

"neither confusing the characters nor dividing the essence." (And if good Latin were to be rendered into good Greek, the sentence would stand thus—"oude sugcheontes ta prosopa, oude chorizontes ten hypostasin." For Aristotle, a conclusive authority in Greek, uses hypostasis for ousia, and Hederic's Lexicon gives *hypostasis* for "substantia.") God's characters (*prosopa*) are nevertheless, in relation to us, true hypostasis, subsistences, substractions, supports—not merely manifestations. But in relation to Himself—in His own view of His own essence—"I am that I am" cannot be changed into "We are that we are."

"For us men and for our salvation"—the Father as God for us ("If God be for us, who can be against us?" Romans viii. 31 and 32)—the Son as God with us, "Immanuel"—and the Holy Ghost as God in us ("the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us" 2. Timothy i. 14)—are three *foundations* of faith, hope, and love.

(In 1. Corinthians, xiii. 13, "ta tria tauta"—the three are these: in Psalm xi. 3, "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?")

But "*the mystery of God*" remains a mystery still. And still we must maintain that "the Father of whom are all things," is God alone—"the blessed and only Potentate," "whom no man hath seen or can see." (Psalm lxxxvi. 10, "Thou art God alone.")

It does seem impossible to be submissive to Scripture without acknowledging each of three revealed Potencies, "by himself to be God and Lord" while we still hold them to be inscrutably identical as one Jehovah.

For myself therefore I accept the clause "non confundentes personas," of the Athanasian Creed, in the Latin: I reject it in the English. For if it were true that we are forbidden to confound the persons," our Lord Himself was a flagrant heretic in his conversation with Philip (John xiv. 3); and the Holy Ghost, in the written word, has lapsed into the same negligence of heresy, again and again.

For, further, we find difficulties, in explication of this doctrine, that are not merely verbal.

The supposed proof-text from 1 John v. 7 and 8, is spurious. In Matthew xxviii. 19, we are ordered to be baptized "into the name of

the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost"—not into the names.

Surely if God required us to keep three subsistences apart, in our minds, He would have spoken more clearly. And when heaven is opened to us in the book of Revelation—God's last word to His church—we hear "of God and of the Lamb;" but we hear nothing of three subsistences composing the Godhead.

We do see the distinction between God and the Lamb; and yet the very throne is called "the throne of God and of the Lamb." We see no other "persons" even when "the temple of God was opened in heaven." We see one great Personage in the nineteenth chapter: "and His name is called the Word of God;" and of Him it is said that "He treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of the Almighty God;" and this same Personage is likewise called "King of Kings and Lord of Lords." This Personage "clothed with a vesture dipped in blood" we recognize as our Immanuel. But together with Him no other "persons" are presented.

Revelation xi. 16 and 17 ("We give Thee thanks O Lord God Almighty, which art and wast and art to come") is a passage alone sufficient to justify us in adhering jealously to the first article of the *earliest* Creed—"I believe in God the Father Almighty; and in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord, who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary"—and any other conflicting view (whether of "subsistences" or of "persons") is discountenanced by our Lord's own message to His disciples: "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." In the face of this message, another clause of the Athanasian Creed is too bold when it asserts that "in this Trinity none is afore or after other, none is greater or less than another." The analogy chosen by God Himself suggests an opposite idea—suggests the pre-eminence of "*the Father*," and the Saviour said expressly, "The Father is greater than I"—in John xiv. 28—after having implied the same thought in John x. 29.

When Joseph Cook states, of the "persons" of the Trinity, that "neither is God without the others,"—he slights inadvertently "the numerous testimonies" (according to Bishop Pearson, on the Creed) "of the ancient doctors of the church who have not stuck to call the Father the origin, the cause, the author, the