion, and the precise day upon which he rose. For the first of these we shall show that the Messiah, who was foretold both to die and to rise again, was not to rise before, and was to rise upon, the third day after his death; and that in correspondence to these predictions our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messiah, did not rise from the dead until, and did rise from the dead upon, the third day.

The typical predictions of this truth were two, answering to our two considerations; one in reference to the distance,

the other in respect of the day itself. The first is that of the prophet Jonas, who "was in the belly of the great fish three days and three nights," and then by the special command of God he was rendered safe upon the dry land, and sent a preacher of repentance to the great city of Nineveh. This was an express type of the Messiah then to come, who was to preach repentance and remission of sins to all nations; that "as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so should the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth;" and, as he was restored alive unto the dry land again, so should the Messiah, after three days, be taken out of the jaws of death, and restored unto the land of the living.

The type in respect of the day was the waved sheaf in the feast of the first fruits, concerning which this was the law of God by Moses:—"When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then shall ye bring a sheaf of the first fruits of your harvest unto the priest; and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you; on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it. And ye shall offer that day, when ye wave the sheaf, an he lamb without blemish, of the first year, for a burnt offering unto the Lord," Lev. xxiii. 10. Under the Levitical law all the fruits of the earth in the land of Canaan were profane; none might eat of them till they were consecrated; and that they were in the feast of the first fruits. One sheaf was taken out of the field and brought to the priest, who lifted it up as it were in the name of all the rest, waving it before the Lord, and it was accepted for them; so that all the sheaves in the field were holy by the acceptation of that; "for, if the first fruits be holy, the lump also is holy," Rom. xi. 16. And this was always done the day after the Sabbath, that is, the paschal solemnity, after which the fulness of the harvest followed; by which thus much was foretold and represented, that as the sheaf was lifted up and waved, and the lamb was offered on that day by the priest to God, so the promised Messiah, that immaculate Lamb which was to die, that priest who dying was to offer up himself to God, was upon this day to be lifted up and raised from the dead, or rather to shake and lift up

and present himself to God, and so to be accepted for us all, that so our dust might be sanctified, our corruption hallowed, our mortality consecrated to eternity. Thus was the resurrection of the Messias after death typically represented both in the distance and the day.

And now, in reference to both resemblances, we shall clearly show that our Jesus, whom we believe, and have already proved to be the true Messias, was so long and no longer dead, as to rise the third day; and did so order the time of his death, that the third day on which he rose might be that very day on which the sheaf was waved, the day after that sabbath mentioned in the law.

As for the distance between the resurrection and the death of Christ, it is to be considered, first, generally in itself, as it is some space of time; secondly, as it is that certain and determinate space of three days. Christ did not, would not, suddenly arise, lest any should doubt that he ever died. It was as necessary for us that he should die, as that he should live; and we, who are to believe them both, were to be assured as well of the one as of the other. That therefore we may be ascertained of his death, he did some time continue it. He might have descended from the cross before he died; but he would not, because he had undertaken to die for us. He might have revived himself upon the cross after he had given up the ghost, and before Joseph came to take him down; but he would not, lest as Pilate questioned whether he were already dead, so we might doubt whether he ever died. The reward of his resurrection was immediately due upon his passion, but he deferred the receiving of it, lest either of them being questioned, they both might lose their efficacy and intended operation. It was therefore necessary that some space should intervene between them.

Again: because Christ's exaltation was due unto his humiliation, and the first step of that was his resurrection; because the apostles after his death were to preach repentance and remission of sins through his blood, who were no way qualified to preach any such doctrine till he rose again; because the Spirit could not be sent till he ascended, and he could not ascend into heaven till he rose from the grave; therefore the space between his resurrection and

passion could not be long ; nor can there be any reason assigned why it should any longer be deferred, when the verity of his death was once sufficiently proved. Lest therefore his disciples should be long held in suspense, or any person after many days should doubt whether he rose with the same body with which he died, or no ; that he might show himself alive while the soldiers were watching at his grave, and while his crucifixion was yet in the mouths of the people, he would not stay many days before he rose. Some distance then of time there was, but not great, between his crucifixion and his resurrection.

The particular length of this space is determined in *the third day* ; but, that expression being capable of some diversity of interpretation, it is not so easily concluded how long our Saviour was dead or buried before he revived or rose again. It is written expressly in St. Matthew, that "as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so should the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," Matt. xii. 40. From whence it seemeth to follow that Christ's body was for the space of three whole days and three whole nights in the grave, and after that space of time rose from thence. And hence some have conceived, that, seeing our Saviour rose on the morning of the first day of the week, therefore it must necessarily follow that he died and was buried on the fifth day of the week before, that is on Thursday ; otherwise it cannot be true that he was in the grave three nights.

But this place, as express as it seems to be, must be considered with the rest in which the same truth is delivered ; as when our Saviour said, "After three days I will rise again ;" and again, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," or, "within three days I will build another, made without hands." But that which is most used, both in our Saviour's prediction before his death, and in the apostles' language after the resurrection, is, that "he rose from the dead the third day." Now according to the language of the Scriptures, if Christ were slain and rose the third day, the day in which he died is one, and the day on which he rose is another, and consequently there could be but one day and two nights between the day of his death and of his resurrection ; as in the case of circumcision, the male

child eight days old was to be circumcised, in which the day on which the child was born was one, and the day on which he was circumcised was another, and so there were but six complete days between the day of his birth and the day of his circumcision. The day of Pentecost was the fiftieth day from the day of the wave-offering; but in the number of the fifty days was both the day of the wave-offering and of Pentecost included; as now among the Christians still it is. Whitsunday is now the day of Pentecost, and Easter-day the day of the resurrection, answering to that of the wave-offering; but both these must be reckoned to make the number of fifty days. Christ then, who rose upon the first day of the week, as is confessed by all, died upon the sixth day of the week before; for, if he had died upon the fifth, he had risen not upon the third, but the fourth day, as Lazarus did. Seeing then it is most certain that our Saviour rose on *the third day*; seeing according to the constant language of the Greeks and Hebrews he cannot be said to rise to life on the third day who died upon any other day between which and the day of his resurrection there intervened any more than one day; therefore those other forms of speech, which are far less frequent, must be so interpreted as to be reduced to this expression of *the third day* so often reiterated.

When therefore we read that after three days he would raise the temple of his body, we must not imagine that he would continue the space of three whole days dead, and then revive himself; but upon the third day he would rise again: as Joseph and his mother "after three days found him in the temple," that is, the third day after he tarried behind in Jerusalem. And when we read that he was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, we must not look upon those nights as distinct from the days, but as Moses spake, "the evening and the morning," that is, the night and the day, "were the first day;" and as the saint spake unto Daniel, "Unto two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings," intending thereby so many days. Nor must we imagine that those three days were completed after our Saviour's death, and before he rose; but that upon the first of those three days he died, and upon the last of those three days he rose;—as we find that

“eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child:” and yet Christ was born upon the first, and circumcised upon the last of those eight days: nor were there any more than six whole days between the day of his birth, and the day of his circumcision; the one upon the 25th of December, the other upon the 1st of January. And, as the Jews were wont to speak, the priests in their courses, by the appointment of David, were to minister before the Lord eight days, whereas every week a new course succeeded, and there were but seven days’ service for each course, the sabbath on which they began, and the sabbath on which they went off, being both reckoned in the eight days; so the day on which the Son of God was crucified, dead, and buried, and the day on which he revived and rose again, were included in the number of three days. And thus did our Saviour rise from the dead upon the third day properly, and was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth synecdochically.

This is sufficient for clearing the precise distance of Christ’s resurrection from his crucifixion, expressed in the determinate number of three days: the next consideration is, what day of the week that third day was, on which Christ did actually rise, and what belongeth to that day in relation to his resurrection. Two characters there are which will evidently prove the particularity of this third day; the first is the description of that day in respect of which this is called the *third*, after the manner already delivered and confirmed; the second is the evangelists’ expression of the time on which Christ rose.

The character of the day on which our Saviour died is undeniable; for it is often expressly called the preparation, as we read, they therefore laid Jesus in the garden, “because of the Jews’ preparation day, for the sepulchre was nigh at hand;” and “the next day that followed the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees” asked a guard, John xix. 42; Matt. xxvii. 62. Now this day of preparation was the day immediately before the sabbath or some other great feast of the Jews, called by them the eve of the sabbath or the feast; and therefore called the preparation, because on that day they did prepare whatsoever was necessary for the celebration of the following festival,

according to that command in the case of manna, "It shall come to pass that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily," Exod. xvi. 5. This preparation being used both before the sabbath and other festivals, at this time it had both relations; for first, it was the preparation to a sabbath, as appeareth by those words of St. Mark, "Now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath;" and those of St. Luke, "That day was the preparation, and the sabbath drew on." Secondly: it was also the eve of a festival, even of the great day of the paschal solemnity, as appeareth by St. John, who saith, when Pilate sat down in the judgment-seat, "it was the preparation of the pass-over." And that the great paschal festivity did then fall upon the sabbath, so that the same day was then the preparation or eve of both, appeareth yet farther by the same evangelist, saying, "The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath-day, for that sabbath-day was an high day;" that is, not only an ordinary or weekly sabbath, but also a great festival, even a paschal sabbath. Now seeing the sabbath of the Jews was constant, and fixed to the seventh day of the week, it followeth that the preparation, or eve thereof, must necessarily be the sixth day of the week; which from the day, and the infinite benefit accruing to us by the passion upon that day, we call Good Friday. And from that day being the sixth of one week, the third must consequently be the eighth, or the first of the next week.

The next character of this third day is the expression of the time of the resurrection in the evangelists. "When the sabbath was past," saith St. Mark, which was the day after the preparation, on which he was buried, "very early in the morning, the first day of the week." "In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week," saith St. Matthew. "Upon the first day of the week early in the morning," saith St. Luke. "The first day of the week, early when it was yet dark," saith St. John. By all which indications it appeareth that the body of Christ being laid in the sepulchre on the day of the pre-

paration, which was the eve of the sabbath, and continuing there the whole sabbath following, which was the conclusion of that week, and farther resting there still and remaining dead the night which followed that sabbath, but belonged to the first day of the next week, about the end of that night, early in the morning, was revived by the accession and union of his soul, and rose again out of the sepulchre.

Whereby it came to pass that the obligation of the day which was then the sabbath died and was buried with him, but in a manner by a diurnal transmutation revived again at his resurrection. Well might that day, which carried with it a remembrance of that great deliverance from the Egyptian servitude, resign all the sanctity or solemnity due unto it, when that morning once appeared upon which a far greater redemption was confirmed. One day of seven was set apart by God in imitation of his rest upon the creation of the world, and that seventh day which was sanctified to the Jews was reckoned in relation to their deliverance from Egypt. At the second delivery of the law we find this particular cause assigned, "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath-day," Deut. v. 15. Now this could not be any special reason why the Jews should observe a seventh day; first, because, in reference to their redemption, the number of seven had no more relation than any other number; secondly, because the reason of a seventh day was before rendered in the body of the commandment itself. There was therefore a double reason rendered by God why the Jews should keep that sabbath which they did; one special, as to a seventh day, to show they worshipped that God who was the creator of the world; the other individual, as to that seventh day, to signify their deliverance from the Egyptian bondage, from which that seventh day was dated.

Seeing then upon the resurrection of our Saviour a greater deliverance and far more plenteous redemption was wrought than that of Egypt, and therefore a greater observance was due unto it than to that, the individual determination of the day did pass upon a stronger reason to

another day, always to be repeated by a seventh return upon the reference to the creation. As there was a change in the year at the coming out of Egypt, by the command of God; "This month, the month of Abib, shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year to you," Exod. xii. 2; so at this time of a more eminent deliverance a change was wrought in the hebdomadal or weekly account, and the first day is made the seventh, or the seventh after that first is sanctified; the first day, because on that Christ rose from the dead; and the seventh day from that first for ever, because he who rose upon that day was the same God who created the world, and rested on the seventh day; "for by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth; all things were created by him and for him." Col. i. 16.

This day did the apostles from the beginning most religiously observe, by their meeting together for holy purposes, and to perform religious duties. The first observation was performed providentially, rather by the design of God than any such inclination or intention of their own; for "the same day," saith the evangelist, that is, the day on which Christ rose from the dead, "at evening, being the first day of the week, the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews," John xx. 19. The second observation was performed voluntarily, "for after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them," John xx. 26. The first day of the week, when Christ rose by the providence of God, the disciples were together, but Thomas was absent; upon the first day of the next week they were all met together again in expectation of our Saviour, and Thomas with them. Again: "when the day of Pentecost was fully come," which was also the first day of the week, "they were all with one accord in one place;" and, having received the promise of the Holy Ghost, they spake with tongues, preached the gospel, and the same day were added unto them about three thousand souls, Acts ii. 41. The same practice of convening we find continued in the following years; for "upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them," Acts xx. 7: and the same apostle gave express command concerning the collection for the saints both to

the churches of Galatia and of Corinth : " Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him."

From this resurrection of our Saviour, and the constant practice of the apostles, this first day of the week came to have the name of the Lord's day, and is so called by St. John, who says of himself in the Revelation, " I was in the spirit on the Lord's day," Rev. i. 10. And thus the observation of that day which the Jews did sanctify ceased, and was buried with our Saviour ; and, in the stead of it, the religious observation of that day on which the Son of God rose from the dead, by the constant practice of the blessed apostles, was transmitted to the church of God, and so continued in all ages.

This day thus consecrated by the resurrection of Christ was left as the perpetual badge and cognizance of his church. As God spake by Moses to the Israelites, " Verily, my sabbath ye shall keep ; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you," Exod. xxxi. 13 ; thereby leaving a mark of distinction upon the Jews, who were by this means known to worship that God whose name was Jehovah, who made the world, and delivered them from the hands of Pharaoh ; so we must conceive that he hath given us this day as a sign between him and us for ever, whereby we may be known to worship the same God, Jehovah, who did not only create heaven and earth in the beginning, but also raised his eternal Son from the dead for our redemption. As therefore the Jews do still retain the celebration of the seventh day of the week, because they will not believe any greater deliverance wrought than that of Egypt ; as the Mahometans religiously observe the sixth day of the week in memory of Mahomet's flight from Mecca, whom they esteem a greater prophet than our Saviour ; as these are known and distinguished in the world by these several celebrations of distinct days in the worship of God ; so all who profess the Christian religion are known publicly to belong unto the church of Christ by observing the first day of the week, upon which Christ did rise from the dead, and by this mark of distinction are openly separated from all other professions.

That Christ did thus rise from the dead is a most necessary article of the Christian faith, which all are obliged to believe and profess, to the meditation whereof the apostle hath given a particular injunction, "Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead," 2 Tim. ii. 8; first, because without it our faith is vain, and by virtue of it strong. By this we are assured that he who died was the Lord of life; and though he were "crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God." By this resurrection from the dead, he "was declared to be the Son of God;" and upon the morning of the third day did those words of the Father manifest a most important truth, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." In his death he assured us of his humanity; by his resurrection he demonstrated his Divinity.

Secondly: by his resurrection we are assured of the justification of our persons; and, "if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead," it will be imputed to us for righteousness; for he "was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification," Rom. iv. 24. By his death we know that he suffered for sin; by his resurrection we are assured that the sins for which he suffered were not his own: had no man been a sinner, he had not died; had he been a sinner, he had not risen again: but, dying for those sins which we committed, he rose from the dead to show that he had made full satisfaction for them, that we believing in him might obtain remission of our sins, and justification of our persons. "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh," and raising up our surety from the prison of the grave, did actually absolve, and apparently acquit him from the whole obligation to which he had bound himself, and in discharging him acknowledged full satisfaction made for us. "Who then shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again," Rom. viii. 33.

Thirdly: it was necessary to pronounce the resurrection of Christ as an article of our faith, that thereby we might ground, confirm, strengthen, and declare our hope; for "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, according

to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled," 1 Pet. i. 3. By the resurrection of Christ, his Father hath been said to have begotten him; and therefore by the same he hath begotten us who are called brethren and co-heirs with Christ; "for if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life." Rom. v. 10. He laid down his life, but it was for us; and, being to take up his own, he took up ours. We are the members of that body of which Christ is the Head; if the Head be risen, the members cannot be far behind. He is the "first-born from the dead," and we "the sons of the resurrection," Col. i. 18. The Spirit of Christ, abiding in us, maketh us the members of Christ, and by the same Spirit we have a full right and title to rise with our Head; "for, if the Spirit of him that raiseth up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in us," Rom. viii. 11. Thus the resurrection of Christ is the cause of our resurrection by a double causality, as an efficient and as an exemplary cause; as an efficient cause, in regard our Saviour by and upon his resurrection hath obtained power and right to raise all the dead; "for as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive:"—as an exemplary cause, in regard that all the saints of God shall rise after the similitude and in conformity to the resurrection of Christ; "for, if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." "He shall change our vile bodies, that they may be like unto his glorious body:" that "as we have borne the image of the earthy, we may also bear the image of the heavenly," Rom. vi. 5; Phil. iii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 49. This is the great hope of a Christian, that Christ rising from the dead hath obtained the power, and is become the pattern, of his resurrection. "The breaker is come up before them; they have broken up and have passed through the gate; their king shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them."

Fourthly: it is necessary to profess our faith in Christ risen from the dead, that his resurrection may effectually

work its proper operation on our lives. For as it is efficient and exemplary to our bodies, so it is also to our souls. "When we are dead in sins, God quickeneth us together with Christ," and, "as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life," Eph. ii. 5; Rom. vi. 4. To continue among the graves of sin while Christ is risen is to incur that reprehension of the angel, "Why seek ye the living among the dead?" To walk in any habitual sin is either to deny that sin is death, or that Christ is risen from the dead. Let then "the dead bury their dead," but let not any Christian bury him who rose from death that he might live. "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." Eph. v. 14. There must be a spiritual resurrection of the soul before there can be a comfortable resurrection of the body. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in this first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power." Rev. xx. 6.

Having thus explained the manner of Christ's resurrection, and the necessity of our faith in him risen from the dead, we may easily give such a brief account as any Christian may understand what it is he should intend when he makes profession of this part of his Creed; for he is conceived to acknowledge thus much:—I freely and fully assent unto this, as a truth of infinite certainty and absolute necessity, that the eternal Son of God, who was crucified and died for our sins, did not long continue in the state of death, but by his infinite power did revive and raise himself, by reuniting the same soul which was separated to the same body which was buried, and so rose the same man: and this he did the third day from his death; so that dying on Friday the sixth day of the week, the day of the preparation of the sabbath, and resting in the grave the sabbath-day, on the morning of the first day of the week he returned unto life again, and thereby consecrated the weekly revolution of that first day to a religious observation until his coming again. And thus I believe *the third day he rose again from the dead.*

ARTICLE VI.

He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

THIS article hath received no variation, but only in the addition of the name of *God*, and the attribute *almighty*; the ancients using it briefly thus, *He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father*. It containeth two distinct parts; one transient, the other permanent; one as the way, the other as the end: the first is Christ's ascension, the second is his session.

In the ascension of Christ these words of the Creed propound to us three considerations and no more; the first of the person, *he*; the second of the action, *ascended*; the third of the termination, *into heaven*. Now the person being perfectly the same which we have considered in the precedent articles, he will afford no different speculation but only in conjunction with this particular action. Wherefore I conceive these three things necessary and sufficient for the illustration of Christ's ascension—first, to show that the promised Messiah was to ascend into heaven; secondly, to prove that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messiah, did really and truly ascend thither; thirdly, to declare what that heaven is into which he did ascend.

That the promised Messiah should ascend into heaven hath been represented typically and declared prophetically. The high priest under the law was an express type of the Messiah and his priestly office; the atonement which he made was the representation of the propitiation in Christ for the sins of the world: for the making of this atonement, the high priest was appointed once every year to enter into the holy of holies, and no oftener. For the Lord said unto Moses, "Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the veil before the mercy-seat, which is upon the ark, that he die not," Lev. xvi. 2. None entered into that holy place but the high priest alone; and he himself could enter thither but once in the year; and thereby showed that "the High Priest of the good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle

not made with hands, was to enter into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," Heb. ix. 11. The Jews did all believe that the tabernacle did signify this world, and the holy of holies the highest heavens; wherefore as the high priest did slay the sacrifice, and with the blood thereof did pass through the rest of the tabernacle, and with that blood enter into the holy of holies; so was the Messias here to offer up himself, and being slain to pass through all the courts of this world below, and with his blood to enter into the highest heavens, the most glorious seat of the majesty of God. Thus Christ's ascension was represented typically.

The same ascension was also declared prophetically, as we read in the prophet David, Psal. lxxviii. 18, "Thou hast ascended up on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men;" which phrase "on high," in the language of David, signifying heaven, could be applied properly to no other conqueror but the Messias; not to Moses, not to David, not to Joshua, not to any but the Christ, who was to conquer sin, and death, and hell, and, triumphing over them, to ascend into the highest heaven, and thence to send the precious and glorious gifts of the Spirit unto the sons of men. The prophecy of Micah did foretel as much, even in the opinion and confession of the Jews themselves, by those words, "The breaker is come up before them; they have broken up and have passed through the gate, and are gone out by it; and their king shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them." And thus Christ's ascension was declared prophetically as well as typically; which was our first consideration.

Secondly: whatsoever was thus represented and foretold of the promised Messias was truly and really performed by our Jesus. That only begotten and eternal Son of God, who by his divinity was present in the heavens while he was on earth, did, by a local translation of his human nature, really and truly ascend from this earth below on which he lived, into the heavens above, or rather above all the heavens, in the same body and the soul with which he lived and died and rose again.

The ascent of Christ into heaven was not metaphorical or figurative, as if there were no more to be understood by it, but only that he obtained a more heavenly and glorious

state or condition after his resurrection. For whatsoever alteration was made in the body of Christ when he rose, whatsoever glorious qualities it was invested with thereby, that was not his ascension, as appeareth by those words which he spake to Mary, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father." Although he had said before to Nicodemus, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven;" which words imply that he had then ascended; yet even those concern not this ascension. For that was therefore only true, because the Son of Man, not yet conceived in the virgin's womb, was not in heaven, and after his conception by virtue of the hypostatical union was in heaven; from whence, speaking after the manner of men, he might well say that he had ascended into heaven; because whatsoever was first on earth and then in heaven we say ascended into heaven. Wherefore, beside that grounded upon the hypostatical union, beside that glorious condition upon his resurrection, there was yet another, and that more proper ascension; for, after he had both those ways ascended, it was still true that he had not yet ascended to his Father.

Now this kind of ascension, by which Christ had not yet ascended when he spake to Mary after his resurrection, was not long after to be performed; for at the same time he said unto Mary, "Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father." And, when this ascension was performed, it appeared manifestly to be a true local translation of the Son of Man, as man, from these parts of the world below into the heavens above, by which that body which was before locally present here on earth, and was not so then present in heaven, became substantially present in heaven, and no longer locally present in earth. For when he had spoken unto the disciples, and blessed them, laying his hands upon them, and so was corporeally present with them, even "while he blessed them he was parted from them, and while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight;" and so he was carried up into heaven, while they looked stedfastly towards heaven as he went up. This was a visible depar-

ture, as it is described, a real removing of that body of Christ which was before present with the apostles ; and that body living after the resurrection, by virtue of that soul which was united to it; and therefore the Son of God according to his humanity was really and truly translated from these parts below unto the heavens above, which is a proper local ascension.

Thus was Christ's ascension visibly performed in the presence and sight of the apostles, for the confirmation of the reality and the certainty thereof. They did not see him when he rose, but they saw him when he ascended ; because an eye-witness was not necessary unto the act of his resurrection, but it was necessary unto the act of his ascension. It was sufficient that Christ showed himself to the apostles alive after his passion ; for seeing they knew him before to be dead, and now saw him alive, they were thereby assured that he rose again : for, whatsoever was a proof of his life after death, was a demonstration of his resurrection. But seeing the apostles were not to see our Saviour in heaven, seeing the session was not to be visible to them on earth, therefore it was necessary they should be eye-witnesses of the act, who were not with the same eyes to behold the effect.

Beside the eye-witness of the apostles, there was added the testimony of the angels ; those blessed spirits which ministered before, and saw the face of God in heaven, and came down from thence, did know that Christ ascended up from hence unto that place from whence they came ; and, because the eyes of the apostles could not follow him so far, the inhabitants of that place did come to testify of his reception ; for " behold two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven ? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven," Acts i. 10. We must therefore acknowledge and confess, against the wild heresies of old, that the eternal Son of God, who died and rose again, did, with the same body and soul with which he died and rose, ascend up to heaven : which was the second particular considerable in this Article.

Thirdly : seeing the name of heaven admitteth divers acceptations in the sacred Scriptures, it will be necessary to inquire what is the true notion of it in this Article, and what was the proper termination of Christ's ascension. In some sense it might be truly said Christ was in heaven before the cloud took him out of the apostles' sight ; for the clouds themselves are called the clouds of heaven : but that heaven is the first : and our Saviour certainly ascended at least as far as St. Paul was caught up, that is, into the third heaven ; for " we have a great High Priest that is passed through the heavens." And needs must he pass through the heavens, because he was " made higher than the heavens ; for " he that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens." When therefore Christ is said to have ascended into heaven, we must take that word as signifying as much as the heaven of heavens ; and so Christ is ascended through and above the heavens, and yet is still in heaven : for he is " entered into that within the veil :"—there is his passage through the heavens ; " into the holy place, even into heaven itself, to appear in the presence of God ;" this is the heaven of heavens. For thus said the Lord, " The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool ;" and, as Christ descended unto the footstool of his Father in his humiliation, so he ascended unto the throne of his Father in his exaltation. This was the place of which our Saviour spake to his disciples, " What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before ?" Had he been there before in body, it had been no such wonder that he should have ascended thither again ; but that his body should ascend unto that place where the majesty of God was most resplendent ; that the flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone, should be seated far above all angels and archangels, all principalities and powers, even at the right hand of God ; this was that which Christ propounded as worthy of their greatest admiration. Whatsoever heaven then is higher than all the rest which are called heavens, whatsoever sanctuary is holier than all which are called holies, whatsoever place is of greatest dignity in all those courts above, into that place did he ascend, where in the splendor of his Deity he was before he took upon him our humanity.

As therefore, when we say Christ ascended, we understand a literal and local ascent, not of his divinity (which possesseth all places, and therefore being every where is not subject to the imperfection of removing any whither) but of his humanity, which was so in one place that it was not in another; so when we say the place into which he ascended was heaven, and from the expositions of the apostles must understand thereby the heaven of heavens, or the highest heaven, it followeth that we believe the body with the soul of Christ to have passed far above all those celestial bodies which we see, and to look upon that opinion as a low conceit which left his body in the sun.

It was necessary to profess this article of Christ's ascension; first, for the confirmation and augmentation of our faith. Our faith is thereby confirmed, in that we believe in him who is received unto the Father, and therefore certainly came from the Father. His father sent him, and we have received the message from him, and are assured that it is the same message which he was sent to deliver, because he is so highly rewarded by him that sent him for delivering it. Our faith is thereby exalted and augmented, as being "the evidence of things not seen." The farther the object is removed from us, the more of faith hath that act which embraceth it. Christ said unto Thomas, "Because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed;" and that blessedness by his ascension he hath left to the whole church. Thus Christ ascended is the ground and glory of our faith; and, by virtue of his being in heaven, our belief is both encouraged and commended; for his ascent is the cause, and his absence the crown, of our faith: because he ascended, we the more believe; and, because we believe in him who hath ascended, our faith is the more accepted.

Secondly: it is necessary to believe the ascension of Christ for the corroboration of our hope. We could never expect our dust and ashes should ascend the heavens; but, seeing our nature hath gone before in him, we can now hope to follow after him. He is our Head, and, where that is, the members may expect admission; for in so great and intimate a union there is no fear of separation or exclusion: there "are many mansions in his Father's house." And, when he

spake of ascending thither, he said expressly to his disciples, "I go to prepare a place for you, and will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also" The first fruits of our nature are ascended, and the rest is sanctified. "This is the new and living way which he consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh," Heb. x. 20. And hence we "have our hope as an anchor of the soul both sure and stedfast, which entereth into that within the veil, whither the forerunner is for us entered," Heb. vi. 19. For if Christ in his ascension be the forerunner, then are there some to follow after; and not only so, but they which follow are to go in the same way, and to attain unto the same place; and, if this forerunner be entered for us, then we are they who are to follow and overtake him there, as being of the same nature, members of the same body, branches of the same vine; and therefore he went thither before us as the first-fruits before those that follow, and we hope to follow him as coming late to the same perfection.

As therefore "God hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together" by virtue of his resurrection; so hath he also "made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus," by virtue of his ascension. We are already seated there in him, and hereafter shall be seated by him; in him already, as in our Head, which is the ground of our hope; by him hereafter, as by the cause conferring, when hope shall be swallowed up in fruition.

Thirdly: the profession of faith in Christ ascended is necessary for the exaltation of our affections; "for where our treasure is there will our hearts be also." "If I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men unto me," saith our Saviour; and, if those words were true of his crucifixion, how powerful ought they to be in reference to his ascension! "When the Lord would take up Elijah into heaven, Elisha said unto him, "as the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee:" when Christ is ascended up on high, we must follow him with the wings of our meditations, and with the chariots of our affections. "If we be risen with Christ," we must "seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God." If we be dead, and "our life hid in Christ with God," we must "set

our affections on things above, not on things on the earth." Christ is ascended into heaven to teach us that we are strangers and pilgrims here, as all our fathers were, and that another country belongs unto us : whence we as strangers and pilgrims should learn to abstain from fleshly lusts ; and not mind earthly things ; as knowing that we are citizens of heaven (" from whence we look for our Saviour, the Lord Jesus)," yea, " fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." We should trample upon our sins, and subdue the lusts of the flesh, that our conversation may be correspondent to our Saviour's condition : that where the eyes of the apostles were forced to leave him, thither our thoughts may follow him.

Fourthly : the ascension of Christ is a necessary article of the Creed in respect of those great effects which immediately were to follow it, and did absolutely depend upon it. The blessed apostles had never preached the gospel, had they not been endued with power from above ; but none of that power had they received, if the Holy Ghost, in a miraculous manner, had not descended ; and the Holy Ghost had not come down, except our Saviour had ascended first. For he himself, when he was to depart from his disciples, grounded the necessity of his departure upon the certainty of this truth, saying, " If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you : but, if I depart, I will send him unto you," John xvi. 7. Now, if all the infallibility of those truths, which we as Christians believe, depend upon the certain information which the apostles had, and those apostles appear to be no way infallible till the cloven tongues had sat upon them, it was first absolutely necessary that the Holy Ghost should so descend. Again, seeing it was impossible that the Spirit of God in that manner should come down, until the Son of God had ascended into heaven ; seeing it was not fit that the second Advocate should officiate on earth, till the first Advocate had entered upon his office in heaven ; therefore in respect of this great work the Son of God must necessarily ascend, and in reference to that necessity we may well be obliged to confess that ascension.

Upon these considerations, we may easily conclude what every Christian is obliged to confess in those words of our Creed, *he ascended into heaven* ; for thereby he is under-

stood to express thus much:—I am fully persuaded that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, after he rose from the dead, did with the same soul and body with which he rose, by a true and local translation, convey himself from the earth on which he lived, through all the regions of the air, through all the celestial orbs, until he came unto the heaven of heavens, the most glorious presence of the majesty of God. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ, who *ascended into heaven*.

And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

THIS second part of the Article containeth two particulars—the cession of the Son, and the description of the Father: the first showeth that Christ, upon his ascension, is set down *at the right hand of God*; the second assureth us, that the God, at whose right hand Christ is set down, is the *Father Almighty*.

For the explication of Christ's session, three things will be necessary; first, to prove that the promised Messiah was to sit at the right hand of God: secondly, to show that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messiah, is set down at the right hand of God; thirdly, to find what is the importance of that phrase, and in what propriety of expression it belongs to Christ.

That the promised Messiah was to sit at the right hand of God was both pre-typified and foretold. Joseph, who was betrayed and sold by his brethren, was an express type of Christ; and, though in many things he represented the Messiah, yet in none more than this, that being taken out of the prison he was exalted to the supreme power of Egypt. For thus Pharaoh spake to Joseph, "Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou. And Pharaoh took off the ring from his hand, and put it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck: and he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had, and they cried before him, Bow the knee; and he made him ruler over all the land of Egypt," Gen. xli. 40. Thus Jo-

seph had the execution of all the regal power committed unto him, all edicts and commands were given out by him, the managing of all affairs was through his hands, only the authority by which he moved remained in Pharaoh still. This was a clear representation of the Son of Man, who, by his sitting on the right hand of God, obtained power to rule and govern all things both in heaven and earth, especially as "the ruler of his house," that is, the church, with express command that all things both in heaven and earth, and under the earth, should bow down before him; but all this in the name of the Father, to whom the throne is still reserved, in whom the original authority still remains. And thus the session of the Messias was pre-typified.

The same was also expressly foretold, not only in the sense, but in the phrase. "The Lord said unto my Lord," saith the prophet David, "Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool," Psal. cx. 1. The Jews have endeavoured to avoid this prophecy, but with no success; some make the person to whom God speaks to be Hezekiah, some Abraham, some Zerubbabel, others David, others the people of Israel; and, because the prophecy cannot belong to him who made the psalm, therefore they who attribute the prediction to Abraham tell us the psalm was penned by his steward Eliezer: they who expound it of David say that one of his musicians was author of it.

But, first, it is most certain that David was the penman of this psalm; the title speaks as much, which is, "A Psalm of David;" from whence it followeth that the prediction did not belong to him, because it was spoken to his Lord. Nor could it indeed belong to any of the rest whom the Jews imagine, because neither Abraham, nor Hezekiah, nor Zerubbabel, could be the Lord of David, much less the people of Israel, to whom some of the Jews referred it, who were not the lords but the subjects of that David. Besides, he who is said to sit at the right hand of God is also said to be "a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec;" but neither Abraham, nor Hezekiah, nor any whom the Jews have mentioned, was ever any priest of God. Again: our Saviour urged this Scripture against the Pharisees, saying, "What think ye of Christ? whose Son is he? They say unto him, the Son of David. He

saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then called him Lord, how is he his Son? and no man was able to answer him a word," Matt. xxii. 42. From whence it is evident that the Jews of old, even the Pharisees, the most accurate and skilful amongst them, did interpret this psalm of the Messias; for, if they had conceived the prophecy belonged either to Abraham, or David, or any of the rest since mentioned by the Jews, they might very well, and questionless would, have answered our Saviour, that this belonged not to the Son of David. It was therefore the general opinion of the church of the Jews before our Saviour, and of divers Rabbins since his death, that this prediction did concern the kingdom of Christ. And thus the cession of the Messias at the right hand of God was not only represented typically, but foretold prophetically, which is our first consideration.

Secondly: we affirm that our Jesus, whom we worship as the true Messias, according unto that particular prediction, when he ascended up on high, did sit down at the right hand of God. His ascension was the way to his session, and his session the end of his ascension; as the evangelist expresseth it, "He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God;" or, as the apostle, "God raised Christ from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places." There could be no such session without an ascension; and "David is not ascended into the heavens; but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly;" let all the blind and wilful Jews be convinced of this truth, that God hath not set at his own right hand, either Abraham or David, either Hezekiah or Zerubbabel, but "hath made that same Jesus, whom they have crucified, both Lord and Christ."

This was an honor never given, never promised, to any man but the Messias: the glorious spirits stand about the throne of God, but never any of them sat down at the right hand of God. "For to which of his angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine ene-

mies thy footstool?" But Christ was so assured of this honor, that before the council of the chief priests, and the elders of the people, when he foresaw his death contrived and his cross prepared, even then he expressed the confidence of his expectation, saying, "Hereafter shall the Son of Man sit on the right hand of the power of God," Luke xxii. 69. And thus our Jesus, whom we worship as the true promised Messias, "is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God," 1 Pet. iii. 22—which was our second consideration.

Our next inquiry is, what may be the utmost importance of that phrase, and how it is applicable unto Christ? The phrase consists of two parts, and both to be taken metaphorically: first, therefore, we must consider what is the *right hand of God*, in the language of the Scriptures; secondly, what it is to *sit* down at that right hand. God, being a spirit, can have no material or corporeal parts; and consequently, as he hath no body, so in a proper sense can he have no hands at all; but because God is pleased to descend to our capacity, and not only to speak by the mouths of men, but also after the manner of men, he expresseth that which is in him by some analogy with that which belongs to us. The hands of man are those organical parts which are most active, and executive of our power; by these the strength of our body is expressed, and most of our natural and artificial actions are performed by them. From whence the power of God, and the exertion or execution of that power, is signified by the hand of God. Moreover, seeing by a general custom of the world the right hand is more used than the left, and by that general use acquireth a greater firmness and strength, therefore the right hand of God signifieth the exceedingly great and infinite power of God.

Again: because the most honorable place amongst men is the right hand (as when Bathsheba went unto king Solomon, "he sat down on his throne, and caused a seat to be set for the king's mother, and she sat on his right hand," 1 Kings ii. 19), therefore the right hand of God signifies the glorious majesty of God.

Thirdly: because the gifts of men are given and received by the hands of men, and "every perfect gift comes from

the Father of lights," therefore the right hand of God is the place of celestial happiness and perfect felicity; according to that of the psalmist, "In thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore." Psal. xvi. 11.

Now as to the first acceptation of the right hand of God, Christ is said to sit down at the right hand of the Father in regard of that absolute power and dominion which he hath obtained in heaven; from whence it is expressly said, "Hereafter ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power," Matt. xxvi. 64.

As to the second acceptation, Christ is said to sit on the right hand of God in regard of that honor, glory, and majesty, which he hath obtained there; wherefore it is said, "When he had by himself purged our sins, he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;" and again, "We have an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens," Heb. i. 3; viii. 1.

In reference to the third acceptation, Christ is said to sit on the right hand of God, because now after all the labors and sorrows of this world, after his stripes and buffetings, after a painful and shameful death, he resteth above in unspeakable joy and everlasting felicity.

As for the other part of the phrase, that is, his session, we must not look upon it as determining any posture of his body in the heavens, correspondent to the inclination and curvation of our limbs; for we read in the Scriptures a more general term, which signifies only his being in heaven, without any expression of the particular manner of his presence. So St. Paul, "Who is even at the right hand of God;" and St. Peter, "Who is gone into heaven, and is at the right hand of God." Besides, we find him expressed in another position than that of session; for "Stephen, looking stedfastly into heaven, saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God; and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." He appeared standing unto Stephen whom we express sitting in our Creed; but this is rather a difference of the occasion than a diversity of position. He appeared standing to Stephen, as ready to assist him, as ready to plead for him, as ready to

receive him ; and he is oftener expressed sitting, not for any positional variation, but for the variety of his effects and operation.

This phrase then "to sit," prescinding from the corporeal posture of session, may signify no more than habitation, possession, permansion, and continuance ; as the same word in the Hebrew and Greek languages often signifies. And thus our Saviour is set down at the right hand of God in heaven ; because he who dwelt with us before on earth is now ascended up into heaven, and hath taken his mansion or habitation there ; and so hath he seated himself, and dwelleth in the highest heavens.

Again: the notion of sitting implieth rest, quietness, and indisturbance ; according to that promise in the prophet, "They shall sit every man under his fig-tree, and none shall make them afraid," Mic. iv. 4. So Christ is ascended into heaven, where, resting from all pains and sorrows, he is seated free from all disturbance and opposition ; God having placed him at his right hand, until he hath made his enemies his footstool.

Thirdly : this sitting implieth yet more than quietness or continuance, even dominion, sovereignty, and majesty ; as when Solomon sat in the throne of his father, he reigned over Israel after the death of his father. And thus Christ "is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." And St. Paul did well interpret those words of the prophet, "Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool," saying, "He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet," 1 Cor. xv. 25.

Fourthly : this sitting doth yet more properly and particularly imply the right of judicature, and so especially expresseth "a king that sitteth in the throne of judgment ;" as it is written, "In mercy shall the throne be established, and he shall sit upon it in truth, in the tabernacle of David, judging and seeking judgment, and hasting righteousness," Isa. xvi. 5. And so Christ sitting at the right hand of God is manifested and declared to be the great Judge of the quick and the dead. Thus to sit doth not signify any peculiar inclination or flexion, any determinate location or position of the body, but to be in heaven with permanence of habitation, happiness of condition, regular and

judiciary power; as in other authors such significations are usual.

The importance of the language being thus far improved, at last we find the substance of the doctrine, which is, that sitting at the right hand of God was our Mediator's solemn entry upon his regal office, as to the execution of that full dominion which was due unto him. For "worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing," Rev. v. 12. Wherefore Christ after his death and resurrection saith, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," Matt. xxviii. 18. For because "he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, therefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth," Phil. ii. 8. And this obedience and submission was and is due unto him, because God "raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principalities and powers, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet; and gave him to be the head over all things to the church."

There was an express promise made by God to David, "Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee; thy throne shall be established for ever," 2 Sam. vii. 16. This promise, strictly and literally taken, was but conditional: and the condition of the promise is elsewhere expressed, "Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne. If thy children will keep my covenant, and my testimony that I shall teach them, their children also shall sit upon thy throne for evermore," Ps. cxxxii. 12. Notwithstanding this promise, the kingdom of David was intercepted, nor was his family continued on the throne: part of the kingdom was first rent from his posterity, next the regality itself; and, when it was restored, translated to another family: and yet we cannot say the promise was not made good, but only ceased in the obligation of a promise, because the condition was not performed. The posterity of

David did not keep the covenant and testimony of their God, and therefore the throne of David was not by an uninterrupted lineal succession established to perpetuity.

But yet in a larger and better sense, after these interruptions, the throne of David was continued. When they had sinned, and lost their right unto the crown, the kingdom was to be given unto him who never sinned, and consequently could never lose it; and, he being of the seed of David, in him the throne of David was without interception or succession continued. Of him did the angel Gabriel speak at his conception, "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke i. 32. Thus the throne of Christ is called the throne of David, because it was promised unto David, and because the kingdom of David was a type, resemblance, and representation of it; insomuch that Christ himself in respect of this kingdom is often called David, as particularly in that promise, "I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their Shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them."

Now as David was not only first designed, but also anointed king over Israel, and yet had no possession of the crown; seven years he continued anointed by Samuel, and had no share in the dominion; seven years after he continued anointed in Hebron king over the tribe of Judah only; at last he was received by all the tribes, and so obtained full and absolute regal power over all Israel, and seated himself in the royal city of Jerusalem: so Christ was born King of the Jews, and the conjunction of his human nature with his divine in the union of his person was a sufficient unction to his regal office; yet, as the Son of Man, he exercised no such dominion, professing that his kingdom was not of this world. But after he rose from the dead, then as it were in Hebron with his own tribe he tells the apostles, "all power is given unto him;" and by virtue thereof gives them injunctions; and at his ascension he enters into the Jerusalem above, and there sits down at the right hand of the throne of God, and so makes a solemn

entry upon the full and entire dominion over all things; then could St. Peter say, "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ," Acts ii. 36.

The immediate effect of this regal power, the proper execution of this office, is the subduing of all his enemies; for he is "set down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool," Heb. x. 12. This was the ancient custom of the oriental conquerors, to tread upon the necks of their subdued enemies; as when Joshua had the five kings as his prisoners he said unto the men of war, which went with him, "Come near, put your feet upon the necks of them," Josh x. 24. Thus to signify the absolute and total conquest of Christ, and the dreadful majesty of his throne, all his enemies are supposed to lie down before him, and he to set his feet upon them.

The enemies of Christ are of two kinds, either temporal or spiritual; the temporal enemies I call such as visibly and actually oppose him, and his apostles, and all those who profess to believe in his name. Such especially and principally were the Jews, who rejected, persecuted, and crucified him; who, after his resurrection, scourged, stoned, and despitefully used his disciples; who tried all ways and means imaginable to hinder the propagation, and dishonor the profession of Christianity. A part of his regal office was to subdue these enemies, and he sat down on the right hand of God, that they might be made his footstool: which they suddenly were according to his prediction, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom," Matt. xvi. 28. For within few years the temple, the city, and the whole polity of the Jews were destroyed for ever in a revenging manner by the hands of the Romans, which they made use of to crucify the Lord of life. The Romans themselves were the next enemies, who first complied with the Jews in Christ's crucifixion, and afterwards in defence of their heathen deities endeavoured the extirpation of Christianity by successive persecutions. These were next to be made the footstool of the King of kings; and so they were, when Rome, the regnant city, the head of that vast

empire, was taken and sacked; when the Christians were preserved, and the heathens perished; when the worship of all their idols ceased, and the whole Roman empire marched under the banner of Christianity. In the same manner all those persons and nations whatsoever, who openly oppose and persecute the name of Christ, are enemies unto this King, to be in due time subdued under him, and, when he calleth, to be slain.

The spiritual enemies of this King are of another nature; such as by an invisible way make opposition to Christ's dominion, as sin, Satan, death. Every one of these hath a kingdom of its own, set up and opposed to the kingdom of Christ. The apostle hath taught us that "sin hath reigned unto death;" and hath commanded us not to "let it reign in our mortal bodies, that we should obey it in the lusts thereof." There is therefore a dominion and kingdom of sin set up against the throne of the immaculate lamb. Satan would have been like the Most High, and, being cast down from heaven, hath erected his throne below: "he is the prince of this world; the spirit which now worketh in the children of disobedience; the prince of the power of the air;" and thus the rulers of the darkness of this world oppose themselves to the true light of the world. Death also hath its dominion, and, as the apostle speaks, "reigned from Adam to Moses;" even "by one man's offence, death reigned by one," and so set up a ruling and a regal power against the Prince of life.

For the destruction of these powers was Christ exalted to the right hand of God, and by his regal office doth he subdue and destroy them all. And yet this destruction is not so universal but that sin, Satan, and death shall still continue. It is true, he shall "put down all rule and authority and power;" but this amounts not so much to a total destruction, as to an absolute subjection; for, as he is able, so will he "subdue all things unto himself." The principal end of the regal office of the Mediator is the effectual redemption and actual salvation of all those whom God hath given him; and whosoever or whatsoever opposeth the salvation of these is by that opposition constituted and become an enemy to Christ. And because this enmity is grounded upon that opposition, therefore so

far as any thing opposeth the salvation of the sons of God, so far it is an enemy, and no farther; and consequently Christ, by sitting at the right hand of God, hath obtained full and absolute power utterly to destroy those three spiritual enemies, so far as they make this opposition; and farther than they do oppose they are not destroyed by him, but subdued to him: whatsoever hindereth and obstructeth the bringing of his own into his kingdom, for the demonstration of God's mercy, is abolished; but whatsoever may be yet subservient to the demonstration of his justice is continued.

Christ then, as King, destroyeth the power of sin in all those who belong unto his kingdom, annihilating the guilt thereof by the virtue of his death, destroying the dominion thereof by his actual grace, and taking away the spot thereof by grace habitual. But, in the reprobate and damned souls, the spot of sin remaineth in its perfect die, the dominion of sin continueth in its absolute power, the guilt of sin abideth in a perpetual obligation to eternal pains: but all this in subjection to his throne, the glory of which consisteth as well in punishing rebellion as rewarding loyalty.

Again: Christ sitting on the right hand of God destroyeth all the strength of Satan and the powers of hell: by virtue of his death, perpetually represented to his Father, "he destroyeth him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil." But the actual destruction of these powers of darkness hath reference only to the elect of God. In them he preventeth the wiles, those he taketh out of the snare; in them he destroyeth the works, those he preserveth from the condemnation of the Devil. He freeth them here from the prevailing power of Satan by his grace; he freeth them hereafter from all possibility of any infernal opposition by his glory. But still the reprobate and damned souls are continued slaves unto the powers of hell; and he who sitteth upon the throne delivereth them to the Devil and his angels, to be tormented with and by them for ever; and this power of Satan still is left as subservient to the demonstration of the divine justice.

Thirdly: Christ sitting on the throne of God at last destroyeth death itself; for "the last enemy which shall be

destroyed is death." But this destruction reacheth no farther than the removing of all power to hinder the bringing of all such persons as are redeemed actually by Christ into the full possession of his heavenly kingdom. He "will ransom them from the power of the grave; he will redeem them from death. O death, he will be thy plague; O grave, he will be thy destruction," Hos. xiii. 14. The trump shall sound, the graves shall open, the dead shall live, the bodies shall be framed again out of the dust, and the souls which left them shall be reunited to them, and all the sons of men shall return to life, and death shall be "swallowed up in victory." The sons of God shall then be made completely happy both in soul and body, never again to be separated, but to inherit eternal life. Thus, he who sitteth at the right hand of God "hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light. But, to the reprobate and damned persons, death is not destroyed but improved. They rise again indeed to life, and so the first death is evacuated; but that life to which they rise is a second, and a far worse death. And thus Christ is set down at the right hand of God, that he might subdue all things to himself.

The regal power of Christ, as a branch of the Mediatorship, is to continue till all those enemies be subdued. "For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. But now we see not yet all things put under him." Therefore he must still continue there; and this necessity is grounded upon the promise of the Father, and the expectation of the Son. "Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool," saith the Father; upon which words we may ground as well the continuation as the session. Upon this promise of the Father, the Son "sat down at the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." Seeing, then, the promise of God cannot be evacuated, seeing the expectation of Christ cannot be frustrated, it followeth that our Mediator shall exercise the regal power at the right hand of God till all opposition shall be subdued.

When all the enemies of Christ shall be subdued, when all the chosen of God shall be actually brought into his kingdom, when those who refused him to rule over them shall be slain, that is, when the whole office of the Media-

tor shall be completed and fulfilled, then every branch of the execution shall cease. As therefore there shall no longer continue any act of the prophetic part to instruct us, nor any act of the priestly part to intercede for us, so there shall be no farther act of this regal power of the Mediator necessary to defend and preserve us. The beatifical vision shall succeed our information and instruction, a present fruition will prevent oblation and intercession, and perfect security will need no actual defence and protection. As therefore the general notion of a Mediator ceaseth when all are made one, because "a Mediator is not a Mediator of one;" so every part or branch of that Mediatorship, as such, must also cease, because that unity is in all parts complete. "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For, when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that hath put all things under him, that God may be all in all," 1 Cor. xv. 24.

Now, though the Mediatorship of Christ be then resigned, because the end thereof will then be performed; though the regal office, as part of that Mediatorship, be also resigned with the whole; yet we must not think that Christ shall cease to be a King, or lose any of the power and honor which before he had. The dominion which he hath was given him as a reward for what he suffered: and certainly the reward shall not cease when the work is done. He hath promised to make us kings and priests, which honor we expect in heaven, believing we shall reign with him for ever, and therefore for ever must believe him King. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever," not only to the modified eternity of his Mediatorship, so long as there shall be need of regal power to subdue the enemies of God's elect, but also to the complete eternity of the duration of his humanity, which for the future is coeternal with his divinity.

Lest we should imagine that Christ should ever cease to be King, or so interpret this article as if he were after the day of judgment to be removed from the right hand of

God, the ancient fathers added those words to the Nicene Creed, "whose kingdom shall have no end," against the heresy which then arose, denying the eternity of the kingdom of Christ.

The profession of faith in Christ, as sitting on the right hand of God, is necessary: first, to remind us of our duty, which must needs consist in subjection and obedience. The majesty of a king claimeth the loyalty of a subject; and, if we acknowledge his authority, we must submit unto his power. Nor can there be a greater incitation to obedience than the consideration of the nature of his government. Subject we must be whether we will or no; but, if willingly, then is our service perfect freedom; if unwillingly, then is our averseness everlasting misery. Enemies we all have been; under his feet we all shall be, either adopted or subdued. A double kingdom there is of Christ; one of power, in which all are under him; another of propriety, in those which belong unto him: none of us can be excepted from the first; and, happy are we if by our obedience we show ourselves to have an interest in the second, for then that kingdom is not only Christ's but ours.

Secondly: it is necessary to believe in Christ sitting on the right hand of God that we may be assured of an auspicious protection under his gracious dominion. For God by this exaltation hath given our Saviour "to be the head over all things to the church;" and therefore from him we may expect direction and preservation. There can be no illegality where Christ is the Lawgiver; there can be no danger from hostility where the Son of God is the Defender. The very name of Head hath the signification not only of dominion but of union; and therefore, while we look upon him at the right hand of God, we see ourselves in heaven. This is the special promise which he hath made us since he sat down there, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne," Rev. iii. 21. How should we rejoice, yea rather how should we fear and tremble at so great an honor!

Thirdly: the belief of Christ's glorious session is most necessary in respect of the immediate consequence, which is his most gracious intercession. Our Saviour is ascended

as the true Melchizedec, not only as the king of Salem, the Prince of Peace, but also as "the Priest of the most high God;" and whereas every priest, according to the law of Moses, "stood daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which could never take away sins, this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God," Heb. x. 11. And now Christ being set down in that power and majesty, though the sacrifice be but once offered, yet the virtue of it is perpetually advanced by his session, which was founded on his passion; for he is "entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Thus, "if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous;" and "He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them," 1 John ii. 1; Heb. vii. 25. What then remaineth to all true believers, but that triumphant exclamation of the apostle, "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth: Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us," Rom. viii. 33. For he who was accepted in his oblation, and therefore sat down on God's right hand, to improve this acceptation continues his intercession; and, having obtained all power by virtue of his humiliation, representeth them both in a most sweet commixtion; by a humble omnipotency, or omnipotent humility, appearing in the presence, and presenting his postulations at the throne of God.

The Father Almighty.

Having thus explicated the session of our Saviour, we are next to consider the description of him at whose right hand he is set down; which seems to be delivered in the same terms with which the Creed did first begin, *I believe in God the Father almighty*; and indeed, as to the expression of his essence, it is the same name of *God*; as to the setting forth his relation, it is the same name of *Father*; but as to the adjoining attribute, though it be the same word, it is not the same notion of *almighty*. What there-

fore we have spoken of the nature of God, and the person of the Father, is not here to be repeated, but supposed ; for Christ is set down at the right hand of that God, and of that Father, whom we understand when we say, *I believe in God the Father*. But because there is a difference in the language of the Greeks between that word which is rendered almighty in the first article, and that which is so rendered in the sixth ; because that peculiarly signifieth authority of dominion, this more properly power in operation ; therefore we have reserved this notion of omnipotency now to be explained.

In which two things are observable ; the propriety and the universality ; the propriety in the potency, the universality in the omnipotency ; first, that he is a God of power ; secondly, that he is a God of infinite power. The potency consisteth in a proper, innate, and natural force or activity, by which we are assured that God is able to act, work, and produce true and real effects, which do require a true and real power to their production ; and in respect of this he is often described unto us under the notion of a *mighty* God. The omnipotency or infinity of this power consisteth in an ability to act, perform, and produce, whatsoever can be acted or produced, without any possibility of impediment or resistance : and in this respect he is represented to us as an *almighty* God. And therefore such an omnipotency we ascribe unto him : which is sufficiently delivered in the Scriptures, first by the testimony of an angel, " For with God nothing shall be impossible ;" secondly, by the testimony of Christ himself, who said, " With men it is impossible, but not with God ; for with God all things are possible." Now he to whom all things are possible, and to whom nothing is impossible, is truly and properly omnipotent. Thus whatsoever doth not in itself imply a repugnancy of being or subsisting hath in reference to the power of God a possibility of production ; and whatsoever in respect of the power of God hath an impossibility of production, must involve in itself a repugnancy or contradiction.

This truth, though confessed by the heathens, hath yet been denied by some of them ; but with such poor and insufficient arguments, that we shall need no more than an explication of the doctrine to refute their objections,

First, then, we must say God is omnipotent, because all power whatsoever is in any creature is derived from him; and well may he be termed almighty who is the fountain of all might. There is no activity in any agent, no influence in any cause, but what dependeth and proceedeth from the principal Agent, or the first of causes. There is nothing in the whole circumference of the universe but hath some kind of activity, and consequently some power to act, for nothing can be done without a power to do it: and as all their entities flow from the first of beings, so all their several and various powers flow from the first of powers: and as all their beings cannot be conceived to depend on any but an infinite essence, so all those powers cannot proceed from any but an infinite power.

Secondly: God may be called omnipotent, because there can be no resistance made to his power, no opposition to his will, no rescue from his hands. "The Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?" "He doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" Isa. xiv. 27; Dan. iv. 35. According to the degrees of power in the agent and the resistent is an action performed or hindered: if there be more degrees of power in the resistent than the agent, the action is prevented; if fewer, it may be retarded or debilitated, but not wholly hindered or suppressed. But if there be no degree of power in the resistent, in reference to the agent, then is the action totally vigorous; and, if in all the powers beside that of God there be not the least degree of any resistance, we must acknowledge that power of his, being above all opposition, to be infinite. As Jehoshaphat said, "In thine hand, O God, is there not power and might, so that none is able to withstand thee?" 2 Chron. xx. 6. From hence there is no difficulty with God to perform any thing; no greater endeavour or activity to produce the greatest than the least of creatures; but an equal facility in reference unto all things; which cannot be imagined but by an infinite excess of power above and beyond all resistance.

Thirdly: God is yet more properly called omnipotent, because his own active power extendeth itself to all things;

neither is there any thing imaginably possible which he cannot do. Thus, when God several ways had declared his power unto Job, Job answered the Lord, and said, "I know that thou canst do every thing," Job xlii. 1. Now that must needs be infinite activity which answereth to all kinds of possibility. Thus the power of God is infinite extensively, in respect of its object, which is all things; for whatsoever effects there be of his power, yet still there can be more produced; intensively, in respect of the action or perfection of the effect produced; for whatsoever addition of perfection is possible is within the sphere of God's omnipotency. The object then of the power of God is whatsoever is simply and absolutely possible, whatsoever is in itself such as that it may be; and so possible every thing is which doth not imply a contradiction. Again; whatsoever implieth a contradiction is impossible, and therefore is not within the object of the power of God, because impossibility is the contradiction of all power. For that is said to imply a contradiction, which, if it were, it would necessarily follow that the same thing would be and not be. But it is impossible for the same thing both to be and not to be at the same time, and in the same respect: and therefore whatsoever implieth a contradiction is impossible. From whence it followeth, that it may be truly said, God cannot effect that which involveth a contradiction, but with no derogation from his power; and it may be as truly said, God can effect whatsoever involveth not a contradiction, which is the expression of an infinite power.

Now an action may imply a contradiction two ways, either in respect of the object, or in respect of the agent. In respect of the object it may imply a contradiction immediately or consequentially. That doth imply a contradiction immediately, which plainly and in terms doth signify a repugnancy, and so destroys itself; as for the same thing to be and not to be, to have been and not to have been. And therefore it must be acknowledged that it is not in the power of God to make that not to have been which hath already been; but that is no derogation to God's power, because not within the object of any power. And he may certainly have all power who hath not that which belongeth to no power. Again: that doth imply a contradiction,

consequentially, which in appearance seemeth not to be impossible, but by necessary consequence, if admitted, leadeth infallibly to a contradiction; as that one body should be at the same time in two distinct places, speaks no repugnancy in terms; but yet by consequence it leads to that which is repugnant in itself; which is, that the same body is but one body, and not but one. Seeing then a covert and consequential contradiction is as much and as truly a contradiction as that which is open and immediate, it followeth that it is as impossible to be effected, and therefore comes not under the power of God.

That doth imply a contradiction in respect of the agent which is repugnant to his essential perfection; for, seeing every action floweth from the essence of the agent, whatsoever is totally repugnant to that essence must involve a contradiction as to the agent. Thus we may say, God cannot sleep, God cannot want, God cannot die; he cannot sleep whose being is spiritual; he cannot want whose nature is all-sufficient; he cannot die who is essentially and necessarily existent. Nor can that be a diminution of his omnipotency the contrary whereof would be a proof of his impotency, a demonstration of his infirmity. Thus "it is impossible for God to lie," to whom we say nothing is impossible; and he who can do all things, "cannot deny himself." Because a lie is repugnant to the perfection of veracity, which is essential unto God, as necessarily following from his infinite knowledge and infinite sanctity. We who are ignorant may be deceived; we who are sinful may deceive; but it is repugnant to that nature to be deceived which is no way subject unto ignorance; it is contradictory to that essence to deceive which is no way capable of sin. For, as it is a plain contradiction to know all things and to be ignorant of any thing, so is it to know all things and to be deceived: as it is an evident contradiction to be infinitely holy, and to be sinful; so is it to be infinitely holy, and deceive. But it is impossible for any one to lie who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Therefore it is a manifest contradiction to say that God can lie, and consequently it is no derogation from his omnipotency that he cannot. Whatsoever, then, God cannot do, whatsoever is impossible to him, doth not any way prove that he is not

almighty, but only shows that the rest of his attributes and perfections are as essential to him as his power; and, as his power suffereth no resistance, so the rest of his perfections admit no repugnance. Well, therefore, may we conclude him absolutely omnipotent, who, by being able to effect all things consistent with his perfections, showeth infinite ability; and, by not being able to do any thing repugnant to the same perfections, demonstrateth himself subject to no infirmity or imbecility. And in this manner we maintain God's omnipotency, with the best and eldest, against the worst and latest of the heathen authors.

Thus God is omnipotent, and God only; for, if the power of all things beside God be the power of God, as derived from him, and subordinate unto him, and his own power from whence that is derived can be subordinate to none, then none can be omnipotent but God.

Again: we say, that *God the Father* is almighty; but then we cannot say, that the Father only is almighty; for the reason why we say the Father is almighty is because he is God; and therefore we cannot say that he only is almighty, because it is not true that he only is God. Whosoever then is God hath the same reason and foundation of omnipotency which the Father hath, and consequently is to be acknowledged properly and truly omnipotent as the Father is. But we have already showed that the Son of God is truly God; and shall hereafter show that the Holy Ghost is also God, and that by the same nature by which the Father is God. The Father, therefore, is almighty, because the Father is God; the Son almighty, because the Son is God; and the Holy Ghost almighty, because the Holy Ghost is God. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are God by the same divinity; therefore, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are omnipotent by the same omnipotency. The Father, then, is not called almighty by way of exclusion, but is here mentioned with that attribute peculiarly, because the power of God answereth particularly to the right hand of God, as being "the right hand of power." The Father, therefore, is here described by the notion of almighty, to show that Christ, having ascended into heaven, and being set down at the right hand of God, is invested with a greater power than he exercised before;

and that power which was then actually conferred upon him, acknowledgeth no bounds or limits; but all power in the ultimate extent of its infinity is given unto him, who is set down on the right hand of him who is God the Father; and, being so, is therefore truly and properly almighty.

It is necessary to profess belief in God almighty; first, because the acknowledgment of his omnipotency begetteth that fear and reverence, submission and obedience, which are due unto his infinite majesty. Our God is "a great God, a mighty, and a terrible;" therefore terrible because mighty. "I will forewarn you," saith our Saviour, "whom ye shall fear: fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him," Luke xii. 5. Three times we are commanded to fear, and one only reason rendered, but sufficient for a thousand fears—the power of him who is able eternally to punish us. God gave a general command to Abraham, and with it a powerful persuasion to obedience, when he said unto him, "I am the almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect," Gen. xvii. 1. It is a rational advice which the apostle gives us: "Humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time," 1 Pet. v. 6. And it is a proper incentive to the observation of the law of God to consider that he is "the one Lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy."

Secondly: the belief of God's omnipotency is absolutely necessary, as the foundation of our faith. All the miracles which have been seen were therefore wrought that we might believe; and never miracle had been seen, if God were not omnipotent. The objects of our faith are beyond all natural and finite power; and, did they not require an infinite activity, an assent unto them would not deserve the name of faith. If God were not almighty we should believe nothing; but, seeing he is so, why should we disbelieve any thing? What can God propound unto us which we cannot assent unto, if we can believe that he is omnipotent?

Thirdly: it is not only necessary in matters of bare faith and notions of belief, but in respect of the active and operative reliance upon the promises of God. This was the particular confidence of Abraham the father of the faithful,

who "staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith, giving glory to God, and being fully persuaded that what he had promised he was able also to perform," Rom. iv. 20. The promises of God are therefore firm and sure, because he is both willing and able to perform them. We doubt or distrust the promises of men, either because we may fear they intend not to do what they have promised, or cannot do what they intend: in the first, we may suspect them, because they are subject to iniquity; in the second, because they are liable to infirmity. But, seeing God is of infinite sanctity, he cannot intend by breaking his promises to deceive us; therefore, if he be also of infinite power, he must be able to perform what he intended, and consequently we can have no reason to distrust his promises. From whence every good Christian may say with the apostle, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day," 2 Tim. i. 12. I am assured that if I be a sheep, and hear my Saviour's voice, the powers of darkness and the gates of hell can never prevail against me; for it was the voice of the Son of God, "My Father which gave them me is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand."—John x. 29.

Lastly: the belief of God's omnipotency is necessary to give life to our devotions. We ask those things from heaven which none but God can give, and many of them such, as, if God himself were not almighty, he could not effect. And therefore, in that form of prayer which Christ hath taught us, we conclude all our petitions unto the Father with that acknowledgment, "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory." Nor can there be a greater encouragement, in the midst of all our temptations, than that we are invited to call upon him in the day of trouble, "that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us," Eph. iii. 20.

After this explication of our Saviour's session, we may conclude what every Christian ought, and may be supposed to intend, when he maketh profession to believe that Christ *is set on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty.* For

thereby he is conceived to declare thus much:—I assent unto this, as a most infallible and necessary truth, that Jesus Christ, ascended into the highest heavens, after all the troubles and sufferings endured here for our redemption, did rest in everlasting happiness; he who upon earth had not a place to lay his head, did take up a perpetual habitation there, and sit down upon the throne of God, as a Judge and as a King, according to his office of Mediator, unto the end of the world; according to that which he merited by his Mediatorship, to all eternity; which hand of God the Father Almighty signifieth an omnipotent power, able to do all things without any limitation, so they involve not a contradiction, either in themselves or in relation to his perfections. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ, who *sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.*

ARTICLE VII.

From thence he shall come to judge the Quick and the Dead.

THIS article containeth it in four particular considerations and no more: first, that Christ, who is gone from us, *shall come* again; secondly, that the place from whence he shall then come is the highest heaven, to which he first ascended, for *from thence he shall come*; thirdly, that the end for which he shall come, and the action which he shall perform when he cometh, is to *judge*; for *from thence* he shall come to judge; fourthly, that the object of that action, or the persons whom he shall judge, are all men, whether dead before, or then alive; for *from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.*

For the illustration of the first particular two things will be necessary, and no more: first to show that the promised Messiah was to come again after he once was come; secondly, to declare how our Jesus (whom we have already proved once to have come as the true Messiah) did promise and assure us of a second coming.

That the Messiah was to come again was not only certainly, but copiously foretold. The Scriptures did often

assure us of a second advent. As often as we read of his griefs and humility, so often we are admonished of his coming to suffer; as often as we hear of his power and glory, so often we are assured of his coming to judge. We must not fancy, with the Jews, a double Messias, one the son of Joseph, the other of David; one of the tribe of Ephraim, the other of Judah; but we must take that for a certain truth, which they have made an occasion of their error, that the Messias is twice to come, once in all humility, to suffer and die, as they conceive of their son of Joseph; and again in all glory, to govern and judge, as they expect the Son of David. Particularly, Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of this advent, saying, "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints," Jude 14. And more particularly Daniel saw the representation of his judiciary power and glory: "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed," Dan. vii. 13. This Son of Man the Jews themselves confess to be the promised Messias, and they take the words to signify his coming, and so far give testimony to the truth; but then they evacuate the prediction by a false interpretation, saying, that if the Jews went on in their sins, then the Messias should come in humility, according to the description in Zechariah, "lowly and riding upon an ass;" but if they pleased God, then he should come in glory, according to the description in the prophet Daniel, "with the clouds of heaven:" whereas these two descriptions are two several predictions, and therefore must be both fulfilled. From whence it followed, that, seeing Christ is already come "lowly and sitting upon an ass," therefore he shall come gloriously "with the clouds of heaven." For if both those descriptions cannot belong unto one and the same advent, as the Jews acknowledge, and both of them must be true, because equally prophetic, then must there be a

double advent of the same Messias, and so his second coming was foretold.

That our Jesus, whom we have already proved to have come once into the world as the true Messias, shall come the second time, we are most assured. We have the testimony of the angels: "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven," Acts i. 11. We have the promise of Christ himself to his apostles; "If I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself. Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away and come again unto you," John xiv. 3. He it is who from the beginning was to come; that express prophecy so represented him, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh come," Gen xlix. 10: the name of Shiloh was obscure, but the notion of the *Comer* added to it was most vulgar. According to this notion, once Christ came; and, being gone, he keeps that notion still; he is to come again: "for yet a little while, and he that shall come will come," Heb. x. 37. Our Jesus then shall come; and not only so, but shall so come, as the Messias was foretold, after the same manner, in the same glory of the Father, as "the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." This was expressed in the prophetic vision by coming "with clouds," and in the same manner shall our Jesus come: "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him," Rev. i. 7. Those clouds were anciently expounded by the Jews of the glorious attendance of the angels waiting upon the Son of Man: and in the same manner, with the same attendance, do we expect the coming of our Jesus, even as he himself hath taught us to expect him, saying, "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels," Matt. xvi. 27. And thus our Jesus as the true Messias shall come again; which was our first consideration.

The place from whence he shall come is next to be considered, and is sufficiently expressed in the Creed, by reflection upon the place whither he went when he departed from us; for *he ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God, and from thence he shall come*; that is, from, and out of the highest heaven, where he now sitteth

at the right hand of God, shall Christ hereafter come to judge both the quick and the dead. For him "the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things;" and, when that time is fulfilled, from that heaven shall he come. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God. Our conversation ought to be in heaven, because "from thence we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus." Our High Priest is gone up into the holy of holies not made with hands, there to make an atonement for us; therefore as the people of Israel stood without the tabernacle, expecting the return of Aaron, so must we look unto the heavens, and expect Christ from thence, "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels," 2 Thes. i. 7. We do believe that Christ is set down on the right hand of God; but we must also look upon him as coming thence, as well as sitting there; and to that purpose Christ himself hath joined them together, saying, "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven," Matt. xxvi, 64. Thus shall the Saviour of the world come from the right hand of power, in fulness of majesty, from the highest heavens, as a demonstration of his sanctity; that by an undoubted authority, and unquestionable integrity, he might appear most fit to judge both the quick and the dead: which is the end of his second coming, and leads me to the third consideration, the act of his judging: *from whence he shall come to judge.*

For the explication of this action, as it stands in this article, three considerations will be necessary: first, how we may be assured that there is a judgment to come, that any one shall come to judge; secondly, in case we be assured that there shall be a judgment, how it appeareth that he who is ascended into heaven, that is, that Christ shall be the judge; thirdly, in case we can be assured that we shall be judged, and that Christ shall judge us, it will be worthy our inquiry in what this judgment shall consist, how this action shall be performed; and more than this cannot be necessary to make us understand that he shall come to judge.

That there is a judgment to come after this life will appear demonstrable, whether we consider ourselves who are to undergo it, or God who is to execute it. If we do but reflect upon the frame and temper of our own spirits, we cannot but collect and conclude from thence that we are to give an account of our actions, and that a judgment hereafter is to pass upon us. There is in the soul of every man a conscience, and, wheresoever it is, it giveth testimony to this truth. The antecedent or directive conscience tells us what we are to do, and the subsequent or reflexive conscience warns us what we are to receive. Looking back upon the actions we have done, it either approves or condemns them; and, if it did no more, it would only prove that there is a judgment in this life, and every man his own judge. But seeing it doth not only allow and approve our good actions, but also doth create a complacency, apology, and confidence in us; seeing it doth not only disapprove and condemn our evil actions, but doth also constantly accuse us, and breed a fearful expectation and terror in us; and all this prescinding from all relation to any thing either to be enjoyed or suffered in this life; it followeth that this conscience is not so much a judge as a witness, bound over to give testimony for or against us, at some judgment after this life to pass upon us. For all men are "a law unto themselves," and have "the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another; in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men," Rom. ii. 14.

Again: if we consider the God who made us and hath full dominion over us, whether we look upon him in himself or in his word, we cannot but expect a judgment from him. First, if we contemplate God in himself, we must acknowledge him to be the judge of all mankind, so that a man shall say, "Verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth." Now the same God who is our judge, is, by an attribute necessary and inseparable, just; and this justice is so essential to his Godhead that we may as well deny him to be God as to be just. It was a rational expostulation which Abraham made, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Gen. xviii. 25. We may therefore infal-

libly conclude that God is a most just Judge; and, if he be so, we may as infallibly conclude that after this life he will judge the world in righteousness. For as the affairs of this present world are ordered, though they lie under the disposition of Providence, they show no sign of a universal justice. The wicked and disobedient persons are often so happy, as if they were rewarded for their impieties; the innocent and religious often so miserable as if they were punished for their innocency. Nothing more certain than that in this life rewards are not correspondent to the virtues, punishments not proportionable to the sins, of men. Which consideration will enforce one of these conclusions; either that there is no judge of the actions of mankind; or, if there be a judge, he is not just, he renders no proportionate rewards or punishments; or lastly, if there be a judge, and that judge be just, then is there a judgment in another world, and the effects thereof concern another life. Seeing then we must acknowledge that there is a Judge who judgeth the earth; seeing we cannot deny but God is that Judge, and all must confess that God is most just; seeing the rewards and punishments of this life are no way answerable to so exact a justice as that which is divine must be; it followeth that there is a judgment yet to come, in which God will show a perfect demonstration of his justice, and to which every man shall in his own bosom carry an undeniable witness of all his actions.

From hence the heathen, having always had a serious apprehension both of the power of the conscience of man, and of the exactness of the justice of God, have from thence concluded that there is a judgment to come. Inasmuch that when St. Paul "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled." The discourse of righteousness and temperance touched him who was so highly and notoriously guilty of the breach of both, and a preconception which he had of judgment after death, now heightened by the apostle's particular description, created a horror in his soul and trembling in his limbs. The same apostle discoursing to the Athenians, the great lights of the Gentile world, and teaching them this article of our Creed, that "God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that

Man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead;" found some who mocked when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, but against the day of judgment none replied. That was a principle of their own, that was confessed by all who either believed themselves or a God, a conscience or a Deity.

But yet, beside the consideration of the internal power of conscience in ourselves, beside the intuition of that essential attribute, the justice of God, which are sufficient arguments to move all men, we have yet a more near and enforcing persuasion grounded upon the express determination of the will of God. For the determinate counsel of the will of the Almighty actually to judge the world in righteousness is clearly revealed in his word: "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." There is a death appointed to follow this life, and a judgment to follow that death; the one as certain as the other. For in all ages God hath revealed his resolution to judge the world.

Upon the first remarkable action after the fall, there is a sufficient intimation given to angry Cain: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and, if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door," Gen. iv. 7; which by the most ancient interpretation signifieth a reservation of his sin unto the judgment of the world to come. Before the flood Enoch prophesied of a judgment to come, saying, "Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." His words might have an aim at the waters which were to overflow the world, but the ultimate intention looked through that fire which shall consume the world preserved from water.

The testimonies which follow in the law and the prophets, the predictions of Christ and the apostles, are so many and so known, that both the number and the plainness will excuse the prosecution. The throne hath been already seen, the Judge hath appeared sitting on it, the books have been already opened, the dead small and great have been

seen standing before him; there is nothing more certain in the word of God, no doctrine more clear and fundamental, than that of eternal judgment. I shall therefore briefly conclude the first consideration from the internal testimony of the conscience of man, from the essential attribute, the justice of God, from the clear and full revelation of the will and determination of God, that after death, with a reflection on this, and in relation to another life, there is a judgment to come, there shall some person *come to judge*.

Our second consideration followeth, seeing we are so well assured that there shall be a judgment, who that person is that shall come to judge, who shall sit upon that throne, before whose tribunal we shall all appear, from whose mouth we may expect our sentence. Now the judiciary power is the power of God, and none hath any right to judge the subjects and servants of God, but that God whose servants they are. The law by which we are to be judged was given by him, the actions which are to be discussed were due to him, the persons who are to be tried are subject to his dominion; God therefore is "the Judge of all." He "shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil;" and so the last day, that day of wrath, is "the revelation of the righteous judgment of God." Now if God as God be the judge of all, then whosoever is God is Judge of all men; and therefore seeing we have proved the Father and the Son, and shall hereafter also prove the Holy Ghost to be God, it followeth that the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, shall judge the world; because the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in respect of the same Divinity, have the same autocratorical power, dominion, and authority.

But, notwithstanding, in that particular day of the general judgment to come, the execution of this judiciary power shall be particularly committed to the Son, and so the Father and the Holy Ghost shall actually judge the world no otherwise but by him. For "God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness; by that Man whom he hath ordained," Acts xvii. 31. It is God who judgeth; it is Christ by whom he judgeth; "for the Father judgeth no man, but hath com-

mitted all judgment to the Son," John v. 22. There is therefore an original, supreme, autocratorical, judiciary power; there is a judiciary power delegated, derived, given by commission. Christ as God hath the first together with the Father and the Holy Ghost; Christ as man hath the second from the Father expressly, from the Holy Ghost concomitantly; for "the Father hath given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man;" not simply because he is a man, therefore he shall be Judge (for then by the same reason every man should judge, and consequently none, because no man could be judged if every man should only judge), but, because of the three Persons who are God. he only is also the Son of Man; and therefore for his affinity with their nature, for his sense of their infirmities, for his appearance to their eyes, most fit to represent the greatest mildness and sweetness of equity, in the severity of that just and irrespective judgment.

Nor was this a reason only in respect of us who are to be judged, but in regard of him also who is to judge; for we must not look only upon his being the Son of Man, but also upon what he did and suffered as the Son of Man. He humbled himself so far as to take upon him our nature; in that nature, so taken, he humbled himself to all the infirmities which that was capable of, to all the miseries which this life could bring, to all the pains and sorrows which the sins of all the world could cause; and therefore in regard of his humiliation did God exalt him, and part of the exaltation due unto him was this power of judging. "The Father," therefore, who is only God, and never took upon him either the nature of men or angels, "judgeth no man" (and the same reason reacheth also to the Holy Ghost), "but hath committed all judgment to the Son;" and the reason why he hath committed it to him is "because he is," not only the Son of God, and so truly God, but also "the Son of Man," and so truly man; because he is that Son of Man who suffered so much for the sons of men.

From whence at last it clearly appeareth, not only that it is a certain truth that Christ shall judge the world, but also the reasons are declared and manifested unto us why he hath that power committed unto him, why he shall come to judge the quick and the dead; for certainly it is a great

demonstration of the justice of God, so highly to reward that Son of Man, as to make him Judge of all the world, who came into the world and was judged here; to give him absolute power of absolution and condemnation, who was by us condemned to die, and died that he might absolve us; to cause all the sons of men to bow before his throne, who did not disdain for their sakes to stand before the tribunal and receive that sentence, "Let him be crucified;" which event as infallible, and reason as irrefragable, Christ himself did show at the same time when he stood before the judgment-seat, saying, "Nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven," Matt. xxvi. 64.

Again: if we look upon ourselves, who are to be judged, whom can we desire to appear before, rather than him who is of the same nature with us? If the children of Israel could not bear the presence of God as a Lawgiver, but desired to receive the law by the hand of Moses; how should we appear before the presence of that God judging us for the breach of that law, were it not for a better Mediator, of the same nature that Moses was and we are, who is our Judge? In this appeareth the wisdom and goodness of God, that, making a general judgment, he will make a visible Judge, whom all may see who shall be judged. "Without holiness no man shall ever see God;" and therefore if God, as only God, should pronounce sentence upon all men, the ungodly should never see their Judge. But that both the righteous and unrighteous might see and know who it is that judgeth them, Christ, who is both God and man, is appointed Judge; so as he is man all shall see him, and as he is God they only shall see him who by that vision shall enjoy him.

Christ Jesus then, the Son of God and the Son of Man, he who was born of the virgin Mary, he who suffered under Pontius Pilate, he who was crucified, dead, and buried, and descended into hell, he who rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and is set down on the right hand of God; he, the same person, in the same nature, *shall come to judge the quick and the dead.* "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and

then he shall reward every man according to his works," He then who is to come is the Son of Man ; and, when he cometh, it is to judge. The same Jesus who was taken up from the apostles into heaven, shall so come in like manner as they saw him go into heaven. That Son of Man, then, who is to judge, is our Jesus, even the same Jesus, and shall come in the same manner, by a true and local translation of the same nature out of heaven. For God will "judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained ; whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead," Acts xvii. 31. He then who ascended into heaven was the same who was raised from the dead ; and by that resurrection God assured us that the same man should judge us. "For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living," Rom. xiv. 9. It appeareth therefore by God's determination, by Christ's resurrection and ascension, that the man Christ Jesus is appointed Judge.

This office and dignity of the Son of Man was often declared by several figurative and parabolical descriptions. John the Baptist representeth him that cometh after him, by this delineation of a husbandman : "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will throughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire," Matt. iii. 12. The Son of Man describes himself as a householder, saying to the reapers in the time of harvest, "Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them ; but gather the wheat into my barn ;" and this "harvest is the end of the world," Matt. xiii. 30. He representeth himself under the notion of a fisherman, "casting a net into the sea, and gathering of every kind : which, when it was full, he drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away," Matt. xiii. 47. He is the bridegroom who took the wise virgins with him to the marriage, and shut the door upon the foolish. He is the man who, travelling into a far country, delivered the talents to his servants, and after a long time cometh again, and reckoneth with them, exalting the good and faithful, and casting "the unprofitable servant into outer darkness," Matt. xxv. 19.

Lastly : he is the Shepherd, and is so expressly described in relation to this judgment. For "when the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory ; and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats, and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left," Matt. xxv. 32. Seeing then the Son of Man is thus constantly represented as making the great decretory separation, and the last judicatory distinction between man and man ; as a husbandman separating the wheat, some time from the chaff, some time from the tares ; as a fisherman gathering the good fish, casting the bad away ; as a bridegroom receiving the wise, excluding the foolish virgins ; as a master distinguishing the servants of his family, rewarding the faithful, punishing the unprofitable ; as a shepherd, dividing his sheep from the goats, placing one on the right hand, the other on the left ; it plentifully proveth that the Son of Man is appointed the Judge of all the sons of men. And thus it appeareth that Christ is he who shall be the Judge ; which is the second consideration subservient to the present explication.

Thirdly : it being thus resolved that the Son of Man shall be the Judge, our next consideration is, what may the nature of this judgment be ? in what that judicial action doth consist ; what he shall then do, when *he shall come to judge*. The reality of this act doth certainly consist in the final determination, and actual disposing of all persons in soul and body to their eternal condition ; and in what manner this shall particularly be performed is not so certain unto us ; but that which is sufficient for us, it is represented under a formal judiciary process. In which first there is described a throne, a tribunal, a judgment-seat ; for "in the regeneration the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory : " and that this throne is a seat not only of majesty, but also of judicature, appeareth by the following words spoken to the apostles, "Ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel," Matt. xix. 28. As in that vision in the Revelation, "I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them, And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it,

from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away," Rev. xx. 4. This throne of Christ is expressly called his judgment-seat, when the apostle tells us, "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ;" and, "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ," Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10. In respect then of the Son of Man, he shall appear in the proper form and condition of a Judge, sitting upon a throne of judicature.

Secondly: there is to be a personal appearance of all men before that seat of judicature upon which Christ shall sit; for "we must all appear," and "we shall all stand before that judgment seat." "I saw the dead," saith the apostle, "stand before God," Rev. xx. 12. Thus all nations shall be gathered before him." "He shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other," Matt. xxiv. 31; for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ is our gathering together unto him.

Thirdly: when those who are to be judged are brought before the judgment-seat of Christ, all their actions shall appear. "He will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts," 1 Cor. iv. 5. He will "bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil," Eccles. xii. 14. To this end, in the vision of Daniel, when "the judgment was set, the books were opened;" and, in that of St. John, "the books were opened, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books according to their works," Dan. vii. 10; Rev. xx. 12.

Fourthly: after the manifestation of all their actions, there followeth a definitive sentence passed upon all their persons, according to those actions, which is the fundamental and essential consideration of this judgment; the sentence of absolution, in these words expressed, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;" the sentence of condemnation in this manner, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels," Matt. xxv. 34, 41.

Lastly: after the promulgation of the sentence, followeth the execution; as it is written, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Thus appeareth Christ's majesty by sitting on the throne; his authority, by convening all before him; his knowledge and wisdom, by opening all secrets, revealing all actions, discerning all inclinations; his justice, in condemning sinners; his mercy, in absolving believers; his power, in the execution of the sentence. And thus the Son of Man shall come to judge, which is the last particular subservient to the third consideration of this article.

The fourth and last consideration is, what is the object of this action; who are the persons that shall appear before that Judge, and receive their sentence from him; what is the latitude of that expression, *the quick and the dead*. The phrase itself is delivered several times in the Scriptures, and that upon the same occasion; for Christ was "ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead." and so his commission extendeth to both: he "is ready to judge the quick and the dead;" his resolution reacheth to each; and, as he is ordained and ready, so "shall he judge the quick and the dead;" the execution excludeth neither, Acts x. 42; 1 Pet. iv. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 1. But although it be the Scripture language, and therefore certainly true; yet there is some ambiguity in the phrase, and therefore the intended sense not evident.

The Holy Ghost speaketh of death in several notions, which makes the quick and the dead capable of several interpretations. Because after death the soul doth live, and the body only remaineth dead; therefore some have understood the souls of men by the quick, and their bodies by the dead; and then the meaning will be this, that Christ shall come to judge immediately upon the resurrection, when the souls which were preserved alive shall be joined to the bodies which were once dead; and so men shall be judged entirely both in body and soul, for all those actions which the soul committed in the body. Now though this be a truth, that men shall be judged when their souls and bodies are united; though they shall be judged according to those works which their souls have acted in their bodies; yet this is not to be acknowledged as the interpretation of

this article, for two reasons; first, because it is not certain that all men shall die, at least a proper death, so that their bodies shall be left any time without their souls; secondly, because this is not a distinction of the parts of man, but of the persons of men.

Again: because the Scripture often mentioneth a death in trespasses and sins, and a living unto righteousness, others have conceived by the quick to be understood the just, and by the dead the unjust; so that Christ shall judge the quick, that is the just, by a sentence of absolution; and the dead, that is the unjust, by a sentence of condemnation. But though the dead be sometimes taken for sinners, and the living for the righteous, though it be true that Christ shall judge them both; yet it is not probable that in this particular they should be taken in a figurative or metaphorical sense, because there is no adjunct giving any such intimation, and because the literal sense affordeth a fair explication; farther yet, because the Scripture in the same particular naming the quick and the dead sufficiently teacheth us that it is to be understood of a corporeal death: "Whether we live or die," saith the apostle, "we are the Lord's For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living," Rom. xiv. 9.

Thirdly: therefore by the dead are understood all those who ever died before the time of Christ's coming to judgment, and by the quick such as shall be then alive; so that the quick and the dead, literally taken, are considered in relation to the time of Christ's coming; at which time there shall be a generation living upon the face of the earth, and before which time all the generations passed since the creation of the world shall be numbered among the dead. And this undoubtedly is the proper and literal sense of the article, that Christ shall come to judge, not only those who shall be alive upon the earth at his appearing, but also all such as have lived and died before. None shall be then judged while they are dead: whosoever stand before the judgment-seat shall appear alive; but those who never died shall be judged as they were alive; those that were dead before, that they may be judged, shall rise to life. He shall judge therefore the quick, that is, those who shall be

then alive when he cometh ; and he shall judge the dead, that is, those who at the same time shall be raised from the dead.

The only doubt remaining, in this interpretation, is whether those that shall be found alive when our Saviour cometh, shall still so continue till they come to judgment ; or upon his first appearance they shall die, and after death revive, and so, together with all those who rise out of their graves, appear before the judgment-seat. The consideration of our mortality, and the cause thereof (" that it is appointed for all men once to die, in that death hath passed upon all ") might persuade us that the last generation of mankind should taste of death, as well as all the rest that went before it ; and, therefore it hath been thought, especially of late, that those whom Christ at his coming finds alive shall immediately die ; and, after a sudden and universal expiration, shall be restored to life again, and joined with the rest whom the graves shall render, that all may be partakers of the resurrection.

But the apostle's description of the last day mentioneth no such kind of death, yea rather excludeth it. For " we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God ; and the dead in Christ shall rise first : then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord," 1 Thess. iv. 15. In which words, they " which remain unto the coming of the Lord " are not said to die or to rise from the dead, but are distinguished from those who are asleep and rise first ; yea, being alive, are caught up together with them, having not tasted death.

The same is farther confirmed by the same apostle, saying, " Behold, I show you a mystery ; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed," 1 Cor. xv. 51. Which, being added to the former, putteth this doctrine out of question ; for the living who remain at the coming of Christ are opposed to them who are asleep, and the opposition consists in this, that they shall not sleep ; which sleep is not opposed to a long death, but to death itself, as

it followeth, "the dead shall be raised incorruptible," and we, who shall not sleep, "shall be changed;" so that their mutation shall be unto them as a resurrection. And the collation of these two Scriptures maketh up this conclusion so manifestly, that I conceive no man had ever doubted or questioned the truth of it, had they not first differed in the reading of the text.

Wherefore seeing the place to the Thessalonians sufficiently proves it of itself, seeing that to the Corinthians, as we read it, invincibly confirmeth the same truth, I conclude that the living, when Christ shall come, are properly distinguished from all those who die before his coming; because death itself hath passed upon the one, and only a change different from death shall pass upon the other; and so conceive that Christ is called the Lord and Judge of the quick and dead, in reference at least to this expression of the Creed. For although it be true of the living of any age to say that Christ is Lord and Judge of them and of the dead, yet in the next age they are not the living but the dead whom Christ shall come to judge, and consequently no one generation but the last can be the quick whom he shall judge. As therefore, to the interpretation of this Article, I take that distinction to be necessary, that in the end of the world all the generations dead shall be revived, and the present generation living so continued, and Christ shall gather them all to his tribunal seat, and so shall truly come to judge both the quick and the dead.

To believe a universal judgment to come is necessary; first, to prevent the dangerous doubts arising against the ruling of the world by the providence of God—that old rock of offence upon which so many souls have suffered shipwreck. That which made the prophet David confess his "feet were almost gone," his "steps had well nigh slipped," hath hurried multitudes of men to eternal perdition, Ps. lxxiii. 2. The conspicuous prosperity of the wicked, and apparent miseries of the righteous; the frequent persecutions of virtue, and eminent rewards of vice; the sweet and quiet departures often attending upon the most dissolute, and horrid tortures putting a period to the most religious, lives, have raised a strong temptation of doubt and mistrust, whether there be a God that judgeth

the earth. Nor is there any thing in this life, considered alone, which can give the least rational satisfaction in this temptation. Except there be a life to come after such a death as we daily see, except in that life there be rewards and punishments otherwise dispensed than here they are, how can we ground any acknowledgment of an overruling justice? That therefore we may be assured that God who sitteth in heaven ruleth over all the earth, that a divine and most holy providence disposeth and dispenseth all things here below; it is absolutely necessary to believe and profess that a just and exact retribution is deferred, that a due and proportionable dispensation of rewards and punishments is reserved to another world; and consequently that there is a universal judgment to come.

Secondly: it is necessary to believe a judgment to come, thereby effectually to provoke ourselves to the breaking off our sins by repentance, to the regulating our future actions by the word of God, and to the keeping "a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man." Such is the sweetness of our sins, such the connaturalness of our corruptions, so great our confidence of impunity here, that, except we looked for an account hereafter, it were unreasonable to expect that any man should forsake his delights, renounce his complacencies, and, by a severe repentance, create a bitterness to his own soul. But, being once persuaded of a judgment, and withal possessed with a sense of our sins, who will not tremble with Felix? who will not flee from the wrath to come? what must the hardness be of that impenitent heart which "treasureth up unto itself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God?" We are naturally inclined to follow the bent of our own wills, and the inclination of our own hearts; all external rules and prescriptions are burthensome to us; and, did we not look to give an account, we had no reason to satisfy any other desires than our own; especially the dictates of the word of God are so pressing and exact, that, were there nothing but a commanding power, there could be no expectation of obedience. It is necessary, then, that we should believe that an account must be given of all our actions; and not only so, but that this account will be exacted according to the rule

of God's revealed will, that "God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to the gospel." There is in every man not only a power to reflect, but a necessary reflexion upon his actions; not only a voluntary remembrance, but also an irresistible judgment of his own conversation. Now, if there were no other judge beside our own souls, we should be regardless of our own sentence, and wholly unconcerned in our own condemnations. But if we were persuaded that these reflexions of conscience are to be so many witnesses before the tribunal of heaven, and that we are to carry in our own hearts a testimony either to absolve or condemn us, we must infallibly watch over that unquiet inmate, and endeavour above all things for a good conscience: for, "seeing that all things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God," 2 Pet. iii. 11. Reason itself will tell us thus much; but if that do not, or if we will not hearken to our own voice, "the grace of God that bringeth salvation teacheth us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ," Tit. ii. 11.

Thirdly: it is necessary to profess faith in Christ as Judge of the quick and the dead, for the strengthening of our hope, for the augmenting of our comfort, for the establishing of our assurance of eternal life. If we look upon the judgment to come only as revealing our secrets, as discerning our actions, as sentencing our persons according to the works done in the flesh, there is not one of us can expect life from that tribunal, or happiness at the last day. We must confess that we have all sinned, and that there is not any sin which we have committed but deserves the sentence of death; we must acknowledge that the best of our actions bear no proportion to eternity, and can challenge no degree of that weight of glory; and therefore in a judgment, as such, there can be nothing but a fearful expectation of eternal misery, and an absolute despair of everlasting happiness. It is necessary, therefore, that we should believe that Christ shall sit upon the throne,

that our Redeemer shall be our Judge, that we shall receive our sentence not according to the rigor of the law, but the mildness and mercies of the gospel; and then we may look upon not only the precepts but also the promises of God; whatsoever sentence in the sacred Scripture speaketh any thing of hope, whatsoever text administereth any comfort, whatsoever argument drawn from thence can breed in us any assurance, we may confidently make use of them all in reference to the judgment to come; because by that gospel which contains them all we shall be judged. If we consider whose gospel it is, and who shall judge us by it, "we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones;" "for which cause he is not ashamed to call us brethren," Eph. v. 30; Heb. ii. 11. As one of our brethren he hath redeemed us, he hath laid down his life as a ransom for us. He is our High Priest who made an atonement for our sins, "a merciful and faithful High Priest, in all things, being made like unto his brethren." He who is Judge is also our Advocate; and who shall condemn us, if he shall pass the sentence upon us, who maketh intercession for us? well therefore may "we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him" unto the throne of that Judge who is our brother, who is our Redeemer, who is our High Priest, who is our advocate, who will not by his word at the last day condemn us, because he hath already in the same word absolved us, saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life," John. v. 24.

Having thus explained the nature of the judgment to come and the necessity of believing the same, we have given sufficient light to every Christian to understand what he ought to intend, and what it is he professeth, when he saith, I believe in him who *shall come to judge the quick and the dead*. For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much:—I am fully persuaded of this, as of an infallible and necessary truth, that the eternal Son of God, in that human nature in which he died, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, shall certainly come from the same heaven into which he ascended, and at his coming shall gather together all those

who shall be then alive, and all who ever lived and shall be before that day dead ; when causing them all to stand before his judgment-seat, he shall judge them all according to their works done in the flesh ; and, passing the sentence of condemnation upon all the reprobates, shall deliver them to be tormented with the Devil and his angels ; and, pronouncing the sentence of absolution upon all the elect, shall translate them into his glorious kingdom, of which there shall be no end. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ *who shall to judge the quick and the dead.*

ARTICLE VIII.

I believe in the Holy Ghost.

In this Article we repeat again the first word of the Creed, *I believe* ; whereas a conjunction might have been sufficient, but that so many particulars concerning the Son do intervene. For as we are baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost ; so do we make confession of our faith, saying, *I believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost* ; and the ancients, whose Creed was something shorter, made no repetition of the act of faith, but only an addition of the object, *And in the Holy Ghost*. And as we repeat the act of faith in this Article, so some did also in the second, *I believe in Jesus Christ*. Wherefore seeing this word, *I believe*, is taken here only by way of resumption or repetition, and consequently must be of the same sense or importance of which it was in the beginning of the Creed, it may well receive the same explication here which it received there ; to that therefore the reader is referred.

For although the ancient fathers did frequently make use of this language to prove the Divinity of the Spirit, and did thence argue that he is really and truly God, because we believe in the Holy Ghost ; yet seeing that language is not expressly read in the Scriptures in relation to the Spirit, as it is in reference to the Son ; seeing to believe in the Holy Ghost is only the expression of the church contained in the Creed ; seeing in the same Creed many of the an-

icients, without any reprehension, have used the same phrase in the following articles expressly, and where the preposition is not expressed, it may very well be thought it was understood ; therefore I think fit to acquiesce in my former exposition, and lay no greater force in the preposition.

It will therefore be sufficient for the explication of this article, if we can declare what is the full and proper object of our faith contained in it, what we are obliged to believe concerning the Holy Ghost. And as to this we shall discharge our undertaking, and satisfy whatsoever is required in this exposition, if we can set forth these two particulars, the nature and the office of that blessed Spirit. For the name of "ghost" or "gast," in the ancient Saxon language, signifieth a spirit, and in that appellation of the Spirit of God his nature principally is expressed. The addition of holiness, though it denote the intrinsical sanctity essentially belonging to that Spirit, yet notwithstanding it containeth also a derivative notion, as signifying an emanation of that holiness, and communication of the effects thereof ; and in this communication his office doth consist. Whatsoever therefore doth concern the Spirit of God, as such, and the intrinsical sanctity which belongeth to that Spirit, may be expressed in the explication of his nature ; whatsoever belongeth to the derivation of that sanctity may be described in his office ; and consequently more cannot be necessary than to declare what is the nature, what the office, of the Spirit of God.

For the better indagation of the nature of the Holy Ghost, I shall proceed by certain steps and degrees ; which, as they will render the discourse more clear, so will they also make the reasons more strong and the arguments more evident. And first, as to the existence of the Spirit of God, it will be unnecessary to endeavour the proof of it ; for although the Sadducees seemed to deny it, who said that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit ; though it hath been ordinarily concluded from thence that they rejected the Holy Ghost, yet it cannot be proved from those words that they denied the existence of the Spirit of God, any more than that they denied the existence of God, who is a spirit : nor did the notion which the Jews had of

the Spirit of God any way incline the Sadducees, who denied the existence of the angels and the souls of men, to reject it. The resurrection, angel, and spirit, which the Sadducees refused to acknowledge, were but two particulars; for it is expressly added, that "the Pharisees confessed both;" of which two the resurrection was one, angels and spirits were the other; wherefore that which the Sadducees disbelieved was the existence of such created spiritual natures as the angels and the souls of men are conceived to have. And as for those disciples at Ephesus, who had "not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost," if they were Gentiles, it is no wonder, because they never had that notion in their religion; if they were Jews, as they seem to be, because they were baptized with the baptism of John, it signifieth not that they never heard of the Spirit of God, but only that they had not heard of the giving of it, which the apostle mentioned: as we read elsewhere, that "the Holy Ghost was not yet;" not denying the existence, but the plentiful effusion of it. For, whatsoever the nature of the Spirit of God may be thought to be, no man can conceive the apostle should deny his existence before Christ's glorification, whose operation was so manifest at his conception. Howsoever, the apostle asked those ignorant disciples, "Unto what then were ye baptized?" intimating that, if they were baptized according to the rule of Christ, they could not be ignorant that there is a Holy Ghost; because the apostles were commanded to "baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." It is therefore presumed that every one who professeth the name of Christ, from the first baptismal institution, acknowledgeth that there is a Holy Ghost; and the only question consists in this, What that Holy Ghost is, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom, according to our baptism, we profess in the Creed to believe?

In order to the determination of which question, our first assertion is, that the Holy Ghost, described to us in the word of God, and joined with the Father and the Son in the form of baptism, is a Person. We are all baptized in the name of three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and the public confession of our faith hath relation to those three. We all confess that two of these, the

Father and the Son, are persons; that which we now assert is only this, that the Holy Ghost, who is of the three the third, is also a person as the other two. That blessed Spirit is not only an energy or operation, not a quality or power, but a spiritual and intellectual subsistence. If we conceive it is an operation only, then must it only be actuated and not act; and, when it is not actuated, it must not be at all. If we say that it is a quality, and not a substance, we say that it is that which we cannot prove to have any being. It seemeth to me strangely unreasonable that men should be so earnest in endeavouring to prove that the Holy Ghost which sanctifieth them is no substance, when they cannot be assured that there is any thing operative in the world beside substantial beings; and consequently, if they be not sanctified by that, they can be susceptible of no holiness. By what reason in nature can they be assured, by what revelation in Scripture can they be confident, that there is a reality deserving the name of quality distinguished from all substance, and yet working real and admirable effects? If there were no other argument but this, that we are assured by the Christian faith that there is a Holy Ghost existing; and we cannot be assured, either by reason or faith, that there is a quality really and essentially distinguished from all substance, it would be sufficient to deter us from that boldness, to assert the Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized, to be nothing else but a quality.

But we are not left to guess at the nature of the Spirit of God; the word of God which came from that Spirit hath sufficiently delivered him as a Person. It is indeed to be observed that in the Scriptures there are some things spoken of the Holy Ghost which are proper and peculiar to a Person, as the adversaries confess: others which are not properly and primarily to be attributed to a Person, as we cannot deny: and it might seem to be equally doubtful, in relation to the Scripture expressions, whether the Holy Ghost were a person or no; and that they who deny his Personality may pretend as much Scripture as they who assert it. But in this seeming indifference we must also observe a large diversity; inasmuch as the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, is not always taken in the same propriety of signification; nor do we say that the Holy Ghost, which

signifieth a Person, always signifieth so much. It is therefore easily conceived how some things may be attributed to the Spirit in the Scriptures which are not proper to a Person, and yet the Spirit be a Person, because sometimes the Spirit is taken for that which is not a Person, as we acknowledge. Whereas, if ever any thing be attributed to the Holy Ghost as to a Person, which cannot be otherwise understood of the Spirit of God than as of a Person, then may we infallibly conclude that the Holy Ghost is a Person. This therefore we shall endeavour fully and clearly to demonstrate; first, that the Scriptures declare unto us the Holy Ghost as a Person, by such attributes and expressions as cannot be understood to be spoken of the Spirit of God any other way than as of a Person; secondly, that whatsoever attributes or expressions are used in the Scriptures of the Holy Ghost, and are objected as repugnant to the nature of a Person, either are not so repugnant as is objected; or, if they be, they belong unto the Spirit as it signifieth not a Person.

First then, the Holy Ghost, or good Spirit of God, is clearly and formally opposed to those evil spirits which are and must be acknowledged persons, of a spiritual and intellectual subsistence; as, "The Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him," 1 Sam. xvi. 14. Now what those evil spirits from the Lord were, is apparent from the sad example of Ahab, concerning whom we read, "There came out a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will entice him: and the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go out and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets; and the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail; go out, and do even so, 2 Chr. xviii. 20. From whence it is evident that the evil spirits from God were certain persons, even bad angels, to whom the one good Spirit as a Person is opposed, departing from him to whom the other cometh.

Again: the New Testament doth describe the Holy Ghost by such personal dispositions, and with such operations, as are as evident marks and signs of a Person as any which are attributed to the Father or the Son, who are unquestionably Persons; and whatsoever terms are spoken of the

Spirit by way of quality are spoken as well of those who are acknowledged Persons. We are exhorted by the apostle not to "grieve the Spirit of God;" but grief is certainly a personal affection, of which a quality is not capable. We are assured that the same "Spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered;" and we can understand what are interceding persons, but have no apprehension of interceding or groaning qualities. The operations of the Spirit are manifest, and as manifestly personal; for he "searcheth all things, yea even the deep things of God;" and so he knoweth all things, "even the things of God," which can be no description of the power of God. He worketh all the spiritual gifts, "dividing to every man severally as he will;" in which the operation, discretion, distribution, and all these voluntary, are sufficient demonstrations of a Person. He revealeth the will of God, and speaketh to the sons of men, in the nature and after the manner of a Person; for the Spirit said unto Peter, "Behold, three men seek thee; arise therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them," Acts x. 19: and the Holy Ghost said unto the prophets and teachers at Antioch, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them," Acts xiii. 2. We cannot better understand the nature of the Holy Ghost than by the description given by Christ who sent him; and he said thus to his disciples, "The Comforter," or the Advocate, "which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things; he shall testify of me: and ye also shall bear witness. If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but, if I depart, I will send him unto you. And, when he is come, he will reprove the world, and he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you," John xiv. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7, 13. All which words are nothing else but so many descriptions of a Person, a Person hearing, a Person receiving, a Person testifying, a Person speaking, a Person reproofing, a Person instructing.

The adversaries to this truth, acknowledging all these personal expressions, answer that it is ordinary in the Scriptures to find the like expressions, which are proper unto persons, given unto those things which are no persons; as when the apostle saith, "Charity suffereth long and is kind, charity envieth not, charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." 1 Cor. xiii. 4. All which personal actions are attributed to charity, which is no person, as in other cases it is usual, but belonging to that person who is charitable; because that person who is so qualified doth perform those actions according to, and by virtue of, that charity which is in him. In the same manner, say they, personal actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost, which is no Person, but only the virtue, power, and efficacy of God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, because that God the Father is a Person, and doth perform those personal actions, attributed to the Holy Ghost, by that virtue, power, and efficacy in himself, which is the Holy Ghost. As when we read the Spirit said unto Peter, "Behold, three men seek thee; arise therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them;" we must understand that God the Father was the Person who spake those words, and who sent those men; but, because he did so by that virtue which is the Holy Ghost, therefore the Holy Ghost is said to speak those words and send those men. In the same manner when we read, the Holy Ghost said unto those at Antioch, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them;" we must conceive it was God the Father who spake those words, who had called Barnabas and Saul, and to whom they were to be separated: but, because God did all this by that power within him which is his Spirit, therefore those words and actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost. This is the sum of their answer; and more than this I conceive cannot be said in answer to that argument which we urge from those personal expressions attributed to the Spirit of God, and, as we believe, as to a Person.

But this answer is most apparently insufficient, as giving no satisfaction to the argument; for if all the personal actions, attributed in the Scriptures to the Spirit, might proceed from the Person of God the Father, according to the power which is in him, then might this answer seem satisfactory; but if these actions be personal, as they are acknowledged, and cannot be denied, if the same cannot be attributed to the Person of God the Father, whose Spirit it is, if he cannot be said to do that by the power within him which is said to be done by the Holy Ghost, then is that defence not to be defended, then must the Holy Ghost be acknowledged a Person. But I shall clearly prove that there are several personal attributes given in the sacred Scriptures expressly to the Holy Ghost, which cannot be ascribed to God the Father; which God the Father, by that Power which is in him, cannot be said to do; and consequently cannot be any ground why those attributes should be given to the Spirit if it be not a Person.

To make intercession is a personal action, and this action is attributed to the Spirit of God, "because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God," Rom. viii. 27. But to make intercession is not an act which can be attributed to God the Father, neither can he be said to intercede for us according to that power which is in him; and therefore this can be no *prosopopœia*, the Holy Ghost cannot be said to exercise the personal action of intercession for that reason, because it is the Spirit of that Person which intercedeth for us. To come unto men, as being sent unto them, is a personal action; and so the Comforter or Advocate, who is the Holy Ghost, did come, being sent: "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father," saith Christ, John xv. 26; and again, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you," John xiv. 7. But to come unto men, as being sent, cannot be ascribed to God the Father, who sendeth, but is never sent; especially in this particular, in which the Father is said expressly to send, and that in the name of the Son; "Whom the Father will send in my name," saith our Saviour. When therefore the Holy Ghost cometh to the sons of men, as sent by the Father in the name of the Son,

and sent by the Son himself, this personal action cannot be attributed to the Father as working by the power within him, and consequently cannot ground a prosopopœia by which the virtue or power of God the Father shall be said to do it. To speak and hear are personal actions, and both together attributed to the Spirit in such a manner as they cannot be ascribed to God the Father. "When he," saith Christ, "the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak," John xvi. 13. Now to speak, and not of himself, cannot be attributed to God the Father, who doth all things of himself. To speak what he heareth, and that of the Son; to deliver what he receiveth from another, and to glorify him from whom he receiveth by receiving from him, as Christ speaketh of the Holy Ghost,—“He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you,”—is by no means applicable to the Father; and consequently it cannot be true that the Holy Ghost is therefore said to do these personal actions because that Person whose Spirit the Holy Ghost is doth those actions, by and according to his own power, which is the Holy Ghost. It remaineth therefore that the answer given by the adversaries of this truth is apparently insufficient, and consequently that our argument, drawn from the personal actions attributed in the Scriptures to the Spirit, is sound and valid.

I thought this discourse had fully destroyed the Socinian prosopopœia; and indeed, as they ordinarily propound their answer, it is abundantly refuted. But I find the subtilty of Socinus prepared another explication of the prosopopœia, to supply the room where he foresaw the former would not serve. Which double figure he groundeth upon this distinction—“the Spirit, that is, the power of God,” saith he, “may be considered either as a propriety and power in God, or as the things on which it worketh are affected with it. If it be considered in the first notion, then, if any personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the Spirit is there taken for God, and by the Spirit God is signified: if it be considered in the second notion, then, if any personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the Spirit is taken for that man in whom it worketh; and that man, affected with it, is called the Spirit of God.

So that now we must not only show that such things which are attributed to the Holy Ghost cannot be spoken of the Father, but we must also prove that they cannot be attributed unto man, in whom the Spirit worketh from the Father; and this also will be very easily and evidently proved. The Holy Ghost is said to come unto the apostles as sent by the Father and the Son, and to come as so sent is a personal action, which we have already showed cannot be the action of the Father who sent the Spirit; and it is as certain that it cannot be the action of an apostle who was affected with the Spirit which was sent, except we can say that the Father and the Son did send St. Peter an advocate to St. Peter; and St. Peter, being sent by the Father and the Son, did come unto St. Peter. Again: our Saviour, speaking of the Holy Ghost, saith, "He shall receive of mine;" therefore the Holy Ghost in that place is not taken for the Father; "and show it unto you," therefore he is not taken for an apostle; in that he receiveth, the first Socinian prosopopœia is improper; in that he *showeth* to the apostles, the second is absurd. The Holy Ghost then is described as a person distinct from the person of the Father, whose power he is, and distinct from the person of the apostle in whom he worketh, and consequently neither of the Socinian figures can evacuate or enervate the doctrine of his proper and peculiar personality.

Secondly: for those attributes or expressions used of the Holy Ghost in the sacred Scriptures, and pretended to be repugnant to the nature of a person, either they are not so repugnant, or, if they be, they belong unto the Spirit, as it signifieth not the person, but the gifts or effects of the Spirit. They tell us that the Spirit is given, and that sometimes in measure, sometimes without measure; that the Spirit is poured out, and that men do drink of it, and are filled with it; that it is doubled and distributed, and something is taken from it; and that sometimes it is extinguished: and from hence they gather that the Holy Ghost is not a person, because these expressions are inconsistent with personality. But a satisfactory answer is easily returned to this objection. It is true that God is said to have "given the Holy Ghost to them that obey him," but it is as true that a person may be given; so we

read in the prophet Isaiah, "Unto us a Son is given;" and we are assured that "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son," and certainly the Son of God is a person. And if all the rest of the expressions be such as they pretend, that is, not proper to a person, yet do they no way prejudice the truth of our assertion, because we acknowledge the effects and operations of the Spirit to have in the Scriptures the name of the Spirit who is the cause of those operations. And seeing to that Spirit, as the cause, we have already shown those attributes to be given which can agree to nothing but a person, we therefore conclude, against the Socinians and the Jews, that the Holy Ghost is not a quality, but a person, which is our first assertion.

Our second assertion is, that the Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized and in whom we profess to believe, is not a created, but a divine and uncreated, person. And, for the proof of this assertion, we shall first make use of that argument which our adversaries have put into our hands. The Spirit of God which is in God is not a created person, but the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of God which is in God, and therefore not a created person. This argument is raised from those words of the apostle: "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God," 1 Cor. ii. 11. That this Spirit of God is the Holy Ghost I find denied by none; that the same Spirit is in God appeareth by the apostle's discourse, and is granted by the Socinians; that it is so the Spirit of God, and so by nature in God, that it cannot be a creature, is granted by the same. It followeth therefore undeniably that the Holy Ghost is no created person; inasmuch as that cannot be a created person which hath not a created nature; and that can neither have nor be a created nature which by nature is in God. Wherefore, although it be replied by others that it is not said in the text that the Spirit is in God, yet our adversaries' reason overweighs their negative observation; and it availeth little to say that it is not expressed, which must be acknowledged to be understood. The Holy Ghost then is a person, as I have proved, and is not of a nature distinguished from that which

is in God, as is confessed, and only denied to be in God, because it is not said so when it is implied; therefore he is no created person.

Secondly: the Holy Ghost is such a one as against whom a sin may be committed, and, when it is so, cannot be remitted. But, if he were no person, we could not commit that sin against him; and, if he were a created person, the sin committed against him could not be irremissible. Therefore he is a person, and that uncreated. The argument is grounded upon the words of our Saviour: "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come," Matt. xii. 31. By which words it appeareth there is a sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost distinct from all other sins and blasphemies committed against God the Father, or the Son of God; that this sin hath an aggravation added unto it, beyond other sins and blasphemies; but, if the Holy Spirit were no person, the sin could not be distinct from those sins which are committed against him whose Spirit he is; and, if he were a person created, the sin could receive no such aggravation beyond other sins and blasphemies.

To this they answer that the sin against the Holy Ghost is not therefore unpardonable, because he is God, which is not to our purpose; but they do not, they cannot, show that it can be unpardonable, if he were not God. It is not therefore simply, and for no other reason unpardonable, because that person is God against whom it is committed; for, if so, then any sin committed against that person who is God would be unpardonable; which is false. But that sin, which is particularly called blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, is a sin against God, and in such a manner aggravated as makes it irremissible; of which aggravation it were incapable, if the Spirit were not God.

Thirdly: every created person was made by the Son of God as God, and is now put under the feet of the Son of God as Man. But the Spirit of God was not made by the

Son of God, nor is he now put under the feet of the Son of Man. Therefore the Spirit of God can be no created person. "All things were made by" the Word, "and without him was not any thing made that was made;" therefore every created person was made by the Word. God, "hath put all things under the feet" of Christ; "but, when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him:" and, seeing none is excepted beside God, every created person must be under the feet of the Son of Man. But the Spirit of God in the beginning was not made, yea rather in the beginning made the world, as Job speaks of God, "By his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens;" nor is he under the feet of Christ, now set down at the right hand of God, who with supreme authority, together with the Father, sent the Prophets; as Isaiah testifieth, saying, "Now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me;" and with the same authority, since the exaltation of our Saviour, sent forth such as were separated to himself, as appeareth in the case of Barnabas and Saul, and with the same authority giveth all spiritual gifts, "dividing to every man severally as he will;" so that in this kingdom of Christ all things are done "by the power of the Spirit of God."

Fourthly: he by whose operation Christ was conceived in the womb of the virgin was no created person; for by virtue of that conception he was called the Son of God; whereas, if a creature had been the cause of his conception, he had been in that respect the son of a creature; nay, according to the adversaries' principles, he had taken upon him the nature of angels. But the Holy Ghost it was by whose operation Christ was conceived in the womb of the virgin. For it was an angel that said to Mary, not that "an angel," but that "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." Therefore the Spirit of God is no created person; which is our second assertion, against the ancient, but newly revived heresy, of the Arians and Macedonians.

Our third assertion is that which necessarily followeth from the former two : that the Spirit of God, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we profess to believe, is properly and truly God. For if he be a person, as we have proved in the declaration of our first assertion ; if he be a Person not created, as we have demonstrated in the corroboration of the second assertion ; then must he of necessity be acknowledged to be God, because there is no uncreated essence beside the essence of the one eternal God. And there is this great felicity in the laying of this third assertion, that it is not proved only by the two precedent assertions, but also by the adversaries of them both. He who denies the first, that is the Socinian, affirms that the Spirit of God is in God, and is the eternal and omnipotent power of God ; he who denies the second, that is the Macedonian, asserts that he is a Person of an intellectual nature subsisting, but whatsoever is a Person subsisting, of eternal and omnipotent power, must be acknowledged to be God. Whether therefore we look upon the truth of our assertions, or whether we consider the happiness of their negations, the conclusion is, that the Holy Ghost is God.

But were there nothing, which is already said, demonstrated, there is enough written in the word of God to assure us of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, to make us undoubtingly believe that the Spirit of God is God. It is written by Moses that, "when he went in before the Lord to speak with him, he took the veil off, until he came out," Ex. xxxiv. 34. And that Lord with whom Moses spake was the one Jehovah, the God of heaven and earth. But we are assured that the Spirit was and is that Lord to whom Moses spake ; for the apostle hath taught us so much by his own interpretation, saying, "Even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit," 2 Cor. iii. 15. The Spirit is here so plainly said to be the Lord, that is, Jehovah, the one eternal God, that the adversaries of this truth must either deny that "the Lord" is here to be taken for God, or that "the Spirit" is to be taken for the Spirit of God : either of which denials must seem very strange to any person who considereth the force and plainness of the apostle's discourse.

But indeed they are so ready to deny any thing, that they will by no means acknowledge either the one or the other; but "the Lord" must be something which is not God, and "the Spirit" must be something which is not the Spirit of God: and then they conclude the argument is of no force, and may as well conclude the Apostle's interpretation hath no sense. "The Lord," they say, is Christ, and not God; for Christ, they say, is not God: "the Spirit," they say, is the mystery of the law, or the hidden sense of it, and that every one knows is not the Spirit of God. But we are assured that the apostle did mean by "the Spirit," the Spirit of God, not the sense of the law; for he addeth immediately, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty;" and the sense of the law is never called the Spirit of the Lord. Nay, were it not that the coherence of the discourse did satisfy us, yet the objection ought not at all to move us: for the name of Spirit, in those places mentioned by them to signify the sense of the law, hath no affinity with this, according to their own way of argumentation; for it is never so taken with the emphasis of an article, and put in the place either of an entire subject or a predicate in a proposition, except by way of opposition; and one of those it must of necessity be, in those words of the apostle, "Now the Lord is that Spirit," and that without the least intimation of any opposition.

Again: we are assured that by "the Lord" the apostle did understand the eternal God; for he speaketh of the same Lord whom he mentioned in the verse before, and that is the Lord God spoken of in the book of Exodus; of whom except the apostle speaks, his argument hath neither inference nor coherence. In vain therefore is this pretended for an answer, that the apostle by "the Lord" doth always, unless he cite some place out of the old covenant, understand Christ; for in this particular he citeth a certain place out of the book of Exodus, and useth the name of "the Lord" in the same notion in which there it is used, framing an argument and urging it from thence; and, if he did not, that rule is not so universal and infallible, but that "the Lord," in the language of the same apostle, may not signify the second, but the first or third Person of the Trinity. If then "the Lord" be the eternal God, as the apostle without

any question understood him in Moses; if "the Spirit" be the Spirit of the Lord, as the apostle expounds himself in the words immediately following; then the Spirit of the Lord is the eternal God, and so termed in the Scriptures.

Again: the same Scriptures do clearly manifest the same Spirit to be God, and term him plainly and expressly so. For when Peter said, "Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart, to lie to the Holy Ghost?" he repeateth the same question in reference to the same offence; "Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God," Acts iv. 3. To lie unto the Holy Ghost is to lie unto God; to lie unto the Holy Ghost is not to lie unto men, because the Holy Ghost is not man; and consequently not to lie unto any angel, because the Holy Ghost is not an angel; not to lie unto any creature, because the Holy Ghost is no creature; but to lie unto God, because the Holy Ghost is God.

To this plain and evident argument there are so many answers, that the very multitude discovers the weakness of them all; for, if any one of them were sufficient to bear down the force of our reason, the rest would be superfluous. First: they answer that it cannot be collected from hence that the Spirit is God, because the Holy Ghost in the original is put in one case and God in another; and the apostle speaking in one manner of the Spirit, and in another of God, cannot show that the Spirit is God. To which it is easily answered, that the case, or manner of the apostle's speech can make no difference, if the sense and substance be the same, as here it is; for to deceive the Holy Ghost is nothing else but to lie unto him, or by a lie to endeavour to deceive him. The act objected to Ananias was but one, which act of his the apostles looked upon as injurious, not to themselves, but to the Holy Ghost; and therefore St. Peter showed the sin to be not against men, but against God: as certainly then as the apostles were men, so certainly was the Holy Ghost, in the esteem of St. Peter, God.

As for that sense which they put upon the words different from that of lying to God, as if Ananias were accused of counterfeiting the Holy Ghost, it is most certain that the words can in this place bear no such sense; for the sin of Ananias is again expressed in the case of his wife Sapphira,

to whom St. Peter said, "How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?" But to tempt the Spirit, and to counterfeit the Spirit, are two several things; and it is evident that in this place the tempting of the Spirit was nothing else but lying to him: for St. Peter said to Sapphira, "Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much; and she said, Yea, for so much:" in which answer she lied. "Then Peter said unto her, How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?" viz. in saying that ye sold the land for so much. Here is no color then for that new pretence, that Ananias did bear the apostles in hand that what was done he did by the motion of the Holy Spirit, and so did pretend, counterfeit, and belie the Holy Ghost. This is not to expound St. Peter, but to belie Ananias, and make him guilty of that sin which he was never yet accused of. It is most certain that he lied; it is also certain that he to whom he lied was the Holy Ghost; and therefore it might be well translated, that he lied to the Holy Ghost.

Next, because they may very well be conscious that this verbal or phraseological answer may not seem sufficient, they tell us, though both the phrases were synonymous, yet they did no way prove that the Spirit is God; and the reason which they render, to justify this negation, is, because there are several places of the Scripture in which the messengers of God, who are acknowledged not to be God, are mentioned in the same relation unto God as here the Spirit is. To which the answer is most plain and clear, that there is no creature ever mentioned in the same manner as the Holy Ghost is here. As when they allege those words of the apostle, "He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us his Holy Spirit," I cannot see what similitude can be made unto the Scripture now in question; for if the Spirit be not understood in the first words, "he therefore that despiseth," it hath no relation to the present question; and, if it be, it were so far from being a confutation, that it would be another confirmation. As for the other, "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me;" it is so far from justifying their interpretation, that it

hath nothing in it like that which founds our reason, that is, no opposition. For there are three particulars in that Scripture which we produce for our assertion; first, that they lied to the Holy Ghost; secondly, that in doing so they lied not unto men; and, thirdly, that by the same act they lied unto God. In which the opposition is our foundation; for if the Spirit of God were not God, as we are sure it is not man, it might as well have been said, "You lied not unto the Holy Ghost, but unto God." And indeed if the apostle would have aggravated the sin of Ananias with the full propriety and iniquity, in their sense, he must have said, "Thou hast not lied unto men, nor unto the Spirit of God, but unto God." But seeing he first told him plainly his sin, "lying to the Holy Ghost," and then let him know the sinfulness of it, "Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God;" it is evident that the Holy Ghost to whom he lied is God.

Thirdly: that Person whose inhabitation maketh a temple is God; for if the notion of a temple be nothing else but to be the house of God, if to be the house of any creature is not to be a temple, as it is not, then no inhabitation of any created Person can make a temple. But the inhabitation of the Holy Ghost maketh a temple, as we are informed by the apostle, "What, know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?" therefore the Holy Ghost is God.

To this is replied differently, according to the diversity of our adversaries; as it is not probable that the deniers of so great a truth should agree. The first tells us that, if we would enforce by this reason that the Holy Ghost is God, we must prove that he is a Person, and that he doth possess our bodies by a divine right. But we have already proved that he is a Person, and certainly there can be no other right but that which belongs to God, by which the Holy Ghost inhabiteth and possesseth us. Nor have they any pretence to evince the contrary, but that which more confirmeth our assertion: for they urge only those words of the apostle, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" 1 Cor. iii. 16. We do certainly know that we are the temple of God; and we also know that the Spirit of God therefore dwelleth in

us ; and we therefore know that we are the temple of God, because we know that the Spirit of God dwelleth in us ; and we know no other reason why we are the temple of God, when the Spirit of God dwelleth in us, but only because we know the Spirit of God is God ; for if the Spirit were any other Person not divine, or any thing but a Person though divine, we could not by any means be assured that he did properly inhabit in us ; or, if he did, that by his inhabitation he could make a temple of us. The second hath very little to say, but only this, that seeing the Holy Ghost who possesseth us is a Person, we must show that our bodies are his by the highest interest, and primarily dedicated to his honor : which he therefore conceives we cannot show, because he thinks our body is not at all his by interest, or dedicated to his honor. But it were very strange if we should be baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, and that the Holy Ghost should have no interest in us, but that he should be ours by interest, and not we his ; that the Spirit of God should call for men to be separated to himself, and that they who are so separated should be no way dedicated to his honor. If the Holy Ghost had no interest in us, because he is given unto us, then Christ can have no interest in us, for he is also given unto us. Indeed if the apostle had said, as our adversary doth, that we ought with our body to glorify, not the Spirit, but God, I should have concluded that the Spirit is not God ; but, seeing that the blessed Spirit which dwelleth in us, and spake by the apostles, never taught us not to glorify him, I shall rather take leave to suspect that of blasphemy than the assertion of his Deity to be false divinity. And whereas it is said that the apostle hath hinted in what respect our body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, to wit, by inhabitation ; this is so far from breeding in me the least thought of diminution, that by this notion only I am fully confirmed in the belief of my assertion : for I know no other way by which God peculiarly inhabiteth in us, but by the inhabitation of the Spirit : I understand no other way by which we can be the temple of God, but by the inhabitation of God, as it is written, “ Ye are the temple of the living God ; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people ;” 2

Cor. vi. 16: and therefore I conclude that the Holy Ghost, who by his inhabitation maketh our bodies temples, is that God who dwelleth in us.

Fourthly: he to whom the divine attributes do belong, as certainly as they belong unto God the Father, is truly and properly God; because those are divine attributes which are properties of the divine nature, and consequently none can be endued with them to whom the nature of God belongeth not. But the divine attributes, such as are omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, and the like, do belong as certainly unto the Holy Ghost as they do unto God the Father: therefore we are as much assured that the Holy Ghost is God. The Scriptures to prove these attributes are so well known that I shall not need to mention them; and they are so many that, to manage them against the exceptions of the adversaries, would take up too much room in this discourse; especially considering they question some of them in the Father as well as in the Spirit, and so I should be forced to a double proof.

Fifthly: he to whom are attributed those works which are proper unto God, by and for which God doth require of us to acknowledge and worship him as God, is properly and truly God; because the operations of all things flow from that essence by which they are; and therefore if the operations be truly divine, that is, such as can be produced by no other but God, then must the essence of that Person which produceth them be truly such. But such works as are proper unto God, by and for which God hath required us to acknowledge him and worship him as God, are attributed often in the Scriptures to the Spirit of God, as the acts of creation and conservation of all things, the miracles wrought upon and by our blessed Saviour, the works of grace and power wrought in the hearts of true believers, and the like. Therefore, without any farther disputation, which cannot be both long and proper for an exposition, I conclude my third assertion, that the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, is a Person truly and properly divine, the true and living God.

Now seeing we do firmly believe that the true and living God can be but one, that the infinity of the divine essence is incapable of multiplicity; seeing we have already shown

that the Father is originally that one God, which is denied by none; and have also proved that the only Son is the same God, receiving by an eternal generation the same divine nature from the Father; it will also be necessary, for the understanding of the nature of the Spirit of God, to show how that blessed Spirit is God: to which purpose, that I may proceed methodically, my fourth assertion is, that the Spirit of God, which is the true and living God, is neither God the Father, nor the Son of God.

First: though the Father be undoubtedly God, though the Holy Ghost be also God, and (because there cannot be two Gods) the same God; yet the Holy Ghost is not the Father; for the Scriptures do as certainly distinguish them in their Persons as they do unite them in their nature. He who proceedeth from the Father is not the Father, because it is impossible any Person should proceed from himself; but the Holy Ghost "proceedeth from the Father;" therefore he is not the Father. He who is sent by the Father, and from the Father, is not the Father, by whom and from whom he is sent; for no Person can be sent by himself, and by another from himself. But the Holy Ghost is sent by God the Father, and by the Son from the Father: therefore he is not the Father.

Secondly: though we have formerly proved that the Son of God is properly and truly God; though we now have also proved that the Spirit of God is God, and in reference to both we understand the same God; yet the Holy Ghost is not the Son; for he who receiveth of that which is the Son's, and by receiving of it glorifieth the Son, cannot be the Son, because no Person can be said to receive from himself that which is his own, and to glorify himself by so receiving. But "the Comforter, who is the Holy Ghost," received of that which is the Son's, and by receiving of it glorified the Son; for so our Saviour expressly said, "He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine," John xvi. 14. Therefore the Holy Ghost is not the Son. Again: he whose coming depended upon the Son's departing, and his sending after his departure, cannot be the Son, who therefore departed that he might send him. But the coming of the Holy Ghost depended upon the Son's departing, and his sending after his departure; as he told the apostles

before he departed, "I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away; for, if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but, if I depart, I will send him unto you:" therefore the Holy Ghost is not the Son.

Thirdly: though the Father be God, and the Son be God, and the Holy Ghost be also the same God; yet we are assured that the Holy Ghost is neither the Father nor the Son; because the Scriptures frequently represent him as distinguished both from the Father and the Son; as when "the Spirit of God descended like a dove, and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," he was manifestly distinguished from the Person of the Son, upon whom he lighted, and from the Person of the Father, who spake from heaven of his Son. The apostle teaches us that through the Son "we have access by one Spirit unto the Father," and consequently assureth us that the Spirit, by whom, is not the Father to whom, nor the Son through whom, we have that access. So "God sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption of sons: and, because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father," Eph. ii. 18; Gal. iv. 4; where the Son is distinguished from the Father as first sent by him, and the Spirit of the Son is distinguished both from the Father and the Son, as sent by the Father after he had sent the Son. And this our Saviour hath taught us several times in his word, as, "The Comforter whom the Father will send in my name;" "The Comforter whom I will send unto you from the Father;" and when that Comforter is come; "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." I conclude therefore, against the old Sabellian heresy, that the Holy Ghost, although he be truly and properly God, is neither God the Father, nor God the Son; which is my fourth assertion.

Our fifth assertion is, that the Holy Ghost is the third Person in the blessed Trinity. For seeing he is a Person, by our first assertion; a Person not created, by the second; but a Divine Person properly and truly God, by the third; seeing, though he is thus truly God, he is neither the Father, nor the Son, by the fourth assertion; it followeth

that he is one of the three; and of the three he is the third. For as there is a number in the Trinity, by which the Persons are neither more nor less than three; so there is also an order, by which, of these Persons, the Father is the first, the Son the second, and the Holy Ghost the third. Nor is this order arbitrary or external, but internal and necessary, by virtue of a subordination of the second unto the first, and of the third unto the first and second. The Godhead was communicated from the Father to the Son, not from the Son unto the Father; though therefore this was done from all eternity, and so there can be no priority of time, yet there must be acknowledged a priority of order by which the Father not the Son is first, and the Son not the Father second. Again: the same Godhead was communicated by the Father and the Son unto the Holy Ghost, not by the Holy Ghost to the Father or the Son; though therefore this was also done from all eternity, and therefore can admit of no priority in reference to time, yet that of order must be here observed, so that the Spirit receiving the Godhead from the Father, who is the first Person, cannot be the first; receiving the same from the Son, who is the second, cannot be the second; but, being from the first and second, must be of the three the third. And thus both the number and the order of the Persons are signified together by the apostle, saying, "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one," 1 John v. 7. And though they are not expressly said to be three, yet the same number is sufficiently declared, and the same order is expressly mentioned, in the baptismal institution made "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." As therefore we have formerly proved the Son to be truly the second Person, and at the same time the Father to be the first, so doth this which we have but briefly spoken prove that the Holy Ghost is the third; which is our fifth assertion.

Our sixth and last assertion (sufficient to manifest the nature of the Holy Ghost, as he is the Spirit of God) teacheth that Spirit to be a Person proceeding from the Father and the Son. From whence at last we have a clear description of the blessed Spirit, that he is the most high and eternal God, of the same nature, attributes, and

operations with the Father and the Son, as receiving the same essence from the Father and the Son, by proceeding from them both. Now this procession of the Spirit, in reference to the Father, is delivered expressly: in relation to the Son, is contained virtually in the Scriptures. First: it is expressly said that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, as our Saviour testifieth, "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me," John xv. 26. And this is also evident from what hath been already asserted; for seeing the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and being so the same in the unity of the nature of God are yet distinct in their Personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other; and, because the Father hath been already shown to have it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from him.

Secondly: though it be not expressly spoken in the Scripture that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, yet the substance of the same truth is virtually contained there: because those very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, for that reason because he proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son; and therefore there must be the same reason presupposed in reference to the Son which is expressed in reference to the Father. Because the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, therefore he is called the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of the Father. "It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you," Matt. x. 20. For by the language of the apostle the Spirit of God is the Spirit which is of God, saying, "The Things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God;" and "We have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God," 1 Cor. ii. 11. Now the same Spirit is also called the Spirit of the Son; for, "because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts;" the Spirit of Christ, "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his;" even "the Spirit of Christ which was in" the prophets; the Spirit of Jesus Christ, as the apostle speaks, "I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the

that he is one of the three; and of the three he is the third. For as there is a number in the Trinity, by which the Persons are neither more nor less than three; so there is also an order, by which, of these Persons, the Father is the first, the Son the second, and the Holy Ghost the third. Nor is this order arbitrary or external, but internal and necessary, by virtue of a subordination of the second unto the first, and of the third unto the first and second. The Godhead was communicated from the Father to the Son, not from the Son unto the Father; though therefore this was done from all eternity, and so there can be no priority of time, yet there must be acknowledged a priority of order by which the Father not the Son is first, and the Son not the Father second. Again: the same Godhead was communicated by the Father and the Son unto the Holy Ghost, not by the Holy Ghost to the Father or the Son; though therefore this was also done from all eternity, and therefore can admit of no priority in reference to time, yet that of order must be here observed, so that the Spirit receiving the Godhead from the Father, who is the first Person, cannot be the first; receiving the same from the Son, who is the second, cannot be the second; but, being from the first and second, must be of the three the third. And thus both the number and the order of the Persons are signified together by the apostle, saying, "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one," 1 John v. 7. And though they are not expressly said to be three, yet the same number is sufficiently declared, and the same order is expressly mentioned, in the baptismal institution made "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." As therefore we have formerly proved the Son to be truly the second Person, and at the same time the Father to be the first, so doth this which we have but briefly spoken prove that the Holy Ghost is the third; which is our fifth assertion.

Our sixth and last assertion (sufficient to manifest the nature of the Holy Ghost, as he is the Spirit of God) teacheth that Spirit to be a Person proceeding from the Father and the Son. From whence at last we have a clear description of the blessed Spirit, that he is the most high and eternal God, of the same nature, attributes, and

interpretation of which words, according to the Latins, inferred a procession; and that which the Greeks did understand thereby was the same which the Latins meant by the procession from the Son, that is, the receiving of his essence from him; that as the Son is God of God by being of the Father, so the Holy Ghost is God of God by being of the Father and the Son, as receiving that infinite and eternal essence from them both.

This being thus the general doctrine of the Eastern and the Western church, differing only in the manner of expression, and that without any opposition; Theodoret gave the first occasion of a difference, making use of the Greeks' expression against the doctrine both of Greeks and Latins; denying that the Holy Ghost receiveth his essence from the Son, because the Scripture saith he proceedeth from the Father, and is the Spirit which is of God. But St. Cyril, against whom he wrote, taking small notice of this objection, and the writings of Theodoret, in which this was contained, being condemned, there was no sensible difference in the church for many years concerning this particular. Afterwards divers of the Greeks expressly denied the procession from the Son, and several disputations did arise in the Western church, till at last the Latins put it into the Constantinopolitan Creed; and being admonished by the Greeks of that, as of an unlawful addition, and refusing to rase it out of the Creed again, it became an occasion of the vast schism between the Eastern and Western churches.

Now although the addition of words to the formal Creed, without the consent and against the protestation of the Oriental church, be not justifiable; yet that which was added is nevertheless a certain truth, and may be so used in that Creed by them who believe the same to be a truth, so long as they pretend it not to be a definition of that council, but an addition or explication inserted, and condemn not those who, out of a greater respect to such synodical determinations, will admit of no such insertions, nor speak any other language than the Scriptures and their fathers spake.

Howsoever we have sufficiently in our assertions declared the nature of the Holy Ghost, distinguishing him from all qualities, energies, or operations, in that he is

truly and properly a person; differencing him from all creatures and finite things, as he is not a created person; showing him to be of an infinite and eternal essence, as he is truly and properly God; distinguishing him from the Father and the Son, as being not the Father, though the same God with the Father; not the Son, though the same God with him; demonstrating his order in the blessed Trinity, as being not the first or second, but the third person, and therefore the third, because as the Son receiveth his essence communicated to him by the Father, and is therefore second to the Father, so the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence communicated to him by the Father and the Son, and so proceedeth from them both, and is truly and properly the Spirit of the Father, and as truly and properly the Spirit of the Son.

Thus far have we declared the nature of the Holy Ghost, what he is in himself, as the Spirit of God; it remaineth that we declare what is the office of the same, what he is unto us, as the Holy Spirit; for although the Spirit of God be of infinite, essential, and original holiness, as God, and so may be called holy in himself; though other spirits which were created be either actually now unholy, or of defectible sanctity at first, and so having the name of Spirit, common unto them, he may be termed Holy, that he may be distinguished from them; yet I conceive he is rather called the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit of Holiness, because, of the three persons in the blessed Trinity, it is his particular office to sanctify or make us holy.

Now, when I speak of the office of the Holy Ghost, I do not understand any ministerial office or function, such as that of the created angels is, who are "all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation;" for I have already proved this Spirit to be a person properly divine, and consequently above all ministration. But I intend thereby whatsoever is attributed unto him peculiarly in the salvation of man, as the work wrought by him, for which he is sent by the Father and the Son. For all the persons in the Godhead are represented unto us as concurring unto our salvation: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son;" and "through that Son we have an access by one Spirit unto

the Father." As therefore what our Saviour did and suffered for us belonged to that office of a Redeemer which he took upon him ; so whatsoever the Holy Ghost worketh in order to the same salvation, we look upon as belonging to his office. And because without holiness it is impossible to please God, because we all are impure and unholy, and the purity and holiness which is required in us to appear in the presence God, whose eyes are pure, must be wrought in us by the Spirit of God, who is called Holy because he is the cause of this holiness in us ; therefore we acknowledge the office of the Spirit of God to consist in the sanctifying of the servants of God, and the declaration of this office, added to the description of his nature, to be a sufficient explication of the object of faith contained in this article, *I believe in the Holy Ghost.*

Now, this sanctification being opposed to our impurity and corruption, and answering fully to the latitude of it, whatsoever is wanting in our nature of that holiness and perfection must be supplied by the Spirit of God. Wherefore, seeing by nature we are totally void of all saving truth, and under an impossibility of knowing the will of God ; seeing as " no man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him ;" even so none " knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God ;" this " Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God," and revealeth them unto the sons of men ; so that thereby the darkness of their understanding is expelled, and they are enlightened with the knowledge of their God. This work of the Spirit is double, either external and general, or internal and particular. The external and general work of the Spirit, as to the whole church of God, is the revelation of the will of God, by which so much in all ages hath been propounded as was sufficient to instruct men into eternal life. For there have been holy prophets ever since the world began, and " prophecy came not at any time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." When it pleased God " in the last days to speak unto us by his Son," even that Son sent his Spirit into the apostles, the Spirit of truth, that he might " guide them into all truth, teaching them all things, and bringing all things to their remembrance, what-

soever Christ had said unto them." By this means it came to pass that "all Scripture was given by inspiration of God," that is, by the motion and operation of the Spirit of God; and so whatsoever is necessary for us to know and believe was delivered by revelation. Again: the same Spirit who revealeth the object of faith generally to the universal church of God, which object is propounded externally by the church to every particular believer, doth also illuminate the understandings of such as believe, that they may receive the truth: for faith is the gift of God, not only in the object, but also in the act; Christ is not only given unto us, in whom we believe, but it is also given us "in the behalf of Christ to believe on him;" and this gift is a gift of the Holy Ghost, working within us an assent unto that which by the word is propounded to us; by this "the Lord opened the heart of Lydia, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul;" by this the word preached profiteth, being "mixed with faith in them that hear it." Thus "by grace we are saved, through faith, and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God." As the increase and perfection, so the original or initiation of faith is from the Spirit of God, not only by an external proposal in the word, but by an internal illumination in the soul; by which we are inclined to the obedience of faith, in assenting to those truths which unto a natural and carnal man are foolishness. And thus we affirm not only the revelation of the will of God, but also the illumination of the soul of man; to be part of the office of the Spirit of God, against the old and new Pelagians.

The second part of the office of the Holy Ghost, in the sanctification of man, is the regeneration and renovation of him. For our natural corruption consisting in an aversion of our wills, and a depravation of our affections, an inclination of them to the will of God is wrought within us by the Spirit of God; for "according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost," Tit. iii. 5. So that "except a man be born again, of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." We are all at first defiled by the corruption of our nature, and the pollution of our sins; but we "are washed, but we are sanctified, but

we are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." The second part then of the office of the Holy Ghost is the renewing of man in all the parts and faculties of his soul.

The third part of this office is to lead, direct, and govern us in our actions and conversations, that we may actually do and perform those things which are acceptable and well-pleasing in the sight of God. If we live in the Spirit, quickened by his renovation, we must also walk in the Spirit, following his direction, led by his manuduction. And, if we walk in the Spirit, we shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh; for we are not only directed, but animated and acted in those operations, by the Spirit of God, who giveth both to will and to do; and as many as are thus led by the Spirit of God, "they are the sons of God." Moreover, that this direction may prove more effectual, we are also guided in our prayers and acted in our devotions by the same Spirit, according to the promise, "I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication," Zech. xii. 10. Whereas, then "this is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will he heareth us," and whereas "we know not what we should pray for as we ought, the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered;" and "he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God," 1 John v. 14; Rom. viii. 26. From which intercession especially I conceive he hath the name of the Paraclete given him by Christ, who said, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter or Paraclete," John xiv. 16. For "if any man sin, we have a Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous," saith St. John; "who also maketh intercession for us," saith St. Paul. A Paraclete then, in the notion of the Scriptures, is an intercessor.

Fourthly: the office of the same Spirit is to join us unto Christ, and make us members of that one body of which our Saviour is the head. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body. And as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one

body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ," 1 Cor. xii. 12. "Hereby we know that God abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us," 1 John iii. 24. As we become spiritual men by the Spirit which is in us, as that union with the body and unto the head is a spiritual conjunction, so it proceedeth from the Spirit; and "he that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit."

Fifthly: it is the office of the Holy Ghost to assure us of the adoption of sons, to create in us a sense of the paternal love of God towards us, to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us," Rom. v. 5. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God," Rom. viii. 14. And "because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father," Gal. iv. 6. For we have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but we have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father. The Spirit itself bearing witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God," Rom. viii. 15. As therefore we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from him our regeneration, so we are also assured by the same Spirit of our adoption; and because being sons we are also "heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ," by the same Spirit we have the pledge, or rather the earnest, of our inheritance. For "he which establisheth us in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts," 2 Cor. i. 21; so that we are "sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession," Eph. i. 13. The Spirit of God as given unto us in this life, though it have not the proper nature of a pledge, as in the gifts received here, being no way equivalent to the promised reward, nor given in the stead of any thing already due; yet it is to be looked upon as an earnest, being part of that reward which is promised, and, upon the condition of performance of the covenant which God hath made with us, certainly to be received.

Sixthly: for the effecting of all these and the like particulars, it is the office of the same Spirit to sanctify and set apart persons for the duty of the ministry, ordaining them to intercede between God and his people, to send up prayers to God for them, to bless them in the name of God, to teach the doctrine of the gospel, to administer the sacraments instituted by Christ, to perform all things necessary "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." The same Spirit which illuminated the apostles, and endued them with power from above to perform personally their apostolical functions, fitted them also for the ordination of others, and the committing of a standing power to a successive ministry to the end of the world; who are thereby obliged to "take heed unto themselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers, to feed the church of God," Acts xx. 28.

By these and the like means doth the Spirit of God sanctify the sons of men, and by virtue of this sanctification, proceeding immediately from his office, he is properly called the Holy Spirit. And thus have I sufficiently described the object of our faith contained in this Article; what is the Holy Ghost in whom we believe, both in relation to his nature, as he is the Spirit of God, and in reference to his office, as he is the Holy Spirit.

The necessity of the belief of this article appeareth, first, from the nature and condition of the Creed, whereof it is an essential part, as without which it could not be looked upon as a Creed. For seeing the Creed is a profession of that faith into which we are baptized; seeing the first rule of faith was derived from the sacred form of baptism; seeing we are baptized "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" we are obliged to profess faith in these three; that as they are distinguished in the institution, so they may be distinguished in our profession. And therefore the briefest comprehensions of faith have always included the Holy Ghost, and some concluded with it.

Secondly: it is necessary to believe in the Holy Ghost, not only for the acknowledgment of the eminency of his

person, but also for a desire of the excellency of his graces, and the abundance of his gifts. What the apostle wished to the Corinthians, ought to be the earnest petition of every Christian, that "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with us all." For "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his;" if he have not that which maketh the union, he cannot be united to him; if he acknowledgeth him not to be his Lord, he cannot be his servant; and "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit;" such is their felicity who have it: "that which is born of the flesh is flesh;" such is their infelicity who want it. What then is to be desired in comparison of "the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ?" especially considering the encouragement we receive from Christ, who said, "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" Luke xi. 13.

Thirdly: it is necessary to profess faith in the Holy Ghost, that the will of God may be effectual in us, even our sanctification. For if "God hath from the beginning chosen us to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit;" if we be "elected according to the fore-knowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience;" if the office of the Spirit doth consist in this, and he be therefore called holy, because he is to sanctify us, how should we "follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord?" How should we endeavour to "cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God?" "The temple of God is holy, which temple we are, if the Spirit of God dwelleth in us;" for the inhabitation of God is a consecration, and that place must be a temple where his honor dwelleth. Now, if we "know that our body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in us, which we have of God;" if we know that "we are not our own," for that "we are bought with a price;" we must also know that we ought "therefore to glorify God in our body, and in our Spirit, which are God's." Thus it is necessary to believe in the Spirit of sanctification, that "our hearts

may be established unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints." 1 Thess. iii. 13.

Fourthly: it is necessary to believe in the Holy Ghost, that in all our weaknesses we may be strengthened, in all our infirmities we may be supported, in all our discouragements we may be comforted, in the midst of miseries we may be filled with peace and inward joy. "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," Rom. xiv. 17. We read of the disciples at first, that they "were filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost;" and those who afterwards "became followers of them, and of the Lord, received the word in much affliction, but with joy of the Holy Ghost." These are the rivers of living water flowing out of his belly that believeth; this is the oil of gladness wherewith the Son of God was anointed above his fellows, but yet with the same oil his fellows are anointed also: for "we have an unction from the Holy One, and the anointing which we receive of him abideth in us."

Lastly: the belief of the Holy Ghost is necessary for the continuation of a successive ministry, and a Christian submission to the acts of their function; unto the end of the world. For as God the Father sent the Son, and "the Spirit of the Lord was upon him, because he had anointed him to preach the gospel;" so the Son sent the apostles, saying, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you; and, when he had said this, he breathed on them and said unto them, Receive the Holy Ghost:" and as the Son sent the apostles, so did they send others by virtue of the same Spirit, as St. Paul sent Timothy and Titus, and gave them power to send others, saying to Timothy, "Lay hands suddenly on no man," and to Titus, "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." Thus, by virtue of an apostolical ordination, there is for ever to be continued a ministerial succession. Those who are thus separated by ordination to the work of the Lord are to "feed the flock of God, which is among them, taking the oversight thereof;" and those who are committed to their care are to "remember and obey them:

that have the rule over them, and submit themselves, for that they watch for their souls as they that must give account.”

Having thus at large asserted the verity contained in this article, and declared the necessity of believing it, we may easily give a brief exposition, by which every Christian may know what he ought to profess, and how he is to be understood, when he saith, *I believe in the Holy Ghost.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much :—I freely and resolvedly assent unto this, as unto a certain and infallible truth, that, beside all other whatsoever to whom the name of Spirit is or may be given, there is one particular and peculiar Spirit, who is truly and properly a Person, of a true, real, and personal subsistence, not a created, but uncreated Person, and so the true and one eternal God ; that though he be that God, yet is he not the Father nor the Son, but the Spirit of the Father and the Son, the third Person in the blessed Trinity, proceeding from the Father and the Son : I believe this infinite and eternal Spirit to be not only of perfect and indefectible holiness in himself, but also to be the immediate cause of all holiness in us, revealing the pure and undefiled will of God, inspiring the blessed apostles, and enabling them to lay the foundation, and by a perpetual succession to continue the edification of the church, illuminating the understandings of particular persons, rectifying their wills and affections, renovating their natures, uniting their persons unto Christ, assuring them of the adoption of sons, leading them in their actions, directing them in their devotions, by all ways and means purifying and sanctifying their souls and bodies, to a full and eternal acceptation in the sight of God. This is the eternal Spirit of God ; in this manner is that Spirit holy ; and thus *I believe in the Holy Ghost.*

ARTICLE IX.

The Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints.

IN this ninth article we meet with some variety of position, and with much addition ; for, whereas it is here the

ninth, in some creeds we find it the last ; and, whereas it consisteth of two distinct parts, the latter is wholly added, and the former partly augmented ; the most ancient professing no more than to believe *the holy church* : and the Greeks having added, by way of explication or determination, the word *catholic*, it was at last received into the Latin creed.

To begin then with the first part of the article, I shall endeavour so to expound it as to show what is the meaning of the church, which Christ hath propounded to us ; how that church is *holy*, as the apostle hath assured us ; how that holy church is *catholic*, as the fathers have taught us. For when I say, *I believe in the holy catholic church*, I mean that there is a church which is holy, and which is catholic ; and I understand that church alone which is both catholic and holy ; and, seeing this holiness and catholicism are but affections of this church which I believe, I must first declare what is the true nature and notion of the church ; how I am assured of the existence of that church ; and then how it is the subject of those two affections.

For the understanding of the true notion of the church, first, we must observe that the nominal definition or derivation of the word is not sufficient to describe the nature of it. If we look upon the old English word now in use, church or kirk, it is derived from the Greek, and first signified the house of the Lord, that is, of Christ, and from thence was taken to signify the people of God, meeting in the house of God. The Greek word used by the apostles to express the church signifieth a calling forth, if we look upon the origination ; a congregation of men, or a company assembled, if we consider the use of it. But neither of these doth fully express the nature of the church, what it is in itself, and as it is propounded to our belief.

Our second observation is, that the church hath been taken for the whole complex of men and angels worshipping the same God ; and again, the angels being not considered, it hath been taken as comprehending all the sons of men believing in God ever since the foundation of the world. But seeing Christ "took not upon him the nature of angels," and consequently did not properly purchase them with his blood or call them by his word ; seeing they are

not in the Scriptures mentioned as parts or members of the church, nor can be imagined to be built upon the prophets or apostles; seeing we are at this time to speak of the proper notion of the church, therefore I shall not look upon it as comprehending any more than the sons of men. Again: seeing though Christ was the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world, and whosoever from the beginning pleased God were saved by his blood; yet because there was a vast difference between the several dispensations of the law and gospel, because our Saviour spake expressly of building himself a church when the Jewish synagogue was about to fail, because catholicism, which is here attributed unto the church, must be understood in opposition to the legal singularity of the Jewish nation, because the ancient fathers were generally wont to distinguish between the synagogue and the church, therefore I think it necessary to restrain this notion to Christianity.

Thirdly: therefore I observe that the only way to attain unto the knowledge of the true notion of the church is to search into the New Testament, and, from the places there which mention it, to conclude what is the nature of it. To which purpose it will be necessary to take notice that our Saviour, first speaking of it, mentioneth it as that which then was not, but afterwards was to be; as when he spake unto the great apostle, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church;" but when he ascended into heaven, and the Holy Ghost came down, when Peter had converted three thousand souls which were added to the hundred and twenty disciples, then was there a church (and that built upon Peter, according to our Saviour's promise); for after that we read, "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved," Acts ii. 47. A church then our Saviour promised should be built, and by a promise made before his death; after his ascension, and upon the preaching of St. Peter, we find a church built or constituted, and that of a nature capable of a daily increase. We cannot then take a better occasion to search into the true notion of the church of Christ, than by looking into the origination and increase thereof; without which it is impossible to have a right conception of it.

Now what we are infallibly assured of the first actual existence of a church of Christ is only this—there were twelve apostles with the disciples before the descent of the Holy Ghost, and the “number of the names together were about an hundred and twenty,” Acts i. 15. When the Holy Ghost came after a powerful and miraculous manner upon the blessed apostles, and St. Peter preached unto the Jews, that they should “repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls,” Acts ii. 38. These, being thus added to the rest, “continued stedfastly in the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers:” and all these persons so continuing are called the church. What this church was is easily determined; for it was a certain number of men, of whom some were apostles, some the former disciples, others were persons who repented, and believed, and were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and continued hearing the word preached, receiving the sacraments administered, joining in the public prayers presented unto God. This was then the church, which was daily increased by the addition of other persons received into it upon the same conditions, making up “the multitude of them that believed,” who were “of one heart and one soul, believers added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women.”

But though the church was thus begun, and represented unto us as one in the beginning, though that church which we profess to believe in the Creed be also propounded unto us as one; and so the notion of the first church in the Acts of the Apostles might seem sufficient to express the nature of that church which we believe; yet because that church was one by way of origination, and was afterwards divided into many, the actual members of that one becoming the members of several churches; and that church which we believe is otherwise one by way of complexion, receiving the members of all churches into it; it will be necessary to consider, how at the first those several churches were constituted, that we may understand how in this one church they are all united. To which purpose it will be farther fit to examine the several acceptations of this word, as it is diversely

used by the Holy Ghost in the New Testament; that, if it be possible, nothing may escape our search, but that all things may be weighed, before we collect and conclude the full notion of the church from thence.

First, then, that word which signifies the church in the original Greek, is sometimes used in the vulgar sense, according as the native Greeks did use the same to express their conventions, without any relation to the worship of God or Christ, and therefore is translated by the word *assembly*, of as great a latitude. Secondly: it is sometimes used in the same notion in which the Greek translators of the Old Testament made use of it, for the assembly of the people of God under the law, and therefore might be most fitly translated the *congregation*, as it is in the Old Testament, Acts xix. 32, 39, 40. Thirdly: it hath been conceived that even in the Scriptures it is sometimes taken for the place in which the members of the church did meet to perform their solemn and public services unto God; and some passages there are which seem to speak no less, but yet are not so certainly to be understood of the place, but that they may as well be spoken of the people congregated in a certain place, Acts xi. 26; 1 Cor. xi. 18, 22. Beside these few different acceptations, the church in the language of the New Testament doth always signify a company of persons professing the Christian faith, but not always in the same latitude. Sometimes it admitteth of distinction and plurality; sometimes it reduceth all into conjunction and unity. Sometimes the churches of God are diversified as many; sometimes, as many as they are, they are all comprehended in one.

For, first, in general there are often mentioned "the churches" by way of plurality; "the churches of God;" "the churches of the Gentiles;" "the churches of the saints." In particular we find a few believers, gathered together in the house of one single person, called a church, as the church in the house of Priscilla and Aquila, the church in the house of Nymphas, the church in the house of Philemon; which churches were nothing else but the believing and baptized persons of each family, with such as they admitted and received into their house to join in the worship of the same God.

Again: when the Scripture speaketh of any country where the gospel had been preached, it nameth always by way of plurality the churches of that country, as the churches of Judea, of Samaria, and Galilee; the churches of Syria and of Cilicia; the churches of Galatia; the churches of Asia; the churches of Macedonia. But notwithstanding there were several such churches or congregations of believers in great and populous cities, yet the Scriptures always speak of such congregations in the notion of *one* church; as when St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians "Let your women keep silence in the churches;" yet the dedication of his Epistle is, "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth." So we read not of the churches, but the church at Jerusalem, the church at Antioch, the church at Cæsarea, the church at Ephesus, the church of the Thessalonians, the church of Laodicea, the church of Smyrna, the church of Pergamus, the church of Thyatira, the church of Sardis, the church of Philadelphia. From whence it appeareth that a collection of several congregations, every one of which is in some sense a church, and may be called so, is properly one church by virtue of the subordination of them all in one government under one ruler. For thus in those great and populous cities where Christians were very numerous, not only all the several churches within the cities, but those also in the adjacent parts, were united under the care and inspection of one bishop, and therefore was accounted one church; the number of the churches following the number of the angels, that is, the rulers of them, as is evident in the Revelation.

Now as several churches are reduced to the denomination of one church in relation to the single governor of those many churches, so all the churches of all cities and all nations in the world may be reduced to the same single denomination in relation to one supreme Governor of them all, and that one Governor is Christ, the Bishop of our souls. Wherefore the apostle, speaking of that in which all churches do agree, comprehendeth them all under the same appellation of one church; and therefore often by the name of church are understood all Christians whatsoever belonging to any of the churches dispersed through the distant and divided parts of the world. For the single

persons professing faith in Christ are members of the particular churches in which they live, and all those particular churches are members of the general and universal church, which is one by unity of aggregation; and this is the church in the Creed, which we believe, and which is in other creeds expressly termed "one," *I believe in one holy catholic church.*

It will therefore be farther necessary, for the understanding of the nature of the church which is thus one, to consider in what that unity doth consist. And seeing it is an aggregation not only of many persons, but also of many congregations, the unity thereof must consist in some agreement of them all, and adhesion to something which is one. If then we reflect upon the first church again, which we found constituted in the Acts, and to which all others since have been in a manner added and conjoined, we may collect from their union and agreement how all other churches are united and agree. Now they were described to be believing and baptized persons, converted to the faith by St. Peter, continuing stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. These then were all built upon the same rock, all professed the same faith, all received the same sacraments, all performed the same devotions, and thereby were all reputed members of the same church. To this church were added daily such as should be saved, who became members of the same church by being built upon the same foundation, by adhering to the same doctrine, by receiving the same sacraments, by performing the same devotions.

From whence it appeareth that the first unity of the church considered in itself, beside that of the head, which is one Christ, and the life communicated from that head, which is one Spirit, relieth upon the original of it, which is one; even as a house built upon one foundation, though consisting of many rooms, and every room of many stones, is not yet many, but one house. Now there is but one foundation upon which the church is built, and that is Christ: "for other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." And though the apostles and the prophets be also termed the foundation, yet even

then the unity is preserved, because as they are stones in the foundation, so are they united by one corner-stone; whereby it comes to pass that such persons as are of the church, being "fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord," Eph. ii. 19. This stone was "laid in Zion for a foundation, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation:" there was the first church built; and whosoever have been, or ever shall be, converted to the true Christian faith, are and shall be added to that church, and laid upon the same foundation, which is the unity of origination. Our Saviour gave the same power to all the apostles, which was to found the church; but he gave that power to Peter, to show the unity of the same church.

Secondly: the church is therefore one, though the members be many, because they all agree in one faith. There is "one Lord, and one faith," and that "faith once delivered to the saints," which whosoever shall receive, embrace, and profess, must necessarily be accounted one in reference to that profession; for if a company of believers become a church by believing, they must also become one church by believing one truth. If they be one in respect of the foundation, which is ultimately one; if we look upon Christ, who is mediately one; if we look upon the apostles united in one corner-stone; if those who believe be therefore said to be built upon the foundation of the apostles, because they believe the doctrine which the apostles preached, and the apostles be therefore said to be of the same foundation, and united to the corner-stone, because they all taught the same doctrine which they received from Christ; then they who believe the same doctrine delivered by Christ to all the apostles, delivered by all the apostles to believers, being all professors of the same faith, must be members of the same church. And this is the unity of faith.

Thirdly: many persons and churches, howsoever distinguished by time or place, are considered as one church, because they acknowledge and receive the same sacra-

ments, the signs and badges of the people of God. When the apostles were sent to found and build the church, they received this commission, "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Now as there is but one Lord, and one faith, so also there is but "one baptism;" and consequently they who are admitted to it, in receiving it are one, Eph. iv. 5. Again: at the institution of the Lord's supper Christ commanded, saying, "Eat ye all of this, drink ye all of this; and all, by communicating of one, become as to that communication one. "For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread," 1 Cor. x. 17. As therefore the Israelites "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink," and thereby appeared to be the one people of God; so all believing persons, and all churches congregated in the name of Christ, washed in the same laver of regeneration, eating of the same bread, and drinking of the same cup, are united in the same cognizance, and so known to be the same church. And this is the unity of the sacraments.

Fourthly: whosoever belongeth to any church is some way called; and all who are so, "are called in one hope of their calling:" the same reward of eternal life is promised unto every person, and we all "through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith," Gal. v. 5. They therefore who depend upon the same God, and worship him all for the same end, "the hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began," Tit. i. 2; having all the same expectation, may well be reputed the same church. And this is the unity of hope.

Fifthly: they who are all of one mind, whatsoever the number of their persons be, are in reference to that mind but one; as all the members, howsoever different, yet, being animated by one soul, become one body. Charity is of a fastening and uniting nature; nor can we call those many, who endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," Eph. iv. 3. "By this," said our Saviour, "shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye

have love one to another," John xiii. 35. And this is the unity of charity.

Lastly: all the churches of God are united into one by the unity of discipline and government, by virtue whereof the same Christ ruleth in them all. For they have all the same pastoral guides appointed, authorized, sanctified, and set apart by the appointment of God, by the direction of the Spirit, to direct and lead the people of God in the same way of eternal salvation; as therefore there is no church where there is no order, no ministry; so where the same order and ministry is, there is the same church. And this is the unity of regimen and discipline.

By these means, and for these reasons, millions of persons and multitudes of congregations are united into one body, and become one church. And thus under the name of *church*, expressed in this Article, is understood a body, or collection of human persons professing faith in Christ, gathered together in several places of the world for the worship of the same God, and united into the same corporation by the means aforesaid. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the true notion of the church as such, which is here the object of our faith. It remaineth therefore that we next consider the existence of the church, which is acknowledged in the act of faith applied to this object. For when I profess and say, *I believe a church*, it is not only an acknowledgment of a church which hath been, or of a church which shall be, but also of that which is. When I say, *I believe in Christ dead*, I acknowledge that death which once was, and now is not: for Christ once died, but now is not dead. When I say, *I believe the resurrection of the body*, I acknowledge that which never yet was, and is not now, but shall hereafter be. Thus the act of faith is applicated to the object according to the nature of it; to what is already past, as past; to what is to come, as still to come; to that which is present, as it is still present. Now that which was then past, when the Creed was made, must necessarily be always past, and so believed for ever; that which shall never come to pass until the end of the world, when this public profession of faith shall cease, that must for ever be believed as still to come. But that which was when the Creed began, and was to continue till

that Creed shall end, is proposed to our belief in every age as being: and thus, ever since the first church was constituted, the church itself, as being, was the object of the faith of the church believing.

The existence, therefore, of the church of Christ, as that church before is understood by us, is the continuation of it in an actual being, from the first collection in the apostles' times unto the consummation of all things. And therefore, to make good this explication of the article, it will be necessary to prove that the church which our Saviour founded, and the apostles gathered, was to receive a constant and perpetual accession, and by a successive augmentation be uninterruptedly continued in an actual existence of believing persons and congregations in all ages unto the end of the world.

Now this indeed is a proper object of faith, because it is grounded only upon the promise of God; there can be no other assurance of the perpetuity of this church, but what we have from him that built it. The church is not of such a nature as would necessarily, once begun, preserve itself for ever. Many thousand persons have fallen totally and finally from the faith professed, and so apostatized from the church. Many particular churches have been wholly lost, many candlesticks have been removed; neither is there any particular church which hath any power to continue itself more or longer than others; and consequently, if all particulars be defectible, the universal church must also be subject of itself unto the same defectibility.

But though the providence of God doth suffer many particular churches to cease, yet the promise of the same God will never permit that all of them at once shall perish. When Christ spake first particularly to St. Peter, he sealed his speech with a powerful promise of perpetuity, saying, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," Matt. xvi. 18. When he spake generally to all the rest of the apostles to the same purpose, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" he added a promise to the same effect: "And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." The first of these promises assureth us of

the continuance of the church, because it is built upon a rock ; for our Saviour had expressed this before, " Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock ; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell not ; for it was founded upon a rock," Matt. vii. 24. The church of Christ is the house of Christ ; for he " hath builded the house," and is as a " Son over his own house, whose house are we ;" and, as a wise man, he hath built his house upon a rock ; and what is so built shall not fall. The latter of these promises giveth not only an assurance of the continuance of the church, but also the cause of that continuance, which is the presence of Christ. " Where two or three are gathered together in the name " of Christ, there he is in the midst of them, and thereby they become a church ; for they are as a builded house, and the Son within that house. Wherefore, seeing Christ doth promise his presence unto the church, even unto the end of the world, he doth thereby assure us of the existence of the church, until that time of which his presence is the cause. Indeed this is " the city of the Lord of hosts, the city of our God ; God will establish it for ever ; as the great prophet of the church hath said, Ps. xlvi. 8.

Upon the certainty of this truth, the existence of the church hath been propounded as an object of our faith in every age of Christianity ; and so it shall be still unto the end of the world ; for those who are believers are the church ; and therefore, if they do believe, they must believe there is a church. And thus having showed in what the nature of a church consisteth, and proved that a church of that nature is of perpetual and indefectible existence by virtue of the promises of Christ, I have done all which can be necessary for the explication of this part of the article, *I believe in the church.*

After the consideration of that which is the subject in this article, followeth the explication of the affections thereof ; which are two, sanctity and universality ; the one attributed unto it by the apostles, the other by the fathers of the church : by the first the church is denominated *holy*, by the second *catholic*. Now the church which we have

described may be called holy in several respects and for several reasons: first, in reference to the vocation by which all the members thereof are called and separated from the rest of the world to God; which separation, in the language of the Scriptures, is a sanctification; and so the calling being holy (for "God has called us with an holy calling"), the body which is separated and congregated thereby may well be termed holy; secondly, in relation to the offices appointed, and the powers exercised in the church, which by their institution and operation are holy; that church for which they were appointed, and in which they are exercised, may be called holy: thirdly, because whosoever is called to profess faith in Christ, is thereby engaged to holiness of life, according to the words of the apostle, "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity:" for those namers of the name, or named by the name, of Christ, are such as called on his name; and that was the description of the church; as, when Saul did persecute the church, it is said he had "authority from the chief priests to bind all that called upon the name of Christ;" and, when he "preached Christ in the synagogues, all that heard him said, Is not this he who destroyed them which called on this name in Jerusalem?" Acts ix. 14; 1 Cor. i. 2. Seeing then all within the church are by their profession obliged to such holiness of life, in respect of this obligation, the whole church may be termed holy: fourthly, in regard the end of constituting a church in God was for the purchasing a holy and a precious people, and the great design thereof was for the begetting and increasing holiness, that as God is originally holy in himself, so he might communicate his sanctity to the sons of men, whom he intended to bring unto the fruition of himself, unto which, without a previous sanctification, they can never approach, because "without holiness no man shall ever see God."

For these four reasons, the whole church of God, as it containeth in it all the persons who were called to the profession of the faith of Christ, or were baptized in his name, may well be termed and believed holy. But the apostle hath also delivered another kind of holiness, which cannot belong unto the church taken in so great a latitude. For,

saith he, "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water, by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish," Ephes. v. 25. Now, though it may be conceived that Christ did love the whole church, as it did any way contain all such as ever called upon his name, and did give himself for all of them; yet we cannot imagine that the whole body of all men could ever be so holy as to be without spot, wrinkle, blemish, or any such thing. It will be therefore necessary, within the great complex body of the universal church, to find that church to which this absolute holiness doth belong; and to this purpose it will be fit to consider both the difference of the persons contained in the church, as it hath been hitherto described, while they continue in this life, and their different conditions after death; whereby we shall at last discover in what persons this holiness is inherent really, in what condition it is inherent perfectly, and consequently in what other sense it may be truly and properly affirmed that the church is holy.

Where first we must observe that the church, as it embraceth all the professors of the true faith of Christ, containeth in it not only such as do truly believe and are obedient to the word, but those also who are hypocrites and profane. Many profess the faith who have no true belief; many have some kind of faith, who live with no correspondence to the gospel preached. Within therefore the notion of the church are comprehended good and bad, being both externally called, and both professing the same faith. For "the kingdom of heaven is like unto a field," in which "wheat and tares grow together unto the harvest;" like unto "a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind;" like unto a floor in which is laid up wheat and chaff; like unto a marriage-feast, in which some have on the wedding-garment, and some not. This is that ark of Noah, in which were preserved beasts clean and unclean. This is that *great house* in which "there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth, and some to honor and some to dishonor." There are many called, of all whom the church consisteth, but

there are few chosen of those who are called, and thereby within the church. I conclude, therefore, as the ancient Catholics did against the Donatists, that within the church, in the public profession and external communion thereof, are contained persons truly good and sanctified, and hereafter saved; and together with them other persons void of all saving grace, and hereafter to be damned: and that church containing these of both kinds may well be called holy, as St. Matthew called Jerusalem the holy city, even at that time when our Saviour did but begin to preach, when we know there was in that city a general corruption in manners and worship.

Of those promiscuously contained in the church, such as are void of all saving grace while they live, and communicate with the rest of the church, and when they pass out of this life die in their sins, and remain under the eternal wrath of God, as they were not in their persons holy while they lived, so are they no way of the church after their death, neither as members of it, nor as contained in it. Through their own demerit they fall short of the glory unto which they were called, and being by death separated from the external communion of the church, and having no true internal communion with the members and the head thereof, are totally and finally cut off from the church of Christ. On the contrary, such as are efficaciously called, justified, and sanctified, while they live are truly holy, and when they die are perfectly holy; nor are they by their death separated from the church, but remain united still by virtue of that internal union by which they were before conjoined both to the members and the head. As therefore the church is truly holy, not only by a holiness of institution, but also by a personal sanctity in reference to these saints while they live, so is it also perfectly holy, in relation to the same saints glorified in heaven. And at the end of the world, when all the wicked shall be turned into hell, and consequently all cut off from the communion of the church; when the members of the church remaining, being perfectly sanctified, shall be eternally glorified; then shall the whole church be truly and perfectly holy. Then shall that be completely fulfilled, that Christ shall "present unto himself a glorious church," which shall be "holy and without

blemish." Not that there are two churches of Christ; one in which good and bad are mingled together; another in which there are good alone: one in which the saints are imperfectly holy; another in which they are perfectly such: but one and the same church, in relation to different times, admitteth or not admitteth the permixtion of the wicked, or the imperfection of the godly.

To conclude: the church of God is universally holy in respect of all, by institutions and administrations of sanctity; the same church is really holy in this world, in relation to all godly persons contained in it by a real infused sanctity; the same is farther yet at the same time perfectly holy in reference to the saints departed and admitted to the presence of God; and the same church shall hereafter be most completely holy in the world to come, when all the members actually belonging to it shall be at once perfected in holiness and completed in happiness. And thus I conceive the affection of sanctity sufficiently explicated.

The next affection of the church is that of universality, *I believe in the holy catholic church*. Now the word *catholic*, as it is not read in the Scriptures, so was it not anciently in the Creed (as we have already shown), but, being inserted by the church, must necessarily be interpreted by the sense which the most ancient fathers had of it, and that sense must be confirmed, so far as it is consentient with the Scriptures. To grant then that the word was not used by the apostles, we must also acknowledge that it was most anciently in use among the primitive fathers, and that as to several intents. For, first, they called the Epistles of St. James, St. Peter, St. John, St. Jude, "The Catholic Epistles," because, while the Epistles written by St. Paul were directed to particular churches congregated in particular cities, these were either sent to the churches dispersed through a great part of the world, or directed to the whole church of God upon the face of the whole earth. Again, we observe the fathers to use the word *catholic* for nothing else but general or universal, in the ordinary or vulgar sense; as "the catholic resurrection" is the resurrection of all men, "the catholic opinion" the opinion of all men. Sometimes it was used as a word of state, signifying an

officer who collected the emperor's revenue in several provinces, united into one diocese; who, because there were particular officers belonging to the particular provinces, and all under him, was therefore called the "Catholicus," as general Procurator of them all, from whence that title was by some transferred upon the Christian patriarchs.

When this title is attributed to the church, it hath not always the same notion or signification; for when by the church is understood the house of God, or place in which the worship of God is performed, then by the catholic church is meant no more than the common church; into which all such persons as belonged to that parish in which it was built were wont to congregate. For where monasteries were in use, as there were separate habitations for men, and distinct for women, so were there also churches for each distinct; and in the parishes, where there was no distinction of sexes, as to habitation, there was a common church which received them both, and was therefore called catholic.

Again: when the church is taken for the persons making profession of the Christian faith, *the catholic* is often added in opposition to heretics and schismatics, expressing a particular church continuing in the true faith with the rest of the church of God, "as the catholic church in Smyrna;" "the catholic church in Alexandria."

Now seeing these particular churches could not be named catholic as they were particular, in reference to this or that city in which they were congregated, it followeth that they were called catholic by their coherence and conjunction with that church which was properly and originally called so; which is the church taken in that acceptation which we have already delivered. That church which was built upon the apostles as upon the foundation, congregated by their preaching and by their baptizing, receiving continued accession, and disseminated in several parts of the earth, containing within it numerous congregations, all which were truly called churches, as members of the same church; that church, I say, was after some time called the catholic church, that is to say, the name *catholic* was used by the Greeks to signify the whole. For seeing every particular congregation, professing the name of Christ, was

from the beginning called a church; seeing likewise all such congregations considered together were originally comprehended under the name of the church; seeing these two notions of the word were different, it came to pass that for distinction sake at first they called the church, taken in the large and comprehensive sense, by as large and comprehensive a name, the catholic church.

Although this seem the first intention of those who gave the name *catholic* to the church, to signify thereby nothing else but the whole or universal church, yet those who followed did signify by the same that affection of the church which floweth from the nature of it, and may be expressed by that word. At first they called the whole church catholic, meaning no more than the universal church; but, having used that term some space of time, they considered how the nature of the church was to be universal, and in what that universality did consist.

As far then as the ancient fathers have expressed themselves, and as far as their expressions are agreeable with the descriptions of the church delivered in the Scriptures, so far, I conceive, we may safely conclude that the church of Christ is truly catholic, and that the truly catholic church is the true church of Christ, which must necessarily be sufficient for the explication of this affection, which we acknowledge when we say, we *believe in the catholic church*.

The most obvious and most general notion of this catholicism consisteth in the diffusiveness of the church, grounded upon the commission given to the builders of it, "Go teach all nations;" whereby they and their successors were authorized and empowered to gather congregations of believers, and so to extend the borders of the church unto the utmost parts of the earth. The synagogue of the Jews especially consisted of one nation, and the public worship of God was confined to one country. "In Judah was God known; and his name was great in Israel; in Salem was his tabernacle, and his dwelling-place in Sion." "He showed his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel; he hath not dealt so with any nation," Psal. lxxvi. 1; cxlvii. 9. The temple was the only place in which the sacrifices could be offered, in which the priests could perform their office of administration; and so under the law there was

an enclosure divided from all the world besides. But God said unto his Son, "I will give the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession," Psal. ii. 8. And Christ commanded the apostles, saying, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature:" "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Thus the church of Christ, in its primary institution, was made to be of a diffusive nature, to spread and extend itself from the city of Jerusalem, where it first began, to all the parts and corners of the earth. From whence we find them in the Revelation crying to the Lamb, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation," Rev. v. 9. This reason did the ancient fathers render why the church was called catholic, and the nature of the church is so described in the Scriptures.

Secondly: they call the church of Christ the catholic church, because it teacheth all things which are necessary for a Christian to know, whether they be things in heaven or things in earth, whether they concern the condition of man in this life, or in the life to come. As the Holy Ghost did lead the apostles into all truth, so did the apostles leave all truth unto the church, which teaching all the same, may be well called catholic, from the universality of necessary and saving truths retained in it.

Thirdly: the church hath been thought fit to be called catholic in reference to the universal obedience which it prescribeth; both in respect of the persons, obliging men of all conditions; and in relation to the precepts, requiring the performance of all the evangelical commands.

Fourthly: the church hath been yet farther called or reputed catholic, by reason of all graces given in it, whereby all diseases of the soul are healed, and spiritual virtues are disseminated, all the works and words and thoughts of men are regulated, till we become perfect men in Christ Jesus.

In all these four acceptations did some of the ancient fathers understand the church of Christ to be catholic, and every one of them doth certainly belong unto it. Wherefore I conclude that this catholicism, or second af-

fection of the church, consisteth generally in universality, as embracing all sorts of persons, as to be disseminated through all nations, as comprehending all ages, as containing all necessary and saving truths, as obliging all conditions of men to all kind of obedience, as curing all diseases and planting all graces in the souls of men.

The necessity of believing the holy catholic church appeareth first in this, that Christ hath appointed it as the only way unto eternal life. We read at the first, that "the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved;" and what was then daily done, hath been done since continually. Christ never appointed two ways to heaven; nor did he build a church to save some, and make another institution for other men's salvation. "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved," but the name of Jesus; and that name is no otherwise given under heaven than in the church. As none were saved from the deluge but such as were within the ark of Noah, framed for their reception by the command of God; as none of the firstborn of Egypt lived, but such as were within those habitations, whose door-posts were sprinkled with blood by the appointment of God for their preservation; as none of the inhabitants of Jericho could escape the fire or sword, but such as were within the house of Rahab, for whose protection a covenant was made: so none shall ever escape the eternal wrath of God, who belong not to the church of God. This is the congregation of those persons here on earth who shall hereafter meet in heaven. These are the vessels of the tabernacle carried up and down, at last to be translated into, and fixed in, the temple.

Secondly: it is necessary to believe the church of Christ which is but one, that being in it we may take care never to cast ourselves, or be ejected, out of it. There is a power within the church to cast those out who do belong to it; for "If any neglect to hear the church," saith our Saviour, "let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican," Matt. xviii. 17. By great and scandalous offences, by incorrigible misdemeanors, we may incur the censure of the church of God; and, while we are shut out by them, we stand excluded out of heaven. For our Saviour said to his apostles, upon whom he built his church "Whosoever sins

ye remit, they are remitted unto them ; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained," John xx. 23. Again, a man may not only passively and involuntarily be rejected, but also may by an act of his own cast out or reject himself, not only by plain and complete apostasy, but by a defection from the unity of truth, falling into some damnable heresy ; or by an active separation, deserting all which are in communion with the catholic church, and falling into an irrecoverable schism.

Thirdly: it is necessary to believe the church of Christ to be holy, lest we should presume to obtain any happiness by being of it, without that holiness which is required in it. It is not enough that the end, institution, and administration of the church are holy ; but, that there may be some real and permanent advantage received by it, it is necessary that the persons abiding in the communion of it should be really and effectually sanctified. Without which holiness the privileges of the church prove the greatest disadvantages ; and the means of salvation neglected, tend to a punishment with aggravation. It is not only vain, but pernicious, to attend at the marriage-feast without a wedding garment ; and it is our Saviour's description of folly, to cry " Lord, Lord, open unto us," while we are without oil in our lamps. We must acknowledge a necessity of holiness, when we confess that church alone who is holy can make us happy.

Fourthly : there is a necessity of believing the catholic church, because, except a man be of that, he can be of none. For, seeing the church which is truly catholic containeth within it all which are truly churches, whosoever is not of the catholic church, cannot be of the true church. That church alone which first began at Jerusalem on earth will bring us to the Jerusalem in heaven ; and that alone began there which always embraceth " the faith once delivered to the saints." Whatsoever church pretendeth to a new beginning pretendeth at the same time to a new churchdom, and whatsoever is so new is none. So necessary it is to believe the holy catholic church.

Having thus far explicated the first part of this article, I conceive every person sufficiently furnished with means of instruction what they ought to intend when they profess to believe the holy catholic church. For thereby every one is

understood to declare thus much:—I am fully persuaded, and make a free confession of this, as of a necessary and infallible truth, that Christ, by the preaching of the apostles, did gather unto himself a church, consisting of thousands of believing persons and numerous congregations, to whom he daily added such as should be saved, and will successively and daily add unto the same unto the end of the world: so that, by the virtue of his all-sufficient promise, I am assured that there was, hath been hitherto, and now is, and hereafter shall be, so long as the sun and moon endure, a church of Christ, one and the same. This church I believe in general holy in respect of the author, end, institution, and administration of it; particularly in the members here I acknowledge it really, and in the same hereafter perfectly, holy. I look upon this church not like that of the Jews, limited to one people, confined to one nation; but by the appointment and command of Christ, and by the efficacy of his assisting power, to be disseminated through all nations, to be extended to all places, to be propagated to all ages, to contain in it all truths necessary to be known to exact absolute obedience from all men to the commands of Christ, and to furnish us with all graces necessary to make our persons acceptable, and our actions well-pleasing, in the sight of God. And thus *I believe in the holy catholic church.*

The Communion of Saints.

THIS part of the article beareth something a later date than any of the rest, but yet is no way inferior to the other in relation to the certainty of the truth thereof. And the late admission of it into the Creed will be thus far advantageous, that thereby we may be the better assured of the true intent of it, as it is placed in the Creed. For it will be no way fit to give any other explication of these words, as the sense of the Creed, than what was then understood by the church of God, when they were first inserted.

If we look upon the first institution of the church, and the original condition of those persons who received the gospel, how they “were all together, and had all things common;” how “they sold their possessions and goods,

and parted them to all men as every man had need ;” how St. Paul urged “ an equality, that the abundance of some might supply the want of others, as it is written, He that had gathered much had nothing over, and he that had gathered little had no lack :” we might well conceive that the communion (which word might be taken for communication) of the saints, may signify the great charity, bounty, and community among the people of God.

But seeing that community, precisely taken, was not of eternal obligation, nor actually long continued in the church ; seeing I conceive this article doth not wholly look upon that which is already past : and, especially, seeing I think neither that custom, nor that notion, was then generally received in the church, when this communion of saints was first inserted, I shall therefore endeavour to show that communion which is attributed to the saints both according to the fathers who have delivered it, and according to the Scriptures from whence they derived it.

Now, all communion being between such as are some way different and distinct, the communion of the saints may either be conceived between them and others, or between themselves ; between them and others, as differing from them, either in their nature or their sanctity ; between themselves, as distinct in person only, or condition also. Wherefore, if we can first understand who or what kind of persons these are who are called *saints* ; with whom besides themselves, and how among themselves, in this relation as they are the saints, they have communion ; and, lastly, in what the nature of that communion in each respect consisteth ; I know not what can be thought wanting to the perfect explication of *the communion of saints*.

That we may understand what communion the saints have with others, it will be necessary first to consider what it is to be a saint, in what the true nature of saintship doth consist, by what the saints are distinguished from others. Again : that we may understand what communion the saints have with or among themselves, it will be farther necessary to consider who are those persons to whom that title doth belong, what are the various conditions of them, that we may be able to comprehend all such as are true saints, and thence conclude the communion between them all.

I take it first for granted that though the Greek word, which we translate *saints*, be in itself as applicable to things as persons, yet in this article it signifieth not holy things, but holy ones, that is, persons holy. Secondly: I take it also for granted that the singular Holy One, the Holy One of Israel, the Fountain of all sanctity, the Sanctifier of all saints, is not comprehended in the article, though the communion of the holy ones with that singular, eminent, and transcendent Holy One, be contained in it. Thirdly: I take it farther for granted that the word in this article which we translate *saints* is not taken in the original of the Creed, as it is often taken in the translation of the Old Testament, for the *sanctuary*, as if the communion were nothing else but a right of communicating or participating of the holy things of God. Lastly: I take it also for granted that, although the blessed and holy angels are sometimes called in the Scriptures by the name of *saints*, yet they are not those saints who are here said to have the communion, though the saints have communion with them.

For this part of the article hath a manifest relation to the former, in which we profess to believe the holy church; which church is therefore holy, because those persons are such, or ought to be, who are within it, the church itself being nothing else but a collection of such persons. To that confession is added this communion; but because though the church be holy, yet every person contained in it is not truly so, therefore is added this part of the article which concerneth those who are truly such. There is therefore no doubt but the saints mentioned here are members of the church of Christ, as we have described it, built upon the apostles, laid upon the foundation of their doctrine, who do not only profess the gospel, but also are sanctified thereby.

The only question then remaining is in what their sanctity or saintship doth consist, and (because though they who are believers since our Saviour's death be truly and more highly sanctified, yet such as lived before and under the law, the patriarchs, the prophets, and the servants of God were so called, and were truly named the saints of God) who are the persons who are capable of that denomination?

Now seeing God himself hath given a rule unto his people, which is both in the nature of a precept and of a pattern (“ Be ye holy, as I the Lord your God am holy : ” “ Be ye holy ”—there is the command ; “ as the Lord your God is holy ”—there is the rule) : seeing it is impossible that we should have the same sanctity which is in God, it will be necessary to declare what is this holiness which maketh men to be accounted holy ones, and to be called *saints*.

The true notion of saints is expressed by Moses, both as to the subject, and the affection or qualification of it ; for they are called by him “ men of holiness ; ” such are the persons understood in this article, which is the communion of men of holiness. Now holiness, in the first acceptation of it, signifieth separation, and that with the relation of a double term, of one from which the separation is made, and of the other to which that which is separated is applied. Those things which were counted holy under the law were separated from common use, and applied to the service of God ; and their sanctity was nothing else but that separation from and to those terms ; from a use and exercise profane and common, to a use and exercise peculiar and divine. Thus all such persons as are called from the vulgar and common condition of the world unto any peculiar service or relation unto God are thereby denominated holy, and in some sense receive the name of *saints*. The penmen of the Old Testament do often speak of the people of Israel as of a “ holy nation,” and God doth speak unto them as to a people holy unto himself ; because he had chosen them out of all the nations of the world, and appropriated them to himself. Although therefore most of that nation were rebellious to him who called them, and void of all true inherent and actual sanctity ; yet, because they were all in that manner separated, they were all, as to that separation, called holy. In the like manner, those of the New Testament writing to such as were called, and had received, and were baptized in, the faith, give unto them all the name of *saints*, as being in some manner such, by being called and baptized. For seeing baptism is a washing away of sin, and the purification from sin is a proper sanctification ; seeing every one who is so called and bap-

tized is thereby separated from the rest of the world who are not so, and all such separation is some kind of sanctification; seeing, though the work of grace be not perfectly wrought; yet when the means are used, without something appearing to the contrary, we ought to presume of the good effect; therefore all such as have been received into the church may be in some sense called holy.

But because there is more than an outward vocation, and a charitable presumption, necessary to make a man holy; therefore we must find some other qualification which must make him really and truly such, not only by an extrinsecal denomination, but by a real and internal affection. What this sanctity is, and who are capable of this title properly, we must learn out of the gospel of Christ; by which alone, ever since the church of Christ was founded, any man can become a saint. Now, by the tenor of the gospel, we shall find that those are truly and properly saints who are "sanctified in Christ Jesus;" first, in respect of their holy faith, by which they are regenerated; for "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God;" by which they are purged, God himself "purifying their hearts by faith," whereby "they are washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus;" "in whom also, after that they believe, they are sealed with the holy Spirit of promise," Acts xv. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Eph. i. 13. Secondly: in respect of their conversation; for "as he which hath called them is holy," so are "they holy in all manner of conversation;" "adding to their faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience godliness, and to godliness brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness charity, that they may neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ," 2 Pet. i. 5. Such persons then as are called by a holy calling, and not disobedient unto it; such as are endued with a holy faith, and purified thereby; such as are sanctified by the Holy Spirit of God, and by virtue thereof do lead a holy life, "perfecting holiness in the fear of God;" such persons, I say, are really and truly saints; and, being of the church of Christ (as all such now must of necessity be), are the proper subject of this part of the article, *the communion of saints*, as it is added to the former, *the holy catholic church*.

Now, as these are the saints of the church of Christ, from whence they were called "the churches of the saints;" so there was never any church of God but there were such persons in it as were saints: we read in the psalms of "the congregation and the assembly of the saints;" and Moses assured the people of Israel that "all the saints of God were in his hand:" we read in the prophets of the "saints of the Most High;" and at our Saviour's death "the bodies of such saints which slept arose." Where again we may observe that they were saints while their bodies were in the grave; as Aaron in the time of David kept the name of "the Saint of the Lord." Such as are holy in their lives do not lose their sanctity, but improve it, at their deaths; nor can they lose the honor of that appellation, while that which gives it doth acquire perfection.

Hence grows that necessary distinction of the saints on earth, and the saints in heaven; the first belonging to the militant, the second to the triumphant, church. Of the first the prophet David speaketh expressly, "Thou art my Lord; my goodness extendeth not to thee, but to the saints that are in the earth," Psal. xvi. 2; of these do we read in the Acts of the Apostles; to these did St. Paul direct his Epistles. Of the second doth the apostle make that question, "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?" And all those who were spoken of as saints then in earth, if truly such, and departed so, are now, and shall for ever continue, saints in heaven.

Having thus declared what is the sanctity required to make a saint, that is, a man of holiness; having also distinguished the saints before and under the gospel (which difference is only observable as to this exposition of the Creed), and again distinguishing the same saints while they live here with men on earth, and when after death they live with God in heaven; having also showed that, of all these, those saints are here particularly understood who in all ages lived in the church of Christ; we may now properly descend to the next consideration, which is, who are those persons with whom those saints have this communion, and in what the communion which they have consists.

First, then, the saints of God living in the church of Christ have communion with God the Father; for the

apostles did therefore write that they to whom they wrote might have communion with them ("that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us," saith St. John), and did at the same time declare that their "communion was with the Father." Wherefore seeing all the saints of God under the gospel receiving the doctrine of the apostles have communion with them; seeing the communion of the apostles was the communion with the Father; it followeth that all the saints of God under the gospel have a communion with God the Father. As we are the branches of the vine, so the Father is the husbandman; and thus the saints partake of his care and inspection. As "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God;" so all who are heirs of the faith of Abraham are made partakers of the same relation. Nor are we only friends, but also sons; for "behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God," 1 John iii. 1. Thus must we acknowledge that the saints of God have communion with the Father, because, by the great and precious promises given unto them, they "become partakers of the divine nature."

Secondly: the saints of God living in the church of God have communion with the Son of God; for, as the apostle said, "Our communion is with the Father and the Son;" and this connexion is infallible, because "he that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son;" and our Saviour prayed for all such as should "believe on him through the word of the apostles, that they might be one, as the Father is one in him and he in the Father, that they also may be one" in both. "I in them," saith Christ, "and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." This communion of the saints with the Son of God is, as most evident, so most remarkable. He hath taken unto him our nature and infirmities; he hath taken upon him our sins, and the curse due unto them; while "we all have received of his fulness, and grace for grace;" and are all called to "the fellowship of his sufferings," that we may "be conformable to his death." What is the fellowship of brethren and coheirs, of the bridegroom

and the spouse ; what is the communion of members with the head, of branches with the vine, that is the communion of saints with Christ. For God " hath called us unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

Thirdly : the saints of God in the church of Christ have communion with the Holy Ghost : and the apostle hath two ways assured us of the truth thereof, one rhetorically, by a seeming doubt, " If there be any fellowship of the Spirit ;" the other devoutly, praying for it, " The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." The saints are therefore such, because they partake of the Holy Ghost ; for they are therefore holy because they are sanctified, and it is the Spirit alone which sanctifieth. Beside, the communion with the Father and the Son is wrought by the communication of the Spirit ; for hereby do we become the sons of God, in that " we have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba Father : " and thereby do we become coheirs with Christ, in that " because we are sons God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father ; so that we are no more servants, but sons ; and, if sons, then heirs of God through Christ." This is the communion which the saints enjoy with the three Persons of the blessed Trinity ; this is the heavenly fellowship represented unto entertaining Abraham, when " the Lord appeared unto him, and three men stood by him : " for our Saviour hath made us this most precious promise, " If any man love me, he will keep my words ; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him," John xiv. 23. Here is the soul of man made the habitation of God the Father, and of God the Son ; and the presence of the Spirit cannot be wanting where those two are inhabiting ; for " if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his," Rom. viii. 9. The Spirit therefore with the Father and the Son inhabiteth in the saints ; for " Know ye not," saith the apostle, " that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you ? " 1 Cor. iii. 16.

Fourthly : the saints of God in the church of Christ have communion with the holy angels. They who did foretel the birth of John the forerunner of Christ, they who did annunciate unto the blessed virgin the conception of

the Saviour of the world, they who sung a glorious hymn at the nativity of the Son of God, they who carried the soul of Lazarus into Abraham's bosom, they who appeared unto Christ from heaven in his agony to strengthen him, they who opened the prison doors and brought the apostles forth, they who at the end of the world shall sever the wicked from among the just, and gather together the elect of God, certainly they have a constant and perpetual relation to the children of God. Nay, "are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" Heb. i. 14. They have a particular sense of our condition; for Christ hath assured us that "there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." And upon this relation the angels (who are all the angels, that is, the messengers of God) are yet called the angels of men, according to the admonition of Christ, "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven," Matt. xviii. 10.

Thus far have we considered *the communion of saints* with such as are distinguished from them by nature, as they are men; the fellowship which they have in heaven with God, and his holy angels, while they are on earth. Our next consideration will be, what is the communion which they have with those who are of the same nature, but not partakers of the same holiness with them?

Fifthly, therefore: the saints of God, while they are of the church of Christ on earth, have some kind of communion with those men who are not truly saints. There were not hypocrites among the Jews alone, but in the church of Christ many cry, "Lord, Lord," whom he knoweth not. The tares have the privilege of the field as well as the wheat; and the bad fish of the net as well as the good. The saints have communion with hypocrites in all things with which the distinction of a saint and hypocrite can consist. They communicate in the same water, both externally baptized alike; they communicate in the same Creed, both make the same open profession of faith, both agree in the acknowledgment of the same principles of religion; they communicate in the same word, both hear the same doctrine preached; they communicate at the same

table, both eat the same bread, and drink the wine, which Christ hath appointed to be received; but the hypocrite doth not communicate with the saint in the same saving grace, in the same true faith working by love, and in the same renovation of mind and spirit; for then he were not a hypocrite, but a saint: a saint doth not communicate with the hypocrite in the same sins, in the same lurking infidelity, in the same unfruitfulness under the means of grace, in the same false pretence and empty form of godliness; for then he were not a saint, but a hypocrite. Thus the saints may communicate with the wicked, so they communicate not with their wickedness; and may have fellowship with sinners, so they have no fellowship with that which makes them such, that is, their sins. The apostle's command runneth thus: "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness;" and again, "Be not partakers of other men's sins;" and a voice from heaven spake concerning Babylon, "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins." To communicate with sin is sin, but to communicate with a sinner in that which is not sin can be no sin; because the one defileth, and the other cannot, and that which defileth not is no sin.

Having thus considered those who differ from the saints of God, first, in respect of their humanity, as they are men; secondly, in reference to their sanctity, as they are men of holiness; we are now to consider such as differ either only in person, as the saints alive, or in present condition also, as the saints departed.

Sixthly, therefore, the saints of God living in the church of Christ have communion with all the saints living in the same church. "If we walk in the light, we have fellowship one with another;" we all have benefit of the same ordinances, all partake of the same promises, we all are endued with the graces of the same Spirit, all united with the same mutual love and affection, "keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace;" all engrafted into the same stock, and so receiving life from the same root; all "holding the same head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God," Col. ii. 19. For, in the philosophy of the apostle, the nerves are not only

the instruments of motion and sensation, but of nutrition also; so that every member receiveth nourishment by their intervention from the head; and seeing the head of the body is Christ, and all the saints are members of that body, they all partake of the same nourishment, and so have all communion among themselves.

Lastly: the saints of God, living in the church of Christ, are in communion with all the saints departed out of this life and admitted to the presence of God. Jerusalem sometimes is taken for the church on earth, sometimes for that part of the church which is in heaven, to show that as both are represented by one, so both are but one city of God. Wherefore thus doth the apostle speak to such as are called to the Christian faith, "Ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant." Heb. xii. 22. Indeed the communion of the saints in the Church of Christ with those who are departed is demonstrated by their communion with the saints alive; for if I have communion with a saint of God, as such, while he liveth here, I must still have communion with him when he is departed hence; because the foundation of that communion cannot be removed by death. The mystical union between Christ and his church, the spiritual conjunction of the members to the Head, is the true foundation of that communion which one member hath with another, all the members living and increasing by the same influence which they receive from him. But death, which is nothing else but the separation of the soul from the body, maketh no separation in the mystical union, no breach of the spiritual conjunction; and consequently there must continue the same communion, because there remaineth the same foundation. Indeed, the saint departed before his death had some communion with the hypocrite, as hearing the word, professing the faith, receiving the sacraments together; which being in things only external, as they were common to them both, and all such external actions ceasing in the person dead, the hypocrite remaining loseth all com-

munion with the saint departing, and the saints surviving cease to have farther fellowship with the hypocrite dying. But seeing the true and unfeigned holiness of man wrought by the powerful influence of the Spirit of God, not only remaineth but also is improved after death; seeing the correspondence of the internal holiness was the true communion between their persons in their life, they cannot be said to be divided by death, which had no power over that sanctity by which they were first conjoined.

This communion of the saints in heaven and earth, upon the mystical union of Christ their head, being fundamental and internal, what acts or external operations it produceth is not so certain. That we communicate with them in hope of that happiness which they actually enjoy is evident; that we have the Spirit of God given us as an earnest, and so a part of their felicity, is certain. But what they do in heaven in relation to us on earth particularly considered, or what we ought to perform in reference to them in heaven, beside a reverential respect and study of imitation, is not revealed unto us in the Scriptures, nor can be concluded by necessary deduction from any principles of Christianity. They who first found this part of the article in the Creed, and delivered their exposition unto us, have made no greater enlargement of this communion, as to the saints of heaven, than the society of hope, esteem, and imitation on our side, of desires and supplications on their side: and what is now taught by the church of Rome is, as unwarrantable, so a novitious interpretation.

The necessity of the belief of this *communion of saints* appeareth, first, in that it is proper to excite and encourage us to holiness of life. "If we walk in the light, as God is in the light, we have fellowship one with another," 1 John i. 6. But "if we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth. For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial?" 2 Cor. vi. 14. When Christ sent St. Paul to the Gentiles, it was "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified

by faith that is in Christ," Acts xxvi. 18. Except we be turned from darkness, except we be taken out of the power of Satan, which is the dominion of sin, we cannot receive the inheritance among them who are sanctified, we cannot be thought "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light." Indeed there can be no communion where there is no similitude, no fellowship with God without some sanctity; because his nature is infinitely holy, and his actions are not subject to the least iniquity.

Secondly: the belief of *the communion of saints* is necessary to stir us up to a proportionate gratitude unto God, and a humble and cheerful acknowledgment of so great a benefit. We cannot but acknowledge that they are "exceeding great and precious promises," by which we become "partakers of the divine nature." "Who am I?" said David, "and what is my life, that I should be son-in-law to the king?" 1 Sam. xviii. 18. What are the sons of men, what are they who are called to be saints, that they should have fellowship with God the Father? St. Philip the apostle said unto our Saviour, "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth;" whereas he hath not only shown us, but come unto us with the Father, and dwelt within us by his Holy Spirit; he hath called us to the fellowship of the angels and archangels, of the cherubim and seraphim, to the glorious company of the apostles, to the goodly fellowship of the prophets, to the noble army of martyrs, to the holy church militant on earth, and triumphant in heaven.

Thirdly: the belief of *the communion of saints* is necessary to inflame our hearts with an ardent affection towards those who live, and a reverent respect towards those who are departed and are now with God. Nearness of relation requireth affection, and that man is unnatural who loveth not those persons whom nature hath more immediately conjoined to him. Now no conjunction natural can be compared with that which is spiritual, no temporal relation with that which is eternal. If similitude of shape and features will create a kindness, if congruity of manners and disposition will conjoin affections, what should be the mutual love of those who have the image of the same God renewed within them, of those who are endued with the gracious influences of the same Spirit? And, if all the

saints of God living in the communion of the church deserve the best of our affections here on earth, certainly when they are dissolved and with Christ, when they have been blessed with a sight of God, and rewarded with a crown of glory, they may challenge some respect from us, who are here to wait upon the will of God, expecting when such a happy change shall come.

Fourthly : this tendeth to the directing and enlarging our acts of charity. We are obliged to be charitable unto all men, because the love of our brother is the foundation of our duty towards man, and in the language of the Scriptures whosoever is another is our brother ; but we are particularly directed to them that are of the household of faith. And as there is a general reason calling for our mercy and kindness unto all men, so there is a more special reason urging those who are truly sanctified by the Spirit of God to do good unto such as appear to be led by the same Spirit ; for, if they communicate with them in the everlasting mercies of God, it is fit they should partake of the bowels of man's compassion ; if they communicate with them in things spiritual and eternal, can it be much that they should partake with them of such things, as are temporal and carnal ?

To conclude : every one may learn from hence what he is to understand by this part of the article, in which he professeth to believe *the communion of saints* ; for thereby he is conceived to express thus much :—I am fully persuaded of this, as of a necessary and infallible truth, that such persons as are truly sanctified in the church of Christ, while they live among the crooked generations of men, and struggle with all the miseries of this world, have fellowship with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, as dwelling with them, and taking up their habitations in them : that they partake of the care and kindness of the blessed angels, who take delight in the ministration for their benefit : that, beside the external fellowship which they have in the word and sacraments with all the members of the church, they have an intimate union and conjunction with all the saints on earth as the living members of Christ ; nor is this union separated by the death of any ; but as Christ in whom they live is the Lamb slain from the

foundation of the world, so have they fellowship with all the saints who from the death of Abel have ever departed in the true faith and fear of God, and now enjoy the presence of the Father, and "follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth." And thus I believe in *the communion of saints*.

ARTICLE X.

The Forgiveness of Sins.

THIS Article hath always been expressly contained and acknowledged in the Creed, as being a most necessary part of our Christian profession: and for some ages it immediately followed the belief of *the holy church*, and was therefore added immediately after it, to show that remission of sins was to be obtained in the church of Christ. For seeing the Creed at first was made to be used as a confession of such as were to be baptized, declaring their faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in whose name baptism was administered; they propounded unto them the *holy church*, into which by baptism they were to be admitted, and *the forgiveness of sins*, which by the same baptism was to be obtained; and therefore in some creeds it was particularly expressed, *I believe one baptism for the forgiveness of sins*.

Looking thus upon this Article, with this relation, we find the sense of it must be this, that we believe *forgiveness of sins* is to be obtained in the church of Christ. For the explication whereof it will be necessary, first, to declare what is the nature of remission of sins, in what that action doth consist; secondly, to show how so great a privilege is propounded in the church, and how it may be procured by the members of the church. That we may understand the notion of *forgiveness of sins*, three considerations are required; first, what is the nature of sin, which is to be forgiven; secondly, what is the guilt or obligation of sin, which wanteth forgiveness; thirdly, what is the remission itself or the loosing of that obligation.

As the power of sin is revealed only in the Scriptures, so the nature of it is best understood from thence. And though the writings of the apostles give us few definitions, yet we may find even in them a proper definition of sin. "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law," saith St. John, and then rendereth this reason of that universal assertion, "for sin is the transgression of the law," 1 John iii. 4. Which is an argument drawn from the definition of sin; for he saith not, "Every sin is the transgression of the law," which had been necessary, if he had spoken by way of proposition only, to have proved the universality of his assertion, but produceth it indefinitely, "Sin is the transgression of the law," which is sufficient, speaking it by way of definition. And it is elsewhere most evident that every sin is something prohibited by some law, and deviating from the same. For the apostle affirming that "the law worketh wrath," that is a punishment from God, giveth this as a reason or proof of his affirmation, "for where no law is, there is no transgression," Rom. iv. 15. The law of God is the rule of the actions of men, and any aberration from that rule is sin: the law of God is pure, and whatsoever is contrary to that law is impure. Whatsoever therefore is done by man, or is in man, having any contrariety or opposition to the law of God, is sin. Every action, every word, every thought, against the law, is a sin of commission, as it is terminated to an object dissonant from, and contrary to, the prohibition of the law, or a negative precept. Every omission of a duty required of us is a sin, as being contrary to the commanding part of the law, or an affirmative precept. Every evil habit contracted in the soul of man by actions committed against the law of God is a sin, constituting a man truly a sinner, even then when he actually sinneth not. Any corruption and inclination in the soul to do that which God forbiddeth, and to omit that which God commandeth, howsoever such corruption and evil inclination came into that soul, whether by an act of his own will, or by an act of the will of another, is a sin, as being something dissonant and repugnant to the law of God. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the nature of sin.

The second particular to be considered is the obligation of sin, which must be presupposed to the solution or remis-

sion of it. Now every sin doth cause a guilt, and every sinner, by being so, becomes a guilty person; which guilt consisteth in a debt or obligation to suffer a punishment proportionable to the iniquity of the sin. It is the nature of laws in general to be attended with these two, punishments and rewards; the one propounded for the observation of them, the other threatened upon the deviation from them. And although there were no threats or penal denunciations accompanying the laws of God, yet the transgression of them would nevertheless make the person transgressing worthy of, and liable unto, whatsoever punishment can in justice be inflicted for that sin committed. Sins of commission pass away in the acting or performing of them; so that he who acteth against a negative precept, after the act is passed, cannot properly be said to sin. Sins of omission, when the time is passed in which the affirmative precept did oblige unto performance, pass away; so that he who did then omit his duty when it was required, and in omitting sinned, after that time cannot be truly said to sin. But though the sin itself do pass away, together with the time in which it was committed, yet the guilt thereof doth never pass which by committing was contracted. He who but once committeth adultery, at that one time sinneth, and at no time after can be said to commit that sin; but the guilt of that sin remaineth on him still, and he may be for ever said to be guilty of adultery, because he is for ever subject to the wrath of God, and obliged to suffer the punishment due unto adultery.

This debt or obligation to punishment is not only necessarily resulting from the nature of sin, as it is a breach of the law, nor only generally delivered in the Scriptures revealing the wrath of God unto all unrighteousness, but it is yet more particularly represented in the word, which teacheth us, if we do ill, how "sin lieth at the door." Our blessed Saviour thus taught his disciples, "Whosoever is angry with his brother, without a cause, shall be liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to hell fire," Matt. v. 22. So saith our Saviour again, "All sins

shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewithsoever they shall blaspheme: But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to eternal damnation," Mark iii. 28. Whence appeareth clearly the guilt of sin and obligation to eternal punishment, if there be no remission or forgiveness of it; and the taking off that liability, obnoxiousness, or obligation unto death, if there be any such remission or forgiveness: all which is evident by the opposition, much to be observed, in our Saviour's expression, "He hath never forgiveness, but is liable to eternal death."

God, who hath the sovereign power and absolute dominion over all men, hath made a law to be a perpetual and universal rule of human actions; which law whosoever doth violate, or transgress, and thereby sin (for by sin we understand nothing else but "the transgression of the law"), is thereby obliged in all equity to suffer the punishment due to that obliquity. And, after the act of sin is committed and passed over, this guilt resulting from that act remaineth; that is, the person who committed it continueth still a debtor to the vindictive justice of God, and is obliged to endure the punishment due unto it: which was the second particular to be considered.

The third consideration now followeth—what is *the forgiveness of sin*, or in what remission doth consist: which at first appeareth to be an act of God toward a sinner, because the sin was committed against the law of God; and therefore the punishment must be due from him, because the injury was done unto him. But what is the true notion or nature of this act, or how God doth forgive a sinner, is not so easy to determine: nor can it be concluded out of the words themselves which do express it, the niceties of whose originations will never be able to yield a just interpretation. For although the word signifying remission have one sense among many other which may seem proper for this particular concernment, yet because the same word hath been often used to signify the same action of God in forgiving sins, where it could have no such particular notion, but several times hath another signification tending to the same effect, and as proper to the remission of sins; there-

fore I conceive the true nature of *forgiveness of sins* is rather to be understood by the consideration of all such ways and means which were used by God in the working and performing of it, than in this or any other word which is made use of in expressing it.

Now that we may understand what was done toward the remission of sins, that from thence we may conclude what is done in it, it is first to be observed that "almost all things by the law were purged with blood; and without shedding of blood there is no remission." And what was then legally done was but a type of that which was to be performed by Christ, and therefore the blood of Christ must necessarily be involved in the remission of sins; for he "once in the end of the world hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." It must then be acknowledged, and can be denied by none, that Christ did suffer a painful and shameful death, as we have formerly described it:—that the death which he endured, he did then suffer for sin; for "this man," saith the apostle, "offered one sacrifice for sins:"—that the sins for which he suffered were not his own; for "Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust;" he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," and therefore had no sins to suffer for:—that the sins for which he suffered were ours; for "he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities;" "He was delivered for our offences; he gave himself for our sins; he died for our sins according to the Scriptures:"—that the dying for our sins was suffering death as a punishment taken upon himself, to free us from the punishment due unto our sins; for God "laid on him the iniquity of us all, and made him to be sin for us who knew no sin; he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes are we healed:"—that by the suffering of this punishment to free us from the punishment due unto our sins it cometh to pass that our sins are forgiven; for "This is my blood," saith our Saviour, "of the new testament (or covenant), which is shed for many for the remission of sins." "In Christ we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace," Matt. xxvi. 28; Eph. i. 7.

In which deduction or series of truths we may easily perceive that *the forgiveness of sins* which is promised unto us, which we upon that promise do believe, containeth in it a reconciliation of an offended God, and a satisfaction unto a just God: it containeth a reconciliation, as without which God cannot be conceived to remit; it comprehendeth a satisfaction, as without which God was resolved not to be reconciled.

For the first of these, we may be assured of forgiveness of sins, because Christ by his death hath reconciled God unto us, who was offended by our sins; and that he hath done so we are assured, because he who before was angry with us, upon the consideration of Christ's death, becomes propitious unto us, and did ordain Christ's death to be a propitiation for us. For we are "justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood." "We have an advocate with the Father, and he is the propitiation for our sins." For "God loved us, and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins," Rom. iii. 24; 1 John ii. 1; iv. 10. It is evident therefore that Christ did render God propitious unto us by his blood (that is, his sufferings unto death), who before was offended with us for our sins. And this propitiation amounted to a reconciliation, that is, a kindness after wrath. We must conceive that God was angry with mankind before he determined to give our Saviour; we cannot imagine that God, who is essentially just, should not abominate iniquity. The first affection we can conceive in him, upon the lapse of man, is wrath and indignation. God therefore was most certainly offended before he gave a Redeemer; and, though it be most true that he "so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son," yet there is no incongruity in this, that a Father should be offended with that Son whom he loveth, and at that time offended with him when he loveth him. Notwithstanding therefore that God loved men whom he created, yet he was offended with them when they sinned, and gave his Son to suffer for them, that through that Son's obedience he might be reconciled to them.

This reconciliation is clearly delivered in the Scriptures as wrought by Christ; for "all things are of God, who hath

reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ," and that by virtue of his death; for "when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, making peace through the blood of his cross, and by him reconciling all things unto himself," Rom. v. 10; Col. i. 20. In vain it is objected that the Scripture saith our Saviour reconciled men to God, but nowhere teacheth that he reconciled God to man; for in the language of the Scripture to reconcile a man to God is in our vulgar language to reconcile God to man, that is to cause him who before was angry and offended with him to be gracious and propitious to him. As the princes of the Philistines spake of David, 1 Sam. xxix. 4, "Wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his master? should it not be with the heads of these men?" Wherewith shall he reconcile Saul who is so highly offended with him, wherewith shall he render him gracious and favorable, but by betraying these men unto him? As our Saviour adviseth, "If thou bring thy gift before the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother:" that is, reconcile thy brother to thyself, whom thou hast injured—render him by thy submission favorable unto thee, who hath something against thee, and is offended with thee; Matt. v. 23. As the apostle adviseth the wife that "departed from her husband to remain unmarried, or to be reconciled to her husband," that is, to appease and get the favor of her husband; 1 Cor. vii. 11. In the like manner we are said to be reconciled unto God, when God is reconciled, appeased, and become gracious and favorable unto us; and Christ is said to reconcile us unto God, when he hath moved, and obtained of God to be reconciled unto us, when he hath appeased him and restored us unto his favor. Thus "when we were enemies we were reconciled to God;" that is, notwithstanding he was offended with us for our sins, we were restored unto his favor by the death of his Son.

Whence appeareth the weakness of the Socinian exception, that in the Scriptures we are said to be reconciled unto God; but God is never said to be reconciled unto us. For, by that very expression, it is to be understood that he who is reconciled in the language of the Scriptures is restored

unto the favor of him who was formerly offended with that person who is now said to be reconciled. As, when David was to be reconciled unto Saul, it was not that David should lay down his enmity against Saul, but that Saul should become propitious and favorable unto David: and therefore, where the language is that David should be reconciled unto Saul, the sense is that Saul, who was exasperated and angry, should be appeased, and so reconciled unto David.

Nor is it any wonder God should be thus reconciled to sinners by the death of Christ, who "while we were yet sinners died for us," because the punishment which Christ, who was our surety, endured, was a full satisfaction to the will and justice of God. "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many," Matt. xx. 28. Now a ransom is a price given to redeem such as are any way in captivity; any thing laid down by way of compensation to take off a bond or obligation, whereby he who before was bound becometh free. All sinners were obliged to undergo such punishments as are proportionate to their sins, and were by that obligation captivated and in bonds, and Christ did give his life a ransom for them, and that a proper ransom, if that his life were of any price, and given as such. For a ransom is properly nothing else but something of price given by way of redemption, to buy or purchase that which is detained, or given for the releasing of that which is enthralled. But it is most evident that the life of Christ was laid down as a price; neither is it more certain that he died, than that he bought us: "Ye are bought with a price," saith the apostle; and it is "the Lord who bought us," and the price which he paid was his blood; for "we are not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ." Now as it was the blood of Christ, so it was a price given by way of compensation; and as that blood was precious, so was it a full and perfect satisfaction. For as the gravity of the offence and iniquity of the sin is augmented and increaseth, according to the dignity of the person offended and injured by it; so the value, price, and dignity of that which is given by way of compen-

sation, is raised according to the dignity of the person making the satisfaction. God is of infinite majesty, against whom we have sinned; and Christ is of the same divinity, who gave his life a ransom for sinners; "God hath purchased his church with his own blood," Acts xx. 28. Although therefore God be said to remit our sins by which we were captivated, yet he is never said to remit the price without which we had never been redeemed; neither can he be said to have remitted it, because he did require it and receive it.

If then we consider together, on our side the nature and obligation of sin, in Christ the satisfaction made and reconciliation wrought, we shall easily perceive how God forgiveth sins, and in what remission of them consisteth. Man being in all conditions under some law of God, who hath sovereign power and dominion over him, and therefore owing absolute obedience to that law, whensoever any way he transgresseth that law, or deviateth from that rule, he becomes thereby a sinner, and contracteth a guilt, which is an obligation to endure a punishment proportionable to his offence; and God, who is the lawgiver and sovereign, becoming now the party wronged and offended, hath a most just right to punish man as an offender. But Christ, taking upon him the nature of man, and offering himself a sacrifice for sin, giveth that unto God, for and instead of the eternal death of man, which is more valuable and acceptable to God than that death could be, and so maketh a sufficient compensation and full satisfaction for the sins of man; which God accepting becometh reconciled unto us, and for the punishment which Christ endured taketh off our obligation to eternal punishment.

Thus man who violated, by sinning, the law of God, and by that violation offended God, and was thereby obliged to undergo the punishment due unto the sin, and to be inflicted by the wrath of God, is, by the price of the most precious blood of Christ, given and accepted in full compensation and satisfaction for the punishment which was due, restored unto the favor of God, who being thus satisfied, and upon such satisfaction reconciled, is faithful and just to take off all obligation unto punishment from the sinner; and in this act of God consisteth *the forgiveness of sins*, which is sufficient for the first part of the explica-

tion of this article, as being designed for nothing else but to declare what is the true notion of remission of sins, in what that action doth consist.

The second part of the explication, taking notice not only of the substance, but also of the order of the article, observing the immediate connexion of it with the *holy church*, and the relation which in the opinion of the ancients it hath unto it, will endeavour to instruct us how this great privilege of forgiveness of sins is propounded in the church, how it may be procured and obtained by the members of the church.

At the same time when our Saviour sent the apostles to gather a church unto him, he foretold "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem;" and, when the church was first constituted, they thus exhorted those whom they desired to come into it, "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out;" and, "Be it known unto you, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins," Acts iii. 19; xiii. 38. From whence it appeareth that the Jews and Gentiles were invited to the church of Christ, that they might therein receive remission of sins; that the doctrine of remission of all sins propounded and preached to all men was proper and peculiar to the gospel, which teacheth us that "by Christ all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses," Acts xiii. 39. Therefore John the Baptist, who went "before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways, gave knowledge of salvation unto his people, by the remission of their sins," Luke i. 76.

This, as it was preached by the apostles at the first gathering of the church of Christ, I call proper and peculiar to the gospel, because the same doctrine was not so propounded by the law. For if we consider the law itself, strictly and under the bare notion of a law, it promised life only upon perfect, absolute, and uninterrupted obedience; the voice thereof was only this, "Do this and live." Some of the greater sins nominated and specified in the law had annexed unto them the sentence of death, and that sentence irreversible; nor was there any other way or means left in the law of Moses by which that punishment might

be taken off. As for other less and more ordinary sins, there were sacrifices appointed for them; and, when those sacrifices were offered and accepted, God was appeased, and the offences were released. Whatsoever else we read of sins forgiven under the law was of some special divine indulgence, more than was promised by Moses, though not more than was promulgated unto the people, in the name and of the nature of God, so far as something of the gospel was mingled with the law.

Now, as to the atonement made by the sacrifices, it clearly had relation to the death of the Messias; and whatsoever virtue was in them did operate through his death alone. As he was the lamb "slain from the foundation of the world," so all atonements which were ever made were only effectual by his blood. But though no sin was ever forgiven, but by virtue of that satisfaction; though God was never reconciled unto any sinner, but by intuition of that propitiation; yet the general doctrine of remission of sins was never clearly revealed, and publicly preached to all nations, till the coming of the Saviour of the world, whose name was therefore called Jesus, because he was to "save his people from their sins."

Seeing therefore we are assured that the preaching of remission of sins belongeth not only certainly, but in some sense peculiarly, to the church of Christ, it will be next considerable how this remission is conferred upon any person in the church.

For a full satisfaction in this particular, two things are very observable; one relating to the initiation, the other concerning the continuation, of a Christian. For the first of these, it is the most general and irrefragable assertion of all, to whom we have reason to give credit, that all sins whatsoever any person is guilty of are remitted in the baptism of the same person. For the second, it is as certain that all sins committed by any person after baptism are remissible; and the person committing those sins shall receive forgiveness upon true repentance, at any time, according to the gospel.

First: it is certain that *forgiveness of sins* was promised to all who were baptized in the name of Christ; and it cannot be doubted but all persons who did perform all

things necessary to receiving the ordinance of baptism, did also receive the benefit of that ordinance, which is remission of sins. "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," Mark i. 4. And St. Peter made this the exhortation of his first sermon, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," Acts ii. 38. In vain doth doubting and fluctuating Socinus endeavour to evacuate the evidence of this Scripture: attributing the remission either to repentance without consideration of baptism; or else to the public profession of faith made in baptism; or, if any thing must be attributed to baptism itself, it must be nothing but a declaration of such remission. For how will these shifts agree with that which Ananias said unto Saul, without any mention either of repentance or confession, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins?" Acts. xxii. 16; and that which St. Paul, who was so baptized, hath taught us concerning the church, that Christ doth "sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water?" Eph. v. 26. It is therefore sufficiently certain that baptism, as it was instituted by Christ after the preadministration of St. John, wheresoever it was received with all qualifications necessary in the person accepting, and conferred with all things necessary to be performed by the person administering, was most infallibly efficacious, as to this particular, that is, to the remission of all sins committed before the administration of this sacrament.

As those who are received into the church by the sacrament of baptism receive the remission of their sins of which they were guilty before they were baptized; so, after they are thus made members of the church, they receive remission of their future sins by their repentance. Christ, who hath left us a pattern of prayer, hath thereby taught us for ever to implore and beg the forgiveness of our sins; that as we through the frailty of our nature are always subject unto sin, so we should always exercise the acts of repentance, and for ever seek the favor of God. This then is the comfort of the gospel, that as it discovereth sin within us, so it propoundeth a remedy unto us. While we are in this life encompassed with flesh, while the

allurements of the world, while the stratagems of Satan, while the infirmities and corruptions of our nature betray us to the transgression of the law of God, we are always subject to offend (from whence whosoever saith "that he hath no sin is a liar," contradicting himself, and contracting iniquity by pretending innocency): and so long as we can offend, so long we may apply ourselves unto God by repentance, and be renewed by his grace, and pardoned by his mercy.

And therefore the church of God, in which remission of sin is preached, doth not only promise it at first by the laver of regeneration, but afterwards also upon the virtue of repentance; and to deny the church this power of absolution is the heresy of Novatian.

The necessity of the belief of this article appeareth, first, because there can be no Christian consolation without this persuasion; for "we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God," nay, "God himself hath concluded all under sin;" we must also acknowledge that every sinner is a guilty person, and that guilt consisteth in an obligation to endure eternal punishment from the wrath of God provoked by our sins; from whence nothing else can arise but a fearful expectation of everlasting misery. So long as guilt remaineth on the soul of man, so long is he in the condition of the devils, "delivered into chains and reserved unto judgment." For we all fell as well as they, but with this difference, remission of sins is promised unto us, but to them it is not.

Secondly: it is necessary to believe *the forgiveness of sins*, that thereby we may sufficiently esteem God's goodness and our happiness. When man was fallen into sin, there was no possibility left him to work out his recovery; that soul which had sinned must of necessity die, the wrath of God abiding upon him for ever. There can be nothing imaginable in that man which should move God not to show a demonstration of his justice upon him; there can be nothing without him which could pretend to rescue him from the sentence of an offended and almighty God. Glorious therefore must the goodness of our God appear, who dispenseth with his law, who taketh off the guilt, who looseth the obligation, who imputeth not the sin. This is

God's goodness, this is man's happiness. For "blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered; blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity," Psal. xxxii. 1. The year of release, the year of jubilee, was a time of public joy; and there is no voice like that, "Thy sins are forgiven thee." By this a man is rescued from infernal pains, secured from everlasting flames: by this he is made capable of heaven; by this he is assured of eternal happiness.

- Thirdly: it is necessary to believe *the forgiveness of sins*, that by the sense thereof we may be inflamed with the love of God; for that love doth naturally follow from such a sense appeareth from the parable in the gospel: "There was a certain creditor which had two debtors; the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. And, when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both," Luke vii. 41. Upon which case our Saviour made this question, "Which of them will love him most?" He supposeth both the debtors will love him, because the creditor forgave them both; and he collecteth the degrees of love will answer proportionably to the quantity of the debt forgiven. We are the debtors, and our debts are sins, and the creditor is God: the remission of our sins is the frank forgiving of our debts, and for that we are obliged to return our love.

Fourthly: the true notion of *forgiveness of sins* is necessary to teach us what we owe to Christ, to whom, and how far we are indebted for this forgiveness. "Through this man is preached unto us the forgiveness of sins," and without a surety we had no release. He rendered God propitious unto our persons, because he gave himself as a satisfaction for our sins. While thus he took off our obligation to punishment, he laid upon us a new obligation of obedience. We "are not our own," who are "bought with a price:" we must "glorify God in our bodies, and in our spirits, which are God's." We must be no longer "the servants of men;" we are "the servants of Christ, who are bought with a price."

Fifthly: it is necessary to believe remission of sins as wrought by the blood of Christ, by which the covenant was ratified and confirmed, which remindeth us of a condition

required. It is the nature of a covenant to expect performances on both parts; and therefore, if we look for forgiveness promised, we must perform repentance commanded. These two were always preached together, and those which God hath joined ought no man to put asunder. Christ did truly appear "a Prince and a Saviour," and it was to "give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins:" he joined these two in the apostles' commission, saying, that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations."

From hence every one may learn what he is explicitly to believe and confess in this article of *forgiveness of sins*; for thereby he is conceived to intend thus much:—I do freely and fully acknowledge, and with unspeakable comfort embrace, this, as a most necessary and infallible truth, that whereas every sin is a transgression of the law of God, upon every transgression there remaineth a guilt upon the person of the transgressor, and that guilt is an obligation to endure eternal punishment, so that all men being concluded under sin, they were all obliged to suffer the miseries of eternal death; it pleased God to give his Son, and his Son to give himself, to be a surety for this debt, and to release us from these bonds; and, because without shedding of blood there is no remission, he gave his life a sacrifice for sin, he laid it down as a ransom, even his precious blood as a price by way of compensation and satisfaction to the will and justice of God; by which propitiation, God, who was by our sins offended, became reconciled, and, being so, took off our obligation to eternal punishment, which is the guilt of our sins, and appointed in the church of Christ the sacrament of baptism for the first remission, and repentance for the constant forgiveness of all following trespasses. And thus *I believe the forgiveness of sins.*

ARTICLE XI.

The Resurrection of the Body.

THIS article was anciently delivered and acknowledged by all churches, only with this difference, that whereas

in other places it was expressed in general terms, *the resurrection of the flesh*, they of the church of Aquileia, by the addition of a pronoun, propounded it to every single believer in a more particular way of expression, *the resurrection of this flesh*. And though we have translated it in our English Creed the *resurrection of the body*; yet neither the Greek nor Latin ever delivered this article in those terms, but in these, *the resurrection of the flesh*, because there may be ambiguity in the one, in relation to the celestial and spiritual bodies, but there can be no collusion in the other. Only it will be necessary, for showing our agreement with the ancients' Creeds, to declare that as by *flesh* they understood the body of man, and not any other flesh; so we, when we translate it *body*, understand no other body but such a body of flesh, of the same nature which it had before it was by death separated from the soul. And this we may very well and properly do, because our church hath already taken care therein, and given us a fit occasion so to declare ourselves. For though in the Creed itself, used at Morning and Evening Prayer, the Article be thus delivered, *the resurrection of the body*, yet in the form of public baptism, where it is propounded by way of question to the god-fathers in the name of the child to be baptized, it runneth thus, *Dost thou believe—the resurrection of the flesh?* We see by daily daily experience that all men are mortal; that the body, left by the soul, the salt and life thereof, putrefieth and consumeth, and, according to the sentence of old, returneth unto dust; but these bodies, as frail and mortal as they are, consisting of this corruptible flesh, are the subject of this article, in which we profess to believe *the resurrection of the body*.

When we treated concerning the resurrection of Christ, we delivered the proper notion and nature of the resurrection in general, that from thence we might conclude that our Saviour did truly rise from the dead. Being now to explain the resurrection to come, we shall not need to repeat what we then delivered, or make any addition as to that particular; but, referring the reader to that which is there explained, it will be necessary for us only to consider what is the resurrection to come, who are they that shall be raised, how we are assured they shall rise, and in what

manner all shall be performed. And this resurrection hath some peculiar difficulties different from those which might seem to obstruct the belief of Christ's resurrection. For the body of the Son of God did never see corruption; all the parts thereof continued in the same condition in which they were after his most precious soul had left them; they were only deposited in a sepulchre, otherwise the grave had no power over them. But other mortal bodies, after the soul hath deserted them, are left to all the sad effects of their mortality: we may say to corruption, "Thou art my father;" to the worm, "Thou art my mother and my sister;" our corpses go "down to the bars of the pit, and rest together in the dust," Job xvii. 14. Our death is not a simple dissolution, not a bare separation of soul and body, as Christ's was, but our whole tabernacle is fully dissolved, and every part thereof crumbled into dust and ashes, scattered, mingled, and confounded with the dust of the earth, There is a description of a kind of resurrection in the prophet Ezekiel, in which there is supposed "a valley full of bones, and there was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone, the sinews and the flesh came upon them, and the skin covered them above, and their breath came into them, and they lived and stood upon their feet," Ezek. xxxvii. 7. But in the resurrection to come we cannot suppose the bones in the valley, for they are dissolved into dust as well as the other parts.

We must therefore undertake to show that the bodies of men, howsoever corrupted, wheresoever in their parts dispersed, how long soever dead, shall hereafter be-recollected in themselves and united to their own souls. And for the more facile and familiar proceeding, in this so highly concerning truth, I shall make use of this method: first, to prove that such a resurrection is not in itself impossible; secondly, to show that it is upon general considerations highly probable; thirdly, to demonstrate that it is upon Christian principles infallibly certain. It is not in itself impossible, therefore no man can absolutely deny it; it is upon natural and moral grounds highly probable, therefore all men may rationally expect it; it is upon evangelical principles infallibly certain, therefore all Christians must firmly believe it.

First: I confess philosophers of old did look upon the resurrection of the body as impossible; and though some of them thought the souls of the dead did live again, yet they never conceived that they were united to the same bodies, and that their flesh should rise out of the dust that it might be conjoined to the spirit of a man. We read of "certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics who encountered St. Paul; and, when they heard of the resurrection, they mocked him, some saying that he seemed to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection," Acts xvii. 18. But as the ancient philosophers thought a creation impossible, because they looked only upon the constant works of nature, among which they never find any thing produced out of nothing, and yet we have already proved a creation not only possible, but performed; so did they think a resurrection of corrupted, dissolved, and dissipated bodies to be as impossible, because they could never observe any action or operation in nature which did or could produce any such effect; and yet we being not tied to the consideration of nature only, but estimating things possible and impossible by the power of God, will easily demonstrate that there is no impossibility that the dead should rise.

For, if the resurrection of the dead be impossible, it must be so in one of these respects: either in reference to the agent, or in relation to the patient; either because it is a work of so much difficulty that there neither is nor can be any agent of wisdom, power, and activity sufficient to effect it; or else because the soul of man is so far separated by death from the body, and the parts of the body so much dissolved from themselves, and altered from their former nature, that they are absolutely incapable by any power to be united as they were. Either both or one of these two must be the reason of the impossibility, if the resurrection be impossible; for if the body be capable of being raised, and there be any agent of sufficient ability to raise it, the resurrection of it must be possible.

Now if the resurrection were impossible in respect of the agent who should effect it, the impossibility must arise either from an insufficiency of knowledge or of power; for if either the agent know not what is to be done, or if he

know it, but hath no power to do it, either he will not attempt it, or, if he do, must fail in the attempt; but that of which he hath perfect knowledge, and full power to effect, cannot be impossible in relation to the agent endued with such knowledge, armed with such power.

Now when we say the resurrection is possible, we say not it is so to men or angels, or any creature of a limited knowledge or finite power; but we attribute it to God, "*with whom nothing is impossible.*" His understanding is infinite: he knoweth all the men who ever lived since the foundation, or shall live unto the dissolution of the world; "he knoweth whereof all things were made," from what dust we came, into what dust we shall return. "Our substance was not hid from thee, O Lord, when we were made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth; thine eyes did see our substance, yet being imperfect, and in thy book were all our members written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them," Ps. cxxxix. 15. Thus every particle of our bodies, every dust and atom which belongeth to us, is known to him that made us. The generation of our flesh is clearly seen by the Father of spirits, the augmentation of the same is known to him "in whom we live, move, and have our being;" the dissolution of our tabernacles is perceived by that God by whom "the very hairs of our head are all numbered," and without whom "one sparrow shall not fall to the ground," Matt. x. 29, 30. He who numbereth the sands of the sea, knoweth all the scattered bones, seeth into all the graves and tombs, searcheth all the repositories and dormitories in the earth, knoweth what dust belongeth to each body, what body to each soul. Again: as his all-seeing eye observeth every particle of dissolved and corrupted man, so doth he also see and know all ways and means by which these scattered parts should be united, by which this ruined fabric should be recomposed; he knoweth how every bone should be brought to its old neighbour-bone, how every sinew may be re-embroidered on it; he understandeth what are the proper parts to be conjoined, what is the proper gluten by which they may become united. The resurrection therefore cannot

be impossible in relation to the Agent upon any deficiency of knowledge how to effect it.

And as the wisdom is infinite, so the power of this agent is unlimited; for God is as much omnipotent as omniscient. There can be no opposition made against him, because all power is his; nor can he receive a check against whom there is no resistance: all creatures must not only suffer, but do what he will have them; they are not only passively, but actively obediential. There is no atom of the dust or ashes but must be where it pleaseth God, and be applied and make up what and how it seemeth good to him. The resurrection therefore cannot be impossible in relation unto God upon any disability to effect it, and consequently there is no impossibility in reference to the agent, or him who is to raise us.

Secondly: the resurrection is not impossible in relation to the patient, because, where we look upon the power of God, nothing can be impossible but that which involveth a contradiction, as we before have proved; and there can be no contradiction in this, that he who was, and now is not, should hereafter be what before he was. It is so far from a repugnancy, that it rather containeth a rational and apparent possibility, that man who was once dust, becoming dust, should become man again. Whatsoever we lose in death is not lost to God. As no creature could be made out of nothing but by him, so can it not be reduced into nothing but by the same: though therefore the parts of the body of man be dissolved, yet they perish not; they lose not their own entity when they part with their relation to humanity; they are laid up in the secret places, and lodged in the chambers of nature, and it is no more a contradiction that they should become the parts of the same body of man to which they did belong, than that after his death they should become the parts of any other body, as we see they do. Howsoever they are scattered, or wheresoever lodged, they are within the knowledge and power of God, and can have no repugnancy by their separation to be reunited when and how he pleaseth. The first dust of which man was made was as far from being flesh as any ashes now or dust can be; it was only an omnipotent

power which could mould that into a human body, and breathe into the nostrils of it the breath of life. The same power, therefore, which must always be, can still make of the dust returning from the bodies of men unto the earth human bones and flesh, as well as of the dust which first came from the earth; for if it be not easier, it is most certainly as easy to make that to be again which once hath been, as to make that to be which before was not. When there was no man, God made him of the earth; and therefore, when he returns to earth, the same God can make him man again. The resurrection, therefore, cannot be impossible; which is our first conclusion.

Secondly: the resurrection is not only in itself possible, so that no man with any reason can absolutely deny it; but it is also upon many general considerations highly probable, so that all men may very rationally expect it. If we consider the principles of humanity, the parts of which we all consist, we cannot conceive this present life to be proportionable to our composition. The souls of men as they are immaterial, so they are immortal; and, being once created by the Father of spirits, they receive a subsistence for eternity; the body is framed by the same God to be a companion for his spirit, and a man born into the world consisteth of these two. Now the life of the most aged person is but short, and many far ignobler creatures are of a longer duration. Some of the fowls of the air, several of the fishes of the sea, many of the beasts of the field, divers of the plants of the earth, are of a more durable constitution, and outlive the sons of men. And can we think that such material and mortal, that such innderstanding souls should by God and nature be furnished with bodies of so long permansion, and that our spirits should be joined unto flesh so subject to corruption, so suddenly dissolvable, were it not that they lived but once, and so enjoyed that life for a longer season, and then went soul and body to the same destruction, never to be restored to the same subsistence? But when the soul of man, which is immortal, is forced from its body in a shorter time, nor can by any means continue with it half the years which many other creatures live, it is because this is not the only life

belonging to the sons of men, and so the soul may at a shorter warning leave the body which it shall resume again.

Again: if we look upon ourselves as men, we are free agents, and therefore capable of doing good or evil, and consequently ordinable unto reward or punishment. The angels who are above us, and did sin, received their punishment without a death, because, being only spirits, they were subject to no other dissolution than annihilation, which cannot consist with longer suffering punishment; those who continued in their station were rewarded and confirmed for all eternity: and thus all the angels are incapable of a resurrection. The creatures which are below us, and for want of freedom cannot sin, or act any thing morally either good or evil, they cannot deserve after this life either to be punished or rewarded, and therefore when they die they continue in the state of death for ever. Thus those who are above us shall not rise from the dead, because they are punished or rewarded without dying; and, where no death is, there can be no resurrection from the dead. Those which are below us are neither capable of reward nor punishment for any thing acted in this life, and therefore though they die, yet shall they never rise, because there is no reason for their resurrection. But man by the nobleness of his better part being free to do what is good or evil while he liveth, and by the frailty of his body being subject to death, and yet after that being capable in another world to receive a reward for what he hath done well, and a punishment for what he hath done ill in the flesh, it is necessary that he should rise from the dead to enjoy the one, or suffer the other. For there is not only no just retribution rendered in this life to man, but, considering the ordinary condition of things, it cannot be. For it is possible, and often cometh to pass, that one man may commit such sins as all the punishments in this world can no way equalize them. It is just that "he who sheddeth man's blood, by man his blood should be shed;" but what death can sufficiently retaliate the many murders committed by one notorious pirate, who may cast many thousands overboard; or the rapines and assassinations of one rebel or tyrant, who may destroy whole nations? It is fit

that he who blasphemeth God should die; but what equivalent punishment can he receive, in this life, who shall constantly blaspheme the name of God, destroy his priests and temples, abolish his worship, and extirpate his servants? What is then more proper, considering the providence of a most just God, than to believe that man shall suffer in another life such torments as will be proportionable to his demerits? Nor can we with reason think that the soul alone shall undergo those sufferings, because the laws which were given to us are not made in respect of that alone, but have most frequent reflexion on the body, without which in this life the soul can neither do nor suffer any thing. It is therefore highly probable, from the general consideration of human actions and divine retributions, that there shall be "a resurrection of the flesh, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad," 2 Cor. v. 10.

Furthermore: besides the principles of which we consist, and the actions which flow from us, the consideration of the things without us, and the natural course of variations in the creature, will render the resurrection yet more highly probable. Every space of twenty-four hours teacheth thus much, in which there is always a revolution amounting to a resurrection. The day dies into night, and is buried in silence and in darkness; in the next morning it appeareth again and reviveth, opening the grave of darkness, rising from the dead of night; this is a diurnal resurrection. As the day dies into night, so doth the summer into winter; the sap is said to descend into the root, and there it lies buried in the ground; the earth is covered with snow, or crusted with frost, and becomes a general sepulchre; when the spring appeareth, all begin to rise; the plants and flowers peep out of their graves, revive, and grow, and flourish: this is the annual resurrection. The corn by which we live, and for want of which we perish with famine, is notwithstanding cast upon the earth and buried in the ground, with a design that it may corrupt, and being corrupted may revive and multiply; our bodies are fed with this constant experiment, and we continue this present life by a succession of resurrections. Thus all things are

repaired by corrupting, are preserved by perishing, and revive by dying: and can we think that man, the lord of all these things, which thus die and revive for him, should be detained in death so as never to live again? Is it imaginable that God should thus restore all things to man, and not restore man to himself? If there were no other consideration, but of the principles of human nature, of the liberty and remunerability of human actions, and of the natural revolutions and resurrections of other creatures, it were abundantly sufficient to render the resurrection of our bodies highly probable.

We must not rest in this school of nature, nor settle our persuasions upon likelihoods; but as we passed from an apparent possibility unto a high presumption and probability, so must we pass from thence unto a full assurance of an infallible certainty. And of this indeed we cannot be assured but by the revelation of the will of God: upon his power we must conclude that we may, from his will that we shall, rise from the dead. Now the power of God is known unto all men, and therefore all men may infer from thence a possibility; but the will of God is not revealed unto all men, and therefore all have not an infallible certainty of the resurrection. For the grounding of which assurance I shall show that God hath revealed the determination of his will to raise the dead, and that he hath not only delivered that intention in his word, but hath also several ways confirmed the same.

Many of the places produced out of the Old Testament to this purpose will scarcely amount to a revelation of this truth. The Jews insist upon such weak inferences out of the law as show that the resurrection was not clearly delivered by Moses; and in the book of Job, where it is most evidently expressed, they acknowledge it not, because they will not understand the true notion of a Redeemer properly belonging to Christ. The words of Job are very express, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God," Job xix. 25. Against the evidence of this truth there are two interpretations; one very new of some late opinionists who understand this of a sudden restitution to his former

temporal condition ; the other more ancient of the Jews, who make him speak of the happiness of another life, without any reference to a resurrection. But that Job spake not concerning any sudden restitution, or any alteration of his temporal condition, is apparent out of the remarkable preface ushering in this expression, "O that my words were now written ! O that they were printed in a book ! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead, in the rock for ever!" He desires that his words may continue as long as his expectation, that they may remain in the rock together with his hope, so long as the rock shall endure, even to the day of his resurrection. The same appeareth from the objection of his friends, who urged against him that he was a sinner, and concluded from thence that he should never rise again ; for his sins he pleaded a Redeemer, and for his resurrection he showed expectation and assurance through the same Redeemer. It is further confirmed by the expressions themselves, which are no way proper for his temporal restitution : the first words, " I also know, " denote a certainty and a community, whereas the blessings of this life are under no such certainty, nor did Job pretend to it ; and the particular condition of Job admitted no community, there being none partaker with him of the same calamity. " I know certainly and infallibly, whatsoever shall become of my body at this time, which I know not, but this I know, that I shall rise ; this is the hope of all who believe in God, and therefore this I also know. " The title which he gives to him on whom he depends, " the Redeemer, " showeth that he understands it of Christ ; the time expressed denotes the futurity at " the latter day ; " the description of that Redeemer " standing on the earth, " representeth the Judge of the quick and the dead ; and seeing God with his eyes declares his belief in the incarnation. The Jewish exposition of future happiness, to be conferred by God, fails only in this, that they will not see in this place the promised Messiah ; from whence this future happy condition, which they allow, would clearly involve a resurrection. Howsoever, they acknowledge the words of Daniel to declare as much, " And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt, " Dan. xii. 2.

If these and other places of the Old Testament show that God had then revealed his will to raise the dead, we are sure those of the New fully declare the same. Christ, who called himself "the resurrection and the life," refuted the Sadducees, and confirmed the doctrine of the Pharisees as to that opinion. He produced a place out of the law of Moses, and made it an argument to prove as much: "As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, 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," Matt. xxii. 31. With the force of which argument the multitude was astonished and the Sadducees silenced. For under the name of God was understood a great benefactor, a God of promise, and to be their God was to bless them and to reward them; as in them to be his servants and his people was to believe in him, and to obey him. Now Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had not received the promises which they expected, and therefore God after their death desiring still to be called their God, he thereby acknowledgeth that he had a blessing and a reward for them still, and consequently that he will raise them to another life, in which they may receive it. So that the argument of our Saviour is the same which the Jews have drawn from another place of Moses, "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them. Nevertheless I have established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage wherein they were strangers." It is not said, "to give their sons," but, "to give them the land of Canaan;" and therefore, because while they lived here they enjoyed it not, they must live again, that they may receive the promise.

And, as our blessed Saviour did refute the Sadducees out of the law of Moses, so did St. Paul join himself unto the Pharisees in this particular; for being called before the council, and "perceiving that the one part were Sadducees and the other Pharisees," one denying, the other asserting, the resurrection, he cried out in the council, "Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the

hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question," Acts xxiii. 6; and answering before Felix that they "had found no evil doing in him, while he stood before the council," he mentioned this particularly, "Except it be for this one voice, that I cried, standing among them, touching the resurrection of the dead, I am called in question by you this day," Acts xxiv. 20.

It is evident therefore that the resurrection of the dead was revealed under the law, that the Pharisees who sat in Moses's chair did collect it from thence, and believe it before our Saviour came into the world: that the Sadducees who denied it, "erred, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God;" that our blessed Saviour clearly delivered the same truth, proved it out of the law of Moses, refuted the Sadducees, confirmed the Pharisees, taught it the apostles who followed him, confirming it to the Jews, preaching it to the Gentiles. Thus the will of God concerning the raising of the dead was made known unto the sons of men: and because God can do whatsoever he will, and will certainly effect whatsoever he hath foretold, therefore we are assured of a resurrection by virtue of a clear revelation.

Besides, God hath not only foretold, or barely promised, but hath also given such testimonies as are most proper to confirm our faith in this particular prediction and promise. For God heard the voice of Elijah for the dead child of the widow of Sarepta, "and the soul of the child came unto him again, and he revived." Him did Elisha succeed, not only in the same spirit, but also in the like power; for he raised the child of the Shunamite from death: nor did that power die together with him; for, when they were burying a dead man, "*they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha, and, when the man was let down and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood upon his feet,* 2 Kings xiii. 21. These three examples were so many confirmations, under the law, of a resurrection to life after death; and we have three to equal them under the gospel. When the daughter of Jairus was dead, "Christ said unto her, Talitha cumi, Damsel, arise; and her spirit came again, and straightway the damsel arose," Mark v. 41, 42. When he came "nigh to the gate of the city called Nain, there was a dead man

carried out; and he came and touched the bier, and said, Young man I say unto thee, arise; and he that was dead sat up and began to speak," Luke vii. 12. Thus Christ raised the dead in the chamber and in the street, from the bed and from the bier, and, not content with these smaller demonstrations, proceedeth also to the grave. When Lazarus had been dead four days, and so buried that his sister said of him, "by this time he stinketh," Jesus cried with a loud voice, "Lazarus come forth;" and he that was dead came forth, John xi. 39. These three evangelical resuscitations are so many preambulatory proofs of the last and general resurrection; but the three former and these also come far short of the resurrection of him who raised these.

Christ did of himself actually rise, others who had slept in their graves did come from thence, and thus he gave an actual testimony of the resurrection. For "if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead," saith St. Paul to the Corinthians, "how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? 1 Cor. xv. 12. If it be most infallibly certain that one man did rise from the dead, as we have before proved that Christ did, then it must be as certainly false to assert that there is no resurrection. And therefore, when the Gentiles did themselves confess that some particular persons did return to life after death, they could not rationally deny the resurrection wholly. Now the resurrection of Christ doth not only prove by way of example, as the rest who rose, but hath a force in it to command belief of a future general resurrection. For God "hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness 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. All men then are assured that they shall rise, because Christ is risen. And "since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor. xv. 20.

This consequence of a future resurrection of the dead from that of Christ already past, either hath a general or a particular consideration. In a general reference it concerneth all; in a more peculiar way it belongeth to the elect alone. First: it belongeth generally unto all men in

respect of that dominion of which Christ at his resurrection did obtain the full possession and execution. "For to this end Christ both died and rose and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living," Rom, xiv. 9. Now as "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," so Christ is not the Lord of the dead, as dead, but as by his power he can revive them and rule them, when and in what they live. By virtue of this dominion, entered upon at his resurrection, "he must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet," and "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death," and there is no destruction of death but by a general resurrection. By virtue of this did he declare himself after this manner to St. John, "I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death," Rev. i. 18. Thus are we assured of a general resurrection, in that Christ is risen to become the Lord of the dead, and to destroy death.

Secondly: Christ rising from the dead assureth us of a general resurrection in respect of the judgment which is to follow. For as "it is appointed for all men once to die; so after death cometh judgment;" and as Christ was raised that he might be Judge, so shall the dead be raised that they may be judged. As therefore God gave an assurance to all men, that he would judge the world by that man, in that he raised him from the dead, so by the same act did he also give an assurance of the resurrection of the world to judgment.

Now as the general resurrection is evidenced by the rising of Christ, so in a more special and peculiar manner the resurrection of the chosen saints and servants of God is demonstrated thereby. For he is risen not only as their Lord and Judge, but as their Head, to which they are united as members of his body; for "he is the head of the body, the church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead:" as the first-fruits, by which all the lump is sanctified and accepted; for "now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept," 1 Cor. xv. 20. The saints of God are endued with the Spirit of Christ, and thereby their bodies become the temples of the Holy Ghost; now as the promise of the Spirit was upon the resurrection of Christ, so the gift and possession of the Spirit is an assurance of the resurrection of a Christian.

For "if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in us," Rom. viii. 11.

Thus God hath determined, and revealed that determination, to raise the dead, and confirmed that revelation by the actual raising of several persons as examples, and of Christ as the highest assurance which could be given unto man, that the doctrine of the resurrection might be established beyond all possibility of contradiction. Wherefore I conclude that *the resurrection of the body* is, in itself considered, possible—upon general considerations highly probable—upon Christian principles infallibly certain.

But as it is necessary to a resurrection that the flesh should rise, neither will the life of the soul alone continuing amount to the reviviscence of the whole man, so it is also necessary that the same flesh should be raised again; for if either the same body should be joined to another soul, or the same soul united to another body, it would not be the resurrection of the same man. Now the soul is so eminent a part of man, and by our Saviour's testimony not subject to mortality, that it never entered into the thoughts of any man to conceive that men should rise again with other souls. If the spirits of men departed live, as certainly they do, and, when the resurrection should be performed, the bodies should be informed with other souls; neither they who lived before then should revive, and those who live after the resurrection should have never been before. Wherefore seeing at the latter day we expect not a new creation but a restitution, not a propagation but a renovation, not a production of new souls, but a reunion of such as before were separated, there is no question but the same souls should live the second life which have lived the first. Nor is this only true of our souls, but must be also made good of our bodies, those houses of clay, those habitations of flesh. As our bodies while we live are really distinguished from all other creatures, as the body of every particular man is different from the bodies of all other men, as no other substance whatsoever is vitally united to the soul of that man whose body it is while he liveth, so no substance of any other creature, no body of any other man, shall be vitally reunited unto the soul at the resurrection.

That the same body which died, not any other, shall be raised to life; that the same flesh which was separated from the soul at the day of death shall be united to the soul at the last day; that the same tabernacle which was dissolved shall be reared up again; that the same temple which was destroyed shall be rebuilt, is most apparent out of the same word, most evident upon the same grounds, upon which we believe there shall be any resurrection. "Though after my skin worms destroy this body," saith Job, "yet in my flesh" (*in flesh*, showing the reality, *in my flesh*, showing the propriety and identity) "shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another," or a stranger eye. "He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies," Rom. viii. 11; after the resurrection our glorified bodies shall become spiritual and incorruptible, but in the resurrection of our mortal bodies, those bodies, by reason of whose mortality we died, shall be revived, "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality," 1 Cor. xv. 53. But this corruptible and this mortal is the same body which dieth, because mortal; and is corrupted, because corruptible; the soul then, at the resurrection of that man who is made immortal, must put on that body which putteth on incorruption and immortality.

The identity of the body raised from death is so necessary that the very name of the resurrection doth include or suppose it; so that when I say there shall be a resurrection of the dead, I must intend thus much: that the bodies of men which lived and are dead shall revive and rise again. For at the death of man nothing falleth but his body, "the spirit goeth upward," and no other body falleth but his own; and therefore the body, and no other but that body, must rise again, to make a resurrection. If we look upon it under the notion of reviviscency, which is more ordinary in the Hebrew language, it proves as much; for nothing properly dieth but the body, the soul cannot be killed, and nothing can revive but that which dieth. Or, to speak more punctually, the man falleth not in respect of his spirit but of his flesh, and therefore he cannot be said to rise again but in respect of his flesh which fell; man dieth not in reference to his soul which is immortal, but his body; and therefore he cannot be said to revive, but in re-

ference to his body before deprived of life; and because no other flesh fell at his death, no other body died but his own, therefore he cannot rise again but in his own flesh, he cannot revive again but in his own body.

Again: the description of the place from whence the resurrection shall begin is a sufficient assurance that the same bodies which were dead shall revive and rise again. They which sleep in the dust of the earth, they which are in the graves, shall hear the voice and rise. "The sea shall give up the dead which are in it, and death and the grave deliver up the dead which are in them," Rev. xx. 13. But, if the same bodies did not rise, they who are in the dust should not revive; if God should give us any other bodies than our own, neither the sea nor the grave should give up their dead. That shall rise again which the grave gives up; the grave hath nothing else to give up, but that body which was laid into it; therefore the same body which is buried, at the last day shall be revived.

The immediate consequent of the resurrection proveth the identity of the dying and rising body: "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad," 2 Cor. v. 10. That which shall be then received is either a reward or punishment; a reward for the good, a punishment for the evil, done in the body: that which shall receive the reward, and be liable to the punishment, is not only the soul but the body; it stands not therefore with the nature of a just retribution, that he who sinned in one body should be punished in another, he who pleased God in his own flesh should see God with other eyes. As for the wicked, God shall "destroy both their soul and body in hell;" but they who "glorify God in their body and their spirit, which are God's," shall be glorified by God in their body and their spirit; for they are both bought with the same price, even the blood of Christ. The bodies of the saints are "the members of Christ," and no members of his shall remain in death: they are "the temples of the Holy Ghost," and therefore, if they be destroyed, they shall be raised again. For "if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us," as he doth, and by so dwelling maketh our

bodies temples, "he which raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in us," Rom. viii. 11.

Furthermore: the identity of the dying and the rising body will appear by those bodies which shall never rise, because they shall never die. This may be considered not only in the translations of Enoch and Elias, but also in those whom Christ shall find alive at his coming, whom he shall not kill but change; "the dead in Christ shall rise first; then they which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall ever be with the Lord," 1 Thess. iv. 16. If those who are alive shall be caught up as they are alive with the same bodies, only changed into glorified and spiritual bodies, that is, with the same bodies spiritualized and glorified; certainly those who were dead shall rise out of their graves to life in the same bodies in which they lived, that they may both appear alike before the Judge of the quick and the dead. Otherwise the saints who shall be with God and with the Lamb for evermore would be chequered with a strange disparity, one part of them appearing and continuing with the same bodies in which they lived, another part with others.

Lastly: those examples which God has been pleased to give us to confirm our faith in the resurrection, do at the same time persuade us that the same body which died shall rise again. For whether we look upon the three examples of the Old Testament, or those of the New, they all rose in the same body before it was dissolved: if we look upon those which rose upon our Saviour's death, it is written that "the graves were opened, and many bodies of saints which slept arose and came out of their graves," certainly the same bodies which were laid in. If then they were to us examples of the resurrection to come, as certainly they were, then must they resemble in their substance after they lived again the substance in which all the rest shall rise. And seeing Christ himself did raise his own body, according to his prediction, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," and declared it to be his own body, saying, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself;" seeing "he shall change our vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto his glorious body;" it followeth that we

shall rise in the same bodies, as our Saviour did, that every particular person at the resurrection may speak the words which Christ then spake, "Behold it is I myself."

We can therefore no otherwise expound this article, teaching *the resurrection of the body*, than by asserting that the bodies which have lived and died shall live again after death, and that the same flesh which is corrupted shall be restored; whatsoever alteration shall be made shall not be of their nature, but of their condition; not of their substance, but of their qualities. Which explication is most agreeable to the language of the Scriptures, to the principles of religion, to the constant profession of the church, against the Origenists of old, and the Socinians of late.

Having hitherto proved the certainty of this article, that there shall be a resurrection, and declared the verity and propriety of it, that it shall be a resurrection of the same body which was dead; we may now proceed farther to inquire into the latitude of the same, to whom the resurrection doth belong. And here we find a great difference between the revelation of this truth under the law, and under the gospel; Christ proved out of the law that there should be a resurrection, but by such an argument as reacheth no farther than unto the people of God, because it is grounded upon those words, "I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob." Job speaketh most expressly of the resurrection, but mentioneth no other than his Redeemer and himself. The place of Daniel, which was always accounted the most evident and uncontradicted testimony, though it deliver two different sorts of persons rising, yet it seems to be with some limitation: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." From whence the Jews most generally have believed that some men should live again, and some should not; because it is written, "Many shall awake," but it is not written, "All shall awake." Nay, some of them have gone so far by way of restriction, that they have maintained a resurrection of the just alone, according to that ancient saying, accepted amongst them, that "the sending of the rain is of the just and the unjust, but the resurrection of the dead is of the just alone." Against which two restrictions, by the light delivered in the gospel, we shall deliver the latitude of this article in these two propositions—first, the resurrec-

tion of the dead belongeth not to the just alone, but to the unjust also—secondly, the resurrection of the dead belongeth not only to some of the just, but to all the just ; not to some of the unjust only, but to all the unjust, even unto all the dead.

For the first, it is most evident, not only out of the New, but also out of the Old Testament. The words of Daniel prove it sufficiently ; for of those many which shall awake some shall rise “to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.” - But it is most certain that the just shall never rise to shame and everlasting contempt ; therefore it is most evident that some shall awake and rise beside the just. The Jews themselves did understand and believe thus much, as appeareth by St. Paul’s apology to Felix : “But this I confess unto thee, that I have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust,” Acts xxiv. 14. The just shall rise to receive their reward, the unjust to receive their punishment ; the first unto a resurrection called, in reference unto them, “the resurrection of life ;” the second unto a resurrection named, in relation unto them, “the resurrection of damnation.” For as there is a resurrection of the just, so there must also be a resurrection of the unjust : that as Christ said unto the charitable person, “Thou shalt be blessed, for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just ;” so it may be said to the wicked and uncharitable, “Thou shalt be accursed, for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the unjust.” For there shall be a resurrection that there may be a judgment, and at the judgment there shall appear sheep on the right hand of the Son of Man, and goats on the left ; therefore they both shall rise, those that they may receive that blessing, “Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world ;” these that they may receive that sentence, “Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels.” At that resurrection then which we believe, there shall rise both just and unjust.

Secondly : as no kind of men, so no person shall be excluded : whosoever dieth is numbered with the just or unjust. Adam, the first of men, shall rise, and all that come from him. “For as in Adam all died, so in Christ shall all be made alive.” Christ is the Lord of the dead,

and so hath a right by that dominion to raise them all to life: it is called the resurrection of the dead indefinitely, and comprehendeth them universally. "By man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead;" and so the resurrection adequately answereth unto death. Christ shall destroy death, but, if any one should be left still dead, death were not destroyed. The words of our Saviour are express and full, "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation," John v. 28. In the description of the judgment which followeth upon the resurrection, "when the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of his glory," it is said that "before him shall be gathered all nations. "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ," and if so, the dead must all arise, for they are all fallen. "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad;" and, before we all appear, the dead must rise that they may appear. This is the latitude of the resurrection; the resurrection of the dead is the resurrection of all the dead, or of all mankind.

Now this resurrection, as an object of our faith, is yet to come; and we are obliged to believe the futurity of it. There were heretics in the apostles' days, who acknowledged a resurrection, but yet destroyed this Article, by denying the relation of it to the time, as "Hymeneus and Philetus, who erred concerning the truth, saying, that the resurrection is past already, and so overthrow the faith of some," 2 Tim. ii. 17. To believe it already past is to deny it; because it cannot be believed past, but by such an interpretation as must destroy it; as they who interpret this resurrection of the likeness of Christ's resurrection—that as he died and rose again, so we should die unto sin and live again unto righteousness,—attributing all to the renovation of the mind, must deny *the resurrection of the body*.

Now as we know the doctrine of the resurrection was first delivered to be believed as to come; so we are assured that it is not yet come since the doctrine of it was first delivered, and is to be believed as to come to the end of the

world ; because, as Martha called it, it is the resurrection of the last day. Job, who knew that his Redeemer lived, did not expect that he should stand upon the earth till the latter day ; Christ hath no otherwise declared his Father's will, than that " of all which he hath given him, he should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day," John vi. 39. The corn is sown and laid in the ground, and " the harvest is the end of the world." We must not expect to rise from the dead till the last trump. " The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God," before " all that are in the graves shall hear his voice." God shall judge the world, and therefore shall raise the world ; but he will not raise them to that judgment till the end of the world.

Thus having demonstrated that the will of God hath been revealed that there should be a resurrection ; that the resurrection which was revealed is the resurrection of the body ; that the bodies which are to be raised are the same which are already dead, or shall hereafter die ; that this resurrection is not past, but that we who live shall hereafter attain unto it ; I conceive I have declared all which is necessary by way of explication and confirmation of the truth of this Article.

The value of this truth, the necessity of this doctrine, will appear, first in the illustration of the glory of God, by the most lively demonstration of his wisdom, power, justice, and mercy. God first created all things for himself, and the resurrection is as it were a new creation. The wisdom and power of God are manifested in this acknowledgment, inasmuch as without infinite knowledge he could not have an exact and distinct comprehension of all the particles and individual dusts of all the bodies of all men ; and without an infinite power he could not conjoin, cement, conglutinate, and incorporate them again into the same flesh. The mercy and justice of God are declared by the same profession ; the mercy, in promising life after that death which we had so justly deserved ; the justice, in performing that promise unto all true believers, and in punishing the disobedient with everlasting flames. " When ye see this," saith the prophet, " your heart shall rejoice, and your bones shall flourish like an herb ; and the hand of the Lord shall be

known towards his servants, and his indignation towards his enemies," Isa. lxvi. 14.

Secondly: it is necessary to profess the belief of *the resurrection of the body*, that we may thereby acknowledge the great and powerful work of our redemption, confessing that death could not be conquered but by death, and that we could never have obtained another life, had not the Saviour of the world "abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." If Christ were not the life, the dead could never live: if he were not the resurrection, they could never rise. Were it not for him "that liveth and was dead, and is alive for evermore," had not he "the keys of hell and of death," we could never break through the bars of death, or pass the gates of hell. But he hath undertaken to vanquish our enemies, and our "last enemy to be destroyed is death; that the prophecy may be fulfilled, "death is swallowed up in victory," and we may cry out with the apostle, "Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ," 1 Cor. xv. 57.

Thirdly: the belief of this Article is necessary to strengthen us against the fear of our own death, and immoderate sorrow for the death of others. The sentence of death, passed upon us for our sins, cannot but affright and amaze us, except we look upon the suspension, relaxation, or revocation of it in the resurrection; but when we are assured of a life after death, and such a life as no death shall follow it, we may lay down our fears arising from corrupted nature, upon the comforts proceeding from our faith. The departure of our friends might overwhelm us with grief, if they were lost for ever; but the apostle will "not have us ignorant concerning those which are asleep, that we sorrow not even as others which have no hope," 1 Thess. iv. 13.

Fourthly: the belief of the resurrection hath a necessary reflection upon this life, by way of preparation for the next, as deterring from sin, as encouraging to holiness, as comforting in afflictions. How can any man commit a deliberate sin while he thinks that he must rise and stand before the judgment-seat, and give an account, and suffer for ever the punishment due unto it? What pleasure can entice him, what inclination can betray him, for a momentary satisfaction to incur an eternal rejection? How can we defile that body which shall never be raised to glory here-

after, except it here become the temple of the Holy Ghost? St. Paul, who hath delivered the doctrine, hath taught us by his own example what work is expected to be wrought upon our souls by it. "I have hope," saith he, "towards God, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. And herein do I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men," Acts xxiv. 15. This is the proper work of a true belief, and a full persuasion of a resurrection; and he who is really possessed with this hope cannot choose but purify himself: "always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as he knoweth that his labor is not in vain in the Lord," 1 Cor. xv. 58. This encourageth all drooping spirits, this sustaineth all fainting hearts, this sweeteneth all present miseries, this lighteneth all heavy burdens, this encourageth in all dangers, this supporteth in all calamities.

Having thus discovered the truth of this article, we may easily perceive what every man is obliged to believe, and understood to profess, when he confesseth a belief of *the resurrection of the body*; for thereby he is conceived to declare thus much:—I am fully persuaded of this, as of a most necessary and infallible truth, that as it is appointed for all men once to die, so it is also determined that all men shall rise from death; that the souls separated from our bodies are in the hand of God and live; that the bodies dissolved into dust, or scattered into ashes, shall be re-collected in themselves; and re-united to their souls; that the same flesh which lived before shall be revived; that the same numerical bodies which did fall shall rise; that this resuscitation shall be universal, no man excepted, no flesh left in the grave; that all the just shall be raised to a resurrection of life, and all the unjust to a resurrection of damnation; that this shall be performed at the last day when the trump shall sound: and thus *I believe the resurrection of the body*.

ARTICLE XII.

And the Life everlasting.

THIS last article, though not to be found in all, yet was expressed in many ancient creeds; in some by way of ad-

dition, *and the life everlasting*; in others by way of conjunction with the former, *the resurrection of the body unto everlasting life*. Upon this connexion with the former will follow the true interpretation of this concluding article; for thereby we are persuaded to look upon it as containing the state of man after the resurrection in the world to come.

As therefore St. Paul hath taught us to express our belief of "a resurrection both of the just and the unjust," so after the resurrection we are to consider the condition of them both; of the one as risen to everlasting life, of the other as risen to everlasting punishment and contempt; and so those who first acknowledged this article did interpret it. Although therefore *life everlasting*, as it is used in the Scriptures, belongeth to the just alone, and is never mentioned otherwise than as a reward promised and given to them who fear and serve the Lord; yet the same words may be used to express the duration of any persons who live never to die again, whatsoever their state and condition in itself shall be. For as *the resurrection of the dead* is taken in the Scriptures for the happy and eternal condition which followeth after it, as when the apostle saith, "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead;" which he must needs be most certain to attain unto who believed the resurrection of the just and unjust, and therefore if he had spoken of the resurrection in general, as it belongeth unto all, he needed not that expression, "If by any means," nor that which went before, "the fellowship of Christ's sufferings," for without them he should certainly rise from the dead; but he meant that resurrection which followeth upon the "being made conformable unto his death," which is a resurrection in conformity to the resurrection of Christ. As, I say, *the resurrection of the dead* is taken in the Scripture for everlasting happiness, and yet the same language is and may be used for the general resurrection of all men, even of such as shall be everlastingly unhappy; so *the life everlasting*, though used for a reward given only unto the elect, may yet be taken as comprehending the condition of the reprobate also, understood barely for the duration of persons living.

All those then who shall rise from the dead shall rise to life, and after the resurrection live by a true vital union of

their souls unto their bodies ; and because that union shall never cease, because the parts united shall never be dissolved, because it is appointed for men once to die, and after their reviviscency never to die again, it followeth that the life which they shall live must be an *everlasting life*.

To begin then with the resurrection to condemnation ; the truth included in this article, in reference unto that, is to this effect, that those who die in their sins, and shall be raised to life, that they may appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, and shall there receive the sentence of condemnation, shall be continued in that life for ever to undergo the punishment due unto their sins ; in which two particulars are contained, the duration of their persons, and of their pains. For two ways this eternity may be denied ; one, by a destruction or annihilation of their persons, with which the torments must likewise cease ; the other, by a suspension or relaxation of the punishment, and a preservation of the persons, never to suffer the same pains again. Both of which are repugnant to the clear revelation of the justice of God against the disobedience of man.

Our first assertion therefore is, that the wicked after the day of judgment shall not be consumed or annihilated, but shall remain alive in soul and body to endure the torments to be inflicted upon them by the justice of God, for all the sins committed by them while they were in the body. They who of late oppose the eternal subsistence and misery of the wicked, strangely maintain their opinion, not as a position to be proved by reason, as some of the heathens did, but as a truth delivered in the Scriptures ; as if the word itself taught nothing but an annihilation of the enemies of God, and no lasting torment : as if all the threats and menaces of the justice and wrath of God were nothing else but what the scoffing atheist expects, that is, after death never to be again ; or if they be, as it were in a moment to lose that being for ever. Because the Scripture speaks of them as of such as shall be destroyed, and perish, and die ; therefore they will give that comfort to them here, that though their life in which they sin be short, yet the time in which they are to be tormented for their sins shall be shorter far. They tell us where the Scripture mentioneth destruction in hell, it speaks of perdition, but no torment there. In this sense they will understand those words of Christ, so full of

terror in the true, so full of comfort to the wicked in their exposition; "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell," Matt. x. 28. If this place speak, as those men would have it, of perdition only, not of cruciation, then will it follow that God is not able to cruciate and torment a man in hell; for there can be no other reason why it must be spoken of perdition only, excluding cruciation, but because he is able to annihilate, not to cruciate. No, certainly a man may be said to be destroyed, and perish, to be lost and dead, who is rejected, separated, and disjoined from God, the better and the nobler life of man; and that person so denominated may still subsist, and be what in his own nature he was before, and live the life which doth consist in the vital union of his soul and body, and so subsisting undergo the wrath of God for ever. Nor shall any language, phrases, or expressions, give any comfort to the wicked or strength to this opinion, if the same Scriptures which say the wicked shall be destroyed, and perish, and die, say also that they shall be tormented with never dying pains, as they plainly and frequently do.

"Depart from me, ye cursed," shall the Judge eternal say to all the reprobate, "into everlasting fire;" and lest any should imagine that the fire shall be eternal, but the torments not, it followeth, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal," Matt. xxv. 46. Now, if the fire be everlasting by which God punishes the reprobates, if the punishment inflicted be also everlasting, then must the reprobates everlastingly subsist to endure that punishment, otherwise there would be a punishment inflicted and none endured, which is a contradiction. Now "the life eternal" may as well be affirmed to have an end, as "the everlasting punishment," because they are both delivered in the same expression.

Indeed the eternity of that fire prepared for the Devil and his angels is a sufficient demonstration of the eternity of such as suffer in it, and the question only can be what that eternity doth signify. For, because some things are called in the Scriptures eternal which have but a limited or determined duration, therefore some may imagine the fire of hell to be in that sense eternal, as lasting to the time

appointed by God for the duration of it. But as the fire is termed eternal, so that eternity is described as absolute, excluding all limits, prescinding from all determinations. The end of the burning of fire is by extinguishing, and that which cannot be extinguished can never end; but such is the fire which shall torment the reprobate; for he, whose "fan is in his hand, shall burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire;" and hath taught us before, that "it is better to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire, to go into hell, into the fire that shall never be quenched;" and hath farther yet explained himself by that unquestionable addition, and undeniable description of the place of torments, "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." And that we may yet be farther assured that this fire shall be never extinguished, we read that "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever," Rev. xiv. 11; and that those which are "cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, shall be tormented day and night, for ever and ever," Rev. xx. 10; which expression of "day and night" is the same with that which declareth the eternal happiness in the heavens, where they rest not "day and night, saying, "Holy, holy, holy;" where "they are before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple," Rev. iv. 8; vii. 15. If then the fire, in which the reprobates are to be tormented, be everlasting, if so absolutely everlasting that it shall never be quenched, if so certainly never to be quenched that the smoke thereof shall ascend for ever and ever, if those who are cast into it shall be tormented for ever and ever (all which the Scriptures expressly teach), then shall the wicked never be so consumed as to be annihilated, but shall subsist for ever, and be co-eternal to the tormenting flames. And so this language of the Scriptures proves not only an effect eternal, as annihilation may be conceived, but an eternal efficient never ceasing to produce the same effect, which cannot be annihilation, but cruciation only. And therefore the fire which consumed Sodom and Gomorrah bears no proportion with the flames of hell; because all men know that fire is extinguished, nor doth the smoke thereof ascend for ever and ever.

Neither doth this only prove the eternity of infernal pains, but clearly refute the only material argument brought

against it, which is laid upon this ground, that the wicked after the resurrection shall be punished with death, and that a second death: and so they shall be no more, nor can in any sense be said to live or subsist. For the enduring of this fire is that very death, and they are therefore said to die the second death, because they endure eternal torments. "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death;" it seems that they who shall die that death shall be hurt by it; whereas if it were annihilation, and so a conclusion of their torments, it would be no way hurtful or injurious, but highly beneficial to them. But the living torments are the second death. For "death and hell were cast into the lake of fire; that is, the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire," this is the second death, Rev. xx. 14. The Jews before our Saviour's time believed there was a second death; and though it were not expressed in the oracles themselves which were committed to them, yet in the received exposition of them it was often mentioned, and that as the punishment of the wicked in the life to come; and what this punishment shall be was in these words revealed to St. John,—“But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death,” Rev. xxi. 8. Now if the part in the lake be the second death, if that part be a perpetual permansion in torment, as before it is proved, then to say that the wicked shall die the second death is not a confutation of their eternal being in misery, but an assertion of it, because it is the same thing with everlasting torments, but delivered in other terms.

And if the pretence of death will not prove an annihilation, or infer a conclusion of torment, much less will the bare phrases of *perdition* and *destruction*; for we may as well conclude that whosoever says he is undone, intends thereby that he shall be no more. Beside, the eternity of destruction in the language of Scripture signifies a perpetual perpeccion, and duration in misery. For when Christ shall come “to take vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, they

shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, 2 Thess. i. 8. Wherefore I conclude that the wicked shall rise to everlasting punishment, continuing both in soul and body under the wrath of God and the torments proceeding from it, never to be quitted of them by annihilation; which is our first assertion, against the covert doctrine of the Socinians.

The second assertion teacheth us that, as the reprobates shall never fail to endure the torments due unto their sins, so the justice of God will never fail to inflict those torments for their sins. They shall never live to pay the uttermost farthing; they shall never come to the days of refreshment, who are cast into perpetual burnings. One part of their misery is the horror of despair; and it were not perfect hell, if any hope could lodge in it. The favor of God is not to be obtained where there is no means left to obtain it; but in the world to come there is no place for faith, nor virtue in repentance. If there be now such a vast distance between the tormenting flames and Abraham's bosom, that none could pass from one to the other, what impossibility must there be when the final sentence is passed upon all! As certainly as no person once received into the heavenly mansions shall ever be cast into outer darkness, so certainly none who is once cast into the fire prepared for the Devil and his angels shall ever enter into their Master's joy. As the tree falleth, so it lieth. There is no change to be wrought in man within those flames, no purgation of his sin, no sanctification of his nature, no justification of his person, and therefore no salvation of him. Without the mediation of Christ no man shall ever enter into heaven, and when he hath "delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father," then shall the office of the Mediator cease.

So groundless was the opinion of Origen, who conceived that after some number of years the damned should be released from their torments, and made partakers of the joys of heaven, or at least try their fortunes in such regions of the world as he conceived should be reserved for their habitation. For he may as well imagine that Christ shall be born and die again, who, being risen, dieth no more, as that any person, being condemned to the flames for contemning of his death, should ever come to live again, and by believing in the death of Christ to be after saved. For cer-

tainly their condition is unalterable, their condemnation is irreversible, their torments inevitable, their miseries eternal. As they shall not be taken from their punishment by annihilation of themselves, which is our first; so the punishment shall not be taken off them by any compassion upon them, which is our second assertion.

To conclude this branch of the Article, I conceive these certain and infallible doctrines in Christianity—that the wicked after this life shall be punished for their sins, so that in their punishment there shall be a demonstration of the justice of God revealed against all unrighteousness of men—that to this end they shall be raised again to life, and shall be judged and condemned by Christ, and delivered up under the curse, to be tormented with the Devil and his angels—that the punishment which shall be inflicted on them shall be proportionate to their sins, as a recompense of their demerits, so that no man shall suffer more than he hath deserved—that they shall be tormented with a pain of loss, the loss from God, from whose presence they are cast out, the pain from themselves, in a despair of enjoying him, and regret for losing him—that they farther shall be tormented with the pain of sense inflicted on them by the wrath of God which abideth upon them, represented unto us by a lake of fire—that their persons shall continue for ever in this remediless condition, under an everlasting pain of loss, because there is no hope of heaven, under an eternal pain of sense, because there is no means to appease the wrath of God which abideth on them. Thus the Athanasian Creed: “They that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.”

The next relation of this Article to the former is in reference to the resurrection of the just; and then the *life everlasting* is not to be taken in a vulgar and ordinary sense, but raised to the constant language of the Scriptures, in which it signifieth all which God hath promised, which Christ hath purchased, and with which man shall be rewarded in the world to come.

Now this life eternal may be looked upon under three considerations; as initial, as partial, and as perfectional. I call that eternal life initial, which is obtained in this life, and is as it were an earnest of that which is to follow: of which our Saviour spake, “He that heareth my word, and

believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life," John v. 24. I call that partial which belongeth though to the nobler, yet but a part of man, that is, the soul of the just separated from the body. I dispute not whether the joys be partial as to the soul; I am sure they are but partial as to the man. For that life consisteth in the happiness which is conferred on the soul departed in the fear, and admitted to the presence of God. St. Paul had "a desire to depart and to be with Christ;" he was willing rather to travel and be absent from the body, and to be present and at home with the Lord. And certainly where St. Paul desired to be when he departed, there he then was and there now is, and that not alone, but with all them who ever departed in the same faith with him, and that is with Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God. This happiness, which the saints enjoy between the hour of their death and the last day, is the partial life eternal. Thirdly: I call that perfectional which shall be conferred upon the elect immediately after the blessing pronounced by Christ, "Come, ye blessed children of my Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," Matt. xxv. 34.

This *eternal life* is to be considered in the possession, and in the duration; in the first, as it is *life*, in the second, as it is *eternal*. Now this life is not only natural, that is, the union of the soul to the body, which is the life of the reprobate; but spiritual, which consisteth in the union of the soul to God, as the apostle speaks, "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life" 1 John v. 12. And it is called after an especial manner *life*, because of the happiness which attendeth it: and therefore to understand that life is to know, so far as it is revealed, in what that happiness doth consist.

To begin with that which is most intelligible; the bodies of the saints after the resurrection shall be transformed into spiritual and incorruptible bodies. The flesh "is sown in corruption, raised in incorruption; sown in dishonor, raised in glory; sown in weakness, raised in power; sown a natural body, raised a spiritual body," 1 Cor. xv. 42. This perfective alteration shall be made by the Son of God, "who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned

like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself," Phil. iii. 21. Thus when we come into that other world, the world of spirits, even our bodies shall be spiritual.

As for the better part of man, the soul, it shall be highly exalted to the utmost perfection in all the parts or faculties thereof. The understanding shall be raised to the utmost capacity, and that capacity completely filled. "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face; now we know but in part, but then shall we know even as also we are known," 1 Cor. xiii. 12. And this even now "we know, that when God shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is," 1 John iii. 2. Our first temptation was, that we should be like unto God in knowledge, and by that we fell; but, being raised by Christ, we come to be truly like him, by knowing him as we are known, and by seeing him as he is. Our wills shall be perfected with absolute and indefective holiness, with exact conformity to the will of God, and perfect liberty from all servitude of sin: they shall be troubled with no doubtful choice, but with their radical and fundamental freedom shall fully embrace the greatest good. Our affections shall be all set right by an unalterable regulation, and in that regularity shall receive absolute satisfaction; and all this shall be effected, that we may be thereby made capable, and then happy by a full fruition.

To this internal perfection is added a proportionately happy condition, consisting in an absolute freedom from all pain, misery, labor, and want; an impossibility of sinning and offending God; an hereditary possession of all good, with an unspeakable complacency and joy flowing from it, and all this redounding from the vision and fruition of God: this is the *life*.

And now the duration of this life is as necessary as the life itself, because, to make all already mentioned amount unto a true felicity, there must be added an absolute security of the enjoyment, void of all fear of losing it, or being deprived of it. And this is added to complete our happiness, by the adjection of eternity. Now that this life shall be eternal, we are assured who have not yet obtained it, and they much more who do enjoy it. He who hath purchased it for us, and promised it unto us, often calleth it

eternal life; it is described as "a continuing city," as "everlasting habitations," as "a house eternal in the heavens;" it is expressed by "eternal glory, eternal salvation," by "an eternal inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away;" by "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." And, lest we should be discouraged by any short or lame interpretation of eternity, it is further explained in such terms as are liable to no mistake. For our Saviour hath said, "If any man keep my saying, he shall never see death:" and, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die," John viii. 51; xi. 26. When "God shall wipe away all tears from our eyes, there shall be no more death;" and, where there is life and no death, there must be everlasting life; which is expressed by St. Paul by way of apposition, calling it "life and immortality," and that together with the abolition of death, saying that "our Saviour Jesus Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel," 2 Tim. i. 10.

The belief of this article is necessary (as to the eternity of torment) to deter us from committing sin, and to quicken us to holiness of life, and a speedy repentance for sin committed. For "the wages of sin is death;" nothing can bring us to those everlasting flames but sin, no sin but that which is unrepented of; nothing can save that man from the never-dying worm who dieth in his sins; and no other reason can bring him thither, but "because he sinned and repented not. They who imagine the pains inflicted for sin to be either small or short, have but a slender motive to innocence or repentance; but such as firmly believe them sharp and endless, have by virtue of that faith within themselves a proper and natural spur and incitement to avoid them; for "who can dwell in everlasting burnings?"

Secondly: the belief of eternal pains after death is necessary to breed in us a fear and awe of the great God, a jealous God, a consuming fire, a God that will not be mocked; and to teach us to tremble at his word, to consider the infinity of his justice, and the fierceness of his wrath; to meditate on the power of his menaces, the validity of his threats; to follow that direction, to embrace that reduplicated advice of our Saviour, "I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; fear him, which, after he hath

killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him," Luke xii. 5: and that exclusively of such fear as concerns the greatest pains of this life, which the martyrs undervalued out of a belief of eternal torments.

Thirdly: this belief is necessary to teach us to make a fit estimate of the price of Christ's blood, to value sufficiently the work of our redemption, to acknowledge and admire the love of God to us in Christ. For he who believeth not the eternity of torments to come, can never sufficiently value that ransom by which we were redeemed from them, or be proportionately thankful to his Redeemer by whose intervention we have escaped them. Whereas he who is sensible of the loss of heaven, and the everlasting privation of the presence of God, of the torments of fire, the company of the Devil and his angels, the vials of the wrath of an angry and never to be appeased God, and hopeth to escape all these by virtue of the death of his Redeemer, cannot but highly value the price of that blood, and be proportionably thankful for so "plenteous a redemption," Psal. cxxx. 7.

Again: as this article followeth upon the resurrection of the just, and containeth in it an eternal duration of infinite felicity belonging to them, it is necessary to stir us up to an earnest desire of the kingdom of heaven, and that righteousness to which such a life is promised. "I will now turn aside and see this great sight," Exod. iii. 3, said Moses, when he saw the burning bush: "It is good for us to be here," Matt. xvii. 4, said St. Peter, when he saw our Saviour transfigured in the mount; how much more ought we to be inflamed with a desire of the joys of heaven, and that length of days which only satisfieth by its eternity, to a careful and constant performance of those commands to which such a reward is graciously promised. For as all our happiness proceedeth from the vision of God, so we are certain that without holiness no man shall see him.

Secondly: this belief is necessary to take off our inclinations and desires from the pleasures and profits of this life; to breed in us a contempt of the world, and to teach us to despise all things on this side heaven; "to set our affections on things above, not on things on the earth," considering we "are dead, and our life is hid with Christ in God." For "where our treasure is, there will our hearts be also."

Therefore we must forget "those things which are behind, and, reaching forth unto those things which are before, press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus," Phil. iii. 13.

Thirdly: an assent unto this truth is necessary to encourage us to take up the cross of Christ, and to support us under it, willingly and cheerfully to undergo the afflictions and tribulations of this life, reckoning, with the apostle, "that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us;" and knowing that "our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," Rom. viii. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 17. And this knowledge is not to be obtained, this comfort is not to be expected, except "we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal."

And now having thus showed the propriety, proved the verity, and declared the necessity of this article, we may fully instruct every Christian how to express his belief in the last object of his faith, which he may most fitly thus pronounce:—I do fully and freely assent unto this, as unto a most necessary and infallible truth, that the unjust, after their resurrection and condemnation, shall be tormented for their sins in hell, and shall be so continued in torments for ever, so as neither the justice of God shall ever cease to inflict them, nor the persons of the wicked cease to subsist and suffer them; and that the just after their resurrection and absolution shall as the blessed of the Father obtain the inheritance, and as the servants of God enter into their Master's joy, freed from all possibility of death, sin, and sorrow, filled with all conceivable and inconceivable fulness of happiness, confirmed in an absolute security of an eternal enjoyment, and so they shall continue with God and with the Lamb for evermore. And thus I believe the *life everlasting*.

ind,
ress
God

en-
tus
ions
stle,
y to
is;
or a
rnal
his
be
are
ags
not

he
ay
ie
a
v
r
t
o
t
e

Jan 13 '51

DUE 1 JUNE '51
SUBJECT TO
RECALL

QUE 26 May '53

FEB 1 4 1962

238.1

P31e

1830

12980

PENN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



A000053012418