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CHAPTER VIII.

THE HOLY TRINITY.

1. What is the etymology and meaning of the word Trinity, and when was it introduced into the language of the church?

This word, in its Latin form, Trinitas, is derived from the adjective trinus, three-fold, or three in one, and it thus exactly expresses the divine mystery of three persons in the unity of one Godhead.

It is said to have taken its place in the language of Christian theology, for the first time, in an apologetic work of Theophylus, bishop of Antioch, in Syria, from A. D. 168 to A. D. 183.—See Mosheim's Eccle. Hist., Vol. I., p. 121, Note 7.

2. What is the theological meaning of the term substantia (substance), and what change has occurred in its usage?

Substantia, as now used, is equivalent to essence, independent being. Thus, in the Godhead, the three persons are the same in substance, i. e., of one and the same indivisible, numerical essence.

The word was at first used by one party in the church as equivalent to subsistentia (subsistence), or mode of existence. In which sense, while there is but one essence, there are three substantiae or persons, in the Godhead.—See Turrettin, Tom. I., locus iii., ques. 23.

3. What is the theological meaning of the word subsistentia (subsistence)?

It is used to signify that mode of existence which distinguishes one individual thing from every other individual thing, one person from every other person. As applied to the doctrine:
of the Trinity, subsistence is that mode of existence which is peculiar to each of the divine persons, and which in each constitutes the one essence a distinct person.

4. What is the New Testament sense of the word ὑπόστασις, (hypostasis) ?

This word, as to its etymology, is precisely equivalent to substance; it comes from ὑπόστημι, “to stand under.”

In the New Testament it is used five times—

1st. Figuratively, for confidence, or that state of mind which is conscious of a firm foundation, 2 Cor. ix., 4; xi., 17; Heb. iii., 14, which faith realizes, Heb. xi., 1.

2d. Literally, for essential nature, Heb. i., 3.—See Sampson’s Com. on Heb.

5. In what sense is this word used by the ecclesiastical writers ?

Until the middle of the fourth century this word, in connection with the doctrine of the Trinity, was generally used in its primary sense, as equivalent to substance. It is used in this sense in the creed published by the Council of Nice A. D. 325, and again in the decrees of the Council of Sardica, in Illyria, A. D. 347. These agreed in affirming that there is but one hypostasis in the Godhead. Some, however, at that time understanding the word in the sense of person, its usage was changed by general consent, chiefly through the influence of Athanasius, and ever since it has been established in theological language in the sense of person, in contradistinction to ὑπόστας, essence. It has been transferred into the English language in the form of an adjective, to designate the hypostatical or personal union of two natures in the God-man.

6. What is essential to personality, and how is the word person to be defined in connection with the doctrine of the Trinity ?

The Latin word, “suppositum,” signifies a distinct individual existence, e. g., a particular tree or horse. A person is “suppositum intellectuale,” a distinct individual existence, to which belongs the properties of reason and free will. Throughout the entire range of our experience and observation of personal existence among creatures, personality rests upon and appears to be
inseparable from distinction of essence. Every distinct person is a distinct soul, with or without a body.

That distinguishing mode of existence which constitutes the one divine essence coördinately three separate persons, is of course an infinite mystery which we can not understand, and therefore can not adequately define, and which we can know only so far as it is explicitly revealed. All that we know is, that this distinction, which is called personality, embraces all those incommunicable properties which eternally belong to Father, Son, or Holy Ghost separately, and not to all in common; that it lays the foundation for their concurrence in counsel, their mutual love and action one upon another, as the Father sending the Son, and the Father and Son sending the Spirit; and for use of the personal pronouns I, thou, he, in the revelation which one divine person gives of himself and of the others.

7. What is meant by the terms ὁμοούσιον (of the same substance), and ὁμοόὐσιον, (of similar substance)?

In the first general council of the church which, consisting of three hundred and eighteen bishops, was called together by the Emperor Constantine at Nice, in Bithynia, A. D. 325, there were found to be three great parties representing different opinions concerning the Trinity.

1st. The orthodox party, who maintained the opinion now held by all Christians, that the Lord Jesus is, as to his divine nature, of the same identical substance with the Father. These insisted upon applying to him the definite term ὁμοοւσιον, (homoousion), compounded of ὁμός, same, and οὐσία, substance, to teach the great truth that the three persons of the Godhead are one God, because they are of the same numerical essence.

2d. The Arians, who maintained that the Son of God is the greatest of all creatures, more like God than any other, the only-begotten son of God, created before all worlds, through whom God created all other things, and in that sense only divine.

3d. The middle party, styled Semi-Arians, who confessed that the Son was not a creature, but denied that he was in the same sense God as the Father is. They held that the Father is the only absolute self-existent God; yet that from eternity he, by his own free will, caused to proceed from himself a divine person of
like nature and properties. They denied, therefore, that the Son was of the same substance (homoousion) with the Father, but admitted that he was of an essence truly similar, and derived from the Father (homoiousion, ὁμούσιον, from, ὁμοιός, like, and ὑσιά, substance).

The opinions of the first, or orthodox party, prevailed at that council, and have ever since been represented by the technical phrase, homoousian.

For the creed promulgated by that council, see Appendix A.

8. What are the several propositions essentially involved in the doctrine of the Trinity?

1st. There is but one God, and this God is one, i. e., indivisible.

2d. That the one indivisible divine essence, as a whole, exists eternally as Father, and as Son, and as Holy Ghost; that each person possesses the whole essence, and is constituted a distinct person by certain incommunicable properties, not common to him with the others.

3d. The distinction between these three is a personal distinction, in the sense that it occasions (1.) the use of the personal pronouns, I, thou, he, (2.) a concurrence in counsel, (3.) a distinct order of operation.

4th. These persons are distinguished as first, second, and third, to express an order indicated in Scripture; (1.) of subsistence, insomuch as the Father is neither begotten nor proceedeth, while the Son is eternally begotten by the Father, and the Spirit eternally proceedeth from the Father and the Son; (2.) of operation, insomuch that the first person sends and operates through the second, and the first and second send and operate through the third.

In order, therefore, to establish this doctrine in all its parts by the testimony of Scripture, it will be necessary for us to prove the following propositions in their order:

1st. That God is one.

2d. That Jesus of Nazareth, as to his divine nature, was truly God, yet a distinct person from the Father.

3d. That the Holy Spirit is truly God, yet a distinct person.

4th. That the Scriptures directly teach a trinity of persons in one Godhead.
5th. It will remain to gather what the Scriptures reveal as to the eternal and necessary relations which these three divine persons sustain to each other. These are distributed under the following heads: (1.) The relation which the second person sustains to the first, or the eternal generation of the Son; (2.) the relation which the third person sustains to the first and second, or the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost; and, (3.) their personal properties and order of operation, ad extra.

I. God is one, and there is but one God.

The proof of this proposition, from reason and Scripture, has been fully set forth above, in chap. vii, on the Attributes of God, questions 5-10.

The answer to the question, How the coordinate existence of three distinct persons in the Trinity can be reconciled with this fundamental doctrine of the divine unity is given below in question 85 of this chapter.

II. Jesus of Nazareth, as to his divine nature, is truly God, and yet a distinct person from the Father.

9. What different views have been entertained with respect to the person of Christ?

The orthodox doctrine as to the person of Christ, is that he from eternity has existed as the coequal Son of the Father, constituted of the same infinite self-existent essence with the Father and the Holy Ghost.

The orthodox doctrine as to his person as at present constituted, since his incarnation, is set forth in chap. 20. An account of the different heretical opinions as to his person are given below, in questions 87-91, of this chapter.

10. How far did the Jews at the time of Christ expect the Messiah to appear as a divine person?

When Christ appeared, it is certain that the great mass of the Jewish people had ceased to entertain the Scriptural expectation of a divine Saviour, and only desired a temporal prince, in a pre-eminent sense, a favorite of heaven. It is said, however, that scattered hints in some of the rabbinical writings indicate that
some of the more learned and spiritual still continued true to the ancient faith.

11. How may the pre-existence of Jesus before his birth by the Virgin be proved from Scripture?

1st. Those passages which say that he is the creator of the world.—John i., 3; Col. i., 15-18.

2d. These passages which directly declare that he was with the Father before the world was; that he was rich, and possessed glory.—John i., 1, 15, 30; vi., 62; viii., 58; xvii., 5; 2 Cor. viii., 9.

3d. Those passages which declare that he "came into the world," "came down from heaven."—John iii., 13, 31; xiii., 3; xvi., 28; 1 Cor. xv., 47.

12. How can it be proved that the Jehovah who manifested himself as the God of the Jews under the old economy was the second person of the Trinity, who became incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth?

As this fact is not affirmed in any single statement of Scripture, it can be established only by a careful comparison of many passages. The evidence, as compiled from Hill's Lects., Book III., ch. v., may be summed up as follows:

1st. All the divine appearances of the ancient economy are referred to one person. Compare Gen. xviii., 2, 17; xxviii., 13; xxxii., 9, 31; Ex. iii., 14, 15; xiii., 21; xx., 1, 2; xxv., 21; Deut. iv., 33, 36, 39; Neh. ix., 7-28. This one person is called Jehovah, the incommunicable name of God, and at the same time angel, or one sent. Compare Gen. xxxi., 11, 13; xlvi., 15, 16; Hosea xii., 2, 5. Compare Ex. iii., 14, 15, with Acts vii., 30-35; and Ex. xiii., 21, with Ex. xiv., 19; and Ex. xx., 1, 2, with Acts vii., 38; Is. lxiii., 7, 9.

2d. But God the Father has been seen by no man (John i., 18; vi., 46): neither could he be an angel, or one sent by any other; yet God the Son has been seen (1 John i., 1, 2), and sent (John v., 36).

3d. This Jehovah, who was at the same time the angel, or one sent, of the old economy, was also set forth by the prophets as the Saviour of Israel, and the author of the new dispensation.
DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

In Zech. ii., 10, 11, one Jehovah is represented as sending another See Micah v., 2. In Mal. iii., 1, it is declared that "the Lord," "the messenger of the covenant," shall come to his own temple. This applied to Jesus (Mark i., 2). Compare Ps. xcvi., 7, with Heb. i., 6; and Is. vi., 1-5, with John xii., 41.


5th. The Church is one under all dispensations, and Jesus from the beginning is the Redeemer and Head of the Church; it is, therefore, most consistent with all that has been revealed to us as to the offices of the three divine persons in the scheme of redemption, to admit the view here presented. See also John viii., 56, 58; Matt. xxiii., 37; 1 Pet. i., 10, 11.

13. What evidence of the divinity of the Messiah does the 2d Psalm present?

It declares him to be the Son of God, and as such to receive universal power over the whole earth and its inhabitants. All are exhorted to submit to him, and to trust him, on pain of his anger. In Acts xiii., 33, Paul declares that Psalm refers to Christ.

14. What evidence is furnished by the 45th Psalm?

The ancient Jews considered this Psalm addressed to the Messiah, and the fact is established by Paul (Heb. i., 8, 9). Here, therefore, Jesus is called God, and his throne eternal.

15. What evidence is furnished by Psalm 110?

That this Psalm refers to the Messiah is proved by Christ (Matt. xxii., 43, 44), and by Paul (Heb. v., 6; vii., 17). He is here called David's Lord (Adonai), and invited to sit at the right hand of Jehovah until all his enemies be made his footstool.

16. What evidence is furnished by Isaiah ix., 6?

This passage self-evidently refers to the Messiah, as is confirmed by Matt. iv., 14-16. It declares explicitly that the child born "is also the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace."
17. What is the evidence furnished by Micah v., 2?

This was understood by the Jews to refer to Christ, which is confirmed by Matt. ii., 6, and John vii., 42. The passage declares that his goings forth have been "from ever of old," i.e., from eternity.

18. What evidence is furnished by Malachi iii., 1, 2?

This passage self-evidently refers to the Messiah, as is confirmed by Mark i., 2.

The Hebrew term (Adonai), here translated Lord, is never applied to any other than the supreme God. The temple, which was sacred to the presence and worship of Jehovah, is called his temple. And in verse 2d, a divine work of judgment is ascribed to him.

19. What evidence is afforded by the way in which the writers of the New Testament apply the writings of the Old Testament to Christ?

The apostles frequently apply the language of the Old Testament to Christ, when it is evident that the original writers intended to speak of Jehovah, and not of the Messiah as such.

Psalm 102 is evidently an address to the supreme Lord, ascribing to him eternity, creation, providential government, worship, and the hearing and answering of prayer. But Paul (Heb. i., 10–12) affirms Christ to be the subject of the address. In Is. xlv., 20–25, Jehovah speaks and asserts his own supreme Lordship. But Paul, in Rom. xiv., 11, quotes a part of Jehovah's declaration with regard to himself, to prove that we must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. Compare also Is. vi., 3, with John xii., 41.

20. What is the general character of the evidence upon this subject afforded by the New Testament?

This fundamental doctrine is presented to us in every individual writing, and in every separate paragraph of the New Testament, either by direct assertion or by necessary implication, as may be ascertained by every honest reader for himself. The mass of this testimony is so great, and is so intimately interwoven with every other theme in every passage, that I have room here
to present only a general sample of the evidence, classified under the usual heads.

21. **Prove that the New Testament ascribes divine titles to Christ.**

John i., 1; xx., 28; Acts xx., 28; Rom. ix., 5; 2 Thess. i., 12; 1 Tim. iii., 16; Titus ii., 13; Heb. i., 8; 1 John, v., 20.

22. **Prove that the New Testament ascribes divine perfections to Christ.**

Eternity.—John i., 2; viii., 58; xvii., 5; Rev. i., 8, 17, 18; xxii., 13.
Immutability.—Heb. i., 11, 12, and xiii., 8.
Omnipresence.—John iii., 13; Matt. xviii., 20; xxviii., 20.
Omniscience.—Matt. xi., 27; John ii., 23–25; xxi., 17; Rev. ii., 23.
Omnipotence.—John v., 17; Heb. i., 3; Rev. i., 8; xi., 17.

23. **Prove that the New Testament ascribes divine works to Christ.**

Creation.—John i., 3, 10; Col. i., 16, 17.
Preservation and Providence.—Heb. i., 3; Col. i., 17; Matt. xxviii., 18.
Miracles.—John v., 21, 36.
Judgment.—2 Cor. v. 10; Matt. xxv., 31, 32; John v., 22.
A work of grace, including election.—John xiii., 18.
Sanctification, Eph. v., 26; sending the Holy Ghost, John xvi., 7, 14; giving eternal life, John x., 28; Turrettin, Tom. I., L. 3, Q. 28.

24. **Prove that the New Testament teaches that supreme worship should be paid to Christ.**

Matt. xxviii., 19; John v., 22, 23; xiv., 1; Acts vii., 59, 60; 1 Cor. i., 2; 2 Cor. xiii., 14; Phil. ii., 9, 10; Heb. i., 6; Rev. i., 5, 6: v., 11, 12; vii., 10.

25. **Prove that the Son, although God, is a distinct person from the Father.**

This fact is so plainly taught in Scripture, and so universally
implied, that the Sabellian system, which denies it, has never obtained any general currency.

Christ is sent by the Father, comes from him, returns to him, receives his commandment, does his will, loves him, is loved by him, addresses prayer to him, uses the pronouns thou and he when speaking to and of him. This is necessarily implied, also, in the relative titles, Father and Son. See the whole New Testament.

III. The Holy Ghost is truly God, yet a distinct person.

26. What sects have held that the Holy Ghost is a creature?

The divinity of the Holy Ghost is so clearly revealed in Scripture that very few have dared to call it in question. The early controversies of the orthodox with the Arians precedent and consequent to the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, to such a degree absorbed the mind of both parties with the question of the divinity of the Son, that very little prominence was given in that age to questions concerning the Holy Ghost. Arius, however, is said to have taught that as the Son is the first and greatest creature of the Father, so the Holy Ghost is the first and greatest creature of the Son; a κτίσμα κτίσματος, a creature of a creature.—See Neander's Ch. Hist., vol. i., pp. 416-420.

Some of the disciples of Macedonius, who lived about the middle of the fourth century, are said to have held that the Holy Ghost was not Supreme God. These were condemned by the second General Council, which met at Constantinople A. D. 381. This council defined and guarded the orthodox faith, by adding definite clauses to the simple reference which the ancient creed had made to the Holy Ghost.—See the Creed of the Council of Constantinople, in Appendix A.

27. By whom has the Holy Spirit been regarded merely as an energy of God?

Those early heretical sects, generally styled Monarchians and Patripassians, all with subordinate distinctions taught that there was but one person as well as one essence in the Godhead, who, in different relations, is called Father, Son, or Holy Ghost. In
the sixteenth century Socinus, who taught that Jesus Christ was
a mere man, maintained that the term Holy Ghost is in Scrip-
ture used as a designation of God's energy, when exercised in a
particular way. This is now the opinion of all modern Uni-
tarians and Rationalists.

28. How can it be proved that all the attributes of personality
are ascribed to the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures?

The attributes of personality are such as intelligence, volition,
separate agency. Christ uses the pronouns I, thou, he, when
speaking of the relation of the Holy Spirit to himself and the
Father: "I will send him." "He will testify of me." "Whom
the Father will send in my name." Thus he is sent; he testi-
fies; he takes of the things of Christ, and shows them to us.
He teaches and leads to all truth. He knows, because he searches
the deep things of God. He works all supernatural gifts, divi-
ing to every man as he wills.—John xiv., 17, 26; xv., 26; 1 Cor.
ii., 10, 11; xii., 11. He reproves, glorifies, helps, intercedes.—
John xvi., 7-13; Rom. viii., 26.

29. How may his personality be argued from the offices which
he is said in the Scriptures to execute?

The New Testament throughout all its teachings discovers
the plan of redemption as essentially involving the agency of the
Holy Ghost in applying the salvation which it was the work of
the Son to accomplish. He inspired the prophets and apostles;
he teaches and sanctifies the church; he selects her officers, quali-
fying them by the communication of special gifts at his will. He
the advocate, every Christian is his client. He brings all the
grace of the absent Christ to us, and gives it effect in our persons
in every moment of our lives. His personal distinction is ob-
viously involved in the very nature of these functions which
he discharges.—Luke xii., 12; Acts v., 32; xv., 28; xvi., 6;
xxviii., 25; Rom. xv., 16; 1 Cor. ii., 13; Heb. ii., 4; iii., 7; 2

30. What argument for the personality of the Holy Ghost
may be deduced from the formula of baptism?

Christians are baptized "in the name of the Father, Son, and
Holy Ghost.” It would be inconsistent with every law of language and reason to speak of the “name” of an energy, or to associate an energy coördinately with two distinct persons.

31. How may his personality be proved by what is said of the sin against the Holy Ghost?

In Matt. xii., 31, 32; Mark iii., 28, 29; Luke xii., 10, this sin is called “blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.” Now, blasphemy is a sin committed against a person, and it is here distinguished from the same act as committed against the other persons of the Trinity.

32. How can such expressions as “giving,” and “pouring out the Spirit,” be reconciled with his personality?

These and other similar expressions are used figuratively to set forth our participation in the gifts and influences of the Spirit. It is one of the most natural and common of all figures to designate the gift by the name of the giver. Thus we are said “to put on Christ,” “to be baptized into Christ,” etc.—Eph. v., 30; Rom. xiii., 14; Gal. iii., 27.

33. Show that the names of God are applied to the Spirit.

Compare Ex. xvii., 7, and Ps. xcvi., 7, with Heb. iii., 7-11.—See Acts v., 3, 4.

34. What divine attribute do the Scriptures ascribe to him?

Omnipresence.—Ps. cxxxix., 7; 1 Cor. xii., 13.
Omniscience.—1 Cor. ii., 10, 11.
Omnipotence.—Luke i., 35; Rom. viii., 11.

35. What agency in the external world do the Scriptures ascribe to him?

Creation.—Gen. i., 2; Job xxvi., 13; Ps. civ., 30.
The power of working miracles.—Matt. xii., 28; 1 Cor. xii., 9-11.

36. How is his supreme divinity established by what the Scriptures teach of his agency in redemption?

He is declared to be the immediate agent in regeneration, John iii., 6; Titus iii., 5; and in the resurrection of our bodies,
Rom. viii., 11. His agency in the generation of Christ's human nature, in his resurrection, and in the inspiration of the Scriptures, were exertions of his divine power in preparing the redemption which he now applies.

37. How can such expressions as, "he shall not speak of himself," be reconciled with his divinity?

This and other similar expressions are to be understood as referring to the official work of the Spirit; just as the Son is said in his official character to be sent by and to be subordinate to the Father. The object of the Holy Ghost, in his official work in the hearts of men, is not to reveal the relations of his own person to the other persons of the Godhead, but simply to reveal the mediatorial character and work of Christ.

IV. The Scriptures directly teach a trinity of persons in one Godhead.

38. How is this trinity of persons directly taught in the formula of baptism?

Baptism in the name of God implies the recognition of God's divine authority, his covenant engagement to give us eternal life, and our engagement to render him divine worship and obedience. Christians are baptized thus into covenant relation with three persons distinctly named in order. The language necessarily implies that each name represents a person. The nature of the sacrament proves that each person must be divine.—See Matt. xxviii., 19.

39. How is this doctrine directly taught in the formula of the apostolical benediction?

See 2 Cor. xiii., 14. We have here distinctly named three persons, and each communicating a separate blessing, according to his own order and manner of operation. The benevolence of the Father in designing, the grace of the Son in the acquisition, the communion of the Holy Ghost in the application of salvation. These are three distinct personal names, three distinct modes of personal agency, and each equally divine.
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40. What evidence is afforded by the narrative of Christ's baptism?

See Matt. iii., 13-17. Here also we have presented to us three persons distinctly named and described as severally acting, each after his own order. The Father speaking from heaven, the Spirit descending like a dove and lighting upon Christ, Christ acknowledged as the beloved Son of God ascending from the water.

41. State the argument from John xv., 26, and the context.

In this passage again we have three persons severally named at the same time, and their relative action affirmed. The Son is the person speaking of the Father and the Spirit, and claiming for himself the right of sending the Spirit. The Father is the person from whom the Spirit proceeds. Of the Spirit the Son says that "he will come," "he will be sent," "he proceedeth," "he will testify."

42. What is the state of the evidence with regard to the genuineness of 1 John v., 7?

I have not room in which to present a synopsis of the argument for and against the genuineness of the disputed clause which could be of any value.—See Horne's Intro., Vol. IV., Part II., chapter iv., section 5.

It will suffice to say—

1st. The disputed clause is as follows, including part of the eighth verse: "in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth."

2d. Learned and pious men are divided in their opinions as to the preponderance of the evidence; the weight of opinion inclining against the genuineness of the clause.

3d. The doctrine taught is so scriptural, and the grammatical and logical connection of the clause with the rest of the passage is so intimate, that for the purpose of edification, in the present state of our knowledge, the clause ought to be retained, although for the purpose of establishing doctrine, it ought not to be relied upon.

4th. The rejection of this passage does in no degree lessen
the irresistible weight of evidence of the truth of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity which the Scriptures afford.

43. What passages in the Old Testament imply the existence of more than one person in the Godhead?

Mark the use of the plural in the following passages.—Gen. i., 26; iii., 22; xi., 7; Isa. vi., 8. Compare the three-fold repetition of the name Jehovah (Num. vi., 24–26) with the apostolical benediction.—2 Cor. xiii., 14. Mark also in Isa. vi., 3, the threefold repetition of the ascription of holiness.

44. What passages in the Old Testament speak of the Son as a distinct person from the Father, and yet as divine?

In Ps. xlv., 6, 7, we have the Father addressing the Son as God, and anointing him.—See also Ps. cx., 1; Isa. xli., 6, 7, 14.

The prophecies always set forth the Messiah as a person distinct from the Father, and yet he is called "Mighty God," etc.—Isa. ix., 6; Jer. xxiii., 6.

45. What passages of the Old Testament speak of the Spirit as a distinct person from the Father, and yet as divine?

Gen. i., 2; vi., 3; Ps. civ., 30; cxxxix., 7; Job xxvi., 13; Isa. xlvi., 16.

V. It remains for us to consider what the Scriptures teach concerning the eternal and necessary relations which the three divine persons sustain to each other.

(I.) The relation which the second person sustains to the first, or the eternal generation of the Son.

46. What is the idiomatic use of the Hebrew word נָעַם (son)?

It is used in the sense, 1st, of son; 2d, of descendant; hence in the plural "children of Israel," for Israelites. Also when joined to a name of place or nation to denote inhabitants or citizens thereof, as "sons of Zion," etc.; 3d, of pupil, disciple, worshipper; thus "sons of the prophets," (1 Kings xx., 35,) and "sons of God," applied, (1.) to kings, Ps. ii., 7; (2.) to angels, Gen. vi. 2; (3.) to worshippers of God, his own people, Deut.
x. iv., 1; 4th, in combination with substantives, expressing age or quality, etc.; thus, "son of years," for aged, Lev. xii., 6; "son of Belial," for worthless fellow, Deut. xiii., 13; "son of death," for one deserving to die, 1 Sam. xx., 31; "a hill son of fatness," for a fruitful hill. The same idiom has been carried into the Greek of the New Testament.—See Gesenius' Heb. Lex.

47. In what sense are men called "sons of God" in Scripture?

The general idea embraced in the relation of sonship includes, 1st, similarity and derivation of nature; 2d, parental and filial love; and 3d, heirship.

In this general sense all God's holy, intelligent creatures are called his sons. The term is applied in an eminent sense to kings and magistrates who receive dominion from God, (Ps. lxxxii., 6,) and to Christians who are the subjects of spiritual regeneration and adoption, (Gal. iii., 26,) the special objects of divine favor, (Matt. v., 9,) and are like him, (Matt. v., 45,) When applied to creatures, whether men or angels, (Job i., 6,) this word is always used in the plural. In the singular it is applied only to the second person of the Trinity, with the single exception of its application once to Adam, (Luke iii., 38,) when the reason is obviously to mark the peculiarity of his derivation from God immediately without the intervention of a human father.

48. What different views with regard to the sonship of Christ have been entertained?

1st. Some Socinians hold that he is called Son of God only as an official title, as it is applied in the plural to ordinary kings and magistrates.

2d. Other Socinians hold that he was called Son of God only because he was brought into being by God's supernatural agency, and not by ordinary generation. To maintain this they appeal to Luke i., 35. For an explanation of this passage see below, question 70.

3d. Arians hold that he is so called because he was created by God more in his own likeness than any other creature, and first in the order of time.

4th. The orthodox doctrine is, that Christ is called Son of
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God to indicate his eternal and necessary personal relation in the Godhead to the first person, who, to indicate his reciprocal relation, is called the Father.

49. What is the distinction which some of the fathers made between the eternal, the ante-mundane, and the mundane generation of the Son?

1st. By his eternal generation they intended to mark his essential relation to the Father as his consubstantial and eternal Son.

2d. By his ante-mundane generation they meant to signify the commencement of the outgoings of his energy, and the manifestation of his person beyond the bosom of the Godhead, in the sphere of external creation, etc.—Col. i., 15.

3d. By his mundane generation they intended his supernatural birth in the flesh.—Luke i., 35.

50. What is the distinction which some of the fathers made between the λόγος ενδιαθετος (ratio insita, reason), and the λόγος προφορικός (ratio prolata, reason brought forth, or expressed)?

The orthodox fathers used the phrase logos endiathetos to designate the Word, whom they held to be a distinct person, dwelling from eternity with the Father. The ground of their use of this phrase was a fanciful analogy which they conceived existed between the relation which the eternal logos (word, or reason), (John i., 1,) sustains to the Father, and the relation which the reason of a man sustains to his own rational soul. Thus the logos endiathetos was God's own reflective idea hypostatized. They were led to this vain attempt to philosophize upon an incomprehensible subject by the influence exerted upon them by the Platonic philosophers of that age, who taught a sort of metaphysical trinity, e. g., that in the one God there were three constituent principles, ὁ ἄγαθος, goodness, νοῦς, intelligence, ψυχή, vitality. Their immediate object was to illustrate the essential unity of the Trinity, and to prove, against the Arians, the essential divinity of the Son, from the application to him by John of the epithet λόγος θεοῦ.

By the phrase logos prophoricos they intended to designate
him as the reason of God revealed, when he proceeded from the Father in the work of creation.—See Hill's Lectures.

The Arians, taking advantage of the essential inadequacy of this language, confused the controversy by acknowledging that the phrase logos prophoricos did truly apply to Christ, since he came forth from God as the first and highest creation and image of his mind. But declaring, with some color of truth, that the phrase logos endiathetos, when applied to Christ, taught pure Sabellianism, since it marked no personal distinction, but signified nothing else than the mind of the Father itself.

51. How is the doctrine of Christ's sonship stated in the Nicene and Athanasian creeds?

See those creeds in Appendix A.

52. What is the common statement and explanation of this doctrine given by orthodox writers?

The eternal generation of the Son is commonly defined to be an eternal personal act of the Father, wherein, by necessity of nature, not by choice of will, he generates the person (not the essence) of the Son, by communicating to him the whole indivisible substance of the Godhead, without division, alienation, or change, so that the Son is the express image of his Father's person, and eternally continues, not from the Father, but in the Father, and the Father in the Son.—See particularly Heb. i., 3; John x., 38; xiv., 11; xvii., 21. The principal Scriptural support of the doctrine of derivation is John v., 26.—Turrettin, Tom. I., L. 3, Q. 29.

Those theologians who insist upon this definition believe that the idea of derivation is necessarily implied in generation; that it is indicated by both the reciprocal terms Father and Son, and by the entire representation given in the Scriptures as to the relation and order of the persons of the Godhead, the Father always standing for the Godhead considered absolutely; and they hold that this theory is necessary to the vindication of the essential unity of the three persons. The older theologians, therefore, styled the Father θεότητος, fountain of Godhead, and αὐτοίς, principle or cause of the Son, while the Son and Holy Ghost were both called διάτατος (those depending upon another as their principle or cause).
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They at the same time guarded the essential equality of the Son and the Holy Ghost with the Father, by saying, 1st, that the whole divine essence, without division or change, and, therefore, all the divine attributes, were communicated to them; and, 2d, that this communication was made by an eternal and necessary act of the Father, and not of his mere will.

53. What is essential to the scriptural doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son?

In the above rendered account of the orthodox doctrine there is nothing inconsistent with revealed truth. The idea of derivation, as involved in the generation of the Son by the Father, appears rather to be a rational explanation of revealed facts than a revealed fact itself. On such a subject, therefore, it should be held in suspense. All that is explicitly revealed is, 1st, the term Son is applied to Christ as the second person of the Godhead. 2d. This term, and the equivalent one, “only begotten,” reveal some relation, within Godhead, of the person of the Son to the person of the Father. The designation Father being reciprocal to that of Son. 3d. That this relation is such that Father and Son are the same in substance, and are personally equal; that the Father is first and the Son second in the order of revelation and operation, that the Son is the express image of the Father’s person, not the Father of the Son’s, and that the Son is not from the Father, but in the Father, and the Father in the Son.

54. How may it be shown that the common doctrine is not self-contradictory?

There is evidently no inconsistency in the simple scriptural statement given in the answer to the last question. Heterodox controversialists, however, have claimed that there is a manifest inconsistency in the orthodox theory that the Father communicates to the Son the whole divine essence without alienating it from himself, dividing or otherwise changing it. This subject does not fall within the legitimate sphere of human logic, yet it is evident that this theory involves no contradiction and no mystery greater than that involved in the whole essence of God being at the same time present, without division or diffusion to every point of space.
55. If God is "*ens a se ipso,*" self-existent, how can the Son be really God, if he be "*θεος έκ θεου, *" God from the Father?

The objection presented in this question does not press against the scriptural statement of the eternal generation of the Son presented above (question 53,) but solely against the theory of derivation as involved in the ordinary definition (see question 52.) Those who insist upon the validity of that view rebut the objection by saying that self-existence is an attribute of essence, not of person. The Father, as a person, generates the person, not the essence of the Son, whose person is constituted of the very same self-existent essence with the Father's. Thus the Son is *dévροεως,* i. e., *Δευς a se ipso* as to his essence, but *θεος έκ θεου,* God from God, as to his person.

56. What argument for the eternal sonship of Christ may be derived from the designation of the persons of the Trinity as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?

In the apostolical benediction and the formula of baptism the one God is designated as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The term Son cannot here be applied to Christ as an official title, or as a miraculously generated man, because, 1st, he is so called as one of the three divine persons constituting the Godhead. 2d. The term Son is reciprocal to the term Father, and therefore designates the relation of the second person to the first. Whatever this relation may involve besides, it evidently must be eternal and necessary, and includes paternity on the part of the first person, and filiation on the part of the second.

57. What argument in support of this doctrine may be derived from the use of the word *Son* in Matt. xi. 27 and Luke x. 22?

In both of these passages the term Son is used to designate the divine nature of the second person of the Trinity in his relation to the first. The Son, as Son, knows and is known by the Father as Father. He is infinite in knowledge and therefore knows the Father. He is infinite in being and therefore can be known by none other than the Father.
58. **State the argument from John i., 1-14.**

Here the eternal Word, who was God, discovered himself as such to his disciples by the manifestation of his native divine glory, "the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." He was "only begotten Son," therefore as God, and not either as Mediator or as man.

59. **State the argument from the application in Scripture of the terms μονογενής, (only begotten) and ίδιος, (own) to the Sonship of Christ.**

Although many of God's creatures are called his sons, the phrase, Son of God in the singular, and when limited by the terms "own" and "only begotten," is applied only to Christ. Christ is called "only begotten Son of God."—John i., 14, 18; iii., 16, 18; 1 John iv., 9.

In John v., 18, Christ calls God his own Father, (see Greek.) He is called the own Son of the Father.—Rom. viii., 32.

The use of these qualifying terms proves that Christ is called Son of God in a sense different from that in which any other is so called. Therefore it designates him as God and not as man, nor as the bearer of an office.

60. **What is the argument derived from John v., 22, and context, and from John x., 33-37.**

In the first passage the terms Father and son are used to designate two divine and equal persons. As Son, Christ does whatsoever the Father doeth, and is to receive equal honor.

In the second passage, Jesus assumes the title, "Son of God," as equivalent to assenting that he was God. The Jews charging it upon him as blasphemy.

61. **What is the evidence furnished by such passages as speak of the manifestation, giving or sending of the Son?**

See 1 John iii., 8; Rom. viii., 3; John iii., 16, etc.

To say that the Son was sent or manifested implies that he was Son before he was sent or manifested as such.

62. **State the argument from Rom. i., 3, 4.**

The argument from this passage is two-fold: 1st. The Son of
The argument from Rom. viii., 3.

Here God's own Son was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh. Obviously he must have preëxisted as such before he assumed the likeness of sinful flesh, the assumption of which certainly could not have constituted him the own Son of God.

State the argument from Col. i., 15-21.

In this passage the apostle sets forth at length the nature and glory of him whom, in the thirteenth verse, he had called God's dear Son. Thus he proves that Christ as Son is the image of the invisible God, and that by him all things consist, etc.

State the argument from Heb. i., 5-8.

Paul is here setting forth the superiority of Christ as a divine person. As divine he calls him "the Son," "the first begotten." This Son is brought into the world, and therefore must have preëxisted as such. As Son he is declared to be God, and to reign upon an everlasting throne.

What passages are relied upon by the opponents of the orthodox doctrine for proof that the term Son, as applied to Christ, is an official title, and how can they be explained?

From such passages as Matt. xvi., 16, and John i., 49, it is argued that the epithets, Christ or Messiah, and King of Israel, are equivalent to Son of God, and that consequently he is called Son only because he occupies these offices. From John x., 35, 36, it is argued that Christ is called Son, because the Father hath sanctified him and sent him into the world.

We answer that not one of these passages, nor any other, expressly declares that Christ is called Son because he bears the office of mediator; they merely declare that he is Son of God, and holds that office. But even if it could be proved that he is called
on occasion "Son of God," on the ground of any subordinate relation, which, as man or as mediator, he sustains to God, that fact could not in the least invalidate the testimony of those passages which we have above cited to prove that he is also called Son of God in a higher sense, as the Word who from the beginning was in the bosom of the Father.

67. Prove that neither the 2d Psalm nor Rom. i., 4, teach that Christ was made Son of God.

Dr. Alexander says (see Com. on Psalms) with relation to Psalms ii., 7, that it means simply, "Thou art my Son, this day I am thy Father, now always eternally thy Father. Even if 'this day' be referred to the inception of the filial relation, it is thrown indefinitely back by the form of reminiscence, or narration in the first clause of the verse. 'Jehovah said to me,' but when? If understood to mean from everlasting the form of expression would be perfectly in keeping with the other figurative forms by which the Scriptures represent things really ineffable in human language." With regard to Rom. i., 4, Dr. Hodge says (see Com. on Romans) that the Greek word ὁρισθηκεῖσθαι, translated in the authorized version declared, is always elsewhere in the New Testament used to signify constitute, appoint. But the great majority of commentators, including some of the most ancient Greek fathers, agree in interpreting it in this passage in the sense of declare, manifest.

It is very evident that Christ called himself Son of God, and was so recognized by his disciples before his resurrection, and, therefore, he might have been revealed or manifested to be the Son of God, but could not have been constituted such by that event.

68. Show that Acts xiii., 32, 33 does not prove that Jesus was made Son of God.

It is argued from this passage that Jesus was constituted Son of God by his resurrection, as the first stage of his official exaltation. This can not be, 1st, because he was sent into the world as Son of God. 2d. Because the word ἀναστηθος, having raised up, refers to the raising up Christ at his birth, and not to his resurrection (there is nothing in the Greek corresponding to the
word *again* in the English.) When this word is used to designate the resurrection it is usually qualified by the phrase *from the dead*, as in verse 34th. Verse 32 declares the fulfillment of the promise referred to in verse 23d.—See Alexander's Com. on Acts.

69. **How can those passages which speak of the Son as inferior and subject to the Father be reconciled with this doctrine?**

It is objected that such passages prove that Jesus, as *Son*, is inferior and subject to the Father.

We answer that in John iii., 13 the "Son of Man" is said to have come down from heaven, and to be in heaven. But surely Jesus, as *Son of Man*, was not omnipresent. In Acts xx., 28 God is said to purchase his church with his own blood; but surely Christ, as *God*, did not shed his blood. The explanation of this is that it is the common usage of Scripture to designate the single person of the God-man by a title belonging to him as the possessor of one nature, while the condition, attribute, relation, or action predicated of him is true only of the other nature. Thus in the passages in question he is called "Son of God," because he is the eternal Word, while at the same time he is said to be inferior to the Father, because he is also man and mediator.

70. **What is the true explanation of Luke i., 35?**

That Jesus was revealed as the Son of God, and proved to be such by his miraculous conception. It is not probable that it is meant he was called Son because of that event, since his human nature was begotten by the Holy Ghost, and yet he is never called the Son of the Holy Ghost.

But even if it were affirmed that he was called Son of God for that reason, it would still remain true, as above shown, that he is revealed as from eternity the Son of God for an infinitely higher reason.

(II.) **The relation which the third person sustains to the first and second, or the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost.**

71. **What is the etymology of the word Spirit, and the usage of its Hebrew and Greek equivalents?**
ETERNAL PROCESSION OF THE SPIRIT.

The English word spirit is from the Latin spiritus, breath, wind, air, life, soul, which in turn is from the verb spiro, to breathe. The equivalent Hebrew word, נִקְנָה, has a perfectly analogous usage. 1st. Its primary sense is wind, air in motion, Gen. viii., 1; then, 2d, breath, the breath of life, Gen. vi., 17; Job xvii., 1; 3d, animal soul, vital principle in men and animals, 1 Sam. xxx., 12; 4th, rational soul of man, Gen. xli., 8, and hence, metaphorically, disposition, temperament, Num. v., 14; 5th, Spirit of Jehovah, Gen. i., 2; Ps. li., 11.—Gesenius' Lex.

The equivalent Greek word, πνεῦμα, has also the same usage. It is derived from, πνεύμα, to breathe, to blow. It signifies, 1st, breath, Rev. xi., 11; 2d, air in motion, John iii., 8; 3d, the vital principle, Matt. xxvii., 50; 4th, the rational soul spoken (1.) of, the disembodied spirits of men, Heb. xii., 23; (2.) of devils, Matt., x., 1; (3.) of angels, Heb. i., 14; (4.) the Spirit of God, spoken of God, a, absolutely as an attribute of his essence, John iv., 24; and b as the personal designation of the third person of the trinity, who is called Spirit of God, or of the Lord, and the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit of Christ, or of Jesus, or of the Son of God, Acts xvi., 6, 7; Rom. viii., 9; 2 Cor. iii., 17; Gal. iv., 6; Phil. i., 19; 1 Pet. i., 11.

72. Why is the third person of the Trinity called the Spirit?

As the one indivisible divine essence which is common to each of the divine persons alike is spiritual, this term, as the personal designation of the third person, can not be intended to signify the fact that he is a Spirit as to his essence, but rather to mark what is peculiar to his person, i.e., his personal relation to the Father and the Son, and the peculiar mode of his operation ad extra. As the reciprocal epithets Father and Son are used to indicate, so far forth, the mutual relations of the first and second persons, so the epithets, Spirit, Spirit of God, Spirit of the Son, Spirit which proceedeth from the Father, are applied to the third person to indicate, so far forth, the relation of the third person to the first and second.

73. Why is he called Holy Spirit?

As holiness is an attribute of the divine essence, and the glory equally of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it can not be applied in
any preëminent sense as a personal characteristic to the third
person. It indicates, therefore, the peculiar nature of his opera-
tion. He is called the Holy Spirit because he is the author of
holiness throughout the universe. As the Son is also styled
Logos, or God, the Revealer, so the Holy Spirit is God, the
Operator, the end and glory of whose work in the moral world is
holiness, as in the physical world beauty.

74. Why is he called the Spirit of God?

This phrase expresses his divinity, his relation to the Godhead
as himself God, 1 Cor. ii., 11; his intimate personal relation to
the Father as his consubstantial spirit proceeding from him, John
xv., 26; and the fact that he is the divine Spirit, which pro-
ceeding from God operates upon the creature, Ps. civ., 30; 1 Pet.
iv., 14.

75. Why is the third person called the Spirit of Christ?

See Gal. iv., 6; Rom. viii., 9; Phil. i., 19; 1 Peter i., 11. As
the form of expression is identical in the several phrases, Spirit
of God, and Spirit of the Son, and as the Scriptures, with one
exception, John xv., 26, uniformly predicate every thing of the
relation of the Spirit to the Son, that they predicate of the rela-
tion of the Spirit to the Father, it appears evident that he is
called Spirit of the Son for the same reason that he is called
Spirit of God.

This phrase also additionally sets forth the official relation
which the Spirit in his agency in the work of redemption sustains
to the Godman, in taking of his, and showing them to us, John
xvi., 14.

76. What is meant by the theological phrase, Procession of
the Holy Ghost?

Theologians intend by this phrase to designate the relation
which the third person sustains to the first and second, wherein
by an eternal and necessary, i. e., not voluntary, act of the Father
and the Son, their whole identical divine essence, without alien-
ation, division, or change, is communicated to the Holy Ghost.

77. What distinction do theologians make between "proc-
sion" and "generation?"
ETERNAL PROCESSION OF THE SPIRIT.

As this entire subject infinitely transcends the measure of our faculties, we can do nothing further than classify and contrast those predicates which inspiration has applied to the relation of Father and Son with those which it has applied to the relation of the Spirit to the Father and Son.

Thus Turrettin, Vol. I., L. 3, Q. 31. They differ, "1st. As to source, the Son emanates from the Father only, but the Spirit from the Father and the Son at the same time. 2d. As to mode. The Son emanates in the way of generation, which affects not only personality, but similitude, on account of which the Son is called the image of the Father, and in consequence of which he receives the property of communicating the same essence to another person; but the Spirit, by the way of spiration, which affects only personality, and in consequence of which the person who proceeds does not receive the property of communicating the same essence to another person. 3d. As to order. The Son is second person, and the Spirit third, and though both are eternal, without beginning or succession, yet, in our mode of conception, generation precedes procession."

"The schoolmen vainly attempted to found a distinction between generation and spiration upon the different operations of the divine intellect and the divine will. They say the Son was generated per modum intellectus, whence he is called the Word of God. The Spirit proceeds per modum voluntatis, whence he is called Love."

78. What is the Scripture ground for this doctrine?

What we remarked above (question 53,) concerning the common theological definition of the eternal generation of the Son, holds true also with reference to the common definition of the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost, viz., that in order to make the method of the divine unity in trinity more apparent, theologians have pressed the idea of derivation and subordination in the order of personal subsistence too far. This ground is at once sacred and mysterious. The points given by Scripture are not to be pressed nor speculated upon, but received and confessed nakedly.

The data of inspiration are simply as follows: 1st. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three divine persons, possess from eternity the one whole identical, indivisible, unchangeable essence. 2d.
The Father from his characteristic personal name, and the order in which his name uniformly occurs in Scripture, and from the fact that the Son is called his and his only begotten, and that the Spirit is called his, the one proceeding from him, and from the order of his manifestation and operation ad extra, is evidently in some way first in order of personal subsistence relatively to the Son and Spirit. 3d. For the same reason (see below, question 80) the Son, in the order of personal subsistence, is before the Spirit. 4th. What the real nature of these distinctions in the order of personal substance may be is made known to us only so far, (1.) that it involves no distinction as to time, since all are alike eternal. (2.) It does not depend upon any voluntary action, for that would make the second person dependent upon the first, and the third upon the first and second, while they are all “equal in power and glory.” (3.) It is such a relation that the second person is eternally only begotten Son of the first, and the third is eternally the Spirit of the first and second.

79. What was the difference between the Greek and Latin churches on this doctrine?

The famous Council of Nice, A. D. 325, while so accurately defining the doctrine of the Godhead of the Son, left the testimony concerning the Holy Ghost in the vague form in which it stood in the ancient creed, “in the Holy Ghost.” But the heresy of Macedonius, who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost, having sprung up in the mean time, the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, completed the testimony of the Nicene Creed thus, “I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Author of Life, who proceedeth from the Father.”

There subsequently arose a controversy upon the question, whether the Scriptures do or do not represent the Holy Spirit as sustaining precisely the same relation to the Son that he does to the Father. This the Latins generally affirmed, and at the third ecclesiastical assembly at Toledo, A. D. 589, they added the word filioque (and the Son) to the Latin version of the Constantinopolitan Creed, making the clause read “Credimus in Spiritum Sanctum qui à Patre Filioque procedit.” The Greek church violently opposed this, and to this day reject it. For a short time they were satisfied with the compromise, “The Spirit proceeding from
the Father through the Son," which was finally rejected by both parties. The Constantinopolitan Creed, as amended at the Council of Toledo, is the one now adopted by the Catholic Church, and recognized by all Protestants, currently bearing the title of "Nicene Creed."

80. How may it be proved that, as far as revealed, the Spirit sustains precisely the same relation to the Son which he does to the Father?

The epithet "Spirit" is the characteristic personal designation of the third person. Whatever is revealed of his eternal and necessary personal relation to either the Father or the Son is indicated by this word. Yet he is called the Spirit of the Son, as well as the Spirit of the Father. He possesses the same identical essence of the Son as of the Father. The Son sends and operates through the Spirit as the Father does. Wherever their Spirit is there both Father and Son are revealed, and there they exercise their power.—John xiv., 16, 26; xv., 26; xvi., 7. With the single exception of the phrase, "which proceedeth from the Father," (John xv., 26,) the Scriptures apply precisely the same predicates to the relation of the Spirit to the Son that they do to his relation to the Father.

81. What office does the Spirit discharge in the economy of redemption?

In the economy of redemption, as universally in all the actings of the Godhead upon the creature, God the Son is the revealed God, God as known, and God the Spirit is that divine person who exerts his energy immediately upon and in the creature. For a more detailed answer see Chapter XXI., on "The Mediatorial Office of Christ," question 9.

(III.) The personal properties peculiar to each of the three persons of the Godhead, and their order of operation ad extra.

82. What is the theological meaning of the word property as applied to the doctrine of the Trinity?

The attributes of God are the perfections of the divine essence,
and therefore common to each of the three persons, who are "the same in substance," and therefore "equal in power and glory." These have been discussed under Chapter VII. The properties of each divine person, on the other hand, are those peculiar modes of personal subsistence whereby each divine person is constituted as such, and that peculiar order of operation whereby each person is distinguished from the others.

As far as these are revealed to us the personal properties of the Father are as follows: He is begotten by none, and proceeds from none; he is the Father of the Son, having begotten him from eternity; the Spirit proceeds from him and is his Spirit. Thus he is the first in order and in operation, sending and operating through the Son and Spirit.

The personal properties of the Son are as follows: He is the Son, from eternity the only begotten of the Father. The Spirit is the Spirit of the Son even as he is the Spirit of the Father; he is sent by the Father, whom he reveals; he, even as the Father, sends and operates through the Spirit.

The personal properties of the Spirit are as follows: He is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, from eternity proceeding from them; he is sent by the Father and the Son, they operating through him; he operates immediately upon the creature.

83. What kind of subordination did the early writers attribute to the second and third person in relation to the first?

They held, as above shown, that the eternal generation of the Son by the Father, and the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son involved in both instances the derivation of essence. They illustrated their idea of this eternal and necessary act of communication by the example of a luminous body, which necessarily radiates light the whole period of its existence. Thus the Son is defined in the words of the Nicene Creed, "God of God, Light of Light." Thus as the radiance of the sun is coeval with its existence, and of the same essence as its source, by this illustration they designed to signify their belief in the identity and consequent equality of the divine persons as to essence, and the relative subordination of the second to the first, and of the third to the first and second as to personal subsistence and consequent order of operation.
84. What is expressed by the use of the terms first, second, and third in reference to the persons of the Trinity.

These terms are severally applied to the persons of the Trinity because, 1st. The Scriptures uniformly state their names in this order. 2d. The personal designations, Father and Son, and Spirit of the Father and of the Son, indicate this order of personal subsistence. 3d. Their respective modes of operation ad extra is always in this order. The Father sends and operates through the Son, and the Father and Son send and operate through the Spirit. The Scriptures never either directly or indirectly indicate the reverse order.

As to the outward bearing of the Godhead upon the creature it would appear, that the Father is revealed only as he is seen in the Son, who is the eternal Logos, or divine Word, the express image of the Father's person. "No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."—John i., 18. And the Father and Son act immediately upon the creature only through the Spirit.

"The Father is all the fulness of the Godhead invisible, without form, whom no man hath seen or can see."

"The Son is all the fulness of the Godhead manifested."

"The Spirit is all the fulness of the Godhead acting immediately upon the creature, and thus making manifest the Father in the image of the Son, and through the power of the Spirit."—"Higher Christian Life," by Rev. W. E. Boardman, p. 105.

85. How can the assumption of personal distinctions in the Godhead be reconciled with the divine unity?

Although this tripersonal constitution of the Godhead is altogether beyond the capacity of reason, and is ascertained to us only through a supernatural revelation, there is evidently no contradiction in the two-fold proposition, that God is one, and yet Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are that one God. They are one in one sense, and three-fold in an entirely different sense. The eternal, self-existent, divine essence, constituting all those divine perfections called attributes of God is, in the same sense and degree, common to all the persons. In this sense they are one. But this divine essence exists eternally as Father, and as Son,
and as Holy Ghost, distinguished by personal properties. In this sense they are three. We believe this, not because we understand it, but because thus God has revealed himself.

86. *How can the separate incarnation of the Son be reconciled with the divine unity?*

The Son is identical with the Father and Spirit as to essence, but distinct from them as to personal subsistence. In the incarnation, the divine essence of the Son was not made man, but as a divine person he entered into a personal relation with the human nature of the man Christ Jesus. This did not constitute a new person, but merely introduced a new element into his eternal person. It was the personal union of the Son with a human soul and body, and not any change either in the divine essence, or in the personal relation of the Son to the Father or the Spirit.

87. *What is Arianism?*

This system was first advocated by Arius, who lived during the first half of the fourth century. He maintained that the God-head consists of one eternal person, who in the beginning, before all worlds, created in his own image a super-angelic being, his only begotten Son, the beginning of the creation of God, by whom also he made the worlds. The first and greatest creature thus created, through the Son of God, was the Holy Ghost. In the fullness of time this Son became incarnate in the person of Jesus of Nazareth.

88. *What was the doctrine of the Semi-Arians?*

This party was so called as occupying middle ground between the Arians and the Orthodox. They held that the absolute, self-existent God was one person, but that the Son was a divine person of a glorious essence, like to (ὁμοούσιον) but not identical with (ὁμούσιον) that of the Father, and from eternity begotten by the Father by a free exercise of will and power, and therefore subordinate to and dependant upon him. This party was largely represented at the Council of Nice.

It appears that some of the Semi-Arians agreed with the Arians in regarding the Holy Spirit as the first and most glorious creature of the Son, but that the majority regarded the words
"Holy Spirit," as significant of a divine energy, or as a synonyme of the word God.—See Neander's Ch. Hist., Torrey's translation, Vol. II., pp. 419, 420.

89. **What is Sabellianism?**

This term represents the opinion that God is one single person as well as one single essence. The term Father is the name appropriated to this one person, when considered in his incomprehensible greatness, and in his absolute sovereignty. The term Son is the name appropriated to the same person when conceived of as revealing himself, and as becoming incarnate and dwelling among men. The term Holy Ghost is the name applied to him when conceived of as operating immediately upon the creature in his works of creation, providence or grace. The more significant and generic title of the sects holding this opinion is Monarchians, or those maintaining the absolute unity of the Godhead, personal as well as essential. They were also called Patripassians, because they believed that the one divine person, called Father, as well as Son or Holy Ghost was united to the man Christ Jesus, who suffered on the cross. This system was taught, with special modifications, by several heretical leaders of the early church, first by Praxeas, a confessor at Rome, at the end of the second century. It has, however, currently born the name of Sabellius, an African bishop who lived during the middle of the third century. The Swedenborgians of the present day are Sabellians.

90. **What is Tritheism?**

This opinion, the extreme opposite of Sabellianism, is said to have been first advocated by John Ascusnage, a Syrian philosopher, who flourished during the sixth century. He taught that the Godhead is constituted of three beings, distinct in essence as well as in person. Hence there are three Gods, united not in being, but only in the most intimate fellowship of counsel and will.

91. **What is Socinianism?**

This system regards God the Father as the only God, one in person as well as essence, and Jesus Christ as a mere man, though an inspired prophet, and called Son of God only on account of his miraculous conception in the womb of the Virgin; and the:
term Holy Spirit only as another name for the one God, the Fa-
ther. The more common and significant title of this system is
Unitarianism. It takes its designation of Socinianism from its
most successful promulgators Leœlius and Faustus Socinus, uncle
and nephew, who flourished during the latter half of the sixteenth
century. Italians by birth, the uncle died in the bosom of the
Reformed Church of Zurich, A. D., 1562, but the nephew, ulti-
mately joining the Unitarians of Poland, gave the final form to
their religious system, and from his writings the Racovian Cate-
chism was principally compiled, which remains to this day the
most authoritative exposition of the Unitarian faith.—See Mos-

92. By what considerations may it be shown that the doctrine
of the Trinity is a fundamental element of the Gospel?

It is not claimed that the refinements of theological specula-
tions upon this subject are essential points of faith, but simply
that it is essential to salvation to believe in the three persons in
one Godhead, as they are revealed to us in the Scriptures. 1st.
The only true God is that God who has revealed himself to us in
the Scriptures, and the very end of the gospel is to bring us to
the knowledge of that God precisely in the aspect in which he has
revealed himself. Every other conception of God presents a false
god to the mind and conscience. There can be no mutual toler-
ation without treason. Socinians, Arians, and Trinitarians wor-
ship different Gods.

2d. The Scriptures explicitly assert that the knowledge of
this true God and of Jesus Christ whom he hath sent is eternal
life, and that it is necessary to honor the Son even as we honor
the Father.—John v., 23 ; xiv., 1 ; xvii., 3 ; 1 John ii., 23 ; v., 20.

3d. In the initiatory rite of the Christian church we are baptized
into the name of every several person of the trinity, Matt. xxviii., 19.

4th. The whole plan of redemption in all its parts is founded
upon it. Justification, sanctification, adoption, and all else that
makes the gospel the wisdom and power of God unto salvation,
can be understood only in the light of this fundamental truth.

5th. As an historical fact it is beyond dispute that in whatever
church the doctrine of the trinity has been abandoned or obscured,
every other characteristic doctrine of the gospel has gone with it,