

M^r. Nye's Institutions

concerning the Holy

Trinity

1703

3

INSTITUTIONS, Concerning the *HOLY TRINITY,*

And the *Manner* of our
Saviour's Divinity;

B E I N G,

- I. An Explication or Declaration of the (General and Current) Doctrine of the Catholic Church, concerning those Articles; and a Defence of the same, against the *Socinians* and *Tritheists*. And an Abstract or Summary of the XV Books of *St. Austin*, concerning the Article of the Trinity, and the *depending* Articles and Questions; with the Clauses of the Confession of Faith, of the Oriental or *Greek* Church, that explain also the same.
- II. A Scholastic Dissertation, that represents the Doctrine of the other *Latin* and *Greek* Fathers, of the Schoolmen, and of the Divines of the Reformation. This last from the *Latin*; but with a Conclusion, and Notes added to it.

The Whole an Abridgment of the *Learning* on these Articles.

By *STEPHEN NYE*, Rector of *Hormead*.

L O N D O N, Printed, and sold by *J. Nutt*
near Stationers Hall. 1703.

INSTITUTION

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

CHURCH

OF THE

UNITED STATES

AMERICAN

CHURCH

OF THE

UNITED STATES

AMERICAN

CHURCH

OF THE

UNITED STATES

AMERICAN

CHURCH

OF THE

Sancto & Reverendo

Clero Anglicano,

H A S, D E

DIVINA TRINITATE,

D E Q U E

CHRISTO ΘΕΑΝΘΡΩΠΩ,

INSTITUTIONES;

Censendas

D D. L M.

STEPHANUS NYE.

The Preface.

BY how much the more Wit or good Sense any Man has, by so much (always) he is more Curious and Inquisitive; and content (or rather pleased) with the Pains, and Attention, that are necessary to a full and sure Information: more especially concerning important Subjects, and that are much litigated. Nor will such mistake Depth, for Obscurity; or Accuracy, for Niceness or Precifity. It is such a Reader that this Book requires; and it will profit no others: more especially the Second Part of it, or the Dissertation. But I will give a particular Account of the Whole; that every Reader may judg for himself, whether he ought to meddle with it, yea or no?

The First Part has two (Principal) Sections. The first Section is only some Part of the 1st and 4th Letters, published about two Years ago, under the Title of **The Doctrin of the Holy**

The Preface.

Holy Trinity, and the manner of our Saviour's Divinity, as they are held in the Catholic Church and the Church of England; in four Letters, to a Peer. *But here I have explained some things more clearly, and fully, than in those Letters: and I have expressed some others more in the Forms and to the Mind of the Metaphysicians, and Scholastics; to take away Occasion from those Pedlars in Learning, who being but Cavillers, would yet set up for Critics.* The other Section of this Part, is an Abridgment of the 15 Books of St. Austin, concerning the Holy Trinity; because the Authority of this Father has always been revered as decisive, (especially in these Questions) by the Catholic Church. This Part will be obvious and easy enough, to whatsoever Reader; and contains nothing but what is necessary to be known by all, for the avoiding of Heresy, or Tritheism.

The second Part, being a Scholastic Dissertation, will require more Attention in the Reader, and that he be content to go over it more than once: if he would fully understand all of it. But for the sake of those, who are indeed the most, that love not to take too much

The Preface.

Pains; I have added a Conclusion, which is a Summary and an Elucidation of the Dissertation: all the Opinions are there clearly represented, and a Judgment made of them. The Sections of the Dissertation, are these;

I. May the Doctrine of the Trinity, being a Mystery, be explained?

II. How much of the Doctrine of the Trinity, is necessary to be believed by all Christians, as a Condition of their Salvation?

III. What Traces and Likenesses of the Divine Trinity may we find in the External Creation?

IV. What in the Human Soul, or Soul of Man?

V. Is there a Trinity of PRINCIPLES (or Essential Attributes) in God, as well as in the Soul?

VI. In what doth the Trinity of PRINCIPLES in the Soul, agree with the Divine Trinity of Principles or Persons?

VII. Is the Trinity of Principles and of Persons in God, the same? This Section hath many lesser ones, viz.

1. What doth the Term Logos (which we render WORD) signify in the context of

The Preface.

St. John, Chap. 1. Vers. 1, 2, &c.

2. *What is a Person?*

3. *What is a Relation, in God?*

4. *What are the Foundations of the Relations in God?*

5. *Wherein do the Divine Principles (or Powers) in God, differ from one another?*

6. *What have the Fathers said of this Matter?*

7. *What is the Doctrine of the Scholastics, or Divines of the middle Ages?*

8. *What have the Divines of the Reformation (those that began and perfected the Reformation) said?*

VIII. *The Determination and Judgment of the Author, concerning the Divine PRINCIPLES and PERSONS.*

IX. *His Propositions concerning the Trinity; Name and Thing.*

X. *The Conclusion, by the Translator; being a Sum, and Elucidation, of the whole.*

When the School-Doctors speak here, it will seem sometimes obscure, sometimes flat; to those that understand not the Metaphysical Terms and Notions; but Learned

Men

The Preface.

Men know that, those accurate Distinctions and Divisions are useful, and are almost necessary, to an exact Knowledge of Things. But Divines, or any that study Theology, must by no means be wholly unacquainted with them; because without 'em, they cannot read the ablest Authors, especially in the Trinitarian and Quinquarticular Controversies. This Dissertation, read sometimes, will acquaint a capable Reader with the meaning of most of the Scholastic and Metaphysical Notions and Terms. Armandus de Bello visu (or Bellovisius) has explained almost all of them, in his Lexicon; Scheibler very many of them, in his Metaphysics.

I should excuse the great Number of Authors, and Authorities here, to the same thing, if I did not foresee that, it is absolutely necessary for appeasing those, who will be so much surprized that the Faith of the Church, is so different from the vulgar meaning of the Terms in which she expresses it.

I expect, to be again charged, as too nice and curious in these Institutions; I refer my self therefore to what I have largely said thereupon, in divers places, of this Treatise.

If

The Preface.

If that will not satisfy, I must answer to such my Accusers, as they deserve: namely that, Fools are always Incurious; and all the Incurious (so far forth, or in proportion thereto) are Fools. To such, I never intended to write; and they shall do well, not to concern themselves with Books.

E R R A T A.

PAGE 3. lin. 15. for *always*, read *ordinarily*. P. 5. l. 32, 33. dele *it is the Individual Intellectual Nature*. P. 25. l. 8, 9. f. *constantly*, r. *ordinarily*. P. 41. l. 32, 33. r. *understand*. P. 47. l. 3. r. *dicitur*. P. 52. l. 26. r. *Oeconomies*. P. 65. l. 27, 28. r. *miserable*. P. 71. l. 15. r. *concrete*. P. 72, 74, 76, 78, 80. r. the running Title thus, *Some Questions and Controversies*. P. 109. l. 9. f. *Art*, r. *Art*. P. 128. l. 31. r. *ægeas*. P. 147. l. 31. r. *Soncinas*. P. 167. l. 29. r. *Gisbert*.

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

THE three following Books publish'd by Mr. Stephen Nye, which contain a Vindication of the Catholick Church and the Church of England, in several Important Points of Faith, may be had of J. Nutt near Stationers Hall, either single, or bound up with these Institutions; viz.

The System of Grace and Freewill, in a Visitation-Sermon.

A Defence of the Canon of the New Testament, in answer to Mr. Toland's Amyntor.

The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and the Manner of our Saviour's Divinity. In several Letters to a Peer.

A Catalogue of the Authors cited
in this Treatise.

FATHERS.

Athanagoras.
Athanasius.
Augustinus.
Ambrosius.
Anselmus.
Agnellus.
Andreas Casariens.
Basilus Casariens.
Basilus Seleuc.
Boethius.
Clemens Rom.
Clemens Alexandr.
Cyprianus.
Constantinus M.
Cyrillus Hieros.
Cyrillus Alexandr.
Chrysostomus.
Chrysologus.
Casarius.
Damasceus.
Eugenius Carthus.
Edmundus Cantuar.
Ephrem.
Epiphanius.
Fulgentius.
Gennadius Schol.

Gregorius Nys.
Gregorius Naz.
Gregorius Thaummat.
Guimundus.
Guilielmus Parisiensis.
Gerson.
Hieronimus.
Hugo de S. Victore.
Hilarius Pictav.
Justinus.
Ireneus.
Joannes Hieros.
Isidorus Pelus.
Lucianus Mart.
Lactantius.
Leo I. Rom.
Macarius.
Maximus Mart.
Methodius.
Origenes.
Peregrinus Laureac.
Potho.
Synesius.
Tatianus.
Theophilus Antiocb.
Tertullianus.

Authors cited in this Treatise.

Theorianus.
Theodorus Abuc.
Thalassius.

Zeno Veronens.
Zacharias Metulen.

S C H O O L M E N .

A *Quinas.*
Albertinus.
Aureolus.
Alensis.
Egidius Rom.
Bassolis.
Bonaventura.
Biel.
Cajetanus.
Capreolus.
Durandus.
Estius.
Ferrius.
Ferrariensis.
Fonseca.
Franciscus à S. Clara.
Faber.
Gregorius de Valentia.
Henricus Gandav.
Hurtadus de Mend.
Holkor.
Hervæus Natalis.

Joannes de Ripa.
Lychetus.
Lyranus.
Lombardus.
Molina.
Mairo.
Meurisse.
Nicholaus D' Orbellis.
Ockamus.
Palacios.
Petrus à Joseph.
Rada.
Richardus de S. Victore.
Scotus.
Scotellus.
Soncinas.
Suaresius.
Toletus.
Trombeta.
Vasquesius.
Zabarella.

M O D E R N S .

Authors cited in this Treatise.

M O D E R N S.

A *Ltingius.*
Arminius.
Amesius.
Beza.
Becanus.
Bucanius.
Bullingerus.
Beumlerus.
Baxterus.
Calvinus.
Cluto.
Chamierus.
Deodati.
Dutch Annotations.
Davenantius.
Fayus.
Forbesius, à Corse.
Fennerus.
Gomarus.
Grotius.
Hommius.
Harmonia Confessionum.
Illyricus.
Junius.
Jansenius.
Keckermannus.
Maccovius.
Maldonatus.

Martyr.
Musculus.
Matth. Martinus.
Maresius.
Melanchton.
Paræus.
Petavius.
Polanus.
Posewitz.
Polyander.
Sohnius.
Snecanus.
Jul. Scaliger.
Scheiblerus.
Scharpius.
Spanhemius.
Trelcacijs Jun.
Thysius.
Theses Sedanenses.
Theses Salmurienses.
Valla.
P. Voetius.
Ursinus.
Waleus.
Wigandus.
Zanchius.
Zuinglius.

Institutions, concerning the Holy Trinity, and the *Manner* of our Saviour's Divinity.

P A R T I.

An Explication or Declaration of the (General and Current) Doctrine of the Catholick Church, and of the Church of England, concerning those Articles; and a Defence of the same, against the Socinians, and Tricheists.

IT is self-evident that, to hold the Doctrines of the Trinity, and of our Saviour's Divinity; in *the Terms* only, without knowing the *Sense* intended (by the Catholick Church) in those *Terms*; is to be no more *positively Orthodox*, in these *Articles*, than an *Ideot* is.

They properly are Infidels, or *Unbelievers*, that know not (or what is the same, *understand not*) the Faith of the Church. To know it, and yet *deny* it, is not un-belief, but dis-belief.

There is no other difference between such a Hea-then, that never heard of the Trinity; and a Chri-istian, that understands not what he ought to *mean*

2 *An Explication of the Catholick Doctrine*

by it; but that the latter is culpably (if not dam-
nably) ignorant, as having both neglected his Du-
ty, and abused his Opportunities; and the other
(the Heathen) hath neither of those Guilts upon
him, he shall answer only for his *Immoralities*.

Whereas some say here, the Trinity and Incar-
nation are *Mysteries*; and that therefore all (pre-
tended) Explications and Declarations of them, are
to be rejected; as not only Presumptuous, but False
also. It is true indeed that, so far forth as any thing
is a *Mystery*, 'tis not Intelligible, and therefore not
Explicable. But the Objectors were never taught
by the Catholick Church, that these Articles of the
Christian Faith are *wholly* and *altogether* Mysteries;
but *Mysteries, in some part and degree revealed*: and
that, so far forth as they are revealed, they may
and *ought* to be declared and expounded, to such as
do not competently know them, or are in Errors
concerning them. That these Articles are Mysteries
revealed *in some part and degree*, is as much held
and taught (and *inculcated* also) by the Catholick
Church; as that, they are in some respects (still)
great and absolute Mysteries.

I hope, these present Papers (the Effects of much
Study and Reading, and of long Consideration)
will sufficiently declare the *revealed Part* of these
Mysteries: which is so necessary to be known, for
the avoiding divers *Heresies*; and which the Catho-
lick Church therefore hath so many ways proposed
to her Children. As, in the *Creeeds*, and *Canons of
Councils*; in the solemn *Condemnations of divers He-
reticks, or Heresies*; and in the *Didactical and Contro-
versial Writings* of so many *Fathers, Schoolmen, and
Modern Divines*. I say therefore,

The Belief of the Church in these (necessary)
Articles of, *three Divine Persons*, and the *Divinity of
our Saviour*; as it lies in the *Creeeds and Canons of
Councils*,

Councils, the (judicial) *Condemnations of Heresies*, and the Current of *approved Writers*; may be couched in these (following) Heads, or Distinctions.

I. There is *but One* (Infinite All-perfect) *uncreated BEING, SPIRIT, or MIND*; who is *sole MAKER* of Heaven, and Earth; *sole Object* of Divine Worship, properly so called; and whom we usually design by this word, *GOD*.

II. The Divinity, or God, (and more especially the *Logos, WISDOM, or WORD*) hath assumed the Humanity of Christ, into such an intimate, personal, and *indissoluble* Union with it self; that thereby the Human Nature is *always* under Divine Illumination and Conduct; and the Divinity doth *always* exert its *natural and eternal Perfections* in, and (*as far as the Humanity is capable*) by the Human Nature.

When I say, the *natural and eternal Perfections* of the Divinity; I mean the Attributes of *Omniscience*, and *Omnipotence*, and the rest. For the *Omniscience* of the Lord Christ was manifested in the knowledg of *the Thoughts*, and of *the Future*: His *Omnipotence*, in the Power of *Miracles*; and of *Creation*, as when he twice multiplied the Loaves.

When I say, *as far as the Humanity is capable*, it is to obviate the *Eutychian* Heresy, that turned the *Humanity* into *God*: And because some of the Divine Perfections seem altogether incommunicable, as the *Omni-presence*, and *Præ-ternity*; tho' also Christ as God, or *with respect to the inhabiting Divinity*, is *Præ-eternal*, and *Omni-present*.

The Catholick Church expresses this Faith very justifiably, by the Terms *Incarnation*; *Personal Union*; *God, God-man*. Some others, more nice than is needful, keep to the words of Scripture; *the Man*

4 *An Explication of the Catholick Doctrine*

Jesus Christ, in whom dwelleth the Fulness of the Godhead: which yet is all that the Church means by those exceeding proper Terms, Incarnation, God-man, &c.

We shall see by and by very fully, what is intended by the *Logos* (which the *Greek Church* interprets **WISDOM**; the *Latin*, not so properly, **WORD**) and which we say *was Incarnate*. But here we must so far anticipate, as to observe that; whereas 'tis the general (and I think, truer) Opinion, that only the **WISDOM**, or **SON** was Incarnate, not the whole **TRINITY**; 'tis to be understood thus. The **WISDOM** (not as 'tis a mere **PERSONALITY**, but) as 'tis Understood with, or as it Implies and *Compriseth that whole Divine Nature, or Godhead, with all its Attributes and Perfections, was united to the Humanity of our Saviour, or doth inhabit his Human Nature*: whereby he is as compleatly and perfectly God, as he should be if the whole Trinity (and not the **SON** only) were Incarnate. And by occasion hereof, I must add also here; when we say, the Divinity (*the Fulness of the Godhead, as St. Paul speaks*) doth inhabit, or is united to the Humanity of Christ: 'Tis not meant by the Church, the Divinity becomes *but commensurate to the Humanity*, Infinite to Finite; nor yet, as *Eutyches* imagined, that *the Humanity is deified*, that is, becomes *Omnipresent, Impassible*, and the rest of that kind; Perfections that are plainly incommunicable to the Humanity, and would destroy it. But we mean; as God is *perfectly and equally* God in whatsoever portion of space, in the *least* imaginable Extension, no less than in the *whole* Immensity of his Essence: therefore he can *fully and perfectly* communicate himself to the Humanity of Christ, tho' but *Finite*. As the whole Nature and (*physical*) Perfection of Fire, is in every part of the Fire, even in a *Spark*; and the whole (*constitutive*) Perfection and Nature

of

of Water is in a single *Drop*, no less than in the whole *Rhine* or *Danube*: So is the whole Nature and (*essential*) Perfection of God in every (and the *least*) assignable part of the Divine Infinitude. But if we reserve these Considerations, till we are got over the next Head, or Particular, they will be more easily and fully apprehended.

III. God is most perfectly *One*, in respect of *Essence*, *Understanding*, *Power of Action*, and *Will*; these are truly and numerically one in God, as in an *Angel*, or a *Man*. There is however such a *Modal Distinction* in God, that thereupon he is called, and is three Persons; not in the *ordinary* and *vulgar* Sense of the term Person, but in the *Theological*.

This modal Distinction hath been declared and explained, with some Latitude; as to the *Terms*, and even as to the *Characters of the Persons*.

Some Divines (as well Fathers as Schoolmen) make the Character of the first Person to be *active Power*, or *Life*, or VITAL ACTIVITY; of the Second, to be *Understanding*, or *Wisdom*, or SELF-KNOWLEDG; of the Third, *Love*, or WILL. For *Love* in God is not, as in us, a Passion; but his *Essential WILL*. In short, these three, SELF-LIVING, SELF-KNOWING, SELF-LOVING, are God's (Essential Immanent) *Acts* on himself, the Eternal Object: therefore several of the Antients, of the School-Doctors, and of the Moderns, go no farther, in accounting for the Mystery of the Trinity. They alledg that, "A
 " Divine Person is a *Mode*, or *Property*, of an
 " individual intellectual Nature; it is the indi-
 " vidual Intellectual Nature; it is the individual Di-
 " vine Nature, with a *discretive Property*, or parti-
 " cular *Mode*. Consequently, God, or the Divine
 " Nature, is THREE PERSONS, on the ac-
 " count

6 An Explication of the Catholick Doctrine

“ count of the aforesaid Modes or Properties ; that
“ is, as he is SELF-LIVING, SELF-KNOWING,
“ and SELF-LOVING. Nor is he *more than Three*
“ Persons ; because these are the only Essential, Im-
“ manent (or *Internal*) Acts of God.

These Doctors were never censured, or blamed in the Church ; as defective in the Faith, or as less Orthodox than they ought to have been. The Fathers that go this way, are mentioned in the (following) *Dissertation* : The *School-Doctors* that I have noted, are *Durand. 1. d. 38. qu. 1. Thom, 1. qu. 19. a. 4. ad quintum, and qu. 25. art. 1. Suarez, Metaphys. disp. 30. p. 113, 114. Of the Moderns, Wendelinus, Alstedius, and Sceibler. Of our English Divines, Mr. Baxter in his Catholic Theology, but very largely in his Methodus Theologiae ; indeed it is the governing Thought that directs his whole Method or System, and goes through it.*

But because tho this Explication accounts for the notion of PERSONS in the Divine Nature ; yet it doth not, with so obvious Facility, satisfy for the RELATIONS (*Father, Son, and Spirit that proceeds from both*) in God : therefore the more current Exposition is *St. Austin's*, as here followeth.

The first Person in the Holy Trinity, is *unbegotten Mind, or Intellect, or ORIGINAL WISDOM* ; the sole Cause (or Principle) of the *Second*, and therefore (by analogy to things Natural, and condescension to the Human Understanding) called the FATHER.

Next is the *Logos*, the Reflex or *begotten WISDOM* ; even the *Wisdom* that is generated by, or that resulteth from, Eternal MIND's contemplating and knowing its own Perfections ; that Ideal Representation, Self-knowledg, or *express Image* (as *St. Paul* speaks) that is necessarily *begotten* within himself, by the *Father's* knowing and understanding himself, and therefore is named the SON.

Lastly,

Lastly, The Divine Volition or LOVE (the joint Act of Father and Son;) by which God loveth or willeth himself; the Eternal SPIRATION, or, as it were, *breathing* of Love towards himself; on that account fitly called the SPIRIT.

They do not mean however that, mere WISDOM, or KNOWLEDG, or LOVE in God, is a *Person*: but each of these Idioms, *as 'tis understood with, or as it includeth the Divine Nature, or Godhead, with all its Attributes and Perfections, is rightly called a Person, and a Divine Person.* And hence also we say, each Person is truly and properly GOD, BEING, SPIRIT; but not a God, a Being, a Spirit; because 'tis the same (numerical) *God, Being, Spirit*, who, as having these three Idioms (Characters, Acts, Modes, Personalities) is therefore named Three Persons.

It is (undeniably) with respect to this Explication of the Trinity, that the Divines of the *Schools*, the General Councils of the *Lateran* and *Lyons*, the Councils of *Toledo*, &c. have defined that, the SON is *eternally generated*, and the SPIRIT *eternally proceeds*. They rightly make the *Generation* and *Spiration* (or *Procession*) to be Essential, Permanent, and Eternal Acts; because eternal *original Mind* must needs be understood to *Know*, and *Will*, or LOVE it self, *by a continual perpetual Act*. And from hence also they truly infer that, the *Generation* and *Procession* are *natural* and *necessary*, not *arbitrary* and *free* Acts. As also that, there can be no more Persons in the Divine Nature, but only these three; only original MIND, the reflex WISDOM, and the eternal *Spiration* of Love, or SELF-COMPLACENCE: for these compleat the Notion, and Perfection of God; and without them he should neither be Happy, nor God.

8 *An Explication of the Catholick Doctrine*

LOVE naturally ariseth, or proceedeth, from what is apprehended, and is *KNOWN*, as our *greatest and most connatural Good*: And the greatest Good of God can be no other, but that he perfectly *KNOWETH* himself; for He only is a *perfect Object*. From whence we see, how the Spirit, who is the Divine LOVE, proceeds from the *Father* and the *Son*, (or from Mind or *INTELLECT*, and from *SELF-KNOWLEDG*;) and that this whole Discourse, of Original MIND, reflex KNOWLEDG, and LOVE, is *verified* (as the *Schools* and *Metaphysicians* speak) in the Divine Nature.

When we say, this Trinity is a *Mystery*; 'tis because all the Terms in which the Holy Scriptures or Church have delivered these Articles, are equivocal, or do not signify the same thing as in Human Speech: *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit* are not here intended, as among Men; as neither is *Persons*. *Persons*, *Father*, *Son*, *Spirit*, *Generation*, *Procession*, *Spiration*, *Begotten*, in the Divinity are so called, as was before said, only by an Analogy (or *remote likeness*) to things *Natural*, and by *condescension* to the *Human Understanding*. In all created Persons, so many *Persons* are so many distinct *Substances*, *Understandings*, *Wills*, and *Powers of Action*; they are so many distinct *BEINGS*, *MINDS*, and *SPIRITS*. In like manner also do *Father* and *Son* differ, in all the *created* kinds; they are as distinct and several (by their respective *Substances*, *Understandings*, *Wills*) as three *Angels* do differ (or are distinct) from three *Men*. How extremely unlike is this *Alterity* and *Diversity*, to the real *Unity* of the *Divine Persons*; or of *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit*, in *God*? For these in *God*, as we have said, are not distinguished, by *distinct Substances*, *Understandings*, *Wills*, &c. but are numerically *one Substance*, *Understanding*, *Being*, *Spirit*; they differ, as a *Mind* and its *Acts*.

The great variety of Terms ; used by Divines, in treating of this Question ; perplexes and confounds most Readers : who are not aware that, all these so (seemingly) different Terms signify the same thing ; but because none of them express it *adequately*, therefore for a more clear and perfect Conception of this Article, we willingly use all sorts of Terms and Explications that help to enlighten it. Thus, Mr. *Hooker*, Author of the *Ecclesiastical Policy*, says : “ The Divine Substance (or Essence) with this *Property, to be of none*, maketh the Person of the FATHER ; the same Divine Essence with this *Property, to be of the Father*, maketh the Person of the SON ; the *self-same* Divine Essence or Substance with this *Property, to be of Both*, maketh the Person of the Holy SPIRIT. So that, in every Person there is implied, the SUBSTANCE of God, and also the PROPERTY, which causeth the same Person to differ from the other two.

It is not a *novel* Explication, devised by Mr. *Hooker* ; but the Explication commonly received in the Church, and only represented in other equivalent Terms. For by the *Property, to be of None* (which, he saith, together with the Divine Essence, doth make the Person of the *Father*) he means ORIGINAL WISDOM. Mr. *Hooker* calls it the *Property to be of None*, because 'tis *un-begotten* and *un-originated*. By the *Property to be of the Father*, he means the Reflex, or BEGOTTEN WISDOM ; which is *generated* (in the manner before declared) by *Original Wisdom*, or the *Father*, and is therefore named the *Son*. He saith again, *to proceed from both* maketh the third Person. Right, for Divine LOVE proceeds from unbegotten MIND and the reflex WISDOM. He concludes as soundly ; “ Each Divine Person is the *Divine Substance* with one of these

“ these *Properties*, and consisteth of the *Property* and “ the *Substance*. ’Tis as much as to say; a Divine Person, is either ORIGINAL WISDOM (*which is of none*) together with the Divine Essence: or it is the Divine Essence with the REFLEX WISDOM, *which is of the former*; or (lastly) ’tis the *same* Divine Essence or Substance, with the Spiration of LOVE, which proceeds *from both*.

— When others call the Divine Persons indifferently by *abstract* or *concrete* Names; which when used of Creatures, or their Qualities or Acts, are readily understood by every Body: but when applied to the Subject of this Article, are understood only by the Learned; and often misunderstood even by them, unless they have been long conversant in these Questions: I say, those as well *abstract* as *concrete* Terms and Names, do all refer to that Explication of this Article that is before given; they are intended only farther to explain it, and *do* explain it.

These Terms or Names are *Acts, Properties, Modes, Subsistences, Characters, Idioms, Notes, Notions, Ideas, Relations, Persons, Personalities, Essence, Substance, Trinity*. Their meaning is, briefly, as here follows.

The Divine Persons are called ACTS; because *Wisdom* and *Love* are indeed Essential *Acts* of God, on himself the Eternal Object. Yet it is not the mere *Act* that is a *Person*, but the Divine Essence (or Godhead, or God) *thus acting*.

They are PROPERTIES, IDIOMS, and CHARACTERS; as they *distinguish*, and thereby variously *denominate*, the Divine Essence. For in respect of one Property, Character, or Idiom, the Divine Essence is named the Father; in respect of another, the Son; in respect of the third, the Holy Spirit. But we must always remember that, these Appellations are not used *Univocally* (or *in the same sense and respect*)

spect.) concerning God and any Creatures, or their Acts. Only the Term or Word *Ens*, an Entity or Being, is predicated *Univocally* of God and Creature; and the more nice Metaphysicians will scarce allow that, the Creature is *Ens* in the same sense as God is. Mr. Baxter, for instance, says: "If God and Creature is *Ens*, then either *distinct* or the *same*; not the *same*, for then the Creature should be *God*: if *distinct* and several, then there is more *Entity* in *God and the Creature*, than in *God alone*; for *two* is numerally more than *One*, and two Beings have more *Entity* than *One*, how small soever the lesser be; and then God shall be but *part* of *Universal Entity*, which is *Imperfection*."

They are **NOTES, NOTIONS, IDEAS**, as they serve to *notify*, or declare to us, the peculiar and proper *Distinctions* and *Acts*, of the Divine Persons. As namely that, the first Person is the *Godhead* (or *God*) under the *Notion* of *Un-begotten MIND*; the second is the same *God, Godhead* or *Divine Essence*, under the *Idea* of *Reflex WISDOM*; the third is the same *Godhead* under the *Note* of *Divine LOVE*.

They are **RELATIONS**, as from the (analogical) *Acts* of *Generation* and *Spiration* there ariseth in *God* the *mystical Relation* of *FATHER, SON, and SPIRIT* proceeding from both.

They are **MODES, and SUBSISTENCES**; or if you will, *MODES of existing*; as by occasion of them *God* is considered as existing, after three *Modes* or *Manners*; namely, as *Un-begotten MIND*, reflex or generated *WISDOM*, and as loving or *WILLING* himself.

They are **PERSONALITIES**, when consider'd abstractedly; that is, *separately*, from the *Divine Essence* or *Godhead*: they are *Persons*, when consider'd concretely, that is, *together with the Divine Essence*;

sence; each of them so consider'd, is no longer a mere *Personality*, but a *Person*; a *Person living, intelligent, really existing*. [Note, In my *four Letters* concerning the Trinity, printed *Anno 1701*. to these last words of this Paragraph, a *Person living, intelligent, really existing*; by the liberality of the Press, there are also added these words, *and not subsisting only*, which were never intended by me, and indeed destroy the Sense; tho (I see) some have taken them as implying some great Depth.]

The **DIVINE ESSENCE**, or **SUBSTANCE**, is the Godhead, or *God*; with all *Divine Attributes and Perfections*.

The **TRINITY** is the same *Divine Essence*, as distinguished by its three *Properties or Relations*, that have been before fully described.

But we may note farther that, of these *Terms*, some are more generally used, and are warranted by greater *Authorities*, than the rest are: such are the *Terms*, **MODES**, **PROPERTIES**, and **PERSONS**; therefore I will speak more particularly of them.

MODE is a *Term* more antient than any of the rest, and also more *proper*; it is older than the *Term TRINITY* it self; it was used by *Justin Martyr* within less than 140 Years after our Saviour. His words are, *μία ὑπόστασις, τρεῖς ἕν ὑπάρξεως τρόποις*, *One Substance or ESSENCE, three MODES of Existing*. 'Tis used also by *J. Damascen*, the first of the *Fathers* that collected together the scatter'd and confus'd parts of *Theology* into a regular *System* or *Body*; his words are, *Ἐπι τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος, ὑπόστασις ἓν ὁ ἀνάρχος τρόπος τῆς αἰδίου ὑπάρξεως*; "In the Holy Trinity, a Person is an Eternal **MODE** or manner of existing." 'Tis also the most common *Term* of the *Divines* of the middle Ages, called the *Scholasticks*, or *School-Doctors*. What

is meant by it, in these Questions, was intimated before, when we said; "The Divine Persons are called *Modes*, as by occasion of them, God is considered as existing after three Modes or *Manners*; namely, as un-begotten MIND, as generated and reflex WISDOM, and as loving or WILLING himself. 'Tis a frivolous Exception that *Maccovius* makes to this Term, when he says; 'Tis but improperly used of the Divine Persons, for a Mode is always *posterior* to that of which it is the Mode; which we must not say of the *Divine Persons*, in respect of the *Divine Essence* or God. For the Affections of Being that we call Modes, are often *connate* to the Beings of which they are the Modes: And in particular 'tis evident in the case before us, that INTELLECT SELF-KNOWLEDG SELF-COMPLACENCE are such Modes of Divinity, as are *Co-eternal* to it; and therefore *Damascen* (before-cited) calls them *τρόποι ἀνάγκη προαιώνια* *pre-eternal Modes*.

PROPERTIES is much used by the *Greek Fathers*; and it signifies here much the same, as in common Speech: for INTELLECT SELF-KNOWLEDG SELF-COMPLACENCE are *Properties* of God, in such sense as *Rationality* and *Risibility* are said to be *Properties* of Man; they are not the *Essence* of Man, but are *natural and inseparable Adjuncts* of his *Essence*, and thereby distinguished from *Accidents*. That which has made this word the more authentick, is the *Programma* of the Emperor *Justin*, to which all the Churches of the Orient (tho not especially thereto required) gave their Assent; as *Evagrius* has informed us, *Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 4.* In this *Programma* it is said; "We adore the Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity: an Unity, as to ESSENCE or GODHEAD; a Trinity, as to PRO-

PERTIES or PERSONS. In the Greek,

τριάδα ἢ κατὰ τὰς ἰδιότητας ἢ κατὰ πρόσωπα.

Mr. Calvin, after a judicious and learned Dissertation concerning the *Holy Trinity*, and the Term *Persons*, concludes, and summeth up all in these words: "But if any are so nice, that after all they will not allow the word *Persons*, yet do what they can, they must confess that when we say *One*, we mean the *Substance*: when we say *Three*, we intend that in the Divine Essence or Substance there are *Three Properties*. Which being sincerely acknowledged by any, we will not litigate with them. *Instit.* c. 6. S. 25. p. 179. *Genev.* 1550."

But *PERSONS* is now more commonly, and almost only, used. St. *Austin* saith of it, "We use the Term *Persons*, not because we find it in Scripture; but because the Scriptures do not contradict it; and by a kind of necessity, as labouring under want of words. *de Trin.* l. 7. c. 10. p. 200."

As the *Latins* did not at first like the Term *Hypostasis*, so the *Greeks* were dissatisfied with *Prosopon*, or *Person*: but they came to an Agreement, by fixing a determinate sense on those very ambiguous words; the *Latins* were content with *Hypostasis*, and the *Greeks* with *Prosopon*, as both are interpreted by *Justin Martyr's* *πρόσωπον καὶ ἰδιότης*, a *MODE* or *manner* of existing.

There was never any thing so truly said, or so well established; but one *Sciolist* or other would be excepting to it, either out of Vanity, or on Mistake and Ignorance: accordingly this Faith of the Church, has been attacked by divers Objections; some of them indeed from otherways Learned Men, but the most from such as were ignorant. I shall mention only the Objections that are considerable; and from able Persons, or Parties.

SENCE OF GODHEAD IN THREE PERSONS OF

Of some Objections.

Of this sort I account the Author of the *Intellectual System*, Dr. Ralph Cudworth, who revived the Errors of *Valentinus Gentilis*, concerning the Trinity. He makes the Three Divine Persons to be *distinct Substances* in number, and only the Father to be truly and properly *God*, or Almighty, and All-knowing; the other two Persons to be *subordinate* to the Father in Power and Authority, and *wholly dependent* on him. Therefore he could not endure the *Doctrine of the Schools* (which is indeed the *Doctrine of the Catholick Church*) concerning the Trinity. He complements us in a very extraordinary manner, on our Explication of that Article; he saith, “The *Scholastick Trinity* is a pure *Jargon*, the Philosophy of *Gotham*: a Trinity that falls not under Human Conception, and which cannot be in Nature. A *phantastick Trinity*, of merely *nominal Persons*; Persons only in name, not in reality. It was invented by *P. Lambard*, Father of the *School-Doctors*, and Bishop of *Paris*; and never was authorized by any publick Authority, except at the Council of *Lateran*, in the Year 1215.

I was surpriz'd I confess, that Dr. *Cudworth* should presume to say; the *Catholick Faith*, or as he calls it the *Scholastick Trinity*, is a Novelty, devis'd by the Bishop of *Paris*; and which hath no Warrant, but the Council of the *Lateran*. We quoted before, the Words of *Justin Martyr*, scarce 140 Years after our Saviour; *one ESSENCE, three MODES of Existing*; and the Definition of *J. Damascen*, *a Person in the Holy Trinity is a MODE or Manner of existing*; which, tho in so few words, implies the *whole Doctrine of the Schools* concerning the Trinity. The *Programma*

also,

16 *An Explication of the Catholick Doctrine*

also, receiv'd by all the *Greek Churches*, is about 600 Years older than *P. Lombard Bishop of Paris*.

As for the *Latin Church*, *St. Austin* has written 15 Books of the *Trinity*; the Sum and Substance of them all, is only this; "*Mens, Notitia, Amor,*" (MIND, WISDOM, LOVE,) are the three Persons of the Holy Trinity: the Blessed Trinity is God, considered as original WISDOM, and as KNOWING and WILLING Himself. This was followed by the *School-Doctors*, and middle Ages; in particular, by the General Councils of *Lateran*, and *Lyons*, and by the Councils of *Toledo*. Those Councils, as well in their Confessions as Canons, very carefully adhere to the Doctrine of *St. Austin*, and of the *Schools* concerning the Trinity.

Of the modern *Jargonists*, I shall mention only *Mr. Calvin*. He is a perfect Disciple of *St. Austin*; as well in this, as in other Articles of Religion: in the 6th Chapter of his *Institutions*, *Genev. 1550*. he saith. "Non est tamen inanis vel supervacua ordinis observatio; dum primus recensetur Pater; deinde ex eo Filius, postea ex utroque Spiritus. Nam & Mens uniuscujusque eò sponte inclinatur, ut primo DEUM consideret, deinde emergentem ex eo SAPIENTIAM; tum postremo Virtutem, quã consilii sui decreta exequitur: qua ratione duntaxat à Patre existere dicitur Filius; à Patre simul & Filio Spiritus. In short, thus; "'Tis even natural to conceive, first GOD, next his Reflex WISDOM; then his POWER, by which he executes his Counsels and Will; on which account only we say, the Son is of the Father, and the Holy Spirit of both. But note here that, *Mr. Calvin*, in his reciting the Order of the Divine Persons, calls only the Father, GOD; but he did this only by way of Appropriation, as they speak. That is, not as if the second and third

third Persons were not also *God*, and equally so with the First; but on the account that the *Father* is *Fons Deitatis*, as the *Antients* spoke, *the Fountain and Cause of the other two Persons*; as is before described. And this way of speaking of the *Father*, is not peculiar to Mr. *Calvin*; other Orthodox Writers, and the Scriptures themselves, sometimes use it, as hath been observed too by others, who have written on these Questions.

The Authority of the *Lateran Council* is not so light, as Dr. *Cudworth* would intimate; much less is this the only Council that confirms the Exposition of the Holy Trinity, now generally received. The Council of the *Lateran*, in the Year 1215. consisted of LXX Metropolitans, CCCC Bishops, other Fathers more than DCCC; the Ambassadors of the *Roman* and *Greek* Emperors, of the Kings of *England*, *Spain*, *France*, *Jerusalem*, and *Cyprus*. They followed the preceding Councils, in accounting for the Mystery of the Trinity; and have been expressly approv'd by all the *Subsequent Councils*.

Dr. *Cudworth*, in opposition to that Council, describes the Divine Persons to be *Nóes*, MINDS; and Πνεύματα, SPIRITS: but neither he, nor Dr. *Pain*, could alledg so much as one *Council* or *Father*, that ever so spoke. So little reason had they, to accuse the *Catholick Doctrine*, as *Novel*; or not warranted by a sufficient Number of good Authorities.

In short, the *Gothamites* and *Fargonists* defend themselves very well against this first Objection; and retort it, on their Opposers.

But others have rais'd another *Exception*, to the *Doctrine* of the Church; before described. They say; by this Account, not only *GOD*, but every other intelligent Being, shall be three Persons: for every Angel, and every Man, has these three *Modes*, *Properties*, or whatever else you will call them; *Mind* or original *WISDOM*, reflex or generated *KNOW-*
C LEDG;

LEDG, and LOVE towards it self. If these internal Distinctions do not make a Man, or an Angel, to be *three Persons*; or introduce the *Relations* of *Father, Son, and Spirit*: why should it be said, they are *three Persons*, or introduce *three Relations*, in God? This is an Objection of the *Unitarians*; much insisted on by a *Polander*, who undertook to answer *B. Keckerman*, Professor at *Dantzick*; and by *M. Ruarus* in his Letters to (the Learned *Minim*) *Marinus Mersennus*. The *Metaphysicians*, and particularly, our Countryman *Mr. Serjeant*, in his *Appendix* to his *Transnatural Philosophy*, answer here with many Subtleties and Finenesses; from the *Metaphysical School*: in my Opinion, the Catholick Faith hath no need of them; and the true Answer is this. The Objectors have not considered that, **PERSONS** and **RELATIONS**, when used of God, are *scientifical Terms*; and therefore have a peculiar meaning in *Theology*, altogether different from their Intendment in familiar Speech. There is no Science or Art; whether Sacred or Civil, whether Learned or Mechanical; but has its *Terms* that are *peculiar* to itself only: which *Terms* are *Words*, all of them borrowed, from common and familiar Speech; but used by the *Art*, in quite another Sense; a Sense peculiar to the Science or Art. Therefore we are not to be surprized at it, that **PERSON**, in *common Speech* and use, is a *particular Being*, distinct from all other Beings; and that hath *sundry Properties or Modes* belonging to it: but in the *Science of Theology*, when we speak of God, it is only a *Mode or Property*; as such *Mode* is considered together with the *Divine Essence, Godhead, or God*. The *Terms* of Sciences and Arts are most commonly *Arbitrary*; we are not to demand a *Reason* of them: 'tis sufficient that, they are explained to us; and that when we know what is intended by them, we find our selves instructed in something that is either use-
ful,

ful, or curious. Notwithstanding, in the choice of Terms, we sometimes affect some sort of Analogy; some Degree of *Likeness*, between the things: that is, the thing intended by the Word, as it is a *scientific Term*; and the thing intended by it, in ordinary Use and Speech. And hence, because SELF-KNOWLEDG, and SELF-COMPLACENCE, are generated by MIND; therefore in *Theology*, these Acts and Properties have the Names of *Father, Son, and Spirit proceeding from both*: and for the same Reason they are called RELATIONS. And again, because by *Person* in ordinary Speech we mean a particular *Intelligent Being*, distinguished from all other Beings, by some peculiar Property or Mode; therefore the God-head, or God, as considered to *three* different and *discretive* Modes or Properties, is considered as (or is named) *three Persons*. And we appropriate to God this way of speaking; we extend it not to Creatures, whether Angels or Men; *out of Reverence to the Divinity*: and *because* these Properties are so much more excellent and perfect in God, than in whatsoever Creatures; *that the same Name agreeth not to them*. And lastly because, as the Fathers express themselves in this Matter, WISDOM and SELF-COMPLACENCE in God are *Permanent*; and always in *Act*: while ours is *transient*, and passes away, dying in the very Act; of which, more hereafter. And it should seem, this Account must necessarily be admitted, by all the Orthodox; who acknowledg no other but a *modal Distinction* in God. It was a Remark, worthy of his Learning and Judgment, that Dr. *Edward Stillingfleet*, late Bishop of *Worcester*, makes in his Preface to his *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*. “When we consider, saith the Bishop, a Divine
 “Essence; there can be no *Distinction* conceived in
 “it, but by *different MODES* of subsisting; or
 “what is the same, *RELATIVE PRO-*

“ P E R T I E S in the same Divine Essence. *Prof.*
p. 16.

There is yet this *farther Scruple*. It is not very obvious, how reflex or *generated WISDOM* can be said to be *incarnate*: or how, if the *Son* and *Spirit* are only the SELF-KNOWLEDG and SELF-LOVE of God, they can be *invocated* in such a *Form* as this: “ O God the SON have mercy upon us
“ miserable Sinners; O God the HOLY GHOST
“ have mercy upon us miserable Sinners. Nay, and the words, *O God the FATHER have mercy upon us miserable Sinners*, will be as improper; for the *Father*, in this Hypothesis, is not a *distinct Being*; the *Father*, as the first Person of the Trinity, is no more but *unbegotten WISDOM*. Farther, the Expressions in the *Nicene Creed*, and divers in the Holy Scripture, attribute such Properties and Acts to the Divine Persons, as plainly suppose them to be *Beings* and *Spirits*: It seems, they cannot be interpreted (unforcedly and naturally) of a mere SELF-KNOWLEDG, SELF-LOVE, or Original WISDOM of God.

This is the great Objection of the *Tricheists*; or of those that hold, the Persons of the Trinity are, so many infinite *Spirits, Minds, and Beings*: It is solely grounded, on a misapprehension of the Churches Meaning, and Doctrine.

For *first*, the Church doth not say that, mere SELF-KNOWLEDG (or generated WISDOM) was Incarnate; but this Property, “ as taken with,
“ or as it comprises the Divine Essence, Godhead,
“ or God, with all his Perfections and Attributes,
“ was Incarnate. Which is warranted by divers (clear) Texts; as, Col. 2. 9. *In him [Christ Jesus] dwelleth the Fulness of the Godhead.* Col. 2. 3. *In whom [the Lord Christ] are all the Treasures of WISDOM and KNOWLEDG.* 1 Cor. 1. 24.

We preach Christ, the Power of God, and the WISDOM of God. Rev. 19. 13. *His Name is called* (ὁ Λόγος τῆς Θεῆς) *the WISDOM of God.* These Texts amount to this, “The Fulness of the GOD-HEAD in the Person of the WISDOM, was Incarnate in the Humanity of Christ.

It is hard indeed to apprehend, how the Divinity (or God) should be incarnate in the Person only of the *Logos*, or WISDOM; while the other two Divine Persons were not Incarnate: and the Answers, usually made, methinks, are not very satisfactory. Some Learned Men have said, not the Λόγος (WORD or WISDOM) only was Incarnate, but *the whole Trinity*: and that, otherways we cannot say, *God was Incarnate*; for GOD implies the whole Trinity. Others have answered; there lies the same Difficulty against the *Tritheistic Hypothesis*: for if there are *three infinite Spirits*, who yet are all but *one God*; what was *incarnate* could not (in this Hypothesis) be *perfect God*, if only one of those *Spirits* was Incarnate: we cannot say, *God was Incarnate*, if only one *Spirit* of the Trinity (or God) was Incarnate. Let the Objectors therefore clear their own Explication from this Exception; and at the same time they will clear ours.

I should chuse to say, We are not concerned in this Difficulty, because we say only, *God was Incarnate*, and the Divine *Wisdom* Incarnate: We go no farther; we affirm nothing in this matter of the Incarnation, concerning the other two Persons. We speak of the Incarnation no farther than it is revealed; that GOD, *perfect GOD*, in the Person of the WISDOM, was Incarnate: this is intelligible, it hath nothing of difficulty to our Apprehensions. He that is disposed, to ask hereupon; Can *God* be Incarnate, and not the whole *Trinity*, which is God; *the Fulness of the Godhead*, and not *all the Persons* of the Godhead? Such a one is too curious,

and importunate; he puts Questions that cannot well (it may be) be answered, without our affirming or denying beyond what hath been revealed by God, or is required by the Catholick Church to be believed. Yet to such a one we may say; It is evident that, *perfect* God can be communicated; when the *whole* of God is not communicated. For God being *perfect* God, as was before observed, in whatsoever portion of Space; in the *least* imaginable Extension, no less than in the whole Immensity of his Essence; He can therefore, tho' *Infinite*, communicate himself *perfectly*, to the finite Humanity of Christ, as to Divine Perfections; tho' he do not communicate himself *wholly*, as to the *Omni-presence and Infinity of his Substance or Essence*. Therefore if something like to this hath also happen'd in the Incarnation of the WISDOM only, while the other two Persons were not Incarnate: It implies no Contradiction; nay it seems sufficiently illustrated by the other, that is to say, so far illustrated or cleared, that we need not to hesitate at it.

The Prayer, "O God the *Father*, O God the *Son*, O God the *Holy Ghost*, have mercy upon us" miserable Sinners, hath been disliked by divers Learned Men, in particular by Mr. *Calvin*: But we must interpret the Church's *Prayers*, by her known *Doctrine*. The Church doth not intend, cannot intend, by that Form; to acknowledg more Divine Objects of Worship than one only; for she professeth the contrary. She intends only therefore here, "to invoke *God*, by, or *under*, the several *Distinctions*, which she acknowledgeth to be in him; and by which she endeavours more perfectly to apprehend him. But these *Distinctions*; tho' for good Reasons named *Persons*, and *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit*; are understood by her as only the different *M O D E S* of the Divine Existence, or Existence of God: and therefore as often as they occur

occur in the Prayers, they are to be taken in the *Theological* Sense, not in the Familiar and Vulgar. But to this Exception, I shall have occasion to speak more fully hereafter.

As to some Expressions in the *Creeds*, and Holy Scriptures. Many things are said of our Saviour in the Scriptures and Creeds, which not only suppose him to have been *pre-existent to the World*; but to be the *Maker*, and *Governor* of it. The Catholick Church understands them, as spoken of his *Person*; but of his *Person*, only in respect of the *inhabiting Divinity*: And she believes that, not the generated WISDOM only, but *GOD in the Person of the WISDOM or SON*, was Incarnate. These two Keys open all the Difficulties of any Expressions in the Church Creeds and Holy Scriptures; whether concerning the WISDOM, WORD, or SON, or concerning our *Lord Christ as he is God and Man*.

Concerning the *Holy Spirit*, where-ever such Attributions are given to him, as imply him to be an actual distinct BEING, MIND, or SPIRIT: They are spoken of him, either by a *Prosopopeia*; or as the *Person* of the *Spirit* includeth, in its *complete* Notion, the Divinity, Godhead, or *God*; and are not spoken of his *Personality* only, which is no more but Divine LOVE, or Divine SELF-COMPLACENCE. *And the same is to be understood of the other two Persons.*

And now, upon review of the whole Explication, I have given of these Articles; I have but this farther to add. First, I will be thankful to any that shall inform me, on good grounds, wherein the Exposition here given, is *more or less*, or *otherways*, than the usual Doctrine of the Church?

Next, I think, nothing hath been said, but what is obvious enough to any ordinary Capacity; using such heed, as is required to the understanding and

comprehending the *Mystery* of any other Art or Science. There is no Science or Art, but must have an intent Application of the Mind of the Learner, or he shall never comprehend it: The Institution in Arts and Sciences, in the very *meanest* of them, must be *diligently* and *often* considered; or a Man shall never be an *Adept*, or Master of his Art. Therefore, if also in Divinity or Religion, some Articles must be heard or read with a close Observation, to apprehend them rightly, fully, and distinctly; if they must be read, it may be, over and over again: Let us be content with some Study, in a Matter of so high a Nature, and so great Concernment to us. I think however, it were well, if the Articles of the Holy Trinity, and the Incarnation, were proposed to our People, and even to all Learners, in a *plainer* and *shorter* manner than is usually done: for instance, in some such Form as this.

“ There is one Eternal BEING, one Infinite
 “ SPIRIT; sole CREATOR of all things.
 “ In the Unity of this Godhead, we are to consider this following Distinction; Eternal MIND,
 “ Divine SELF-KNOWLEDG *generated by Mind*,
 “ Divine SELF-COMPLACENCE necessarily *proceeding*
 “ *from both*. Of these *the first* is called
 “ the FATHER, as being manifestly the sole Origin and Cause of the Second; *the second* is called the SON, as being the *Generation* and Offspring of Eternal Intellect or *Mind*; *the third*, as the joint Act, and (as it were) *Spiration* of the two former, is fitly called the SPIRIT. They are
 “ PERSONS; not as an Angel, or a Man, is a
 “ Person: But as each of them is understood with,
 “ or compriseth the Divine Nature; that is to say,
 “ *as it comprehendeth, and is comprehended by this*
 “ Word GOD. Concerning our Saviour, we are
 “ not to think of him as a mere Man; he is GOD-
 “ MAN.

“ MAN. *Man*, in respect of his reasonable Soul,
 “ and human Body; *God*, in respect of the indwel-
 “ ling Divinity. Which is not to be understood only
 “ of an occasional (*assisting*) Indwelling, such as
 “ that in the old or later Prophets: But of such an
 “ Union of the Humanity to the Divinity, that the
 “ former is *always* under the Conduct and Illumina-
 “ tion of the other; and the Divinity doth *con-*
 “ *stantly* exert the Divine Attributes and Perfecti-
 “ ons *in*, and *by* the Human Nature. What was
 “ thus Incarnate, was *perfect God*, in respect of *Di-*
 “ *vine Perfections*: It was not however, if we may
 “ so speak, the *whole* of God, in respect of *Persons*.
 “ For the Divinity, or God, communicated him-
 “ self (in the manner before said) to the Humani-
 “ ty of Christ; only in the Person of the genera-
 “ ted WISDOM, or SON; not in the Persons of
 “ the FATHER, and SPIRIT. Which hath
 “ more of Difficulty, and less of Necessity, to
 “ comprehend the *manner* of it; than to be (ordi-
 “ narily) requisite for us to inquire into it.

Such an Exposition (or Declaration) of the
 Faith, as is this, would prevent all the (numerous
 and dark) Questions and Disputes of the *Schools*
 concerning these Articles; and satisfy the *Dissenters*
 from the Churches Doctrine: as well as be a true
 and *just* representation of what is necessary to be
 believed and affirmed; either because it is revealed
 in Holy Scripture, or is discovered by Reason, or
 defined by the Catholick Church. As it is certain,
 this is all that the Church intends; so it would hap-
 pily supersede and nullify a vast number of Logical
 and Metaphysical *Terms* and *Distinctions*; besides the
 many (dangerous and captious) *Questions* that oc-
 cur in the Writings of the *Scholastics*, and other *Po-*
lemical Writers; which will clearly appear to any
 that shall, with judgment and heed, read the *Differ-*
tation

tion added to these Papers. But it will be proper to say something more particularly, of the *Socinians*; and to them: because many think, and themselves also for the most part, that they have a great Controversy with the Catholick Church on these Articles; while in truth the Dissent and Controversy (on both sides) is only from a misapprehension of one anothers Sense and Meaning. The last, and one of the most considerable Writers of the *Socinians*, is *Guil. Vorstius*, in his *Bilibra*: Let us examine and discuss this Book.

Of the Socinians, and the Bilibra of Guil. Vorstius.

In this Book, *Vorstius* has published his Thoughts on the Question, *What the Synagogue believes concerning God, and the Messias*; that is, whether the Jews know (and acknowledg) any thing of the *Holy Trinity*, and the *Divinity of the Messias*? His Book is (chiefly) in answer to Mr. *Voisin*, a Learned *Jesuit*; who maintains that the *Jews* believe, at least have (generally) believed a Trinity of Divine Persons, and that the *Messias* is to be *God* as well as *Man*, or *God incarnate*: *Vorstius* denies both these. He had the Advantage of his *Antagonists*, *Voisin* and *Rittangel*, as to the Subject in question; whether any *Jews*, who are so by Religion, believe these Christian Articles: and being a Learned *Rabbinist*, he not only answered, and exposed, his two Opposers; but prevented also (for the most part) what the Author of the *Judgment of the Jewish Church* has (since) farther objected.

But in the *Bilibra*, *Vorstius* not only proves that; no *Jew* by Religion, ever owned a Trinity of Divine Persons, or that the *Messias* is *God*; but he also openly and directly opposes the Truth of those Articles.

ticles. He is so much the more to blame; because the *Jesuit*, to whom he replies, had rightly stated these Doctrines. The *Jesuit* cites divers *Fathers and Councils*, who explain the Divine Trinity by *Intellect*, or original WISDOM; the Word, or reflex WISDOM; and Will, or Divine LOVE. He observes, *Knowledg*, and WISDOM being *the Product* of MIND, is fitly called the SON; and LOVE as it is the *Spiration* of WISDOM and INTELLECT, is properly named the SPIRIT. One of his clearest Authorities, is the *Canon* of a Council of *Toledo*, which says; "Let MIND be put as the Person of *the Father*; then the *Word* (or WISDOM) *issuing* from MIND will be understood to be the SON; as by the WILL, *proceeding* from MIND and WISDOM, is meant the *Spirit*. He says farther, as this is the Trinity believed in the Catholick Church; one may find the same Notions among the *Jews*. But the *Jewish* Books that he alledges; he either mistook, or wrested their meaning. And besides they are partly spurious (pseudepigraphal) Books; and partly have talked in such an obscure or equivocal Cant, mixed with so many absurd Fables, that neither can any certain Sense be made of the most part of what they say; nor can they be considered at best, but only as *Visionaries* and *Enthusiasts*.

Vorstius could not endure this fooling; and being an *Anti-Trinitarian*, makes what advantage he can of *Voisin's* trifling and mistakes. He often falls foul on the Explication of the Trinity, by *Voisin*; he exclaims against it, as a mere *rational* Trinity; a Trinity (*saieth* he) of *Logical* Notions, not of *Physical* or *real* Persons. To the Authorities of *Councils*, and *Fathers*, cited by *Voisin*, he answers. "Indeed many of the Antients greatly pleased themselves, with those Subtleties; *Mind*, reflex *Wisdom*, and the *Spiration* of *Love*: but the Holy Scriptures have
" not

“ not a word of any such Trinity. That is, instead of being aware of what the *Jesuit* had proved by so many Authorities, that the Trinity believed in the Catholick Church, is only a *Modal Distinction* in the Divine Nature; and is as evident and certain in *Philosophy*, as it can be made by the most express *Revelation*: consequently that, it is not the Trinity of the Church; but of *Philoponus, Joachin, Gentilis*, and such others; that *He* and his *Friends* meant to oppose. I say, not being sensible, as he ought to have been, of his *own* and *Parties* mistake of the *Churches* Doctrine: he takes notice only of the *Jesuits* (unlucky) overdoing in the Case; his false and impertinent pretence and endeavour, to find the mystery of the Trinity in the *Kabbalistical* and *Allegorical* Books of some *Jews*. We grant, *Vorstius* had here a sufficient Advantage: but it had become so learned and able a Person, rather to have observed the *Jesuit's* true Explication of the Trinity; and thereupon have urged him with it, that there is no difference in the *Ideas* that the *Church* and the *Unitarians* have of the Unity of God; than to throw so much Salt upon him, for his overcurious and partial Discussion of the *Jewish* Books, in search of a Doctrine, without which the true Unity of God is not rightly explained or understood.

But he seeks to cramp us, by saying; “ The Holy Scriptures mention no such Trinity, as original WISDOM, reflex WISDOM, and Divine LOVE. First, they mention no other. The Church never pretended, to have learned from *Holy Scripture*, or from the *Antients*, any other than a *Modal Distinction* in God. Which she expresses by the Terms TRINITY, and PERSONS; and explains those Terms, as has been already declared.

Next, the Exception is frivolous and impertinent; in this place. For the Controversy between him

him and *Voisin* was not, concerning the Proofs of the Trinity from Holy Scripture: which, we shall grant, our ordinary Controversial Writers have so mistaken, as to give occasion to People to misunderstand the Doctrine and Faith of the Church: but their Debate was, concerning the Trinity itself; namely whether there be not such a Distinction in the Divine Nature, or God, as has been before described; and whether some of the Jews have not owned it? That there is such a distinction in the Deity, neither *Vorstius*, nor his Party, will think fit to deny: why then do they litigate about mere Terms, *Trinity, Persons, Hypostatical Union*; which the Church professes, not to use in the vulgar Sense, but in a *Scientific* and *Theological*.

But to open the Question between the Church and the *Unitarians*, to the capacity of every body; and to make it undeniable to these Gentlemen of the *Unitarian* Persuasion, that there is not the least Reason to divide from the Church. They may observe that, as there are two very different Significations of the Term *Persons*; the *Theological*, and the *Vulgar*: so in speaking of God we sometimes call him a *Person*, sometimes *three Persons*. When we speak of God, with exactness; that is, when we speak of him, *as he is in himself*; we cannot but own, he is *three such Persons*, as the *Catholick Church* teaches: that is, the modal Distinction of *original* and *reflex WISDOM*, and of *Divine Love* or *SELF-COMPLACENCE*, are so certainly in his Nature; that without them, he should neither be *happy* nor *God*. But when we consider him, only as a *particular Intelligent Being*, and as *distinct from any other particular Intelligent Being*, or *Beings*; which is the *vulgar* Acceptation of the Word *Person*: we generally call him a *Person*. Thus we say, for Instance; some Irregularities are Sins against the *Laws* of God: but others are Sins, against his *Person*; as *Blasphemy, Perjury* and some more;

more; such Wickednesses are Sins against the very *Person* of God, considered as *this* particular Being. In like manner, the most learned Divines of the *Moderns* and *Antients* are sometimes wont to say; the Angels that appeared during the Old-Testament Oeconomy, had sometimes the Names of *Jehovah* and *God* given to them, because they represented his *Person*, and spake in his *Name*. In this Sense of the word *Person*, the Church of *England*, even in her Translations of Holy Scripture, call God a *Person*; namely, in the Texts that speak of him, as a particular (*Intelligent*) *Being*, and as distinct from some other, or all other particular *Beings*. Job 13. 7, 8. *Will ye speak wickedly for God, will ye talk deceitfully for him, will ye accept HIS PERSON?* Heb. 1. 1, 2, 3. *GOD, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times past to the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last times spoken to us by his SON; — who being the brightness of his (God's) Glory, and the express Image of his (God's) PERSON; — when by himself he had purged our Sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.* In the first Text, God is intended to be distinguished from the *Persons* whom he at any time judgeth; in the other, from the *Lord Christ* considered as our *High-Priest* or *Intercessor* with God. There is no Learned Divine, but is aware of this, and therefore all such do sometimes, as well in writing as preaching, say *the Person* of God: namely, when they speak of God, not according to the *internal* Perfection of his Nature; but according to some *external* Relation, to other *Intelligent Beings*; that is, as distinguished from them, or as opposed to them, or some such like.

I do not wonder, *F. Socinus* was not aware of this; as having no other but *Grammatical* Learning, not the least tincture of *Academical*, much less of *Theological*: But *Vorstius* ought to have been aware of

of it. Because *Socinus* knew not, what the Church intends by *Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, when she uses them of God; therefore he denied, there are three Persons of God, or three Divine Persons: And because he mistook what is meant by *Incarnation, Hypostatical Union*, and such-like, when he heard of them in Sermons; therefore he denied the Divinity of our Saviour. I shall make this undeniable from the *Raccovian Catechism*, which is the *Socinian System* of Divinity; contrived and compiled originally by *Socinus, Smalcius, and Moscorovius*, at *Raccou* in *Poland*; and often re-printed, with the Notes and Improvements of all the Great Men of that Way; and last of all by *B.W.* (that is, *Benedict Wiffowatius*) at *Stawropolis*, (that is, *Amsterdam*) in the Year 1680. When this *Catechism* would prove that, there is but one Person of God; What is their Argument, or (as they call it) *Demonstration*? Take it, in their own words: *Essentia Divina una est, non Specie, sed numero: quapropter plures numero Personæ in eâ esse non possunt; cum Persona nihil aliud sit, nisi Essentia individua intelligens.* In *English* thus; “The Essence of God is but one: and there can be but one Person of God; because a Person is as much as to say, one Intelligent Essence. *Catech. Racc. p. 26.* This is their *Demonstration*, to prove that, there is but one Divine Person; or one Person of God: But they will never be able to produce one *Catholick Writer*, that ever said; *God is three Persons*, in this Sense of three Persons, *i. e. three Intelligent Essences.* The *Catholick Church* ever owned that, in this respect God is but one Person; she ever taught, he is but one Intelligent Essence: She declares it to be *Heresy, and Tritheism*, to affirm three (*infinite*) Intelligent Essences, she believeth but one such Essence; consequently that, in that regard God is but one Person.

Let these Gentlemen know therefore, their Patriarch hath misinformed them, concerning the Churches Doctrine: He has engaged 'em, to oppose a Trinity that was never held in the Church; and to impugn his own (unlearned) *Mistakes*, as the proper Errors of the Catholick Church.

'Tis too certain that, *Socinus* had never read one Theological Book, when he first set up for an *Heresiarch*. The Method of Education and Study, in his time, was this; they first learned Grammar, and the Classical Authors: they went then from the *School* to some *University*, where they read first *Logick*, then *Ethicks* and *Physicks*, then *Mathematicks* and *Astronomy*: This qualified them for an *Academical Degree*; which Degree entred them on the study of *Medicine*, *Law*, or *Divinity*. *Socinus* began no part of the *Academical Learning*: He knew nothing of the very *first* part of it, *Logic*, till the latter part of his Life; as his Books show, and as *himself* confesses. It is no wonder therefore that, when he heard in the *Church-Confessions*, and *Liturgies*, of three *Divine Persons*, of *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit*; of *Incarnation*, *Hypostatical Union*, and such-like; he took them, as 'tis to be feared the Unlearned too commonly do *now*, in the familiar and *vulgar* Sense.

He imagined three *such* Persons, as three *Men*, or three *Angels* are; that is to say, Persons that are *essentially distinct*, and not *modally* only. When he heard of *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit* distinct from both; he conceited a *physical* and natural Generation, or that they are distinct *Beings*, and distinct *Spirits*. He took *Incarnation*, and *Hypostatical Union*, as implying that; the *whole* of God was incarnate, and the *Humanity* of Christ was *desied*: The first, the Heresy of the *Patripassians*; the other, of *Eucybes*. Because he was not aware, *perfect* God may be incarnate;

nate; when the *whole* of God is not. And because he knew not that, we say indeed the Lord Christ is *true God*, Creator, and from all Eternity; and we say this, of *his Person*: But of his Person, not as Man; but in respect only of the indwelling *Divinity*, or *God in him*.

Briefly, I say; had *Socinus* been qualified by any Theological, or Academical Learning; he was a Man too discerning to have opposed the *Doctrin*e of the Church, or have controverted the *Terms* she uses: but because *Ovid's Epistles*, *Tully's Offices*, and a few Pages of *Hesiod* and *Homer*, were the whole Extent of his Learning; he first mistook the Church, and then opposed her. This provoked *A. Rivet*, Professor at *Leyden*, to say of him; *Ego in isto homine nihil video, prater imperitiam, omnia ignorandi; & audaciam, omnia negandi.*

Some of the most Learned of *Socinus* his Followers, have known that the Church doth not intend three *such* Persons in God, as are *three distinct Essences*; which is the Trinity they oppose. Therefore to excuse themselves, and *Socinus*, they have said that; the *true* meaning of the word *Person*, in common and familiar Speech, is, *one Intelligent Essence, distinct and diverse from all other particular (Intelligent) Essences*: And that therefore, if indeed the Church means not, there are three distinct *Essences* of God; neither ought she to say, there are three *Persons* of God. In short, she *giveth* the Scandal, by her *unproper* Language.

To this, I answer: If the Gentlemen of this Way, will not allow us to use any Terms in Theology, that are borrowed from familiar and vulgar Speech; and to give to them such signification, as is proper to declare the Nature of the Subject of which we treat: they deny to us what is yielded to all other Sciences and Arts, whether Liberal or Mechanical,

without any contradiction. For the Sciences adopt the Words of familiar Speech, and appropriate them to their Mysteries; in a Sense that shall make the Mystery more intelligible, without wholly or intirely stripping the Word or Term of its primitive or vulgar Signification. Why do we quarrel with the Church about *Persons*, and other Terms; because not used in Theology, as in vulgar Speech; when we are content that, all other Sciences use that liberty? Why, for instance, are not large Volumes written also against the Logicians, or the Metaphysicians; for their *Genus*, *Species*, *Differentia*, *Proprium*, and *Accidens*: which those Gentlemen have borrowed from the (*Roman*) Classical Authors, and from common Speech; but have clothed them with a *new* Sense, utterly different from their *vulgar* meaning? In *Latin* Authors, *Genus* is the Family, or *Linage* of any Person; *Species* is the Form, Physnomy, or *shape* of a thing; *Differentia*, on the contrary, is the *dissimilitude* of Persons or Things; *Proprium* is a Man's *own*, in opposition to things *borrowed* or *stolen*; *Accidens* is any *Casualty*, good or bad, that happens to any Persons. But when these words are used, as *Terms* in their Science or Art, by the Metaphysicians, or the Logicians; Bless us, how do *Mysticks* transform them? *Genus*, according to them, is not the *Linage* or Pedigree; but is, as BEING to *Substance* and *Accident*, and as SUBSTANCE to *Spirit* and *Bodies*. *Species* is not the Form, *Shape*, or *Phyz*; but is, as MAN to *Peter* and *James*, or as the specifick *general* Nature of *Lion* and *Bear* to *particular* Lions and Bears. *Differentia* is not, as among the *Vulgar*, the external *Dissimilitude* of things; but the *particular* *Modality* of each Individual in the several specifick Natures, namely the Angelical, the Human, and that of Mutes. *Proprium* is by no means a Man's *own* Goods and Chat-

tels ; but is, as *Risibility* in a Man, a Property that is no *essential* part of his Nature, but yet is always in it. *Accidence*, or *Casualty*, they metamorphize into an inferior sort of *Beings* ; it is as *Colour*, or other *Qualities* are in *Bodies* ; which are things that may be away, or may be changed into their *Contraries*, or be varied in degree, and yet the *Body* (to which they belong) remain the same. Here now was abundant Matter, for *Socinus* his Grammatical and Philological Skill : He may eternally confute the *Logicians* and *Metaphysicians* from the good *Authors* he has read ; from *Terence*, and *Plautus* ; nay from *Tully*, and *Quintilian*, who spake not only a true, but *learned* Latin. And truly every body must grant that, he might as well (or better) have attacked the *Metaphysicks*, and all other *Arts* ; for using words, as he thinks, improperly ; that is, not as they are used *by the Vulgar* : as have reformed, or pretended to reform the *Language* of the *Church* ; which he understood too, just as much as he did the *Metaphysicks*.

'Tis pertinent here to take account of what passed between *Mersennus*, and *Ruarus* ; two Men very well matched, in respect of *Elegance* of *Learning*, and *Freedom* of *Thought* : there have scarce been two *Contemporaries* so eminent, in *both* these respects. *Mersennus* was a *Roman Catholic* ; a *Regular*, of the *Order* of the *Minims* : but to whom all *Learned Men* that visited *France*, always took care to be recommended, and to pay their *Respects* to him. *Ruarus* was a *Holsteiner*, a *Gentleman* of ample *Fortunes*, and a *Mind* no less great : He was a *Socinian* ; and tho he never wrote a particular *Book*, yet his *Letters* to *Learned Men* of all *Persuasions*, procured him a *Reputation* all over *Christendom*, as well as among his own *Party*, as the (*Honorary*) *Head*, or *Principal*, of that whole *Sect*. These

Letters were published, after his Death, in two Volumes, at *Amsterdam*; the first Volume, *Anno 1677.* the other, *Anno 1681.* both in *Octavo.*

Mersennus having heard of this Gentleman, and being desirous to read the *Socinian* Authors, wrote to him; entreating him, to send to him the principal Books of the Men of that Way: which were scarce in *France*; but very common in *Poland*, where *Ruarus* had chose to reside, at a place near *Dantzick.* *Ruarus* immediately made a Remittance of the Works of *Crellius*, *Volkelius*, and *Schlichtingius*; which was requited by *Mersennus*, by a Present of his own Books, and of the Works of the Jesuit *Petavius.*

But when *Mersennus* had looked over the *Socinian* Books, he presently observed what I have been now saying, that; the *Socinians* wholly mistook the *Doctrine* and *Terms* of the Catholic Church. They seem, says this Great Man, not to be well informed what is the Faith of the Church concerning the Holy Trinity; I assure you, I will even swear to you that, there is no *Tritheism* in our Doctrine. We say, “The Father is Original WISDOM, the Principle or Cause of that WISDOM by which he knoweth himself; and of that WILL by which he loveth himself, or is delighted in his own Perfections. *Pater est ORIGO INTELLECTUS, quo se perfectè Intelligit; & VOLUNTATIS etiam, mediante Intellectu.* The words *mediante Intellectu*, were added to signify the Procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son; or by the Son, as *mediante Intellectu* more properly signifies. His words may be thus Analyfed, *viz.*

Pater est Origo INTELLECTUS, the Father is Original Wisdom.

Intellectus, quo se perfecte Intelligit. The Original or Cause of that WISDOM, by which he perfectly understandeth himself, or of the S O N.

Et voluntatis, mediante Intellectu. The Principle also of WILL, (or the Spirit) by the reflex WISDOM; or Son.

I have not seen the Catholick Doctrine couched in so few words; but as it is said in the Proverb, *A Word to the Wise*: In so few words, he thought he had said enough, to such a Mercury as Ruarus; and that he had fully answered all the Socinian Books that Gentleman had sent to him. And so it proved; for tho Ruarus took a year's time to answer, his Reply serves only to confirm what Mersennus had said. He answers,

First. This Explication of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, is *Σόφρον φάρμακον*, a good Excuse. Is it so? But had it not been as easy, and a little more sincere to have said; 'Tis a just Defence? For if it be the former, 'tis the latter.

Secondly. He is in bodily fear lest it should be Sabellianism. I scarce think that, he is in earnest; so Learned a Man could not but know, the Doctrine of Sabellius is directly contrary to this of the Church. For the Divine Persons, according to the Church, are Modal Distinctions in the Divine Nature, or Essence; whereof the second is generated by the First, and the Third proceeds from the other two: Whence they are rightly called, INTERNAL RELATIONS of the Deity, to it self. On the contrary, the Trinity of Sabellius, is three EXTERNAL RELATIONS of God, to his Creatures: That is to say, God acting in the three Dispensations; the Law, the Gospel, and the effusion of the Spirit on the Apostles, and other Faithful. I shall own however, that this is an old Objection to the Churches Doctrine: for Socrates witnesseth that, the Council of

Nice was accused by many, as reviving *Sabellianism*, by their term *Homo-usios*; by which they meant, God is one Substance, and the Divine Persons are one Essence, and one Spirit. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccl. l. i. c. 23.

Thus these two Wits parted; and made no more words of the Matter, in their following Letters: *Ruarus* found there was no more to be said to the Objection; and *Mersennus* perceived, he had already objected enough, tho in so few words.

Of St. Austin.

The Disputes we have lately had in *England* concerning the true Notion of the Divine Trinity, make me willing to confirm what hath been (hitherto) said; by some such *Authorities*, as may entirely satisfy the doubtful: I will begin with that of *St. Austin*, because it includes so many more. For as to this Father, *Monsieur Du Pin* has rightly and justly observed, in his *History of the Ecclesiastical Writers, 5th Century, p. 207.* “ *St. Austin* Bishop
“ of *Hippo*, framed (if we may so speak) the Bo-
“ dy of Divinity for all the *Latin Fathers* that came
“ after him: They have not only taken out of his
“ Books, the *Principles* they made use of; but oft-
“ times they have only transcribed him. The *Coun-*
“ *cils* have borrowed his words, wherewith to ex-
“ press their Decisions. *R. Lombard*, Bishop of *Pa-*
“ *ris* in the 12th Century, undertook to make an
“ Epitome of the whole Body of *Theology*; his
“ Work, after all, is little else but a Collection of
“ Passages out of this Father. And tho *St. Thomas*
“ and other *School-Doctors* followed another *Method*;
“ yet for the most part they adhere to *St. Austin's*
“ *Principles*, and upon them have erected their Theo-
“ logical

“logical Opinions and Conclusions. In short, *he saith*, the Councils of the Church, the Fathers, and School-Doctors or Divines of the middle Ages, in the *Latin Church*, have all strictly followed the Doctrine of St. *Austin*. We shall see hereafter that the *Greek Churches* have no less deference for St. *Austin*, especially in the Article of the Holy Trinity; than the *Latin* (or *Western*) have.

Of all the Works of St. *Austin*, his fifteen Books of the Trinity, seem to have cost him the most time and pains. Mr. *Du Pin* saith, he began them in the Year of our Lord 400. and finishd them in 416. No doubt that Learned Critic had very good Reasons for that Supputation; but St. *Austin* himself, speaking more generally and laxly, saith, *De Trinitate (qua Deus verus & summus est) libros juvenis inchoavi, senex edidi*: “The Books concerning the Trinity, “which is the true and most High God, I began “when young, I published them when old. They are directed, (or if you will, dedicated) to *Aurelius* Bishop of *Carthage*, and Primate of *Africa*, in these words: *Beatissimo, & Sancto, & sincerissimâ charitate Venerando, Fratri & Confacerdoti, Papæ Aurelio*. “To the most blessed, holy, venerable, our “beloved Brother and Fellow-Priest, Pope *Aureli-* “*us*. To which we may note, by the by, that *Pope* and *Saint* were Titles that were given indifferently to *all* Bishops in that Age, and down to the latter end of the 11th Century; when *Pope* began to be appropriated to the Bishop of *Rome*, and *Saint* was bestowed only on the Dead, and by that Bishop.

Mr. *Du Pin* well expressed the Nature, and Design, of these Books of St. *Austin*, in these words: “They are rather a *dogmatical* Discourse (or *Institu-* “*tion*) concerning the Mystery of the Trinity, than “*controversial* Writings against Hereticks. He in-

“ Hereticks, or proving the Doctrine of the Church ;
 “ as upon subtle and curious Enquiries, for clearing
 “ or *expounding this Mystery*. Eccl. Hist. Cent. 5. p.
 193. I mention this, the rather, because a late
 Learned Writer has thought fit to say, in his *Prefa-*
tory Discourse, to an Examination of an Exposition of
the XXXIX Articles, by my Lord Bishop of Sarum ;
 “ There is very little, if any thing, to be met in
 “ Holy Scripture, to *explain the Trinity: nor is it*
 “ *what any one ought to pretend to explain*, any farther
 “ than to prove a *Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Tri-*
 “ *nity*, (according to what is revealed in Scripture)
 “ is to be worshiped. *St. Austin*, on the contrary,
 thought that; when we say *Trinity in Unity, and*
Unity in Trinity, and these are to be worship-
 ed; 'tis as necessary that one should understand
 what is meant by *Trinity in Unity, and Unity in*
Trinity, as 'tis to *worship* such *Unity in Trinity, or*
Trinity in Unity. And truly other-ways, either by
false Ideas, we shall be guilty of *Idolatry*; or by *none*,
 of *Atheism*. But let us hear the Father himself: *Cer-*
tè cum credunt Scripturis sanctis, agant orando, & bene
vivendo, ut intelligant hæc. Id est, ut quantum fieri po-
test, videatur mente quod tenetur Fide. Quis hoc probi-
beat; imò quis ad hoc non hortetur? “ Let 'em endea-
 “ your by Prayer, and by Holy Living, to under-
 “ stand these things; that is, to *comprehend by the*
 “ *Mind, what is believed by Faith*. Who will forbid
 “ 'em; or rather, who will not advise them there-
 “ to? *De Trin. L. 15. c. 27*. Again, “ That God
 “ is a Trinity, we ought to evince (*if we can*) by
 “ some Demonstration, to all capable Persons; as
 “ well as to *Believers*, that rest in the Authority of
 “ Scripture. Why I said *if we can*, will better ap-
 “ pear; when the Matter itself begins to be opened,
 “ in the following Enquiry concerning it. But God
 “ will help us: for it is written in the Psalms of *Da-*

“ *vid.* The Heart of them shall live that seek the Lord.
 “ And, Let those that seek thee, rejoice. And again,
 “ seek ye the Lord, seek him always. Farthermore,
 he often takes notice of St. Paul's words to the Ro-
 mans; *The invisible things of God are clearly seen, being un-*
derstood by the things that are made: to which he as often
 adds the words of God, in the first Chapter of *Genesis*;
Let us make Man, in our Image, after our Likeness.
 Grounding himself on these Texts, he discovers a
 Trinity, in the visible and sensible part of the Crea-
 tion; but more especially in the *Soul* of Man, on which
 (saith he) the Image of the Trinity is manifestly im-
 pressed; in his own words, *Immortaliter immortalitati*
ejus insita. Which things, saith he again, we have
 made to be the Subject of this present Writing, from
 our 9th to our 14th Book. *Lib. 15. c. 2.* He believes,
 it was the very Reason that an Intelligent Nature is
 given to us; even this, to enquire and search con-
 cerning God; *ad hoc debet homo esse Intelligens, ut re-*
quirat Deum. L. 15. c. 2. He speaks there, not of
 knowing *that* God is, but *what* he is; the *Unity* of
 his Nature, the *Trinity* of Persons, and *how both are*
to be understood: which is the matter of his Enquiries,
 in all these Books.

St. Basil surnamed the *Great*, St. Gregory called the
Theologer or *Divine*, and St. Gregory *Nyssen*, *Greek*
 Fathers that flourished sometime before St. *Austin*, are
 very much employed in *explaining* the *Mystery* of the
 Trinity: there will be occasion hereafter to set down
 their *Explications*; here I only mention them, to
 show that the most celebrated Fathers believed it to
 be lawful, and even thought it to be necessary, to *un-*
stand with the Mind (as we have heard St. *Austin* speak-
 ing) *what is believed by Faith.*

The Councils also, General and Provincial, the
 Confessions of Faith by the Protestant Churches;
 have almost all of them given some *Explication*, and
 divers

divers of them a very large Explication, of the Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity.

Neither ought we to omit that, the Heretical Explications of *Sabellius*, of *Arius*, and *Philoponus*, among the Antients; of *Joachim*, *Gilb. Porretan*, *P. Abailardus*, in the middle Ages; of *Gentilis*, *Curcellanus*, and *Mr. Bidle*, since the Reformation; do inevitably engage the Orthodox in very particular Explications of this Article: unless by only using the general Expressions of *Trinity in Unity*, and *Unity in Trinity*, we should rather seem to license all of them, than disallow any of them. For 'tis undeniable that, all those Heretics contend for *Trinity in Unity*, and *Unity in Trinity*; tho in Heterodox Senses.

Therefore if some Learned Men have more employed themselves in other Studies, than in this; so that they don't think fit, themselves to state the Doctrine of the Catholick Church in this Article: they ought not hereupon to forbid to others all Exposition of the Churches Faith, but only this; that we are to believe and worship *Trinity in Unity*, and *Unity in Trinity*. Rather, we ought never to use those words, without an Exposition: to speak 'em without Ideas, that is without a meaning, is to speak them (to say the best) as *Parrots*; to speak them with wrong Ideas, implies *Heresy*. But I return to the *Father*.

To give a distinct Account of *St. Austin's* Work, we were best to observe this Method; we will consider, 1. The curious Questions, relating to the Article of the Trinity, that are here resolved. 2. The Expositions of some of the *Greek* Fathers, that *St. Austin* rejects; as partly imperfect, and partly as leading to Error. 3. Some likenesses of the Trinity, that he finds in the visible Creation, and in the Soul of Man; but which come not up to a tolerable Explication. 4. The Explication, that after
much

much canvassing, he approves; and the Image of that Trinity in Man, *Immortaliter immortalitati ejus insita.*

Questions concerning the Trinity, or the Divine Persons, resolved by St. Austin.

It is a Question among the *Modern Divines*, whether the Apparitions of God to the Patriarchs, were indeed so many Apparitions of God himself, in the Person of the *Λόγος* or WORD; or only of Angels, who representing God on those occasions, are therefore called the LORD, or as 'tis in the Hebrew JEHOVAH. The Reason of the Doubt is, because in some Texts of Holy Scripture, particularly in divers of the *New Testament*, those Apparitions are called *Angels*. Thus, the appearance to *Moses* in the burning Bush, is by *Moses* called *Jehovah*: he saith expressly, when *Jehovah* saw that *Moses* turned aside to see; God called to him out of the midst of the Bush. *Exod. 3. 4.* But *St. Stephen* interpreteth this appearance of *Jehovah* to have been, not immediately by himself, but by his *Angel*. *Acts 7. 30.* There appeared to *Moses* (in the Wilderness of Sina) an *Angel of the LORD*; in a flame of Fire, in a Bush. He not only says, it was an *Angel*; but he denies that it was the LORD. Therefore to this difficulty, *St. Austin* answers, by saying. *Scriptum est, dixit DOMINUS ad Mosem; non vero, dixit Angelus ad Mosem: quia cum verba Judicis Præco pronuntiat, non scribitur in gestis, ille Præco dixit, sed ille Judex dixit.* "It is written (in the Book of *Exodus*) the LORD said to *Moses*; not the *Angel* said to *Moses*: because when the *Crier* of the Court pronounces the Sentence of the *Judg*; it is not register'd in the Rolls, the *Crier* said, but the *Judg* said. *Lib. 2. c. 11.*

It should seem, this was the Manner of the Courts in St. *Austin's* Time: and he thought it a sufficient, either Example, or Comparison, to show that what an Inferior says or does by express and immediate Order of his Superior, it is to be reckoned, not to the *Sent*, but the *Sender*; not to the Messenger, but to his Principal; and accordingly in the Case now before us, not to the Angel, but to the LORD that sent him.

He is troubled with that Text, *Mark* 13. 32. *Of that Day and Hour knoweth no Man; no not the Angels, nor the Son, but the Father.* Or as St. *Matthew* has it, the *Father* only. Did not our Saviour know that time, of the last Judgment; or as others here interpret, of the Excision of Jerusalem? If not; how was he God? If he did; how shall we defend his Veracity? When he saith so expressly, *the Son knoweth not that Day and Hour, but the Father; nay the Father only.* *Matth.* 24. 36. The *Father* answers; our Saviour knew the precise Time, the Day and Hour, of the Event concerning which he was asked: but his Answer is such a form of Speech, as that of St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, *1 Cor.* 2. 2. *I knew nothing* (or I resolved to know nothing) *among you, but only Jesus Christ; and him crucified.* Or as when God said to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 22. 12. *Now I know, that thou fearest God; seeing thou hast not withholden thy Son, thy only Son, from me.* It appears by these Texts that, in the Phraseology (or manner of speaking) of the Jewish Nation, to know a thing, or not to know it, implies sometimes only that, we make it known, or do not make it known, to others. For when St. *Paul* says, He knew nothing among the *Corinthians*, but only Jesus Christ; and him crucified: he means only, he made nothing else known to *THEM*, he spoke to them of no other thing. Of all the Learning he had acquired at the Feet of *Gamaliel*, or at the University of *Tarsus*, he said nothing to the *Corinthians*: Among them he knew

knew nothing but Jesus Christ, and him crucified; tho they were curious and eager of other Knowledge. And when God said to *Abraham*, *Now I know that thou fearest me*; it is certain, he as much knew it before: but now *he made it known to Abraham*; for it was by this high Trial, that *Abraham* was made to know with certainty his own Heart towards God. Therefore so also it was that our Saviour *knew*, and *did not know*, that Day and Hour: he knew it *as to himself*, or personally knew it; he did not know it *with respect to his Disciples*, from whom he thought fit to conceal it: as the Apostle knew nothing *with respect to the Corinthians*, but only Jesus Christ: and him, crucified. *Lib. 1. c. 12.*

To the Question, Whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, or from the Father only? *St. Austin* answers; The Holy Spirit is the Spirit both of the Father and the Son: He proceedeth from both; but not as from two Principles, but as from one. He saith however, the Spirit proceedeth *principally* from the Father; and he well explaineth this dangerous Saying, by adding that; “The Son deriveth from the Father *Being and Godhead*; and herewith he also deriveth necessarily “from the Father this Power, if we may so speak, “of communicating (together with the Father) “*Being and Godhead* to the third Person in the undivided Trinity. *Lib. 15. c. 17.* In short, the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father *and from the Son*; but from the Father *principally*, in regard that it is from the Father that the Son hath this Power of communicating *Being and Godhead* to the Holy Spirit, both *equally* and as *one Principle* with the Father. Besides the Texts usually alledged, to prove the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, *St. Austin* alledges also that; if the Spirit proceeded from the Father only, and not from

from the Son, then the Son could not have given the Spirit; but *he breathed on his Disciples, and said, Receive the Holy Ghost.* John. 20. 22. He saith hereupon, the Disciples (or any other Man or Men) had no power to give the Holy Spirit; but only to pray that he might be given to those Persons upon whom they should lay their hands. Upon this he enlargeth much; I shall only repeat one Paragraph, as being very remarkable. *Quantus est Deus ille, qui dat Deum? Nec enim aliquis Discipulorum ejus dedit Spiritum Sanctum: Orabant ut veniret in eos, quibus manus imponebant; non ipsi eum dabant. Atque hunc morem in suis Prepositis etiam nunc servat Ecclesia: nos accipere quidem hoc donum possumus, pro modulo nostro, effundere autem in alios non possumus. Ut hoc fiat, Deum (a quo efficitur) super eos invocamus.* “How great a God is he, who can give God? For we are to be aware that, none of the Disciples gave the Holy Spirit; they prayed, that he might come upon those, on whom they should lay their hands. And this Custom is still preserved in the Church, by the Bishops: We can receive this Gift, according to our Measure; bestow it on others, we cannot; that it may be given to others, we pray over them, to that God who alone can do this thing. *Lib. 15. c. 26.*

Why do we say, the Son is *begotten*, but the Spirit *proceeds*? As we say, the Son is *begotten* by the Father: why not also the Spirit is *begotten*, by the Father and the Son; but he *proceeds* from both? The Saint answers; besides the Reasons known to God, who himself maketh this distinction in his Word: we may say, with respect to our selves, we are taught this Mystery in the distinct Terms of *begotten* and *proceeding*; to preserve the Propriety and Significancy of Human Speech: if *begotten* and *proceeding* were indifferently used, we could not understand

what was said. For we never say Son or begotten, but only where there is *but one begetter*; no Son is the Son of two Fathers. *Non dicitur Nasci, sed potius Procedere Spiritus Sanctus; quoniam si & iste Filius diceretur, amborum utique Filius diceretur: quod est absurdissimum; nam Filius nullus est duorum, nisi Patris & Matris.* "The Spirit is not said to be begotten, but rather to proceed; because if he also were called a Son, he should be the Son of the Father and Son: Which were most unproper, and even absurd in Speech; for we never say the Son of two, but only when we mean it of Father and Mother. Lib. 15. c. 27. He observes however that, tho we must not say, the Spirit was begotten; which were to contradict the Holy Scriptures, which say, he doth proceed: yet neither doth the Catholick Church say, he is *unbegotten*; lest any should suspect, that in the Trinity there are two Fathers, or two who are of None. In his own words, *Ne vel duos Patres in Trinitate, vel duos qui non sunt de Alio, quispiam suspicetur.* Lib. 15. c. 26. No doubt St. Austin would have declined this, and some other Questions, if he could; but he saith, there were great Enquiries and Disputes about it in his time, by all the Sects of Christians: So that it was necessary to say something to it, for appeasing an untoward Curiosity, that has grown up among the generality of Christians. His answer, tho it doth not unfold the Mystery; it satisfies however the Enquirer thus far, that he needs not to ask or look any farther, but be contented with the Words of God: who hath used terms of distinction, because there is a Distinction; but hath not declared wherein the Distinction consists, either because it was not necessary for us to know it, or because (at present) we are not capable to know it.

Concerning the Question, lately controverted between some eminent Divines among us ; Whether as there are three Divine Persons, these Persons are so many *distinct Spirits*, or only one (Infinite, Eternal, Allperfect) *Spirit* ? This Father hath so explained the Mystery of the Trinity, (as we shall see hereafter) that there can be no manner of Doubt, that he understood the *Trinity of Persons* to be only a *MODAL Distinction* in God ; not so many Substances, Beings, or Spirits. And wherever he undertakes to define or describe the Divinity, it is under the Character of a *Spirit*, not *three Spirits*. *De Creatore necesse est credere, eum summè vivere, cuncta sentire & intelligere ; — esse Spiritum omnium potentissimum, justissimum, optimum, beatissimum.* “ Concerning the *Creator*, it is necessary to believe that, “ he most perfectly lives, perceives, and understands all things ; that he is a *Spirit*, of all others “ the most powerful, just, good, and happy. *Lib. 15. c. 4.* But he hath also some Paragraphs, where he expressly denieth that, God is more than one Spirit. *Et Pater Spiritus est, & Filius, & ipse Sanctus Spiritus : nec tamen tres Spiritus, sed unus Spiritus ; ut non tres Dii, sed unus Deus.* “ The Father is “ *Spirit*, the Son *Spirit*, and the Holy Ghost *Spirit* : “ yet not three Spirits, but one Spirit ; as not three “ Gods, but one God. *Epist. 174.* He saith not, the Father is a *Spirit*, the Son a *Spirit*, the Holy Ghost a *Spirit* ; but the Father is *Spirit*, and so of the rest : As the Father is God, not a *God* ; the Son and Holy Ghost, each of them God, not a *God*. For if each of these was a *Spirit*, and a *God* ; there must be three Spirits, and three Gods. The Father *Spirit*, the Son *Spirit*, the Holy Ghost *Spirit*, is no more but this ; the Father *Spiritual*, the Son *Spiritual*, the Holy Ghost *Spiritual*. Whereas he cautions us at last, *Non tres Spiritus, sed unus Spiritus ;*

Spiritus; ut non tres Dii, sed unus Deus. “ There
 “ are not three Spirits, but one Spirit; as there
 “ are not three Gods, but one God. ’Tis as much
 as to say, we must no more affirm three (Divine)
 Spirits, than we would affirm three Gods. He
 could not have declared more plainly, and directly,
 against the Explication of those who make the three
 Divine Persons to be so many Spirits; than by say-
 ing, *We must as little own three Spirits, as three*
Gods.

Parallel to this, is that Passage, *Lib. 5. c. 11. de*
Trinitate. “ The Trinity may be called One God,
 “ but not be called One of the Persons. We may
 “ not call the Trinity, the FATHER; except in
 “ this respect, that we are his Children by *Adoption.*
 “ Nor may we call the Trinity, the SON, in any
 “ respect or sense whatsoever. But we may say,
 “ the Holy Trinity is (*Sanctus Spiritus*) a Holy Spi-
 “ rit; because the Scriptures say, GOD IS A SPI-
 “ RIT. As for that *Holy Spirit*, which is not the
 “ Trinity, but *in the Trinity*; it is called Spirit, *re-*
 “ *latively only: i. e.* As it is a *Spiration* from Father
 and Son, and therefore *related* to them; as *Princi-*
pium and *Principiatum.* He often discourses in this
 manner, in the xv Books: and he excuseth his fre-
 quent Repetition of it, by saying; I often come over
 with the same things, in these Books, to fix them in
 my Reader’s Memory; and because if there be a
 mistake, it will be more easily discovered by coming
 so often under consideration.

But the most important of all the Questions, that
 concern the Mystery of the Trinity, is; of the
 Terms *Essence, Substance, and Persons*: whether these
 are to be used, concerning God; and in what Sense?
 On this, it will be necessary to cite always the Fa-
 ther’s own Words. *Essentiam dico, quæ ’Ουσία græcè*
dicitur; & quam nos Latini usitatus substantiam voca-

mus. Dicunt quidem & Græci Hypostasim; & nescio quid volunt inter esse inter Usiam & Hypostasim: ita & plerique nostri Latini, qui hæc Græco tractant eloquio, dicere consueverunt $\mu\iota\alpha\nu\ \delta\upsilon\omicron\iota\alpha\nu$, $\tau\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$; quod est latinè, unam Essentiam & tres Substantias. Sed quia nostra loquendi consuetudo jam obtinuit, ut hoc intelligatur cum dicimus Essentiam, quod intelligitur cum dicimus Substantiam; non audemus dicere, unam Essentiam & tres Substantias, sed unam Essentiam vel Substantiam & tres Personas. In short thus; "The Greeks say, one Essence of God, and three Hypostases: because they distinguish Hypostasis and Substance; [in the same manner as the Latins distinguish between Substance and Person.] But the Latins always using Essence and Substance in the same sense, or to denote the same thing; therefore we dare not say, one Essence of God, and three Substances; but one Essence or Substance, and three Persons. Lib. 5. c. 8.

But is Persons then a proper Term to be used, in describing the ternal Distinction in God? St. Austin thinks, it is not; unless the very equivocal ambiguous Sense of this word be fixed. He observes, 'tis used of Men; for we call three Men, three Persons: but God is not so three Persons, as three Men (or three Angels) are three Persons. Three Men are three such Persons, as have distinct Substances, three individual Natures; with so many distinct Understandings, and Powers of Willing: And one of these Human Persons is not so much as all the three; as it is in the Divine Trinity, where any one of the Persons is equal to all the three; the Father to himself and to the Son and Spirit, the Son to himself and to the Father and Spirit, the Spirit also to himself and to the Father and Son. Each of these Persons having the whole Divine Essence or Substance, together with all Essential Attributes and Perfections thereof, is perfect God; and therefore not more or less than the whole Trinity.

nity. There being this immense difference between the term Persons, when intended of three Human Persons, and the same Term when meant of the Divine Persons; St. *Austin* often concludes that, this Term is too ambiguous, and not strictly proper in the Mystery of the Trinity. *Cum queritur, Quid tres? Magnâ prorsus inopiâ laborat eloquium humanum; dictum est tres Personæ, non ut illud diceretur, sed ne taceretur.* “When it is asked, What three? Human Speech is too barren to answer; we say three PERSONS, not that we should say it, but lest we should say nothing at all. *Lib. 5. c. 9.* And again, *Lisuit loquendi & disputandi necessitate tres Personas dicere; non quia scriptura dicit, sed quia non contradicit. Si autem diceremus tres Deos, contradiceret Scriptura; que dicit, “Audi Israel, Dominus Deus tuus Deus unus est. — Quid igitur restat, nisi ut fateamur, loquendi necessitate parca hæc vocabula; cum opus esset disputatione contra Insidias, vel Errores, Hæreticorum?* “In speaking and arguing concerning this Mystery, it hath become usual and lawful to say three Persons; not because the Scriptures say it, but because they do not gainsay it. But if we said, three Gods, the Scriptures would gainsay it; for they say, *Hear O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God.* — What remains then but that, we confess that these words [Persons and Hypostases] have been introduced by a certain Necessity; to repel the Sophistries, and confute the Errors of Hereticks? *Lib. 7. c. 4.* He repeats the same Thought, in another place, in these words; *Non major Essentia est Pater & Filius & Sanctus Spiritus, quam solus Pater aut solus Filius; sed tres ille substantia sive Personæ, si ita dicende sunt, equales sunt singulis.* “Father Son and Spirit are not a greater Essence, than the Father alone, or the Son alone; but these three Substances, or Persons, IF WE

“ MAY SO CALL THEM, are but equal to any
 “ one of their own number. *Lib. 7. c. 6.*

It appears by all this, that, *St. Austin* would willingly have set aside *three Substances* : because in Latin, and the Languages derived therefrom, *Essence* and *Substance* are the same ; so that to say three Substances, is the same as to say three *Essences*, which in God (by confession of All) were three Deities, or Gods. Notwithstanding, because the *Greeks* say, one *Essence*, three *Hypostases* ; and that by *Hypostasis* they do not mean *Substance* properly so called, but mean only what the *Latins* intend by *Person* : therefore he is not absolutely against saying three *Hypostases*, or three *Substances* ; when by *Substance* we mean only (as the *Greeks*, and some *Latins* that follow them) *Persons*. Secondly, That, *Persons* it self is but too equivocal and ambiguous ; and has not been introduced by any Example from Scripture : But the Sense of that Term being once rightly fixed, it is by all means to be retained ; as of excellent use, nay as almost necessary, against *Heretics*. Against the *Tritheists*, who would introduce three *Divine Essences*, or *Substances*, properly so called. And against the *Sabellians*, who assign to the *Persons* no *Substance* or *Essence* at all, either in particular or in common ; but represent them as only so many *Oeconomists*, or *Manifestations of the Divine Will* : namely under the *Law*, then under the *Gospel* by *Christ* ; and again when after our *Saviour's* *Ascension*, the *Apostles* were farther instructed in all Matters, by the *Effusion of the Holy Spirit*, or *Inspiration of God*. The *Holy Father* having said thus much, one may wonder that himself has not defined the Term *Person* ; as applied to the *Mystery of the Trinity*. It had been agreeable to the *Accuracy* that he uses through his whole *Disputation*, in xv *Books*, to have distinguish'd the several *Acceptations of Person* : which, taken for

Substance, hath occasioned the *Tritheistick Heresy*; taken for *Oeconomy*, or *Manifestations*, begets the *Sabellian Heresy*; taken for a *Mode of Existing*, or a *Property*, that includes in it the *Divine Essence*, is the *Catbolick Doctrine*. But he hath left it to the observant Reader, himself to form the *Definition* or *Description* of *Person*, in the *Divine Nature*; from the *Explication* he gives of the *Trinity* it self. From that *Explication*, the *Divines of the Schools* describe a *Person* in the *Holy Trinity*, to be “ the *Divine* “ *Essence*, or *Godhead*, under a particular (intel- “ *lectual co-eternal*) *Mode of Existing*. Of which “ *Modes*, they note, there can be but three; ori- “ *ginal Intellect*, reflex *Self-Knowledg*, and the *Love*, “ or *Self-complacence* that proceeds from both.

That these *Doctors* have rightly understood *St. Austin*, we shall see; when we come to his *Explication*.

Some Expositions of the Trinity, that St. Austin rejects; some Likenesses of the Trinity, that he finds in the Works of the Creation: The true Explication, and the Image thereof in Man.

Certainly we must say, this *Father* was a right good *Man*: he argues on the *Article* of the *Trinity*, with a moderation and sweetness, that would oblige the widest *Dissenter* from him; oblige one, to consider well what he says, and to be sorry if perhaps one cannot agree to every thing that he says. He begins his *Disquisitions*, concerning this *Mystery*, with saying; *Quisquis hac legit, ubi pariter certus est, pergat mecum; ubi pariter hesitat, querat mecum: ubi errorem suum cognoscit, redeat ad me; ubi*

meum, revocet me. " I desire my Reader that, where-
 " ever in these Books he is satisfied with what I say,
 " he would go forwards with me, to what remains ;
 " where we doubt, let us together seek farther con-
 " cerning the Matter : If he finds that himself has
 " mistaken, let him come over to me ; where he sees
 " I have mistaken, let him call me over to him. Lib.
 1. c. 3. In another place ; *Cum Homines Deum qua-*
runt, & ad intelligentiam Trinitatis (pro capite infirmi-
tatis Humana) animum intendunt ; facillimè debent ig-
noscere errantibus in tanti per investigatione secreti.
 " When Man seeks after GOD ; when the Human
 " Frailty seeks to find out *the Trinity*, as far as 'tis
 " able : such a one ought to be very facile in for-
 " giving others, that have perhaps erred in their
 " searches concerning so great a *Mystery*. Lib. 2.
 c. 1. He concludes yet better ; he ends his Books
 with this Prayer. *Domine, Deus Unus, Deus Trini-*
tas ; quaecunque dixi in his Libris de tuo, agnoscant &
Tui ; signa de meo, ignosce Tu, ignoscant Tui. " O
 " Lord, One God, God the Trinity ; what I have
 " said in these Books *from thee*, let it be owned by
 " all *Thine* ; if I have said ought *from my self*, do
 " thou pardon it, and may *Thine* also forgive it.
 Lib. 15. c. 28.

But come we, as we proposed in the Title of this
 Section, to some Expositions that this Father notes,
 and rejects.

Some Greek Divines, in their Books on this Article,
 had said. " There is one *Essence* of God, and three
 " *Hypostases* ; and it is to be thus understood. One
 " Divine *Essence*, or one *Divine Nature*, as one *Hu-*
 " *man Nature*, or one *Angelical Nature* : and three
 " *Divine Hypostases*, as in the *Angelical Nature* there
 " are *divers Angels* ; and in the *Human Nature* *di-*
 " *vers Men*, for instance, *Peter, James, and John.*
 " And again, thus ; *three Statues of Gold*, they are
 " three

“ three Statues and but one Gold : as we say three Di-
 “ vine Persons, each of them God, and all but one
 “ God. According to these Doctors, God is no o-
 therways one God, than Peter James and John are one
 Man, or three Statues (all of them Gold) are one Gold;
 and the Divinity is as truly three Gods, as the Huma-
 nity is three (or more) Men, or three Golden Statues
 are three Golds; if we might have their leave so to
 speak, which we shall argue by and by. St. Austin was
 so moderate, as not to say expressly that, these Explica-
 tions necessarily and immediately infer (or suppose)
 three Gods; tho all the *Moderns* say it: he contents
 himself to show that, they are not only, not just Ex-
 plications; but not fit *Similitudes*, or Comparisons.
 “ We do not say, three Persons, and one Essence or one
 “ God; in such sense as if a Substance or Mass were
 “ made into any 3 things, *Statues* (suppose) or Vessels.
 “ We do not say, *tres Persona ex eâdem Substantiâ*, three
 “ Persons formed out of the same Substance: like
 “ three Statues out of the same Gold; or like three
 “ Men, in or of the same Human Nature. For there
 “ are more than three Men in the same Human Na-
 “ ture, and may be more than three Statues of Gold;
 “ and one Statue is not so much as three, or one
 “ Man as three Men: but contrary in the Trinity,
 “ for in the Trinity there are no more than three
 “ Persons; and all them are not more than one
 “ of them is. This is the Sum of what he saith. *Lib.*
7. c. 6. I have abridged that Chapter, because his
Latin would be obscure to those that are not accus-
 tomed to the *Latin* of *Barbary*; such as all the *Afri-*
can Fathers, but only St. *Cyprian*, wrote: I will sub-
 join however his very Words, because some will ex-
 pect and desire them.

Non sic Trinitatem dicimus tres Personas, unam Es-
sentiam & unum Deum; tanquam ex unâ materiâ tria
quædam subsisterent, etiamsi quicquid illud est, in his

tribus explicatum sit. Non enim aliquid aliud ejus Essentia est præter istam Trinitatem. Tamen tres Personas ejusdem Essentia, vel tres Personas unam Essentiam dicimus: tres tamen ex eadem Essentiâ non dicimus, quasi aliud ibi sit quod Essentia est, aliud quod Persona; sicut tres Statuas ex eodem auro possumus dicere, aliud enim illic est esse aurum, aliud esse Statuas. Et cum dicuntur tres Homines una Natura, vel tres Homines ejusdem Naturæ, possunt etiam dici tres Homines ex eadem Naturâ; quia ex eadem Natura & tres alii Homines possunt existere. In illa vero Essentia Trinitatis, nullo modo alia qualibet Persona ex eadem Essentia potest existere. Deinde, in his rebus, non tantum est unus Homo, quantum tres Homines simul; & plus sunt Homines duo, quam unus Homo; & in Statuis æqualibus, plus auri sunt tres simul, quam singulæ Statuæ; & minus auri est una, quam duæ. At in uno Deo non ita; non enim major Essentia est Pater Filius & S. Spiritus, quam solus Pater aut solus Filius.

He thinks it necessary, often to repeat this last; for (besides other places) we have it again, *Lib. 6. c. 7. Nec quoniam Trinitas est, ideo triplex est; alioquin minor erit Pater solus, quam simul Pater & Filius.* "Tho it be a Trinity, it is not threefold; for the
 " Father alone is not less, than the Father and Son
 " together. The short is; he advances two Reasons, against those Explications by three Men and three Statues. First that, in the Human Nature are more than three Men, and there may be more Statues of Gold than three; but the Divine Persons can be no more than three: therefore the Comparison is not adequate. But it would lead us also into Error, and therefore is not Just; for one Man is less than three Men, and of equal Statues one is not so much as three; but in the Divine Trinity, all the three Persons are not greater than any one of them is. Each of them

is *perfect God*, to whom nothing can be added; he is therefore as much as *the whole Trinity*: and if each were not *perfect God*, he should not be God at all; for no definite number of Imperfects, can make up an infinitely Perfect.

The Moderns have treated those Explications much more roughly, than did *St. Austin*. He considered them as the honest Endeavours of Orthodox Writers; to *explicate* (that I may use his own Words) *what is more easily understood by the Mind, than expounded in words to others*: but now they are judged to be so intolerable, that some pronounce them a broad-fac'd *Atheism*, others an implicate *Tritheism*. The *Atheism* consists in this, that these Expositors suppose the *Divine Nature* (or Godhead) is just such to the *Divine Persons*, as the *Human Nature* (or the Humanity) is to *Human Persons*. This, say some, is an open *Atheism*: for the Humanity (or Human Nature) is *nothing*, 'tis only a Metaphysical or *abstracted* Notion; 'tis but only the general Idea that we form in our Minds, when we consider what is proper and peculiar to Man, as he is Man. The Properties, and natural Incidents, that belong to Man as he is Man, we give to them the general Name of the *Human Nature*: but this Human Nature is not a real thing, a *Being*, or actually existent; but only a notional Collection made by our Minds, of certain general Properties that are common to all Men, and peculiar to Men only. If therefore the *Divine Nature* or *God* be but such to the *Divine Persons*, as the *Human Nature* or *Humanity* is to particular *Human Persons*: it is only a Notion, not a *Being*, or a Substance, whether bodily, or spiritual; no more than the other Chimera (*Human Nature*) is. Then for the *Tritheism*; say others, if one *Divine Nature* and three *Divine Persons* have just such respect to one another, as hath the *Human Nature* to *Human Persons*: besides the apparent Advantage

of the Human Nature above the Divine, in that it compriseth an infinite number of Human Persons, and the Divine but only three Persons; it will follow that, as three Human Persons in the Human Nature are *three Men*, so the three Divine Persons in the Divine Nature are *three Gods*.

The Explication, or rather Comparison, of the three golden Statues; which are *three Statues*, and but *one Gold*; they reckon, it is scarce considerable enough to be confuted. The Strength of it consists in this, that we cannot say three golden Statues are *three Golds*; they suppose it to be monstrously improper, to say *three Golds*: tho themselves, that they may make three golden Statues an Explication (or at least an Illustration) of the Trinity, say three Statues and *one Gold*. It is asked; Are three *Bars*, or *Rods*, of *Iron*, *three Irons*? It is certain they are called so in common Speech. But if *three Irons*; which is most common: why not *three Golds*? If three *Rods*, or *Bars* of *Iron*, are three *Irons*: three *Rods*, or *Bars*, or *Plates*, or *Statues* of *Gold*, will be three *Golds*. It is not usual indeed, to say *Golds*; but it is proper, and Grammatical, and therefore may be used whenever there is occasion, or when any one shall please. But it is as little usual, and altogether *Ungrammatical*, to call three *Bars*, or *Statues* of *Gold*, *one Gold*; as they, who use this Comparison, are forced to do.

Come we now to the *Likenesses* of the Trinity, that St. *Austin* finds in the *Works of the Creation*. He so propounds them, as to show also their *Disagreement* to the Divine Trinity; and that "they are infinitely short of an Adequate Representation (or Image) of the Trinity in God; yet some of them come nearer to it, than others do. He discourses largely of them, from the 9th to the 14th Book; I shall content my self, for the most part, to report them

as they stand abridged in the 15th Book. Premising, and admonishing, only thus much in general, that;
 “ all of them suppose, and imply that, the Divine
 “ Persons are not so many distinct Beings, or Spi-
 “ rits: but that the Divine Essence, Godhead, or
 “ God, is the Being; the Persons are the Modes, or
 “ Properties, or Acts of that Being; as the Reader
 “ will immediately see.

In ipso Animo, ex iis que sunt extrinsecus introducta, est quedam Trinitas. Nempe Imaginatio [legendum puto IMAGO] corporis que in Memoria est; & inde Informatio, cum ad eam convertitur acies cogitantis: & denique utrumque [lege utramque] conjungens Intentio Voluntatis. “ The Objects that enter into the Mind,
 “ make there a kind of Trinity. As first, the I-
 “ MAGE of the Object, that is impressed (as it
 “ were) on the Memory; then the Information or
 “ KNOWLEDG caused thereby in the Mind, when
 “ it directs its Sight to the Treasure of Objects, and
 “ Images stored in the Memory; and lastly the
 “ WILL that joineth together the other two. *Lib.*

15. c. 3.

Mens meminit se, intelligit se, diligit se: hoc si cernimus, cernimus Trinitatem; non quidem Deum, sed Imaginem Dei. “ The Human Mind REMEMBERS it
 “ self, KNOWS it self, LOVES it self: if we see
 “ this, we see a Trinity; not indeed the Trinity
 “ which is God, but which is the Image of God. *Lib.*

14. c. 8.

Sicut duo sunt Mens & Amor ejus; ita duo quedam sunt Mens & Notitia ejus, cum se novit. Mens vero, & Amor, & Notitia ejus, ita tria quedam sunt, ut hec tria unum sint. Amor & Notitia non tanquam in Subjeto insunt Menti; sed substantialiter ista sunt, sicut & Mens ipsa: quia etsi relative dicuntur ad invicem, in sua tamen sunt quaque Substantia. — Unius igitur ejusdemque Essentie necesse est hec tria sint. “ The
 “ MIND,

"MIND, and its LOVE to it self, are two; so are
 "MIND, and its KNOWLEDG of it self. But
 "MIND, its KNOWLEDG, and LOVE, are (ap-
 "parently) *so three*; as that also at the same time
 "they are but one. — For KNOWLEDG and LOVE
 "are not in the MIND, as *Accidents* in their *Subject*;
 "but rather are *substantial*, as the Mind it self is: for
 "tho these three are *Relatives*, yet all of them are in
 "their proper *Substance*. — Therefore all three (of
 "necessity) are one and the same Essence. *Lib.*
 9. c. 4. When he saith, *they are all in their proper*
Substance, he means *in the Soul*. For in this, and all
 such like Comparisons, by MIND he doth not mean
 the SOUL, but its *prime Faculty*, even the Intellect
 or UNDERSTANDING; as appears plainly by
 these words, at *Lib. 15. c. 7. Non Anima, sed quod*
excellit in Anima mens est. "By MIND we do not
 "mean the *Soul* it self, but the Faculty that is most
 "excellent in it. But let us hear him discoursing
 these things more largely, and more explicitly, in
 some other places.

Ista tria [Mens Notitia Amor] inseparabilia sunt a
semetipsis; eorum quodque substantia est, & simul om-
nia una Substantia vel Essentia. "These three,
 "[MIND KNOWLEDG LOVE] are inseparable
 "from one another; every one of them is SUB-
 "STANCE, and all of them but one Substance or
 "Essence. *Lib. 9. c. 5.* When he says, every one
 of them is *Substance*; he uses the word *Substance*
adjectively: for the meaning only is, they are *sub-*
stantial. And he calleth them *substantial*, because
 they are *always* in the Substance of the Soul: Not as
Accidents in their *Subject*, but absolutely inseparable
 from it, or rather are one with it. But he goes
 on:

MENS cum seipsam cognoscit, sola PARENS est
NOTITIÆ suæ, & Cognitum hic & Cognitor ipsa est.
 — Quod

Quod ergo cognoscit se, parem sibi NOTITIAM sui GIGNIT, quia non minus se novit quam est; nec alterius essentia est PROLES sive NOTITIA ejus. Nec minor AMOR, quia tantum se diligit MENS, quantum novit, & quanta est. "MIND knowing it self, is the PARENT of such its KNOWLEDG; and is the *Knower*, and *thing Known*. — And in that MIND knows it self, it BEGETS such a knowledg of it self, as is *equal* to it self; for it *fully* knows it self, and its Knowledg is not of another Essence. — This OFSPRING (the *Self-knowledg*) is not less than MIND, because Mind has an *adequate* knowledg of it self: Nor is the LOVE less, because Mind loves it self as *adequately* and *perfectly* as it knows it self; even with a just Equation. *Lib. 9. c. 12.*

The sum of all these Arguings, is; MIND KNOWLEDG LOVE in the Human Soul, are a Trinity that is the Image of God the true Trinity. For *Mind* or INTELLECT BEGETS (he saith) a SELF-KNOWLEDG, that is equal to it self, or equal to *Mind*, and is the OFSPRING of *Mind*; and from these two naturally springs a LOVE, that is equal to either. And farther, *they have all the same Essence*, being all of them *substantially* (and not as *fitting Accidents*) in the Soul; which is their common Substance.

St. *Austin* thinks, this is that Image of God in the Soul of Man, that was intended in those words, *Let us make Man in our Image*. He saith, it is *indelible*; *Immortaliter Immortalitati ejus insita*, "Immortally impressed on an Immortal Subject. Neither Sin, nor Death, nor the (future) Blessedness, hath or will efface it; the Soul will always be *Mens conscia, & se amans*, *An Intellect that KNOWS and LOVES it self*.

Having thus made his way, to the true Trinity; he saith,

saith, *An & hac sapientia, qua Deus dicitur, non se intelligit, non se diligit? Quis hoc dixerit? An putandum est, sapientiam illam qua Deus est, scire alia; nescire seipsam? Qua si dici, & stultum, & impium est; ecce Trinitas, SAPIENTIA scilicet, & NOTITIA SUI, & DILECTIO SUI.* “ May we think that, the
 “ WISDOM which is called GOD, doth not know
 “ it self, or not love it self? Who will say it? That
 “ WISDOM that knows all things, is it ignorant of
 “ it self? But if so to say, is as foolish as it is im-
 “ pious, then see here *the Trinity*; Understanding
 “ or INTELLECT, SELF-KNOWLEDG, and
 “ SELF-COMPLACENCE. He doth not propound this, as a Similitude, Comparison, or Likeness; but as the very Trinity: He insists on it largely, in this and other Chapters, that; to see the Trinity of *Intellect Knowledge and Love* in our selves, who are God’s Image; and not to see the true Trinity, or *the Trinity which is God*, is too much either Slowness, or Negligence; the Trinity within us, does even point to the Trinity without us, we being that part of the Creation in which especially (as saith the Apostle) *the invisible things of God may be clearly seen and understood.* Lib. 15. c. 6.

We ought not to omit that Passage, at Lib. 15. c. 14. *Sciunt invicem Pater & Filius; ille Gignendo, iste Nascendo.* “ The Father and Son KNOW each
 “ other; the Father by begetting, the Son by being
 “ begot. He intends hereby; in the Holy Trinity, Father and Son, or INTELLECT and SELF-KNOWLEDG, are what we should mean when we say *to beget* and *be begotten*; and *vice versa*. This is a farther assurance that, he understood the Terms *to beget*, and *be begot*, in the Mystery of the Trinity; not, as Terms that naturally or properly express what we ought to conceive; but as *figurative Speeches*: *To beget* in this Mystery, is *to know*; to
 be

be begot, is the Reflex or Self-knowledg in God; and vice versa.

This large Account of the Doctrine of St. *Au-*
stin, I apprehend, will not be unwelcome to the
 (inquisitive) Reader; because of the great (and
determining) Authority of this Father, in the Ca-
 tholic Church: and it is almost necessary, to *Me*.
 As there is nothing so absurdly jealous as a supersti-
 tious Ignorance; it is commonly as barbarous and
 rude, as it is suspicious: And from hence are the
 Complaints, or murmurs of some, that in my *four*
Letters concerning the Trinity, I have been too cu-
 rious and particular; I have pretended to find a
Clue for that *Labyrinth*, into which I ought not to
 have enter'd at all, but should have consider'd it as
 a sacred impervious Place. I should have contented
 my self with the Doctrine of the Trinity, as it is
 commonly propounded in the Church; a *Trinity in*
Unity, and *Unity in Trinity*: without any (pre-
 tended) Explications, that might satisfy the vain
 (if not rather the *profane*) Curiosity of those, that
 will not submit to the only safe guidance of *Revela-*
tion. “ Explications, say these Gentlemen, are de-
 “ vifed Commentaries; by which, for the most
 “ part, the Church's Doctrine is expounded away:”
 “ They serve instead of *Tolerations*, and *Comprehen-*
 “ *sions*; to relieve the *Heretics*, and *Schismatics*; and
 “ to let those into the Church, whom our *Articles*
 “ and *Creeeds* were purposely designed to exclude.
 But it is News to me, that our *Creeeds* and *Articles*
 are *Labyrinths*; and that we must not enter into
 them; or what is the same, *must not understand them*.
 'Tis as surprizing that, these Gentlemen affect to
 seem zealous for the Church; while they openly
 contend for such an *obscure Brevity*, in declaring her
 Faith, as takes away the distinction of *Heretic* and *Or-*
thodox.

thodox. Nay they vend themselves for the only (Faithful and Dutiful) Sons of the Church, while they proclaim to every body, that they are afraid of nothing so much, as that the Church should grow like to *the Tree* in the Prophet *Daniel*; *the height whereof reached to Heaven, and the sight thereof to the ends of all the Earth; all the Birds of Heaven sang in her Branches, and her Fruit was Meat for all Flesh.* Dan. 4. 11, 12. Explications, they say, will let every body into the Church; and the Design of 'em (too often) is, to expound away the Faith of the Church. I shall confess that, I think, it were well if our Explications could (as they speak) let every body into the Church: But it is certain, their *Design*, and their *Effect*, has always been quite contrary to that Fear of some; namely, *to limit the Sense, and thereby exclude Heresy, and Heretics.* There could be no need of *Explications*, if the Sense were *clear*, and withal not *Equivocal* or *Ambiguous*: He therefore that determines the Sense by an *Explication*, excludes all pretending Parties but one only; he is at the farthest Remotion from the *Accusation*, of opening our Doors too wide. If the *Explication* destroys the *Doctrine*, it is a Fault indeed: and that some such *Explications* and *Expositions* (of the Article of the *Trinity*) have been advanced, I not only do not deny, but I professed it was the principal occasion of the *Four Letters*. But sure the *Exposition* of *St. Austin*, should not have been suspected by any body: when they were told, in my first Letter, it is *St. Austin's*, and I have gone no farther than that *Father* led me; they should have considered me, only as a *Relater*, and the *Father* as *the Expositor*. I am satisfied with being of that *Catholic Church*, of which *St. Austin* was a *Father*, and a *Saint*: They that have accused the *Explication* in my *Letters*, as too particular and curious, I wish they

they would tell us, *which* and *where* is their Church; who are the *Fathers*, and *Saints* of it? If it be a Church, that does not profess the Doctrine of *St. Austin*; I believe, it may be good discretion, to keep it private to themselves.

I think, I ought to mention here a Letter, sent me from *Cambridge*; my Friend the bringer of it, intimated that it was from the Head of a *College* there, but desired to be excused from naming him, because he had subscribed only *N. N.* This *Anonymous* tells me, I have quoted *St. Austin* in the first of my four Letters, as Author of the Explication of the Holy Trinity given in those Letters: But, saith this Adviser, *M. Du Pin* gives a very different account of *St. Austin's* Doctrine concerning the Trinity. *M. Du Pin* saith, when the Father accounts for the Trinity in God, by **I N T E L L E C T**, **S E L F**-**K N O W L E D G**, and **L O V E**; he doth not pretend, this is the very Divine Trinity, but an *Image* of it, and a *very imperfect One*. *St. Austin* saith that, all our Notions of the Trinity, are infinitely short of it; and that, we see it now but only in a *Figure*, and *enigmatically* or darkly. This Letter saith farther, that divers have found fault, that I should say in the same first Letter; "The Prayer, *O God the Fa-*
 " *ther have mercy upon us, O God the Son have mercy up-*
 " *on us, O God the Holy Ghost have mercy upon us mi-*
 " *serably Sinners,* being the first Invocation in our
 " *Litany,* has been disliked by divers Learned Men;
 " in particular, by *Mr. Calvin*. My Admonisher
 finds, *Mr. Calvin* did dislike it; but he thinks "*John*
 " *Calvin's* Authority ought not to be laid in the Bal-
 " lance against the Liturgy of the Church of *England*.

To begin with this last; neither do I put *Mr. Calvin's* Authority into the Ballance, against our Church: But after I had incidentally, and as they speak *en passant*, mentioned *Mr. Calvin's* dislike of a *distinct*

Invocation of the Divine Persons *together*, as if they were so many several Objects of Worship; I show, in what Sense our Church intends this Invocation. Not as Mr. Calvin seems to have taken it, as if we had three distinct Objects of Worship; but as *one such Object, invoked under its several Distinctions*: My words are these. "The Church doth not intend, cannot intend, by that Form; to acknowledge more Divine Objects of Worship, than one: for she professeth the contrary. She intends therefore here, only to invoke GOD, by or under the several Distinctions, that she acknowledgeth to be in him. But these Distinctions; tho' for good Reasons named Persons, and Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; are understood by her, as only the different *MODES* of the Divine Existence, or Existence of God: and therefore as often as they occur in the Prayers, they are to be taken in the Theological Sense, not in the Vulgar and Common.

But I wonder, it should seem a new thing to any at *Cambridg*, that; some Learned Men have disliked the *distinct (Trine)* Invocation of the three Divine Persons: When there is no Learned Man but doth dislike it, except with the Interpretation I have given. No body will question the Orthodoxy of *J. Forbesius*: His *Instructiones Historico-Theologicae* have been received by all learned Men, with great Acknowledgments of the Author's excellent Erudition, Judgment, and Exactness. He says; *Non est idoneus Adorationis modus, si tribus distinctis Invocationibus tres Personae veluti seorsim Adorentur. Supplicatio facta uni Personae, non est iteranda ad aliam immediate; ne in unam simplicissimum. Religiosi cultus objectum aliquam Separationem, vel Separationis speciem, inducere videamur.* — *Franciscus à Sanctâ Clara, & Doctores communiter, ipsis Divinis Personis (precise sumptis) negant subesse terminum formalem adorationis Patrie; sed*

hoc Deitati solum primò competit, Relationibus vero prout Identificantur cum Essentiâ. Lib. 1. c. 23.

“ It is not a proper manner of Worship, when the
 “ three Divine Persons are severally adored, by
 “ *distinct* Invocations. The Invocation made to one
 “ Person, should not be repeated *immediately* to ano-
 “ ther Divine Person; lest thereby we make, or seem
 “ to make, a separation in the Object, of Religious
 “ Worship; which is most strictly One. — *Fran-*
 “ *ciscus à Sancta Clara*, and generally the Doctors
 “ of the Church, deny that, the Divine Persons as
 “ *Persons*, are the Objects of Divine Worship: that
 “ belongeth only to the Deity it self; and to these
 “ *Relations* (the Divine Persons) but only as they
 “ are identified with the Divine Essence. That is,
 “ as each of these *Relations, Properties, or Personali-*
 “ *ties*, includeth (in its full Notion) the Godhead,
 “ or *God*. But of the Invocation and Adoration of the
 “ Divine Persons, more fully by and by.

As to Mr. *Du Pin*, he hath accounted for these
 Books of *St. Austin*, with too much brevity; his
 Abstract or Abridgment of them is comprised in
one Page: As Brevity has always some Obscurity,
 my *Cambridg-Adviser* might (excusably) mistake
 M. *Du Pin*; tho that Critic (to do him right) hath
 perfectly well understood *St. Austin*.

Mr. *Du Pin* saith: “ *St. Austin* tells us, tho we
 “ have here below several Representations of the
 “ Trinity, yet we should not look for it but in *Im-*
 “ *mutable and Eternal Things*: And that, we cannot
 “ see it in this Life, but in a *Figure*, and *Enigmati-*
 “ *cally*. And thus he pretends that, we have an *Idea*
 “ of the Generation of the Son, by the Production
 “ of the WORD of our own Understanding; and an *Idea*
 “ of the Proceeding of the Holy Spi-
 “ rit, by the LOVE that proceeds from our *Will*.
 “ But he confesseth that, *these Notions are very im-*
 “ *perfect*;

“ perfect ; and that there is an infinite difference betwixt
 “ these Comparisons, and the Mystery of the Trinity.
 Hist. of Eccl. Writers, Cent. 5. p. 194.

As I said, he hath truly reported St. Austin ; but only too briefly ; that one cannot readily understand his true meaning, without also looking into St. Austin himself.

He saith, St. Austin teaches. “ We are not to
 “ seek for the Trinity, but in *Immutable and Eter-*
 “ *nal Things*. Right, St. Austin often says it ; We
 are not, *says the Father*, to expect a true Image of
 the Trinity in the merely *sensible Creation* : but as
 God himself is Eternal and Immutable, his Image
 (or Likeness) must be sought in such a Being ; and
 the Soul of Man, *saith he*, is such, it is Immutable
 and Eternal. Again, he saith ;

“ We do not see the (Divine) Trinity, but in
 “ a Figure, *enigmatically and darkly*. He speaks of
 the Image of the Divine Trinity in the Soul of Man :
 Our Intellect, *saith he*, our Self-Knowledg, and
 Self-Love, is but a Figure ; and that too, an enig-
 matical or obscure Figure ; of the like Trinity in
 God ; and yet it is in this only that we can (at
 present) see that Divine Trinity. The enigmatical
 Figure of the Divine Trinity in the Soul of Man, is
 as much short of that Trinity, as *our Nature* is short
 of the *Divine Nature*.

Lastly, He maketh St. Austin to say ; “ These
 “ Notions are very imperfect : there is an infinite
 “ difference betwixt *these Comparisons*, and the My-
 “ stery of the Trinity. But St. Austin says not
 that, Divine MIND, Divine SELF-KNOWLEDG,
 Divine LOVE, are *Comparisons of the True Trinity* ;
 much less that, they are *imperfect Comparisons* : for
 he saith often and often, that they are the very Di-
 vine Trinity. But these Notions, and these Compa-
 risons, of *Human Intellect* or MIND, *Human SELF-*
 KNOW-

KNOWLEDG, and *Human* SELF-LOVE; or *Human* MEMORY, KNOWLEDG, and LOVE, and others of that kind; tho we find them in the Soul, an *Eternal* and *Immutable Thing*, are Comparisons and Notions infinitely short of the Mystery of the Trinity. This is what *St. Austin* said, and what *Mr. Du Pin* (if his words be heedfully observed) makes him to say; but this *latter* could not possibly speak as clearly and accurately in a Page, as the *Father* in fifteen Books.

We have said enough before, of the Deference of the whole *Latin* (or *Western*) Church, to the Person and Doctrine of *St. Austin*; the *Greck* Church, or the *Orient*, have not less respected him: The *Greeks* account for the Faith of the Trinity, in the very Words and Notions of *St. Austin*. In the Year of our Lord 1453. *Gennadius Scholarius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, presented to the Grand Signior *Mahomet*, who had then lately taken *Constantinople*, a Confession of the Christian Faith; in the name of himself, and of the *Greck* Churches: You have it in the *Turco-Gracia* of *M. Crucius*, Lib. 2. and in *Chytraeus*, *Orat. de Statu Eccl. in Gracia*; and in the last Edition of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. It saith, first, in general;

“ We believe, there are in God three PROPER TIES; that are the Principle and Fountain (as it were) of all his other Properties: We call those Properties three HYPOSTASES, or PERSONS. But in that the Properties do not divide the Divine Essence; therefore is God but *one God*, tho endued with these *three Properties*. Then, more particularly;

“ We believe that, in the Nature of God is the LOGOS and SPIRIT; as in the Fire is *Light* and *Heat*. And as Fire, tho there be no Object which it may either enlighten or warm, yet al-

ways, hath both Light and Heat, and emits
 both; in like manner, before the World was,
 there were in God the LOGOS and the SPIRIT,
 as the *natural Acts* of God. These three, MIND
 the WISDOM and SPIRIT, are one God; as in
 one and the same Soul of Man there is MIND
 REASON and WILL, which tho' three, are yet
 but *one Soul* in respect of *Essence*. We call the
 LOGOS the WISDOM, and the POWER, and
 the SON of God; because he is *generated* of the
 Essence of God, *as a Man's Thought is the Offspring*
of the Human Soul. The WILL of God, we call
 the SPIRIT, and LOVE; but MIND it self
 we call the *Father*, because he is neither begotten,
 nor has any Cause that is prior to him; and be-
 cause he is the Cause of the *Son and Spirit*. Be-
 cause God understands and *knows*, not only the
 Creatures made by him, but *himself*; therefore it
 is plain that, he hath a *Logos*, or WISDOM by
 which he knows himself properly and distinctly
 from all other things. In like manner, he not on-
 ly Willeth, which is to say LOVE TH, whatsoy-
 ever he hath made; but *Himself* much more. So
 that, 'tis hereby evident that; there proceeds
 eternally from God, both his LOGOS and SPI-
 RIT, and yet that they are eternally *in him*: and
 farther that, the one God is the Father and these
 two. As I said; the Thoughts, and very *Words*
 of St. Austin

I perswade my self, there are not many but will
 be satisfied, by these Authorities. Notwithstand-
 ing, I shall add also a *Scholastic Dissertation*, that
 will explain the Mystery more particularly; and
 which contains the Authorities of the other *Fa-
 thers*, the *School-Doctōrs*, and the *Divines of the Re-
 formation*. Only first touching briefly on some Que-
 stions,

tions, and Controversies, that are warmly argued (on both sides) by the School-Doctors.

On some Questions and Controversies of the Schools.

The *Four Letters* excited the Curiosity of many; a great number of Learned Persons, of all Orders in the Church, thought it worth their while, to signify to me their Approbation of, or their Exceptions to, what I had published: But the most agreed, in telling me that, something should have been said in those Letters, to divers Questions, and Difficulties; that are there wholly omitted, or but lightly touch'd. As,

When we say *three Divine Persons*; are we to understand it, in the *concrete*, or abstract Sense, of the Term *Persons*? If in the abstract, that is, for the *Personal Properties*, it may be answered by some or other, *Personal Properties* are not proper *Persons*. If in the *Concrete*, that is, for an *Essence* (or *Substance*) and the *Property together*; so three *Persons* will be three *Substances* or *Essences*: which implies *Tritheism*. Scheibler says, "To what the *Photinians* (or *Socinians*) alledg, that a *Person* is an *intelligent Substance* or *Essence*, therefore three *Divine Persons* must be three *Essences* or *Substances*; the true Answer (I think) is. The word *Person* is sometimes taken complexly or *concretely*, for the *Property* and *Substance together*; as when we say a *Person* is an *intelligent Substance*: or only for the *Property*, that is added (as it were) to the *Substance* or *Essence*, as when we say *there are three Divine Persons*; for the meaning of that is, *the one Essence or Substance of God subsisteth under three distinct Properties*. *Metaphys. l. 2. c. 2. n. 61.* And a la-

ter (very Learned) Scholastic, J. Pafewitz in his *Theologia Scholastica*, and his *Metaphysica Scholastica*, says; "Three Divine Persons taken concretely, seem to imply three Essences or Substances: and therefore 'tis the more common Opinion of the Doctors that, these words *three Divine Persons* signify abstractly; they denote the Subsistences or Properties. *Metaphys. Schol. p. 30.*

It is a Question also, whether the Divine Persons are *Infinite*, or *Finite*? If we say, they are *Infinite*; there will be *three Infinites*: but as there is *but one Eternal*, and *but one Incomprehensible*, as saith the *Athanasian Creed*; so neither can there be more than *one Infinite*. But if we say, the Persons are but *Finite*; nothing *Finite* is God, or in God.

Whether the Persons of the Trinity are Objects of Divine *Worship*, and *Invocation*; especially of distinct *Invocation*, and *Worship*, at the same time; seems another hard Question, and necessary to be resolved. For on the one Side, there seems to be the Practice of the Church of *England*, in the first *Invocations* in the *Litany*; nay of all Churches. On the other, besides the *Canons* of some Councils; it may be said, seeing the Persons are not *Beings*, or *Spirits*, but the Modes and Properties of a *Spirit* and *Being*, only the Deity or *God* (who is that *Spirit*) can be the proper Object of *Latria*, or of *Invocation*.

And finally, as to the *manner* of our Saviour's Divinity; it consists without doubt in the *Hypostatical* (or *Personal*) Union of the *Logos* to the Humanity of our Saviour: but what is this *Personal Union*? Is it such an *Indwelling* of the *Logos* in the Humanity, that the Humanity is always under the *Conduct* and *Direction* of the Divinity? as a Learned Prelate after divers *Fathers* and *Schoolmen* has lately explained it. But they object to him, that *Nestorius* said

as much: and it may seem that, this differs from the Inspiration and Indwelling in the Prophets and Apostles, only in time; in them it was occasional and *temporary*, in our Saviour constant and *perpetual*. Or is it such an Indwelling, as seems intimated in the *four Letters*; that Divine Perfections, Properties or Attributes, (as Omniscience and Omnipotence) are exerted *in and by* the Humanity? But this is very obscure. For what means *by the Humanity*, can Divine Properties (or Perfections) be exerted *by the Humanity*, if they are not communicated to the Humanity? But how can *Infinite* Properties be communicated to a *Finite* Subject? Or how can the Properties of one Being be communicated to another? for it is by their Properties that things are distinguished from one another. If therefore *Properties* can be really communicated, the Natures of all things are confounded; they are no longer distinct but *Identified*. Or if you say, not Identified; you incur this Contradiction, that they are *the same* by a Communication of their distinctive Properties, and yet not *the Same*. And a Property, say the Metaphysicians, as it is a Property is *incommunicable*; else it were not a Property: for *proper* and *common* are directly contrary, and therefore inconsistent with one another.

To these Questions, and Arguings upon them, I say,

It is needless, methinks, to ask; Whether *three Divine Persons* is to be understood in the Concrete, or Abstract? For they that mean *concrete Persons*, intend no more than others do. They intend not that, as there are three Properties and Modes, so there are three Essences and Substances: they mean only, (as *Posewitz* and *Scheibler* and the rest, who say three Persons in the *Abstract*) *each Person is a Property and the Divine Essence; and otherways it should be a mere Property (Personality or Mode) and not a Person.* In short,

short, the Modes of existing are three; and each *with the Essence*, is a distinct Person: but the Essence being but One; therefore the Divine Persons are not, as *Human* and *Angelical* Persons, so many distinct Beings; but one Being, subsisting after a *threefold manner*. That is, as original WISDOM, reflex KNOWLEDG, and SELF LOVE; or, as UNBEGOTTEN, BEGOTTEN, and PROCEEDING: because the reflex, or SELF-KNOWLEDG is the *Act*, and therefore (humanly speaking) the Generation or *Offspring* of Original WISDOM or Intellect; and the LOVE or Self-Complacence necessarily proceeds from Intellect and Self-Knowledge. This being the whole meaning of both Parties; it is a mere verbal Contentions, whether we are to speak and mean in the concrete, or abstract way.

To the *second* Question, Are the Persons *Finite*, or *Infinite*? If we say *Infinite*, there will be *three Infinites*; which is impossible, and contrary also to *St. Athanasius*. If *Finite*; nothing *Finite* is *God*, or *in God*. I say upon this,

II. To avoid this *Dilemma*, 'tis usually answered; neither *Finite* nor *Infinite* is to be used of the *Divine Persons*, but only of the *Essence*. *Infinity* is an *Essential*, not a *Personal* Attribute.

But in my Judgment there is little danger, from the first *Horn* of the *Dilemma*: for 'tis no more inconvenient, or contrary to *Athanasius*, to say *three Infinite Persons*; than to say, *three incomprehensible, or three Eternal Persons*. When *Athanasius* denies *three Eternals, three Incomprehensibles, three Infinites*, he means *three Infinite (Eternal Incomprehensible) Substances, Essences, or Beings*; not *three Infinite Eternal or Incomprehensible Persons*: for by *three Divine Persons* he means only the *Divine Essence or Substance, under its three Properties*.

But

But if we should take *Person*, not in the Concrete, for *Property and Substance*; but in the Abstract, for the *Property* only: I see not, why we may not say, each *Person* is Infinite, and there are *three Infinites*. For certainly the *Divine Intellect*, *Self-Knowledg*, and *Self-Complacence*, are each of them Infinite; in their *formal Conception*, abstractly from the *Essence*, they are Infinite.

III. The third Controversy; Whether the *Divine Persons* are Objects of *Latria*, and of *Invocation*; like the first, it is but Verbal. For whether they are invocated singly, or conjunctly; it is not the mere *Mode* or *Property* that is invocated, or is worshiped; but the *Mode* or *Modes* as including the *Divine Essence*, *Godhead*, or *God*. When they are invocated singly; 'tis the *Property with the Essence*, or rather the *Essence under such Property*; when conjunctly, *God* is (intended to be) invocated as distinguished after a triple manner.

But occasions of scandal, or mistake, ought to be removed by *careful*, and *often* explaining the *Public Forms*, in our *Sermons*, and *Catechisms*.

IV. The fourth Question, concerning the manner of our *Saviour's Divinity*. It consists, without doubt, in the *Hypostatical Union* of the *Divinity*, to the *Humanity* of our *Saviour*; but what is this *Hypostatical Union*?

If we say, 'tis such an *Indwelling* of *God* in *Man*, that the *Divine Perfections* which are the *Properties* of the *Divine Nature* (such as the *Omnipotence*, *Omniscience*, and the rest) are exerted *in*, and by the *Humanity*.

First, if only *in* the *Humanity*; it should seem, *Christ* shall thereby be no more *God*, than the *Prophets* and *Apostles* were.

Secondly, If by the Humanity, it should seem; the Divine Perfections, which are the *distinguishing* Properties of the Divine Nature, cannot be exerted by the Humanity, except they be communicated to the Humanity: against which there are many Exceptions; and the *Catholics* and *Calvinists* impute to the *Lutherans* the *Eutychian* Heresy, on the account that they maintain a *real* Communication of some Divine Properties, (as namely, Omniscience, and Omnipotence) to the Humanity of Christ. Of the *Calvinists*, *Francoise. Turrettinus*, Instit. Theol. par. 2. loco 13. quest. 7. p. 345, &c. *L. Ryffonius*, Compend. Theol. loco 11. Controv. 5. p. 106, &c. Of the *Lutherans*, *J. Posewitz*, Theol. Schol. & Metaph. Schol. p. 30. and *Chr. Scheibler*, Metaph. Lib. 1. c. 23. Of the *Catholics*, *M. Becanus*, Theol. Scholast. par. 3. and *Card. Bellarmin*, de Christo Lib. 3. c. 8, 9, 10. have perplexed this Enquiry, with extraordinary Difficulties. Yet there seem to be but two Opinions: the *Cardinal* and the *Calvinists* well agreeing; I shall however propound their Doctrine, in their own Terms.

The *Cardinal*, after proposing and rejecting divers Forms, and Explications, of the *Fathers* and *Moderns*, acquiesces in this; "The Humanity of Christ hath not a proper Subsistence, or Subsistence of its own, but exists in the WORD, as the Arm (for instance) in the Body: the Divinity so sustaineth the Humanity, (ut totum sustentat Partes sibi intimè conjunctas & unitas) as the WHOLE sustains its PARTS. de Christo L. 3. c. 8. With due reverence to his *Purple*; the Union is greater, or we cannot say *Christ is God*: for hereby no real Advantage, but only an *Honorary*, is given to the Humanity. The Humanity becomes hereby a kind of *Adjunct*, or *Appendix*, to the Divinity; but receives nothing from it, but only *Nominally*: and as the Arm is not the

the *Body*, nor any *part* may be called the *whole*; so neither may *Jesus* be called *God*, by such an Union to *God*.

The *Calvinists* say, there is a Communication indeed of Idioms or Properties; but it is to the *Person* of *Christ*, as *God-Man*; not of the *Divine Nature* to the *Human Nature*, or *vice versa*. The *Perfections* or Properties of the *Divine Nature* are no more really communicated to the *Human Nature*, than the *Imperfections* of the *Human Nature* to the *Divine*. The *Humanity* is no more *Omniscient*, *Omnipotent*, *Self-living*, *Adorable*; than the *Divinity* is *passible*, that is, *Hungers*, *Thirsts*, *Grieves*, *Dies*. We say indeed, *God* died for the *Sins* of the *World*, *God* was born of the *Virgin Mary*, and divers such like: but we mean, *he who is God* was born and died; but not *as he is God*, or according to his *Godhead*, but *as he is Man*, or in his *Manhood*. So we say also, the *Man Christ Jesus* is *Eternal*, *Creator* of *Heaven* and *Earth*, knoweth all things, can do all things: but *not as Man*, or according to his *Manhood*, or *by the Manhood*; but *as he who is Man*, is also *God*, or according to his *Godhead*, or *by the Godhead*. In short, the different Properties of each *Nature*, are ascribed rightly to the *Person* who is made up of these two *Natures*: but they are not communicated from one *Nature* to the other *Nature*, or may be ascribed to the other *Nature*; for that were to confound the *Natures*, and introduce *Eutychianism*. They say moreover, the *Hypostasis* or *Subsistence* of the *WORD* is not communicated to the *Humanity*; but only the *Humanity* is so assumed into the *WORD*, as to be *sustained* by it, as a *Part* is sustained by the *Whole*. The *Reasons* of this *Opinion*, are these.

What is a Property of (or what is the same, is proper to) one thing, cannot be communicated to another;

ther ; for so, it would lose its Nature : it would cease to be *proper*, and become (the contrary) *common*.

Again, the *Divine* uncreated Nature cannot be communicated to any *created* Nature ; for then it would no longer be created, but *uncreated*. Therefore neither can the *Properties* of the Divine Nature be communicated ; for the *Properties* are *identified* with the Nature, and are but so many inadequate (or *partial*) Conceptions of the Nature.

Farther. The *Properties* of the Divine Nature are inseparable ; they are *really* one, and more but only *conceptively*, for they are the same with the Essence : But now it is granted, some of the Divine *Properties* are not communicable ; as the *Præ*ternity, *Omni*-presence, *Independence*.

And, the Union between the Divinity and Humanity is *reciprocal* : Therefore, if in virtue of the Union, the Divine Perfections and Idioms are *really* communicated to the Humanity ; the human Idioms, which are all of them Imperfections, are communicated to the Divinity. Such as to be passible, to Hunger, Thirst, Grieve, be Fallible.

The *Lutherans* say, these are Finenesses, very proper to defend *Nestorianism* ; and the Doctrine it self is no better or other : They say therefore roundly, the *Hypostatical Union* and manner of our Saviour's Divinity, consists in the *Communication* of *Divine Properties*, to the *Humanity* of *Christ*. Or *Christ* is God by *such* an *Indwelling* of the Divinity, in the *Humanity* ; that the *Divine Properties* (or *Perfections*) are communicated to, and are exerted by the *Humanity* : And the *Humanity* is *formally* united to the *Person* of the *WORD* ; and not only *assumed* into it, or *sustained* by it. They expound this, by some Comparisons ; taken out of *Origen*, *St. Athanasius*, *St. Basil*, and other *Fathers* : The
Com-

Comparisons are (usually) these two.

As *Fire* communicates its Property of *Heat*, to *Iron* and other Metals; while still *Fire* remains *Fire*, and *Iron* *Iron*: So are the Properties of the Divinity, communicated to the Humanity; only with this difference, they are in the Divinity φυσικῶς or naturally, in the Humanity χεχωρισμένως, or by gratuitous Communication; in the Divinity primarily, in the Humanity secondarily.

The other Comparison is better, and is hinted in the *Athanasian Creed*. As the *Soul* communicates its Properties of Life, Sense, and Understanding, to the *Body*, without communicating to it *Spirituality*; for the *Body* lives, sees, tastes, and (in the *Brain*) understands, and not the *Soul* only in the *Body*: So the indwelling Divinity communicates to *Christ's Humanity*, the Divine Properties of which it is capable, Omniscience, Omnipotence, and some more; without communicating to it Præ-eternity, Infinity, or Independence. "If, say they, as the Reasonable *Soul*, and *Human Flesh* is one Man, so God and Man is one *Christ*; which are the words of the *Athanasian Creed*, received by all Churches: as the *Soul* communicates its Properties, Life, Sense, and Intellection, some of them to the whole *Body*, others to some part of it; so does the Divinity communicate its Properties, that are communicable without a Contradiction implied, to the Humanity of our Saviour, or to the Man *Christ Jesus*. And by less than this, 'tis manifest, *Jesus* is not θεός, *God*; but only θεόφορος, a *Man in whom God is*: which is the Heresy of *Nestorius*.

The Church of *England* not having defined, that I know of, in these Matters; I am not willing to be too forward: I shall only say,

I. The Properties of a Being are so called, because they are natural to, and are primarily in, such Being; not because they are absolutely incommuni-
cable

cable. This is clearly proved by the Instances of St. Basil and Athanasius, namely of Fire and the Soul, that communicate their Properties to Iron, and to the Human Body.

2. It does not seem so impossible that, the In-dwelling of God should communicate Divine Properties, the communication of which implies no Contradiction, to Christ's Humanity; as that the Soul (that has but a finite Power) should communicate its Properties of Life and Sense to the whole Body, and Intellection to the Brain. It may be, these two Considerations do answer all the Reasons (before-mentioned) of the Calvinists and Cardinal Bellarmine against the real Communication of Idioms or Properties.

3. It implies a Contradiction that, Pre-eternity or Infinity should be communicated to a Man, or to a Human Nature, which had once a beginning, and is circumscribed in a place: therefore these and such-like Properties are not communicable to a Human Nature.

4. The sole Difficulty seems to be this; Whether it imply not also a Contradiction, that a Finite Being should receive Perfections that are Infinite, such as Omniscience, Omnipotence, and the rest? And I make this a doubt, because tho' there seems an incapacity in the Recipient, by its being finite in its Extension; yet, are we sure that the Incapacity of a Finite Extension, may not be surmounted by the Infinite Power and Wisdom of the Giver? For is it more impossible, than to make all things out of Nothing? And hath not God all infinite Perfections, in the least (assignable) part, of his immense and infinite Nature? Nay, hath no finite Recipient, any infinite Property, or Properties: are not eternal Duration, and infinite Divisibility, such Properties; and are they not actually communicated to some
Crea-

Creatures, in particular to Matter or Bodies? And would it not better answer to the Scripture-Expressions, concerning our Saviour's *Knowledge* and *Power*; to say, the Divine Indwelling is *such* in him, as to communicate to him Divine Properties: than to say, all was meant of *God in him*?

But I determine nothing in the case; the more knowing may be more adventurous: I submit my self to Information.

G Insti-

Institutions, concerning the Holy Trinity, and the *Manner* of our Saviour's Divinity.

P A R T II.

A Scholastick Dissertation, concerning the Trinity of Principles, or Essentialities; and Persons.

THAT I may not confound, rather than edify, the common Reader; or leave him *mad*, whom I found only *ignorant*; I resolve to say nothing of divers bold and overcurious *Questions*, of which the *Scholastics* (or Divines of the middle Ages) largely treat.

Quest. I. The Trinity being a tremendous Mystery; and not only *Heretics*, but even the *Scholastics*, having been so unfortunate in their Enquiries and Determinations concerning it; shall we not presume too much, if we undertake to discourse accurately and clearly of it?

Ans. Those Considerations should caution us, against a proud or profane Curiosity and Boldness; and Strifes concerning *Logical* and *Metaphysical* Terms; or such things, as being above us, and not revealed,

revealed, must therefore be unknown to us: but they may by no means discourage us from a sober enquiry and search of *Truth revealed*.

For, 1. the Doctrine of the Trinity, is the very Foundation of all true Theology; and is (as it were) the Life of the other subsequent Doctrines.

2. There are every where many Adversaries of this (first and chief) Article of our Faith: some of those directly oppose it; others, yet worse, taking Scandal and Offence at this Doctrine, do thereupon deny and renounce the whole Christian Religion.

Against these, that every *Minister*, nay that every *Christian*, be well instructed; Souls, the Church, Christianity, and even *Christ* (our Head and Lord) are most deeply interested. For when Infidels and Heretics (*Deists* and *Socinians*) dispute with any of our Clergy, or Laity, that are not well informed concerning these Questions; they go off with a clear Victory; to the great damage and disgrace of the Christian Verity.

Quest. 2. How much of the Doctrine of the Trinity, is necessary to be believed by all Christians; as a Condition of their Salvation?

Ans. So much as is the true, clear, and necessary Sense of our *Baptismal Profession* and Faith; when we say, *I believe the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*. Namely, 1. That, we believe Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, to be the one, true, co-eternal God; *one* in Essence, *three* in a manner that is incomprehensible by Mortals. 2. That we believe also, Christ is *God-man*, the Saviour of the World. 3. Whereas in this Sacrament, as in a Holy Covenant, God offers himself to us, under the Relation of our God, (of Creator, and *reconciled* Father, of

reconciling Mediator, and sanctifying Spirit;) that we profess on our part, we accept this God with a cordial *fiducial Assent*, and *practical Consent*, and as it were Oblation and Surrendry of our selves to him. This Faith in the Holy Trinity is necessary, chiefly as *practical*; that is, as we devote our selves to God (under the aforesaid threefold Relation) to be sanctified, saved, and perfected in Love by him.

When St. *Austin* sets himself to discover and explicate the Mysteries of the Trinity; not to discourage those Christians who were not capable of such Depths and Subtilties, he answers to the Question, that I last proposed, in these words. “ Neither let us unfaithfully doubt, of what we ought to believe; nor determine rashly of what may be learned: In the *first* let us hold to the Authority of *Revelation*; in the other, let us enquire out the Truth, with *diligence*. Therefore to the Question, I say; let us believe, Father Son and Spirit is one God, Maker and Governor of the whole Creation: That the Father is not the Son, the Holy Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son; but a Trinity of Persons related to one another, and an Unity of equal Essence. But let us *endeavour to understand this*; begging help of him, concerning whom we enquire; and as he shall enable us, explicating it to others, with that heedful regard to Piety, that *if by mishap we say that of one Person which belongeth to another, we say not however what is unworthy of either*. As, if we say that of the Father, that properly belongeth not to the Father, but to the Son, or the Spirit, or the Trinity; or of the Son, that appertaineth not to him, but appertaineth to the Father, or the Spirit, or the Trinity; or lastly, of the Holy Spirit, that doth not explicate the Character and Property of the Spirit, but is found in the Fa-
“ ther

“ther or the Son, or the one God the Trinity.
 “And such is the Question I would next answer,
 “Whether LOVE be properly the Holy SPIRIT;
 “or whether the Father be LOVE, or the Son, or
 “the Trinity it self be LOVE? For *the Word of*
 “*Truth* saith, GOD IS LOVE. 1 *John* 4. 8. De
 Trin. lib. 9.

Reader, allow me this Latitude of *St. Austin*;
 confine thy Censures, and Faith, in these Bounds;
 and both *Faith* and the *Peace* will be secured.

Quest. 3. Whether there are not some *Traces* (if
 we may so speak) of the Divine Trinity, in the
 External Creation; and also *the Image* of it, in
 Man?

Answ. Almost all the Fathers so thought; espe-
 cially *St. Austin*, de Trin. lib. 10, & 11, & 14.
 And well near all the Scholastics, chiefly *P. Lombard*,
 Dist. 3. and *T. Aquinas*, 1. qu. 93. ar. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,
 6, 7, 8. This last (in the place here cited) proves,
 the *natural* Image of God is in all, his *holy* Image in
 the Sanctified; his *glorious* in the Glorified; that
 this Image is in the Mind only, but some *Traces* or
Scriptures of it, in the inferior Faculties, as also in
 the other Creatures. To which the greatest part of
 those Doctors agree; tho I do not cite here their
 Words, or refer to the Chapters or Pages in their
 Works.

Quest. 4. What is that in Man, that is the *natu-
 ral Image* of the Divine Trinity; and what Tri-
 nity in Man, or other Creatures, is chiefly observa-
 ble?

Answ. We must distinctly consider these three
 things. 1. What *Traces*, and what *Image* of the
 Trinity, in Man, are certainly and plainly disco-
 verable by *Reason*, and *common Sense*. 2. Doth this

Image consist in the *Faculties*, or their *Acts*; and in which soever of these, whether as they respect *our selves*, or as they refer to *God*? 3. That, *St. Austin* mistaking about this, misled the *Divines* of the *Schools*.

I. I omit the *three Passive Natures*; *Air*, *Water*, and *Earth*. The *Active Natures* (whose *Form* tends to *Action*, as the *Passive* do, to *Rest*) are *three*; the *Vegetative*, *Sensitive*, and *Rational*; and have each a *threefold Virtue*.

The *Vegetative Nature*; which I take to be *Fire*, incorporated, and working, in *Matter* rightly disposed to *Vegetation*; its *Virtue* radically and centrally is but *one*, but *Exeunter* (or in the *Effects*) is *threefold*. *Viz.* *Active*, or *Motive*; *Discretive*, by which it distinguishes *Foods* proper and apt for *Nourishment*, from those that are inept and improper; and *Attractive*, that (as it were) desires, draws and assimilates the *Nourishment*, and answers to the natural *Appetite* in *Animals*. Which so far deceived *Campanella* and others; that they thought all things were indued with *Sense*; because (as I said) there is in *Vegetables* something *Analogous* to *Sense*.

The *Sensitive Nature* hath also its *formal Virtue* centrally and radically (in its *Substance*, whether that be *Corporeal*, or as I rather think *Spiritual*) but *one*: but in the *Effects*, or *operatively*, *threefold*. *Viz.* *vitally-Active*, *Approhensive*, and *Appetitive*, in the way of *Sense*.

The *Intellective* or *Rational Nature* also hath centrally *one Formal Virtue* essential to it; which *operatively* and *externally* is *threefold*, *Active-Vital*, or *vitally-Active*, *Intellective*, and *Volitive*. This *Nature*, as renewed by *Grace*, has likewise a certain *Trinity*; a holy *Vitality* or *Power*, a holy *Wisdom*, and holy *Love*.

All

All these meet in Man. He has the three (material) *Passive* Natures; also the Vegetative, Sensitive, and Rational Natures; with the *trine Power* (or *Virtue*) in each of them. As renewed by Grace, he hath the *moral* Image of God, or the Trinity, *viz.* in his Vital Power, *Spiritual Life*; in his Intellectual, *Spiritual Light*, or Knowledge; and his Volitive, *Divine Love*. We are not to look farther or elsewhere, for the *natural* or the *moral* Image of God in Man, as *Man*; or as *renewed*: This is the *Image* intended by *Moses*, and by God, *Gen.* 1. 27. and 9. 6.

There is scarce any Controversy concerning these things; saving that, *T. Aquinas*, and some that follow him, have unhappily said, the *Virtues* or *Powers* (before-mentioned) of the Rational Nature, are *Accidents*: but the *Scotists* and *Nominals* have clearly proved the contrary. And he that shall read *Zabarel*, and the more moderate *Thomists*, will plainly see that, it is a strife about Words and Terms only. For they confess the Soul operateth (at least so far as it produceth these Powers) by *its Essence*; and that these *Virtues* and *Powers* are *proximately* and inseparably in the Soul; or (what is the same) *emanate* from it, by a *natural* and *constant* Necessity.

II, As to the second Question, I see not the least reason, why we should think; the *Divine Image* in Man is in the *Virtue*, or *Power*, or *Faculty* only, or in the *Act* only. It is *radically* in the *Faculty* or *Power*, actively or *operatively* in the *Acts*. For as our distinct *Notions* of the *Power* (or *Virtue*) and the *Act* in the *Divine Nature*, are but inadequate (or *partial*) *Conceptions* of the *same* thing; for the *Act* and *Power* are in God the *same* thing, the *Act* being nothing else but *the Power acting*: so it is necessary that, the *Conception* of the *Objective Vir-*

tue or *Power*, and the *Act*, do concur to the forming of the *Image* of God in us.

To the second part of the Question; Whether the Image of God in the Soul consists in the *Acts* towards *it self*, and the *Creature*, or towards *God*? I answer; *T. Aquinas* will have it to consist only, in the *Acts* towards *God*. But we must distinguish, between *God's Natural*, and *Moral Image* in us: And again, between the *primary*, and *inferior* part of the natural Image. And hereupon I say; 1. The primary and more eximious part of the Divine Image, is in the *Faculties* of the Soul, and their *Acts* towards *God*; as to *know* God, and to *love* God, &c. The inferior part is in *every Act* of the Mind or Soul, *as it is an Act*. 2. The whole Nature of the Holy or *Moral Image*, is seated in the *Inclination*, *Acts*, and *Actions* towards *God*; and towards *the Creature*, *as dignified with the Image of God*, in some degree; or at least *for God's sake*. But our Question is only concerning the natural Image.

III. *St. Austin* has not rightly named the triple *POWER*, and *ACT*, in the Soul; he puts *Memory*, instead of *active Vital-Power* or *Vital-Activity*. We are not however to wonder that, in those first and ruder Ages, they understood not so well the Nature and Powers of the Soul; for *St. Austin* was the *first*, that discoursed and argued *accurately*, of Theological Matters. He formed, as it were, and perfected, the too general and confused *Notions* of the *Antients*, establish'd, and fixed, their loose indetermined Thoughts. Being a Man of a penetrating Wit, and clear Head; untaught by any, he laid those Foundations of the methodical *Scholastic Theology*, on which *Boethius* and *Damascen*, and after them *P. Lombard*, built more regularly and symmetrically. Few Philosophers will allow that, *Memory* is a Faculty distinct

distinct from the *Phantasy*, and *Intellect*; all Memory is an Act of the Intellect, or Phantasy. See *Durandus*, Lib. 1. dist. 3. qu. 3. where you will find, they understood by Memory, the Intellect *as acting*; or they distinguish it from Intellect, only *in Power*, that is, as capable of acting. And *Scotus*, with others that follow *St. Austin*, do not make *Memory* a distinct Faculty, but the *Intellect as pregnant*; and in this respect, give it a place in the Trinity of Acts: and thus it is only *Mind*.

Divers *Scholastics* confess in express words, that; they acknowledg *Memory* to be a part of the Image of the Trinity, only out of regard to *St. Austin*, from whose Doctrine we must not depart in the least. But as it is certain, *Memory* and *Intellect* are not distinct Faculties of the rational Soul; so 'tis most certain that *Vital-Activity*, *Intellect*, and *Will* are, and that there is no *fourth*.

Quest. 5. Is there a Trinity of PRINCIPLES (or *Essential Attributes*) in God?

Ans. Yes, out of Controversy. I will not however litigate about the Name: whether you will say *Principles*, or (as *Campanella*) *Primalities*; or *Essentialities*, or *Attributes*, or *Essential Properties*. But the other Attributes are to be distinguished from these, which are the *Formalities* (as it were) of the Divine Nature, and do essentiate it.

1. All sober Men must confess, the *Life*, the *Intellect* and *Will* of God, are not *formally* the same with ours: These Words are not used of God and Men *univocally*, but *equivocally*; or not in the same Latitude, and (precise) sense. And tho some say here, they are used of God and the Creature, neither *Univocally* nor *Equivocally*, but *Analogically*: Yet the *Scotists* are in the right, who prove there is no *third*; but what is said *Analogically*, is said *Equivocally*.

vocally. See on this, *Phil. Faber, Meurisse, Rada, Trombetus, Lychetus*, and the rest of that *School*. [But see also on the contrary (the judicious *Metaphysician*) *Scheibler*, pag. 86, 87. of the *Oxford Edition*.]

2. It must not be dissembled here that, God is no otherwise known to us Mortals, but (as saith the *Apostle*) in a *Glass*: which *Glass* is the *Creature*, and the *written Word*, of the *Creatures*, chiefly the *Human Soul*. Therefore we are necessitated to think, and speak, of God; after the *Likeness* of the *Soul*: only removing from our *Conceptions* of God, our *Imperfections*; and acknowledging the *equivocalness* or *impropriety* of our *Ideas* and *Expressions*. But to speak better or otherwise of God, we cannot; we must thus speak of the *Trinity*, or not at all.

And I pray, why is this *Trinity* of *Faculties* in the *Soul*, confessed (by all) to be *the Image of God* in us; if we are not to conceive of God and the *Trinity*, according to *this Image*, rather than any other *Ways*?

If any doubt, whether *Omnipotence* *Intellect* and *Will*, are to be attributed to God; let 'em read *Aquinas*, the *Scholastics*, the *Fathers*, or the *Scriptures* themselves: for I would not spend time, in proving what is almost universally acknowledged. Some indeed have said, there is no *Power* in God; tho they confess his *Omnipotence*: as *Petavius*, and some more. As if *Omnipotence* were not *Power*. But the rest explain themselves better, and say; there is no *passive Power* in God, *active* there is: and that, this *active Power* is always in *Act*, never *quiescent*; in short, they own an *active Omnipotence*, that always acteth, at least *immanently*, tho not *excun-ter* or *externally* and *terminatively* on the *Creature*.

Quest. 6. In *what*, and *how many* things, doth the Trinity of PRINCIPLES in the *Image*, agree with the *Divine* Trinity of PRINCIPLES, or of PERSONS?

Ans. 1. In the Human Soul, or in an *Angel*, *Essence* and *Virtue* or Power make no Composition. But because we cannot well conceive of a Spiritual Substance, but only by inadequate (or *partial*) Conceptions, after the manner of *Matter* and *Form*: therefore we are constrained in speaking of the Soul or other Spiritual Being, to use the Terms *Substance* and *Formal-Virtue*, intending them in the analogical way; that is, so as to answer *Matter* and *Form* in Bodies. But by those Terms and Notions I intend no *Composition*, in the Spiritual Beings. I would have this to be applied also, and more especially, to the Principles, and the *Divine Persons*, of the Trinity in God.

2. The whole *Formal Essence* of the Soul, is contained in this *triple Virtue*; neither is there any *fourth*. But even these, *Vital-Activity* *Intellect* and *Willy*, have many *Names*, *connotatively*; that is, as acting and terminated on External Objects. And the same is to be understood of the *Divine Trinity*, whether of *Principles* or *Persons*.

3. The *triple Virtue* (or Power) is not an *Accident* in the Soul; but is its very *Essence*. And the same is to be confessed by All, of the *Divine Trinity* of *Principles*, and *Persons*.

4. This *triple Virtue* is not divided, as if one part of the Soul were the *Active-vital* Power, another part the *Intellectual*, and another the *Volitive*; but the *whole* Soul is *vitaly-Active*, the *whole* *Intellective*, the *whole* *Volitive*. And so also in both the *Trinities*; the *whole* *Divine Essence*, not part of it, is *Active-Life*, the *whole* *Intellect*, and

the

the whole *Will*; the whole is *Father*, the whole *Son*, and the whole *Holy Spirit*.

5. But the *whole* Soul is not *wholly* Active-Power, or Life; nor *wholly* Intellect, or *wholly* Will. That is, each of these denotes or signifies the Soul, *not wholly*, but inadequately; all of them *together*, as conceived also with the Substance and all *Modalities* and *Relations*, are the Soul adequately and wholly. In like manner the whole Divine Essence is expressed, tho *not wholly*, by Active-Life or Power; or by *Intellect* or *Will*: or by the word *Father*, or *Son*, or *Holy Spirit*.

6. As to *immanent Acts* of the Soul; (1.) An *immanent* Act properly so called, is when, not only this Act effecteth nothing *externally*; but the very Object of it, is nothing that is *external*, but the Soul it self. (2.) Or more generally, and less properly and strictly, when the Act is on some *external* Object; but abideth in the Soul, and (as before) effecteth nothing *externally*. The former of these is not any thing different from the Soul; but is the Soul it self, *knowing* or *loving* it self, or as in *Vital-Action*. In short, it is only another State, *Mode*, or Manner of the Soul, differencing it from the same Soul, when consider'd as not thus acting, or as not in the Act of *knowing it self*, or *loving it self*, &c. And tho some call these Acts, *Accidents* of the Soul; yet they intend that Term improperly: namely, on the account that (as they think) these Acts are not always in the Soul, but die away sometimes, without the Soul's dying; but not because they are *adventitious* things, *externally* adventitious, but so many several Modes or States of the Soul.

If it be true, which I much doubt; that the Soul doth not always *understand*, and always *love*; no not by a profound and unobserved Act: this hapneth only by occasion of its unperfect and dependent Nature, which is finite and limited. It hapneth not to

the uncreated Divine Nature, which is Infinite and Perfect. It seemeth truer that, these Acts of the Soul are permanent and constant; they are a sort of *Habits*, that are not (sensibly) perceived by the Agents, but only when the Effects are also perceived. As a Traveller, tho' thinking or talking of other things, continues his Journey, in the right way, and by all its windings or its turnings off from the direct Line; or as the Musician plays his Tune, without reflecting or perceiving what he doth, but wholly intent upon other Matters. So perhaps may the Soul perform always its Essential Acts, of *Intellection* and *Love*, as well as of *Vitality*; without Notions, or Observation of those Acts.

The Soul *understanding* and *loving* it self, may be consider'd not only, as *Acting* or *in Act*; but also, with its Object; that is, as acting *on it self*. And thus it has a double Respect, of *Agent*, and of *Object*; from whence a special or particular Denomination ariseth. While its Acts are toward it self, and within it self; they are nothing but the *Soul it self*; nor can it be called any thing but a mutual Relation. But when its Acts are towards external Objects, tho' they do not operate on them; these Acts, as Acts, for so much as the Agent is concerned, are nothing else but the Soul in a particular State *Mode* or *Manner*: but as they are *specified* by those external Objects, they *ought* to have (and they have) another Name; for they are now of a *mixt Nature*, viz. as they are *the Acts of the Agent*, and *as terminated on external Objects*. Again, when the Faculties of the Soul have an External Object or Objects, and do operate on them; such Action as it is the *Agent's*, 'tis but a mere Habit or *Mode* of such Agent; or as *Scorus* speaks, it is not any thing different from the Soul, but as it is *specified* (or specifically *denominated*) by its Object, Term, or Effect; 'tis to be conceived of as distinct from the Soul.

How

How these things in the Image, are to be applied to the Divine Trinity of Principles or Persons, I need not particularly explain; the Reader will do it in his own Mind, and I would not offend by an unnecessary Prolixity.

7. The Order and Conjunction of the three Faculties of the Soul in their acting, is really admirable. We perceive a diversity of the Action; but what or how great that diversity is, we can scarce tell, or rather cannot tell: for our Faculties have such a mutual dependence, and conjunction, that whenever one Faculty is *principal* in acting, the other co-operate; as much as the capacity of the terminating Object will permit. And all Divines say the same thing of the Principles and Persons in the Divine Trinity.

8. The first of these Faculties, in the order of *Nature*, is the *Active-Vital-Power*; this we may say is the Foundation and Principle of the other Powers, in all their Actions: for we must conceive the Soul as acting, before we can conceive it as acting *intellectually*, or in the way of *Volition*: and the Soul's thus acting is its *Living*; I do not mean, its living as it animates or vivifies the Body, but its *Essential Life*. From hence some have taken occasion to say, *Vital-Activity* or *Active-Vitality* is not one of the three Powers of the Soul, but is their *Genus*; they are only Branches of this Power: but this I shall fully confute in its proper place. And tho we have no particular Name or Word, whereby to discriminate the Life, or *Active-Power* of Man, from that of Brutes; yet that they are of a different kind or sort, their Operations and their Effects show.

By the *Vital-Power* is first GENERATED the *Intellectual Act*, and from both PROCEEDETH the *Volitive-Act*.

I don't think, that I need teach my Reader, to ap-

apply or accommodate these Notions to the Divine Life, Intellect, and Will; to the Father, the Logos, and Holy Spirit.

9. The *formal Virtue* or Power of the Soul is *one* and *three*; single, and yet triple. *One* centrally, radically, or with respect to the Essence; *triple*, virtually, processionally, and by connotation and respect to its *triple Act*.

And certain it is, the *Divine Principles* are radically one, as they are the Essence; but virtually, connotatively, and relatively to the Acts, they are three: and the same is to be held of the *Divine Persons*.

10. But to make a just Distinction of the Faculties or Powers of the Soul, and to adapt to them *Names* that shall accurately express their Nature and Differences, is (it may be) what a mortal Wit should attempt in vain: and otherways there would not remain so many Controversies about it, among (the most subtle and distinguishing Heads) the Divines of the Schools. Who will think that, he can explicate (whether in more or fewer words) that abstruse difference, that recondit arcane Distinction; so as to satisfy others: that difference, I say, of the Faculties of the Soul, that has escaped the clear and penetrating sight of *Aquinas, Aureolus, Capreolus, Cajetan, Ferrariensis*; of *Scotus, Trombet, Maior, Faber, Rada*; of *Ockam, Gregorius Aviminensis, Hurtaeus*; and so many more? And much more should we say the same of the *Principles, and Persons*, of the Divine Trinity.

11. But the least Difference that we can (with reason) affirm of them, is a *Virtual-Relative*, and *Denominative* by connotation from their Acts: The whole Controversy is, Whether their Difference be *real*, and *formal in the nature of the thing*. Apply this also to the Trinity of Principles and Persons.

12. Whatsoever diversity of Action there is in the Human Life, it all arises from this *Power* (of the Soul) which radically is *one*, and processionally *three*. And (in like manner) all the Diversity in created Beings, is wholly owing to that (Divine Essential) *Power* or *Virtue*, which (as we have said) is *three* and *one*; or the Trinity of Persons in one Essence.

13. As the Trinity of Faculties and *Powers* in the Soul, are known (with certainty) *that* they are; but scarce can we express, or conceive, *what* they are: We must be willing to acknowledg the same, of the Divine Trinity of Principles, and Persons.

14. The Powers (or Faculties) of the Soul always Act, their *not to Act* were *not to Be*; but they do not *always* act on outward Objects, nor by the Spirits of the Body: They do not always animate or vivify the Body; as namely, not in a State of Separation, or when the personal Union of the Soul and Body is dissolved. Nor do they always *know*, or *will* this or that particular thing; nor even themselves, *sensibly, by the bodily Organs*.

The Divine *Virtue* also always acts, to *Act* and to *Be* are the same in God; but it doth not *always* create, or govern the World, or operate on external Things. The Divine Persons do not always Create, Redeem, or Sanctify; tho they always *are*, and *act* immanently, or *internally*.

15. The *active-vital-Power*, *Intellect*, and *Will*, in the Soul, are centrally and radically one *formal Virtue* or Power; yet we must not say, the Soul lives or *acts* by the Intellect, or *understands* by the Will. But we must say, (1.) *Formally* the Soul *acts* by its vital-Activity, *understands* by its Understanding, and *willeth* by its Will. (2.) And *effectively* the Will *willeth* by Intellection, and the Intellect *understandeth* by vital-Activity. The Soul acteth it self, by its
Vitality;

vitality; understandeth it self, by Intellect; willeth it self, by Will. And tho it be truly said, the *vital-Activity* understandeth and willeth, by it self with the Intellect and Will; and the *Intellect* willeth, by it self with the Will: Yet 'tis better said, and more properly, the Soul *acteth, understandeth, and willeth*, by its Virtue or Power; as was noted before. Therefore 'tis not properly said, God *formally* liveth (or vitally acteth) by his Intellect, or understandeth by his Will; or that the Father *vitally-acteth* by the Son, or the Son (eternally) *understandeth* by the Spirit. But it is rightly said, God acteth by his *vital-Activity*, and understandeth by his *intellective-Power*, and *productively* by his vital-Activity; and he willeth by his *Volitive-Power*, but *productively* by his Active and Intellective. By this the Reader sees also, how he is to speak of the *Persons* in the Divine Trinity.

16. Saith *Hurtadus de Mendoza, de Anim. Disp. 5. S. 5.* "A thing is said to be *specified*, when it hath its Essence in order to something else; as Form in order to Matter, and Matter in order to Form: And every Power receiveth a Specification *immediately* in order to its own Acts, and *remotely* in order to Objects. From hence then it is that, the Faculties of the Soul are to have *names* that express a Distinction and Diversity; and from hence also the *Divine Principles* are diversly named. Whether it be so in the *Persons* too, I leave undetermined: But certain it is, the *Father* is thus named; for he is called the Father, 1. Respectively to the Act of Generating. 2. With respect to the Son as generated. Therefore I ask, Whether also the *Logos* (WISDOM, or SON) is not named, 1. From the Act of Intellection. 2. From the Deity as the Object understood. And in like manner the Holy Spirit,

H

1. From

1. From the Act of *Self-loving*. 2. From the Deity as the Object loved.

17. The *triple* Virtue or Power of the Soul, is not only the *Essence* of the Soul; not an *Accident*, as *Aquinas* mistook: but we are also to conceive those Faculties as *distinct*, tho not as *divided*; if we will have an adequate Conception of the Soul. The *first* part of this Assertion has been (long ago) proved by *Ockham*, *Gregory of Ariminum*, *Henr. Gandavensis*, *Gabriel Biel*, *Hurtadus de Mendoza*, *Scotus* and all the *Scotists*. *Durandus* affirmeth the same, *Dist* 3. *qu.* 4. *n.* 8. of *Angels*. *Gregory of Valentia* saith, it is probable; *Suarez* and *Vasquez* say, the contrary cannot be easily proved. The *second* part clearly follows.

What in this Matter is said of the Triple Power of the Soul, is to be understood also of the Divine Trinity.

18. Tho to conceive adequately of the Soul, we must think of it under the Notion of a *Spirit*, or purest Substance, as well as of a *formal Virtue*; yet it is more known to us, under this last Conception, than under the other. For we know but little, if any thing, of the *substantiality* of a *Spirit*; or as others speak, the *Metaphysical Matter* of it: But we clearly apprehend what it is to *Will*, *Understand*, and *vitally Act*; and from thence, what *Vital Power*, *Intellective* and *Volitive Power*, are? And from hence, *Cartesius* and his Followers argue, *Cogito, ergo sum*; *I Think, therefore I am*: Hereby making the *Act* of *Cogitation* the first part of *Knowledg*, and from whence our *Existence* (or *Being*) it self is proved.

19. As to the *Arbanasian Creed*, I would say that, all those things are to be said of the *Divine Principles* (and also, in its measure, of the *Soul*) that are com-

commonly said of the Trinity of *Divine Persons*.
 “ The Catholick Faith is this, that we worship one
 “ God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity ; neither
 “ confounding the *Principles*, nor dividing the *Sub-*
 “ *stance* ; for the *vital Active-Power* is one. the *In-*
 “ *tellective* another, the *Volitive* another : But the
 “ Deity of the *Life*, of the *Intellect*, and *Will*, is
 “ the same ; the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eter-
 “ nal. As is the *Life*, so is the Understanding, and
 “ Will. The Life uncreate, the Intellect uncreate,
 “ the Will uncreate ; the Life incomprehensible,
 “ the Intellect incomprehensible, the Will incompre-
 “ hensible ; the Life eternal, the Intellect eternal,
 “ the Will eternal : yet not three Eternals, but one
 “ Eternal ; as neither three Incomprehensibles, nor
 “ three Uncreate, but one Uncreate and one Incom-
 “ prehensible. — and so of the rest. All the Que-
 “ stion is, Whether *Omnipotence* may be ascribed, in
 “ proper speaking, to each of them *distinctly* and *se-*
 “ *verally* ; concerning which see the Author, whether
 “ *Arbanasius*, or *Anastasius*, or some other. For my
 “ own part I scruple not to say, the Divine *active-*
 “ *Life* is intelligent, or wise ; and the *Intellect* (or
 “ Wisdom) is vital ; and the *Love* is vital and intel-
 “ lective. But ’tis not properly said *in the Abstract*,
 “ the *active Vital-Power*, is a Power *formally* intel-
 “ lective ; or that, to live or act, is to *understand* ; or
 “ to understand, is to *will* ; or the Wisdom is *Love*,
 “ or Love is *formally* Wisdom or Life. And the like of
 “ the *Persons* in the Trinity.

20. As the most adequate Conception of the Soul
 is that ; ’tis “ a created Spirit (or most pure *Sub-*
 “ *stance*) endued with a *formal*, vitally-Active, In-
 “ tellective, Volitive Power ; *first* and *necessarily* to-
 “ ward it self, then towards external Objects. So
 we cannot have a truer Conception, in the present
 Life, concerning God ; than this. “ He is one, in-

“ dependent, infinite, necessary, immutable *Es-*
 “ *sence* ; a Spirit (that is, Life, Intellect, and Will)
 “ most perfect ; Father, Son, and Holy Spirit ;
 “ Self-living, Self-knowing, Self-loving : of whom,
 “ by whom, and to whom, are all things. And
 from this, inferring his *Relations* to his Creatures ;
 Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier.

Quest. 7. Is the Trinity of *Principles* (Active-
 Life, Intellect, and Love) and of *Persons*, the
 same ?

Ans. To answer this, I shall first propose these
 Points to be considered by the Reader.

- I. What doth the term *Logos* (which we render
 WORD) signify in the Context of *John* 1. 1,
 2, 3, 4, &c.
- II. What is a *Person* ?
- III. What is a *Relation* ?
- IV. What are the Grounds or *Foundations* of the
 Relations ?
- V. Wherein, or how, do the Divine *Principles*
 (or *Virtues*) differ from one another ?
- VI. What have the *Fathers* said of this Matter ?
- VII. What say the *Scholastics*, or Doctors of the
 (Academical) Schools ; that lived in the mid-
 dle Ages, between the Fathers and the Divines
 of the Reformation ?
- VIII. What is the Doctrine of the *Moderns*, or
 those since the Reformation ?

I. *Of the LOGOS.*

The word LOGOS, in Ecclesiastical and Pro-
 fane Authors, is variously used ; sometimes for *Rea-*
 son in general, sometimes for an *Argument*, some-
 times

times for a *Definition*, for a *Speech* also and *Word*, and many more; as may be seen in Lexicons. But it being used by the Spirit of God, in the Context of St. *John* before-named; therefore its *Theological* signification is there chiefly to be sought. And tho' *in the beginning* there, is by most Interpreters rather taken for *in the beginning of the Creation*; than as St. *Cyril* interprets, *in the Father*: And tho' in that Context the *Evangelist* speaks of the Creation of all things by the **WORD**. It will not thence follow that, Christ had *then* his *first* Original or Beginning, or was *then* created: For 'tis there also said, on the contrary, *the WORD was with God*; which intimates his *Eternal Co-existence*. Nay it is said there, *the WORD was God*: therefore, not a Creature; much less, then first originated. But from hence it is evident, *first* that, this name the **WORD**, has respect to the Work of Creation; when *God SAID*, *Let there be Light*, and so of the rest. And therefore it is, that the Works of God are often in Holy Scripture ascribed to his *Word*, Psal. 33. 6. and 148: 8. 1 *Pet.* 3. 5. And *Solomon* (*Prov.* 8. 22, &c.) says almost the same thing of **WISDOM**, for so we render *Logos* in that Context, *viz.* that, "It was from Everlasting, *from the Beginning*, before the Earth. "When there were no Fountains, or Depths; before the Mountains, and Hills; when he prepared the Heavens, I was there. *Secondly*, We must understand St. *John* as speaking of the *Word* as *præ-existing*, even from Eternity; tho' named the *Word* in time, with respect to the Creation. So the *Logos* is both the *eternal WORD*, or *inexisting WISDOM*, of the Father; and that *creating WORD* and *WISDOM* of the Omnipotent, that *went forth* to make all things. The Context it self teaches us to understand the **LOGOS**, neither as only the *eternal inexisting WISDOM*, nor as only that *proceeding*

WORD and WISDOM that went forth to create ; but so as to comprehend *both* these Senses. The Philosopher *Zeno* is deservedly commended both by *Tertullian* and *Lactantius*, for saying ; the *Logos* is the maker of the World. See their words at length in the Annotations of *Grotius* on this context.

At the 4th Verse it is said, *In him was LIFE* ; as 'tis said elsewhere by Christ, " As the Father hath LIFE in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have LIFE in himself. By which is meant, not only that, Christ is the Cause and Author of our *Life* ; but is that *Radix* or Root of Life, or Eternal WISDOM, that was *generated* by the Omnipotent Divine LIFE : and therefore 'tis here said of Christ, both as eternally *inexisting*, and as proceeding to give Life to Men.

The LIFE was the LIGHT of Men. It was said, to signify the *Property* of the Person ; for it is not meant only of the *Act* of illuminating the World, but of the eternal *Property* of the Enlightner : *Light*, the second *Property* of the Sun, is always likened to *Intellect* the second Faculty of the Soul. So the sense is, " The *Logos* or INTELLECT, the " Eternal WISDOM of God, being Incarnate, was " the Light of the World : The Eternal, *Inexist-* " *ing*, Intellectual Light, is our Teacher or Pro- " *cessional* Light. *John* 11. 10. and 12. 35. 1 *John* 1. 7. *Rev.* 21. 23.

Grotius observes here that, *Seneca* and the *Stoics* say, the creating *REASON* ; and *Chalcidius*, " The " *REASON* of God, is God taking care of human " Affairs ; and is the cause that Men live well and " happily, if they neglect not the Gift of the most " High God.

I do not oppose the Exposition of *Deodati*, and some others, that say ; Christ is called the *Light* of Men, because he created the *Reasonable* Soul ; and because

because he *enlightens* it, after it hath been darkned by Original Sin. Nor would I contradict those, that have said, the WORD is so called; because in all Ages he hath *declared the Father* to Men, as a *Word* or Speech doth the Mind. But I would have these to pass but only as *secondary* Reasons of this Name.

The *Belgic* Annotations have rightly said, “ The *Logos*, that is, the substantial *Word* and REASON; as *Reason* signifies also, both the *Internal Reason* or Intellect of Man, and that *external Word* by which the *Internal Reason* is expressed. And on the 4th Verse, *The Light of Men*, i. e. “ The Author and Cause of Light, namely of that *Reason* and *Understanding* with which the human Kind was endowed and ennobled, when created.

See *Beza*, *Calvin*, *Jansenius*, *Lyra*, and others on this Context. The Jesuit *Maldonat*, after observing and censuring divers impertinent and inept Interpretations here, saith; “ A great number of the *Antients*, and almost all the *Moderns*, think the SON is called the LOGOS, because he is *Nortia Patris*; the Knowledg (or Wisdom) of the Father. This Opinion hath been received with a marvellous Consent and Agreement of *Divines*; and hath obtained such an Authority, that it would be rashness to depart from it: Notwithstanding, there may also other Reasons (and true ones) be given of this Appellation. Yes, I will give two Reasons; that will comprehend all the rest. 1. By the *Word* of God, the World was made; God *said*, *Let there be Light*, and so of the rest. 2. Because the Son *declares* to Men the Commands and Will of God. And I am wholly of Opinion, we ought here to take the most comprehensive sense, rather than any narrower.

Lyra notes that, the Word or Conception of the Mind, not which is unformed and confus'd, but which is determinate and perfect, and therefore call'd *Definition*, is the *Image* of the *Divine Word* in us; because God understandeth himself, and all things, by one *Act* of Intellection: And thus there is in God but one *Word*, because in him there can be but one (most perfect and compleat) *Conception*. But he disagrees here, in part, from the generality of the *School-Divines*, who say; "The Son or WORD" is not God's KNOWLEDG of other things, but "only of Himself.

II. Of the word P E R S O N.

Or, What is a Person? We ask, 1. concerning the Name or Term, Whether the Term *Person* be necessary in explaining the Trinity? 2. Of its signification?

1. If *Necessary* be taken in a large sense, for what tends to preserve the Faith pure and entire; the term *Person* may be call'd *Necessary*: because its signification is so determin'd and fix'd by Ecclesiastical Use and Custom, that he that rejects this Word, is suspected to reject the true Faith it self. Otherwise no *Term* whatsoever is necessary, because no one *Language* is necessary to Religion; much less is the word *Person* necessary, which is not found in Scripture in this sense.

2. To the second; *Boethius* and *Aquinas* define a *Person*, to be an individual Substance in the Rational Nature. *Aquinas*, much perplex'd and distress'd, opens the whole Matter, thus. "Person in general" signifies, an Individual Substance, of the Rational Nature. Individual is what is distinct from all others, and indistinct in it self. Person in whatsoever

“foever Nature, signifies what is *distinct* in that
“Nature; and in the Human Nature, it signifies
“*this* Soul, *this* Flesh, *these* Bones: for these are
“the individuating Principles of a *Man*. ———
“But the distinction in the *Divine Nature*, is not
“made but by *Relations of Origination*; i. e. Gene-
“ration, Spiration, Procession. *Relation* in the
“Divine Nature is not an *Accident* inhæring in its
“Subject, but is the Divine Essence it self; and
“therefore subsisteth, as the Divine Essence *subsist-*
“*eth*. Therefore as the Deity or *Divinity* is *God*;
“so the *Divine Paternity* is *God the Father*, who is a
“*Divine Person*. Therefore a *Divine Person* signi-
“fies a *Relation as subsisting*; and this (a *Rela-*
“*tion as subsisting*) signifies a *Relation after the*
“*manner of a Substance*, which is an *Hypostasis*
“subsisting in the *Divine Nature*: though a
“Subsistence in the *Divine Nature* is not any
“thing different from the *Nature*, but is the
“*Nature*. And *Quest. 30.* when upon this *Que-*
“*stion, Are there more Divine Persons?* He is puzzled
with this *Objection, There is but one Person, because*
there is but one individual intellectual Substance or Na-
ture; which hath since been the *Objection of the So-*
cinians; He answers thus. “In the *Definition of a*
“*Person*, the word *Substance* doth not denote *Es-*
“*sence*, but *Suppositum*. And in *Qu. 39. Is Essence*
and Person the same in God? He answers, “In *God,*
“*Essence and Suppositum* is the same; and *Supposi-*
“*tum* in all *Intellectual Substances* is the same as
“*Person*. But it seems to be a *Difficulty*, that tho
“there are three *Divine Persons*, there is but one
“*Divine Essence*. To this, some have said; *Per-*
“*sons and Essence* differ in *God*, as the former are
“*assisting Relations*; considering *Relations* only as
“they refer to one another, and not as they are *En-*
“*tities or Things*. But in truth, *Relations* in
“created

“ created Beings are only Accidents, in God they
 “ are the Divine Essence ; from whence it follows
 “ that, in God *Person* and *Essence* differ not *quoad*
 “ *rem*, or really. And yet the Divine Persons re-
 “ ally differ from one another ; for a Person signi-
 “ fieth a *Relation*, as *subsisting*, in the Divine Na-
 “ ture. A *Relation*, with respect to the *Essence*,
 “ differs from the *Essence* *ratione tantum*, i. e. only
 “ by an Act of our Mind, or *in our manner of con-*
 “ *ceiving* ; but a *Relation*, with respect to its Cor-
 “ relate (or opposite *Relation*) differs from it *re-*
 “ *ally*, for it is opposed to it. The Sum is, in the
 “ self-same *Essence* or *Substance* are three *Relations*,
 “ that are *really* distinct : Which *Relations* are yet
 “ really the same with the *Substance* or *Essence* ;
 “ not as it is an *Essence*, but as a *Suppositum*, or *Per-*
 “ *son*. See Q. 39. a. 1. ad 3. I shall take leave
 to hope that, all shall not be damned, that do not
 understand these things ; or understanding them,
 cannot reconcile them.

Cajetan saith, God (precisely considered) is a
Suppositum : but *Fonseca*, *Suarez*, and others blame
 this. According to *Scheibler*, a *Suppositum* is a *Singular*
 (or *individual*) *Substance*, *complete*, and *incommuni-*
cable ; and therefore is more general and comprehen-
 sive than *Person*, which is defined an *intelligent* *Suppo-*
situm, to distinguish it from a *Suppositum* (or *individual*
Substance) not *intelligent*. According to *Valla* and
Scaliger, a *Person* is not a *Substance* ; but a *Quality*.
 The Objection of *Valla* (and the *Socinians*) is better
 answer'd by *Scheibler*, than by *Aquinas*. The Objec-
 tion is, *If a Person is a Substance, then three Persons are*
three Substances ; he denies the Consequence. “ Be-
 “ cause *Person* is sometimes taken complexly or *con-*
 “ *cretely*, that is, for the *Substance* and *Property* toge-
 “ ther ; it is thus taken when a *Person* is said to
 “ be a *Substance*, and when we say the *Father* is a
 “ *Person*.

“ Person. But Person is also taken *abstractly*, or
 “ for what it signifies above or more than the mere
 “ Essence: it is taken thus, when we say there are
 “ *three Divine Persons*; for the meaning of *that*, is,
 “ *there subsisteth one Divine Essence, under three (Per-*
 “ *sonal) Properties*. He means, the Holy Trinity
 is three *Properties*, added (as it were) to the Divine
 Essence, Godhead or God. And he explains it, by
 the Trinity of Affections in every *Ens* or Being; *ve-*
rum, bonum, unum; and by the *Unity* of a Being, as
 it is a Being.

But a Difficulty still remains; What are these *Pro-*
properties? Are they the *Relations*; or their *Founda-*
tions; or their *Antecedents*, or their *Consequents*?
 Do these *Properties* differ from the *Essence*, and how?
 Lest I should rather confound, than edify, my Rea-
 der; if I undertook to discuss all the Opinions of the
Scholastics, concerning the difference between *Nature*
 and *Suppositum*: therefore I will refer him only to
Scheibler, *Metaph. l. 2. c. 2. n. 74, &c*; and to *Sua-*
rez, *Metaph. d. 34*; and *Fonseca*, 5 *Metaph. c. 8. 4.*
 6. And if he would see the Matter treated more co-
 piously, he may read (and tire himself in) the *Tho-*
mists, *Scotists*, and almost all the *Nominals*. But if
 we might have leave to say, “ *Personality* in the Deity
 “ is *radically* the Eternal Trinity of Principles, *Life*
 “ *Intellect* and *Will*; next the *formal Existence* of this
 “ Eternal Trinity of Principles, as in *immanent Act*
 “ in God himself, that is, as Self-living Self-knowing
 “ Self-loving, with *mutual Relation* of Act to Act,
 “ and of each Act to its Object; and lastly with re-
 “ spect to the Creation, (or *processionally*) first obje-
 “ ctively, and then effectively. I say, if it were suf-
 ficient, thus to speak; which I do not, here, or now,
 determine; the whole Matter would be certain,
 and clear, so far as the Divine Nature is compre-
 hensible, by us Mortals.

III. Of a RELATION.

We have often occasion to say, a *Person* in the Trinity is a *Relation*; which is therefore obscure, because the Entity or Nature of a *Relation* is obscure. *Scheibler* has said well, *Metaph. Lib. 2. c. 9. n. 1.*

“ Because the Human Understanding hath but a *middle* Perfection, therefore it doth not readily understand some things on the account of the *Excess* of their Perfection, and again others as hardly on the account of the *Defect* of their Perfection; for in both Cases they are *disproportioned* to our Understandings. Our Intellect is almost blind, in the Knowledg of God, the most perfect Being; and but weak in the Knowledg of Relations, because their Beings or Natures are so imperfect as to be scarce discernable. It is asked, is *Relation* a real thing; or only a Notional, that is, a Conception? Is it any thing distinct from its Subject, Foundation, or Term? And if it is, what is it? In good truth, the *Order* of things, as distinct from the things themselves, occasions great Trouble and Puzzle to the Human Understanding; and *notional* Entities are innumerable, and take up a great part of our Life: such a Play, such a Dream, is the Human Life. Yet all Notional Beings are not to be thought little Matters, for it was the Divine Wisdom that was the cause of ORDER; and not only all *Relations* do result from the *Order* of things, but (if I mistake not) all Morality is *formally* in Order and Relation, and *materially* in the Mode or Manner of it. God, as *Maker*, is the Cause and Foundation of Nature; as a Wise *Governour*, of Order; as *Love*, of Perfection. But what the *Order* of things is, and what their *Relations* (thereupon) to one another, is better known by the things themselves; than by artificial studied Notions. The

The Foundation of Relations is in the *Order* of things; this *Order* is found in Substances, Quantities, Qualities, Actions, Passions, and even in Relations; for Relation is *the comparability* (or if you will, the *comparing of things*) that are in *Order*, with one another. The Understanding is endued with a Power, of comparing things; and thence that passive Capacity of things, by which they are Objects of the *comparing Art*, is called their Comparability or Relation: which is not something *really* different from the *Order*, nor the *Order* something diverse from the things in *Order*; nor (in short) is it any way more clearly or better expressed, than by the bare *Names* of *Order* and *Relation*, assisted by our Sight or other Senses. From *Order*, and the Relations, resulteth all that which we call Beauty, and Harmony. *Order* and *Comparability* are only between things that are diverse from one another. I know nothing farther of the Relations of things, tho I have been often wearied with the Disputations concerning them. I don't think that we should enquire or study for new or other things, concerning the *Order* of things, or their Relations. Tho they are not *real* things, or *real Entities*: yet one may say, an *Ordinal* is *Non-nihil*, or somewhat considerable; as being found in every part of the boundless Field, or *Champaign* rather of Nature. We may say, it is a *World* that the Human Understanding hath framed or *created*, as it were *out of nothing*: and with how much Noise, and what Conflict, have the most Learned Metaphysicians and Logicians contended in it, and about it?

The Logicians hitherto, for the most part, distinguish *Relation*, from its *Foundation*. And otherways why have they several Names; and why do we say that, *Relation* resulteth or ariseth from the *Foundation*? Bnt what the difference between 'em, is; they are not so well agreed. Some dream

dream of a *real* Distinction, such as is between one Thing or Being and another; as *Cajetan*, 1. p. q. 28. a. 2. *Ferrariensis* cont. Gent. L. 4. c. 14. *Capreolus*, 1. d. 30. q. 1. But *Hurtadus* is for a mere modal Distinction. Some contend for such a modal Distinction, as between *Quantity* and *Figure*; others (as *Scotus* and *Fonseca*) are for a *formal* Distinction, at least where Relations are separable from their Foundation. The Opinion of *Durandus* may be seen in himself, 1. D. 30. Q. 2. and that of *Suarez*, in his *Metaphysics*, *Disp.* 47. *Sect.* 2. n. 4, 5. Yet others tell us, Relation is distinguished from the Foundation, only *ratione ratiocinatâ*, by a mere Act of our Reason; so *Ockam*, 1. d. qu. 1. and d. 31. q. 1. *Ariminensis* d. 28. q. 2. a. 2. *Egidius* 1. d. 26. q. 4. *Hervæus*: and *Suarez*, *Metaph.* disp. 27. §. 2. n. 22. And *Scheibler* Lib. 2. c. 9. punct. 2. n. 50. Those that are for a *Modal* Distinction, differ from those that maintain a *formal*, most commonly only in the Name; *Albertinus* who defends the *Formal*, instances in *Quantity* and *Figure*: what difference they pretend between *Modal* and *Formal*, see in *Albertinus* de Rel. Q. 6. p. 387; and Q. 13; and in the *Formalists*. They alledg the Authority of *Aquinas*; see *Hurtadus*, *Metaph.* d. 15. p. 898, 899.

And verily there is nothing but is the Effect of some Cause, except only the first Cause; and *Relation* requireth no efficient Cause but the Foundation, the Term, and Subject. This *Egg* (for instance) is like to never so many thousands of *new* laid Eggs, without any change in it self. And if Relation were a *real Entity*, how many millions of Entities must there be in every Person, nay in every Dust and Sand?

P. Hurtadus has most fully proved that, Relation is distinguished from its Subject, Foundation, and Term, only by mental Conception; not really, formally, or modally, unless by *Formality* and *Mode*
you

you mean only *mental Conception*. Also that, the Term is essential to the Relation; and tho the Relation is denominated from its Foundation and Subject, it hath essential reference to its Term: for it is the *Comparability of one thing to another*, and therefore belongeth to both, or is between both. When *Scotus* says, 'tis a *false Conception*, if Reason distinguishes where the *thing* is not diverse: *Albertin* rightly answers, it is no false Conception; for while Reason conceives one thing without conceiving another, it doth not affirm, but only *abstracts negatively*; as the Sight doth not err, while it perceives *Colour*, and doth not perceive *Tast*. *Albert. de Rel. qu. 12. p. 400.*

IV. Of the FOUNDATIONS of the Divine Relations.

The School-Divines speak obscurely of the *Foundations* of the Divine Relations. They say enough indeed of the twofold *Procession*, the *Procession* of the *Word* or WISDOM by an Act of the *Intellect*, and of the *Spirit* by an Act of the *Will*: In God, say they, *there is no Procession but by an Act*. *Thomas* (1. q. 27. 3. c.) saith; "In the first *Procession*, "the thing *understood* is in the *Understander*, in the "other the thing *loved* in the *Lover*. But whether they would have the *Acts*, or the *Processions* to be the *Foundations of the Relations*; I know not how they will be able to distinguish the Relations from one another. For they say, the Divine *Intellect* and *Will* are the same, and to *Understand* and *Will* (in God) are the same; so are to *Speak* and *Will*, and to *Beget* and *Breath*. But if thus the *Foundations* are the same, and the *Terms* the same; what Mortal can understand but that the Relations also must be the same? *Aquinas* indeed says, 1. q. 27. a. 3. ad 3m. "Tho

“ Tho in God the Intellect is not another *thing* than
 “ the Will; yet it is of the nature of the Will and
 “ the Intellect, that the *Processions* that result from
 “ the Acts of these Powers, should have a certain *Or-*
 “ *der*. But we cannot understand *Order*, but only
 between *distinct* things, as neither *Relation*. If there
 be no *real* diversity in the Divine Act, no *Modal* or
Formal in the nature of the thing; it seems uncon-
 ceivable that an *Act* in all respects the same, should
 be related to it self by distinct and opposite Re-
 lations.

They make four *real* Relations, in the Deity; the
 words of *Aquinas* are these, 1. q. 28. a. 4. “ There
 “ are four Relations; Paternity, Filiation, Spira-
 “ tion, and Procession: They say moreover, Rela-
 “ tions cannot be in God but only as founded on
 “ *Action*, and such Action too as is Immanent or *In-*
 “ *ternal*. Of such Processions there are only two;
 “ one by the Action of the Intellect, which is the
 “ Procession of the WORD; the other by the Acti-
 “ on of the Will, which is the Procession of LOVE:
 “ But in each of these Processions, there are two
 “ opposite Relations; one of *that which proceeds* from
 “ the *Principle*, the other of the *Principle* it self.
 “ The Procession of the WORD is called the *Gene-*
 “ *ration-Relation* of the Principle *Paternity*; the Re-
 “ lation of what proceeds from the Principle, is
 “ called *Filiation*. The Procession of LOVE hath
 “ not a particular Name, nor yet the Relations ari-
 “ sing from it: but the Relation of the *Principle*
 “ here is called *Spiration*; the Relation of what pro-
 “ ceeds from it, *Procession*. So far the *Angelical*
 Doctor; but if the real Relations are four, either
 a Person and a real Relation in God are the same,
 or not the same: If the same, there are four Di-
 vine Persons; if they are not the same, we must
 find some other *definition* of P E R S O N, such a
 one

one that real *Relation* shall not be the *formal Reason* of it. And again, if there be four Relations in God, let 'em give a Reason; why both the Relations arising from the first Procession are *Persons*, and not the Relations from the Second? Lastly, Seeing the Processions are from one *Act*, how can either the Processions or Relations be diverse? The Reason of the Question, is, as *Durandus* expresses it, 1. d. 5. q. n. 8. p. 67. "It is impossible, when things are perfectly the same, that one should differ (or be distinct) from the *other*, when this other doth not differ (or is not distinct) from *that*. For if it be a true Rule that, things that are the same in some *third*, are necessarily the same with *one another*: It will follow, by a stronger Reason, that, things perfectly the same with *one another*, are the same in respect of whatsoever *Third*. And what *Faber* has said of Novity, is another Objection against the diversity and *real* distinction of Relations. Real Relation, properly so called, necessarily follows on the Position of *Extremes*; and so there can be no new Relation, without some *Novity in the Extremes*. I ask, Can the Relation be diverse, without diversity of *Extremes*? As *D^r Orbellus* saith, 1. d. 32. *the Relation of the same thing to it self, is not a real Relation*. Theor. 98. c. 2.

[Note here, the Learned Author often sets himself to perplex the Doctrine of Relations, and other Heads of Scholastick Learning; for what reason we shall observe hereafter: but the whole that he hath here either observed, or collected, is all of it answered, by that known (and certain) Aphorism; *Idem diversimodè consideratum, Formalitate Relation non est idem*; a thing diversly considered, is not the same in its *Relative Formality*, but is diverse from (nay opposed to) it self by those Relations.]

I intend not however to deny that, what *Holkot* says, is in its measure and sense true. “The *natural Logic* is defective, when applied to Matters of Faith. And, the Rational Logic of Faith is different from the Logic of Nature; the Philosophers saw not that, a thing might be *Three and but One*; and therefore they said nothing of it in their Rules. The Logic of Faith hath such Rules as these, every *Absolute* may be predicated of three in the Singular, and not in the Plural; Unity holdeth its *Consequent*, where the *Opposite* of the Relation doth not hinder; we may grant, contradictory Propositions of the same *Suppositum*, when it is with specification of diverse Natures. Notwithstanding, I will not deny *clear* things concerning the Trinity, as some do, only because they are *clear*. I don't think we may argue after this manner; “The Doctrine of the Trinity is a *Mystery*; your Account of it is no Mystery, therefore it is not the true Doctrine of the Trinity: For it will be still mysterious enough to us, tho we do not reject what is clear, or certain, about it. See on this *Ruez*, d. 15. & d. 21.

V. Of the Difference of the Divine PRINCIPLES or ATTRIBUTES.

Nor are the Schools well accorded, how the *Principles*, or *Attributes*, as some call them, differ from one another: The most grant that these Attributes or *Principles* (*viz.* the Divine LIFE, INTELLECT, and WILL) are the very *Essence* of God; but it is questioned, Whether they are of the *Essence as such*, that is, *as an Essence*? *Suarez*, *Metaph. Disp.* 30. S. 6. says; “The Attributes, according to their *formal Reasons*, are not of the
“Essence;

“ Essence; tho in reality they are not distinguish'd
 “ from it.

Aureolus, m. 1. d. 8. q. 3. a. 2. and the *Nominals*, *Ockam*, *Biel*, *Hurtadus*, *Ariminensis*, 1. d. 8. q. 2. do not distinguish the Attributes from the Essence at all, *in the nature of the thing*.

Scotus, 1. d. 8. q. 4. & d. 2. q. 7. and the *Scottists*, teach, that the Attributes are distinguished from the Essence by a *formal Distinction*, *in the nature of the thing*, without any Act of the Understanding. Of this, see *Rada*, cont. 4. p. 57.

Thomas Aquinas, 1. p. q. 4. a. 2. & q. 13. a. 12. q. 28. a. 2. says; The Attributes are distinguish'd from one another, by an Act of the Understanding. And so also the *Thomists*, some of 'em calling it a *Virtual Distinction*, others a *Fundamental*, others an *Apstinde*. By this last they mean, when a thing on its own part is *one* and *undistinguish'd*, yet the Understanding formeth *different* knowledges of it, that signify or denote something that is *real*. And in truth, the Opinion of the *Nominals*, approved by *Suarez*, comes up to this. The *Scottists* say, it is *Non-identity*, where there is not *distinction*; as, between *Ens* and *Non-ens*, and between *Habit* and *Privation*; for *Distinction* as it is an incident and affection of *Being*, can only be between *positive Extremes*. And here they deny *real Distinction*; but assert a *formal*, *viz.* distinct *objective Conceptions*, and *Definitions*. They mean by *Form* here, any manner or way under which a thing may be conceived (as they speak) *in the Nature of the thing*; and hence they coin the term *Formality*. Saith *Rada*, “ The Formality is nothing
 “ else, but the *objective way or manner*, under which a
 “ thing may be conceived, in (or according to) the *Na-*
 “ *ture of the thing*. And they say a thing is *formally*
distinct, which is neither part of a *Definition*, nor
 the whole *Definition*; nor agreeth to it *per se*, or of

its own Nature, in the first Mode or Instant. But it is to be noted that, *Scotus*; and the *Scotists*, *Trombeta*, *Lychetus*, *Mairo*, *Faber*, *Meurisse*, *Bassolis*, *Rada*, and the rest; say both that, the Divine Relations or *Persons*, and these *Attributes*, are formally distinguish'd from the Essence; and so affirm the same formal distinction of them both.

Here the confounding of Attributes, is no small occasion of Error. These three essential Attributes (the Divine LIFE, INTELLECT, and WILL) are not to be confounded with the Attributes of another sort. And the *Essence* of God is taken, either inadequately for *ουσία*, or general Notion of Being, or for a Conception analogous to *Metaphysical Matter*; and so the *Principles* are not *de Essentiâ* (of the Essence) as an Essence. But if we take *Essence* in the most perfect Sense, or as some speak for the *Divine Form*; that is, for an objective Conception analogous to *Form*; so the triple active Power (or Principles) are *de Essentia Dei*, of the Essence of God, as it is an Essence: but in the Radix of the Essence it is one Power, not three. We must hold, contrary to *Scotus*, such Conception of the Divine Essence is not adequate and perfect, that doth not include all these *Principles*. Methinks *Rada* hath not well said, p. 73. "The Divine Essence, prescinding from the Attributes, is an Entity so perfect, that a more perfect cannot be conceived. What? An Essence that *understandeth* not, and *willeth* not, may it be called most perfect? Of *Mercy* and *Justice*, which are nothing else but the same *Principles* as they respect the Creatures, we must indeed say otherways; because to respect the Creature, is not *Essential* to God. Therefore however we conclude and determine concerning the distinction of *Attributes* among themselves, or from one another; we must hold as certain truth that, these three are *Essential*

essential to God, and must be distinguished as so many inadequate Conceptions of the Essence. And tho Rada saith rightly, p. 80. *Append. 1.* "The Divine
 " Perfections are not said of one another, *formally,*
 " *in the Abstract*, viz. *Wisdom* is not, *formally,*
 " *Love*; nor *Intellect* *formally* *Will*. Yet he hath
 not rightly said, *God, as considered quidditatively, or*
in the quidditative Conception, is not wise. Yes, he is
 Life, Intellect, Will, Power, *Wisdom*, Love.

But it is asked, Whether the same must be said of
 the Trinity of *Persons* or *Relations*? *Suarez, Me-*
taph. 2. d. 30. §. 4. says; "There is a great dif-
 " ference between *Relations* and these *Attributes*:
 " For prescind- ing the *Relations*, yet the *Essence* of
 " God is fully compleated; and each *Divine Per-*
 " *son*, separately considered, by the same *absolute*
 " *Essence*, is *formally*, and *essentially*, and *fully*,
 " and *perfectly* God, without the other *Relations*.
 " And hence the *formal Perfection* of a *Relation*, is
 " in reason *eminently* contained in the *Essence*, before
 " it is *formally* joined to it: because tho there is
 " *formally* no *Imperfection* in a *Relation*, there is
 " however somewhat in it that doth not simply ap-
 " pertain to *Perfection*. But I dare not subscribe to
 these things; nor do I understand, how it can be
 true what many *Scholastics* say, that a *Relation* is the
Essence of God, and yet doth not belong to the
perfection of the *Essence*: nor dare I to say, the *Di-*
vine Essence is adequately conceived, as compleat
 and perfect, without including the Trinity of *Per-*
sons. If, as *Aquinas* saith, *1. q. 29. a. 2. c.* a *Per-*
son in the *rational kind* of *Substances*, signifies as in
 the *whole kind* of *Substances*, *Subsistence*, a *natural*
thing, *Hypostasis*; and as he saith, *a. 4. c.* *Person* is
 to be used in the *Divine Nature*, because it implieth
Perfection; and *a. 4. c.* a *Divine Person* signifies a
Relation in the way of Substance and Hypostasis in the

Divine

Divine Nature. I say, if these Maxims of *St. Thomas* be true, I see not how a Conception of the Divine Essence can be *quidditative*, adequate and perfect, that doth not include the Trinity of Principles and Persons. Is that Intellect perfect, that doth not understand it self; or that Intellect that doth not produce a Self-complacence, or that Life that is not essentially Life to it self?

Gregory Ariminensis saith, 1. d. 8. "No attributal Perfection in God; whether you call it Formality, or quidditative Reason, or whatever else; is an Entity, either great or little, if considered as distinct from the Divinity (or Divine Essence) precisely taken. He proves it thus: Taking, saith he, the Divinity by it self, without any sort of Mode distinct from it; either it is Wisdom, or not. If it is; then either no Wisdom, or the Wisdom that is Formality is in God distinct from the Divinity, which is the thing desired: or there are more Wisdoms in God, which is erroneous. — If the Divinity is not Wisdom, which no Christian, nay no Heathen, will deny; it follows that, God is not the Wisdom by which himself is wise, which is false. And indeed it seems to me that, the Conception God abstracted from Wisdom, is a lame inadequate Conception; as the Conception Fire abstracted from Heat, is inadequate and imperfect.

But it is a greater Question, whether Attributes are distinguished from one another; tho not in this primary Essentiality? The Reason why *Gregory* and others deny it, is chiefly the Divine Simplicity. But the *Scotists*, as particularly *Rada*, Cont. 4. & 24. p. 339. says; "Formal Non-identity is not contrary to the most perfect Simplicity. Whence a formal Distinction in the nature of the thing, tho it be consistent with Composition, yet does not neces-

“sarily

“sarily infer it; because things that are distin-
 “guished *formally*, by precise formal Reasons, are
 “not necessarily as *Act* and *Power*; but as two *Acts*,
 “neither of which is *in Power* to the other. To
 which Argument notwithstanding, it is answered by
Gregory Ariminensis; “Tho perhaps *Composition* may
 “be so avoided, yet the *Simplicity* is not saved.
 “The Reason is, because no *thing* that in the afore-
 “said manner doth include *more*, is simple; and it
 “shall be so much the less simple, as the *things in-*
 “*cluded* make it less *one*. And it is certain that,
 “those *more*, of which every one is in *Act*, and
 “none of them in *Power* to another of them: I say,
 “such *more* make a thing to be less *one*; than do
 “those *more*, of which one is *in Power* to another.
 But we will not proceed farther in these Matters;
 dark, and therefore ungrateful to most Readers.

VI. *The Doctrine of the FATHERS.*

For what the Fathers have said, in these Matters;
 the best, and largest account given of it, is by the
 Learned Jesuit *Dionysius Petavius*. One cannot deny
 that, many of the Fathers of the first Ages *Platonized*
 but too much; I am not he that will undertake to de-
 fend all their Sayings; I would not corrupt Theology
 with any thing unsound, from a superstitious Reve-
 rence of Antiquity. I grant to *Petavius* that, di-
 vers of the Antients have endeavoured to explicate
 the Mystery of the Trinity in a *rational way*; there-
 by to facilitate the Conversion of Heathens: But I
 will not grant to the *Arians*, that almost all the An-
 tients were *Arian*; or to the *Heathens*, that well
 near all the Fathers were Hypocrites and Dissem-
 blers, who to deceive the People have wrote what
 themselves did not believe. But he that shall read

on the one side *Philostorgius*, and the later *Arian Sandius*; and on the other the rigid Discussion and Irrition of the Doctrine and Sayings of the Antients, by *Petavius*; will see that Nets and Snares are laid for his Faith, to prevent (if possible) his believing that most, or but many Christians of the first Ages, had a sound Faith concerning the Trinity. Tho' *Petavius* has indeed, elsewhere, well enough vindicated the *Catholick Church* it self of those Times, from any sinister Imputation, of that kind. But if *Petavius* have truly reported the Fathers, as 'tis granted he has; one may wonder that, the *Roman Catholics* were obliged by the Council of *Trent*, to swear that they will understand and interpret Holy Scripture, according to the unanimous Consent of the Fathers.

I omit what he saith of *Philo*, *Trismegistus*, and (the late) *Eugubinus*.

The words of *Justin* also must be corrected.

Nor does *Athenagoras* speak cautiously enough of the WORD. But when he saith, in his *Apology*; MIND and the WORD of God, is the Son of God. And again, "He is the first Of spring of the Father, not created; for God who is Eternal MIND, had within himself from the beginning the Logos, WORD or WISDOM, for he was always wise. I say, herein he speaks as divers others of the Fathers did.

Tatianus, otherwise unfound, yet speaks agreeably to the other Fathers; "A Power was the Principle or Cause of the Logos.— And with him, (with that Power) the Logos that was in him made all things. When he saith here, a Power was the Principle of the Logos or WISDOM, he is not alone in this way of speaking.

Theophilus Antiochenus, ad Aureol. L. 2. says almost the same things. "Which WORD (or WISDOM)

“ DOM) he took as his Minister and Instrument,
 “ and by him made all things. This same is called
 “ *the Beginning*, because he hath the Sovereignty and
 “ Dominion over all things that were made by him:
 “ this is the *Spirit* of God, the Beginning, the Wis-
 “ dom and Power of the most High. The Word by
 “ which were all things made, taking on him the
 “ Person (*Πρόσωπον*) of the Father and Lord of
 “ all, came into Paradise.—Before any thing exist-
 “ ed, the Father had for Counsellor him, who is
 “ his *Mind* and *Wisdom*.—But when God would
 “ make whatsoever he had decreed to make, he be-
 “ gat this *prolatitious WISDOM*, or *WORD*. In the
 “ beginning was God only, and the *Word* or *Wisdom*
 “ *in him*;—the *Wisdom* therefore being *God*, and
 “ originated *from God*, is sent to *whatsoever* place,
 “ *whensoever* the Father of all willeth. Because he
 calleth this *Wisdom* or *Word*, *inward*; and the *Mind*
 and *Wisdom* of the Father: *Petavius* overhastily con-
 cludes that, he believed he was not yet a *Son*, but the
 same with the Father: or that he imagined a two-
 fold *WISDOM*, one *Internal* or *Inward*, even the
 Understanding or Intellect of God; the other tempo-
 rary, *prolatitious* and outward, the Minister and In-
 strument of the Creation. But *Theophilus* is hereby
 wronged; for clearly he intends only, as the other
 Antients, to consider the *only Word* and *Wisdom* of
 God in a double State. *viz.* 1. In the State of Eter-
 nal In-Existence and Co-Existence. 2. Of tempo-
 ral Operation. He doth not *deny* the Eternal Gene-
 ration, or Filiation, tho he *expresses* only his In-Ex-
 istence; he teaches a double *Production* of the same
 Son, not *two Sons*.

Irenæus unsoundly maketh the *WORD* and *WIS-
 DOM* to be the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*; and of *both*,
 saith very improper and inept things. But as others
 also do, he saith *Principles* for *Persons*.

I leave *Clemens Romanus* to the Judgment of the Reader; but as divers more he speaketh unboundly.

Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. l. 7. says; "The Son is *Wisdom, Knowledge, and Truth*; and more easily known than the Father: he is all Mind, all Light, all Eye;—one God with the Father.

Origen speaks very badly sometimes; not always, unless in those places it is his Translator *Ruffinus*. And we must say the same of *Dionysius Alexandrinus*. Indeed some of the Fathers of those Ages seem to have held a *twofold Nature* in Christ, before his Incarnation; the first a Divine, whereby he was the Eternal Logos or WISDOM of God; a second, created, Super-angelical, the first-born of the Creatures, the Minister and Instrument of God in the Creation: and this last only was acknowledged by *Arius*. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, whose words are recited by *St. Basil*, seems to have believed the *twofold Nature*. But other Fathers of these Ages (the three first) a *double Procession*; even the *Eternal Generation*, and the temporary Progression to the Work of Creation.

Petavius blames also *Methodius* the Martyr, because he calleth the Father and Son *two Powers*; when indeed both of them are but one Power. But the Power that is indeed but one radically and essentially, may be triple or threefold *respectively and processionally*.

I leave *Lucian* the Martyr also, to his proper Judg. *Tertullian* believed the Son and Logos is the Eternal Divine *Wisdom*; but he seems to have thought that, he then became a *Person*, when he proceeded to the Work of Creation. In Truth, many of these Fathers held a certain *Secondary Personality* in the Deity; (a Personality in respect and reference to the *Creatures*;) in the threefold Manifestation of God, by the Creation, Incarnation, Regeneration

or Sanctification. But as to *Tertullian*, I really think with *Pamelius*; he acknowledged our Saviour to be Co-Eternal to the Father, in one Essence, in one Power; and in one *immanent Act*, as the Self-Knowledge or *Wisdom* of God.

Nor can I otherways free *Athenagoras*, *Tatianus*, *Origen*, *Theophilus Antiochenus*, *Tertullian*, *Lactantius*, or even *Zeno Veronensis*, or *Constantine the Great*; accused by *Petavius*, p. 30, 31. I say, I cannot otherways clear them of the Imputation of *Arianism*, but by supposing that; they held the Son or WORD is the Divine Intellect and WISDOM, in *Power* and *immanent Act* co-eternal and co-equal with the Father, and proceeding from him by an Eternal Generation; and that, they mistook his Procession to the *transient Act* of Creation, to be also a sort of Generation: and lastly *that*, they spoke almost only of this last, because known to the World. The *Logos* as a *Power*, and as an *immanent Act*, is the same: for every Divine Power or Virtue is always in *Act*, at least *immanently*; and every *Act* is Almighty, and the same with the Virtue or Power; these are but inadequate (or *partial*) Conceptions of the same thing. And the Divine Action as *external*, as it is the *Act* of the Agent, and not of the Patient or Effect, is God himself under a partial Conception: but because the External transient *Act* is spoken of, with Connotation of the Effect, (or is denominated from the Effect, as when we say Creation, Sanctification, or the like;) and is often said to be in the Patient; therefore these Fathers improperly and ineptly said, the *Logos* was then generated, and the Father then breathed the WORD, when he was about to create Angels and the World. It is better thus to interpret these Fathers, especially there being some ground for it; than to grant to the *Arians* that, the true Faith was believed but by very few Writers

Writers of the first Ages, when Baptism was administered in the Name of the Holy Trinity. The Testimony of all Ages witnesses that, Christ was always celebrated in the Catholick Church, with unanimous Consent, as the Logos or WISDOM of God.

Considering the inept Sayings of (some of) the Fathers, the obscurity of the thing, the diversity of Expression among the most Orthodox, the unpolish'd Wit of the most; I would be of the Number of those, who hope better of the Salvation of many, in those days called Heretics, than some others do: there are but too many that scarce give any other Sign of their Orthodoxy, or even of their Christianity, and future Salvation; but their censuring others as Heretics, or at least as Heterodox. *Philastrius*, whom they call *St. Philastrius*, has hastily, and as it were in the dark, huddled together a great number of Heresies; in his Book on that Subject: but in the same Book he has heaped also so many weak Fallacies of his own, some of them contrary to common Sense; that I scarce think, he would have escaped the Imputation of Heresy, if he had not thus set up for an Accuser of others.

Cyprian, de Idol. Van. Edit. Goulart. p. 336. says; "The WORD and Son of God was sent to be the Teacher and Administrator of this Indulgence, Grace, and Polity; the Gospel. The Prophets speak of him, as the Doctor and Light of Mankind; he is the Power, Reason, Wisdom, and Glory of God. *St. Cyprian* too much conceals the Eternal Generation; but confesses Christ is the REASON and WISDOM of God.

The Error of *Marcellus Arcyranus*, whom *Athanasius* defended, seems to have been this; that he denied the Eternal Wisdom of God is an Hypostasis or Person.

I omit the Case of *Meletius*.

The Passages out of *Hermis*, *Clemens Romanus*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, and others; cited and repeated by *Petavius*, Præf. c. 2, 3. are such as the other Fathers, censured by *Petavius*, would have said.

St. Athanasius acknowledged but one *Hypostasis* in the Deity; but their Controversy was only *Verbal*. He saith, *Lib. cont. Gentil.* the Logos is the WISDOM of God; and as others, he describes him by the transient *outward* Act of Creation. The WORD and WISDOM, saith he, obeying the Father created all things. He calls him, WISDOM, LIGHT, TRUTH; all synonymous Names. He adds, "For as he is the *Word* and *Wisdom* of the Father, he condescends also to the Creatures; he becomes their Sanctifier, Life, Shepherd, Door, and Way, that they may know and understand God. And, *de Incarn. Verbi*, he calls our Saviour *God*, the WORD of the true God, the WISDOM of the Father.

The Fathers long used the Terms *Hypostasis* and *Uxia* as common to all the Divine Persons; and it was a good while before the *Greeks* would admit of *Person*: and seeing neither *Hypostasis* nor *Person* was a *discretive* Term with them, 'tis no wonder that they spoke not altogether as the *Moderns* do. See *Petavius*, de *Trinitate*, *Lib. 4. c. 1. p. 312.* and of the Sense of the Terms *Person*, *Substance*, *Existence*, *Nature*, *Nature of the Thing*, *Genus*, *Suppositum*, at cap. 3, 4. as also concerning the Contentions and Stirrs about the Terms *Hypostasis* and *Person*. We must observe, and ought to lament it; what this *Jesuit* has largely proved, cap. 9. that *Gregory Nyssen*, *Cyril of Alexandria*, *Maximus the Martyr*, *Theodorus Abucara*, *Theorianus*, and even *J. Damascen*, seem sometimes to teach only a *specific Unity* of Nature between the Divine Persons; such as between *Peter James* and *John*, whom they would
not

not have to be called three Men, but *one*, because they are of the *same Species*; lest otherways they should be obliged also, on their Principles, to confess three Gods. It was on this Foundation, that *Philoponus* grounded his Error. If they really held this, *the specific Unity*; I don't see, how they can avoid the just Imputation of *Tritheists*. When they departed from the Trinity of *Principles*, very many fell into the extreme of *Tritheism*: and at this time the State of the Church was very unhappy; there were but few Writers who, in describing the Trinity or the Person of Christ, were free from the Accusation of Heresy by one another. And truly we ought to pity the *Sabellians*, *Eutychians*, *Nestorians*, *Monothelites*; if these Fathers, reputed Orthodox, were indeed *Tritheists*: which without doubt we must say of those of them who have taught that, the Divine Essence is not singularly and individually, but only *specifically one*; for 'tis plain that such assert *one Deity in three Gods*, as they would one Humanity in (three Men) *Peter James and John*. It may be, it has pleased God to permit that, so few should speak soundly and rightly of these Mysteries; partly that we may learn to pity Human Infirmary, in our Brethren: and again partly to admonish us, to content our selves with a shorter Creed, (a Creed according to *Scripture*, and our *Baptismal Covenant*) and a more *practical Faith*; rather than affect controverted Doctrines, and over-curious Determinations.

St. Austin was the first, or of the first, I think, that denied that the Essential Attributes of WISDOM and LOVE, by which God *loveth* and is *Wise*, are appropriate to the *Persons*; he was followed herein by *P. Lombard*, and *Lombard* by many of the *Scholastics*. *Anselm* also follows *St. Austin*, but doubtingly; he calls the Father *Memory* and *Supreme Wisdom*, the

the Son *Wisdom of Wisdom*. Monolog. c. 43, & 46. At c. 33, & 45. he speaks variously; "When the Spirit saith *himself*, he thereby saith *all things* that are made;—perhaps because he is the highest Wisdom, and highest Reason, in which are all things that have been made. Cap. 45. "It is certain, the Son is the true WORD; that is, the perfect *Knowledg*, or the perfect Cognition Intellection and Science of the whole *paternal Substance*, the *Wisdom* that understands and knows the Essence of the Father. Therefore it is no Error, if it be said, the Son is (in this sense) Understanding Knowledg and Wisdom; because he knoweth and understandeth the Father.

The Argument, alledged by St. *Austin* and his Followers, is; "Because WISDOM is the *Essence*, and a *Divine Perfection*, it must be common to each Divine Person. We must not say, the *Father* is not wise in himself; but by the Son: or Father and Son are not Love, &c. Thus they hold a double *Wisdom* in God; the first Unbegotten, the other Begotten. But the other Side answer; "The Father is *wise*, as he hath the Logos, or Son; which is the same as to be wise: and the Son is the Father's *Wisdom*. The Father is not without the Son, because not without *Wisdom*; as the Antients spoke in this Matter. And the same is to be said of *Love*, or *Will*. They say, again; both the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, are most perfect God; and the same is to be said of the Divine LIFE, INTELLECT, and WILL: but the Term *Father* alone, or *Son* or *Spirit* alone, doth not speak the *whole* Perfection of the Deity, nor is an adequate Conception of God. And they think St. *Austin* says the same, even when he seems to oppose it; Because, i. he saith, the *begotten WISDOM* is God's *Knowledg* of HIMSELF, and the SPI-

SPIRIT God's *Love* of HIMSELF; and they deny that, God's *Knowledg* or *Love* of Creatures are Son or Spirit. 2. God's *Knowledg* and *Love* of HIMSELF, is always in *Act*: but if so, I pray, what *Intellect* or *Will*, what *Knowledg* or *Love*, can be ascribed to God, but the *Knowledg* and *Love* of HIMSELF? for the *Knowledg* and *Love* of Creatures is here excluded. And if the Son is God's *whole* *Knowledg* of himself, it is no Imperfection that the Father *as distinct from the Son* is not the *Knowledg* of himself; or that again, the Father *as distinct from the Spirit* is not the *Love* of himself.

Elias Cretensis, in *Nazianzen*, p. 846. " In the
 " Divine and incomprehensible Trinity, there is an
 " Unity in the *thing*, because of the Identity or
 " *sameness* of the Essence, Power, and Will; the
 " Division is only in our Conception: For the Per-
 " sons are in one another, according to that of our
 " Saviour, *I am in the Father, and the Father in me*;
 " we must conceive the difference, or *distinction*, on-
 " ly in the Personal Properties, *Unbegotten Begotten*
 " *Proceeding*.

But let us again look back to the Sayings of the
 Antients. *St. Cyprian*, *Test. l. 2. adv. Judeos, c. 2, 3.*
 proves from Scripture, our Saviour is the WISDOM
 and WORD of God.

St. Athanasius, as was noted before, teaches;
 God is not without the Logos, because not without WIS-
 DOM.

Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat. 1. p. 16.* denies three
 Principles, *ἀπλως*; and the same at *Orat. 23. p. 425.*
 but he means only, in the Trinity the Father is the
sole Principle of the Son and Spirit. He saith, the
 Son was not without a Principle (that is, was not
 unoriginated) and he (the Son) is the Principle or
 Cause of all other things, *Orat. 29. p. 490.* In the
 same place, he calls the Father the Cause of the Son:

And

And at p. 492. By *Principle*, saith he, I mean *Cause*. He often, and earnestly, says; the *Unity* of the Essence, and *Trinity* of the Properties, is to be held without enquiring into the *manner* of this Secret; Christians ought to be solicitous, rather about a good Life, than Curiosities. *Orat.* 59. p. 493. And both he, and his Interpreter *Ruffinus*, say; Christ is the WISDOM of the Father *immanently*, and with respect to the Creation, or *externally*. *He is the WISDOM of the Father, according to the Apostle; and therefore called the WISDOM of God, to signify that the Father was never without Wisdom, that is, never without the Son.*

The Exposition of the Faith, ascribed to *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, saith, p. 98. "No Man can know the Father, except he know the Son; for the Son is that *Wisdom* by which all things were made. He is not such a *Wisdom* of God, as Man hath, but Perfect; proceeding from God, and yet ever abiding; not like to the *Knowledge* of Man which passeth away, or to the *Word* of Man, which is extinct as soon as spoken: And therefore he is not only the WORD, but the *Son*; not only WISDOM, but God. Whether we would know God by the Creatures, or by the Holy Scriptures; we cannot know him but by his WISDOM.

Macarius, Homil. 46. saith, The WORD of God is GOD; and *Homil.* 11. the Holy Spirit is like to *Fire*. This Father, by saying nothing of the Controversies about the Trinity, and by teaching piously and practically, made shift to escape the imputation of Heresy.

We may say the same of *Basil of Seleucia*; but he ventures to say, *There is in Man the Image of the Trinity.* *Orat.* 1. p. 5, 6.

And such also was *Ephrem the Syrian*; who yet, in his *Testament*, swears in an odd Form; “ By the
 “ threefold Fire of the Holy Trinity; by that one,
 “ and only *Wisdom* of God; by the three *Subsisten-*
 “ *ces* of the Intellectual Fire, which are thy Subli-
 “ mity and Will, and one and the same.

Cyril (or John) of Jerusalem, often says; Men ought not to be wise beyond Scripture, concerning the Divine Mysteries. *Catech.* 16. p. 176. *What the Holy Spirit hath not said (in Scripture) let us not hear.* *Cat.* 11. p. 101. *What thou art commanded, that only be careful to learn.* Yet he saith, Christ is the WISDOM and POWER of the Father: and again, the Son is God the WISDOM and God the WORD. *Cat.* 4. p. 26.

Synesius hath said but too little of the Trinity, and of Christ; he saith however, *Hymn* 1. n. 60. p. 314. *The Unity diffused in an ineffable manner, hath a triple Power.* He saith not, only a triple Relation. *Hymn* 3. n. 210 p. 323. *Thou hast begot the Son, thy excellent Wisdom, and maker of all things.* And *Hymn* 4. p. 336. *The pregnant Counsel, the mediating Principle, the Holy Spirit.*

Sr. Basil of Casaria, *Lib.* 4. c. *Eunom.* says; “ If
 “ Christ is the WISDOM and P O W E R of
 “ of God, and this *Wisdom* and *Power* is uncreate
 “ and coeternal with God; as 'tis certain God
 “ was never unwise or impotent: it will follow that,
 “ Christ is uncreate and coeternal with God. But he doth not interpret what is said of *Wisdom*, in the first Chapter of the *Proverbs*, as meant of Christ. In the Book concerning the *Holy Spirit*, against *Sabellius*; he grants that Christ is the WORD and WISDOM of God; and shows at the same time that he is a *Person*; which *Sabellius* denied. He often dissuades from overcurious Enquiries.

I omitted that, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *ad Gent.* says; “ The Image of God is the Son and *Logos*,
 “ and

“ and Man is the Image of the *Logos*: There is a
 “ *Mind* in Man, who is therefore said to be made in
 “ the Image of God: Man, on the account of the
 “ *Wisdom* in him, is likened to the *Divine Logos*.

St. Gregory Nyssen, *Lib. de Imag. & Simil. Dei*, sets
 himself to prove that, the Soul of Man is the Image
 of God, in respect of *Substance*, and *Trinity*. “ If
 “ thou wilt know God, first know thy self; thou
 “ may’st know him by thy own Structure and Make,
 “ and by the Things within thee. There are three
 “ personal *Properties*, in the one *Substance* of the
 “ Soul; namely that state of the Soul that is *unbe-*
 “ *gotten*, the Word that is *begotten*, and the *Proces-*
 “ *sion* of the Spirit or Mind. And I will confident-
 “ ly affirm, it was with respect to this Trinity in
 “ the Soul that the *Apostle* says, *Man was made in the*
 “ *Likeness and Image of God*. After he had said, the
Soul, Word and Mind are the Image of the Trinity;
 he especially notes that, only our WORD (the *in-*
ward and that which is *spoken*) is the Image of the
 Son of God. And from the Writings of the Philo-
 sophers he discovers another Image of the Trinity,
 even the *Inascible Concupiscible and Rational Faculties*
 in Man. How boldly would the good Man have
 talk’d, if he had known the true Trinity of Princi-
 ples in the Human Nature? Perhaps by the *Soul*, the
 Image of the Father, he meant VITALITY; by
Reason, the Image of the Son, he meant the
 Thoughts, or the Faculty of THINKING; by
Mind, the Image of the Spirit, our FORMAL
 CONCEPTIONS.

But more clearly, *Catechet. Orat. c. 1, & 2*.
 “ He that confesses, God is not *Ir-rational*, must ne-
 “ cessarily confess that he hath REASON; the Hu-
 “ man Reason is but equivocally so called: if there-
 “ fore any one saith, that he understandeth the
 “ REASON and WISDOM after the likeness of

“ the same in us, he will be led thereby to a more
 “ sublime Knowledge. After this he shows, like the
 other Antients, that, the WISDOM and WORD
 passes not away, as ours does, but is *permanent*.
 [N. B. They mean, Human Reason or Wisdom;
 (whether inward, or as a *Conception*; or outward,
 or as it becomes a *Word*;) ceases and is extinguished
 with the Act of Thinking or Speaking: but the
 WISDOM of God not so, for it is an *Eternal Act*;
 and as it is the same with the Essence, a *Person*. For
 in God, the Act and Essence are really the same,
 their Distinction is only *Modal*; the Act is the *Essence*
acting.]

St. *Ambrose*, Tom. 4. p. 43, & 46. often says;
 Christ is the WORD and WISDOM of the Fa-
 ther. And, p. 48. *There is one that is the Lover, ano-*
ther the Beloved; and another who is the Love of both,
even the Holy Spirit: but all the same God.

St. *Ferom*, tho accused by his Enemies as a Heretic
 concerning the Trinity, yet has written very little
 of these Matters. But he writes very earnestly to
 Pope *Damasus*, against three *Hypostases*; which, he
 saith, in all good Authors signifys three *Substances*.
 “ All Philologers, says he, understand nothing by *Hy-*
 “ *postasis* but *Essence*; but what blasphemous Mouth
 “ dares to say *three Substances*? If you please, let us
 “ hold one *Hypostasis*, without mentioning three *Hy-*
 “ *postases*. Tom. *Epist.* 2. p. (Edit. *Erasmi*) 131, 132.
 And in another Epistle, *ad Marcum Presbyterum*, 315.
 “ Because I believe and teach a Trinity of *Persons* that
 “ have all the same *Substance*, I am called Heretic, and
 “ *Sabellian*. — I am an Heretic; What doth it hurt
 “ thee? Be content, I have confessed it. — Every day
 “ they demand, What is my *Belief*? As if I had been
 “ baptized, without confessing the *Creed*. I make
 “ such a Confession as they would have me, it doth
 “ not satisfy ’em: I subscribe, they won’t believe
 “ of me. See the rest in the Author. * I

I omit *Eusebius* the Church-Historian, because he too much favours the *Arians*; as *Petavius* has fully proved, tho *Socrates* would not have it so.

What *St. Hilary*, of *Poitiers*, thought; one may guess by what he has delivered *Lib. 12. de Trin. p. 282.* “Neither will I be so foolish and impious, as to determine that, the Father hath been at any time without his **WORD, WISDOM, and POWER**; that is, without the only-begotten God, even my Lord and Saviour *Jesus Christ*. For as in us, **WORD, WISDOM, and POWER** is our own inward Motion and Work: So with the Father, his inward **WISDOM and POWER** is generated by him, and inseparable from him; and it appears that he is indeed born of the Father, in that he hath these Names (which are the Names of God’s *Eternal Properties*) given to him. Again, *de Synod. p. 324.* “None is the Image of himself, but represents him whose Image he is; an Image is the undifferenced Likeness of one thing as compared with another: There is therefore a Father, and a Son the Likeness of the Father; but that he may really be the Image and Likeness of his Father, we must suppose that *he hath the Nature and Essence of the Begetter.* And, *de Trin. l. 12. p. 267.* *We say, Christ is the WISDOM and POWER of God. Lib. 2. p. 11.* “There is one God the Father, of whom are all things; and one Lord *Jesus Christ*, by whom are all things; one Holy Spirit, the Gift in all. One *Power*, of which are all things; one *Of-spring*, by whom are all things; one *Gift*, the ground of perfect Hope. You may see also his Comment on *Matth. Chap. 11. p. 519.* and *de Synod. p. 326.*

We must not expect that, *Epiphanius* should tell us what, or where, is the Image of the Trinity; for he denies that the Image of God is in the *Soul* of

Man, or in his *Body*, or in his *Power*, or in his *Regeneration* by Baptism; or that (in short) we can find where it is. Tho he uses many words concerning the Trinity, he explains the Mystery but little; it amounts to thus much, "There is *one* God, and a " real *Trinity* of Hypostases, but it is inscrutable. But, *Tom. 1. Hæres. 70. & Her. 69. contr. Arianos*, and often elsewhere, he says; "The Son is the " WISDOM of God; the supreme WISDOM of " God, not in any *figurative* speaking, but in *reality*. And, p. 751. "The Father beget, neither " willingly nor unwillingly; as the *Arians* would " have us to say; but *by Nature*, which is superior " to Will and Counsel.

Isidorus Pelusiota commends *Philo's* Confession; and says, Christ is the WISDOM and POWER of God, and an Hypostasis; and that he is called the WORD, because *Impassible*. Lib. 2. Epist. 143.

St. John Chrysostom, as his Adversary *Epiphanius*, maketh the Image of God in Man to consist only in the *Dominion over the other Creatures*; on *Gen. 1. Hom. 8.* and on *Gen. 6. Hom. 21.* He speaks of the Holy Trinity, only in general, and in Scripture-terms; he says, *The Unity of the Deity, and the Trinity of Hypostases.*

Andreas Cesariensis, in *Apoc. Serm. 20.* says; "The Hypostasis of the Son is called the WISDOM, " either to signify his *impassible Generation* from the " Father; or because he containeth the Ideas and " *Reasons* of all things, or (and chiefly) because " he is the Interpreter and Minister of the Father's " WISDOM and Power.

Leo Romanus saith many things against *Nestorius* and *Eutyches*, for the true Deity and Humanity of Christ; for the Unity of *Person* and Duality of *Nature* in him: but he has no *Scholastic* Subtleties concerning the Mystery of the Trinity; but as some

other

other Fathers, of the fourth and fifth Centuries, saith only, "There is one *Essence*, and a Trinity of *Pro-*
 " *porties* or Persons. In *Tract. adv. error. Eutych.*
 p. 189. he saith ; "The Holy Trinity divided (as
 " it were) the Work of our Redemption and In-
 " stauration ; for the Father *was reconciled*, the Son
 " *did reconcile*, and the Holy Spirit *sanctified*.

Nor has *Maximus Taurinensis* much concerning these Questions : he says only, with Holy Scripture ; *The Son is called the WISDOM and POWER of God, that we may know that the Father beget not after a carnal manner, but in a manner ineffable and incomprehensible.* Homil. in Natal. Euseb. Vercel.

Peter Chrysologus, Serm. 119. says ; *Christ is the true WISDOM of God.* But I think, he saith this, only in regard that our Saviour was the Teacher of that *Wisdom* which is from above, or the Gospel.

Fulgentius hath many things of the Trinity, but plain and scriptural ; as *ad Monim. ad Thrasimund. ad Petrum, &c.* But, *cont. Serm. Fastidiosi*, c. 16, & 17. he saith after *St. Austin* ; *Christ is that WORD or WISDOM which is (as it were) the THOUGHT that springs from MEMORY.* Because *St. Austin* sometimes explains the Trinity by *Memory, Knowledge, and Love.* And, *ad Thrasim. l. 2. c. 4.* *If the WISDOM were not coeternal to the Father, then hath God been mutable.* He means, of Unwise became Wise.

Agnellus Ravennatensis, ad Armen. de rat. Fid. Epist. Bibl. Patr. T. 3. 147. says ; "When the Father
 " would beget the Son, Had he a Power to beget
 " this *Virtue*, or to will this *Wisdom* ? If you say,
 " he had not ; you blaspheme. If you say he had
 " not POWER, or had not WISDOM ; you blas-
 " pheme.—Add to the WORD, POWER, and
 " you have the third Person.

There is a Fragment said to be *St. Austin's*, concerning the Trinity, in *Bibl. Patr. Græco-Latin.*

Vol. I. p. 540. where it is said ; “ Reason teaches
 “ that, the *Essence* of God is Eternal LIFE. But
 “ if this true LIFE was without beginning, it is
 “ certain that it KNEW also this Life from all
 “ Eternity ; for if it did not, it would not be *wise*,
 “ which we cannot think of God. But if the
 “ Eternal LIFE always knew its Life, or always
 “ *knew it Self* ; it had not this KNOWLEDG from
 “ another, but the *Knowledg* is co-essential to the
 “ *Life*, altho the *Life* begat the *Knowledg* as its
 “ Issue. — Therefore the *Father* never was without
 “ the *Son*. And, p. 545. “ I said, the *Essence* of
 “ God is *Life* ; but true *Life* KNOWETH that
 “ it liveth : And if it KNOWETH its *Life*, it also
 “ LOVETH it. But in God to *live*, to *know*, to
 “ *love*, are no other thing but *to be* : The *Love* of
 “ God therefore is *Life*, the *Life* is *Spirit* : And be-
 “ cause by *Love* God gave Being to all things, there-
 “ fore the *Love* is called SPIRIT ; and HOLY,
 “ because it *sanctifieth* all things. — By the *Spirit*
 “ of God we are to understand nothing else but the
 “ LOVE of God ; and from hence God is called
 “ *Love* by the Apostle *John*. The *Father* loveth the
 “ *Son* as himself, and the *Son* loveth the *Father* as
 “ himself ; for the *Life* loveth to be *wise*, and the
 “ *Wisdom* loveth to *live* ; and we proved before
 “ that, the *Life* and *Knowledg* (or *Wisdom*) have
 “ the same *Essence* : therefore *Love* which is the Ho-
 “ ly *Spirit* is co-essential to the *Father* and *Son*, and
 “ proceeds equally *from both*. This perfectly agrees
 “ with the *Triple Principle*, or *Trinity*, that we de-
 “ scribed in some of the foregoing Sheets ; and shall
 “ more amply and clearly discourse hereafter. [But
 “ this cannot be *St. Austin* Bishop of *Hippo* ; but some
 “ other *Austin*, who being also antient, his *Work*
 “ hath been mistaken to be that *Father*’s. For accord-
 “ ing to *St. Austin*, the *Father* is not LIFE, but *Mind*
 “ or

or INTELLECT ; and tho he teaches that, the Spirit proceeds from the Father *and the Son*, yet he expressly denys (as we noted before) that he proceeds *equally from both*, as this Writer saith. Nor would St. *Austin* have said, *the Father is Eternal LIFE*, and then that *the LIFE is the ESSENCE*, for so the Father is the *Essence* ; which is Heresy.]

Casarius, in *Dial.* 1. *Ibid.* p. 549. says ; The Trinity may be explained in a sort, by the *Sun*, viz. his Fire, Rays, and Light. He hath there more to the same purpose.

Zacharias Mitylenensis, *Disp.* *Ibid.* p. 357. says ;
 “ The WORD or WISDOM presided in the Pro-
 “ creation and Constitution of Things ; and the
 “ Divine SPIRIT inspires into Essences the Prin-
 “ ciples of Reason and Understanding, and thus
 “ perfecteth their Substance. We call the Father of
 “ the Word or *Wisdom*, and from whom also pro-
 “ ceedeth the *Spirit*, the *first Cause* and *Principle* of
 “ the Deity.

We mention'd him before ; but again, *Cyril of Alexandria*, on *John* 1. 1. *contra Eunom.* says ; “ The
 “ Son is the *Word*, *Wisdom*, *Eternal Light* of God ;
 “ and the *Son* is not one thing, and the Internal
 “ *Word* another. Then he explicates his Generation by the Likeness of *Fire* and *Light* ; with a great deal more to the same purpose.

The Reader may usefully see the Creed or Confession of *Peregrinus Laureacensis*, *Patr. Orthod.* Vol. 2. p. 1625. and *Eugenius Carth.* de *Cath. Fide*, *Ibid.* p. 1617. and *Thalassius*, *Hecatontad.* 4. Because I am afraid of tiring my Reader, I am constrained to omit many others : I almost repent that I began so long a Work ; but it will be necessary that we do not wholly overpass some few very clear Passages of the following Ages.

Guitmundus, Archiepiscopus Aversanus, Bibl. Patr.
Tom. 6. p. 226, 227. speaks copiously; the short is.
 “ God begot his WISDOM, by whom are all things
 “ of himself. This WISDOM is the Son of God,
 “ God of God.—But what should God make by
 “ this WISDOM, if he did not first *love* it? therefore
 “ it is evident that, *Love* proceedeth from the Fa-
 “ ther to the Son, and from the Son to the Father :
 “ This LOVE is the Spirit; which so proceedeth
 “ from both, as to remain *in* both.—The Fa-
 “ ther KNOWETH his *whole* self, and LOVETH
 “ his *whole* self; therefore the WISDOM and LOVE
 “ are each as *great* as himself, that is, the *Son* and
 “ Spirit each equal to the Father. The LIFE liveth,
 “ the WISDOM liveth, the LOVE liveth; the
 “ WISDOM is *Wise*, the LIFE *wise*, the LOVE
 “ *wife*; the LOVE loveth, the LIFE *loveth*, the
 “ WISDOM loveth. The Father is LIFE, the Son
 “ WISDOM, the Holy Spirit LOVE. And these
 “ three are but *one Substance*, which is *God*. The
 “ Father is *Living*, the Son *Wise*, the Holy Spirit
 “ *Loving*; and the Father *Living*, *Wise*, *Loving*;
 “ yet but *one Nature*, which so Liveth as to be
 “ LIFE, is so *Wise* as to be WISDOM, so Loveth
 “ as to be LOVE. [N. B. This comes fully up
 with the triple *Principle*, or Trinity of Principles,
Life, Wisdom, Love; which our Author approves
 above all other Explications. But in answering
 the Question here following, this Father wholly ad-
 heres to *St. Austin*.] “ It is asked; Is the Son that
 “ *Wisdom*, by which the Father is *Wise*; or what is
 “ the same, is the Father *Wise* by that *Wisdom*
 “ which is the Son? *Ans.* The Father is *Wise* *as he*
 “ *hath the Divine Essence*: Therefore if the Father
 “ were *Wise* by the Son, he must have *Wisdom* from
 “ the Son, and consequently *Essence* from the Son;
 “ that is, he should not be the Father, but the Son.
 “ As

“ ——— As Man died and was lost by *Insipience*, so
 “ by WISDOM only he could be restored; the *Wis-*
 “ *dom* of God was incarnate, that the *Insipience* of
 “ Man might be taken away.

Potho Prumensis, Bibl. Patr. Tom.9. p.567. Lib. 1. de
statu domus Dei, says; “ There are three Invisible
 “ Things of God, POWER, WISDOM, GOOD-
 “ NESS; from which all things proceed, in which
 “ they subsist, and by which they are governed: the
 “ Father is *Power*, the Son *Wisdom*, the Holy Spirit
 “ *Goodness* or Love; the *Power* Creates, the *Wisdom*
 “ Governs, the *Love* Preserves. The *Power* by
 “ Love *wisely* Creates, the *Wisdom* by *Power* *kind-*
 “ *ly* Governs, the *Love* by *Wisdom* *powerfully* Pre-
 “ serves.

Edmundus, Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis, in speculo
Eccl. c. 28. saith; “ By such a way as this, Man
 “ cometh to the Knowledg of God, that he is *one*
 “ in Substance, *three* in Persons; for every Man seeth
 “ it in himself. Every Man hath always in himself
 “ *Power*, *Wisdom*, and *Love* proceeding from both:
 “ and when he sees it thus in himself, he will infer it
 “ is also so in God, who is above him. Namely
 “ that, in God is POWER, from whence proceed-
 “ eth WISDOM, and from both LOVE. And be-
 “ cause from the first Person proceeds the second,
 “ and from the first and second the third; therefore
 “ the first is called the *Father*, the second the *Son*,
 “ the third the *Holy Spirit*. By this Method, Man
 “ attaineth to the Knowledg of his Maker; *how* he
 “ is without beginning, and *why* it is said he is *one*
 “ in Substance and *three* in Persons: as also, *why* the
 “ first Person is called the *Father*, the second *Son*,
 “ the third *Holy Spirit*; *why* *Power* is appropriated
 “ to the *Father*, *Wisdom* to the *Son*, *Love* or *Good-*
 “ *ness* to the *Spirit*? ——— And this manner of
 “ knowing God, is the Foundation of *Holy Contem-*
 “ *plation*.

Richardus de S. Victore, in opuscul. ad S. Bernardum, de appropriatis Personis, saith; "Power Wisdom Goodness are things most known to us, in that we see and understand the invisible things of God, by the things that are made. In the Elements, Plants, and Brutes, there is a certain Power, without Wisdom; in Men and Angels a Power, not without Wisdom: in *Lucifer* a Power and Wisdom, without Goodness; in Angels and good Men there is not Goodness, or a good Will, without the Power and Knowledge. Therefore we must say, these three are distinct: the Power is Principal, and of it self; the Wisdom is from the Power, the Goodness or good Will is of both.

Gulielmus, Episcopus Parisiensis, de Universo, parte 1. pag. 580. c. 20, 21. saith; "Almighty God created all things by the WORD, that is the Son; and by his WILL, that is the Spirit. The Word is his THOUGHT; in God to THINK and WILL are two Divine Productions: but God doth not think, by forming Conclusions, or by parts; but by one most perfect Act. Again, *parte 2, pag. 917.* he largely shows that; "The Human Soul is the Image of the Father, who is Vital Activity or LIFE; and of the Son who is WISDOM, and of the Spirit which is LOVE. The Holy Spirit is seen in the Good, by their Goodness; the Son in the Wise, by Wisdom; the Father in the Powerful, by Power. LOVE is the proper Character of the Spirit, WISDOM of the Son, POWER of the Father.

And we often meet such like Passages in the famous *J. Gerson*; as at *par. 3. fol. 397. col. 3.* and elsewhere.

But see the Sense of the Antients concerning the Trinity, more largely, in *Petavius*; *Dogm. Theol. Tom. 2. lib. 1. cap. 3.*

VII. The Doctrine of the Schools and the Scholastics.

The Divines of the Schools explain the Distinctions or Differences of the Divine Persons, by the Differences of the Attributes and Primalities; and call the Persons by the Name of Primalities; that is, MIND or INTELLECT, WISDOM, and LOVE.

We have spoke before concerning St. *Austin*, the Father in this Matter of the School Doctors. But take also his Words, cited by *Petavius*, de Trin. L. 5. c. 4. p. 503. "God is the Cause of all things; and as of all things, so also of his WISDOM; neither was God at any time without his WISDOM: he is the Eternal Cause of his own Eternal WISDOM, he is not præ-existent in time to his own WISDOM.

P. Lombard, Bishop of Paris, disp. 3. F. p. 8. says; "The Son is the TRUTH of the Father, the Holy Spirit GOODNESS. And G. he saith; "MIND remembers it self, understands it self, loves it self; if we understand this, we understand the Trinity: not indeed that Trinity which is God, but which is the Image of God. [For he speaketh here of the HUMAN Mind.]—M. p. 11. "Those three are natural Properties and Powers of the Mind, and distinguished from one another; for Memory is not Intellect or Will, nor Intellect Will or Memory, &c. — But these three are referred to (or suppose) one another; for Mind cannot remember it self, or love it self, unless it know it self; and so of the rest. — They are also one Substance; for they are substantially, and not as Accidents, in the Soul or Mind. From whence St. *Austin*, de Trin. lib. 9. says; "Memory Intellect and Love

“ Love exist not as Accidents in their Subject; as
 “ Colour (for Example) in a Body; but substanti-
 “ ally: because tho they are predicated *relatively*,
 “ yet each of them is *substantially* in his Substance,
 “ which is the Soul. He says moreover, *de Trin. lib.*
 15. “ He that considers the Human Mind, sees there
 “ the Image of the Divine Trinity. It appears by this
 that, neither *St. Austin* nor *P. Lombard* thought the
 Faculties of the Soul are Accidents; as the *Thomists*
 have since taught. And it may be doubted, whe-
 ther *St. Austin* intended here to describe the mere *Re-*
lations, or three *Relative Faculties*.

But *Lombard* not well satisfied with *St. Austin's*
 MEMORY, substitutes another Explication of the
 Trinity, out of *St. Austin* also; *S. T.* “ MIND, its
 “ KNOWLEDG, and LOVE of it self, are three;
 “ for *Mind* knoweth, and loveth it self, nor could
 “ it love it self without knowing it self. Mind and
 “ its Knowledg are two things, so are Mind and its
 “ Love; therefore when Mind knows and loves it
 “ self, here is a *Trinity*, even Mind Knowledg and
 “ Love. But he distinguishes afterwards the *Begot-*
ten and *Unbegotten* Wisdom, and so also between *Be-*
gotten and *Unbegotten* Love; following *St. Austin*:
 but there is no ground for such Distinction.

Aquinas also, tho he confesses the Philosophers did
 not *explicitly* know the Mystery of the Trinity, yet they
 knew the *Essential Attributes* that are appropriated
 to the *Persons*; *Power* to the Father, *Wisdom* to the
 Son, *Goodness* to the Spirit. Here note, 1. These
 Attributes are *Essential*. 2. Known and certain to
 the Philosophers by the Light of Nature. 3. They
 are appropriate to the *Persons*; or distinguish the
Persons, as their proper Characters. 1. *Qu. 32. ar.*
 1. *ad 1mam.*

2. Divers Scholastics, following *St. Austin*, lest
 they should be constrained to say, the Father is not
 Wise

Wise and Loving, of himself. And lest it should seem, the Father is *of the Son*; if he be wise by the Son, because *to be* and *to be wise* are the same in God. Therefore they say that, *Wisdom and Love as they are the Divine Essence* are common to each Divine Person; but the *Begotten Wisdom* is the Son, and the *Begotten Love* the Holy Spirit, and the *Unbegotten Wisdom* is the Father, or *Wisdom as Unbegotten* is the Father's. They say however, there are not two *Wisdoms*, or two *Loves*, but one only; one *Essential Wisdom*, *Begotten* and *Unbegotten*, and one *Love*. Of which the *Master of the Sentences* says, *it is above my Understanding; but it is safe to speak as the Doctors do.* But the Reason why the several *Attributes* are appropriated to the Persons; and why *Wisdom* to the Son, *Love* to the Spirit, *Power* to the Father; rather than *Love* to the Son, and *Wisdom* to the Spirit; I say, I do not see that any of them have given a *probable Reason* of this, when (according to them) *Power Wisdom and Love* are nothing else but the *Essence*. Of the *Relations* of these *Attributes* much indeed may be said; but for the Reason of the Appropriation of these *Relative Attributes*, there can scarce any thing be said satisfactorily, on the Hypothesis of St. *Austin*.

Estius, a Man indeed that affected not *Subtleties*, speaks the clearest, *1. d. 34. s. 3. p. 113.*
 “ Of the Appropriations of the Divine Persons, the
 “ most common, both in Holy Scripture and Wri-
 “ ters of the Church, are **POWER WISDOM** and
 “ **GOODNESS**; Power proper to the Father, **Wis-**
 “ **dom** to the Son, **Goodness** to the Holy Spirit.
 “ To which three Attributions, do correspond
 “ **CREATION REDEMPTION SANCTIFICA-**
 “ **TION** or **GLORIFICATION**, as the *Acts* of the
 “ other. — The Reason why **Power** (or **Omnipotence**) is appropriated to the Father, seems to
 “ be,

be, because he is the Origin or Principle not only of
 the Creatures, but of the other two Divine Per-
 sons. By how much any one is able to effect or
 produce more things, by so much he is wonted to
 be accounted by Men most *Powerful*; therefore
Power being most accommodate to the Property of
Father, it is appropriated to *him*. And again, be-
 cause the Divine *Power* is the most remarkable and
 conspicuous of the Attributes in the work of Cre-
 ation, therefore is *Creation* ascribed to the *Father*.
 But of this, another Reason may be also given;
 the Father is the *first* of the Divine Persons, and
 the Original of the other two; and the work of
 Creation is the *first* of the Works of God, and the
 Foundation both of Redemption and Sanctifica-
 tion: therefore Creation is reckned to the Father.
f. 4. p. 114. After this, he proves from Scripture
 that, WISDOM is appropriate to the Son. “ Be-
 cause, according to his Divine Nature, the Son
 proceedeth from the Father after the manner of a
 WORD; and a WORD, saith St. *Thomas*, is no-
 thing else but a Conception of Wisdom. [*i.e.* A
 mental Conception, which is Knowledg or Wis-
 dom.] But as the Son, as he is God, is a middle
 Person between the Father and the Spirit; as the
 WORD is a middle between MIND and LOVE:
 so it was congruous that the Son, after taking on
 him our Nature, should be *between* God and Men.
 2. The Attribute of Wisdom has been given to
 the Son, because he is to *us* the Teacher of the true
 and heavenly Wisdom. 3. Goodness Love Be-
 nignity is appropriated to the Holy Spirit, be-
 cause the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the
 Son after the manner of *Love*. He rejects the
 Reasons given by *Hugo*, in *Tract. 1. c. 10*; and
 these given by himself, if some higher be not added,
 afford but little Satisfaction.

3. All of them confess, that the Image of the Trinity in us (our Mind or *Life*, our *Intellect* and *Love*) is not such an Image of the Divine Trinity as is perfect, and exactly corresponding. "It is enough" (say *Scotus* and *Lychetus*, 1. d. 3. q. 9. p. p. 142.) "that it represents the Trinity and Unity, which" "require *Consubstantiality*, *Distinction*, and *Origination* : tho it doth not represent in every respect the" "Divine Trinity. And *St. Austin*, *Scotus*, and *Lychetus*, say there, 1. "There is an Image of the" "Holy Trinity in the Soul, tho an *unperfect* one ;" "when it *understands* and *loves* the *Creatures*. 2. It" "is a more perfect Image, as *Understanding* and" "Loving *it self*. 3. It is most perfect, when it" "actually *understands* and *loves* the *Divine Trinity* ;" "because by *such Acts* it is *assimilated to the Object*," "the *Act of Intellection* being the *Likeness of the Ob-*" "ject."

4. *Scotus* and the *Scotists*, and some others; say ; "The Image of the Trinity in the Human Soul," "consists both in the *first* and *second Acts*. That" "is, it comprehendeth *Intellect* and *Will*, and also" "the *Acts of Understanding* and *Willing*. See *Lychetus*, *ibid.* p. 141.

5. What hath occasioned much Obscurity in the Minds and Doctrine of the School-Divines, when they dispute concerning the Image of the Trinity in the Human Soul, is that; they knew only of two *Principles* or *Faculties* in the Soul, *Intellect* and *Will* : They were not aware of the first, even *Active-Vital-Power*, or *Vitality*, or *LIFE* ; that this also is a *Principle*. *St. Austin*, to make Three, added *Memory*. When out of the same *St. Austin*, they substituted *MIND* for *Memory* ; Matters went better and more easily. *Scotus* and *Lychetus* have noted all this, in the places last cited. [But neither the Learned Author, nor those Schoolmen; had read

St. *Austin* carefully and heedfully enough. St. *Austin* did not make Intellect the second *Principle*, but the first; the Order and Names according to St. *Austin* are, MIND, which he explains by *Intellect*, SELF-KNOWLEDG, and SELF-LOVE.]

6. It is controverted by the Schoolmen, Whether the *Image* is only the second Act, or whether it includes the first also? And *Scotus* denies that, “The Act of Willing (or *produced Love*) is the third part of the Image; because it doth not imply any *Consubstantiality* with the Soul, being really distinguish’d from it: But the *Will* it self, as *informed* by the *Act of Willing*, or by *Love*, is (according to him) the third part of the Image; because, in respect of the Will, it supposes (or rather it implies) *Consubstantiality*. As *Lychetus* reports him, *Ibid.* p. 141.

I ask, Whether the same may not be said of the three *Faculties*? Concerning the Image you may see more in *Alex. Alensis*, 1. q. 60. Memb. 3. a. 3. *Bonaventura*, 1. d. 3. q. 3. *Richardus*, 1. d. 3. q. 1. a. 2. *Scotus*, 1. d. 3. q. 9. *St. Thomas*, 1. q. 93. a. 5, & 6. *Durandus*, d. 3. q. 3. *J. Bacconus*, 1. d. 3. q. 3. We must note the words of *St. Thomas*, 1. q. 39. a. 7. c. “The *Essential Attributes* are more known to us by *Reason*, than those that are proper to the *Persons*; because the former are certainly learned from the *Work of Creation*, the *Personal Properties* not. In the same place, and again a. 8. he proves the *Appropriation of the Attributes*.

7. They almost all agree that, the three *Persons* are three *Relations*.

8. Also that, these *Relations* are not *Accidents*; for which reason the *Thomists* deny any *Relations of God to the Creatures*, lest thereby they should be obliged to admit *Accidents in God*. But one that understands

derstands the true Nature of a *Relation*, as before explained, will not fear that Consequence.

9. Most of the Schoolmen hold that, the Trinity is by no means constituted by any Relation to the *Creatures*, but only of God to *Himself*. But some of 'em grant, there is a twofold Cause or Reason of the *Denominations* of the Persons; one *Internal*, the other with *respect to the Creatures*. That God is really *related* to the *Creatures*, predicamentally, and even *de novo* (or in all their *Changes*, whether Natural or Moral) is indeed denied by *St. Thomas, Cajetan, Ferrariensis*; but defended by *Ockham*, 1. Disp. 30. *Gabriel*, *ibid.* 4, 5. *Durandus*, q. 3. *Gr. Ariminensis*, Disp. 28. q. 3. a. 1. *Marsilius*, 32. a. 1. *Palacios*, 1. d. 5. And saith *Hurtadus*, by *Anselm* Monolog. c. 24. (*Hurtadus* himself defends it, *Metaph. Disp.* 15. *Sect.* 2. p. 901.) "God, " saith *Hurtadus*, is *formally distinct* from *Peter*; more perfect than He, and (besides) his " Lord: But these are *formally predicamental Relations*, therefore God hath *predicamental Relations*. I know well what *Capreolus* and others have alledged and argued to the contrary; but cannot easily force my self to believe or say that, God is not *related* to the Holy, really and truly, as their Redeemer, Sanctifier, Lord, Governour, Father; and also as their Efficient, Dirigent, and Final Cause. Whether these are to be called *Predicamental*, or rather *Transcendental* Relations, let *Aristotle* see to it; for I care not. *Hurtadus* however observes that, even of the *Thomists*, *Soncinus* and *Herveus* do assert the Relation of *Dominion* in God is *real*. *Molina*, 1. p. q. 13. a. 7. says; *These Relations are affirmed to be in God*, by *Durandus*, *Gabriel*, *Gregory*, and others. Whom he doth not oppose, except in the distinction of these *Relations* from their *Foundation*; but tho they are not distinguished from their *Foundation*, we may affirm

them in God, without abſurdity. Of this mind alſo is *Fonſeca*, *Metaph.* lib. 5. c. 15. q. 1. ſect. 7. and *Palacios*, *diſp.* 5. *Suarez* thinks, this Doctrine is not to be cenſured, *Metaph.* 47. *diſp.* ſect. 15, 16, 17. Notwithſtanding, this School-Doctor, out of reſpect to the *Society of the Jeſuits* of which he was, forſakes here the *Nominals*; and joins himſelf to the *ſcotiſts* and *Thomiſts*. viz. *Aquinas*, 1. p. q. 13. a. 7. & 2. *contra Gent.* c. 12. *Cajetan*; *Ferrarienſis*; *Capreolus*, 1. d. 30. q. 1. a. 1. c. 3. and a. 2. c. 2, & 3. *Bonaventura*, a. 1. q. 3. *Richardus*, a. 1. q. 4. *Scotus*, q. 1. *Aegidius*, q. 2. *Henricus*, quodl. 9. q. 1. *Alenſis*, 1. p. q. 25. *Albertinus* would prove the contrary, by ſome trifling un-concluding Arguments, *de Relat. prim. Corol.* p. 417, 418. But if there be a true Foundation of this Propoſition, *God created the World*, there is a true Foundation of the *Relation of Creator*.

10. “ A *Perſon*, ſaith *St. Thomas*, being a *ſub-
“ ſiſting Relation* in the *Divine Nature*, is really the
“ ſame with the *Divine Eſſence*. — As *Relations* in
“ created Things are but *Accidents*, ſo in *God* they
“ are the very *Divine Eſſence*. — A *Perſon* in the
“ *Divine Nature* is a *Relation as ſubſiſting*: a *Rela-
“ tion* compared with the *Eſſence*, can differ from
“ it but only by *mental Conception*; compared
“ with the *opposite Relation*, it hath a *real* *diſtincti-
“ on* from it, by its *oppoſition*. 1. q. 39. a. 1. c.
It ſeems then, *Oppoſition* and *real Diſtinction*, may
be in a thing really and altogether the ſame. By
this it appears that, *Relation* is a term wholly equi-
vocal, when applied to *Divine* and *Human Things*:
for in *Divine Things*, they ſay, it is a *Subſtance* not
an *Accident*; but in *human* and *created Things*
there is no *Relation* but what is an *Accident*, and not
formally a *Subſtance*. They that ſay, the *Founda-
tion* and *Relation*, the *Term* being ſuppoſed, are the
ſame,

same, may say, *Relation is a Substance* when the Foundation and Term are Substances. But this is not the Doctrine of *these* Schoolmen: and hitherto Relation, as *Relation*, has been distinguish'd almost by all from the Foundation, tho not *really*; and therefore 'tis really only an *Ens Rationis*, a *Creature of Reason*, tho its Foundation is not. But a Relation which formally, or *as such*, is a Substance; and a Substance perfectly the same, and yet divers ways related to it self; and a distinct Relation, where the Subject, Foundation, and Term, are altogether the same; are things unknown to *Men*: and therefore a *Divine Personality* is no more understood by the term *Relation*, than by any unknown or barbarous Word that one might devise; because it doth not signify what *Relation* is used to signify by Men.

11. Yes, saith St. *Thomas*, 1. q. 28. a. 2. c. " A
 " Relation *really existing* in God, is the same (as to
 " the thing) with the Essence; and doth not differ,
 " but only in our way of Conceiving. — What-
 " ever in created Things has an *accidental* Existence,
 " in God hath a *substantial*; — Whatsoever is in
 " God, is his Essence. And thus it is manifest that,
 " a Relation really existing in God, is the same re-
 " ally with the Essence; its Distinction is only an
 " *Act of Reason*. In short, the *Being* of a Relation,
 " and the *Being* of Essence in God, are the same.
 The sum then is; the Essence is *One*, the Relations
Three: the Relations are *real*, and *really different* from
 one another; and yet *really* they do not differ from
 the *one* Essence. Nay, they are *opposite* to one ano-
 ther; in an Essence *not really* different or diverse,
 there is a *real* opposition. The Reader may consider
 of these Maxims of the *Thomists*, and other School-
 Doctors. [But this was an affected darkning of
 Things: The *Opposition* is not of the Essence, as such,
 but only of the Relations; which should not be Re-
 lations,

lations, if they were not opposed as *Relation* and *Correlate*. And tho there are *three* Relations in God, that *really* exist, and are the *same* with the one *Essence*; they *exist* only as they are the *Essence* related, and they are *three* and opposite only as they are *Acts*, and *respects* of the *Essence*. The *Essence* acting after three Modes or *Manners*, *Vitally*, *Intellectively*, and *Volitively*, is as *really* distinguished; as those three immanent *Acts*, or the *respects* arising from them, can distinguish it. They become *Relations*, as the first *Generates*, the second is *Generated*, and the third *Proceeds*: Which is more easily understood in *St. Austin's* Hypothesis, as also is all the rest; than in the (*Learned*) *Authors*. To *generate*, and *be generated*, do infer *Relation*; and yet every one sees, they are opposite, tho in the *same* *Essence* and *Substance*.]

12. *Dionysius Petavius* could not digest or endure these things; he opposes them largely, *de Trin. lib. 4. c. 11. p. 405*. He says, contrary to *St. Austin* and the *Thomists*; "A *Person* properly and directly signifies something *Relative*; it doth not denote the *Essence* in God, but a *Relative Property*, and that too but obscurely. *n. 9. p. 411*. He rejects those that say; "Relation as spoken of it self, or as including the *Essence*, doth constitute the *Person*, and distinguishes as it is opposed to another *Relation*, or as he speaks *quatenus ad alteram dicitur*. *N. 10. p. 412*. he saith, as the *Schools* more commonly do, *A thing is distinguished, by the same that is constituted*. But he confesses; "The *Notion* of *Relation* and *Person* in *God*, is not the same as in *Man*, or other created *Beings*: For in *God*, *Relation* as distinguished by the *Mind* from *Essence*, is a *Relation* subsisting of it self, and by it the *Essence* subsisteth, &c. According to him then, *Relation* or *Person* differs only *notionally* from the *Essence*,

sence, not really; and yet subsisteth of it self, and the Essence by it, tho they differ not; *n. 11. p. 413.* He saith farther, *c. 16. n. 5. p. 456.* *What is simply one, is neither in it self, nor is numbred.* Agreeing herein with *Richardus de S. Vict. de Trin. lib. 6. c. 12.* "Nothing is rightly said to be equal with it self. Where there is Unity, we ought not to say *Equality*, but *Identity*. — What comparison can there be in Unity? there is neither Similitude nor Dissimilitude, where there is simple and perfect Unity.

13. *St. Thomas*, 1. q. 28. a. 4. reckons four Relations, two Processions, three Persons: Therefore they do not think, every Relation is a Person; tho they say, a Relation that is a Person, differs from a Relation which is not a Person. [Only opposite Relations, which in the Deity are but three, are *Persons*.]

14. The *Scorists* conclude they clear these Matters, better and more easily, by their *formal Distinctions*. The 24th Controversy in *Rada*, is; "Whether a *Person* as subsisting is constituted by Relation, as Relation notionally and conceptively *differs* from Essence; or whether as *identified* with the Essence? In answer, he saith, (1.) According to *Capreolus*, *Ferrariensis*, and *St. Thomas*; there is in God but one *essential Subsistence*, common to the three Persons; not three relative personal Subsistences. (2.) On the contrary, according to *Cajetan*, 1. q. 40. a. 4, Relation, not as the same with Essence, but as *conceptively* distinguish'd from it, constitutes a *subsisting Person*, or a Person as subsisting. This last is the Opinion also of the Jesuit *Petavius*. Note, a thing is said by these Writers to be *distinguished in Reason*, that is distinguished only Notionally or Conceptively.

The same *Rada* opens the Opinion of *Scotus* in these Conclusions, (1.) We must believe *three Subsistences* in God, if Subsistence be taken in the *Concrete*. (2.) And three Subsistences in the *abstract* also, meaning thereby three Modes, or Manners, or *Ways* of Subsisting. (3.) Essence as differenced only notionally from Relation, doth not make a Person. (4.) Essence as distinguished from personal Relation; either *formally* in the nature of the thing according to *Scotus*, or notionally according to *St. Thomas*; doth not make a subsisting Person. (5.) Relation as identified with the Essence, doth not give subsistence to a Person. (6.) A Divine Relation as only *notionally* differing from the Essence, doth not make a subsisting Person. And here they object to the *Thomists*, that their way of constituting a Person is mere Fiction; theirs are not really *Divine Persons*, but only *Conceptions*. (7.) Relation, according to its proper *formal* Entity, according to which it is not *formally* in the nature of the thing the same with the Divine Essence, doth constitute a Person. After this, he proves that *formal Non-Identity*, is not contrary to the most perfect Simplicity.

Because this Author has treated of all that concerneth the *Persons* more *clearly*, than the other *Masters in Subtily*; therefore omitting what they have said, I will only set down here *his* Conclusions upon some of the Questions.

The Resolutions and Conclusions of *Rada*.

Contr. 23. p. 340. Qu. *Doth this term Person signify a Relation?* In answer; First he approveth the definition of *Person* given by *Richardus*, *A Person is an incommunicable Existence, in the rational Nature.* Then he asks; Doth *Person* imply the first, or second

cond Intention; that is, the *real* or *notional*? He answers, contrary to some others, the term Person doth not signify the second Intention.

Quest. *Doth Person primarily signify Relation, or an absolute Entity?* Answ. 1. Person taken *universally*, doth not signify Relation. 2. The term Person is common to the three Divine Persons. 3. And not by an equivocal Community, which consisteth in the Name only; but an Univocal. 4. The term Person doth not *formally* signify the second Substance, or *Quiddity*. 5. Nor formally a Relation, expressly. 6. If the term Person formally importeth *Negation*, it signifieth neither Substance nor Relation; because Negation is neither Substance nor Relation: yet it connoteth something *positive*. 7. If Person signifieth something *positive*; it is hard to determine whether that Positive in God, be *Absolute* or *Relative*. 8. The term Person doth not primarily formally signify a *relative Subsistence*, or a *relative Subsistent*. 9. Nor an absolute Subsistent. 10. But a Subsistent or Subsistence that is indifferent to Absolute and Relative. 11. All this is to be applied to a *Divine Person*. 12 and 13. "The term a *Divine Person*; according to the current Opinion, which maketh it to be somewhat *positive*; primarily and *formally*, signifies a *Subsistent* in the rational Nature; *Materially* the particular Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: *Secondarily*, the *distinctive Formalities* in the Persons: and lastly, the *Essence* common to them all.

Contr. 23. Qu. *Are the Divine Persons in their personal Entity constituted by the Relations?* Answ. The Persons are not distinguished by *themselves*, as the *ultimate Differences*, but by *Personal Properties*; nor are they constituted by themselves. *Are they constituted then by Absolutes?* We must deny it; not because it is without probable Reasons, or Authorities: but

but because it is denied by the *Fathers*, and *Councils*. 2. It is a rash Opinion, because contrary to the Current of the *School-Doctors*. 3. We must say, it is near to Error, because it seems contrary to the *Councils*, and *Fathers*, and the *Schools*. 4. It is not plainly and manifestly Heretical. This he proves largely.

Quest. *Are the Divine Persons constituted by Relations; and in what manner?* Answ. 1. Relation under the *express Form* of Relation doth constitute a Divine Person, in its real Being; without any Act of the Mind. 2. The first Person hath only two Relations of Origination: The first by which he is related to the second Person, belongeth only to the first Person, and is called *Paternity* or *Generation*; the second by which he is related to the third Person, is common to the first and second Persons, and is called *Active-Spiration*; it is *numerically* the same Spiration in the Father and Son. 3. The Relation of Origination of the first Person to the second, hath really but one formal Reason, even *Paternity* or *Generation*. 4. The first Person is not constituted by Relation to the *Third*. 5. The first *Personal Entity* is constituted by the *Paternity* or *Generation*.

In the following Conclusions he shows, *in what Manner* Relation doth constitute a Person; in our way of conceiving. *Concl.* 1. If we conceive the first Person in God by a compleat Conception, we must needs conceive him *Relatively*; namely the Father, as a *Father*. 2. By an *incompleat Conception* we conceive the first Person, first under the Notion of an *Hypostasis* or Person, then of *Begetter*; and of *Begetter*, before *Father*. For so in created Beings, we conceive first a *Suppositum*, then *Begetter*, then *Father*; this is the *natural* Order of these Conceptions. 3. In a compleat Conception the *constitutive Entity* of the Person of the Father is conceived under the Notion of an *Hypostatical Form*, because 'tis conceived under the
Notion

Notion of *Generation*, and as *Generation*, before as *Paternity*. 4. The Divine Persons, *in the Order of our imperfect Conception*, are not constituted by Relations under the *express Form* of Relations; but of *Hypostatical Forms*, as an Hypostatical (or Personal) Form abstracts both from *Relation* and *Absolute*, and is indifferent to both. [Hitherto *clear* and edifying *Rada*; now again our Author himself.]

I omit other thorny Questions and Subtleties of the *Scholastics*, as also the Opinions (and Reasons of them) that are contrary to these here mentioned; but these I have reported, because I have not elsewhere found the Matter so clearly and briefly opened.

Scotus confesses that, he makes Relation to be the *Material* of Person, because it is the least of Differences; and in the most *perfect Unity* the *least Difference* is the only true. [But our Author likes not these things; he opposes them, and answers to the Reasons (alleged for them) in some Sections; but the whole is so obscured, by *Scholastic Terms*, and by *Metaphysical Subtleties*, that I shall not trouble the *English Reader* with it: but the *short* of his Opinion, in plain *English*, is. “ The *Divine Personality* is not to be placed in one or some of these things, but in all of them. *Radically*, in the *Trinity of Essentialities*, *Life Intellect Will*; then, in the threefold immanent Act, even *Self-living Self-knowing Self-loving*, and the Relations thence arising: and lastly, *Processionally* in *Creation Redemption* and *Sanctification*, and (thereupon) *God’s triple Relation* (of *Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier*) to us Men. He concludes these Riddles with commending to the Reader the *Soliloquium* of *Henricus de Hassia*, as an excellent Work; and which treateth briefly and soundly of the *Trinity*.]

VIII. *The Explications by the Reformed Divines.*

The *Reformed* have no difference with the *Romanists*, concerning the Trinity; and are generally more modest, as well in their Determinations as Enquiries, than the *School-Doctors*. For the most part they contain themselves, within the Bounds of Scripture; and when they do not, they dissent from one another, tho' not so much as the *Romanists*.

Luther in his *Common-places*, p. 8. contents himself in a manner with a bare Proposal and Assertion of the Unity and Trinity. *Zuinglius* indeed objects to him some Heterodoxes, in these Articles; but they seem rather *Obreption*, than formed Errors. See *Zuinglius*, Tom. 2. p. 475.

Zuinglius himself well explains the Mystery of the Trinity; Tom. 2. p. 523, & 525. He illustrates it by the Trinity of *Faculties* in the Human Soul; and shows, why OMNIPOTENCE is appropriated to the *Father*, WISDOM to the *Son*, LOVE to the *Spirit*.

Mr. Calvin is most Orthodox, in these Matters; *Genebrard* in vain quarrels with him, for his calling our Saviour 'ΑΥΤΟΘΕΟΣ God of himself, when the *Nicene Creed* saith God of God, i. e. God the Son of God the Father. *Mr. Calvin* has been well defended, as to this, by the Divines of *Leiden*; and by Cardinal *Bellarmino*. *Mr. Calvin* seems to doubt of the Explications and Illustrations of the Trinity, by Human Comparisons. He confesses however that, the Holy Scriptures distinguish, by attributing to the Father the first Causality or beginning of Action; to the Son WISDOM, Counsel, and the Government of the Things; to the Spirit POWER, and Efficacy of Action.

Beza is altogether sound; he notes and blames those (inept) Expressions of divers Fathers, that explain the Divine Unity as only a *specific Unity*. See *Beza de Trinitate*, in *Tract. Theol. Vol. I. p. 176.*

P. Martyr says very little of the Trinity, in his *Common-places*; and as well there, as in his other Works, he agrees with the rest.

Antonius Fayus treats of these Articles more largely and accurately. He saith, "The *Persons* differ from the *Essence*, not really, but conceptively; but they are really distinguish'd from one another. disp. 2. thes. 8, & 30. and disp. 3. "Christ is the WISDOM, and WORD of the Father; in respect both of his *Essence*, and Office of Mediator. disp. 2. thes. 23.

Musculus, a Divine of great Judgment and Sincerity, speaks only known and certain things; the manner of the Eternal Generation he dismisses as inscrutable. But that the Trinity is not incredible in Reason, he proves by the Trinity of *Faculties* in the Human Soul; and by the *Substance Light* and *Heat* of the Solar Body. *Loci comm. p. 12, 13, 14.*

I say the same of *Bullinger*, who hath this Passage, *Decad. 4. Serm. 3. p. 272.* "It is enough that, the Faithful believe and confess (according to Scripture and the *Creed of the Apostles*) one Divine *Essence* or Nature, in which are *Father Son* and *Holy Spirit*. Nor need we to be very solicitous, whether they are called *Substances*, *Subsistences*, or *Persons*; if we but express their *Distinction*, and *Properties*: so confessing the Unity, as not to confound the Trinity, or deprive the Persons of their Properties. And, c. 2. p. 275. "The *Creed of the Apostles* was published, that none might controvert the Faith; or perplex it with needless Disputations, and Curiosities.

Illyricus recites several Senses of the Word *Logos*, given by others; and thinks them *uncertain*: he believes *this* to be the most probable, take it in his own words. “ Because the *Chaldee Paraphrase* often uses “ the Term *Meimar* or WORD, for *Jehovah*; and “ that the *Chaldee* was the vulgar Language of the “ *Jews* in the Age of our Saviour and the Apostles: “ therefore *St. John*, to signify the *Messias* is true “ *Jehovah*, calls him (in *Greek*) *Logos*; because “ *Logos* as well as *Meimar* is WORD. *Clav. scrip. p.* “ 1247. And, *Clav. part. 2. p. 615.* he endeavours to prove that, the Name of *Jehovah*, first revealed to *Moses*, doth signify that *God shall become Man*: it ought not (saith he) to be interpreted *I am that I am*; but *I will be, or he will be*; that is, *he will be the (Incarnate) Redeemer*. He saith also, “ The *Chal-* “ *dee Paraphrast* renders the Words of the *Psalmist*, “ *The LORD said to his WORD, sit on my right Hand,* “ *Psal. 110. 1.* And that *St. John*; *chap. 1. vers.* “ 1. having regard to the Words of *Moses* (*Gen.* “ 1.) *God SAID, Let there be Light*, and so of the “ rest; therefore calls the *Son* the WORD. The “ Word *Jehovah* is still a Mystery to the *Jews*, be- “ cause *Christ* is hid to them. There are three Per- “ sons, Father Son and Holy Spirit; what they are, “ no words can express. *Clavif. part. 2. p. 208.*

Wigandus maketh *Persons* to be a part of the *Defini-* *tion* of *God*; and largely proves from *Scripture* the common Faith, not meddling with *Niceties* and *Sub-* *tleties*. *Syntag. p. 48.*

Zanchinus is copious, and accurate. He saith, *de* *tribus Elohim lib. 8. c. 1. p. 337.* “ A Divine Person “ is nothing else but the *Essence* as distinguished (and “ as it were individuated) by a *Personal Property*. And *p. 340.* “ The *FATHER* is an *Eternal, Sim-* “ *ple, utmost Perfect, Living, Intellectual, Volitive,* “ and *Uncommunicated Essence*; and thereby is a “ Person,

“ Person, simply *Unbegotten*; and generating the
 “ Son, by a Communication of himself, *that is, of*
 “ *his own Essence.* The SON is an Eternal, most
 “ Simple, most Perfect, *Living, Intelligent, Volitive*
 “ Essence; but which was communicated to him by
 “ an *immanent* and incomprehensible Act of the Fa-
 “ ther, which the Scriptures have called *Generation*;
 “ and therefore he is a *Person Begotten*, by God the
 “ Father, from all Eternity. The Holy SPIRIT is
 “ *the same Eternal Essence*; an Essence most Simple,
 “ most Perfect, *Living, Intelligent, Volitive*; com-
 “ municated to him by an ineffable immanent Action
 “ of the Father and Son; and therefore a *Person*,
 “ *proceeding (through all Eternity)* from the Father
 “ and the Son. He seems here to distinguish a dou-
 ble immanent Action of God; but whether these
 Actions are *really* distinct, from the Essence or from
 one another, or only notionally and conceptively,
 he has not determined. He notes, *Lib. 1. p. 4.*
 “ The Fathers have confessed that, one can dispute
 “ of no Subject that is so difficult, or dangerous, as
 “ this of the Trinity.

Junius, Vol. 1. p. 2012, 2013. saith; “ The Di-
 “ vine Persons are distinguished from the Essence,
 “ only conceptively; but from one another, by *real*
 “ Distinction, which is the Ground of the Proper-
 “ ties and Relations. Farther, he distinguishes the
 “ inward Personal Acts; (Begetting, Breathing,
 “ Proceeding;) and saith the Father begat the *Per-*
 “ *son*, not the Essence. p. 2016.

Polanus has performed well; but he did not
 thoroughly understand the meaning of the School-
 Doctors, whom he endeavours to follow. He saith,
Syntag. l. 3. c. 8. p. 224. “ The Relations of the
 “ Persons *really* differ from one another; so that the
 “ Father is one *thing*, the Son another *thing*, the Ho-
 “ ly Spirit a third *thing*: but from the Essence they
 “ differ

“ differ *Modally*, and *Formally*, not *Really*. And, p. 226. “ *Relation only makes the Distinction; the Relation of the Persons is a Mode of existing*. He asserts, “ with *Gabriel*, a formal Distinction; and with *St. Thomas* that, not every (real) Relation maketh a Distinction (or Personality) but only an *opposite* Relation. But, 1. Either he means Relations, as including their Foundations, or as abstracted from the Foundations: if the former, Relations are the very Divine Essence or Substance; if the latter, Relation is nothing else but Comparability or Reference, a mere Child of Reason, not a *Thing* or *Mode* of a Thing. 2. A real Distinction, or as of one *thing* from another *thing*, is not the same as either *Modal* or *Formal* Distinction; which are indeed *in the Nature of the thing*, but not *real*. Therefore when he afterwards distinguishes the Essence, as a thing from *its Modes*, he speaks Contraries.

Bucanus, Loc. 1. p. 10. says; The difference (of the Persons) is not, 1. Essential. 2. Nor Rational, that is Conceptive Notional or Verbal only. Nor, 3. Respective; as the same Man may be both Father and Son. 4. It is real, but Incomprehensible. He explains it however, by a *Mode of Existence*; and therefore, probably, he thought it *Modal*.

Ursinus and *Paraus*, in *Catechesi*, say nothing out of the common Road; but intimate that, the distinction of the Persons is *Modal*.

Matth. Martinius, a Divine of the first Note, *de Symb.* p. 60. says; the Persons are distinguished *really*. In *Onomastico*, in the word *Person*, he saith; “ It is enough to Salvation to know that, Father “ Son and Spirit are *three*; and yet are *but one God*. If this was sufficient to so great a Man; why do we require more of the Unlearned? Do we expect, they should understand the nice Subtleties of the *Schools*;

Schools; five *Notions*, four *real Relations*, three *real opposite Relations*, two *Processions* in God. And that, in all this there is however but *one indistinct* Essence. That, all Distinctions in God, but only that of *Persons*, are not real, but only *conceptive* and *fictitious*. That, tho the distinction of *Persons* is *real*, yet they are one *undistinguish'd* Essence; because there is nothing in God but God. All this, sure, is not necessary to Salvation.

Snecanus, *Method. de Deo*, p. 70, & 120. lays down many most useful Rules concerning the Trinity; and but few Subtleties. But when he denies, the Father is a *Principle* with respect to the Son; he must mean it of a *temporary* Principle.

G. Sohnius, tho a Divine of great acuteness, has said only common things; either in his *Method*, *Common-places*, *Theses*, or *Exegetis*. But in this last, p. 87. he says with some Schoolmen, against some of ours; "The Father by communicating his whole Essence begat the Son. that is, another Person from himself; and the Son, by receiving the whole Essence of the Father, exists, as Light of Light. And the same of the Holy Spirit, p. 88.

Ph. Melancthon, after *Luther*, finds many Traces of the Trinity, in the Sun, and the Human Soul; and Similitudes of it, in the Arts, as in Astronomy, in Music, in Geometry, Arithmetic, Grammar. *Loc. com* p. 3, 4.

Ludovicus Crocius, a Divine of great Reputation, has many things (*in Syntagm.*) concerning the Attributes; especially the LIFE, INTELLECT, WILL, and EXECUTIVE POWER. But in truth, they are but three, *Active-Vital-Power*, *Intellect*, and *Will*. He saith not much of the Trinity; yet he saith, Generation is an *immanent Act*, p. 696. and that the Persons are distinguished from one another *really* and *actually*, but from the Essence only by an Act of Reason. He concludes, the Trinity

is an inſcrutable Myſtery ; to be adored, not ſearch-
ed.

Biſhop *Davenant*, as cited by *Crocus* ; “ It hath
“ been well and neceſſarily determined that, *God* is
“ one in Eſſence, trine in Perſons that are diſtinct.
“ But a Man ſhould deſerve but little, either of the
“ Church or of our Saviour, who would define or
“ determine on either ſide in the Diſputes of the
“ Schools ; concerning the manner of the *Generation*
“ or *Proceſſion*. And, *Determ.* 24. p. 112, 113. he
ſaith ; “ A *Relation* ſignifyſ only this or that Mode
“ (or *manner*) of having the Divine Nature.

Keckerman, *Syſt. Theol. Lib.* 1. c. 3. follows the
Scholaſtics, and is of their number, who ſay ; The
Perſons are *Relations* and *Modes* ; and that the Acts
of *Speaking*, and of *Breathing* or *Loving*, are the
Foundations of the *Relations*. He rejects the *real*,
and *formal*, and merely *conceptive* Diſtinctions, of
the Perſons ; preferring the *Modal* : and therefore
explains what a *Mode* is, tho by Inſtances not very
congruous.

Beumlerus, a Divine that underſtood the uſefulneſs
of well-choſe Method, *Theol. Lib.* 3. p. 50, 51. pre-
fers the Definition of a Perſon by *Anaſtaſius* and *Cy-
ril*, before all others ; *The Perſons differ, or are di-
ſtinguiſh'd from one another truly, but not really, each
by his Mode of ſubſiſting*. And, p. 52. *they are di-
ſtinguiſhed by Relation, and a certain manner of ſub-
ſiſting*. He affirms, 'tis improperly ſaid that ; the
Eſſence begets or communicates the Eſſence, or the Eſ-
ſence emanates from the Eſſence.

Trelcatius, *Inſtit. Lib.* 1. p. 38. ſays ; “ The di-
“ ſtinction of Perſons (in the Unity of the Eſ-
“ ſence) is *real*. And, p. 39. “ The Eſſence is di-
“ ſtinguiſhed from the Perſons, not as a *thing* from
“ other *things*, but as a *thing* from the *Modes* of a
“ thing : for the Perſons are *Modes* of the Divine
“ Eſ-

“ Essence; from which they are differenced, not by
 “ a *real* Distinction, or by mere *Conception*, but as
 “ the *Degree* or *Mode* of a thing. But when he
 saith, the Distinction of the Persons from one ano-
 ther is *real*; and afterwards, 'tis in *Degree* and
Mode: Either he thinks, *Degree* and *Mode* is an En-
 tity or *thing*, or he does not use the term *real* Di-
 stinction in a *Scholastic* sense, or he contradicts
 himself. But he well describes the Trinity of Attri-
 butes.

Dudl. Fennerus concerns himself with no Contro-
 versies; and *Wendelinus* affirms that, a *Mode* of sub-
 sisting doth not constitute a Person.

Maccovius, Colleg. Theol. speaks properly;
 “ 'Tis asked, May Person in the *Abstract* be called
 “ a *Mode*? I would not affirm it directly; because
 “ a *Mode* is always posterior to the thing or being,
 “ of which it is the *Mode*: Which must not be said
 “ of God. And yet there is nothing else by which
 “ we can better express, or conceive, a *Personality*
 “ in God. For if *Personality* is really in God, it is
 “ Essence, or Accident, or *Mode*; there is no fourth.
 “ But it is not Essence, for then there should be
 “ three Essences; nor Accident, for that would take
 “ away the Simplicity of God: It is therefore a
 “ *Mode*; but *Mode* analogically, not properly,
 “ taken; and it is, as saith *Damascen*, an *Eternal*
 “ *Mode*.

Gomarus saith, a Person is a *Being*, that hath its
 proper *Mode* of Existence; and not only a *Mode* of
 Existing. But he speaketh this of Person in the
Concrete, or as it includeth the Essence; not of Per-
 sonality. He engages in no Difficulties. *Lec. 3.*

Scharpius, *Curs. Theol. p. 211.* hath the same No-
 tion; A Person, saith he, is a *Being* that hath its
 proper *Mode* of Existing, and is not only a *Mode* of
 Existing.

Fest. Hommius, Disp. 7. n. 6. says ; “ In the Nicene Creed, Christ is called *God of God, Light of Light* ; not in respect of his Essence, but Person.

Cluso, *Idea Theol.* disp. 5. p. 40. saith ; “ The Divinity contracted is *analogically* called a Person ; the Persons are distinguished by *Properties*, and the Properties arise from the Acts proper to the Persons : The Persons are *really* distinguished from one another, that is, not conceptively only. He hath not ventur'd to say any thing of *Personality*.

Amesius, *Medul. Theol.* l. 1. c. 4. n. 26. saith ; “ The Divine Attributes are in God, not only *virtually* and *eminently*, but *formally*. But, n. 28. he says also ; “ They are distinguish'd from the Essence and from one another *ratione ratiocinatâ*, or so that the *Foundation of the Distinction* is in God. But, 1. Foundation is an ambiguous word ; and signifies, either that there is a certain *true Diversity and Difference* in the thing : or only that, there is an *Occasion*, without Difference in the thing ; as, when it is distinguished by inadequate (or partial) Conceptions. 2. The Distinction of *ratio ratiocinata* is of the last sort ; but *modal, formal, and real* Distinction, is of the other sort. *Chap. 5.* He distinguishes *Subsistences* from the *Essence*, as *Modes of Subsisting* (not as *Modes of Being* ;) and from one another by *Relative Properties*, or *Relative Affections*. He saith, as do others, the difference between *Generation* and *Procession* is inexplicable : But that, it may be in a sort explained by this Similitude ; the Father is (as it were) GOD KNOWING, the Son GOD THE INTELLECT, the Holy Spirit GOD LOVED. Somewhat like the *Scholastics*.

Polyander, in *Synopsi Leidensi*, Disp. 7. p. 78. says ; “ A Mode of Subsisting doth not *really* distinguish *Person* from *Essence*, but only notionally or

“ con-

“ conceptively. *N.* 28. But the Persons are distinguished from one another, not by a Conception of our Reason, but really. *N.* 20. But the *Manner* is rather to be adored, than searched.

Waleus, *Ibid.* Disp. 8. recites the Explications of the Fathers, by the Acts of *Intellect* and *Will*; and doth not reject them. And, *n.* 16. he saith, The Father communicated his whole Essence to the Son by this *Eternal Generation*.

Thysius, *Ibid.* Disp. 9. *n.* 10. saith; “ Procession is to be understood as an *immanent* Action in the Essence of God, whereby God so acteth in the Essence, that being *reflected* on himself, he maketh a *Relation* by communication of the Divine Essence. [But this mystical Flourish is nothing but this; Procession is God’s reflex Act of Love, or his SELF-COMPLACENCE.] Upon this of *Thysius* we may note; Either this *Act* is the same with the *Person*, or not the same. If the *same*, then the *Attributes* and *Essential Acts* are the *Persons*: for God’s *Love*, and *to love*, and *to love himself*, are the same in God: and God’s *Intellect*, and *to understand*, and *to understand himself*, are also the same. But if they say, the *Act* is *not the same* with the *Person*, then they must first distinguish the *Attributes* and the *Essential Acts* from one another; and after say, the *Relations* arise from them.

Spanhemius, Disp. Th. de Trin. p. 46. *n.* 6. says; “ The Persons are distinguish’d from the Essence, not by a *real* Distinction: but by a *formal*, or a *modal*, or a *conceptive*; but he determines not by which of these. But, as *Amesius*, he mistakes the meaning of the Distinction *Ratione ratiocinatâ*: He thinks, ’tis such Distinction as hath its *Foundation in the Thing*, when indeed it doth not signify any difference in the *thing it self*. Again, he distinguishes the Persons, in respect, 1. Of their *Order*.

2. Of their *Properties*, and Personal Operations.
 3. Of their *manner* of operating, in the *Essential Works*. 4. Of the *Terms* of operating, or the *Objects on which they operate*. 5. Of their mutual Relation. n. 13. He saith farther, the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son, is not in respect of Essence, but of Person only: and yet he saith, the Explication of the Generation and Procession, by the Acts of Intellect and Will, do rather perplex than expound those Secrets. n. 16. And he saith, as St. *Austin*, he doth not know how to distinguish them. n. 19. He saith, contrary to St. *Austin*, and the *Schools*; Relations are not the *constitutive* Principles of the Persons, but only the *notifying*. He adds, a *Mode* is used but improperly in describing the Persons, n. 21. [But he means, 'tis not in all respects the same in God and *Creatures*; but so neither is *Person*, or any of the other Terms.]

The *Theses Sedanenses*, de Trin. n. 7. p. 90. piously say; " The Doctrine of the Trinity has for its end,
 " rather the comforting and strengthening the Con-
 " science, than instructing the Mind. And, p. 9.
 " It is peculiar to this Controversy that, not only a
 " Mistake is easily made, and the Truth is hard to
 " be found; but even when found, is not proposed
 " and published without danger: For a true Expli-
 " cation, less accurately or properly exprest, mini-
 " sters occasion of Calumny and Accusation to the
 " Malicious, and of Mistake to the Unlearned. The
 " safest way is, to keep close to *Scripture*, and the
 " measure of Knowledg there revealed; and that too
 " in as few words as may be: lest we seem to speak
 " things that are indeed ineffable, and withal for-
 " bidden. N. 18. It is sufficient to prove the *Eter-*
 " nity of the Son, that he is called (*Prov. 8.* and
 " *John 1.*) the WISDOM and WORD of the Fa-
 " ther: For the Father, all will grant, never was
 " with-

“ without WISDOM; or his *inward* WORD, which
 “ is nothing else but the WISDOM of the Father.
 See also *N.* 20, 21, 22.

Lud. Capellus, in *Thef. Salmuriens. Vol. 1. n. 12. p. 179.* says; “ A Person differs from the Essence,
 “ not really, but only conceptively: as a *Mode* of
 “ a Thing, from the *Thing*; for example, as a *degree*
 “ of Heat, from *Heat*. But the Persons are *really*
 “ differenced from one another, as the *Mode* of a
 “ Thing from other *Modes* of it; as in example,
 “ one degree of Heat from another. But this is
 more than *conceptive* Distinction. He hath besides,
 at *N.* 23, & 181. some notable Exceptions; against
 the Explication by the immanent Acts of the *Intellect*
 and *Will*: but having been already more prolix than
 I intended, I shall omit them.

Altingius, *Loc. Com. pag. 46.* speaks cautiously;
 “ The Persons are not *really* distinct from the Es-
 “ sence, but *eminently* by an *Act of Reason*; but from
 “ one another *really*, but not *essentially*, or *separably*.
 The Essence, *he saith farther*, is not generated, but
communicated.

P. Voetius, *Theol. Natural.* has abridged almost
 the whole Theology of the Schools, concerning the
 Trinity, and the Divine Attributes. But the Rea-
 der may consider; whether what he says *c. 7. S. 4.*
n. 2, 3, 4. p. 116, 117. agrees with *n. 7, 8. p. 120.*
 [But on the whole, *Voetius* is both learned and accu-
 rate. Note, it is *Paul Voetius*, not *Gilbert*.]

D. Chamier, *Panstrat. de Trin. l. 1.* vindicates
 Mr. *Calvin*; who had wished, on certain Conditions,
 that the terms *Trinity* and *Persons* were buried. *c. 2.*
 He proves that, the Substance or *Deity* is not a Rela-
 tion. *c. 3. n. 35.* And he proves largely that, the
 terms WORD, and IMAGE, are *figurative*, against
Suarez, *Gontier*, and others. *c. 8, 9.* He saith, The
 Divines of the *Schools* have proved that, there is not

one word (but *Ens*, or a Being) used univocally, or in the same sense, concerning God and the Creatures: And yet some please themselves, he saith, in barking madly against the Sober, who cannot agree to their Folly and Ignorance, in asserting that WORD and IMAGE are spoke of God and the Creatures univocally. The Reason of *Suarez* and *Gontier* are like other vain Subtleties of the Schools; they say, in short; "We must distinguish between the Knowledge of God taken simply, and his knowing by way of the Internal WORD; the first is common to the whole Trinity, the other is terminated on the Internal Word. And God's speaking (say they) antecédeth his WORD, that is, his Knowledge; as *Scotus* and the *Scotists* (besides others) teach. God's speaking is his thinking, as the School-Doctors teach; his WORD is, as it were, an intelligible Species received. As if God, like us, properly thought; or knows, by receiving a Species, and not by one most perfect Intuition. And as if in God, speaking were one thing, and understanding another; or his simple Self-knowledge different from his Self-knowledge by way of WORD; and that in proper speaking. Saith *Chamier* again, c. 8. n. 6. "If I should grant that, the inward SPEAKING is terminated on the inward WORD; which yet is an extravagant Battology, because the Terms are the same; yet the Internal Speaking, and the Internal Word, is a mere crackle of Words, differing in sound, not in signification. A bold insult on the whole fineness of the Schools! But see also what he says c. 10. where he proves that; as to external Works the Father is the first Principle of Action, the Son the Second, the Spirit the Third; yet not three Principles really distinct, but one.

Maresius, yet more boldly and remarkably, *Colleg. Loc. com. Theol. 3. n. 22.* says, "Altho the
" three

“ three *Personal Properties* may be expressed by the
“ *Relative Terms*, of *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit*: Yet
“ the Relations, *Paternity*, *Filiation*, active and pas-
“ sive *Spiration*, are untruly by some *Scholastics* cal-
“ led *Real Entities*, and by others, *Substances sub-*
“ *sisting of themselves*; from which Mistake of theirs,
“ have come all their Disputes about the *Divine Re-*
“ *lations*. For a Relation, consider'd precisely and
“ abstractly, is a mere *respect* of one thing to ano-
“ ther: which *respect* tho it hath a real Foundation
“ in the thing, and the habitude of things towards
“ one another; yet (*in actu exercito*) it always de-
“ pends on the Operation of the Understanding, as
“ referring, or else opposing one to the other ac-
“ cording to their natural Disposition and Habi-
“ tude. N. 23. And seeing according to the Meta-
“ physicians, the *Absolute Properties* of a Being are
“ not *real Beings*; How should the *Relative Properties*
“ of Persons be Real Entities or Beings? The Per-
“ sons indeed in God are constituted by Relations,
“ as considered in their Foundation; which some
“ call *the Manner of Founding*: and not as consider-
“ ed in their External, Denominative, and Respective
“ (*Esse*, or) Being. *Paternity*, as it is the Relati-
“ on of the Father to the Son, doth not make the
“ (Person of the) Father, but only denotes that
“ he is *Father* by his Generation of the Son. I per-
“ ceive by this, Friend *Maresius* has read the *School-*
“ *Doctors*; and that in Metaphysics and Logics, he
“ does not take *Names for Things*: But the *Romanists*
“ will call thee *Heretic*. They will take it uncivilly
“ that thou wilt not know, or not observe, that the
“ Divines of the *Schools* do not by Relation understand
“ Relation properly so called; but something that can
“ neither be expressed, nor understood; and yet that,
“ they may write numerous Volumes of what is not to
“ be understood.

Arminius, Disp. 4. p. 187. speaks as the rest do. I say nothing of the *Tritheism* of *Curcellanus*; nor of the Minority of the Son in respect of the Father, asserted by *Episcopius*. But it is remarkable what this last advises, concerning rejecting all the *Scholastic* Questions and Disputations about these Matters, and of the Trouble and Vexation they gave to him and others. See of this, his *Institut.* c. 33. p. 337. & c. 32. p. 333. See also what he saith, c. 24. & 35. of the Indifference of believing the *manner* of the Divine Filiation of Christ. And in truth, if the many Dissensions of the School-Doctors, are damning to one of the Parties; these famous Disputers are in a bad Condition. Wo to the World, if every one shall be damned, who is not more subtle than the *Scotists*, *Ockamists*, and the rest. These Damners and Heretic makers represent our Lord Christ, as a monstrous Tyrant, rather than a Saviour; and as a teacher of Subtleties, not of practical Truths.

See the 27 Differences, observed by *Voetius*, between a *Divine* and *Human* Person. *Theol. Natural.* c. 5. S. 2. p. 52, &c.

Not farther to trespass on the Patience of the Reader, I advise him to read the *Corpus Confessionum* of the Protestant Churches; that he may see how much (according to them) is necessary to be believed in these Questions.

I will conclude with the words of *Grægius*, in *Catechesi*.

Quest. What reason have you to believe *Three in One*?

Ans. Finite cannot comprehend Infinite.

Q. But is there no *likeness* any where, of the *Great Three-one*?

A. The Sun, his Light, and Heat, are Three and but One.

Q. Is there not the Image of the Maker in *Man* also?

A. To *Live, Understand, and Will,* are Three in One.

Quest. VIII. *In this diversity of Opinions; What is your own Judgment of the Trinity of Primalties and Persons compared?*

Ans. We have said wherein they agree; the rest may be expressed in these *Theses.*

1. Nothing should be proposed, as *necessary* to be believed, but what is *certain.*

2. Nothing is *necessary* to be believed in these Matters, but what is comprehended in the meaning of the *Baptismal Covenant,* and may be understood by all sincere Christians.

3. It is *certain* that, the *moral* Image of God, is the Holiness of the *natural* Image: Which *moral* Image is a Trinity of *spiritual* LIFE, KNOWLEDG, and LOVE, in the Unity of the Spirit or Soul.

4. It is *certain* that, there is a *Trinity* of Principles or *Faculties* in the Unity of the Essence, in *Man;* the Image of God.

5. It is *certain* that, the *Motive Luminous* and *Calefactive* POWER of the Sun, and the *Vital Intellective* and *Volitive* Virtue or POWER of the Human Soul, are the *Essential* and *Formal* Differences of the Sun and Soul: Yet they make no *Composition* in the Essence, nor are *Parts* of it; but the *whole* Essence is *Life* or *Vital,* and so of the rest, tho not *wholly.* And yet these *Faculties* are necessarily to be *distinguish'd* from one another; for who doth not distinguish the *Motive Illuminative* and *Calefactive* Virtues, or the *Vital Intellective* and *Volitive* Powers?

6. No

6. No body questions that, the Processional or External *Acts* of the Soul are distinguished by (or according to) their Objects; and therefore also the Powers or *Faculties* (from whence those Acts proceed) are distinguished, *connotatively*, by (or according to) the Objects: So that Intellect, Will, and Vital-Active-Power, which is executive, are undoubtedly distinguish'd.

7. Not only the External, but the *immanent* Acts are to be distinguish'd; so that to *act vitally*, to *understand* and *love* himself, are not altogether the same. To *live*, to *know that I live*, and to *will to live*, one clearly and certainly perceives that they are not the same. And in like manner, to *understand*, to *will to understand* (and so of the rest) are not one another.

8. Tho we are certain that, here is a difference; yet *what* it is, or *how* to express it, we cannot find: one may say with *Ockam*, it is better perceived by mental *Intuition*, or some *Internal Sense*, than by Organical and Verbal Explication; but the Difference is not to be denied, because it cannot be defined.

9. It is *certain* that, as was before said; the Soul both in *Naturals* and *Morals* is the Image of God: and therefore the Image by which Man is like to God, consists in this Trinity in Unity; in the Active-Vitality, Intellect, and Will, in the one Essence of the Soul. As by that, he is the *Natural* Image of God, as is said, *Gen. 9. 6.* and is distinguished by it from Brutes: so Holy Men are distinguished from Wicked, by God's *Moral* Image in them; even the *Spiritual* Life, Light, and Love, that is begot in them by Grace.

10. It is *certain* that, only *Ens* or Being, no other thing can be spoke of God and Creatures *Univocally*, or in the same Sense; and that no Mortal can have a proper

proper and *formal* Conception of God, and yet less can express it: we must necessarily conceive of God by equivocal and improper Conceptions; all our Terms and Words concerning God are *Metaphorical*. For tho' the thing expressed is primarily and eminently in *God*; yet the Notion of ours that expresses it, is primarily in the Creature, the most famous *Signification* (as Grammarians speak) is in the created thing.

11. Because we must speak of God *metaphorically* and *improperly*, we can borrow our improper and metaphorical Expressions and Conceptions from no other thing so well as the Human Soul. We have no other Natural *Glass*, as saith the Apostle, in the present Life, in which we can see God more clearly; and certainly it was not for nothing that the Soul of Man is called, in Scripture, and by God himself, the *Likeness and Image of God*.

12. It is *certain* that, the Lord Christ (I speak here of him as *Man*) is the most perfect Image of God, known to *us*; who had therefore *natural* and *sanctified* Faculties, as a Trinity in Unity.

13. Neither is it to be slighted that, we see the *Traces* of the Maker in all created Nature: every *Active-Nature* is formally constituted, of *one Substance*; and of one formal Power in the Substance or Essence, which yet processionally is *threefold*; as was noted before, in my Answer to the *fourth* Question.

14. Therefore, either we must say nothing at all of God; or we must speak of him, from the *Glass* before described: that he is one in *substantial* Essence, and one in *formal* Power or Virtue; which Power processionally or objectively is *triple*. This Trinity in Unity is certain; but the Notion or *Manner* of it, is not clearly and formally known: but a certain thing is not to be denied, because the manner of it may be above us.

15. And

15. And therefore again 'tis no wonder there is here so great Diversity of Opinion. Whether these Attributes differ from the Essence and from one another *really*: or only *in the Nature of the thing*, namely Formally, or Modally: or only *Virtually*, by inadequate Conception, called *Ratione ratiocinatâ*; or *connotatively*, by extrinsecal Denomination, called *Ratione ratiocinante*. But almost all agree that, a good account of the *Difference* of Conceptions, is given from *the thing it self*.

16. What are the same with a *third*, are also the same among themselves; but no farther than they are the same with the said *Third*: so the Attributes and Persons, so far as they are the same with the Essence, are the same with one another.

17. He that will not distinguish the *Intellect* of God, from the *Will*, must not discourse of God. Would he preach, as the Scriptures speak, to Edification; or deserve well of God, and the Church; who should teach, *that* God, in himself, and with respect to his own Act, equally *loves* Himself and the Creature, Holiness and Impiety, *Peter* and *Judas*; or that his *Will* to save and to damn, is the same; or that his *Knowledg* of Sin, is the same with *Willing* of Sin; because in Truth *Intellect* and *Will* in God are altogether the same?

18. Altho the *Esse*, the *Verum*, and *Bonum* of God; as *Metaphysicians* speak; are the same: yet after the Manner and *Glass* of the Creature, we must say that, to live, to understand himself, to *love* himself, are not the same in God; that is, are not the same necessary *Human Conception* of God.

19. Relation, meant univocally and intelligibly, as distinguish'd from its Foundation, has no greater Entity (or Reality) besides what it has in mental Conception, than *Faculties* or Powers as distinct from their

their Substances; no nor any greater real Difference from other Relation.

20. If the *Relations* in God have a greater Difference or Distinction from one another, than the *Attributes*; it will become more hard to answer to their Objection, who say, it doth not agree with the *Divine Simplicity*. The Trinity of *Primalities* is not more contrary to the *Divine Simplicity*, than the Trinity of *Real Relations* which are the same with the Essence.

21. They that say, the *Personal Relations* or *Persons* really differ from one another; while they differ from the Essence, only by an *Act of Reason*; can by no means deny the same of the *Primalities*. [He means, the *Life Intellect* and *Love* in God, or the *Vital Intellective* and *Volitive Powers*, are not less really distinguished from one another; tho they differ from the *Essence* only by an *Act of Reason*; than the *Vital Intellective* and *Volitive ACTS* are.]

22. They that say, the Foundations of the *Personal Relations* really differ from one another; either make the Foundations (them only, or them with the *Relations*,) to be *Persons*; or suppose some other *real* Distinctions in God besides the *Relations*. And because they hold the Foundations are the *immanent Acts*, [the *Acts of Self-living*, *Self-knowing*, *Self-loving*.] and every *immanent Act* of God is the *Essence*; they teach a *real* Difference in *Absolutes*. [But the learned Author did not consider there, that; the *immanent Acts* are not the *Essence* simply, but are said to be the *Essence*, only because they are the *Essence acting*: and therefore tho those *Acts* are really distinct, this doth not make a *real* Distinction in *Absolutes*.]

23. But if there be no Difference in the Foundations of the *Relations*, neither *real* nor in the *Nature of the thing*; it cannot be understood, how *real Relations* should arise without any Difference in the *Fundamentals*,

damentals, Subject, or Term; and a thing altogether the same would be really *Relatively* distinguished, without Connnotation of Externals.

24. They that assert a *Modal* Distinction, and *Modes* of Existence, while they deny *Accidents*, say no more than we plainer Men; namely, that there is a Difference, but of what sort they know not. For by distinguishing the *Mode* of a Thing from the *Thing*, both *Substantial* and *Accidental*, they say nothing distinct, but confused. They that make a *Mode* somewhat between *something* and *nothing*, tell of *four* such Sorts of *Modes*: but *Gassendus* and others the best Philosophers say now, all *Accidents* are either the *Modes* or *Qualities* of Substances. Therefore they confess that they know not what a *Mode* is, in that they are not able to explicate it to others.

25. It is certain that, there is neither Composition, nor Imperfection in God.

26. And the School-Divines confess that, a Plurality of *real* Relations and Hypostases in God, is no way contrary to the Divine Simplicity. Nor is it discernable by Reason, how a mere Relation, tho predicamental, should infer Composition or Imperfection. If among the Antipodes there are a thousand People *like* or *unlike* to me, there arises hereby to me no Imperfection or Composition. Some say, the Creatures are Related (or *referred*) to God, not he to the Creatures; others that, Relations are attributed to God *secundum dici*, or Verbally and Notionally; others that, the Relations are real, but Transcendental; others, they are Predicamental, even with respect to the Creatures: but none of these think that, there is hereby any Composition in God. And sure, if it made God to be imperfect or compounded, that we say he is *relatively* a Creator; then to *create* must also make him imperfect and compounded: for to be a *Creator* is nothing else but to be *He who doth create*.

27. The

27. The dim Human Mind hath Ideas of Perfection, by which too many judg rashly of the Divine Perfection, without knowing whether these Notions do quadrate to the Divine Perfection. Thus the *Arians* think, a Trinity of Persons is contrary to the *Divine Simplicity*: when it is God only that knows his own Perfection; and no Difference of Attributes, Acts, Properties, Relations, Persons, that is clearly affirmed of God, in the Word of God, can imply any Imperfection or Composition.

28. Altho the Notions and Terms of *Active-Life Intellect* and *Will*, spoken or conceived of God and Creatures, are not Univocal; but Analogical or Metaphorical: yet because in the present Life we have none more proper, it is necessarily to be held that, God *liveth, understandeth, and willeth*. And because from Eternity there was no other Object but himself, we must say that; as he is *Self-living*, so he *understandeth himself*, and *willeth* (or loveth) *himself*: but herein is no Composition, or *real Diversity* of the Agent, Act, or Object.

29. As *Life* is the first Act, the same with *the Liver*; so in the *Image* it hath some Influence on the Intellect and Will: and as the Notion of Life, precedes the Notion of Intellect; so it must be said, *I understand and will, because I live*; not *I live, because I understand and will*. Intellect also is prior (in the Order of conceiving) to *Will*: and the Vital-Act produceth the Act of Intellection, the Vital and Intellectual Act produceth the Volitive.

30. An Act, conceived without a Vital-Active-Power, is either of an imperfect Agent, or is an imperfect Conception; for a *Stone* may act. I wonder therefore that, some *Metaphysicians* are afraid they should impute Imperfection to God, if with the *Act* they also attributed to him an *Active-Power*: for in very Deed we can have no higher or more perfect

Conception of God than that, he is an Infinite Virtue and Power, always and most perfectly in Act; it is the true Conception of a most perfect Spirit.

3.1. He that shall well consider the ways of distinguishing of the School-Doctors, will perceive that those Divines plainly declare that; they own a certain Difference between the *Attributes*, and again between the *Relations* and *Persons*: but that withal, they do not know the true Notion or Nature of the Difference; seeing they dispute (with so much Subtlety, and so great Dissent from one another) whether it be a *real* Distinction, such as of one thing from another thing, or *Modal*, or *Formal*, or *Virtual*, or by *External Connotation*? Nay one may see, they understand not perfectly their own Distinctions, viz. The *Formal*, *Modal*, *Virtual*, *Rationis ratiocinate*, *Rationis ratiocinantis*: for what one calls a *Formal*, another names it a *Virtual* Distinction. As lately *Posewitz*, *Theol. Schol.* p. 142, 143. calls the *Formal* Distinction of *Scotus*, *Virtual*; and yet *real*, tho not *actual*: while yet the *Nominals* make *Virtual* Distinction to be only *connotative* or *denominative* of the same Virtue, by a Diversity of Acts and Effects. But whether there be some Inexplicable Difference of the *Powers* or *Virtues* between one another, which with *Posewitz* we must call *Virtual*: or whether (as I rather think) the Power that is altogether *one* in itself, is *triple* with respect to its Acts and Effects; this Difference may well enough be called *Virtual*. [Whereas the Learned Author says here, the *Scholastics* do not understand their own Distinctions; and gives for Instance that, what one calls *Formal*, another calls *Virtual*, and might have instanced after the same manner in the other Distinctions: as his Observation is untrue, so his Argument or Instance is nothing to the purpose. His Instance doth not prove that, they understand not their own Distinctions; but only that,

that, they do not always *apply* them alike: nor is it to be expected that they should, till all Mens Observations and Knowledg of the true Natures of things, is of like Extent and Perfection. The Truth is, these Metaphysical Precisions are the very Perfection of Knowledg; without them we can discourse accurately of nothing. But our Author's aim in perplexing thus (all along) the *Scholastic* Learning, and more particularly their *Distinctions* that are applied to *Essence* and *Relations*, was this; to establish thereby his own Notions of *Persons* and *Trinity*, both which in his Hypothesis (or Explication) comprehend a great deal more, than they do in St. *Austin's*, or the *Scholastic* Conception or Account of them; as he will make us presently to see.]

32. If St. *Austin* and the *Schoolmen*, who observed the *Triple Faculty* in the Soul, had not put *Memory* instead of *Active Vitality*; without doubt they had otherways ordered their Notions of the *Divine Trinity*, of which the *other* (in the Soul) is the *Image*, than now they have done. And those that are forced, either to prove or illustrate the Trinity, by only the Acts of *Understanding* and *Loving*, have drawn on themselves such Difficulties, as discourage others from conceiving of, or explaining the *Trinity* by the *Image* of it in Man. St. *Thomas* for instance, and *Alex. Gill*, have laboured very much; I am afraid, without the desired Success; to prove that, if we follow the Explication of the Trinity by the *Triple Faculty* of the Soul, there will be only three Divine Persons. *Posewitz* has many things against this way of establishing the number of the Divine Persons; he endeavours to prove that, by this way of proving and explaining, there will either be more Divine Persons, or none. And *Becanus*, against *Keckerman*, and against his own *Scholastics*, endeavours by many Arguments to subvert this way of

N 2

proving

proving the Trinity; namely, by the Image. But if they had understood that, *Active-Vitality* or LIFE is in the Order of Nature the *first* Essential Power, and that it produces its own proper Act, and the Act also of INTELLECT; and that *Life* and *Intellect* produce the VOLITIVE ACT; lastly that, these three Powers do concur to all *External* Acts: they would have thought, the *Image* is the most proper both Proof and Explication of the Divine Trinity.

33. And I truly don't see that St. *Austin* and the *School-Doctors*, while they deny that, the Essential *Attributes* are the Trinity of *Persons*; avoid the Assertion and Inconvenience, that they designed hereby to escape: I fear, they affirm and deny almost the same thing. For the Acts of *Speaking*, *Understanding*, *Loving*, are nothing else but the Essential *Attributes*, as always in *Act*. And saith P. *Aquila Scotellus*, 1. d. 2. q. p. 42. "The *Notional Acts* are founded on the *essential Immanent Acts*; and with him are divers others. And hence, *J. de Ripa* and some more, endeavour to prove that, *Personality* includeth something that is absolute; tho many contradict it, and *Petavius* thinks it an intolerable Absurdity. And *Posewitz*, q. 21. p. 125. repeating the Arguments on both sides, seems to incline to them that say; *Personality* is something absolute: and he answers there the Objections. And if *Intellect* and *Will*, to *Understand* and *Will*, to *Speak* and *Breathe*, differ not in God; it is unintelligible that, the self-same thing should be related to it self by a different *real* Relation. But they that make the Essential *Attributes* both the *Foundation* and *Terms* of the *Personal Relations*; I leave it to be considered, how and how much they distinguish the *Attributes* from the *Relations*? And I have observed that, ordinarily *Divines* do not hear it very approvingly, when

it is said *the three Divine Persons are only three Relations.*

The Determination of the Author, upon the whole that hath been said in this Dissertation.

We must now declare, what we our selves think.

(1.) As to the *Thing*; the Doctrine of the Trinity.

(2.) As to the *Term*; Persons.

(1.) As to the *Thing*. I think it both safe, and necessary, to hold and affirm all those Truths, about which the contending Parties are *agreed*; so if we err, it will be only in Words and Terms, not in the *Thing* it self. Therefore,

1. I think it *certain* that, from the Unity and Trinity of Principles, or *formal active Powers* in every active Nature, chiefly in the Soul of Man, which is the Image of God; we must say, Analogically, and according to the Human Capacity; God is one in *substantial formal Essence*, or, as they speak, in the *Quidditative Conception*: And in this one Essence is a *Trinune Power*, a Power that is Three and One; *One*, as Essence; *trine* or *three*, *Virtually*, *Connotatively*, most certainly; but whether also *Formally*, and *Modally*, I must profess not to know.

2. It is *certain* that, this Triple Power or Virtue is *Vital-Act*, or *Active Vitality*, *Intellect* and *Will*: And that, it is to be consider'd, both as a Virtue (or *Active Power*;) and as an *Act*, that is Virtue and Power in the *second Act*.

3. *Certain* it is that, God hath *self-Life*, *Understandeth himself*, *Willeth himself*.

4. Therefore *these Relations* are found in God. First, The Fundamental Relation, *viz.* by *self-Life* and *self-Action* to *beget* Intellection, and to *produce*

Volition or self-Love. Secondly, By Intellection (or self-Knowledg) together with Life, to produce Volition. Thirdly, To *Will* or Love himself, proceeds from the other two, as in the order of Nature *Consequents* from *Antecedent Principles*.

5. These *Relations* are distinguished by *Properties*, as the School-Doctors have shown.

6. Tho' what are the same in a *third*, are the same with *one another*; whereby these *Properties*, *Relations*, and immanent Fundamental Acts, are the same with the *Essence*, and with one another in the *Unity* of the *Essence*, that is, *with respect to the Oneness of the Essence*: yet they are distinguish'd and differ from one another, in the *Nature of the Thing*, and antecedently to any *Act of the Understanding*; but in a *manner* unknown to us.

7. I never said, or thought that, the *Trinity of Essentialities* (*viz.* the *Vital Intellective Volitive Powers*) are the same with the *Trinity of Persons*, or *Father, Son, and Spirit*. What I say, is only that; the *Trinity of Essentialities* or *Primalities*, showing its *Traces* or *Impressions* on all Nature, in every part of *active Nature*, as I proved in the Answer to the fourth general Question; if it is not the *Trinity of Persons*, yet makes that *Trinity* intelligible and credible. For no reason can be given, why *one Trinity* in the *Unity of Essence*, should be discoverable in God, by the mere *Light of Nature and Reason*; and the other be in a manner incredible. I say not therefore, they are the same; but I prove the *revealed Trinity* to be credible, by the *natural*, as by a *Demonstration*: The *Notions and Opinions* of others, which I do not understand, I do not however deny.

8. It is *certain* that, God is to be (*inadequately*) conceived by us, in a triple manner. First, As an *Alive-Vital, Intellective, Volitive Power*. Secondly, In

In the triple *Immanent Act*, on himself; or as *self-Living, self-Knowing, self-Loving*. Thirdly, In a triple, external, or *processional Act*, as it is the Act of the Agent; or as *Creating, Redeeming, Sanctifying* or *Glorifying*.

9. It is *certain* that, in Holy Scripture the Works of *Power* are most commonly attributed to the *Father*, those of *Wisdom* to the *Son*, of *Love* to the *Spirit*; *effecting* to the Father, *directing* to the Son, *perfecting* to the Spirit; Creation to the Father, Redemption to the Son, Sanctification to the Spirit. The Father is the Author of *Nature*, the Son of the *Remedy*, the Spirit of *Salvation*; all of them conjunctly of *Glory*.

10. I hold as *most certain* that, the fæderal Doctrine of the Trinity necessary to Salvation, is *practical*: He that will be saved, must so believe Father, Son, and Spirit, to be three Persons in one Essence, as to *give* and *dedicate* himself to God, and to place his Faith and Hope in him; as his *Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier*; his Lord, his King, and Friend. This is the *saving Faith* of the Trinity. And hitherto of the *Thing*; Now,

(2.) As to the Name or *Term*; and here,

1. The Terms *Person, Hypostasis, Subsistence*, are not *inept*, or to be avoided: but neither are they simply *necessary*, as not being found in Scripture in this sense. Tho' *Posewitz* has said much of the Inconvenience of these Terms: And *Petavius* has cited much more out of *St. Jerom* and other Fathers against them.

2. I willingly give the Name or Appellation *Persons* to the *Properties* and *Relations*; but know not, whether they are to be given to the *Primalities*.

3. For it is not certain to me that, *Properties*, or the name *Persons*, should be so separated from the *Essential Primalities*, that the *Primalities* neither are the *Persons*, nor the *Foundations of the Persons*: It

seems rather that, the name *Persons* should be given to the Relations, Properties, and essential Primalities, *conjunctly*. [He means, the Trinity of Divine Persons is, the *Vital Intellective* and *Volitive* Power of the Divine Essence, or God; *then* the immanent *Acts* of Self-living, Self-knowing, and Self loving; *then* the *internal* Relations hereupon, of Paternity, Filiation, Spiration, as is more particularly explained at *Numb. 4.* in the first part of this *Determination*; *Lastly*, The *External* Relations of God to his Creatures, or Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. And to say, and confirm this, was the whole Aim of the Learned Author in this Dissertation.] But if any one lists to contradict these; I, who am ignorant in the Matter, will not gainsay him.

4. That there is something here inexplicable and unconceivable, and that shall hereafter be revealed and opened, I have no manner of doubt.

5. I doubt not that, besides the consideration of these *Eternal* Properties, God is often called in Holy Scripture the *Father*, on the account that he is the *Creator*; and *Son*, because he was Incarnate, and for that reason also is said to be generated or *begotten*; and *Holy Spirit*, because given by an *Inspiration* to Men. These are the *Personalities* best known to us; and on these accounts, as well as higher, are the Son and Spirit said to *proceed from the Father*.

6. But neither can I doubt that, Father, Son, and Spirit, have been three *Persons*, *from all Eternity*: I hold the *Eternal* Generation, and Processions; according to the manner so often already declared.

7. Tho I hold, with most of the *Scholastics*, that; the immanent Acts of God on himself, are the primary *Foundations of the Properties*: Yet I dare not to affirm that even from Eternity the Divine Vitality, Intellect and Will, and Father, Son and Spirit, had no *Secondary* denominating respect to the things that were to be created. [The meaning here is: Tho
Father,

Father, Son, and Spirit, are primarily so called from the immanent Acts of God on himself, his Self-living, Self-knowing, Self-loving; yet it may be they are secondarily so named, even from Eternity, with respect to (or on the account of) the decreed Creation, Incarnation, and Sanctification.]

8. I judg the Reasons of *Rada* to be most sound, those I mean by which he proves that, 'tis neither Heresy, nor favouring of Heresy, to place the *Persons* in the *absolute Attributes*: And he himself seems of the same mind, in that he has alledged and proposed them; but he durst not declare it, it being against the most. [The absolute Attributes are *Power, Wisdom, Goodness*: If the Divine Personality be placed in these; then God is three Persons as he is God *Almighty, infinitely Wise, and most Good.*]

9. As no one shall be damned for the Name or *Term*, that believeth the whole *Thing*; viz. The trin-une Virtue or *Power*, the immanent Acts, the Properties, internal Relations, processional Acts, and external Relations; all which I firmly hold. So none shall be saved, because perhaps he asserts three *Persons*, but only in the *Name*; and uses indeed the Terms of the *Schools*, but never heeds, it may be knows not, that *one* by *Persons* means three *Absolutes*, another three *Relations*, a third three *Modes*, a fourth three *Formalities*, but *Himself* hath no Idea of his term Persons. “ The Unity of a *Term*, that is “ differently understood, doth not make an Unity “ in *Faith*; nor is an Unity of Faith that consisteth in “ *things*, destroyed by a diversity in the *Terms*.

If the Reader would see more, and what is accurate, on the Trinity; let him read *Alcuinus* (or *Albinus*) *Præceptor* sometime to the Emperor *Charlemain*, de Trinitate: You have him *Patr. Orthod.* Vol. 2. p. 1730. Also *Meurisse* the *Scotist*, de Trinitate. And *Henricus de Hassiâ*, Soliloq. de Anima;

you meet him *Patr. Orthod.* Vol. 2. p. 1607. These Authors are brief, clear, and sound.

The Conclusion; with a Summary, and Elucidation, of the Whole.

Thus far the Learned Author; who has led us to the *Determination* he at last makes, through a long and difficult way: And therefore, Reader, let us now refresh, with something that may be more pleasant, and more easy.

And in the first place, here is a pretty company of Authors, for one Man to have read, on one Subject. Especially considering that, they are not *Pamphleteers*, or your slender *Octavo*, or even *Quarto* Writers; they are all *Folio-men*, the least of 'em in two, or three Volumes in *Folio*, divers in six or seven, some in ten or twelve; and *Suarez* in twenty four. It is truth, some Men may read all their Lives long, and be never the wiser, but rather the more foolish: But we should wrong our Author, if we did not say; his own *Determination* upon the whole, is worthy of so great previous Pains and Study; it is Learned, Judicious, Modest. As he had read more Authors, than any Man before him, on these Questions; not excepting *D. Petavius*: So he understood them best; and allowing that he writes in the *Scholastic* way, expresses himself clearest.

Well, this *Bee* has been upon every Flower, growing (or that hath grown) in the Churches Garden; let us examine what he hath brought away, and stored up, for common use.

I. In some things all his Authors are agreed; the *Fathers* with the *Scholastics*, both with the *Moderns*, and all of them with one another. As that, there is one Deity, Divine Essence, or God; an *individual* Divine

Divine Nature, which is *numerally* one; distinct from all others, indistinct in it self. Some *Greek* Fathers indeed are accused, as having spoke unaccurately, and incautelously, concerning the Divine Hypostases, or *Persons*. For in explaining, how three Divine Hypostases can be but one God; they use such Comparisons as seem to intimate that the Hypostases or Persons are *Specifically* one Nature, but physically and *numerally* three: which would be three Gods in one (Specific) Divine Nature, as *Peter, James, and John*, are three Men in one (Specific) Human Nature. But withal these Fathers say some other things, that are inconsistent with such an Error. As particularly that, the second Hypostasis is the WISDOM of God, not metaphorically, *say They*, but *properly* speaking. And again, God was never without the Son or second Hypostasis, because never without WISDOM, or *never unwise*. They say indeed, the Divine WISDOM and WORD is not like *ours*, but is a *Person*: But they explain it, by saying; it is *permanent*, and *always in Act*, and thus (considered with *the Essence*) a *Person*; while ours is *transient*, passes away as soon as conceived or spoken.

II. They agree also, except perhaps *two* or *three*, (who in so great a Number, are to be reckoned *none*;) that; we can know God but only (as saith the Apostle) as in a *Glass*, which Glass is first the Divine Word or *Holy Scripture*, and then the *Works of God*. The former of these, in many Texts, refers us to his *Works*; as where he may be best seen and known by us, while we are *in Viâ*: by these we know that, he is; by these we discover his *Essential Attributes*, his Omnipotence Omniscience and Goodness. But of these *Works*, the Human Soul is (by the Scripture-Writers, and by God himself) called the LIKENESS and the IMAGE of God: and therefore

fore here it is that, we may inform our selves of him; *what* he is, as well as *that* he is; with more clearness, and particularity, than elsewhere. The Human Soul should not, in distinction from the rest of this Sub-lunary Creation, be called God's *Image*; if it were not like to him *in Trinity*, as well as *Unity*: in *the Unity* every thing may be said to be like to him; for it is the first Property of every thing that is, as *Metaphysicians* observe and agree, to be *Unum*, One.

The Soul resembles the Unity of God, in its *Es-sence*, which is one; and the Trinity, in its *Prop-erties*, or (if you will) *triple Power*.

III. But because the *formal* Nature of the Soul, hath not been equally understood by all: therefore in assigning or naming, and describing the Powers, Properties, or *Faculties* of the Soul, there is some Difference among the Church-Writers; and consequently in their Conceptions of the Divine Trinity, or in assigning the *Characters* of the Divine Persons, by which they are distinguished from one another.

Concerning the second Property or *Person*, it is *unanimously agreed* that, it is the WISDOM of God: and so much is implied in the Name or Appellation, *Logos*; which signifies WISDOM, or KNOW-LEDG. They mean not however, the Knowledg of the *Creature*; but only God's SELF-KNOW-LEDG, which is *Eternal* and *Immanent*, and *the same with himself*. And as the *Logos* is the second *Person*, or discrete Property, in God; so is *Reason* (or *Wisdom*) in the Human Soul. But for the other *Faculties of the Soul*, how they are to be named; and the two other *Divine Personalities*, what are their *Characters*; there hath been (as I said) a great Variety among the Doctors of the Church, from the very first.

Some distinguish the *Powers* of the Soul, into *Memory Intellect* and *Will*; and the same in God: and this was St. *Austin's* first Opinion.

Afterwards he said, *Mind* or INTELLECT, SELF-KNOWLEDG, SELF-COMPLACENCE. Which is commonly followed by the *Schools*, and *Councils* of the middle Ages; and not only by the *Latin*, but *Greek* Churches, as appears by the Confession of Faith drawn up by the Patriarch *Gennadius*.

But divers of the *later* Fathers said, *active Life* or VITALITY, INTELLECT, and WILL, are the *formal essential* Powers of the Human Soul. And therefore these said, the triple Distinction in God is by LIFE, INTELLECT, and LOVE or *Will*; for *Love* in God, is not a Passion, but his Essential WILL. So, God is three Persons as he is SELF-LIVING, SELF-KNOWING, SELF-LOVING. These say, *Life, Intellect, Will* are most certainly three distinct Powers, Properties, or Faculties of the Soul; and *together* are its *Essential Form*: therefore here we must abide, and by these explain the Divine Trinity. But a Difficulty arises; for some suspect that, *Life* is not a distinct Power or Faculty, but as it were the Genus and Foundation of the other Faculties. But the Exception is not valuable; for *Intellect* also is as it were the Foundation of *Will*, there can be no *Will* where there is not *Intellect*, and the Choices of the *Will* are (at least generally speaking) grounded on the Judgment that the *Intellect* makes. What deceived the Objectors was, that *Life* is not a Faculty of the Human Soul, as it is a *Rational Soul*; but 'tis a Faculty or Power, and the first Power of the Soul *as a Soul*.

Some of the Antients, and Moderns also, distinguished yet otherways; some saying, the *Character* of the *first* Person is *Power*: therefore their Trinity is God, as *Almighty, Self-Knowing, Self-Loving*. Which seems however coincident with the Former; for

for by *Active-Life* they meant, or however intended to include in it, the *Vital-Activity* or **POWER**.

But others make *Power* to be the Character of the *third Person*; according to those words of the Angel to the Virgin *Mary*, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, the POWER of the Highest shall overshadow thee*: therefore they explain the Holy Trinity to be God, as the *first Cause* of all things, as *Self-Knowing*, and *All-Powerful*. This last was the Thought of Mr. *Calvin*; and is followed by the Churches that follow *his Model* of Doctrine and Discipline, as is seen in the *Corpus* or *Harmony of Confessions* of the *Protestant Churches*, published at *Geneva* 1581.

But some Fathers of the middle Ages, and some *Scholastics* that immediately followed them, insist only on *Power Wisdom* and *Goodness*; as that Distinction by which God is denominated *three Persons*.

The Divines of the middle Ages did not wrangle in that bitter Manner, concerning their Opinions; as before and after was done: they usually content themselves with a *videtur quod sic*, or *videtur quod non*, in their Oppositions and Answers to one another. They did not hereticate one another, for Differences in the very highest Controversies and Articles; provided the Churches former *express* Decisions were not opposed, or denied. The Opponent whether in speaking or writing, having first proposed his *Doctrine*, in a Proposition or Propositions, and explain'd the *Terms*, said thereupon, & *probatur*: the Answerer, having heard or read the Argument of the Opponent, said, *at contra*; and thereupon either denied, or distinguished, what had been offered. In short they argued, or conferred, without wrangling: and hence it is that, tho' their Explications of the Trinity, or what is meant by three Divine Persons, are so very different; yet there was no dividing from one another, much less condemning or hereticating one another. They are the only Authors,

thors, since the Foundation of the Christian Name, that have been content to argue disputable Matters in the Schools of the Learned; without bringing them to the Magistrate, or People, to be determined by Power or Numbers without Knowledge.

IV. Of so many Writers, not one has so much as once thought that, the Divine Persons are so many several or distinct *Spirits*, or *Minds*; they all agree in explaining the Trinity by *Properties*, or *Powers*, or *Modes*, or some such Affection of Being; in the Unity of one Mind, Spirit, Substance, Being.

V. This Agreement should content us; the disagreement being in a Matter so unconsiderable. One God, one Eternal Infinite Spirit; most *Powerful*, infinitely *Wise*, and infinitely *Good*, which last implies infinitely *Just*; our *Creator*, *Instaurator*, and *Perfector* in Holiness and Happiness; that hath *Eternal Self-Life*, *Self-Knowledge*, *Self-Complacence*: in this all agree. The Disagreement is only that, whereas there is a *triple Distinction* in God, known in the Catholic Church by the Name of *Persons*, and *Father Son* and Spiration or *Spirit* proceeding from both; whether these be the *triple Power*, of LIFE KNOWLEDG and WILL? Or the *immanent Acts*; of SELF-LIFE, SELF-KNOWLEDG, SELF-COMPLACENCE; or some such like? Or lastly, *all* these; so as to comprehend also the triple *External Relation* of God to his Creatures; that is, their CREATOR, INSTAURATOR, and PERFECTOR? I say, this Disagreement, or Question rather, is *little*. Because the Appellation *three Persons* is applicable (and perhaps *equally*) to any of these Expositions of the triple Distinction; if we conceive with them (as all agree we should) the *Divine Essence*, Deity, or God. And as to the *Relative Terms*, *Father Son* and *Spirit* proceeding from both; since they are not used, by Confession of all, in the Physical or Vulgar, but in the Hyper-physical and

Theolo-

Theological Sense: it is as plain that, a Reason of those Names may be given also from any of the Expositions, and indeed is actually given; as naturally and adequately, as is requisite to such Terms as are confessed not to be *Univocal* to God and Creatures, but Analogical Reductive and Figurative only.

VI. Therefore, for obtaining an *Uniformity* of speaking, in the Article of the Trinity; it seems best that, all would agree to speak of the Matter, as St. *Austin* does. I mean not that, those that speak otherways, have not *probable* Reasons for it; but I say, they are not so much better (after all Objections and Exceptions are satisfied) than that *Father's*, as will countervail the Inconvenience of so many *different* ways of speaking. Without resolving to adhere to St. *Austin*, there will be an endless Variety and Dissonance, in particularizing and adjusting the Characters of the Divine Persons: to the hazarding of the Churches Peace; and to no manner of Advantage, in respect either of necessary Piety, or saving Knowledg.

The Differences of Divines in adjusting the Characters of the Divine Persons, or in explaining the triple Distinction in God, seems somewhat like to the Controversy among *Geographers* about placing their *first Meridian*. *Ptolemy* drew it a Degree Westward of the *Fortunate* (or *Canary*) Islands. The *Dutch* commonly draw it over the Pike of *Tenariff*, which is one of the *Canaries*. Mr. *Sanson* (the *French* Geographer) over the *Isle Fer*, another of the *Canaries*. It is drawn by many over the *Azore* Islands; by others, among those of *Cape Verd*. The *Spaniards* draw it, sometimes over *Cape Finisterre*, sometimes over the City of *Toledo*. Some Geographers have withdrawn it Eastward, to the *Cape of Good Hope* in *Africa*. Our *English* Maps begin to draw it over *London*. It may be, we shall see that, other Nations will also honour their *Capitals* with the first Meridian.

Meridian. This *Schism* of the Geographers, from their Father *Ptolemy* and from one another, is as *needless*; as it will be *endless*: for at what Point soever one makes the *first Meridian* to intersect the *Equator* in the Maps; all Geographical Questions or Difficulties are answer'd and satisfied, with equal Truth and Certainty. I say hereupon, as the Geographers may make all their Maps *uniform*, as to the Longitudes of Places; by returning to *Ptolemy*, the *first* of them that *thoroughly* understood the Celestial and Terrestrial Systems: so may the Divines, and perhaps ought to, conform to the Hypothesis and Explication of *St. Austin*; and thereby abolish that *Confusion of Language*, in the Article of the Trinity, that has been (*dangerously* as well as *rashly*) introduced by Mens over-valuing their own Authority and Discoveries.

VII. Till this is obtained, all ought to be warned in the mean time that, the Catholic Church has always allowed a *Latitude*, in adjusting the Characters of the Divine Persons; or what is the same, in expounding what is meant by *three Divine Persons, in one Divine Essence*. She approves what *St. Austin* says, *de Trin. lib. 9.* 'Let us endeavour to understand the Mystery of the Trinity; begging help of him, concerning whom we enquire; and as He shall enable us, explicating it to others. So explicating it, that if by mishap we say that of one Divine Person, which belongeth to *another*, or to the *Trinity*; we say not however what is unworthy, either of such Divine Person, or of the Trinity. This Moderation and Caution of the Holy Father, hath been always observed in the Catholic Church; all the Writers cited in the foregoing *Dissertation* concerning the Trinity, tho' (divers of them) so widely differing in their Expositions, yet are allowed by the Church to be *Catholic Writers*, for so much as respects these Questions. The Church rejects or censures none but those, that advance a *specific Unity*; so making the Divine Persons to be so many distinct Substances, Minds, or Spirits.

VIII. An especial care is to be used, in the Proofs (or Arguments) that we alledg, for establishing the Article of the Trinity. He that by speaking or writing would prove the *Holy Trinity*, should begin with explaining the *Terms*; God, Essence, Persons, Unity, Trinity: So he

will see, what sort of *Scripture-Proofs*, or Arguments from the *Works of God*, on which the Divine Nature and Properties are in some measure *impressed*; may be *properly* and *consistently* alledged: and the like in proving the Divinity of our Saviour. The safest, and most home Proofs of the Trinity, from Holy Scripture, are without doubt those that direct us to know God by *his Image*; the Human Soul. The Soul is one, in *Essence* or *Substance*; triple, in Properties, immanent Acts, and Modes of existing: What we say beyond or besides this Image, is arbitrarily said; or very imperfectly. For God is not known, *immediately*; but in *the Glass* of the Creature, and in his (declared) *Likeness*, the Soul of Man: He is an Object too great and disproportioned, to be known by us, *immediately*; He is knowable by us, only inadequately and partially, and by these *Similitudes* of him.

IX. If we first explain the *Terms*; and then prove the Contents of them, by their *proper* Proofs; there will be no more Disputes concerning this Article, or the *depending* Articles and Questions: the Article will be so clear and certain, that none will litigate about it.

The *Socinian* Controversy arose, merely from a neglect of the Church-Writers, to explain the Terms; Trinity, Persons, Essence, Unity, Father, Son, Spirit, Generation, Procession: and will be quieted, so soon as the Litigants know the meaning of the Terms, that is, know the true Meaning of the Catholic Church.

The same may be said of the other controverted Articles and Doctrines of the Catholic Church; the Strife was begot by a *Misrepresenting* by one side, and *Misunderstanding* by the other side: and this, not only in the Controversies about the *Faith*, but in those also about the *Discipline* of the Church. There needs no more to a *Coalition* among *Christians*, more especially among *Protestants*, but only, 1. A true Representation, and *dextrous* Proposal, of the Catholick Faith and Discipline. 2. That, the (supposed) contrary Parties excuse in one another but as much, as they *all* tolerate in the Members of their respective Parties. Which thing, if I have opportunity; by retreat and leisure: I shall clear to the *unprejudiced* of all Perswasions. I have had this Design, not only in my Mind, but on my Hands, these many Years. It looks indeed

indeed very much like to the Projects of some Mathematicians; to square the *Circle*, double the *Cube*, give the *perpetual Motion*; or if there be any thing else that more bears the Countenance of Impossible. But things of this nature seem not more impossible, before they are done; than facile, after Men are shown the manner of doing them. But these Designs are in the hand of Providence: and I owe nothing to the Publick, if that owes nothing to Me.

X. I will conclude with it, that; when we speak (or write) to the *People*, and not as *they* speak, we ought to explain our selves, otherways we mislead 'em; and the Errors, whether in their Faith or Practice, to which we so give occasion, shall be imputed to us by God. The Terms *Persons, Father, Son, Spirit, Eternal Generation*, and the rest, in the Language of the People, imply so many *distinct* actual Beings; and are always so understood by them: But it is certain, if we leave them in this Error, by neglecting to explain to 'em those Terms, and the Faith intended in 'em; they cannot avoid to be Tritheists and Idolaters. When we go before 'em every Lords-day, and every Wednesday and Friday, in these words; *O God, the Father, have mercy upon us miserable Sinners; O God, the Son, have mercy upon us miserable Sinners; O God, the Holy Ghost, have mercy upon us miserable Sinners.* When we say so often, to the Father, concerning the Son and Holy Spirit; *Who liveth, and reigneth, with thee and the Holy Ghost, World without end.* And at other times, *To whom, with Thee and the Holy Ghost, be all Honour and Glory, now and for ever.* When we say, in the *Athanasian Creed*, *There is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost; and, the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God.* And in the same Creed, concerning the Son, he is *God, of the Substance of the Father, before all Worlds.* And in the *Nicene Creed*, 'I believe in one God the Father, Almighty, 'maker of Heaven and Earth: And in one Lord Je- 'sus Christ, begotten of the Father before all Worlds; 'God of God, very God of very God; who came down 'from Heaven, and was Incarnate. I believe in the Ho- 'ly Ghost, the Lord and giver of Life, who proceeds 'from the Father and the Son, and is worshipped to- 'gether

gether with the Father and Son. I say, when our Words are such, is it not necessary that, we inform our People with great care and explicitness, that since the compiling the *Liturgy*, and those *Creeeds*, the word *Person* hath received a *new* signification in common and ordinary Speech, from what it then had: and that, the *other* Phrases and Expressions were intended, and are to be understood Θεοπροσωπῶς? That, we no more intend by any of those expressions to impute to God a *Physical* Generation or Procession, or to represent the Divinity as three Beings, or three distinct Objects of Worship; than when we speak of God's *Anger* or *Love*, his *Eyes* or *Bowels*, we mean he hath real *Passions* or organical *Parts*; or than when we say in the same *Creeeds*, *He came down from Heaven, and was Incarnate*, we mean to deny his *Infinity* and *Immobility*? In short that, we interpret to them, with great exactness, and often, the true Doctrine of the Church in these Articles, and the true meaning of the Terms and Forms we use? The unwillingness of so many, to explain (as they speak) these *Mysteries*, I hope, is from some better Cause than a secret Tritheism, or culpable ignorance of the Churches Faith: But if they had that *clear* and *certain* Knowledge of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church concerning the Holy Trinity, or that abhorrence of Tritheism and Paganism, that they ought to have; it is matter of wonder to me that, their Caution and Zeal is not (almost) wholly on the other side. That is, that they are not as mindful and as forward, to *explain* the Article of the Trinity, and the manner of our Saviour's Divinity; as now they are reserved in both.

By *explaining*, in this whole Treatise, I mean, expounding, or (rather) *declaring* our own (and the Churches) meaning; not, explaining the Mysteries, either of the *Unity* or *Trinity*. For God is more perfectly *One* than we can comprehend: And the *immanent Acts* that make the *Persons*, and by which God is denominated *Three*, are as much above our apprehension; as to their Nature, and (especially) their *Manner*.