XII ARGUMENTS drawn out of the Scripture:

Wherein the commonly received Opinion touching the Deity of the Holy Spirit, is clearly and fully refuted.

ARGUMENT I.

HE that is distinguished from God, is not God. The Holy Spirit is distinguished from God. Ergo.

The Major is evident: for if he should be both God, and distinguished from God, he would be distinguished from himself; which implies a Contradiction. The Minor is confirmed by the whole current of the Scripture, which calleth him the Spirit of God, and faith that he is sent by God, and searcheth the depths of God, &c. Neither let any Man here think to fly to that ignorant Refuge of making a distinction between the Essence and Person of God, saying that the Holy Spirit is distinguished from God, taken Personally, not Essentially: for this wretched distinction (to omit the mention of the Primitive Fathers) is not only unheard of in Scripture, and so to be rejected, it being Presumption to affirm any thing of the unsearchable Nature of God, which hath not first affirmed of himself in the Scripture; but is also disclaimed by Reason. For, first, it is impossible for any Man, if he would but endeavour to conceive the thing, and not deduce both himself and others, with empty Terms, and Words without understanding, to distinguish the Person from the Essence of God, and not to frame two Being or Things in his Mind, and consequently two Gods. Secondly, If the Person be distinct from the Essence of God, then it must needs be something; since nothing hath no Accident, and therefore neither can it happen to it to be distinguished. If something, then either some finite or infinite thing; if finite, then there will be something finite in God, and consequently, since by the Confession of the Adversaries every thing in God is God himself, God will be Finite; which the Adversaries themselves will likewise confess to be absurd. If Infinite, then there will be two infinites in God, to wit, the Person and Essence of God, and consequently two Gods; which is more absurd than the former. Thirdly, To talk of God taken impersonally, is ridiculous, not only because there is no Example thereof in Scripture, but because God is the Name of a * Person, and signifies him that hath sublime Dominion or Power; and when it is put for the most High God, it denotes him who with Soveraign and Absolute Authority ruleth over all; but none but a Person can rule over others, all Actions being proper to Persons; wherefore to take God otherwise than per-

* By Person, Understand, as Philosophers do, Supposed Intelligens, that is an Intellectual Substance complete, and not a Mode or Substance, which are fantastical and fanciful Terms, brought into common use.
fonsally, is to take him otherwise than he is, and indeed to mistake him.

ARGUMENT II.

If he that gave the Holy Spirit to the Israelites to instruct them, be Jehovah alone, then the Holy Spirit is not Jehovah or God. But he that gave the Holy Spirit to the Israelites to instruct them, is Jehovah alone. 

Ergo.

The Sequel of the Major is plain; for if he that gave the Holy Spirit be Jehovah alone, and yet the Holy Spirit that was given be Jehovah too, the same will be Jehovah alone, and not Jehovah alone, which implies a Contradiction. The Minor is evident by Numb. 9, 6, 20.

ARGUMENT III.

He that speaketh not of himself, is not God. The Holy Spirit speaketh not of himself. Ergo.

The Minor is clear from Job. 16, 13. The Major is proved thus: God speaketh of himself; therefore if there be any one that speaketh not of himself, he is not God. The Antecedent is of it self apparent; for God is the primary Author of whatsoever he doth; but should he not speak of himself, he must speak from another, and so not be the primary, but secondary Author of his Speech; which is absurd, if at least that may be called absurd, which is impossible. The Consequence is undeniable. For further Confirmation of this Argument, it is to be observed, that to speak or to do any thing not of himself, according to the ordinary Phrase of the Scripture, is to speak or do by the leading, teaching, commanding, authorizing, or enabling of another, and consequently incompatible with the supreme and self-sufficient Majesty of God. Vid. Job. 5.

ARGUMENT IV.

He that heareth from another what he shall speak, is not God. The Holy Spirit doth so. Ergo.

The Minor is plain from the fore-cited place, John 16, 13. The Major is proved thus: He that is taught, is not God. He that heareth from another, what he shall speak, is taught. Ergo.

The Major is clear by Rom. 11, 34, 1 Cor. 2, 16. For these places of the Apostle, compared with that of the Prophet, shew that Jehovah did not by the Spirit of the Lord there understand the Holy Spirit, but the Mind, or Intention of God. The Minor is evidenced by John 8, where our Saviour having said in the 26th Verse, Whosoever I have heard from him (the Father) these things I speak; in the 28th Verse he expresseth the same sense thus: According as the Father hath taught me, these things I speak. Neither let any Man go about to elude to pregnant an Argument, by saying, that this is spoken of the Holy Spirit improperly: For let him turn himself every way, and screw the words as he pleases, yet shall he never be able to make it out to a wise and considering Man, how it can possibly be said, that any one heareth from another what he will speak, who is the prime Author of his Speech, and into whom it is not at a certain time infinuated by another. For this Expression plainly intimateth, that whatsoever the Holy Spirit speaketh to the Disciples, is first discovered and committed to him by Christ, whose Embassador he is, is being proper to an Embassador to be the Interpreter not of his own, but of another's Will. But it is contradictory to imagine that the most High God can have any thing discovered and committed to him by another.
ARGUMENT V.

HE that receiveth of another's, is not God. The Holy Spirit doth so. Ergo.

The Minor is witnessed by the aforesaid place, John 16. 14. The Major is proved thus: God is he that giveth all things to all; wherefore if there be any one that receiveth of another's, he cannot be God. The Antecedent is plain by Acts 17. 25. Rom. 11. 35. 36. The Consequence is undeniable: for if God should give all things to all, and yet receive of another's, he would both give all things, and not give all things; have all things of his own, and have something of another; both which imply a Contradiction. The Major of the Prophylaxis is otherwise urged, thus: He that is dependent, is not God. He that receiveth of another's is dependent. Ergo. The Major is unquestionable: for, to say one is dependent, and yet God, is in effect to say he is God, and not God, which implies a Contradiction. The Major also is evident; for to receive of another's, is the Notion of Dependency.

ARGUMENT VI.

HE that is sent by another, is not God. The Holy Spirit is sent by another. Ergo.

The Minor is plain from the fore-quoted place, Joh. 16. 7. The Major is evinced thus: He that ministreth, is not God. He that is sent, ministreth: Ergo.

The Major is indubitable, it being dissonant to the supream Majesty of God to minister, and serve another; for that were to be God and not God; to exercise Sovereign Dominion over all, and not to exercise it. The Minor is confirmed by Heb. 1. ult., where the Divine Author sheweth, that the Angels are all ministreth Spirits, in that they are sent forth; as he before intimateth Christ to be Lord, because he sisteth at the Right-hand of God, in saying that he sisteth in Heaven. The Minor is further proved thus:

He that receiveth a Command for the performance of something, doth minister: He that is sent forth, receiveth a Command for the performance of something: Ergo.

The Major is evident to common Sense, since it isteth with none but Ministers and Inferiours to receive Commands. The Minor is manifested by John 12. 49. The Father that hath sent me, he gave me a Command what I shall speak. Neither let any Man here reply, that this very thing is spoken also of Christ, unless he has first proved that Christ is suprem God, he will grant that whatsoever is spoken of him, is spoken of him as God; or can make, good that to be sent at least may agree to him as God. The contrary whereof I suppose I have clearly proved in this Argument, shewing that it is unuitable to the Divine Majestie.

ARGUMENT VII.

HE that is the Gift of God, is not God. The Holy Spirit is the Gift of God. Ergo.

The Minor is plain by Acts 12. 17. Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift (meaning the Spirit) as he did unto us, who have believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, was I one that could withstand God? The Major, though of it fall sufficiently clear, is yet further evidenced thus:

He that is not the Giver of all things, is not God.

He that is the Gift of God, is not the Giver of all things: Ergo.

The Major is apparent from Acts 17. 25. God giveth to all Life, Breath, and all things. The Minor is proved thus:

He that is himself given, is not the Giver of all things:

He that is the Gift of God, is himself given: Ergo.

And undeniable, for otherwise the same would be the Giver of all things,
and yet not the Giver of all things, inasmuch as he himself, a principal thing, is given, which implieth a Contradiction. The Minor needeth no Proof. Moreover, a Gift is in the Power, and at the disposal of the Giver; but it is gross and absurd to imagin that God can be in the Power, or at the disposal of another. Neither let any Man here think to evade, by saying, that not the Holy Spirit himself, but only his Gifts are imparted to Men; since both the more learned Adversaries themselves confess, that the Person of the Holy Spirit is given together with his Gifts, and the Scripture putteth the matter out of doubt, if you consult Heb. 9. 20. and Rom. 5. 5. In both which places, the Holy Spirit is said to be given contrariadly from his Gifts and Operations: in the first, contrariadly from the Instruction flowing from him; in the other, contrariadly from the Love of God diffused in our Hearts by him.

Whence we may draw this Corollary, That if the Person of the Holy Spirit be out of Favour given to certain Men, as the aforesaid places testify, then he was not personally present with them before, and consequently, by the Concession of the Adversaries themselves, cannot be God, since they will not deny that God is always personally present with all alike. But I foresail the following Argument.

**Argument VIII.**

He that changeth place, is not God. The Holy Spirit changeth place.  

*Abi, Ariane, ad Jordanem, Or Trinitate videb. deit.*

**Argument IX.**

He that prayeth unto Christ, to come to Judgment, is not God. The Holy Spirit doth so.  

*Ergo.*

The Major is granted. The Minor is evident from Rev. 22. 17. compared with the 12th Verse. Neither let any Man think to elude this Proof, by saying, that the Spirit is here said to pray, only because he maketh the Bride to pray: for when the Scripture would signify the Allsistance of the Holy Spirit in causing Men to speak, it is wont to affirm, either that the Holy Spirit speaketh in them, as Matt. 10. 20. or that they spake by the Holy Spirit, as Rom. 8. 15. We have received the Spirit of Adoption, by whom we cry, Abba, Father. But here it is expressly said, that the Spirit and the Bride say, Come; not the Spirit in the Bride, nor the Bride by the Spirit.

**Argument X.**

He in whom Men have not believed, and yet have been Disciples and Believers, is not God. Men have not believed in the Holy Spirit, and yet have been so.  

*Ergo.*

The Major is plain: for how can they be Disciples and Believers, according to the
him that is God? The Minor is proved thus: Men have not so much as heard whether there were an Holy Spirit, and yet have been Disciples and Believers: Ergo. They have not believed in the Holy Spirit; and yet have been Disciples and Believers.

The Antecedent is apparent from Acts 19. 2. The Consequent is grounded on that of the Apostle, Rom. 10. 14. [How shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard?] Now if any Man, to decline the dint of this Argument, shall say, that by Holy Spirit in these words ["\'Αλαλέε ὁ Θεός ἐστιν ἡ τύχη τῶν ἁπαθῶν ἔχων ἑαυτὸν ἐπιστάμενον"] is meant not the Person, but the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. He, besides that he perverteth the plain and genuine meaning of the words, and speaketh without Example*; doth also evacuate the Emphasis of the Particles ἀλλ' ἁπάντως, which imply that these Disciples were so far from having received the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, whereof we may without Prejudice to our Cause, grant that the Question made mention, that they had not so much as heard whether there were an holy Spirit or not. Again, that the holy Spirit is not God, doth further appear by this very Infiniteness, since the Apostle, when there was so ample an occasion offered to declare it (if it had been so) doth quite decline it: for it is incredible that he, who was so intent and vigilant in propagating the Truth, as that casually seeing an Altar at Athens inscribed, To the unknown God, he presently took a hint from thence, to preach unto the Heathen the true God; yet here being told by Disciples that they had not so much as heard whether there were an holy Spirit, or not, should not make use of the opportunity to discover unto them, and in them to us, the Deity of the holy Spirit, but suffer them to remain in ignorance touching a Point of such Consequence, that without the knowledge thereof (if we believe many now a-days) Men cannot be saved. Certainly, the Apostle had a greater care both

of the Truth of God, and the Salvation of Men, than to do so.

**Argument XI.**

He that hath an Understanding distinct from that of God, is not God. The Holy Spirit hath an Understanding distinct from that of God. Ergo.

The Major is clear: for he that hath an Understanding distinct from that of another, must needs likewise have a distinct Essence, wherein that Understanding may reside. The Major is proved thus: He that heareth from God at the second hand, namely, by Christ Jesus, what he shall speak, hath an Understanding distinct from that of God. The Holy Spirit heareth from God: Ergo.

The Minor is evident from Job. 16. 13, 14, 15. The Major is confirmed thus: He that is taught of God, hath an Understanding distinct from that of God. He that heareth from God what he shall speak, is taught of God: Ergo.

The Minor is manifest from Job. 8, where our Saviour Christ having said in Verse 26. Whatever I have heard from him (the Father) these things I speak. In Verse 28, he expresseth the same Sentence thus: [According as the Father hath taught me, these things I speak.] The Major is of it itself clear: for he that is taught, hath an unknowing Understanding, since none can be taught what he knoweth already; and he that teacheth, hath a knowing Understanding, otherwise he could not teach another something; but it implies a Contradiction, that the same Understanding should at the same time be both knowing and unknowing of the same thing. Besides, that the Holy Spirit hath an Understanding distinct from that of God, is easily deducible from the words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 2. 10, where he affirmeth, that the Spirit searcheth the depths of God (as Rom. 8. 27, he intimateth, that God searcheth the Heart of the Spirit.) but to search the depths of any one, necessarily
rily supposeth one understanding in him that 
searcheth, and another understanding in him 
whose Depuls are searched, as is evident, not 
only by collation of other places of the 
Scripture, as 1 Pet. 1. 11. Rev. 2. 23. but 
even by common sense, dictating to every 
Man so much, that none can, without ab-
sumcity, be said to search the depths of his 
own understanding. Whence the Apostle 
going about to illustrate what he had spoken 
of the Spirit of God, by a similitude drawn 
from the Spirit of a Man, doth not say, that 
the Spirit of a Man doth search, but know 
the things of a Man, though his former words 
did seem to lead him thereunto.

ARGUMENT XII.

H e that hath a Will distinct in 
number from that of God, is 
not God. The Holy Spirit hath a 
Will distinct in number from that of 
God. Ergo.

The Major is irrefragable. The Minor is 
ascribed thus.

He that willeth conformably to the Will of 
God, hath a Will distinct in number from that 
of God.

The Holy Spirit so willeth: Ergo.

The Major is plain; for conformity must 
be between twain at least, else it will not be 
Conformity, but Identity. The Minor is 
confirmed by Rom. 8. 26, 27. Likewise the 
Spirit also helpeth our Infirmities; for we know 
not what to pray for as we ought, but the Spi-
rit itself maketh intercession for us, with groans 
untellable: But he that searcheth the Hearts, 
knoweth the Mind of the Spirit; for he maketh 
intercession for the Saints, according to the Will 
of God. Neither let any Man here reply, that 
there is no mention made in the Greek, either 
of the Will of the Spirit, or of the Will of 
God: For, first, the word intercede, which 
signifieth to make suit for something, im-
pleth both the Will of him that maketh the 
Suit, for if he did not will the thing, he would 
not make suit for it; and also the Will of 
him to whom the Suit is made; for were he 
not endued with a Will, it would be bootless 
to make suit unto him, all Suits whatsoever 
being made to bend the Will of him to whom 
they are made: So that this, without any 
more, sufficiently sheweth that the Holy Spi-
rit hath a Will distinct in number from that 
of God; since the one iseth, the other is 
said at the same time, and for the same thing. 
Secondly, the word ἐγκαυμάζω, in English 
rendered Mind, doth here signify the same 
with Will or Desire, as appareth from the 
6th and 7th Verses of this Chapter; and also 
from the Verb ἐγκαυμάζω, whence it is derived, 
which signifieth to Afflict, Will, Desire, Press; 
see Verse 9. of the same Chapter, and Col. 
3. 2. Thirdly, Though the Greek hath ἐπι 
θέόν, according to God; yet is this, in the 
judgment of the English Translators them-
selves, the same as if it had been said, ἐπὶ ἡ 
θέων, according to the Will of God; 
neither can any other commodious Interpre-
tation be put upon the words.

But this Passage of the Apostle, doth fur-
ther afford us a second and third impregnable 
Argument of the Holy Spirit's being inferior 
to God. For, first, he is here said to 
make intercession for us, (as we before urged 
his praying to Christ, Argument 9.) and that 
with groans unutterable; which is not so to 
be understood, as if the Holy Spirit were 
here said to help our Infirmities, only by 
suggesting Petitions and Groans unto us, (as 
Is commonly, but falsely affirmed) for the very 
words of the Context sufficiently exclude 
such a gloss; since they say, that the Spirit 
himself, not we by the Spirit, (as we have it 
in the 15th Verse of the same Chapter) maketh 
intercession for us; yea, vicarious intercession, 
as the Greek word ἐγκαυμάζω signifies: But to help others Infirmities, by making in-
tercession; and, what is more, vicarious in-
tercession for them, is not to intitul Petitions in-
to them, but to pour our Petitions apart in 
their behalf; as is apparent both from the 
thing itself; since none can intercede for 
himself, all Intercession (at least such as is 
here spoken of) requiring the entremise of a 
third Person; and by the Collation of Verse 
34 of the same Chapter, and 1 Tim 2. 1.
Heb. 7. 25. Neither let any Man think to
baffle off this place, (which is written with
a Beam of the Sun, and hath, together with
that John 16. 13, 14. quite nonpluss'd, not
only Modern Authors, but the Fathers them-
selves) by saying, that this is improperly
spoken of the Holy Spirit: For, besides,
that he hath no other ground to say so, but
his own pre-conceived Opinion touching the
Deity of the Holy Spirit, he ought to know
that the Scripture, though it speaketh some
things of God in a Figure, and improperly;
yet doth it no where say any thing that ar-
gued his inferiority to, and dependance on
another. But this Passage of the Apostle
plainly intimateth, that the Holy Spirit is in-
ferior to God, and dependent on him; oth-
erwise what need had he to make intercession
to God, and that with groans unutter-
able, for the Saints? Secondly, The Holy
Spirit is here distinguished from him that
searcheth the Hearts; and this Description is
made use of to put a difference between God
and the Holy Spirit: But how could this be
done, were the Holy Spirit also a searcher of
the Hearts? For can a Description that is
common, yea alike common to twain, (for
so the Adversaries hold concerning God, and
the Holy Spirit) be so to distinguish the one
from the other? For instance; to prepare the
Passover for Christ, is an Action common to
Peter with John, for they twain were sent by
Christ to that purpose, and did accordingly
perform it; see Luke 22. 8, 13. Wherefore
can a Description taken from this Action, be
fit to difference Peter from John? And is it
suitable to say, He that prepared the Passover
for Christ, was a greater Apostle than John?
Would not this plainly argue, that John did
not prepare the Passover for Christ? So that
it is apparent, that the Holy Spirit is not a
searcher of the Hearts. If therefore, it would
not follow that the Holy Spirit is God, al-
though it had been said in the Scripture, that
he searcheth the Hearts, unless he had such a
faculty originally, and of himself, (for no-
thing hinders but that God may confer it up-
on others, as we see by the Scripture, that
he hath, de facto, conferred it on Christ,
having given him all Judgment, and that, be-
cause he is the Son of Man, John 5. 22, 27.
for such Judgment requireth that he be a
searcher of the Hearts); If, I say, it would
not even then follow that he is God; how
clearly, how irrefragably doth it on the con-
trary follow, that he is not God, but hath an
understanding distinct from, and inferior to
that of God; in as much as he is deficiente of
such a perfection, as the searching of the
Hearts, which is inseparable from the Divine
Majesty? These two Considerations have I
added at the close of my twelfth Argument,
because they are not so much new Arguments,
as Props and further Confirmations of the
Ninth and Eleventh Arguments,