



79-3

61

LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,

AT
PRINCETON, N. J.

DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter

No.

March 25th, 1858.

Case,

500

Shelf,

1599

Book,





A
DISCOURSE

Of the EVERBLESSED

Trinity in Unity,

WITH AN
EXAMINATION

OF

Dr. CLARKE'S

SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE

OF THE

TRINITY.

By THO. BENNET, D. D.
Vicar of St. Giles's Cripplegate.

L O N D O N :

Printed for W. INNYS at the *Prince's Arms* in
St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1718.



To my most Honored Patrons,
The Rev^d. Dr. HENRY GODOLPHIN
Dean of St. Paul's, London, and
Provost of Eton College ;

The Rev^d. Dr. WILLIAM STANLEY
Dean of St. Asaph, the Rev^d. Dr. JOHN
YOUNGER Dean of Sarum, and the
Rev^d. Dr. FRANCIS HARE Dean of
Worcester ; the Residentiarys of
St. Paul's, London.

GENTLEMEN,

MY Design in this public Address
is to return You my humblest
Thanks for so remarkable an
Instance of Your Favor, as I want
Words to express ; Your conferring up-
on me, in the most generous and oblig-
ing Manner, one of the principal Paro-
chial Benefices in the Kingdom ; in
which as I have Opportunity of doing
a large Share of our Great Master's
Work, and thereby earning Everlasting
A 2 Wages

The DEDICATION.

Wages (which is the most valuable Consideration) so I reap the Advantage of a plentiful Income, which affords me even a Temporal Reward for the Labors of my present Station.

I am truly sensible of this Your undeserved Kindness to me ; and shall endeavor, by God's Assistance, in some Measure to answer Your pious Intentions therein, by a sincere Discharge of my Duty to the best of my Power.

May that God, who gives Men Ability, and inclines their Hearts to promote his Glory, amply recompence all Your good Deeds ; particularly that for which I shall ever stand deeply indebted to You. May he shower down upon You the Blessings of this Life, and crown You at length with endless Glory. I am,

REVEREND SIRS,

*Your most Obliged, most Grateful,
and most Obedient Servant,*

*Cripplegate, London,
Oct. 23. 1717.*

Tho. Bennet.

T H E

P R E F A C E.

WHEN the Reverend Dr. Clarke published his Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity; as I could not but perceive and lament the natural Tendency of such a Book (especially considering what Credit the Author had gained by his former excellent Writings, and consequently how powerfully the Authority of his Name would recommend even the most dangerous Notions) so I could not but observe the Course of that Controversy, which arose upon that unhappy Occasion.

Every body knows, that many Writers, of different Spirits and Abilitys, attacked the Doctor in different Manners, as their Inclinations or Judgments led them. But notwithstanding this Variety of Opposition, I heartily wish I could not say, that what to me seemed in such a Case the most desirable, or rather absolutely necessary, was totally neglected. For tho' much commendable Zeal was spent against the Book in general, and diverse Parcels

The PREFACE.

of it were particularly question'd and taken to pieces: yet none of the Doctor's Adversarys attempted a Confutation of his whole Scheme, and a thorough Examination of every Branch of his Doctrin.

Wherefore, since I could not bear, that any one Person intended to prevent me, by ingaging in so reasonable an Undertaking; and since the Controversy about the Holy Trinity, which has lately been revived, is of greater Consequence, than those other Matters which lay before me: I judg'd it reasonable to postpone what I should otherwise have proceeded in, and determin'd to write a full Reply to that celebrated Treatise of my Learned Friend.

Accordingly, as my Affairs would permit me, I got thro' the Work, and brought up with me every Chapter of it in January 1747, when I left Colchester, and fixed my self in London. And I should immediatly have published it, had not my Removal involved me in so much new Business, that I found it impossible for many Months, not only to prosecute my Studys, but even to review what I had actually written. And tho' at length I made shift to draw up a short Argument against the Non-jurors Separation (which the most pressing Necessity extorted from me) and then hoped to have work'd off this without farther Delay: yet fresh Interruptions arose from which I could not disentangle my self till about May last, when I resumed my Papers; and then they should have seen the Light, had not the Controversy about the Bishop of Bangor's Sermon preached before the King, which ingrossed the Thoughts of all People, oblig'd me to suspend
the

The PREFACE.

the Publication till now; if perchance some few may even now be at leisure to peruse them.

I need not acquaint the Reader, that in the whole Controversy concerning the Everblessed Trinity, the principal Point, and that which has been the most largely and warmly debated, is the Divinity of the Son or Second Person. Upon this therefore I have spent the greater Part of my Discourse, wherein I have carefully answered all Objections; and particularly the Learned will be perhaps not displeas'd with the Pains I have taken in establishing, what our Greatest Divines do generally either suppose or assert, tho' they have been over scaring in the Proof of it; I mean the Quiescence of the WORD during our Savior's Ministry.

Of what Consequence this Notion is, 'tis impossiblle for the most negligent not to perceive. It enables us clearly to account for our Savior's not knowing the Day of Judgment, which has hitherto been esteem'd the great Difficulty: and it gives such a Turn to the whole Dispute, that I can't but wonder, how those Divines, who have been necessitated to shelter themselves under it, and have therefore so frequently suggested and propos'd it; should not discern, or at least so imperfectly display, that Evidence of it, which the Holy Scriptures afford us. I dare affirm, that whosoever impartially considers what I have offer'd (and truly I thought my self oblig'd to enlarge pretty freely on a Matter of such Importance, especially when it has been too much neglect'd by others) will readily embrace a Truth, which is so

The P R E F A C E.

manifestly useful in the Demonstration of our blessed Lord's Divinity.

There is one thing, which (in the Opinion of some Persons) may possibly need an Apology. I have taken the Liberty of maintaining the Preexistence of our Savior's Human Soul; not because I am in the least inclined to favor the Preexistence of other Souls; but because the Holy Scriptures, I humbly conceive, do warrant that Position. I promise my self, that the Reader will candidly weigh what I have advanced concerning that Tenet. I assure him, I have no particular Fondness for it, notwithstanding it has been, and still is, maintained by Great Divines. I can't but think it the most rational Way of interpreting diverse Texts of Scripture: but if any one will shew me, how to interpret those Texts without admitting that Doctrine, I shall readily become his Convert. This I am sure of, the Consubstantial Divinity of our Lord is so plainly taught in Scripture, that I would admit any Hypothesis, provided it were barely possible, rather than deny it: and if those Texts can be explained so, as not to injure that great Truth; the Author of such Explication shall find me, not his Adversary, but truly thankful, for imparting such valuable Secrets to me.

*As I have been solicitous to obviate all Objections; so have I been designedly brief in the positive Part: concerning which, as I am persuaded I have said enough; so I was unwilling to say more than was indispensably necessary. 'Twill not be expected there-
fore*

The P R E F A C E.

fore, that I should heap up all those Arguments, which have been urged by former Writers ; or that I should insist upon all those Texts, wherein the same Doctrin is contained.

This Method I have purposely chosen, that I might not expose the Doct̄or and my self to infinit Wranglings, which do rather obscure, than confirm, the most important Truths, with respect to the Generality of People ; who are rather confounded, than instructed, by a Multiplicity of Reasonings, guarded against numberless Exceptions, thro' the whole Course of which 'tis difficult for those who have not very strong Heads, to see every Consequence clearly, and upon the Whole to form an exact Judgment.

I have therefore proceeded in such a Manner, and selected such Topics, as will (I hope, thro' God's Assistance) not perplex the meanest, but yet convince the best Understandings ; such as will not embarrass any, but yet satisfy every Reader.

Briefly, if those Arguments which I have pitched upon, be conclusive ; the Cause will not suffer for want of others to accompany them : and if those Arguments are not conclusive, I must for my self confess, that I know of none which have more Force in them.

CRIPPLEGATE, LONDON,
Octob. 23. 1717.

THO. BENNET.

BOOKS Written by the Reverend Dr. Bennet, Vicar of
St. Giles's Cripplegate, and Sold by W. Innys at the
Prince's Arms in St. Paul's Church-Yard.

AN Abridgment of the *London Cases*. The Fifth Edition.
A Contutation of *Popery*, in Three Parts. The Fourth
Edition.

Devotions: *viz.* Confessions, Petitions, Intercessions and
Thanksgivings, for every Day in the Week: and also Before,
At, and After the Sacrament; with Occasional Prayers for all
Persons whatsoever.

A Discourse of Schism. The Fourth Edition.

A Defence of the Discourse of Schism. The Fourth Edition.

An Answer to Mr. *Shepherd's* Considerations on the Defence
of the Discourse of Schism. The Fourth Edition.

A Confutation of *Quakerism*. The Second Edition.

A Discourse of the Necessity of being Baptiz'd with Water,
and receiving the Lord's Supper; taken out of the Confutation
of *Quakerism*. Price 3 *d.* or 20 *s.* a 100.

A brief History of the joint Use of precomposed set Forms of
Prayer. The Second Edition.

A Discourse of joint Prayer. The Second Edition.

A Paraphrase with Annotations upon the Book of *Common
Prayer*, wherein the Text is explain'd, Objections are answer'd,
and Advice is humbly offer'd both to the Clergy and the Layety,
for promoting true Devotion in the Use of it. The Second
Edition.

Charity Schools recommended in a Sermon preach'd at St.
James's Church in *Colchester*, on Sunday March 26. 1710. Publish-
ed at the Request of the Trustees. The Second Edition. Pr. 1 *d.*

A Letter to Mr. *B. Robinson*, occasion'd by his *Review* of the
Case of Liturgies and their Imposition.

A second Letter to Mr. *B. Robinson* on the same Subject.

The Rights of the Clergy of the Christian Church.

Directions for studying, I. A general System or Body of Di-
vinity. II. The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. To which
is added, St. *Jerom's* Epistle to *Nepotianus*. The Second Edition.

An Essay on the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.

The Nonjurors Separation from the Public Assemblies of the
Church of *England* examin'd, and prov'd to be Schismatical up-
on their own Principles. The Second Edition.

The Case of the Reform'd Episcopal Churches in *Great Poland*
and *Polish Prussia* consider'd, in a Sermon preach'd on Sunday
Nov. 18. 1716. at St. *Laurence Jewry*, *London*, in the Morning, and
St. *Olave's Southwark*, in the Afternoon. The Second Edition.

A Spittal Sermon preach'd before the Lord Mayor, Alder-
men, &c. of *London*, in St. *Bridger's* Church, on April 24. 1717.

T H E C O N T E N T S.

C H A P. I.

THE *Occasion and Design of this Discourse.*
Pag. 1

C H A P. II.

Of the Paternity of God. p. 5

C H A P. III.

*Of the Union of the Divine and Human Natures
in our Lord Jesus Christ.* p. 7

C H A P. IV.

That God is the Father of the Man Jesus Christ. p. 16

C H A P. V.

*The State of the Controversy between Dr. Clarke
and the Author concerning the WORD, or Di-
vine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ.* p. 19

C H A P. VI.

Of the Exaltation of our Lord Jesus Christ. p. 23

C H A P. VII.

Phil. 2. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. explain'd. p. 39

C H A P. VIII.

*That during the Time of our Savior's Ministry, the
Disciples did not believe, that he was any thing
more than a mere Man conducted and assisted by
the Spirit of God.* p. 50

C H A P.

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. IX.

*That during the Time of our Savior's Ministry, the
WORD was quiescent in the Man Christ Jesus.*

P. 125

CHAP. X.

Of our Savior's not knowing the Day of Judgment.

P. 151.

CHAP. XI.

*Of Christ's saying, My Father is greater than I;
with Reflections upon diverse other Texts.*

P. 156

CHAP. XII.

*That the Holy Scriptures do teach, that the WORD,
or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, is
the Very God.*

P. 175

CHAP. XIII.

That the Holy Ghost is the Very God.

P. 197

CHAP. XIV.

Of the Trinity in Unity.

P. 215

*An Examination of Dr. Clarke's Scripture Do-
ctrine of the Trinity.*

P. 227

E R R A T A.

P. Ag. 26. lin. ult. read *Phil. 2. 19, 24.* p. 39. l. 3. read *thereby
more happy.* p. 64. l. 6. read *come, v. 5. which.* p. 87. l. 18.
read *οὐ τὸ τὸν.* p. 89. l. 10. read *us, Col. 1. 15. that.* p. 108.
l. 22. read *saying, John 8. 58.* p. 158. l. 20. read *by the.*

A
DISCOURSE
Of the EVERBLESSED
TRINITY in UNITY.

CHAP. I.

The Occasion and Design of this Discourse.

To the Reverend

Dr. SAMUEL CLARKE.

DEAR SIR,

WHEN I receiv'd those Copies of the several Pieces you have publish'd concerning the Trinity, which you were pleas'd to send me; as I could not but esteem them fresh Instances of your good Affections towards me (of which I have had much happy Experience in a Course of many Years Acquaintance) so I am perswaded,
B You

You were far from expecting my Approbation of them. On the contrary, as it became a Person that loves you sincerely, I signified to you, by Letter and otherwise, my dislike of your Notions; and you condescended to bear my usual Plainness with that Patience, Candor, and Sweetness of Temper, which you constantly discover in your whole Conduct.

You have well (a) observ'd, that the Doctrin of the Trinity is of the greatest importance in Religion; a matter not to be treated of slightly and carelessly, as it were by Accident only, after the manner of superficial Controversies about Words, or of particular Occasional Questions concerning the meaning of single ambiguous Texts; but which ought, when discours'd upon at all, to be examin'd thoroughly on all sides, by a serious study of the whole Scripture, and by taking care that the Explication be consistent with it self in every part. You (b) profess that you have, according to the Weight and Dignity of the Subject, considered it throughout, as carefully and distinctly as you were able; and desire only, that the Reader, when he begins the Book, would peruse it all, and consider seriously every Part, and compare the Whole of what is here said, with other whole Schemes, before he passes his Judgment upon it. For my own part, I solemnly make the same Profession with your self; and what you desire of the Reader, I have conscientiously perform'd: and yet I must assure you, that after all the Pains I have bestow'd in considering this nice Subject (both at former Times, and since your several Books have been publish'd) I am as thoroughly convinc'd, that you are in the Wrong, as you your self can be that you are in the Right.

(a) Preface to your Scripture Doctrin of the Trinity.
 (b) Ibid.

Now, since the Subject of these your Writings is of so great Consequence, and the difference between your Sentiments, and those which, I firmly believe, are deliver'd in the Holy Scriptures, is so exceedingly wide, that your Mistakes are not less certain than dangerous, and prejudicial to our common Christianity; and since these fatal Errors are Patroniz'd by a Writer of establish'd Reputation in the Learned World: certainly those who retain any Zeal, in this Lukewarm Age, for the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, and are persuaded that an Orthodox Belief is the only firm Foundation of a truly Christian Practice; can't but desire, even with some degree of Impatience, to see your Notions fairly examin'd, and substantially disprov'd; so that neither the Weight of your Authority in the Commonwealth of Letters, nor your excellent Management of what I can't but esteem a very ill Cause, may prejudice the Truth, disturb the Church's Peace, and deceive the Unwary.

Besides, I can't bear the Thoughts of your being injurious to the Church of Christ. God forbid, that you should in any Respect wound that Religion, which you have in so many Respects adorn'd and defended. Farther, I am fully persuaded, that you'll be glad to see your Mistakes, and that you will also readily acknowledge them, if they appear to you. I think my self therefore bound in strict Duty to God, and in pure Friendship to your self, to lay aside for a while those several Tasks, which would otherwise have found me full Employment, for many Years; that I may contribute what lies in my small Power, to the clearing of the Truth, and your Conviction.

These Considerations, and only these, have engag'd me to undertake the present Controversy with you ; being so abundantly satisfy'd of the Goodness of my Cause, and so eagerly bent to do what little Service I can (particularly to your self) that I am resolv'd to risque my Endeavors. And I humbly trust our great and good Master, who will not desert such as impartially seek to advance the Truth, and aim only at his Glory, with the Success of my Labors.

May that God, who knows the Secrets of both our Hearts ; May that incarnat Savior, who must judge us both at the last great Day ; May that blessed Spirit, who works in Men both to will and to do ; so direct and influence us both, that no Prejudice or Interest may blind our Understandings, no unmortify'd Lust may pervert our Wils, no Desire of Glory or Reputation may bribe our Affections : but that each of us may behave himself, in the Course of this Friendly Disputation, as becomes those who live in a constant Expectation of giving an Account of all their Actions ; and are practically convinc'd, that whatever little Ends may be serv'd in this World by Artifice, Shift, and Collusion ; yet nothing but the most unbiass'd Integrity in our Conduct here, can prevent our everlasting Disgrace, and insupportable Confusion hereafter.

Let us now, with a firm Dependence on the Divine Assistance, proceed to the Business lying before us.

C H A P. II.

Of the Paternity of God.

THAT there is one selfexistant, infinitely perfect and glorious Being, the Author and Preserver, not only of Man, but also of all other Beings whatsoever, which Being we call GOD; I shall not prove. This Task your excellent *Demonstration*, for which the Christian World will ever be your Debtor, has rendred perfectly needless.

But then, the Word *God* has also been us'd in other Senses. Such Beings as deriv'd their very Existence from the One selfexistant Being; nay, the mere Creatures of human Invention, which never did exist at all, have been dignify'd with that Appellation. And accordingly the Apostle says, *there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven or in earth, as there be Gods many and Lords many*, 1 Cor. 8. 5. Wherefore, that the One selfexistant Being may effectually be distinguish'd from all those other Beings, which are Gods in Name only, and not really such; I shall frequently call him the *very* or true God.

Now this very God is, in the holy Scriptures, frequently call'd the *Father*; and that upon different Accounts. I shall not be curious in the Specification of them. 'Tis sufficient to observe, 1. That he is confessedly the Father, not only of all Mankind, but even of the Universe; because he created all Things, and they owe their Existence to him. So that whatsoever is, besides himself, proceeds from him, and he is therefore the Father of it. 2. That he is also confessedly the Father of

Christians, by reason of that Covenant which he makes with them in and thro' our Savior Jesus Christ, whereby we become his Children, not by Creation (for such are all Mankind) but by Adoption ; that is, he receives us into his particular Grace and Favor, by which we are entitled to such inestimable Benefits, as we could not claim by that Relation to him which his bare Creation gives us. Thus the Apostle says, *For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus*, Gal. 3. 26.

But then, as the very God is the Father of all Mankind in general, and of Christians in particular ; so is he, in an especial Manner, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom the holy Scriptures do commonly stile the *Son of God* in an emphatical Manner, and the *Only Begotten of the Father* ; which Phrases do necessarily imply, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of the very God, and consequently the very God is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, in some peculiar and extraordinary Sense.

Briefly therefore, The very God is the Father of all Mankind by a *general* Paternity, of all Christians by a *particular* or *federal* Paternity, and of our Lord Jesus Christ by a *special* Paternity.

C H A P. III.

*Of the Union of the Divine and Human Natures
in our Lord Jesus Christ.*

NOW for the better understanding of this wonderful Relation between the very God and our Lord Jesus Christ, which arises from the special Paternity of the very God, and consequently the special Filiation of Jesus Christ our Lord, it must be remembred, that our Lord Jesus Christ has a twofold Nature united in him.

First, the λόγος, or WORD of God, which *was with God, and is God, was made Flesh, or was incarnat, and dwelt among us, in the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ.* This is not only taught by your self, but expressly asserted by St. *John, Ch. 1. v. 1, 14, 15.* That this WORD is abundantly superior to, and consequently quite different from, an human Soul, you constantly suppose, and therefore you will not desire me to prove. Whether this WORD is the very God, or a Secondary Being, that derives his Existence from the One selfexistent Being or very God, I do not at present inquire. This is certain, and allow'd by your self, that the WORD is superior to all created Beings whatsoever. For *all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made, John 1. 3.* And since you know and maintain, that the WORD is expressly call'd God, therefore I join with you in calling the WORD the Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Secondly, Our Lord Jesus Christ is very Man, consisting of an human Body and an human Soul.

That our Lord Jesus Christ has an human Body, is agreed between us. And indeed, 'tis as certain, as that *Julius Cæsar* had one. For we have the same Evidence of both. But perhaps we are not agreed that he has an human Soul: at least you do not once affirm it. You (a) say, *On which side soever that Question (viz. whether the Divine Nature supply'd the Place of the Human Soul in Christ) be determined, it makes no Alteration at all in my Scheme. And therefore, to avoid all needless Difficulties, I neither affirmed nor supposed any thing, which will not hold equally true upon either Hypothesis.* Whether your Doctrin may be maintain'd with equal Advantage upon either Hypothesis, I do not at present dispute. But 'tis plain, you have not appear'd willing to speak *Your Thoughts* freely about this Matter; and therefore, since I think it of Importance with respect to the Controversy, you will give me leave briefly to offer some of *my Thoughts*.

I observe therefore, 1. That no Argument can be drawn from Reason against our Savior's having an human Soul. His Actions never discover'd the Want of it. And therefore we must intirely depend upon the Holy Scriptures for the Determination of this Point. 2. That the Holy Scriptures do not so much as once expressly say, that our Savior had not an human Soul. There is not one Text alleg'd for that Purpose, that I know of. 3. That tho' *the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us*, and consequently was united to an human Body; yet this does not prove, that our Lord had not an human Soul. For the WORD might as well be united both to an human Body and to an human Soul, as to an human Body without an human Soul.

(a) Answer to the Bishop of Chester, p. 219.

Wherefore we have no reason to deny our Savior an human Soul, altho' the WORD was incarnat.

But the Holy Scriptures, not only do not deliver, but manifestly oppose, and overthrow this Conceit. For as 'twas ever believ'd, that a Man consists of an human Soul and an human Body united (so that if either of these integral Parts be wanting, the Man, that is, a true, perfect, and proper Man, is not) so the Holy Scriptures, which by a Man do understand such a compounded Nature, do represent our Savior as a Man, as fully, plainly, and clearly, as any one other Man in the World. He is without a Figure, and not in any borrow'd Sense, expressly stiled *ἄνθρωπος* and *άνηρ*, that is, a Man, both by himself and the Sacred Writers. He himself saies, *But now ye seek to kill me, a man that has told you the truth, which I have heard of God,* John 8. 40. And elsewhere he makes him as much a Man, and a Man in the same Sense, as was Adam himself, saying, *for since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive,* 1 Cor. 15. 21, 22. And again, *the first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven,* v. 47. Nay, he gives him the very Name of Adam, saying, *the first man Adam was made a living Soul, the last Adam was made a quickning spirit,* v. 45. Nay, 'tis very observable, that the Apostle declares him to be as much a Man, and a Man of the very same Kind, as we our selves in general are. For says he, *But not as the offence, so also is the free gift: for if through the offence of one, many be dead; much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded (εις πολλῶς) unto many, that is, unto many Men,* Rom. 5. 15. So that our Lord Jesus Christ is as truly a Man as any of our selves; the

the Redeemer is the same sort of Man as the Persons Redeem'd by him. Thus the same Apostle saies, there is *one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. And again, *he has appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he has ordained: whereof he has given assurance unto all men, in that he has raised him from the dead*, Acts 17. 31. So that our Mediator and Judge is as much a Man, as those for whom he intercedes, and who shall be judged by him. To these I might add diverse other Texts. And what is the plain Sense of them? What did our Savior and his Apostles understand by the Word *Man*? What sort of Creature did they take *Adam*, and all other Men, to be? Even such as was our Lord himself. The human Soul is by much the principal Part of Man, and his chief constituent Part: and therefore to suppose a Man (a true, perfect, and proper Man, and such as our Lord is notoriously describ'd and affirm'd to be) without an human Soul, is the height of Absurdity.

I will not enter into a Metaphysical Inquiry, what constitutes the Essence or Substance of an human Soul or human Body. The Essences or Substances of Things are little understood by us. We can't precisely determin, what makes an Identity of Nature or Kind. But tho' we can't precisely determin, what makes an Identity: yet a small share of common Sense can discern a manifest Diversity; for instance, that the WORD which created all things, is not an human Soul. And consequently for any one to affirm, that the WORD joined to an human Body makes a Man, is much more ridiculous, than to affirm, that an human Soul joined to the Body of a Lion, is a Man. For there is a
wider

wider Difference between the WORD and an human Soul, than between the Body of a Man and the Body of a Lion.

Whoſoever therefore affirms, that our Savior wanted an human Soul, muſt not think to prove his Doctrin true, by ſaying, that 'tis poſſible in the Nature of the Thing, for the WORD to ſupply the want of an human Soul in Chriſt (for tho' I do by no means yield, that ſuch a Suppoſition is conſiſtent with the Scriptural Account of the Bleſſed Jeſus; yet if it were granted, 'tis no Proof) but he muſt give ſome convincing Demonſtration, that tho' the Holy Scriptures do not expreſſy ſay, that Chriſt wanted an human Soul; yet, when they call him Man, they certainly mean ſomething different from what that Word does ordinarily import, as it occurs in the inſpired Books. 'Till this is don (which is evidently impoſſible) the Word *Man*, when ſpoken of the Bleſſed Jeſus, muſt be underſtood in the obvious, uſual and common Senſe. And conſequently it appears by the plain Declarations of himſelf, and of the Inſpired Writers, that our Savior had an human Soul.

Again, let us obſerve, how the Author to the *Hebrews* argues. Having ſhewn in his firſt Chapter, that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is a Perſon of greater Dignity than the Angels, he infers from thence, in the former Part of the ſecond Chapter, the Neceſſity of our Obedience to the Laws of the Goſpel. Then he proceeds to evince our Savior's Exaltation from the Old Teſtament, by quoting ſome Words of the Eighth Pſalm, thus, *But one in a certain place teſtified, ſaying, What is man that thou art mindful of him: or the ſon of man, that thou viſiteſt him? Thou madeſt him a little lower than the Angels, thou crown-*
edſt

edst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands: Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet, Heb. 2. 6, 7, 8. He then observes the Universality of this Subjection, saying, For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him, v. 8. He then concludes, that this must be understood, not of Man in General, but of one Particular Man, viz. our Lord Jesus Christ, saying, But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the Angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that he by the grace of God should tast death for every man, v. 8, 9. 'Tis notorious therefore, that Christ Jesus was a Man in the same Sense with other Men in General, that is, he had the same human Nature with our selves. Otherwise the Apostle's Argument is impertinent, and a mere Cheat put upon his Readers. Now if Christ Jesus was as much a Man as others, he certainly had an human Soul, as well as an human Body.

But, what is still more remarkable, now follows. He informs us, that Christ ought to be of the same Nature with our selves, in order to his being the Redeemer of Mankind. For these are his Words, Wherefore in all things it behoved him (*ὁμοιωθῆναι*) to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted, ver. 17, 18. I confess, this Passage is the Conclusion of his Argument for the Necessity of Christ's having Flesh and Blood, as we have: but then, the Expressions are such, as manifestly suppose and imply, that he had also an human Soul. For he says, it behoved Christ to be made like unto his Brethren, *καὶ πάντα*, in all things. Now this does indeed

indeed demonstrat, that he ought to be cloath'd with Flesh and Bloud, as we are (for if he had not had Flesh and Bloud, he would in that *one* thing have been unlike his Brethren) but surely his being cloath'd with Flesh and Bloud did not make him like us, or of the same Nature with us, *in all things*. For the principal Part of our Nature would be still wanting in him, if he had not an human Soul. And since his having Flesh and Bloud is but one Instance of Similitude, I would fain know, what other he could have, upon Supposition that he had not an human Soul; and consequently with what Propriety of Speech he could be said to be like us in *all things*, which must imply *two* things at least. Besides, if 'twas necessary that he should have Flesh and Bloud for this very Reason, that he might be like his Brethren, or of the same Nature with them; 'twas much more, or at least 'twas equally necessary, that he should have an human Soul also, the Enjoyment of which wou'd give him the principal Likeness to Mankind. So that, tho' the Apostle did indeed attempt to prove no more, than that our Savior ought to have a Body like ours (for he did not suspect, that any wou'd doubt of his having an Human Soul; and therefore did not designedly guard against that Error) yet the whole Tenor of his Discourse, and the whole Force of his Argument, do necessarily infer, that in the Apostle's Opinion, Christ had an human Soul, as well as an human Body.

Nay, the very End of his being cloath'd with Flesh and Bloud demonstrats, that he had an human Soul. For the Apostle says, *in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself*

self hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted, v. 17, 18. Now those that deny our Lord an human Soul, affirm that the WORD supply'd the want of it. But this Conceit makes the Apostle's Argument ridiculous. For then, how could Christ be a merciful and faithful High Priest, and able to succor them that are tempted, for this Reason, because *he himself hath suffered being tempted?* Do not the Apostle's Words imply, that because he was tempted like us, he is therefore sensible of human Infirmities, and will pity us in the same Circumstances? Is not this what the same Author elsewhere urges in this very Epistle? Does he not say, *We have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin?* Chap. 4. v. 15. Does he not also say, that *Every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins: Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity?* Chap. 5. v. 1, 2. And does he not manifestly apply this to Christ? But how can this be, if Christ had no human Soul, but the WORD supply'd the want of it? Could the WORD, who is essentially superior to all created Beings whatsoever, the Maker and Former of all things, be tempted like us?

I confess, those that allow Christ an human Soul, must own, that there is some Difference between Christ's Temptations and ours, upon the account of our laboring under Original Sin, from which Christ was wholly free: but they are notwithstanding perfectly consistent with the Apostle, because they allow Christ's Soul to be of the same Kind with our own; and therefore he

was

was truly tempted as a Man, even as *Adam* and *Eve* were in the State of Innocency, and he had therefore a true Experience of Human Frailty; and can make suitable Allowances for our Degeneracy. But if the **WORD** supply'd the Defect of an Human Soul in Christ, 'twas impossible that Christ could, in any tolerable Sense, Measure, or Degree, be tempted like us, or have any Experience of our Frailty. For that Power and Wisdom, which are essential to, and inseparable from, the great Architect of the Universe, and the Creator of all intelligent Beings, even the brightest Angels themselves, could no more be influenc'd or wrought upon by the Artifices of the Devil, or the Allurements of the World, than a Fly (for Instance; and even that Comparison is infinitely too low) can stop the Motion of the Spheres, and invert the Order of Nature. Our Savior therefore certainly had an Human Soul, without which 'twas not possible for him to be tempted like us. For I presume, no Man in his Wits will dream of Temptations working upon mere Flesh, without an intelligent Being to inform it, and make it capable of Moral Actions.

I could offer diverse other Considerations: but I think, what has been already suggested, is more than sufficient to silence this Dispute.

You must therefore suffer me to assert, that our Lord Jesus Christ was, and is, very Man, consisting of an human Body and an human Soul; and that to this Man the **WORD** was, and still is, united. For you will heartily yield, that what our Savior was, whilst he convers'd upon Earth, the same he continues ever since his Ascension into Heaven, and the same will he be at the last great Day.

C H A P. IV.

That God is the Father of the Man Jesus Christ.

NOW you well know, that the very God is the Father of the Man Jesus Christ. I have already observ'd, that the very God is the Father of all Mankind by his *general* Paternity, even because he is the Author of all Beings whatsoever. But then, every body knows, what we mean by the Father of a Child in the ordinary Acceptation of that Phrase. Tho' the very God is by his general Paternity the Father of every Child, as he is the Original Author of all Beings; yet he having appointed inferior Agents to be the instrumental and immediat Causes of different Effects, has setled such a Course of Things, that Mankind is produc'd by Propagation; and he who propagats a Child, is call'd the Father of it, as being under God the instrumental and immediat Cause of that Child's coming into the World. Since *Adam* and *Eve* were form'd, the same Species has been continu'd in this usual manner, in every Instance except the Blessed Jesus; who tho' he is very Man, of the same Species with ourselves, was notwithstanding begotten in a different Way; and tho' he had an human Mother, yet he had not an human Father. For the very God was to him instead of an human Father.

There can be no Dispute between your self and me about this Matter. However, for the sake of others, let me prove it.

The Angel told the blessed Virgin, that she should bring forth a Son, and call his Name Jesus, *Luke* 1. 31. *Then said Mary unto the Angel, How shall this*

this be, seeing I know not a man? And the Angel answer'd and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God, v. 34, 35. The blessed Virgin, having never been known by Man, could not understand, how she should bear a Son. The Angel removes that Difficulty, by telling her, that she should conceive by the Operation of the Holy Ghost, and that therefore her Child should be called the Son of God. 'Tis true, her Child was call'd the Son of Man, as we shall soon see: but then he is also call'd the Son of God, and particularly for that very Reason, because he was begotten, not by a Man, but by the Operation of the Holy Ghost. I confess, 'twas only the Body of the blessed Jesus, which was then begotten; but yet, since an human Soul is of Course added to every human Body, which is produc'd: 'tis certain, that God is as properly the Father of the Man Christ Jesus, as any Man is the Father of his Child, when he begets his own Likeness. And accordingly, tho' God is the Father of all Mankind by his *general* Paternity, and the Father of all Christians by his *particular* or *federal* Paternity; yet he is the Father of the blessed Jesus by a *special* Paternity, even because the blessed Jesus was begotten by him in so peculiar a manner, as no other Man ever was.

Nor can it be objected, that our Lord is frequently call'd the Son of Man. No body knows better than your self, that that Phrase imports no more, than that he was of human Race, being descended truly and properly from the *Jewish* stock. And so he certainly was by the Mother's side, altho' God was his Father.

You will give me leave to add, that God is the Father of the Man Jesus Christ, upon the account of his Resurrection also. For, to use the Words of a most excellent ^(a) Writer, *Christ must therefore be acknowledg'd the Son of God, because he is raised immediately by God out of the Earth unto immortal Life.* For God hath fulfilled the Promise unto us, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. The Grave is as the Womb of the Earth; Christ who is raised from thence, is as it were begotten to another Life; and God, who raised him, is his Father.* So true it must needs be of him, which is spoken of others, who are the Children of God, being the Children of the Resurrection. Thus was he defined, or constituted and appointed, the Son of God with Power, by the Resurrection from the Dead: neither is he called simply the first that rose, but with a Note of Generation, the first born from the Dead.

But then, it must be remembred, that tho' Christ is for the present, yet he will not always be, the Only Son of God, or the Only Begotten of the Father, upon this Account. For all that shall be rais'd to Everlasting Life, will be the Sons of God in this Respect. However, Christ is the first born Son of God upon the account of his Resurrection. For tho' some others were rais'd from the Dead by God before the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, yet they dy'd again: whereas our Lord Jesus Christ never dy'd after his Resurrection. For as the Apostle speaks, *Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more Dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he li-*

(a) Bishop Pearson on the Creed, p. 106.

with unto God, Rom. 6. 9, 10. Our Savior therefore is the *first begotten* and the *first born* from the Dead; because he is the very first that was rais'd by God to eternal Life.

C H A P. V.

The State of the Controversy between Dr. Clarke and the Author concerning the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ.

TH E S E things being premis'd, wherein (I hope) we are perfectly agreed, let us now enter upon the Consideration of the first Point in Controversy between us. 'Tis confess'd on both Sides, 1. That the blessed Jesus has a Divine Nature, *viz.* the WORD. 2. That the WORD, or Divine Nature of the blessed Jesus, is call'd God. But the Question is, whether the WORD, or Divine Nature of the blessed Jesus, be the very God, that is, the one selfexistant Being. I affirm, that he is; and You deny it, making him a Being distinct from, and inferior to, the one selfexistant or very God. That this is your Notion, I need not prove. I heartily wish it did not appear too frequently in your Writings concerning the Holy Trinity.

Now the Truth is, since there are two Natures united in the blessed Jesus, that is, since the WORD and the Man Jesus Christ are united into one Person: we can't wonder, that the holy Scriptures do speak of him in very different Manners; and affirm such Things of him with respect to the one Nature, as can't possibly be affirm'd with respect to the other.

Let us but reflect upon our selves. Each of us has a Body and a Soul. These constituent Parts are vastly different from each other, the one being material, the other immaterial. Now if any Person should affirm of a Man's Soul, that 'tis material, or of his Body, that 'tis immaterial; would not these Affirmations be arrant Falshoods? And yet it may notwithstanding be truly affirm'd of the Man, that he is material, and that he is immaterial. But then these Propositions are true concerning the Man in different Respects. With respect to his Body, he is material: with respect to his Soul, he is immaterial. Wherefore we must carefully distinguish between what is affirm'd of him with respect to his Soul, and what is affirm'd of him with respect to his Body. Else what is really true, will appear false; and what is really false, will appear true, by a confus'd Misapplication.

Even thus, since in the blessed Jesus two Natures are united, which are vastly different from each other: if a Man should affirm concerning his Divine Nature, that 'twas Created; and concerning his human Nature, that it made the World; these Affirmations would be arrant Falshoods. And yet it may notwithstanding, be truly affirm'd of the blessed Jesus, that he made the World, and that he was created. These Propositions therefore are true of the blessed Jesus in different Respects. His human Nature was created; and his Divine Nature made the World. Wherefore we must carefully distinguish between what is respectively affirm'd of him upon the account of the Divine and human Natures. Else we shall blunder into numberless Untruths, and make the holy Scriptures a mere jumble of Contradictions.

No Man, that has consider'd the Controversies concerning the Trinity, can be insensible of those Mistakes, into which Learned Men have fallen by not observing this Rule. And indeed, even Zeal for the real Truth has too commonly betray'd Men into gross Errors, and plung'd even the Maintainers of a right Cause into insuperable Difficulties. For, in Opposition to those against whom they have bestow'd their Labors, they have greedily caught at every Text, that would, if understood in a particular Sense, confound their Adversaries; and by this Means they have expos'd themselves to such Objections, as they could never get clear of upon their own Principles, and without retracting what they had themselves before advanc'd. Thus has the Doctrin of the Trinity been rendred infinitely perplex'd and intricat; whilst succeeding Writers have been afraid to part with any one Argument, that has been urg'd in favor of Orthodoxy by their Predecessors in Controversy.

We must therefore lay aside our Prejudices, and disentangle our selves from those Notions, which we have receiv'd, not from the holy Scriptures, but from fallible Writers. We must have recourse to our Bibles, if we desire to be resolv'd, whether the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, be the very God, or no. We are not left destitute of sufficient Means for the Determination of this Point. The inspir'd Writings are exceedingly clear, and speak very plainly, concerning it. They have so manifestly taught us, that the WORD is the very God, that could I find any one Passage, which implies the contrary, I should own the Scriptures to be inconsistent with themselves, and not pretend to reconcile them.

Why has created such fierce Disputes about our Lord's Divine Nature? Why, the holy Scriptures do frequently speak of Jesus Christ as inferior to the very God; and some Learned Men, having unfortunately thought that diverse of those Passages relate to his Divine Nature, have from thence concluded (justly indeed, if that Principle be granted) that the WORD, tho' expressly call'd God, yet is not the one very self-existent God, but a secondary Being or inferior God. And they have accordingly labor'd to put such a Sense upon those Texts, which speak of our Savior's Divinity, as is agreeable to their Conceptions of an inferior Deity. Whereas in Reality, tho' the holy Scriptures do frequently speak of Jesus Christ as inferior to the very God; yet there is not one of those Texts, but what either fairly may, or necessarily must, be understood of his human Nature. And consequently they do not prove, that the WORD, or his Divine Nature, is inferior to the very God. Wherefore those Texts, which speak of our Savior's Divinity, must be understood in their natural Sense; which effectually demonstrats, as will soon appear, that the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Savior, is very God.

I hope, I have shewn the Difference between us in such an intelligible manner, that a Person even of the meanest Capacity will fully and distinctly perceive it. I shall therefore proceed to establish my own Assertion, and to confute yours, by proving,

1. That the Holy Scriptures do not teach, that the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, is inferior to the very God.

2. That the Holy Scriptures do teach, that the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the very God.

C. H. A. P.

C H A P. VI.

Of the Exaltation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

FIRST then, I shall shew, that the Holy Scriptures do not teach, that the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, is inferior to the very God. This I shall do, by examining all those Texts, which are suppos'd to teach it.

The first is a famous Passage of the Second Chapter of the Epistle to the *Philippians*, wherein the Apostle speaks very remarkably of the Humiliation and Exaltation of our Lord Jesus Christ. And to prepare the Way for the true Explanation of that difficult Passage, I must offer to your Consideration an Account of what the holy Scriptures (setting aside for the present this Text in dispute) do say concerning our Lord's Exaltation.

When he solemnly ascended from Earth in the Presence of his Disciples, we read that he was *received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God*, Mark 16. 19. Soon after this, St. Stephen the first Martyr, *being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God*, And said, *behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God*, Acts 7. 55, 56. St. Paul also, Rom. 8. 34. Col. 3. 1. Heb. 10. 12. and St. Peter, 1 Epist. 3. 22. assure us of his being and sitting *at God's right hand*, or, as 'tis sometimes express'd, *at the right hand of the throne of God*, and *on the right hand of the throne of the majestie in the heavens*, Heb. 8. 1. Thus has God exalted him *to be a prince*, Acts 5. 31. By this he is made *Lord*, Acts 2. 36. even *Lord of all*, Acts 10. 36. that is, Governor of the whole Creation. For

God has put all things under his feet, 1-Cor. 15. 27. He is the head of all principality and power, Col. 2. 10. Angels, authorities, and powers being made subject unto him, 1 Pet. 3. 22. God has set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: And has put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, Which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all, Eph. 1. 20, 21, 22, 23. So that he might justly say, I am set down with my father in his throne, Rev. 3. 21. And accordingly the same Throne is the Throne of God, and of the Lamb; For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne, shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, Rev. 7. 17. And he shewed me a pure river of water of life clear as chrystal, proceeding out of the throne of God, and of the Lamb. Rev. 22. 1. And there shall be no more curse, but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it, and his servants shall serve him, v. 3.

Being in this glorious Station, he is our Mediator and Intercessor, pleading the Merit of his own Sacrifice in our behalf. He is the *one mediator between God and men*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. He maketh intercession for us, Rom. 8. 34.

In this exalted Condition he receives Religious Worship. No sooner was he carried up into Heaven, but it follows immediatly, *and they worshipped him*, Luke 24. 52. And accordingly St. Stephen at his Martyrdom pray'd to him, saying, *Lord Jesus receive my spirit. And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge*, Acts 7. 59, 60. St. John also says, *Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, And has made us kings and priests unto God and his father; to him*
be

be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen. Rev. 1. 5, 6. 'Tis said of him, that he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne. And when he had taken the book, the four beasts, and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; And hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders, and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, honor, glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever, Rev. 5. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. To him the Martyrs cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? Rev. 6. 10. The great Multitudes also cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, Rev. 7. 10. Infomuch that our Lord's Words were then signally verify'd, that Men should honor the son, even as they honour the father, that is, should pay religious Adoration to him, John 5. 23

Then did our Lord's great Power display it self. He shower'd down those Blessings upon his Church, which God had enabled him to bestow, who then actu-

actually possess'd, by the Father's Gift, *all power in heaven and in earth*, Mat. 28. 18. The Apostles represent him as the Dispenser of Grace, Mercy and Peace, in Subordination to, and as the Son of, the very God. *Grace be unto you and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ*, Phil. 1. 2. *Grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ our Savior*, Tit. 1. 4. *Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ*, Phil. 3. *Grace be with you, mercy and peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ the son of the father*, 2 John 3. *Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne: And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth*, Rev. 1. 4, 5.

And indeed, how should it be otherwise? For our Lord, immediatly after his Ascension, began his Spiritual Reign, as the Vicegerent of the very God, over all created Beings. How truly might it then be said, *The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever*, Rev. 11. 15? *Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ*, Rev. 12. 10. *He has on his vesture, and on his thigh a name written, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*, Rev. 19. 16. Then might all his Enemies justly tremble and dread his Power. Well might they say to the mountains and rocks, *Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: For the great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand?* Rev. 6. 16, 17. And as his Enemies dreaded him, so his faithful Disciples might well rely upon him. Accordingly St. Paul trusted in him for what he hop'd to accomplish, *Phil. 2. 9, 24.*

The

The blessed Jesus shall continue thus exalted till the Consummation of all things, when all Mankind shall stand at his Tribunal, and he shall sentence them to eternal Happiness or eternal Misery. For God shall then judge the World by Jesus Christ. *For the Father judgeth no man: but hath committed all judgment unto the son, John 5. 22. It is he which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead, Acts 10. 42. even the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing, and his kingdom, 2 Tim. 4. 1.* This his general Judgment will be exceedingly glorious. *For the son of man shall come in the glory of his father, with his angels: and then he shall reward every man according to his works, Matt. 16. 27. and again, When the son of man cometh in the glory of his father with the holy angels, Mark 8. 38.*

In this exalted Condition must the Blessed Jesus continue, till he has gain'd a complete Victory over all his Enemies. *For this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God: from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his foot-stool, Heb. 10. 12, 13. For he must reign, till he has put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroy'd, is death. For he has put all things under his feet, 1 Cor. 15. 25, 26, 27.*

After this general Judgment, our Lord Jesus Christ shall cease to be the Administrator of God's Kingdom. *For then cometh the end, when he shall have deliver'd up the Kingdom to God, even the Father, 1 Cor. 15. 24. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all, v. 28.* I confess, it may be objected, that St. Paul seems to affirm, *Heb. 10. 12.* that he shall administer God's Kingdom *for ever*, and consequently after the Day of Judgment. *But, says Dr. Whitby in his Com-*
ment

ment on that Text, “ by comparing this with v. 14. “ By one offering he has perfected, *εις το διηνεκές*, for “ ever, them that are sanctified, and with v. 1. where “ it is denied, that the legal Sacrifices could *τελειῶσαι εις το διηνεκές*, expiate sins for ever, and from the Strefs “ the Apostle here, v. 10. and elsewhere lays upon this “ *προσφορά ἑπαύλαξ*, oblation once for all, I imagine “ that these Words may be better rendred thus, This man, “ after he had offer’d one sacrifice for sin for ever, “ is fate down.

But tho’ this Administration by the Son shall then cease, yet doubtiefs that Happiness and Joy, which the Son possesseth as the Reward of his Sufferings, as it undoubtedly may (because, tho’ by God’s Appointment ’tis at present join’d with it, yet ’tis in its own Nature distinct from it) so most certainly will, continue everlastingly.

Thus have we consider’d the Blessed Jesus as invested with, and exercising, the Authority of the very God, from the time of his Entrance on that sublime Office, to the time of his Resignation of it into the Hands of his Father, from whom he receiv’d it.

The only Observation I shall make upon the whole, is, that tho’ there are Two Natures united in the Person of our Lord, yet this Exaltation respects his human Nature only.

Now plain Fact demonstrats this Exaltation of his human Nature. However, let us consider what the Scriptures say. The Lamb that was slain, Rev. 5. 6, 12. he whose Throne is the same with that of God, Rev. 22. 1, 3. is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God, angels, and authorities, and powers, being made subject unto him, 1 Pet. 3. 22. Him that was rais’d from the dead has God set at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power.

power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: And hath put all things under his feet, Eph. 1. 20, 21, 22. To him that rose from the Dead, was given all power in heaven and in earth, Matt. 28. 18. And at the Last Day God will judge the World in Righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he has given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead, Acts 17. 31. For the son of man shall come in the glory of his father, with his angels: and then he shall reward every man according to his works, Matt. 16. 27.

Now he that shall be our Judge, is at present our Mediator. For there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, 1 Tim. 2. 5. And to him that is at present our Mediator, and shall hereafter be our Judge, we are requir'd to give Religious Adoration. For it must be observ'd, that the Father hath given him authority to execute judgment, for this plain and express Reason, viz. *because he is the son of Man*, John 5. 27. And because the Son of Man hath Authority to execute Judgment, therefore he is thereby constituted the Object of Religious Adoration. For the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father, v. 22, 23. that is, should give him Religious Adoration, as they do to God. For you have rightly (a) observ'd, that the Word "*ἰσθῶς*, even as] in St. John's Style, never signifies an exact Equality, but only a general Similitude. Thus John 17. 11. *That they may be one, as ἰσθῶς we are.* Ver. 14. *They are not of the world, even as ἰσθῶς] I am not of the world.* Ver. 21. *That they*

(a) Reply to the Bishop of Chester, p. 260, 261.

“ all may be one, as [*καθὼς*] thou, father, art in me, and
 “ I in thee. Ver. 23. Thou hast loved them, as [*καθὼς*]
 “ thou hast loved me. Wherefore, as you have (b)
 elsewhere explain’d this Passage, “ the Meaning is not,
 “ that the Son’s Authority (you will now understand
 “ me of the Man Christ Jesus, whatever you your
 “ self intended to signify by the Son in this Place)
 “ should, like that of the Father, be looked upon as under-
 “ rived, absolute, supreme and independent: but that as the
 “ Jews already believed in God, so they should also for the
 “ future believe in Christ, Chap. 14. 1. As they already
 “ honour’d God the Father (I mean the very God, who
 “ is commonly call’d the Father) so they should also
 “ for the future (*viz.* after his Exaltation) honor the
 “ Son of God (who is also here call’d the Son of
 “ Man, *viz.* the Man Christ Jesus.) Honor him as
 “ having all Judgment committed to him; honor
 “ him to the Honor of the Father which sent him; ac-
 “ knowledge him to be Lord, to the Glory of God the
 “ Father. It is certain therefore, that to him that
 wash’d us from our Sins in his own Blood, we are
 bound to give Glory and Dominion for ever and ever,
 Rev. 1. 5, 6.

I shall add but one thing more. The Author of
 the Epistle to the Hebrews quotes some Verses of
 the eighth Psalm, thus, *But one in a certain place tes-
 tified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of
 him, or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou
 madest him a little lower than the Angels, thou crownedst
 him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the
 works of thy hands: Thou hast put all things in subjection
 under his feet, Heb. 2. 6, 7, 8.* He then shews the
 Universality of Man’s Dominion over the Crea-
 tures, adding immediatly, *For in that he put all in*

(b) Script. Doct. p. 137.

subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him, ver. 8. Then he proves, that this could not be meant of Man in general, but must be understood of our Lord Christ in particular, saying, *But now we see not yet all things put under him: But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the Angels, for the suffering of death, crown'd with glory and honor, ver. 8, 9.* This is so manifest a Declaration of the Exaltation of the human Nature of our Savior, that it needs no Words to apply or illustrat it.

But tho' the Holy Scriptures do speak so expressly and so frequently of the Exaltation of Christ's human Nature; yet there is not one Passage in all the Bible, which speaks of the Exaltation of his divine Nature, or can't very fairly and clearly be understood of the Exaltation of the human Nature only. For even *Heb. i. 9.* when duly consider'd, not only well may (which would be sufficient for my Purpose) but necessarily must, be understood of the Exaltation of Christ's human Nature only.

To set this matter in a just Light, I will repeat the whole Passage. The Apostle quotes two Verses of the 45th Psalm, and assures us, that they are spoken unto the Son; *But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom: Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oyl of gladness above thy fellows,* *Heb. i. 8, 9.* Now 'tis agreed, that the former of these two Verses is manifestly to be understood of Christ's divine Nature; but the Question is, Whether the latter relates to the same, or no. I affirm, that it does not.

In order to the Proof of my Opinion, I observe, that the Psalmist was undoubtedly well acquainted with our Savior's having two Natures united in
him.

him. That he expressly spake of his divine Nature in the Psalm now quoted by the Apostle, is agreed : and that he elsewhere speaks of the human Nature also, appears from those Verses of the 8th Psalm quoted by this very Apostle, and by him proved to be spoken of the human Nature of Christ, as I noted just now. The same appears from diverse other Passages of the Psalms, quoted in the New Testament, and expressly apply'd to Christ's human Nature, which (because no body can contest it) I omit for Brevity's sake. No wonder therefore, that the Psalmist, who so well understood this Mystery, should speak of the two Natures in the same Breath ; even as *St. Paul* does several times join such things together, and affirm them of Christ in the same Breath, as relate partly to his divine, and partly to his human Nature.

This being premis'd, I desire it may now be consider'd, that Men are call'd μέτοχοι Χριστοῦ, that is (not as we most improperly render it, *Partakers of Christ*, as if Christ were put for what he purchased, and denoted a Thing, not a Person ; but) as μέτοχοι, or συμμέτοχοι, when it governs a Word betokening a Person, notoriously signifies, *the Companions of Christ*, or *Partakers of the same Happiness which Christ enjoys*, Heb. 3. 14. as we are call'd συγκληρονόμοι Χριστοῦ, *joint Heirs with Christ*, Rom. 8. 17. So that Men are certainly μέτοχοι Χριστοῦ with respect to his human Nature, as they are also call'd ἀδελφοί, his *Brethren*, particularly by the Author of this very Epistle, *Chap. 2. ver. 11, 12.* in the same Respect. This Passage therefore may, upon the plainest Scripture Grounds, particularly of this very Epistle, be understood of Christ's human Nature, which upon the Account of his perfect Love of Righteousness, and perfect Hatred of Iniquity (he being free from all
Spot

Spot of Sin, even from all Original Corruption) was rewarded by God with a vastly greater Share of Happiness, than any other Man; altho' every Man, that serves God as well as he is able in this corrupted State, shall in some degree or other, but every one in a far lower degree than our Holy Redeemer, partake of the very same Happiness. What Reason therefore have we to feign an Exaltation of the Divine Nature of Christ, of which there is not one Word spoken in any other part of Scripture; when this Text so naturally admits the same Sense with numberless other plain and clear ones, which apparently speak of the Exaltation of his human Nature?

But farther, this Text not only fairly may, but manifestly must, be thus understood. For,

I. The WORD has in himself, even upon your own Principles, all the Power that the Spirit can be suppos'd to confer; and therefore was incapable of that Unction with the Spirit, which gives the Son the Title of Messiah. So that if the Unction of *gladness* be the Unction of the Messiah; it can relate only to the Son's human Nature. But I am persuaded, the Unction of *gladness* is distinct from the Unction of the Spirit, and did not denominate him the Messiah, but was the Reward of his discharging the Office of the Messiah. It manifestly betokens his Exaltation to God's Right Hand, for having perform'd the Will of God upon Earth during his Humiliation, which Obedience is meant by his *loving righteousness and hating iniquity*. And consequently this Unction relates to his human Nature, which was certainly exalted upon that Account. Whatsoever therefore this Unction was, it shews, that the Psalmist spake of his human Nature only.

2. I would fain know, who were the חברים, the μέτριοι, of our Savior Christ (that is, his *Fellows, Companions, or Partners*) with respect to his Divine Nature. Whereas 'tis notorious, that Christians are his חברים or μέτριοι (his *Fellows, Companions, Partners, and even his Brethren*) with respect to his human Nature. This Consideration therefore determins, what Nature this Phrase is apply'd to. But for farther Confirmation it must be observ'd, that the Psalmist manifestly supposes, that he was chosen from amongst others of the same Nature with himself, and that for his Obedience he was exalted above them. *Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, has anointed thee with the oyl of gladness above thy fellows.* Now this is strictly true of Christ with respect to his human Nature; but 'tis unintelligible and false, if understood of his Divine Nature.

If it be said, that Christ was θεάνθρωπος, and therefore the WORD might have μετόχως: I answer, that tho' indeed it may be affirm'd of Christ, that he has μετόχως, as he is θεάνθρωπος, yet it can be affirm'd with respect to his human Nature only. For when any thing is affirm'd of Christ, we must always consider, in what Respect, or upon the Account of what Nature, 'tis affirm'd of him. Else we shall fall into endless Blunders and Absurdities. Since therefore Christ has no μέτριοι with respect to his Divine Nature, but most certainly has μέτριοι with respect to his human Nature; 'tis plain, that this Verse, which speaks of his μέτριοι, must be understood of his human Nature. And consequently the Exaltation here mention'd, his being anointed with *the oyl of gladness*, relates to his human Nature only.

And

And indeed, whoever peruses the whole Psalm, will naturally understand the main Body of it to relate to the Glory and Triumph of the Man Christ Jesus. For, tho' some Passages which are directed to God, were (as we are now assur'd by a Divine Interpreter) address'd to Christ's Divine Nature (from whence I shall afterwards infer his being the Very God) yet the main Body of the Psalm relates to that Exaltation, which the Very God vouchsaf'd to his Human Nature. And the Psalmist, who well knew the great Mystery of the Union of two Natures in one Person, which was in God's due Time to be verify'd and declar'd in Fact, expresses himself in such a manner, as implies his actual Adoration of the Divinity, and his inspired Knowledge of the Humanity, of which he gives a Prophetic Description, setting forth the Dominion and Spiritual Kingdom, which the Messiah should enjoy, after that his Sufferings upon Earth were recompens'd with his Exercise of supreme Authority over the whole Creation, and especially over all Mankind, which should gradually become Members of his Church.

You will forgive my adding one thing. *St. Paul* says, *God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.* 1 Tim. 3. 16. If any Person therefore should be weak enough to pretend, that the Divine Nature of Christ was exalted, because *God was received up into glory*; I answer, that the plain Meaning is, that Christ, who is here simply called *God* upon the account of his Divine Nature, as he is elsewhere called *Man* upon the account of his Human Nature, tho' he is in reality both God and Man; was *received up*, and consequently exalted, in his Human Nature, the Exaltation of

which is so frequently and fully declared, and expressed by this very Phrase ἀνελήφθη. The Context it self, not only allows, but leads to this Exposition. For the God who was received up, was *manifest in the flesh*; and as such, *viz.* as a God incarnat, he was received up.

Whensoever therefore the Exaltation of Christ is mention'd, it constantly means the Exaltation of his Human Nature only; of which alone 'tis expressly affirmed, or plainly suppos'd, in Holy Scripture. For as it can't be affirm'd of his Human Nature, tho' united with the WORD in one Person, that it made all Things; because, tho' 'tis expressly affirm'd of his Divine Nature, that it made all Things, yet the same is never once affirm'd or imply'd of the Human Nature: even so it can't be affirm'd of the Divine Nature, tho' united with the Human in one Person, that it was exalted; because, tho' 'tis expressly affirm'd of the Human, yet 'tis never once either affirm'd or imply'd of the Divine Nature. 'Tis certain therefore, that Christ was exalted with respect to his Human Nature only; and that his Divine Nature never was exalted at all.

What has been already said, is abundantly sufficient to establish the true Doctrine of our Savior's Exaltation. We ought not to expect a positive Declaration in Scripture, that the WORD or Divine Nature is not exalted. For we ought to restrain Christ's Exaltation to his Human Nature, unless we have good Grounds to extend it farther; that is, unless we have some clear Proof, that the Divine Nature is exalted also. However, I shall now evince what I have been contending for, by such a Consideration, as I think is equivalent to an express Restriction of our Savior's Exaltation to his

his human Nature, and an exprefs Exclusion of the Divine Nature from the Participation of that Exaltation. 'Tis this.

The Evangelist tells us, that all Things whatsoever were made by the WORD or Divine Nature, *Johm* 1. 3. So that the whole Creation, even the most glorious created Beings whatsoever, derive their Existence from him. Hence 'tis evident, that he is by Nature their Superior. Now the utmost pitch of our Lord's Exaltation is his exercising supreme Dominion over all Creatures. For the fullest and most pompous Description of it amounts to no more. And consequently that Exaltation which our Lord enjoys, could be no Exaltation to the WORD, or his Divine Nature, because he is necessarily as great in himself, as that Exaltation could make him. How then could Christ be exalted with respect to his Divine Nature? How could that which Christ is said to be advanc'd unto, be represented as an *ὑπερψαλις*, an *exceeding* Exaltation, if understood of his Divine Nature? 'Tis indeed an *ὑπερψαλις*, an *exceeding* Exaltation, of his human Nature; but 'tis no Exaltation at all to his Divine Nature. Because his Divine Nature (whether it be the very God, or an inferior Being) always was, even upon your own Principles, and before the Creation, every whit as Great and Glorious, as the most magnificent Scripture Description of Christ's present Exaltation supposes him to be.

I can't frame more than one Objection against this Way of reasoning; and 'tis indeed such, as I would scarce mention, were I not unwilling to neglect any thing, that even a weak Mind may stumble at. Perhaps it may be pretended, that how great soever the WORD essentially is (for

you see, I don't as yet determin whether he be the very God, or no) by reason of his having made all created Beings whatsoever; yet the Exercise of supreme Authority over what he himself had made, may be esteem'd an Exaltation of him. To this I answer, 1. That since he is essentially above it, and can gain nothing by it, his immediat Government of the Universe must be esteem'd a Condescention rather than an Exaltation. Because it tends only to the Advantage of his Subjects, and not in the least to his own Advancement. 2. That the very God himself exercis'd this Authority immediatly, and without the Interposition of a Mediator, before Christ's Exaltation. But was the very God exalted thereby? Is it not Blasphemy to suppose it? And why could not the very God be thereby exalted? Even because he is by Nature superior to the whole Creation. And is not this the self-same Argument which I used before with respect to the WORD? If the WORD were not the very God; yet since he is (at the least, and upon your own Principles) vastly superior to the whole Creation, his Administration of the Government of it can be no Exaltation, till a Way shall be found, whereby he may be suppos'd the better by it.

If it be said, that the WORD is rendred the more glorious in the Eyes of his Creatures by having the Government of them in his own Hands; I ask, whether the very God can be exalted, by the most glorious Conceptions which Creatures can have of him? Was not the very God as high before the Creation, as he has been or can be since? Were Creatures produc'd to exalt the very God? Or can he be in any respect exalted by them; I mean, as to his Condition of Happiness, and his essential Greatness? No surely. Accordingly

dingly therefore, the WORD can't be exalted by the utmost Honor the Creatures can pay him, or by the noblest Idea they can frame of him. There is no real Exaltation, unless the Being be rendred the more happy, than the Condition of its Nature supposes. And yet the whole Account of our Lord's Exaltation implies his being really the better for it, and a Gainer by it; his having, not only more Honor from inferior Beings, but more substantial Happiness also, by his Exaltation, than the Condition of his Nature could invest him with. 'Tis plain therefore, that Christ is exalted only with respect to his human Nature. For the WORD, or his Divine Nature, is essentially superior to, and consequently not capable of, nor does participate, that change of Condition, which his Exaltation has made with respect to his human Nature.

C H A P. VII.

Phil. 2. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. explain'd.

LET us now examin the remarkable Text before mention'd.

The Apostle says, *Phil. 2.*

Ver. 5. *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus;*

6. *Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God;*

7. *But made himself of no reputation, and took upon*

v. 5. Τὸ το γὰρ φρονεῖτω ἐν ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,

6. Ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπαρχῶν ἐχάρσατο μὴ ἴσῃσθαι τῷ Θεῷ

7. Ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, μορφῶν δούλων λαβὼν, ἐν ὁμοιωμά-

on him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.

8. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

9. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name :

10. That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth ;

11. And that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Certainly never was a Passage of Scripture more unfairly used, than this noble Paragraph of St Paul. It has been wrested quite contrary Ways, and to opposit Extremes. Some have from hence infer'd, that the WORD, or Divine Nature of Christ, is the very God : Others, that his Divine Nature is a Being inferior to the very God. Whereas in Reality both sides are manifestly in the wrong ; nor does the Apostle speak one Syllable of the WORD, or Christ's Divine Nature, in this whole Passage, as will soon appear. In order thereto, let us settle the Meaning of some particular Phrases.

As for the $\epsilon\chi$ $\alpha\rho\theta\rho\upsilon\mu\omega\nu$ $\eta\gamma\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$, several Commentators have given the true Interpretation of it. 'Tis sufficient for my present Purpose to transcribe what

π $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega\nu$ $\gamma\eta\omicron\mu\omega\Theta$.

8. $\text{Καὶ ἡ\u03c4\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota \u03b4\iota\epsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma \u03c9\varsigma \u03b1\u03bd\theta\rho\omega\pi\Theta, \u03b5\u03c0\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\u03bd\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu \u03b5\u03b1\u03c5\tau\omicron\nu \gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\omega\Theta \u03c9\theta\eta\kappa\omega\Theta \mu\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota \theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma, \theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma \u0394 \sigma\alpha\nu\rho\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma.$

9. $\text{Δ\iota\delta \u03c7\iota \u0399 \u0398\epsilon\omicron\delta\varsigma \u03b1\u03c5\tau\omicron\nu \u03c9\pi\epsilon\epsilon\u03c1\u03c5\psi\omega\sigma\epsilon, \u03c7\iota \u03b5\u03c7\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\iota\tau\omicron \u03b1\u03c5\tau\omicron\ \u0399\u03bd\omega\mu\alpha \tau\omicron \u03c9\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu \u0399\u03bd\omega\mu\alpha,$

10. $\text{\u201c}\text{\u0399}\nu\alpha \u03b5\nu \tau\omicron\ \u0399\u03bd\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota \text{\u201c}\text{I}\eta\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma, \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu \gamma\omicron\nu\nu \kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\eta \u03b5\u03c0\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu\iota\omega\nu \u03c7\iota \u03b5\u03c0\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\omega\nu \u03c7\iota \kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha\chi\theta\omicron\nu\iota\omega\nu,$

11. $\text{Κα\iota \u03c0\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha \gamma\lambda\omicron\omega\sigma\iota \u03b5\u03be\omicron\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\sigma\eta\tau\iota, \u0399\pi \text{\u201c}\text{K}\u03c5\epsilon\iota\Theta \text{\u201c}\text{I}\eta\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma \text{\u201c}\text{K}\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma, \u03b5\iota\varsigma \delta\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma\alpha\nu \theta\epsilon\omicron\ \pi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma.$

what Dr. *Whitby* has written concerning it. His Words are these :

This Greek Phrase is only to be met with in Plutarch, saith Grotius (though I cannot find it there) and in Heliodorus ; in which Writer it plainly signifies, to covet earnestly, or look upon a thing as much to be desired, and snatched at. Thus when Cybele went about to allure Theagenes to the lustful Embraces of Arface, finding him out of the Temple, in a By-apartment, she did (a) ἀρπασμα ποιῆν πρὸς ξυντυχίαν, that is, she snatch'd at the Occasion, or look'd upon it as a thing desirable for her Purpose ; and when none of her Proposals or Allurements would prevail with Theagenes to gratifie the Queen's Desires, she brake forth into this Admiration, (b) What Averseness from Love is this ! A young Man in the Flower of his Age thrusts from him, or refuses, a Woman like unto himself, and desirous of him, καὶ ἐχ' ἀρπασμα ἔδει ἐρμαιῶν ἠγείται τὸ πρῶγμα, and does not look upon this as a great Offer, and a thing very desirable : And when she had found out, that his Affection to Chariclea was the Cause of this Averseness, she proposeth to Arface the Death of Chariclea, as an expedient to gain his Affection, and (c) ἀρπασμα τὸ ῥηθὲν ἐπιήσαστο ἢ Ἀρσάκη, Arface embraces the Motion as a thing very desirable, or to be coveted. So that ἀρπασμα ἠγείσθαι, saith Scmidius, is rem optatam persequi, & studiosissime occupare.

That you have (d) endeavor'd to confirm the Doctor's Exposition by some other Passages of Antiquity, I need not remind you.

(a) *Heliodor. Lib. 7. Pag. 322.*

(b) *Pag. 340.*

(c) *Pag. 337.*

(d) *Script. Doct. p. 178, 179, 180.*

In the next Place, to use the Words of the same Commentator, τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῶν is to be or appear as God, or in the Likeness of God. So the Word ἴσα is adverbially used frequently in the Septuagint, answering to the Hebrew Caph. Job 5. 14. They grope in the noon-day, ἴσα νυκτὶ, as in the night. Chap. 10. 10. Hast thou not curdled me, ἴσα τυρῶ, as cheese? Chap. 11. 12. Man is born, ἴσα ὄνω ἐρημίτη, like a wild Asses colt. Chap. 13. 12. Your remembrance is, ἴσα σποδῶ, like unto ashes. And Ver. 20. He consumes, ἴσα ἀσκή, as a bottle. Chap. 15. 16. Man drinketh in iniquity, ἴσα ποτῶ, as drink. Chap. 24. 20. Wickedness shall be broken, ἴσα ξυλῶ, as a tree. Chap. 27. 16. He prepareth raiment, ἴσα πλῶ, as the clay. Chap. 28. 2. Brass is molten out of the stone, ἴσα λιθῶ, as the stone. Chap. 29. 14. I put on judgment, ἴσα διπλοῖδι, as a robe. Chap. 40. 15. He eateth grass, ἴσα βουῖν, as an ox. Isa. 51. 23. Thou hast laid thy body, ἴσα τῆ γῆ, as the earth. Wisd. 7. 1. I my self am a mortal man, ἴσιν ἄπισιν, like to all men; And the first voice I uttered was, πάντων ἴσα χλαίων, weeping as all others do, ver. 3.

Whether ἴσα does ever signify an exact Equality, I will not inquire: but what I have quoted, demonstrates, that it does not necessarily require, and that very frequently it will not bear or admit, that Sense. And therefore it is not to be forc'd upon it here. However, I will freely grant, that τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῶν imports full as much, as ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάραξιν. And that it can't possibly signify more, I am persuaded, no Man in his Wits will desire me to prove.

As for ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, you would have it translated, *he emptied himself*. I will take the liberty of observing, that it may as well be rendred, *he made himself mean, vile, or contemptible*. Either Version may

be admitted : but I shall not contend for either. And indeed I'm of Opinion, that they are in the End and Consequence the very same.

But the greatest Difficulty is about *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ ἰσάρεχον*. This Phrase is expressly apply'd to our Blessed Lord : but Learned Men have interpreted it very differently.

Such as would persuade us, that Christ is a mere Man, and that he did not exist before his Incarnation, pretend, that his being *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ* signifies his Power of working Miracles by the Finger of God during his Abode upon Earth. But this Exposition is utterly precarious. For tho' Christ had such a Power of working Miracles during his Abode upon Earth ; yet there is not the least Shadow of Proof, that this is what the Apostle meant by *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ ἰσάρεχον*. Neither this Phrase, nor any thing like it, has such a Signification in the Scriptures: nor is it the natural and obvious Meaning of the Words themselves. Nay, on the contrary, there are just Objections against this Explanation. For tho' *Moses*, and the Prophets, and our Savior's Disciples, wrought so many Miracles, and their Power of doing so is expressed by such a Variety of Phrases ; yet this Phrase is never once us'd to denote it by any Writer whatsoever. Besides, Christ's being *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ*, is oppos'd to his *κένωσις*, and being *ἐν μορφῇ δούλου*. What then can his *κένωσις* and being *ἐν μορφῇ δούλου* signify, upon this Supposition ? Did Christ ever want the Power of working Miracles ? And can his *κένωσις* and being *ἐν μορφῇ δούλου* bear such a Sense ? Besides, if his being *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ* signifies his Power of working Miracles ; how could it be said, that he did not earnestly desire to be *ἴσιν θεῶν*, which is certainly equivalent to his being *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ* ? Did not Christ always earnestly desire

fire to continue possess'd of, and to exert, that Divine Power, by which he demonstrated the Truth of his Mission? But I need not spend more Time in the Confutation of this arbitrary Fausety.

It may be imagined perhaps, by others, that Christ did therefore *ἐν μορφή θεῶ ἰσάρεχεν*, because he was the Great Prophet. For our Savior assures us, that the Psalmist called them Gods, unto whom the Word of God came, John 10. 35. And he confirms the Psalmist's Use of that Phrase by subjoining immediately, *and the Scripture cannot be broken*. Now those unto whom the Word of God came, were inspir'd Persons. Thus the Word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, Chap. 1. Ver. 2, 4, 11. that is, God reveled his Will to him by Inspiration. And accordingly God said to Moses concerning Aaron his Brother, *he shall be thy Spokesman unto the People: and he shall be, even he shall be to thee* (לפה), that is, as it should be translated) a Mouth; *and thou shalt be to him* (לאלהים), that is, as it should be translated) a God, Exod. 4. 16. And again, God said to Moses, *See I have made thee a God to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy Prophet. Thou shalt speak all that I command thee: and Aaron thy brother shall speak unto Pharaoh, that he send the children of Israel out of his land*, Exod. 7. 1, 2. In these Places, Moses is stiled a God to Aaron and Pharaoh, because he was inspired, and they learned the Will of God from him. And consequently our Savior, who received the Spirit without Measure, might more justly have been stiled a God upon that Account, than any other inspired Person whatsoever. And if he might have been justly stiled a God upon the account of his being the Great Prophet; why might he not be said *ἐν μορφή θεῶ ἰσάρεχεν* for that Reason?

I answer therefore, that tho' our Savior did certainly deserve the Appellation of a God, upon the account of his being inspired, much more justly than any other Prophet whatsoever; nay, if that very Appellation had been given him, upon that very account, a thousand times over (as it never once is in all the Bible) yet it can't be said, that he was ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ upon the account of his being inspired. For, as I observ'd before, the Apostle opposes his being ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ to his κένωσις, and being ἐν μορφῇ δούλου. If therefore his being ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ signifies his being inspired; what can his κένωσις and being ἐν μορφῇ δούλου mean? Did Christ ever cease to be inspired? Can any Christian bear such a blasphemous Supposition? Besides, 'tis said, that when he was ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ, he did not earnestly desire to be ἴσα θεῶ; that is, he did not earnestly desire to continue ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ, which is equivalent to εἶναι ἴσα θεῶ, but was pleased ἐουπὸν κενεῖν, and to take μορφὴν δούλου. But is not this detestably false, upon Supposition, that his being ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ, and consequently his being ἴσα θεῶ, denotes his being inspired? For did Christ ever cease to desire the Continuance of the Spirit's Presence with him? Or did he ever throw it up, or cast it off? This Exposition therefore cannot stand.

And indeed, let Men strain their Wits as hard as they please, they will never be able to make ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ ὑπάρχων applicable to our Savior during his Abode upon Earth. And accordingly, not only your self, but the Generality of Writers, especially those who affirm that the WORD, or divine Nature of Christ, is very God, do unanimously and zealously contend, that Christ did ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ ὑπάρχειν before the Incarnation. The Truth is, this is so plainly the obvious Meaning of the Apostle's Expressions;

Expressions; that as the common Sense of Mankind has led them to understand him thus, so one would wonder, how any Person can think them capable of a different Interpretation. For is not that State, wherein Christ did *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ ὑπάρχειν*, manifestly oppos'd to, and distinguish'd from, and suppos'd inconsistent with, that State in which he existed, after he had condescended *ἑαυτὸν κενῶν*, and *μορφῶ δέλε λαβεῖν*? And could he then be in those two opposite and distinct, nay, inconsistent States, at the same time? And did he not *ἑαυτὸν κενῶν* and *μορφῶ δέλε λαβεῖν*, when he became incarnat, *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων ἡυόμνηθ*? For does not that Phrase manifestly mean his Incarnation? Wherefore that State, wherein he did *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ ὑπάρχειν*, was prior to his Incarnation, and was left by him, when he vouchsaf'd to take upon him Flesh and Blood.

Besides, 'tis remarkable, that these Words, *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων ἡυόμνηθ*, are so placed, that they are necessarily appropriated to that State, in which Christ existed, after he did *ἑαυτὸν κενῶν* and *μορφῶ δέλε λαβεῖν*, and can't be extended to that State, in which 'tis said that he did *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ ὑπάρχειν*. For there are two opposit Branches of the Apostle's Words, the latter of which begins at *Ἄλλὰ*, and is thereby totally separated from what goes before. Now these Words, *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων ἡυόμνηθ*, concludes this latter Branch, and must therefore appertain to it: But they can't be extended to the former Branch also with any tolerable Congruity of Speech. For had the Apostle meant, that our Lord was *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων*, that is, Incarnat, at that time, of which he expressly affirms, that he did *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ ὑπάρχειν*, as well as when he had vouchsaf'd *ἑαυτὸν κενῶν* and *μορφῶ δέλε λαβεῖν*: He would certainly have plac'd *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων ἡυόμνηθ* in the

the former Branch, and not have made those Words the very Conclusion of the latter. He would have said thus, or to this purpose, ὅς ἐσ' ὁμοιωματὶ ἀνθρώπων ἡθρομυθησάμενος, καίπερ ἐν μορφῇ θεῶν ὑπέσχετο, ἔχ' ἀρπαγμὴν ἠγύσασατο ἕως ἴσα θεῶν, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, κ. τ. λ. This would naturally have express'd his Meaning; whereas the present Disposition of his Phrases confines ἐν ὁμοιωματὶ ἀνθρώπων ἡθρομυθησάμενος to Christ's Afterstate, to his κένωσις, when he did μορφῶν δέλου λαβεῖν: nor can we fasten any other Intention on St. Paul, without taking such Liberty, as his usual Diction does not warrant, and consequently we must not arrogate to our selves.

Nay farther, our Lord himself says, *And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was,* John 17. 5. This plainly shews, that our Lord left a glorious State, which he did not enjoy during his abode upon Earth. Nay, this very Apostle says, *Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich,* 2 Cor. 8. 9. But was Christ both Poor and Rich at the same time? Did he not therefore leave his Riches, and become Poor? Was he not then Rich, or Glorious and Happy, before his Incarnation: and did he not become Poor, that is, mean and miserable, by it? These Texts are notoriously parallel to that which we are considering; and they do all of them speak of a prior State of Glory, which Christ left; and a posterior State of Contempt and Sorrow, which he voluntarily assum'd by being Incarnate.

Nay farther still, were the Apostle's Words in this disputed Place fairly capable of different Senses; yet we ought to understand them in that Sense, which I have been contending for, and which

Mankind

Mankind have usually put upon them, for this plain Reason. The Apostle is pressing his Disciples to Humility and Condescension from the Example of Christ. And it can't be doubted, but that Christ's leaving a glorious State preceding his Incarnation, merely to do us good, and redeem our Souls, would make the Apostle's Argument from his Example much stronger, than if he urg'd only what Christ did upon Earth, without taking notice of his leaving a preceding State of Glory. Since therefore the Apostle certainly knew, what the Blessed Jesus left at his Incarnation; we must suppose, that he took into his Argument that Glory, which Christ enjoy'd before he was cloath'd with Flesh and Blood; unless we can imagin, in spite of the good Manners due to an Apostle, and in manifest Contradiction to St. Paul's constant Practice, of pressing every thing to the very best Advantage, that he purposely omitted what was most of all to his own Purpose, and designedly enervated his own Reasoning.

Upon the whole, I think, 'tis very clear, that our Savior did ἐν μορφῇ θεῶν παύσασθαι before his Incarnation; and that when he became Incarnate, he left that State in which he did ἐν μορφῇ θεῶν παύσασθαι, and which he had till then enjoy'd. The Question therefore is, in what Sense Christ did ἐν μορφῇ θεῶν παύσασθαι before his Incarnation.

Those that affirm the WORD, or Divine Nature of Christ, to be very God, have endeavor'd to establish that Doctrine by this very Phrase. For they imagin, that ἐν μορφῇ θεῶν παύσασθαι signifies to be really and truly God; because they suppose, that being ἐν μορφῇ δούλου signifies being really and truly a Servant. Now tho' none can more heartily believe, that the WORD, or Divine Nature of Christ,

is very God, than I my self; and I hope, in due time, to give you sufficient Demonstration of the Truth of that Doctrin: yet I must own, I am fully perswaded, that ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ ὑπάρχειν does not signify being really and truly God. For is this Phrase, or any thing like it, ever us'd in that Sense in any part of the Bible? Or rather, if the Apostle meant to express Christ's being very God, would he use this Way of Expression? Is it in any measure proper, or tolerable? Does not μορφή denote a Shape, Form, Likeness, or Appearance? And could he that is very God, be said to be ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ, that is, in his own μορφή? Christ might indeed be ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων, and be found ὅμοιος ὡς ἄνθρωπος, that is, be a Man like others; because with respect to his Manhood there are so many others of the same kind, whom he resembles and appears like: But 'tis absurd to say, that a Being which has not any other of the same Kind, is in its own μορφή, that is, resembles or appears to be like it self. Besides, Christ's being ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ, is opposed to his Humiliation, and being ἐν μορφῇ δούλου. So that whilst he was ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ, he was not ἐν μορφῇ δούλου, and vice versa. For ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε μορφῷ δούλου λαβὼν, he emptied (or debased) himself, taking (or by taking, or when he took) upon him the form of a servant. But can this be said of him that is very God? Can the very God cease to be what he is? If being ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ is being the very God, could Christ empty himself of his μορφή θεῶ at his Incarnation?

But in truth, the very Ground of this Interpretation is utterly false. 'Tis commonly argued, that being ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ does therefore signify being really and truly God, because being ἐν μορφῇ δούλου signifies being really and truly a Servant. But was Christ at any time during his Humiliation, really and truly

a Servant? Nothing less. He did indeed condescend to be a Servant, that is, to perform servile Offices, upon some Occasions; but at the same time he claim'd the Authority of a Master over those very Persons, for or towards whom he perform'd servile Offices. The Condition of our Savior therefore, whilst upon Earth, tho' 'twas always mean, yet was not that of a Servant. And consequently, since his being *ἐν μορφῇ δούλου* can't possibly signify more, than his acting sometimes as a Servant, tho' he was not such by Condition of Life: 'tis plain, that his being *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ* can't possibly signify his being by Nature the very God.

What then is meant by that Phrase? Why, one would think, it should scarce need to be unfolded. Every body knows that *μορφῇ* signifies a Shape, Form, Likeness or Appearance; and consequently, to be *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ* must denote to appear as God, the very same which is meant by *ἢ ἴσα θεῶ*. I need not observe, that God being immaterial, cannot have any such Form, Likeness, Shape or Appearance, as will admit of a visible Resemblance of his Divine Nature. And therefore Christ's appearing as God, must signify his appearing *for*, or *in the stead of*, or *as the Ambassador of*, the very God in some such manner, that the very God himself was then personated by Christ. So that his being *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ* signifies his acting God's Part: even as his being *ἐν μορφῇ δούλου* betokens his appearing as a Servant, his condescending to act a Servant's Part, by performing servile Offices, as he sometimes did. Wherefore the Being which was *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ*, was not that God, in whose *μορφῇ* he was; as the Being which was *ἐν μορφῇ δούλου*, was not really a Servant, that is, a Servant by Condition of Life; but only acted as such

such on some Occasions. Now this Interpretation I shall justify by the Holy Scriptures.

You well (e) observe, that it is the constant Doctrine of all the Primitive Writers of the Church, that every Appearance of God the Father, in the Old Testament, was Christ appearing in the Person of the Father (ἐν μορφῇ θεῶν) in the Form of God, as being the Image of the invisible God, Col. 1. 15. Of Him, whom no Man has seen at any time, Job. 1. 18. Of Him, whom no Man has seen nor can see, 1 Tim. 6. 16. But I shall descend to Particulars, that I may shew, how far the inspired Writings do give countenance to this ancient Notion.

1. Then, Let us compare the following Texts of Scripture.

And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed.

And Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt.

And when the Lord saw, that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, here am I.

And he said, Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the

And when forty years were expired, there appeared to him in the wilderness of mount Sina, an angel of the Lord in a flame of fire in a bush.

When Moses saw it, he wondered at the sight: and as he drew near to behold it, the voice of the Lord came unto him,

Saying, I am the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Then Moses trembled, and durst not behold.

Then said the Lord to him, Put off thy shoes from

(e) Script. Doct. p. 102.

place whereon thou standest, is holy ground. thy feet: for the place where thou standest, is holy ground.

Moreover he said, I am the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face: for he was afraid to look upon God.

And the Lord said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters: for I know their sorrows.

And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land, unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey; unto the place of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites.

Now therefore, behold, the cry of the children of Israel is come up to me: and I have also seen the oppression wherewith the Egyptians oppress them.

Come now therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh,

I have seen, I have seen the affliction of my people which is in Egypt, and I have heard their groaning, and am come down to deliver them. And now come, I will send thee into Egypt.

This Moses whom they refus'd, saying, Who made thee a ruler and a judge? the same did God send to be a ruler and a deliverer by the hands of the angel which appeared to him in the bush. Acts 7. 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35.

raoh, that thou mayst bring forth my people, the children of Israel out of Egypt. Exod. 3. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God, and they stood at the nether part of the mount.

And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly.

And when the voice of the trumpet sounded long, and waxed louder and louder, Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice.

And the Lord came down upon mount Sinai, on the top of the mount: and the Lord called Moses up to the top of the mount, and Moses went up.

And the Lord said unto Moses, Go down, charge the people, lest they break through unto the Lord to gaze, and many of them perish.

And let the priests also, which come near to the Lord, sanctifie

This is he that was in the church in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us. ver. 38.

Who have received the law, by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it. ver. 53.

sanctifie themselves, lest the Lord break forth upon them.

And Moses said unto the Lord, The people cannot come up to mount Sinai: for thou chargedest us, saying, Set bounds about the mount, and sanctifie it.

And the Lord said unto him, Away, get thee down, and thou shalt come up, thou, and Aaron with thee: but let not the priests and the people break through, to come up unto the Lord, lest he break forth upon them.

So Moses went down unto the people, and spake unto them, Exod. 19. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25.

And God spake all these words, saying,

I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

Thou shalt have no other Gods before me, &c. Exod. 20. 1, 2, 3, &c.

And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire. Deut. 4. 12.

Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven. Nehem. 9. 13.

The Law is said to have been ordained by angels, Gal. 3. 19.

The word spoken by angels, Heb. 2. 2.

'Tis plain from hence, that what the Lord, *viz.* the very God, is said to have don and spoken, was in Reality don and spoken by his Angel, who acted in his Name and Stead, and spake the very Words of God, like unto God himself, or after the same manner as if God himself had personally spoken them.

And accordingly we read, that *an angel of the Lord came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, I made you to go up out of Egypt, and have brought you unto the land which I swore unto your fathers; and I said, I will never break my covenant with you. And ye shall make no league with the inhabitants of this land; you shall throw down their altars: but ye have not obeyed my voice. Why have ye done this? Wherefore I also said, I will not drive them out from before you: but they shall be as thorns in your sides, and their gods shall be a snare unto you. And it came to pass, when the angel of the Lord spake these words unto all the children of Israel, that the people lift up their voice and wept,* Judges 2. 1, 2, 3, 4. I dare say, I need not make any Observations upon this Message. For, not to mention other Particulars, common Sense will inform the meanest Reader, that the Angel could not call the Covenant with the Israelites, which was so certainly God's Covenant with them, by the Name of *my Covenant*, if he did not thus speak the Words of God.

But I shall give a Variety of other Instances.

And the angel of the Lord found her by a fountain of water in the wilderness, by the fountain in the way to Shur: And he said, Hagar, Sarab's maid, whence camest thou? and whither wilt thou go? and she said, I flee from the face of my mistress Sarab. And the angel of the Lord said unto her, Return to thy mistress, and submit thy self under her hands. And the angel of the Lord said unto her, I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be

numbered for multitude. And the angel of the Lord said unto her, behold, thou art with child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael; because the Lord hath heard thy affliction. And he will be a wild man: his hand will be against every man, and every mans hand against him: and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren. And she called the name of the Lord that spake unto her, Thou God seest me: for she said, have I also here looked after him that seeth me? Gen. 16. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. And God heard the voice of the lad, and the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven, and said unto her, what aileth thee, Hagar? fear not: for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hand; for I will make him a great nation, Gen. 21. 17, 18. And the angel of the Lord called unto him out of heaven, and said, Abraham, Abraham. And he said, Here am I. And he said, lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me, Gen. 22. 11, 12. And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, The angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads, and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac, and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth, Gen. 48. 15, 16.

These Texts are plain Proofs of what I have before observ'd.

Again, in the History of Joshua we read thus, And it came to pass when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lift up his eyes and looked, and behold there stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand: and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries? And he said, Nay, but as captain of the host of the Lord am I now come. And Joshua

Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my Lord unto his servant? And the captain of the Lords host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy: and Joshua did so, Josh. 5. 13, 14, 15.

Thus ends the Fifth Chapter; and then immediately follows a Continuation of the same Appearance and Discourse in these Words, *Now Jericho was straitly shut up, because of the children of Israel: none went out, and none came in. And the Lord said unto Joshua, See, I have given into thine hand Jericho, and the king thereof, and the mighty men of valour, Josh. 6. 1, 2.*

Farther, God's Manifestation of himself to Gideon is very remarkable. *And there came an angel of the Lord, and sat under an oak which was in Ophrah, that pertained unto Joash the Abi-Ezrite: and his son Gideon threshed wheat by the wine-press, to hide it from the Midianites. And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him, and said unto him, The Lord is with thee, thou mighty man of valour. And Gideon said unto him, Oh my lord, if the Lord be with us, why then is all this befallen us? and where be all his miracles which our fathers told us of, saying, Did not the Lord bring us up from Egypt? but now the Lord hath forsaken us, and deliver'd us into the hands of the Midianites. And the Lord looked upon him, and said, Go in this thy might, and thou shalt save Israel from the hand of the Midianites: have I not sent thee? And he said unto him, Oh my lord, wherewith shall I save Israel? behold, my family is poor in Manasseh, and I am the least in my fathers house. And the Lord said unto him, Surely I will be with thee, and thou shalt smite the Midianites as one man. And he said unto him, If now I have found grace in thy sight, then shew me a sign that thou talkest with me. Depart not hence, I pray thee, until I come unto thee, and bring forth my present, and set it before thee.*

And

And he said, I will tarry until thou come again. And Gideon went in, and made ready a kid, and unleavened cakes of an ephah of flour; the flesh he put in a basket, and he put the broth in a pot, and brought it out unto him under the oak, and presented it. And the angel of God said unto him, Take the flesh, and the unleavened cakes, and lay them upon this rock, and pour out the broth. And he did so. Then the angel of the Lord put forth the end of the staff that was in his hand, and touched the flesh, and the unleavened cakes, and there rose fire up out of the rock, and consumed the flesh, and the unleavened cakes: then the angel of the Lord departed out of his sight. And when Gideon perceived that he was an angel of the Lord, Gideon said, Alas, O Lord God: for because I have seen an angel of the Lord face to face, Judges 6. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22. This is manifestly one and the same History and Appearance; and 'tis expressly attributed to the Angel, v. 11, 12, 20, 21, tho' 'tis expressly attributed to the Lord, v. 14, 16. And tho' Gideon answer'd the Lord, yet he certainly convers'd with the Angel, v. 17, 18, 19, 22.

I shall only add the following Passage of the Prophet Zechary. *And he shewed me Josphua the high priest, standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan, even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee: Is not this a brand pluckt out of the fire? Now Josphua was cloathed with filthy garments, and stood before the angel. And he answered, and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will cloath thee with change of raiment. And I said, Let them set a fair mitre upon his head: so they set a fair mitre upon his head, and*
cloathed

cloathed him with garments, and the angel of the Lord stood by. Zech. 3. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

The Truth is, 'twas usual in those Parts for such as deliver'd Messages from others, to speak after the same manner, as those very Persons would have don, in whose Names they came; and those that return'd Answers by Messengers, spake as if those very Persons were present, in whose Names the Messengers came. The History of our Savior and the Centurion furnishes us with a notorious Proof of this. For let us compare the two Evangelists.

St. Matthew says,

And when Jesus was entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a Centurion, beseeching him,

And saying, Lord, my servant lieth at home sick of the palsie, grievously tormented.

And Jesus saith unto him, I will come and heal him.

The Centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst come under my roof: but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed.

For I am a man under authority, having souldiers under me: and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth: and to another, Come, and he cometh: and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it.

When

St. Luke says,

Then Jesus went with them. And when he was now not far from the house, the Centurion sent friends to him, saying unto him, Lord, trouble not thy self, for I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof.

Wherefore neither thought I my self worthy to come unto thee: but say in a word, and my servant shall be healed.

For I also am a man set under authority, having under me souldiers, and I say unto one, Go, and he goeth: and to another, Come, and he cometh: and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it. Luke 7, 6, 7, 8.

When Jesus heard it, he marvell'd, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel.

And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven.

But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

And Jesus said unto the Centurion, Go thy way, and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the self-same hour. Matt. 8.

5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

'Tis plain from the seventh Verse of St. *Luke*, that the Centurion did not come to Christ in Person; but that all this was done by Messengers. And tho' the thirteenth Verse of St. *Matthew's* Relation seems address'd to the Centurion in Person; yet it must be remembred, that when *Abigail* return'd an Answer to *David's* Messengers, she spake as if *David* had been personally present. For we read thus, *And when the servants of David were come to Abigail to Carmel, they spake unto her, saying, David sent*

sent us unto thee to take thee to him to wife. And she arose, and bowed her self on her face to the earth, and said, Behold, let thine handmaid be a servant to wash the feet of the servants of my lord. 1 Sam. 25. 40, 41. Our Savior therefore told the Centurion's Friends, what Answer they should return in his Name; and he expressed himself in the same manner, as if he had spoken to the Centurion himself. And accordingly in the Holy Scriptures we often find Matters deliver'd to Messengers in such a Style, as implies, that they were to deliver the Words of their Principals after the same manner, as if their Principals were personally present. Nay, 'tis exceedingly observable, that even Men have deliver'd Charges from God in such Words, as God himself would have us'd, had he spoken personally. For Instance, we read of *Moses*, that *he gave Joshua the son of Nun a charge, and said, Be strong and of a good courage: for thou shalt bring the children of Israel into the land which I swore unto them: and I will be with thee.* Deut. 31. 23. And *Jeremiah* is commanded to say to the *Jews* (without any Preface of *Thus saith the Lord*, or the like) these very Words, *Like as ye have forsaken me, and served strange Gods in your land; so shall ye serve strangers in a land that is not yours.* Jer. 5. 19.

Thus you see, that in conformity to the Eastern Custom, the Words utter'd by an Angel sent from God, are usually the very same, which God himself would have spoken, had he personally conversed with Man. In such Cases, the Angel acts in the stead of the very God, uses his Expressions, and personats his Divine Majesty. And I am persuaded, that the Reason, why Angels are so often call'd *אלהים*, is because they so frequently transacted Matters with Mankind in the Name of the very God.

2. When the Lord did thus by his Angel converse with Man, we are sometimes told, and 'tis several other times imply'd, that the Lord *appeared*. And we find, that in the very same Relations, Mention is indifferently and promiscuously made, sometimes of the very God, and at other times of his Angel. This is so notorious, that I forbear to point at the particular Places of Scripture, which evince it. Now 'tis certain, that the very God himself cannot be represented by any bodily Shape: but yet, when God, that is, when God by his Angel, did appear; there was usually some visible Glory, Brightness, or Form, which was truly and properly a *μορφὴ θεῶν*, an *Appearance of God*, or that in which that Angel, who personated the Divine Majesty, became in some Sense Visible. And the Angel that did thus appear in God's stead, and converse with Man in his Name and Words, was to that Man truly and properly, in the strict and natural Sense of the Words, *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶν* and *ἴσα θεῶν*.

3. That our Lord Christ is stiled an Angel, even *the Angel* (or as our Translation readeth it, *the Messenger*) of the Covenant, is allowed on all sides; nor can any Person doubt of it, who compares *Mal.* 3. 1. with *Matt.* 11. 10. *Mark* 1. 2. *Luke* 1. 16. and 7. 27. And therefore the *Angel of God's presence*, *II. 63. 9.* is justly understood to be our Savior Christ; whom also, as you truly (f) assert, God meant, when he said, *Behold, I send an Angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not, for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him. But if thou shalt indeed obey his*

(f) Reply to the Bishop of Chester, P. 246.

voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries. For mine Angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites: and I will cut them off, Exod. 23. 20, 21, 22, 23. For God spake those very Words by that very Angel, viz. our Lord; and as you justly (g) note, It is the same Manner of speaking, as occurs in all Writers, when any one is introduced speaking as the Representative of another, and mentioning himself (as Grammarians speak) in the third Person. Thus also we may interpret the History of the Institution of Circumcision, Gen. 17. and that of the Angel's appearing to Abraham and Lot, Gen. 18. But concerning our Savior's being God's Angel, there will be no Controversy; and therefore I need not enlarge.

Thus then 'tis certain, that when the very God appear'd in the Old Testament, some Angel did at those Times personat the Divine Majesty, and was consequently ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ and ἰσὺ θεῶ. Now since our Lord Christ is so often stiled God's Angel, and so expressly affirmed to have been ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ and ἰσὺ θεῶ, which Phrases are never once attributed to any other Angel; therefore I conclude, that our Savior did, ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ ἰσαπέχων, and was ἰσὺ θεῶ, when he acted in the Appearances of the very God, and then personated or represented the Divine Majesty, which we do not find, that any other Angel ever did, tho' so many of them have been employ'd as the very God's Embassadors to Men.

It may now be proper, before I leave this Point, to consider one Difficulty. The Law is

(g) *Ibid.* p. 247.

stiled *the Word spoken by Angels*, Heb. 2. 2. and is upon that account opposed to the Gospel, which was delivered by *the Lord*, v. 3. and the Apostle says, *unto the Angels hath he* (*viz.* the very God) *not put in subjection*, *οικουμένην μέλλουσιν* (that is, the Gospel State, tho' we literally render it) *the world to come*, which notwithstanding is subjected to Christ. How then could Christ be that Angel which deliver'd the Law, and did at that Time personate the very God? I do not mention this as an Objection which either of us can start against the other, but as a Matter which deserves to be clear'd upon this Occasion; and in the Solution of which you and I shall agree, in opposition to such as are apt to make a very ill use of those Passages of Scripture, which they can't account for.

I shall not therefore plead, that our Savior is expressly call'd *ἄγγελος*, *an angel* (tho' we translate it *a Messenger*) Mal. 3. 1. as I have already noted (for the Difficulty will still return) but I observe, that *ἄγγελος* and *ἄγγελος* do originally signify any Messenger in general, even one Man sent by another Man. Thus *Jacob* sent *ἄγγελοι*, *messengers*, say the Septuagint (and we translate it *Messengers*) to his brother, Gen. 32. 3. Nay, St. *John Baptist* is call'd *ἄγγελος*, even from God to Men, Mal. 3. 1. Matt. 11. 10. and elsewhere. From hence those Spiritual Beings, whom God imployes as his Messengers and Ambassadors to Men, are emphatically call'd Angels, by the Appropriation of a common Word to a particular Sense. We must therefore always observe, when *ἄγγελοι* or *ἄγγελοι* are mention'd in Scripture, whether the Context obliges us to interpret the Word in a large or a restrain'd manner. Now our Savior, before his Incarnation, might justly be call'd an Angel,
upon

upon the account of his being sent from God to Men, when he personated the very God; even tho' he was not a Spirit precisely of the same Kind or Degree with those, whom God at other times employ'd, and of which there was a vastly great and innumerable Host. But after he became incarnat, he might very properly be distinguish'd from Angels; that Name being usually given to, and understood of, such Spirits as were not embodied. The Apostle therefore might well oppose our Savior, when he was at his Incarnation united to the WORD, and become the *Son of God*, and *appointed Heir of all things* (and thereby dignified above all created Beings) even to himself, when consider'd only as God's *Angel* or Messenger to Mankind. And it might well be said, that the Gospel State is *not subjected to Angels*, as was that of the Law, altho' the same Person was the *Angel* under the Law, who was the *Son* and the *Lord* under the Gospel. Because the wonderful Alteration of his Condition by his personal Union with the WORD, and his special Sonship to God, and Designation to the Dominion of the Universe, gave the justest Ground for that Antithesis. For since the whole Stress of what the Apostle says, lies upon the Dignity of the Person empower'd to act and govern; 'tis certain, that the Dignity conferr'd upon the Man Christ at his Incarnation, made him in that respect as different from himself before that Dignity was conferr'd, as if two distinct Beings had been spoken of. And whoever considers the Apostles Words in the Places before cited, will find, that the whole of his Reasoning turns upon this one thing.

I think, 'twill be proper to add farther, that tho' one Angel only is mention'd, *Acts* 7. 35. as concern'd in the Delivery of the Law; whereas the

Delivery of it is attributed to *Angels* in the Plural Number, *v. 53. Gal. 3. 19.* and *Heb. 2. 2.* yet this can create no Difficulty to us, or be objected against our joint Assertion, that Christ was the Angel which deliver'd the Law. For, 'tis well known, that the Plural Number is often put for the Singular in the Holy Scriptures. We have a remarkable Instance of this Kind, *Heb. 9. 23.* *It was therefore necessary, that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.* 'Tis plain, that the better Sacrifices can mean only, that one Sacrifice which Christ offer'd upon the Cross. And accordingly *Angels* in the Plural may be put for *Angel* in the Singular Number. But, 2. Other Angels attended at the Delivery of the Law besides our Savior, who was the immediat Deliverer, and the principal Being entrusted with that Affair; so that the literal Sense is preserv'd, and the Difference in point of Number vanishes of course. This Exposition is warranted by *Moses's* Words, *Deut. 33. 2.* *The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints: from his right hand went a fiery law for them.* 'Tis also confirm'd by the Psalmist's Words, *The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of Angels: the Lord is among them as in Sinai, in the holy place,* *Psal. 68. 17.*

Here I can't but repeat a very pertinent Observation of yours. You (*b*) say, that the following Words [*ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε* But emptied himself] shew those immediatly foregoing, not to be part of the preceding Character of Christ's Greatness, but part of the consequent

(b) *Ibid.* p. 178.

Account of his Humiliation. For so the Construction is more usual and natural, and the Connexion plainer. [Tho' he was in the Form of God, yet he was not greedy of being honor'd as God; but (on the contrary) willingly emptied himself of his Glory.] But in the other Interpretation the Word [ἀλλὰ] has not so natural a Place: [He thought it not Robbery to be equal with God; but yet nevertheless (not so properly ἀλλὰ, but rather ἀλλ' ἑμῶς, or ὁμῶς ὃ) he emptied himself, &c.

You will now give me leave to observe in my turn (and I doubt not of the Concurrence of your Judgment) that the whole seventh Verse ought to be literally rendred thus, *But he emptied himself, taking the appearance of a servant, being in the likeness of men; that is, he divested himself of that Glory which he enjoy'd; and when he was incarnat, he condescended to appear as a Servant. For ἐν ὁμοιωματι ἀνθρώπων ἡρόμηνυθῆ, tho' plac'd after μορφῇ θεού λαβών, yet ought to be construed before it. And then the next Verse runs very naturally thus, καὶ And (or as we should say in our own Tongue; Nay farther, or Moreover) being found in fashion as a man, &c.*

Lastly, the Apostle says, that our Savior was exalted *ὡς δόξαν θεῶ πατρὸς, to the Glory of God the Father.* For this beneficent Action towards Christ Jesus, necessarily redounded to the honor of God the Author of it. Thus that Phrase manifestly signifies; and thus it is used by this Apostle, particularly in this Epistle, *Phil 1. 11. Being filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ unto the praise and glory of God.* Thus also the same Apo-

He expresses himself elsewhere; for Instance, *Rom. 15. 7. Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us, to the glory of God. 1 Cor. 10. 31. Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.*

I will now subjoin such a Paraphrase of the whole Passage, as is agreeable to the Sentiments of us both. *St. Paul* is pressing Humility and Condescension from the Example of our Blessed Savior, saying,

v. 5. *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus,*

v. 6. *Who being in the form of God, that is, tho' he appear'd in the stead of the very God himself, and personated his Divine Majesty, yet he did not earnestly covet to be, or desire still to continue, as God, viz. as personating the Divine Majesty of the very God:*

v. 7. *But emptied himself of that vast Glory (or made himself vile and mean) and condescended so far, that when he was incarnat, and in the likeness of other men, he did not appear in great and splendid Circumstances, but he even took upon him the form or appearance of a servant. For tho' his Condition was not that of a Servant, yet he vouchsaf'd upon some Occasions to perform servile Actions.*

v. 8. *And farther still (or nay further) during the time of this his Incarnation, being found thus in fashion as a Man, he humbled himself to such a degree, that he not only sometimes acted as a Servant, but he was content to be debas'd yet lower, and became obedient unto a violent death; and that very Death also*

also was the most ignominious, for 'twas even the death of the cross.

v. 9. *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, who voluntarily ceas'd to be in the Form of God, and vouchsafed to be Incarnat, and during that Incarnation to perform the meanest Offices, and even to die the Death of a Malefactor; God, I say, has therefore highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name:*

v. 10. *That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth:*

v. 11. *And that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to (or, if you please, in) the glory of God the father, who has conferred such Dignity on him, that he is now become Lord of the Creation, and the Object of Religious Worship.*

Thus far, if I understand you right, we are perfectly agreed. 'Tis evident at first sight, and you plainly acknowledge, that the Blessed Jesus did exist before his Incarnation. For the Apostle, in this very place, ascribes his being Incarnat to his own free Choice, and grounds his Argument for our Practice of Humility and Condescension, upon our Savior's devesting himself of a glorious State, and voluntary Debasement of himself, when he became Man. The Question therefore now depending between us, is, what that intelligent Being was, which voluntarily debased or emptied it self of a glorious State, and condescended to be Incarnat, and to undergo such Temporal Hardships, and even the Death of a Malefactor, and was therefore afterwards exalted by the supreme God to a State of Power and Authority over all created Beings. I say, the Question is, what that intelligent Being was. That it was not the very God, neither of us

needs to be convinc'd. And therefore, those who acknowledge the Divine Nature of Christ to be the very God, must be forc'd, in consequence of their own Principles, to acknowledge, that 'twas the human Soul of Christ. For there is no other intelligent Being in the God-man, besides his Divine Nature, and his human Soul.

And indeed, I am amaz'd to think, that this Exposition has not been universally given by all the Patrons of the Orthodox Doctrin of the Trinity. As for the Preexistence of human Souls in general, I am fully persuaded, that 'tis (in the Words of a (i) late judicious Writer) *mere Suspicion and Conjecture, without any possibility of Proof; and there is this plain Reason against it, that no Man can be punished for his Amendment, who knows nothing of it. For it is inconsistent with the Nature and End of Punishment, that the Offender should not be made sensible of his Fault, especially when the Punishment is designed for his Amendment, as it is said to be in the present Case.* But as for the Preexistence of Christ's human Soul in particular, as it can't be charged with the least appearance of any one ill Consequence; as it can't be said, that 'tis upon any one Account improbable, or that it clashes with any one Text of Scripture: so the bare Admission of it as an Hypothesis, solves many Difficulties, which 'tis otherwise impossible to give any tolerable Account of upon any Principles whatsoever, without making the Holy Scriptures inconsistent with themselves.

I need not observe to you, what Influence this single Consideration has had upon diverse learned Persons, who have distinguished themselves by

(i) Dr. Jenkins's Reasonableness and Certainty of the Christian Religion, Vol. 2. Chap. 13.

their Writings on the Holy Trinity. The Course of that very Controversy, which your own *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* has occasion'd, affords us sufficient Instances of it. The present Bishop of Chester frankly (*k*) declares, That *there seems to be great Reason to believe the human Soul of Christ to have existed before the World; many Texts of Scripture being easily explain'd upon this Hypothesis, which 'tis difficult to account for any other Way.* And the Author of the *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity Vindicated* (which Book was usher'd into the World, and recommended, by my late excellent Friend Mr. Nelson's truly Christian Letter to you (*l*) says, *That the Angel or Christ is a distinct Subject, or substantially different from the Name of God in him, not in respect of his Divine Nature, but of a created Nature assumed by the WORD at the Beginning of all Things, as the first Fruits of the Creation, and in respect of which he may be more properly and accurately denominat'd an Angel; may be readily as-sented to as a strong Probability, not a little favor'd by the Sacred Writings.* The same Gentleman repeats the same Notion (*m*) afterwards.

'Tis true, these your Antagonists have not enter'd into the Detail of that Dispute; and consequently they have not oblig'd you to return an Answer to those Arguments by which the Pre-existence of Christ's human Soul is evinc'd: But yet these occasional Affirmations do abundantly signify their respective Opinions; and demonstrat the Necessity of this Notion, in their Judgments, for the clearing of many Texts of Scripture.

(*k*) Bp. Gastrell's Remarks on Dr. Clarke's *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 47.

(*l*) p. 65.

(*m*) p. 103.

I shall take the liberty of instancing in but one, which as it does not affect the Controversy depending between your self and me ; so it affords a pregnant Proof of what those your learned Adverſaries have juſtly noted. St. Peter ſays, *For Chriſt alſo hath once ſuffered for ſins, the juſt for the unjuſt (that he might bring us to God) being put to death in the fleſh, but quickned by the (Power of the) ſpirit: By which (Power) alſo he went and preached unto the ſpirits in priſon; Which ſometime were diſobedient, when once the long-ſuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight ſouls were ſaved by water.*, 1 Pet. 3. 18, 19, 20. In theſe Words the Apoſtle affirms, 1. That Chriſt went and preached to thoſe Sinners in *Noah's Days*; 2. That Chriſt did ſo by the Spirit, that is, by the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt. I deſire therefore to be informed, how, or in what Senſe, the WORD or Divine Nature of Chriſt, which not only the Orthodox, but your ſelf alſo, do own to be at leaſt equal to the Holy Ghoſt, could go and preach to thoſe ancient Sinners, by the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt. That Chriſt's human Soul might do it as God's Angel (upon Suppoſition of its Pre-exiſtence) will eaſily be allowed.

But to return. Since this Notion of the Pre-exiſtence of Chriſt's human Soul is ſo perfectly free from all Poſſibility of doing Miſchief; certainly, if the Arguments alleg'd to prove, that the WORD, or Chriſt's Divine Nature, is the very God, are unanſwerably ſtrong (as I hope to ſhew they are) and there is no ground of Objection againſt them, but what may fairly be remov'd upon Suppoſition of this moſt innocent Aſſertion; we are indiſpenſably bound to embrace

brace it, as being virtually taught in all those Texts, which can't be clear'd without it.

I confess, it so effectually undermines and destroys the Opinion of those, who affirm the WORD, or Christ's Divine Nature, to be different from, and inferior to, the very God; that I can't wonder at your (*n*) calling it *a mere Fiction without any Ground* (tho' I am persuaded, could you at any time get quit of a strong Objection against a plausible Opinion, by making such an Hypothesis, you would readily come into it, and no reasonable Person would blame you for asserting and maintaining it) But 'tis strange, that tho' several great Men have purposely asserted it, yet a greater Number have not espy'd a Truth, which so effectually supports their own Cause, and ruins that of their Adversaries. And yet I believe a good Reason might be assign'd (were it worth while) for this Inadvertency.

However, waving bare Supposals (which this Doctrin does not stand in need of) let us endeavor after Certainty. Since the Blessed Jesus has but two Natures, and consequently but two intelligent Beings, united in his Person, *viz.* the WORD, and his human Soul; 'tis plain, that that Being of which St. Paul here affirms, that 'twas *ὁ μορφή θεῶ*, and *ἴσα θεῶ*, and afterwards emptied or debased it self by Incarnation, was either the WORD, or his human Soul. That it was not the WORD, if the WORD be the very God, is agreed between us. For tho' the WORD was certainly Incarnat, and the Incarnation of the WORD was unspeakable Condescension in him (and so is God's vouchsafing to be reconcil'd to fallen Man) yet the Incarnation

(*n*) Answer to the Bishop of Chester, p. 244.

can't be that Humiliation by *emptying* or *debasing himself*, which St. Paul here speaks of, and declares to have been rewarded with an exceeding *Exaltation*, upon Supposition that the WORD is the very God.

Let us inquire therefore, whether the WORD might here be meant by St. Paul, upon Supposition, that the WORD were inferior to the very God. For tho' I do by no means grant, that the WORD must be inferior to the very God, if the Apostle may be suppos'd to mean the WORD here (because I have other Arguments to prove, that the WORD is the very God, and consequently that this Exposition is impossible; and I think the Evidence of that Truth so great, that it obliges us to admit any other possible Exposition of this Passage) But I say, let us make Experiment, for your farther Conviction, whether the Apostle can be understood to speak of the WORD's being *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ* and *ἰσα θεῶ*, and afterwards emptying or debasing himself by Incarnation, and thereby meriting an exceeding Exaltation; upon Supposition that your own Opinion, *viz.* that the WORD is inferior to the very God, be true. For if it be made appear, that the Apostle can't mean all this of the WORD; even tho' the WORD be suppos'd inferior to the very God: then you must necessarily grant, upon your own Principles, that the Apostle speaks of the human Soul of Christ. And consequently we have Scripture Evidence of the Preexistence of Christ's human Soul, upon your Principles, as well as our own; that is, in short, Christ's human Soul did certainly preexist, whether your Notion of the Trinity be true, or no. And therefore you can't pretend, that his Preexistence is invented and asserted merely to serve a Turn.

Well

Well then, the Question is, whether the Apostle affirms in this Passage, that tho' the human Soul of Christ was *ἐν ἡρῶν θεῷ* and *ἵτα θεῷ*, it afterwards emptied it self of that Glory, or debased it self, by the Incarnation. As for those, that do already own the Preexistence of our Savior's human Soul, even tho' they had formerly inferr'd it from other Texts of Scripture, I dare say, they will readily assent to my Exposition of this Place, whatever their Opinion of the WORD, or Christ's Divine Nature, be. And as for those, who own the WORD, or Divine Nature of Christ, to be the very God, I have already prov'd (and I doubt not but you'll agree) that they are oblig'd by their own Principles, to interpret this Passage of Christ's human Soul preexisting before the Incarnation. My present Business therefore is, to convince such, as affirm the WORD, or Divine Nature of Christ, to be distinct from, and inferior to, the very God, and who do also flatly deny the Preexistence of our Savior's human Soul; I say, my Business is to convince those Persons, that this Passage of St. Paul does most certainly prove the Preexistence of Christ's human Soul. And this I shall do by shewing, that the Apostle can't be understood to mean the WORD, or Divine Nature of Christ, when he affirms of our Savior, that he was *ἐν ἡρῶν θεῷ* and *ἵτα θεῷ* before the Incarnation. For,

First, If the Apostle meant, that the WORD was *ἐν ἡρῶν θεῷ* and *ἵτα θεῷ* before the Incarnation; 'tis evident, that he purposely weaken'd the Force of his own Argument. To evince this, let it be observ'd, 1. That the WORD, or Divine Nature, is affirm'd to have been *θεός*, God, *ἐν ἀρχῇ*, in the beginning, which you own to mean before the Foundation of the World. 2. That if the human Soul of Christ did

did not preexist, you must be forc'd by your own Principles to acknowledge, that the WORD left at the Incarnation, not only the Glory of being $\epsilon\nu\ \mu\omicron\sigma\epsilon\phi\eta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ and $\iota\omicron\sigma\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, but even that Glory also, which he enjoy'd before the Creation of all things, when he could not be $\epsilon\nu\ \mu\omicron\sigma\epsilon\phi\eta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ and $\iota\omicron\sigma\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, that is, personat the very God. This is evident from *John* 17. 4, 5. where our Savior says to God, *I have glorified thee on earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* You well (o) observe, that the Socinian Interpretation of this Passage, is very harsh and unnatural: who understand it to signify only the Glory, which Christ had in the Foreknowledge and Predetermination of God. The plain and literal Meaning of the Words, is that which has been before expressed, Numb. 535. And what is that? Why, explaining the first Words of St. *John's* Gospel (viz. *in the beginning*) you (p) speak thus, *In the beginning] Before all Ages; before the Creation of the World; before the World was,* *John* 17. 5. And *Verf. 3. of this Chapter,* All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made. And *Ver. 10.* The world was made by him. Thus was this Phrase constantly understood in the Primitive Church: And nothing can be more forced and unnatural, than the Interpretation of the Socinian Writers; who understand, in the beginning, to signify only at the first Preaching of the Gospel. Wherefore, if Christ's human Soul did not preexist, this Passage of our Savior's Prayer must be meant of the WORD, or his Divine Nature. And accordingly you (q) say, that at his

(o) Script. Doct. p. 112.

(p) Pag. 85.

(q) Script. Doct. p. 367, 368.

Incarnation he emptied himself [ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν] *of that Glory, which he had with God before the World was.* And if so, 'tis evident, that his Divine Nature was not, at the Time of our Savior's praying, possess'd of that Glory, which it had before the Foundation of the World; but he pray'd to be restor'd to the Possession of it. And consequently his Divine Nature left, at the Incarnation, not only the Glory of being ἐμορφῆ θεῶ and ἴσα θεῶ (which was necessarily posterior to the Creation) but even that Glory which he enjoy'd before the Creation of all Things. 3. That an Argument for Humility and Condescension, drawn from Example, is by so much the stronger, by how much the more excellent the Person is represented, and the greater distance there is between his proper Condition and the Practice he submits to. 4. That being even a Secondary God, and the Maker of all created Beings, argues a Person to be more excellent, than being ἐμορφῆ θεῶ and ἴσα θεῶ, that is, the Being which personated God; which is the utmost that those Phrases do or can import, as has been fully shewn. For any created Being can personate God; whereas being next in Nature to the very God, and being the Creator of the Universe, must necessarily argue a vastly superior Excellency of Nature, than the personating of the very God amounts to or implies.

Let us now consider the Apostle's Argument for Humility and Condescension, as it stands upon your Principles. 'Tis drawn from the Example of Christ. And what is the Height of that Excellence, which Christ is said to have laid aside? Why, the Office of personating God. But was this all the Excellence that Christ laid aside upon your Principles? Did he not leave that Glory, which he had

had before the Creation of the World, as he was even ἐν ἀρχῇ, *in the Beginning*, θεός, *God*, and the *Creator of all things*? Would not this Consideration enforce the Argument from his Humility and Condescension vastly more, than that of his ceasing to personate God, or be God's Embassador to Men? Is not the Distance between his being by Nature next to the very God, and the Maker of all created Beings, and the servile Offices he discharged, vastly greater, than the Distance between those servile Offices and his personating God, which any other created Being is capable of?

The Apostle therefore, had he meant the WORD or Christ's Divine Nature, would not have argued thus, *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ ὡς ἄρχων* (personating God) *did not earnestly desire to be, or continue ἴσα θεῶ (like God, viz. in the aforesaid glorious Office) but debased himself, or emptied himself thereof, &c.* I say, the Apostle would not have argued thus, and thereby have in a great measure enervated the Force of Christ's Example: but he would have expressly call'd him θεός, *God*, as he does elsewhere, particularly 1 Tim. 3. 16. and accordingly he would have said, ὁ θεός ὡς ἄρχων, *who being himself God*; and then he would have subjoin'd, ἐν ᾧ ἐκτίθη τὰ πάντα, τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἕγενοῖς, ἢ τὰ ἐπὶ τῷ γῆς, τὰ ὄρατα ἢ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θεῖνοι, εἴτε κτιστοί, εἴτε ἀρχαὶ, εἴτε ἑξουσίαι, τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἢ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται. Καὶ αὐτός ἐστι πρῶτος πάντων, ἢ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε

which are his own lofty Expressions in Col. 1. 16, 17. or something else parallel to these Words, and to what he says elsewhere. This would have demonstrated a vastly greater Humility and Condescension than what the Apostle describes; and the Fact is as certain as the other that he expressly insists on. Would St. Paul therefore argue in this manner, if
he

he meant the WORD, or Christ's Divine Nature? Let any Man that has a Taste of that Apostle's Strength and Majesty of Stile upon other (especially the like) Occasions, judge, whether he could upon this sublime Argument write (comparatively speaking) so flatly, and so unlike himself. For my own part, I confess, had I nothing else to offer, I have a better Opinion of St. Paul's admirable Genius (setting aside the Divine Assistance) than to think him capable of it. And this Consideration alone would therefore oblige me to embrace any other possible Interpretation; such as that, which makes him speak of the preexisting human Soul of Christ, most certainly is; as I have fully shewn. But,

Secondly (what is far worse) if St. Paul meant, that the WORD was ἐν μορφῇ θεῶν and ἰου θεῶν, his Argument is utterly inconclusive and impertinent. To evince this we must take notice, that St. Paul exhorts his Disciples to imitate the Example of the Blessed Jesus; and accordingly he represents to them, 1. What the Blessed Jesus did, 2. What Reward he received. He proposes therefore Christ's Practice, and the Reward of his Practice; and enforces the one with the other. His Argument amounts to this, *viz.* that Christ practised the utmost Humility and Condescension, merely to obtain and promote the Happiness of us Men; and that for this amazing Instance of Love and Compassion, he was amply rewarded by Almighty God: and consequently, if we follow his Example, we shall be proportionably rewarded for so doing. How then did the Blessed Jesus condescend and humble himself for our sakes? and how was he rewarded for so doing? upon Supposition that his human Soul did not preexist? Why thus. The
WORD

WORD left his Glory, and became united to the Man Christ; and the Man Christ was afterwards greatly rewarded for this Condescension and Humility of the WORD. This is our Pattern and Encouragement, upon your Principles. And what Influence can this have upon a mere Man? Will not the Man reply, that it does not at all affect him, because of the prodigious Diversity of Circumstances? He would be very thankful, if the WORD, or any other vastly superior Being, would degrade it self, and thereby merit for him an unspeakable Reward, and suffer him to enjoy it alone, without partaking of that which was purchas'd by its own Desert. But how does it enforce the Practice of any mere Man's Humility and Condescension? Or how does it shew, that a mere Man shall ever be the better for his own Humility and Condescension? I confess, the Man Christ Jesus did sometimes submit to servile Offices; and this Part may be drawn into Example by us; but what the Apostle chiefly proposes, is the WORD's devesting himself of vast Glory, before the Man Christ Jesus had a Being; and the Man Christ Jesus's receiving a vast Recompense for the unspeakable Kindness of the WORD. He lays the Stress upon this; which is in reality forein to the Purpose. For tho' it may work upon such as are generous enough to transfer their Merit to others; yet it can't affect those, who would fain merit for themselves, and enjoy the Fruit of their own good Deeds.

And can we suppose, that St. Paul would write thus? Would he argue besides the Question? Was this the manner of that inspired Disputant? If it should be replied, that after the Union of the two Natures there was *Communicatio Idiomatum*, and that the Blessed Jesus, being thus consider'd as God-Man,

Man, did practise the whole of this Humility and Condescension, and was accordingly rewarded for the same; I say if this be reply'd, I freely grant, that by Virtue of this Union there was a *Communicatio Idiomatum*, and that in Consequence thereof, the Blessed Jesus might properly be rewarded in his Human Nature for what the Divine Nature effected. But what is this to the present Purpose? Still 'tis the Practice of a distinct Nature, which chose to debase it self before the Union of the two Natures commenced. And 'tis the Condescension and Humility of the WORD alone, in which the Man has no Share. And therefore it can't fairly be urged as an Argument to a mere Man, who has not any other Nature (who has not either the WORD, or any other excellent Being) united to him, that would bestow the same unspeakable Favor upon him, as the WORD bestow'd upon the Man Christ Jesus. In short, according to this Interpretation, 'tis an Example drawn from a wrong Topic. 'Tis manifestly an Example of the Bounty of the WORD to the Man Christ Jesus, with whom the WORD vouchsaf'd to be personally united: and not an Example of what the Man Christ Jesus gain'd by his own Practice as a Man. And yet nothing is more certain, than that the Reward of the Man Christ Jesus (for the Man only was capable of, and did enjoy, the Reward) is propos'd in this Place as an Encouragement to our selves; because we our selves, as the Man Christ Jesus did, shall reap great Advantages by our Humility and Condescension. You see therefore what wretched Sophistry we make the Apostle use, if we suppose, that he affirms the WORD to be *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ* and *ἴσα θεῶ*, and afterwards to have empty'd or debas'd himself by the Incarnation.

Thirdly, We are agreed, that our Lord was the Angel that deliver'd the Law, and that upon this account he was ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ, and consequently ἴσα θεῶ. This you (q) fully acknowledge, and I heartily assent to it. Well then, the same Nature of Christ, which was God's Angel, was that very Nature which was ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ, and consequently ἴσα θεῶ. Now 'tis evident, that Christ could not be God's Angel with respect to his divine Nature. For the Apostle says, *Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by Angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him?* Heb. 2. 1, 2, 3. You see, the Apostle argues upon this Principle, viz. that the Person who deliver'd the Gospel, was of greater Dignity, than the Angel who deliver'd the Law. Now if he that deliver'd the Law, was the WORD or Divine Nature of Christ, this Principle is notoriously false. Because, tho' the Human Nature of Christ is now vastly exalted above all created Beings whatsoever, and is consequently superior in Dignity to them all; yet 'tis not even now superior to what you own the WORD always was: and as for the WORD or Divine Nature, it never was exalted, as I have largely proved; but was every whit as great in Dignity at the Delivery of the Law, as it was at the Delivery of the Gospel. Wherefore the WORD, or Divine Nature of Christ, was not the Angel which deliver'd the Law.

Upon these several Accounts 'tis plain, that the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus

Christ, was not ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ and ἴσα θεῶ before the Incarnation, even upon your own Principles, who suppose that his Divine Nature is inferior to the very God. And therefore, since the Apostle does expressly affirm, that Jesus Christ was ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ and ἴσα θεῶ before his Incarnation; 'tis evident even to Demonstration, that he was ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ and ἴσα θεῶ with respect to his human Nature. And consequently his human Soul (for his Body was not as yet in Being) preexisted before the Incarnation.

And indeed, the Admission of this (which I now take the liberty of calling an evident) Truth, makes the Apostle argue like himself in this controverted Place; and also throughly clears, what we read in the second Chapter of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. For,

1. The Apostle infers Humility and Condescension from the Example of the Blessed Jesus; and he sets before them, that Christ, *viz.* his preexisting human Soul, personated the very God; and urges his voluntary Debasing of himself by Incarnation, when that State of Glory was freely exchanged for a mean Condition upon Earth, in which he sometimes discharged servile Offices, and at last suffered Death upon the Cross. So that the Apostle expressly mentions the utmost Pitch of Glory which Christ's human Soul left, and the lowest Pitch of Humiliation which it submitted to. And consequently the Example could not be press'd more home to the Consciences of his Disciples, nor could any more prevalent Pattern be offer'd to them.

2. This makes the Apostle's Argument truly conclusive, and exactly pertinent. For 'tis drawn from what Christ's human Nature did, and 'tis supported by what his human Nature receiv'd as the Reward

of it. So that every Man was thereby encourag'd and provok'd to imitate so bright a Pattern; since he was sure to receive the Recompence of his own Action, and must not otherwise expect it. 'Tis as if the Apostle had said thus, Do you imitate the Example of the Man Christ Jesus, whose Soul, tho' it preexisted before his Appearance in the Flesh, and had the honor of personating God; yet when he consider'd the sad Condition of poor Mortals, and the Necessity of an unspotted Sacrifice in order to their Redemption; of his own Choice he divested himself of that great Glory, and became in all things like unto us, being cloath'd with Flesh and Blood; and even when he was upon Earth, he did not affect State and Pomp, but submitted, when Occasion offer'd, even to servile Employments, and at last was content to be murder'd upon the Cross for us. Wherefore God has highly exalted this incarnat human Soul, *viz.* the Man Christ Jesus, &c. Do ye therefore act, as much as your Circumstances will permit, in like manner; do ye voluntarily submit your selves for the sake of others; and God will accordingly bestow a blessed Recompense upon you.

3. The Author to the *Hebrews* might, upon these Principles justly argue, that the Gospel was deliver'd by a greater Person than he that deliver'd the Law. For the bare human Soul of Christ, tho' it had indeed the Honor of personating God, deliver'd the Law: but when that same Soul voluntarily became incarnat, 'twas united to the WORD it self, the Creator of the Universe; and even the Man Christ Jesus became God's own Son, and was appointed Heir of all things, and the supreme Governour of all created Beings, even of the highest Angels,

Angels, such as were before in Nature and Degree vastly superior to it self.

And indeed, 'tis exceedingly observable, that the Apostle had no sooner argued from the superior Dignity of him that promulged Christianity, but he supports what he had said, by adding as follows, *For unto the Angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak. But one in a certain place testified saying, What is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the Angels, &c. Heb. 2. 5, 6, 7.* And then he goes on to prove from the Psalmist, that Christ's human Nature was to be exalted, and that it was at that time accordingly placed at God's Right Hand. Now the Apostle could not have done thus, if he had spoken before of such a Nature, as was always at least equal to what the human Nature of Christ was made by its utmost Advancement. Whereas, if he spake before (as he certainly did) of the human Nature of Christ, and shewed the Difference between the same Messenger, when delivering the Law, and when delivering the Gospel; what he subjoins, is the most proper Consideration imaginable to strengthen what he had said immediatly before. For thereby he proves, that the Scriptures foretold that very Advancement of the human Nature, from Christ's actual Enjoyment of which he had justly argued, that a Person superior to a bare Angel had promulged the Gospel.

In short, let any Man attentively read St. Paul's Words, and he can't but perceive, that the very same intelligent Being which was rewarded, did also practise that Humility and Condescension, for which he was rewarded. For 'tis said, that *God hath highly exalted him, who being in the form of God, &c.*

condescended to suffer Death upon the Cross; and God did *therefore* so highly exalt him, *because* he so greatly submitted, even tho' he was in the Form of God. Now I need not observe to you, that we who believe the WORD, or Divine Nature of Christ, to be the very God, dare not assert, that the WORD, or Christ's Divine Nature, was thus exalted for leaving its former Glory. For did the very God cease to be in his own glorious State? Was he afterwards exalted by himself, as by some other distinct Being, to that his former glorious State, as the Reward of his Humiliation? And was this an *exceeding* Exaltation to the very God? We cannot therefore assert such an impious Doctrin.

Again, What was this *exceeding* Exaltation? Why his having a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth: And that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to (or if you please in) the glory of God the father. Could this be said of the very God? Had not he before, had not he always, could he possibly cease to have, a Name above every Name? Had he not necessarily, is it possible for him not to have, the supreme Dominion over the whole Creation? Was a State of supreme Dominion therefore a State of *exceeding* Exaltation to the Divine Nature of Christ, upon supposition that his Divine Nature is the very God? Such are the wretched Effects of using bad Arguments in a good Cause.

But this, you'll say, does not affect Men of your Principles. True. But then, even upon your own Principles, if the same Nature that was exalted, was formerly *ἐν ἰσότητι θεῶ* and *ἰσὺ θεῶ*, 'tis manifest, that

that the human Nature alone was *εν ωσει θεῦ* and *ἰου θεῦ*. And consequently 'twas the human Nature alone, which practis'd that Humility and Condescension, of which the Apostle is to be understood in this Place now under Consideration. For I have demonstrated, that the human Nature alone was rewarded. And that the human Nature could not practise that Humility and Condescension which the Apostle insists on, and which was manifestly prior to the Incarnation, unless the human Soul did preexist; I presume, you will not desire me to prove.

Nothing now remains, but that I observe one thing, *viz.* that the human Soul of Christ preexisted before the Foundation of the World. For our Savior says in his Prayer to God, *And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was* (*αε) ἔστων κόν-μεν* ἔ) before this world was) John 17. 5. Again he says, *Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world, v. 24.* 'Tis evident from hence, that our Savior did exist *before the foundation of the world, or before this world was.* And I freely acknowledge, and you will readily grant, that we who believe the WORD, or Divine Nature of Christ, to be very God, can't possibly interpret these Passages of the WORD, or Divine Nature. For 'tis manifest, that when our Lord offer'd up this Prayer, he did not actually enjoy some Glory or Happiness, of which he had formerly been possess'd; and that he begg'd of God to be restor'd to it. Wherefore he could not mean that Glory or Happiness, which he had as very God. For the Glory or Happiness of the very God is essential to

him, and inseparable from him. Wherefore we who believe the WORD to be very God, must necessarily understand the former of these Texts of our Savior's human Soul, which existed with God (that is, in God's Presence, and beholding his Face, as Angels now do) before this World was. And if his human Soul did thus exist before the World was; certainly God's loving Christ before the Foundation of the World, which is asserted in the later of these Texts, ought to be understood of his loving the Man Christ Jesus, *viz.* his preexisting human Soul.

And as for your self, who do not believe the WORD, or Divine Nature of Christ, to be very God, I will not dispute with you, whether it be conceivable, that the WORD or Divine Nature of Christ could, upon your own Principles, cease to enjoy that Glory or Happiness which he had before the World was: but what I insist upon with you, is this. I have by other Considerations proved to you, that our Lord's human Soul did pre-exist. And if this be granted; I may safely appeal to your self, whether both these Texts do not naturally admit and require that Interpretation which I have given them.

However, I can't forbear adding, that Christ is expressly called *the Lamb without blemish and without spot, Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times, 1 Pet. 1. 19, 20.* This certainly respects his human Nature. Now St. Paul says, that God hath called us according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the world began; but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, 2 Tim. 1. 9, 10. He says also, that God hath chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world, Eph. 1. 4. and that he

he promised eternal Life before the world began, Tit. 1. 2. The same Apostle calls the Wisdom of the Gospel the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory, 1 Cor. 2. 7. I conclude therefore, that our Lord's human Soul was then made, when the very God was preparing the Habitation of Mankind, whom he then purposed to redeem by Christ, and for whose sake Christ was already decreed to be slain. And accordingly St. Paul assures us, that Christ is *πρωτόπαιον κλίσεως*. For tho' I readily grant, that *πρωτόπαιον* may signify him that has the *jus primogeniti*, when it appears by other Considerations, that he who is styl'd *πρωτόπαιον*, was not the first in order of Birth: yet in the present Case we ought not to recede from the natural and obvious Sense of the Word; because the Tenor of Scripture is so far from obliging us to it, that it manifestly forbids it. And indeed, when our Savior says of himself, that he is *ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κλίσεως τῆς θεῆς*, Rev. 3. 14. I can't but understand him in the same Sense, viz. as affirming himself, that is, his human Soul, to have been produced before any other created Being whatsoever.

Upon the whole, St. Paul is so far from teaching (in this remarkable Passage of his Epistle to the *Philippians*, which we have largely examin'd) that the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, is inferior to the very God; that he does not therein speak one Syllable of the WORD, or his Divine Nature, but only treats of the Humiliation and Exaltation of his Human Nature, from whence he draws an Argument for our Practice of Humility and Condescension.

C H A P. VIII.

That during the Time of our Savior's Ministry, the Disciples did not believe, that he was any thing more than a mere Man, conducted and assisted by the Spirit of God.

BEFORE I proceed to the Examination of the second Text of Scripture, which is suppos'd to teach, that the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, is inferior to the very God; 'tis necessary for me to prove, 1. That during the Time of our Savior's Ministry, the Disciples did not believe, that he was any thing more than a mere Man, conducted and assisted by the Spirit of God; 2. That during the Time of our Savior's Ministry, the WORD, or Divine Nature, was quiescent in the Man Christ Jesus.

FIRST then, during the Time of our Savior's Ministry, the Disciples did not believe, that he was any thing more than a mere Man, conducted and assisted by the Spirit of God.

Whether you will grant me this Proposition, I know not. You expressly (a) declare, that Christ's Disciples *had not any the least Thought of his claiming to be God in any Sense*, when he utter'd what we read in *John* 5. 18. Nor do I remember, that you have any where said or supposed, that they had afterwards, during the Time of his Ministry, different Sentiments. If I guess aright, you will rather allow, that they continued of the same Opinion till

(a) Reply to Mr. Nelson's Friend, p. 136.

his Ministry was ended. However, since you have not inform'd us, whether you do grant this Proposition or no; and because 'tis certain, that too many others will not grant it: therefore I think my self obliged to evince the Truth of it. In order thereto I observe,

First, That there is not in all the New Testament any one Passage, which either asserts or implies, that the Disciples believed him to have had any Divine Nature during his Ministry. They did indeed esteem him a great Prophet, even the Messiah, the greatest of Prophets: but yet at the same time they esteem'd him a mere Man; and did not apprehend, that another Nature, superior to that of a Man, *viz.* the WORD of God, was personally united to the Man Christ Jesus.

I can't think of more than one Text, that can possibly be alleged against this Assertion, *viz.* *John* 16. 30. where the Disciples say, *Now are we sure, that thou knowest all things.* And if any Person should conclude from hence, that the Disciples then believ'd him to be strictly Omniscient, and that consequently he was more than a mere Man conducted and assisted by God's Spirit; I answer, 1. That the same Spirit which did so certainly discover the most secret Things to him and his Disciples, might discover, if he pleas'd, even *all Things* in the most absolute and unlimited Sense, altho' our Savior himself were at the same time no more than a mere Man. The Text does not say, that the Disciples thought, that Christ had inherently in himself, by the Necessity of his own Nature, a strict Omniscience (which would indeed have proved, that he discover'd himself to be the very God) but it says, that they thought he knew *all Things* (we will now suppose in the utmost Extent of the Expression)

pression) and so might a mere Man by the Communication of the Spirit. 2. That the Words of the Disciples do by no means imply, that they thought out Savior endued with a strict Omniscience. For let us observe the Context. Our Savior had said, *A little while and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father*, v. 16. His Disciples did not understand this Saying, and therefore had some privat Discourse about it, which they did not speak so loud, as that our Savior should hear them. For says the Evangelist, *Then said some of his disciples among themselves, What is this, that he saith unto us, A little while and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while and ye shall see me: and because I go to the Father. They said therefore, what is this that he saith, A little while? We cannot tell what he saith*, v. 17, 18. Our blessed Lord therefore, who knew their Hearts, prevented their asking a Solution of the Difficulty that puzzled them, and which they would gladly have heard him resolve. For the Text says, *Now Jesus knew, that they were desirous to ask him, and said unto them, Do ye enquire among your selves of that I said, A little while and ye shall not see me, and again a little while and ye shall see me*, v. 19? And then he proceeds to explain himself in some following Verses. After which his Disciples said unto him, *Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no Proverb. Now are we sure, that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: by this we believe, that thou camest forth from God*, v. 29, 30.

The *all things* therefore, which they perceiv'd from this Fact that our Lord knew, were only the Secrets of their Hearts (for they could conclude no more from that Instance of his Knowledge) and the following Words declare as much. For he, in
their

their Opinion, therefore knew *all things*, because he knew what they were desirous to ask, and gave them instantly a most apt Answer to their intended Inquiry; so that he needed not, that any should ask him. By his knowing *all things* therefore, they can't reasonably be understood to have meant more, than that he had a vast Knowledge, even of such things as are inscrutable to mere Man.

And accordingly, 'tis certain, that this Phrase is used in a very limited Sense in both the Old and New Testament. Thus, when the wise Woman said to David, *My Lord is wise according to the wisdom of an Angel of God, to know all things that are in the earth*, 2 Sam. 14. 20. and when St. John said to his Disciples, *But ye have an unction from the holy one, and ye know all things*, 1 John 2. 20. and again, *the same anointing teacheth you of all things*, v. 27. no Man in his Wits can conceive, that either of them meant more by *all things*, than a great deal, or a very extensive Knowledge. In the same Sense St. Paul said to Timothy, *The Lord give thee understanding in all things*, 2 Tim. 2. 7. Nay, we our selves in common Discourse usually say, *such an one knows every thing*; but surely we don't mean, that the Person is strictly Omniscient.

What has been already said, is sufficient to clear the abovesaid Text. But there is one other Consideration, which demonstrates the Truth of my Interpretation. The Disciples had no sooner said, *Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee*; but they immediately subjoin, *By this we believe, that thou camest forth from God*. Now by Christ's coming forth from God is meant his being a true Prophet. For the Difference between true and false Prophets is this, That the true ones are sent by God, and the false ones
are

are not sent by him, but come of themselves. Accordingly our blessed Lord says, *I proceeded forth* (ἔξῆλθον, the same Word which in this other Place is rendred, *came forth*) *and came from God: neither came I* (ἐδὲ γὰρ ἐλήλυθα, *for I did not come*) *of my self, but he sent me,* John 8. 42. You see, our Lord proves, that he came forth from God, because he did not come of himself, but God sent him. And consequently his *proceeding forth from God* signifies his being a true Prophet, in Contradistinction to what he would have been, had he come of himself, without God's Mission. Now his Disciples concluded, that he proceeded forth from God (that is, was a true Prophet) because he *knew all things, and needed not that any man should ask him.* And indeed, this miraculous Knowledge was a good Proof of the Truth and Certainty of his Divine Mission. But then, since from this his miraculous Knowledge, they infer'd nothing more, than that he was a true Prophet; 'tis manifest, that they did not from this his Knowledge infer, that he was more than a mere Man conducted and assisted by God's Spirit, and consequently more than a true Prophet.

Whether the same Phrase, as used by St. Peter in that remarkable Declaration, *Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee,* John 21. 17. does admit or require the same limited Interpretation; I need not determin. Because 'twas spoken after the Time of our Lord's Ministry was ended, even after his Resurrection; and consequently 'tis beyond the Bounds of our present Inquiry. But,

Secondly, As there is not in all the New Testament any one Passage, which either asserts or implies, that the Disciples believ'd him to have had any Divine Nature during his Ministry; so 'tis very remarkable, that the whole Course of our Savior's

wonderful Actions affords no Proof, nor even the smallest Intimation, of his having any Divine Nature at all. And consequently the Disciples could not infer from thence, that he was any thing more than a mere Man conducted and assisted by God's Spirit.

'Twas prophesy'd of the Messiah, that God's Spirit should be poured on him. Thus, when our Lord concealed himself, the Evangelist observes, *That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the Prophet, saying, Behold, my servant whom I have chosen, my beloved in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall shew judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry, neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smocking flax shall he not quench; till he send forth judgment unto victory. And in his name shall the Gentiles trust,* Matt. 12. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. St. Luke also gives us the following Relation, *And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, and as his custom was, he went into the Synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the Prophet Esaias, and when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the Minister, and sat down: and the eyes of all them that were in the Synagogue, were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears,* Luke 4. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. And accordingly St. Peter declares, that God anointed Jesus Christ of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with Power, Acts 10. 38.

This

This solemn *U*nction by the Spirit was perform'd immediatly after his Baptism. For the Evangelist tells us, that *J*esus, when he was baptiz'd, went up straight-way out of the water: and lo, the heavens were open'd unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him. And lo, a voice from heaven, saying, *T*his is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, *Matt.* 3. 17. And accordingly *S*t. *J*ohn Baptist, who administred Baptism to him, bare record, saying, *I* saw the spirit descending from heaven, like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, *U*pon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God, *John* 1. 32, 33, 34.

Now we are told, that *G*od giveth not the Spirit by measure unto the blessed *J*esus, *John* 3. 34. that is, *G*od poured the Spirit upon him in a most plentiful and abundant Manner. But then, it must be remembred, that our *L*ord *J*esus Christ is the Head of his Body the Church, and we receive divine Communications from and by him. Accordingly, as in the natural Body, when *O*yl is plentifully poured upon the Head, it must run down to the inferior Parts (thus the *P*salmist says, *I*t is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down unto the beard, even unto *A*aron's beard, and went down to the skirts of his clothing, *Psal.* 133. 2.) So when our *L*ord *J*esus Christ was plentifully anointed with the Holy Spirit, his *D*isciples, the Members of his Body, receiv'd a Share of those Spiritual Gifts, which that anointing conferr'd on him. For whatever Gifts of the Spirit our *L*ord exercis'd during his Ministry, his *D*isciples exercis'd the very same, partly during his Abode with them, but especially after his *A*scension,

sion, when the Baptism of the Holy Ghost was by our Lord's Mission of the Spirit conferr'd on them. For let us descend to Particulars.

Our Lord knew the Thoughts of Mens Hearts. Of this we have a general Declaration in these Words; *Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast day, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did. But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testifie of man: for he knew what was in man,* John 2. 23, 24, 25. But he gave many particular Instances of this Knowledge. *Jesus knowing their thoughts,* Matt. 9. 4. *Jesus knew their thoughts,* Matt. 12. 25. *Jesus perceiv'd in his spirit, that they so reasoned within themselves,* Mark 2. 8. *Jesus perceiving the thought of their heart,* Luke 9. 47. *Jesus knew in himself, that his disciples murmur'd at it,* John 6. 61. *Jesus knew, that they were desirous to ask him,* John 16. 19. *Jesus knew from the beginning, who they were that believed not, and who should betray him,* John 6. 64. *For he knew, who should betray him,* John 13. 11. Nay, he knew Things distant. *Nathanael saith unto him, Whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him, Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig-tree, I saw thee,* John 1. 48. He knew also, that the Samaritan Woman had had five Husbands, and that he whom she had at the Time of his talking with her, was not her Husband, *John 4. 18.* Nay, he probably was acquainted with the Course of her Life, at least with the principal Passages of it. For the Woman said to those of her City, *Come, see a man which told me all things that ever I did,* ver. 29. Our Lord also foretold Things to come, of which many Instances are recorded in Holy Scripture.

And his Disciples were evidently endued with the same wonderful Knowledge. One of the Gifts of the Spirit was that of *discerning Spirits*, 1 Cor. 12. 10. that is, a Knowledge of the Hearts and Inclinations of others; which Knowledge they demonstrated in several particular Instances recorded in Scripture (not to mention such Facts as the Primitive Writers have recorded) *viz.* in the Case of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, *Acts* 5. 3, 4, 9. that of *Simon* the Sorcerer, *Acts* 8. 21. that of *Elymas* the Sorcerer, *Acts* 13. 9, 10. to which I may add that of the lame Man, *Acts* 14. 9. And as for their Prophecies, the Instances are so notorious, that I forbear to mention Particulars. Thus also the ancient Prophets, not only foretold Things to come, but also knew the Secrets of Mens Hearts. *Abijah* understood the Intentions and Errand of the Queen of *Israel*, notwithstanding her Disguise, 1 *Kings* 14. 6. And *Elisha* discover'd to the King of *Israel*, what the King of *Syria* spake in his Bedchamber, 2 *Kings* 6. 12. Now as this Knowledge does not prove, that the Prophets and the Apostles had any Divine Nature; but only that they were conducted and assisted by the Spirit of God: so neither did the same Knowledge, tho' in a greater Degree, shew to the Disciples, that our Lord Jesus Christ was more than a Man conducted and assisted by God's Spirit, or that he had any Divine Nature at all.

Nay, 'tis very observable, that when a Woman that was a Sinner, stood at his feet behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment, *Luke* 7. 38. the Pharisee which had bidden him to the Entertainment, at which this was done, spake within himself, saying, *This man, if he were a Prophet, would have known, who,*
and

and what manner of woman this is, that toucheth him: for she is a sinner, ver. 39. So that as the Blessed Jesus, who was the greatest of Prophets, knew the Thoughts of the Pharisee, even tho' he *spake* (or, as the Word may well be rendred, according to the Use of the Hebrew *חשבה*, he *thought*) *within himself*; as appears by what he said immediatly to St. Peter: so the Jews were of Opinion, that this Knowledge might ordinarily be expected and found in Prophets, whom notwithstanding they never suppos'd to have a Divine Nature, but only to enjoy the Spirit's extraordinary Assistance.

It may be objected perhaps, that none of the Apostles knew Things distant, as our Blessed Savior so certainly did. And I confess, I do not remember, that any Instance of it is recorded. However, 1. Tho' the Object is different; yet the Knowledge of Things distant is of the same Kind, and is communicated the very same Way, with the Knowledge of Things future, and the Secrets of Mens Hearts. For the Spirit of God reveles them all. And consequently, if the Knowledge of the Secrets of Mens Hearts, and of Things future, does not; then neither does the Knowledge of Things distant, discover the Person to be more than Man assisted and conducted by the Spirit. 2. *Elisha* knew what *Gebazi* did at a distance, and upon his Return said to him, *Went not mine heart with thee, when the man turned again from his chariot to meet thee?* 2 Kings 5. 26. And he several times inform'd the King of *Israel*, that the *Syrians* were actually come down to certain Places at a distance from him, 2 Kings 6. 9, 10. These Instances are parallel to what our Savior said to *Nathanael* and the *Samaritan Woman*; and shew, that the Knowledge of Things distant is no Proof of the Person's having a Divine Nature, or

that he is more than a Man conducted and assisted by the Holy Ghost.

And accordingly 'tis very observable, 1. That *Nathanael* did not conclude from what our Savior said, that the WORD was personally united to him: but only reply'd, *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel*, *John* 1. 49. that is, thou art the Messiah, whom we expect for our King, and whom the Baptist has proclaim'd to be the Son of God, *v.* 34. These Titles our Savior constantly assum'd and own'd; tho' 'twas never once infer'd from thence by his Disciples, that Christ thereby pretended to be the Son of God otherwise than with Respect to his Human Nature only. 2. The *Samaritan Woman* concluded nothing more from what our Savior said to her, than that he was a Prophet, or the Messiah, *John* 5. 19, 29.

In the next place, our Lord Jesus Christ wrought many Miracles by healing Diseases, casting out Devils, and likewise by raising the Dead. Instances of these sorts I need not give. Now his casting out Devils is expressly ascrib'd to the Spirit by our Savior himself, who says, *But if I cast out devils by the spirit of God, then the Kingdom of God is come unto you*, *Matt.* 12. 28. And the other mighty Works were manifestly perform'd by the same Power; which is also elsewhere declared to be the Power of God, and the Power of his Father, in a great Number of Places. Particularly our Savior says, *the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me*, *John* 10. 25. And again, *the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works*, *John* 14. 10. And *St. Peter* says, *Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God, among you, by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you*, *Acts* 2. 22. And again, *God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with pow-*

er ; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with him, Acts 10. 38. Now that the very same Power enabled his Disciples also to do the very same Things in every kind, is manifest from the Holy Scriptures, as well as from the primitive Writers. Nay, 'tis very remarkable, that as we read of the Blessed Jesus, that *there went virtue out of him, and healed them all, Luke 6. 19.* and that he perceived, that *virtue had gone out of him, and healed the Woman that touched his Garment, Mark 5. 27, 28, 29, 30. Luke 8. 44, 45, 46.* and that he healed the Nobleman's Son at a distance, *John 4. 46.* So we read, that *they brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that at the least the shadow of Peter passing by, might overshadow some of them, Acts 5. 15.* and also that *God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul: So that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them, Acts 19. 11, 12.* And consequently, since the Disciples were no more than mere Men conducted and assisted by the Spirit of God, notwithstanding what Miracles they wrought: so 'tis evident, that the Miracles perform'd by our Savior during his Ministry, did not discover him to be more than a Man conducted and assisted by the same Power; nor did those Miracles give his Disciples any Reason to imagin, that he had a Divine Nature personally united to his Manhood.

Lastly, Our Lord Jesus Christ said to the Sick of the Palsy, and to the Woman that was a Sinner, *Thy sins are forgiven, Matt. 9. 2, 5. Mark 2. 5, 9. Luke 5. 20, 23. and 7. 48.* Now whatever is meant by that Phrase, 'tis certain, that Christ's *forgiving Sins* was no Discovery of his Divine Nature. I shall not argue from God's remarkable Charge to the *Israelites, Be-*

bold, I send an Angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not: for he will not pardon your Transgressions: for my name is in him, *Exod. 23. 20, 21.* In which Words 'tis manifestly imply'd, that an Angel is capable of forgiving Sins; so that a Creature, and consequently a mere Man, may do it, if God pleases. But what I insist on, is, that the Apostles could forgive Sins. For Christ said to them, *Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained, John 20. 23.* And surely no Man will say, that the Apostles had any Divine Nature, because they exercis'd this Power.

I confess, the *Jews* objected Blasphemy to our Savior, because he pretended to forgive Sins, alleging, that none but God could do it, *Matt. 9. 3. Mark 2. 7. Luke 5. 21.* And what if their Objection was ill grounded? I'm sure, you'll grant it was. For by the God who alone could forgive Sins, they undoubtedly meant the Very God. And consequently, if they objected justly, then (upon your Principles) the WORD, whom you suppose inferior to the Very God, could not forgive Sins. And yet Christ did in Fact forgive them. But in truth, our Savior's conferring on the Apostles the Power of forgiving Sins, demonstrats, not only the Falshood of the *Jews* Pretence, but also that a mere Man may forgive Sins in the very same Sense in which our Savior forgave them; unless it can be shewn, that that Phrase is apply'd to our Savior in one Sense, and to his Apostles in another quite different from it.

If it be objected, that the Apostles forgave Sins by a delegated Power, whereas Christ forgave them by the original and inherent Power of his
Divine

Divine Nature; I answer, 1. That this is only begging the Question. For the Scriptures do not warrant our making this Difference during his State of Humiliation. 2. That Men of your Principles will scorn this Plea; because you suppose, that all the Power of the WORD is delegated to him from the Very God, as from a distinct Being. 3. With respect to the Orthodox, I answer, that as our Savior's Miracles are (as I before observ'd) expressly attributed to the Father, and to the Spirit: so he roundly affirms, in the most general Terms, *The Son can do nothing of himself*, John 5. 19. and again, *I can do nothing of myself*, ver. 30. And consequently all that suppose the WORD to be Very God, must acknowledge, that tho' the WORD has an original and inherent Power of forgiving Sins; yet our Savior during his Humiliation forgave them only as a Man, *viz.* ministerially, and for that Reason his forgiving Sins was no Indication of a Divine Nature. 4. That I may at once effectually silence this Objection, the Evangelist expressly tells us, that *when the multitude saw it, they marvelled, and glorified God, which had given such power (τῷς ἀνθρώποις) unto men*, Matt. 9. 8. So that that very Multitude, some Persons in which had lately thought, that none but God could forgive Sins, *Mark 2. 7. Luke 5. 22.* were by this very Fact convinc'd, that God had given unto *Men* that Power of forgiving Sins, which 'twas suppos'd he had reserv'd to himself. And consequently our Savior's forgiving of Sins, was no Proof of his having a Divine Nature.

If it be said, that during the Time of his Ministry, Christ not only wrought Miracles himself, but also gave others a Power to do the same (for *when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and*

to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease, Matt. 10. 1.) I answer, that Christ's conferring on others a Power of working Miracles, was no Argument of his having a Divine Nature (and consequently his Disciples could not from thence infer, that he had a Divine Nature) unless it be also granted, that the Apostles had a Divine Nature, who conferr'd on others the very same Power, as appears from the following Texts of Scripture. *Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. And when Simon saw that through laying on of the Apostle's hands, the Holy Ghost was given, he offer'd them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost, Acts 8. 17, 18, 19. While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonish'd, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God, Acts 10. 44, 45, 46. When Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied, Acts 19. 6. For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, Rom. 1. 11.*

In short, the Man Christ Jesus was conducted and assisted by the Spirit, from his very Conception to the time of his Death. The same Spirit that begat him, did also preserve him, both from original Corruption, and from voluntary Transgression. For *through the eternal Spirit he offer'd himself without spot to God, Heb. 9. 14.* that is, he offer'd himself to God without Spot through the eternal Spirit, which preserv'd him clear from all Spot, either of actual Sin, or vitiated Inclination. *He was led by the Spirit into the wilderness, being forty days tempted of the Devil,*

Devil, Luke 4. 1, 2. and he return'd from thence in the power of the Spirit, ver. 14. And the perpetual Presence of the same Spirit appears in the whole Course of his Actions. And accordingly you truly affirm, that (b) during the Time of his Incarnation, he was all along under the Conduct of the Holy Spirit. And again you (c) say, The Holy Spirit is describ'd in the new Testament, as the immediate Author and Worker of all Miracles, even of those done by our Lord himself; and as the Conductor of Christ in all the Actions of his Life, during his State of Humiliation here upon Earth. And again, speaking of the Holy Spirit, you (d) say, He is describ'd as being the Conductor and Guide of our Lord during his State of Humiliation here upon Earth. Nor did Christ ever perform any thing throughout the whole Space of his Ministry, which might not be perform'd by a mere Man conducted and assisted by the Holy Spirit. And consequently, during his Ministry, his Disciples could not learn from his wonderful Actions, that he was God as well as Man.

Thirdly, Those Declarations which our Lord was pleas'd to make concerning himself, did not cause his Disciples to believe, that he was more than a Man conducted and assisted by the Spirit of God. That this may appear, I shall go through them distinctly. They are of three different Sorts.

First, In diverse of them he declares what was past at the time of his speaking.

1. He said several times, that he came down from Heaven. I need not observe to you, that those who suppose the WORD to be the Very

(b) Script. Doctr. p. 197, 198.

(c) *Ibid.* Prop. 28. p. 301.

(d) *Ibid.* Prop. 42. p. 352.

God, can't possibly interpret several of those Texts of the Descent of Christ's Divine Nature, without the Assistance of such forcible Strains, as (I hope) I shall never dare allow my self the the Use of. But since I have shewn, that Christ's Human Soul pre-existed, they are all of them very plain and easy. For let us examin Particulars.

Our Lord says, *No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man* ὁ ὢν ἐν τοῖς ἔξουσι (that is, not as we translate it, *which is in heaven*, but) *which was in heaven*, John 3. 13. For 'tis notorious, that the Participle ὢν must sometimes be construed in the *Preter Tense*. For the Proof of this I need go no farther than the 31st Verse of this Chapter, where the Baptist says, Ὁ ἀνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ὄντιν. Ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ γῆσι, ἐκ τῷ γῆσι ὄντι, καὶ ἐκ τῷ γῆσι λαλεῖ· ὁ ἐκ τῆς ἔξουσι ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ὄντι. Now 'tis certain, that ὁ ἐρχόμενος ought in this Place to be rendred, *he that came*; and consequently, ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῷ γῆσι, which Phrase is manifestly opposed to ὁ ἐκ τῆς ἔξουσι ἐρχόμενος, must be rendred, *he that was from the earth*. Thus also the Participle ὢν is us'd elsewhere. For Instance, Τουφλὸς ὢν ἄρτι βλέπω, *whereas I was blind, I now see*, John 9. 25. καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκρὰς τοῖς ἁμαρτίαισι συνέζωοποίησε πρὸς Χριστῷ, which ought to be rendred thus, *And us, who were dead in sins, hath he quickened together with Christ*, Eph. 2. 5. And accordingly the Baptist's Meaning is plainly this; *He that was from the earth, is* (or continues still to be) *from the earth*, that is, a common Man, &c. So that our Savior's Words are very clear and intelligible. For his Meaning is, that the Son of Man, which was in Heaven, because his Human Soul preexisted there, came down from Heaven, when his preexistent Soul was cloath'd with a Body, and convers'd amongst us as a Man.

Again,

Again, Christ says, *the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world,* John 6. 33. and again, *I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me,* v. 38. These Texts mean, that the Man Christ Jesus became incarnat, that he might perform God's Will; and that the same Man Christ Jesus gives Life to the World, by Virtue of that Authority and Power, which God has given for that Purpose.

Thus also, when he says, *What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* v. 62. he means, that his human Soul was in Heaven before his Incarnation.

But there is one Verse, which (I think) requires another Sense. Our Lord says, *I am the living bread, which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world,* v. 51. In this Passage our Savior asserts, that his Flesh came down from Heaven. But did his Body then exist before the Incarnation? And did his preexisting Body descend thro' the Blessed Virgin's Womb? No; but as I have (e) elsewhere observed, by *coming down from heaven* in this Place is meant, being begotten by the immediat Power of God. For our Savior's Flesh, tho' born of the Virgin Mary, was conceiv'd in her by the Overshadowing of the Holy Ghost. And thus the *Jews* understood our Savior. For they knew, that by his pretending, that his Flesh came from Heaven, he meant that he was not born of the Will of Man; and therefore they objected his having Earthly Parents, and could not understand, how he could be

(e) Confutation of *Quakerism*, Ch, 12. p. 153.

said to come down from Heaven with respect to his outward Man. This is plain from the Text, which says, *The Jews then murmured against him, because he said, I am the bread which came down from heaven. And they said, is not this Jesus the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it then that he saith, I came down from Heaven?* v. 41, 42. So that our Blessed Savior came down from Heaven with respect to his Body as well as his Soul. His Soul preexisted there, and his Body came therefore down from Heaven, because it was begotten by the Will and Operation of God. Thus St. *John's* Baptism was said to be *from heaven*, Matt. 21. 25. that is, to proceed from God, and to be of Divine Original; in Opposition to its being of Men, that is, instituted by human Authority.

2. He speaks of the Glory, which he had with the Father *before the World was*, John 17. 5. and of his Father's Loving him *before the foundation of the world*, v. 24. These Passages have been already explain'd of the Preexistence of his Human Soul in the Seventh Chapter. And as for his saying, *Before Abraham was, I am* (or as it ought to be rendred, *I was*, by a known Scriptural Figure) it most evidently relates to the same Preexistence of his Human Soul.

Secondly, Other Declarations of the Blessed Jesus relate to the then present Time.

1. Our Lord calls himself the *only begotten Son of God*, John 3. 16, 18. and this he truly was with respect to his Human Nature. For tho' *Adam* is call'd the *Son of God*, Luke 3. 39. yet that was upon the Account of his Formation out of the Dust, and not because he was really begotten of a Woman by the Holy Ghost. *Adam* could not be said to have been *begotten* by God: but our Lord Jesus Christ was as truly begotten by God, as we are by our respective

spective natural Fathers. Nor was any other Man ever so begotten by God; and therefore Christ is God's *only begotten Son* as to his Human Nature.

Whether he is not also the only begotten Son of God as to his Divine Nature, I do not now inquire. What I at present assert, is, that his declaring himself to be the only begotten Son of God, did not discover to his Disciples or others, that he was more than a Man, or had any Divine Nature at all.

2. He speaks of the intimat Union between God and himself, and declares, that God was in him, and he in God, saying, *I and my Father are one*, John 10. 30. *Though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him*, v. 33. *At that day ye shall know, that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you*, John 14. 20. *And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep thro' thine own name, those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are*, John 17. 11. *That they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe, that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them: that they may be one, even as we are one. I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know, that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me*, v. 21, 22, 23. Now it must be observ'd, that the very same Phrases, which express the Union between God and Christ, do also express the Union between Christ and his Disciples, and between the Disciples themselves. As God is said to be *in Christ*, and Christ *in God*, John 10. 38. so Christ is said to be *in his Disciples*, and his Disciples *in him*, even as God is *in Christ*, John 14. 20. And as
Christ

Christ declares, that God and he are *one*, John 10. 30. so he prays, that his Disciples may be *one*, *even as his Father and himself are one*, John 17. 11, 22. And their being *one* is manifestly the same as, or necessarily supposes, their *dwelling in each other*, whether the Phrases be applied to God and Christ, or to Christ and his Disciples. For *indwelling* implies the (f) Favor and Protection of a Superior, and the Obedience of an Inferior. And being *one* denotes a perfect Union of Affections and Goodwill. And accordingly Christ prays, *that they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us*, John 17. 21. *I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one*, v. 23. Now there most certainly was this admirable Agreement and Union between God and the Man Christ. God really favor'd and protected the Man Christ, and the Man Christ was absolutely obedient unto God. And there was undoubtedly between them a most ardent reciprocal Love. But none of the Expressions before mention'd did any way discover, that the WORD or Divine Nature was united to the Man Christ.

3. Our Lord says, *Γινώσκω τὰ ἐμένα, καὶ γινώσκομαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐμοῦ. Καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ἐγὼ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα*, John 10. 14, 15. These Words, as you rightly (g) observe, ought to be translated thus, *I know my sheep, and am known of mine. Even as the Father knoweth me, I know the Father*. This Knowledge therefore, which is attributed to the Sheep, as well as to God and Christ, can't imply, that Christ appear'd more than Man. The Phrase plainly signifies, that as God and Christ did entirely love each

(f) See the Confutation of Quakerism, Chap. 3. p. 25.

(g) Script. Doct. Pag. 99.

other, so there was an entire mutual Love between Christ and his Sheep. For that to *know* frequently signifies to love, to be pleas'd with, to favor, and to obey; and that God is thus said to know Men, and Men to know God, I need not prove to a Person so conversant in the Scriptures as your self. However, for the sake of others, I will transcribe three Texts. *For the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous: but the way of the ungodly shall perish,* Psal. 1. 6. *And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,* John 17. 3. *And hereby we do know, that we know him, if we keep his commandments,* 1 John 2. 3. Wherefore Christ's Knowledge of the Father or Very God, and being reciprocally known by him, was no Argument to his Disciples of his being more than Man.

4. Our Lord says, *If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also; and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him. Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father; and how say'st thou then, shew us the Father? Believest thou not, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of my self: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. Believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very works sake,* John 14. 7—11. Now from the Disciples knowing and seeing the Father by knowing and seeing the Son, it can't be inferr'd, that the Son discover'd his Divine Nature. Because these Phrases manifestly import, as the Context shews, such a Knowledge and Sight of God, as is gain'd by the Son's Revelation of his Will, and doing Miracles
by

by his Power. For that the Spirit's Assistance, by which he wrought Miracles, was his Father's Power, is manifest from numberless Places, and granted on all Hands. Now the Son might revele the Father's Will, and do Miracles by his Power, even tho' he had no Divine Nature, as the Apostles and others did, who were mere Men, tho' conducted and assisted by the Spirit of God.

5. Our Lord said, *The Son can do nothing of himself; but what he seeth the Father do. For whatsoever things he doth, these also doth the Son likewise,* John 5. 19.

I beg leave to explain this Passage in Dr. *Whitby's* Words, who says, *The Jews concluding Christ to be a false Prophet, because he in this peculiar Manner styl'd God his Father, Christ here undertakes to shew, First, That he exercis'd his Prophetick Office according to the Will of the Father. Secondly, That he confirm'd it by Miracles done by the Power of God residing in him.*—As to *speake nothing of himself, is to speak nothing of his own Instinct and Will, without Commission from God*—So to do nothing of himself, is to do nothing without Commission from, and Knowledge of the Will of God, that he should do it, and so respecteth his Prophetick Office, and things done in Confirmation of it; and then the Words following, unless he see the Father doing them, must bear this Sense, Unless he by the Spirit of the Father residing in him, see that the Father would have them done by him; For what the Father $\rho\omega\tilde{\nu}$, would have done, he doth according to his Will, or as he would have them to be done. And this Import of the Words seems to be confirm'd from the following Words; For the Father loveth the Son, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\ \delta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \delta\epsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}\delta\epsilon\ \rho\omega\tilde{\nu}\ \rho\omega\tilde{\nu}\epsilon\iota$, and sheweth him all things which he (the Son) doeth; and he will shew him greater Works than these (which are to be done by him, even that of raising the Dead, v. 21.)

For,

For, because we receive all our Knowledge from our Eyes and Ears, therefore Christ speaking of the Execution of his Prophetick Office, useth these Metaphors, declaring, that he spake and testified what he had seen, Chap. 3. 11. what he had seen with the Father, Chap. 8. 38. And so the Baptist saith, What he hath seen, he testifieth: And again, that he spake what he had heard from the Father, Chap. 8. 26, 40. --- 15. 15. And because they who teach or declare things, do by that shew them to us; therefore Christ useth this Metaphor here, and saith, Chap. 8. 28. I do nothing of my self; but as my Father hath taught me, so I speak. And again, Chap. 12. 49, 50. I have spoken nothing of my self, but as the Father who sent me, gave me commandment what I should say and speak; the things therefore which I speak, as the Father said to me, so I speak. Now that he spake this with respect to the Spirit of Prophecy, with which he was anointed, and by the Father sent to preach the Gospel to the Poor, &c. Luke 4. 18. the Baptist teacheth in these Words, What he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth; for he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for the Father giveth not him the Spirit by measure, Chap. 3. 23, 24. And he himself intimates by saying, Chap. 14. 10. The words that I speak to you, I speak not of my self; the Father abiding in me, he doth the works. Thus far Dr. *Whitby*.

Wherefore the Son's doing whatsoever the Father did, was no Discovery of his being more than a Man conducted and assisted by the Spirit. Especially if it be consider'd, that as general as this Expression is concerning the Son's Works, yet the Son never did any sort of Works during his Humiliation, which his Disciples did not also at some time or other perform. And consequently it might be truly said of his Disciples, that whatsoever God

did, they did the same. And yet 'tis plain, that the Disciples were not more than mere Men, but only had the Assistance and Guidance of a Divine Power.

6. Our Lord affirm'd himself to be *greater than the Temple*, Matt. 12. 6. and *Lord of the Sabbath*, v. 8. And thus the Disciples might well think of him, because he was the greatest of Prophets, and the Son of God; even tho' they had not the least Suspicion of his being God-Man.

Thirdly, With respect to what was then future,

1. Our Lord affirms, that he *hath life in himself, even as the Father hath*. • But let us read the Context. *Verily, verily I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear, shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself: so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself*, John 5. 25, 26. You see, our Savior proves, that the Son shall raise the Dead at the last great Day; because the Father hath given to the Son to have Life in himself, as the Father also hath. So that to *have Life in himself*, manifestly signifies to have a Power of raising the Dead. But since he declares, that he should raise the Dead by his Father's Power; 'tis certain, that he did not thereby declare himself to be more than Man. For a mere Man assisted by the Spirit might also raise the Dead; as the Apostles themselves did.

2. Our Lord says, *All things that the Father hath, are mine*, John 16. 15. For the Explication of these Words, I shall recite two parallel Texts. *All things are delivered unto me of my Father*, Matt. 11. 27. *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand*, John 3. 35. The Meaning plainly is, that God has given the Son all manner of Power and Authority to direct and govern the Church. Christ is speak-

ing

ing of the Spirit's Descent to instruct his Disciples fully, and to guide them into all Truth; and tells them, that *he shall not speak of himself: but whatsoever he shall hear, that he shall speak, and he will shew you things to come*, v. 12. 13. adding, *He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and he shall shew it unto you*, v. 14. That is, I will send the Spirit to revele to you whatsoever it shall be fit for you to hear concerning me and my Kingdom. This will therefore tend to my Glory; because he shall act as sent by me, and deliver my Messages. And that you may not doubt of my being able to perform this Promise, I assure you, that I am fully empower'd to send the Spirit. For the Father has committed to me all Power and Authority relating to the Church; and therefore what the Spirit shall do in that respect, will be perform'd by him as sent by me for that Purpose. But how did this discover to the Disciples, that Christ was at that time more than a Man? He foretels indeed what he should certainly be able to do; and he speaks of the same in the Present Tense, to denote the Certainty of it, as the *Jewish* Manner was; and all this he ascribes to the good Pleasure of his Father, from whom he should receive such wonderful Abilities, at the time of his Exaltation, which he frequently prophesied of. And this he might well say to them, without causing them to believe, that he was at that time any thing more than a Man conducted and assisted by that very Spirit, which he himself should afterwards pour forth upon his Disciples.

3. Our Savior speaking of the Persecutions of his Disciples after his Exaltation, bids them not be solicitous about making their Defenses, saying, *Settle it therefore in your hearts, not to meditate before, what ye shall answer. For I will give you a mouth and wisdom,*

which all your Adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist, Luke 21. 14, 15. This again is only a Declaration of what God would enable him to do for them after his Exaltation (and well might he do it, who could pour forth the miraculous Gifts of the Spirit on them) but the Disciples could not gather from thence, that their Master had a Divine Nature. Especially considering, that his Disciples themselves conferr'd the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost, as I noted before.

4. Our Blessed Lord declares, that he shall raise the Dead at the Day of Judgment. *This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day,* John 6. 40. *Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day,* v. 54. This indeed shews, that he should at that time fully exercise that Power, which he exercis'd in some measure whilst upon Earth, and which his Disciples also exercis'd by the Assistance of God. But the Disciples could not from thence conclude, that he actually was more than Man at the time when he foretold this Instance of his Spiritual Government. They could not but conclude, that he should be then much greater than he appear'd at that Instant of his speaking; but they could not conclude, that at the Instant of his speaking he had a Divine Nature.

Hitherto I have been considering such Declarations of our Lord, as might have been strictly true, and consequently might (had God pleas'd) have been made by him, even tho' he had been nothing more than a mere Man conducted and assisted by God's Spirit, and had not had a Divine Nature personally united to his Manhood. I proceed now to some Declarations of a different kind. *First,* he foretels

foretels his receiving of Religious Worship, saying, *The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath sent him,* John 5. 22, 23. Secondly, he foretels his Presence with his Disciples even after his Ascension, saying, *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,* Matt. 18. 20. Thirdly, he assures them, that he would answer their Prayers, saying, *Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it,* John 14. 13, 14. Now, because the great Mystery of the Union of the Divine and Human Natures is so fully revel'd to us in the Holy Scriptures; therefore we justly infer, that the Truth of these Declarations is built upon that Union, and the meaning of them is very clear and intelligible to us, by reason of that Discovery. And accordingly I grant, that the aforesaid Declarations (and perhaps there may be others, of the same sort) did hint and imply our Lord's having a Divine Nature.

But yet it does not follow from hence, that the Disciples did, during his Ministry, believe him to be more than a mere Man conducted and assisted by God's Spirit. For how does it appear, that they took the aforesaid Hints, that they apprehended what was imply'd, or understood those surprising Speeches? 'Tis certain, they were very often at a Loss, and knew not what to make of their Master's Sayings. They perceiv'd not the Meaning of them, when they were deliver'd; tho' they perceiv'd it afterwards, particularly when the Spirit was poured on them. Thus we are expressly told, that they understood not what he spake concerning

cerning his Death and Resurrection (which Matters were certainly more obvious to their Understandings, and more level to their Capacities, than his having a Divine Nature) till after his Sufferings were accomplish'd, *Mark* 2. 32. *Luke* 9. 45. and 18. 34. *John* 2. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23. Sometimes they were afraid to ask for Interpretations; at other times our Savior did not give them; and indeed they were not qualify'd, during his Ministry, for the Reception of many sublime Doctrins, which should in due time be declar'd. You well know these remarkable Words of Christ, *I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth,* *John* 16. 12, 13. No wonder then, that they did not for the present apprehend our Lord's having a Divine Nature, which is certainly the greatest Mystery of our Religion, and what they would least of all suspect, and most of all be shockt at. Nay, 'tis absurd for us to imagin, that they believ'd this astonishing Article of Faith during Christ's Ministry, without undeniable Evidence of their believing it; which I dare say, no Man in his Wits will pretend. But when the Comforter was come, they thoroughly understood what they had formerly no tolerable Notions of. For the Spirit refresh'd their Memories at the same time that he enlighten'd their Understandings. For our Lord said, *These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you,* *John* 14. 25, 26. So that by comparing his Discourses with the Events, they perfectly comprehended them; and

and accordingly they might well know and believe, that their Master had a Divine Nature.

I must add, that if they had believ'd him to have had a Divine Nature during the time of his Ministry; 'tis utterly unconceivable; that there should be no clear Indication of it in Scripture. The Belief of that one Proposition could not but have discover'd it self numberless Ways in the whole Course of their Actions. It must have forced from them some open Acknowledgments and Expressions of that Belief. It must have led them into a quite different Conduct from that which the whole History of the Gospels discovers to us. And yet there is not the slightest Intimation of this Nature. Wherefore, tho' 'tis sufficient for my Purpose, that we have no Evidence to the contrary; yet I can't but esteem this single Consideration (*viz.* the Silence of Scripture in so Momentous a Part of Sacred History) a plain and positive Demonstration of what I have been proving, *viz.* that during the Time of our Savior's Ministry, his Disciples did not believe him to be more than a mere Man conducted and assisted by the Spirit of God.

I must now intreat your Patience, whilst I dispatch three Particulars, which some Persons, less learned than your self, may possibly stumble at, or raise Objections from.

1. St. *John* the Baptist said of Christ during his Ministry, *He is above all*, John 3. 31. and again, *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand*, v. 35. Now if any Man should imagin, that the Baptist thereby discover'd Christ's Divine Nature, and consequently Christ's Disciples might perhaps believe it, even during his Ministry; I answer, 1. That if the Baptist's Expressions did certainly imply, that Christ had a Divine Nature; yet how

shall it appear, that Christ's Disciples reach'd the full Meaning of them? Why must they be suppos'd to understand the Depth of the Baptist's Discourses, better than they did those of their own Master? But, 2. The Baptist's Expressions did by no means imply, that Christ had a Divine Nature. For doubtless the Man Christ Jesus was, even during his Ministry, superior to all other Prophets, to whom the Baptist's Words must necessarily be restrain'd, if understood in the then Present Tense. But I am perswaded, that they ought to be understood in the then Future Tense, so as to denote the then future Exaltation of the Man Christ Jesus. Thus when St. Paul says in the Present Tense, *The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant*, *ὡς εἶς πάντων ὄν*, tho' he be lord of all, Gal. 4. 1. he must necessarily be understood in a Future Tense. For the Heir is for the present Lord of all, no otherwise than by the Designation of his Father; and shall not be actually Lord of all, till he enjoys the Inheritance. And accordingly the Baptist said in the then Future Tense, *he (Christ) is above all*; meaning that he should most certainly be so at the Time of his Exaltation, which tho' he was not at that time actually possess'd of, yet he should infalibly receive of his Father; of whom the Baptist also said, *he hath given all things into his hand*, that is, he hath absolutely determin'd so to do. For that our Lord did not actually exercise all Power both in Heaven and in Earth, till after his Ascension, every body knows.

2. St. John the Evangelist says, *Θεὸν ἑτεῖς ἐώρακε πώποτε. Ὁ μονογεῖος ὁ υἱός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸ κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖ ἐξηγήσατο*, that is, according to our Translation, *No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declar'd him,*

John

John 1. 18. Now these Words were undoubtedly spoken after our Lord's Exaltation; and consequently, whatsoever they declare concerning Christ, it is (properly speaking) foreign to the present Question. For upon Supposition, that Christ's being in his Father's Bosom did really imply his having a Divine Nature; yet it does not follow, that because St. *John* affirm'd after his Ascension, that he had a Divine Nature, therefore the Disciples believ'd that he had a Divine Nature during his Ministry. But in Truth, that Phrase is strictly applicable to the Human Nature of Christ. For if *ὁ ὢν* be rendred *who was*, yet 'tis certain that his being in the Bosom of the Father, signifies in the *Jewish* Expression, being exceedingly belov'd of him, the nearest to him, and the most intimate with him; as the Human Soul of our Savior certainly was, before he came from Heaven, whilst he was in the Form of God (for his Father loved him before the Foundation of the World, *John* 17. 24.) and also after he came into the World, even during his Ministry, above any Prophet that ever was sent by God.

But I am persuaded, that the Apostle spake of what then was, when he wrote; and affirm'd, that Christ, who was at that Time in the Bosom of his Father, was he who declar'd the Father, that is, was his Interpreter to Mankind, and the Reveler of his Will. And Christ was undoubtedly at that Time in his Father's Bosom with respect to his Human Nature, which had ascended into Heaven, and actually sat at the Right Hand of God, and was placed in Authority next to, and in Conjunction with, the Very God.

3. Our Savior is charg'd by the *Jews* with making himself equal with God, and with making himself God, John 5. 18. and 10. 33. And if he thus discover'd his Divine Nature to the Malicious *Jews* during his Ministry; how can we imagin, but that his Disciples believ'd it at the same Time? Now this will instantly appear a trifling Plea, if we consider, what Occasion our Lord gave the *Jews* for this Accusation. It seems he had called the Very God ὁ πατὴρ μου, John 5. 17. Now because he call'd the Very God ἰδοὺ πατέρα, his (or if you please his own) Father, therefore they infer, that he made himself equal with God. Now they understood not the Myſtery of God's being the Father of Christ's Human Nature, by begetting him in such a manner, that God was to him ἰδοὺ πατήρ, as properly as any other Man is the ἰδοὺ πατήρ of his Natural Son. And therefore, because when a Man begets his own Likeness, the Son is specifically equal to his ἰδοὺ πατήρ, they conclude, that Christ made himself equal to God by calling God ἰδοὺ πατέρα.

What has been said, may easily be applied to the other Text. Our Savior call'd God his Father, John 10. 29. Then the *Jews* took up stones again to stone him. *Jesus* answer'd them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? The *Jews* answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest thy self God. *Jesus* answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said ye are Gods? If he called them Gods, unto whom the word of God came; and the scripture cannot be broken: Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God? v. 31. 32, 33, 34, 35, 36. You see by our Savior's Answer;

swer, that all he pretended to, was that he was the Son of God; and he prov'd, that he deserv'd that Character, because the Father had sanctified him, and sent him into the World, v. 36. Here is not a Tittle of his Divine Nature mention'd: and the *Jews* made the very same false Inference as before.

I confess, you have given these Texts a different, but not an opposit Sense. You (g) say, *The Jews, willing to take any Handle (tho' never so unreasonable) of accusing him, infer (John 5. 18.) by way of Calumny, not by way of strict Reasoning, that his calling God his Father [ὁ πατήρ μου] was as much as assuming to himself, that God, who was the common Father of them all, was in a higher and more peculiar manner [πατήρ ἰδίον] his own proper Father: and from this, and from his joining and comparing his own Works with his Father's Works in one and the same Sentence, they infer further, in the next step of Calumny, that he made himself equal with God: meaning thereby, not that he claimed to himself to be God indeed in any Sense; (for neither they nor his own Disciples had as yet any the least Thought of that;) but that by Consequence (which angry Accusers draw very hastily,) he assum'd to himself a Power and Authority like that of God. The Expression is the same, and meant in the same Sense, as that other Accusation, John 10. 33. Thou being a Man, makest thy self God: which was spoken after the same Manner, as Men say to an assuming Person, You make your self King; when they intend to charge him with taking upon himself, not the Person, but the State of a Prince. And (h) again you say, That the Jews meant to accuse him, not of affirming himself to be the supreme, selfexistent Deity; nay, nor so much as of taking upon himself to be a divine Person at all; but only of as-*

(g) Reply to Mr. Nelson's Friend, p. 135, 136.

(h) Pag 147, 148.

suming to himself the Power and Authority of God. For, their Accusation, thou makest thy self God, was not founded upon his affirming himself to be one with the Father, (which Phrase it does not appear they thought at all difficult to be understood;) but the Accusation was founded upon his stiling God his Father, [v. 25, 29, and 30.] and consequently making himself the Son of God. This appears plainly from the Answer our Lord gave them in the Words immediately following, v. 34, 35, 36. Is it not written in your law, I said, ye [Rulers and Magistrates] are Gods, [and Children of the most High?] If he call'd them Gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God? From these Words 'tis evident, that their Charge against him of Blasphemy, for which they went about to stone him, was founded upon his calling God his Father, or declaring himself to be the Son of God; which they, in their Anger, represented by way of Aggravation, as making himself God.

Whether your Interpretation of these Passages be preferable to mine, let others judge. If my Interpretation be allow'd, the *Jews* drew a wrong Conclusion from what our Savior said; because either they did not, or would not, understand his true Meaning. If your Interpretation be allow'd, their Malice improv'd what he said into an arrant Calumny. But either Interpretation shews, that it can't be concluded from the Accusation of the *Jews*, that our Lord at that time pretended to a Divine Nature, or to be more than a Man conducted and assisted by God's Spirit.

Finally therefore, tho' the WORD or Divine Nature was most certainly united to the Man Christ Jesus during the Time of his Ministry; yet
his

his Disciples did not in the least apprehend that wonderful Union, nor were they aware of their Master's real Dignity, till his Humiliation was ended, and clearer Manifestations of his Excellency were imparted to them, either by his own Discourses after his Resurrection, or by that miraculous Effusion of the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost, whereby they were led into all Truth.

C H A P. IX.

That during the Time of our Savior's Ministry, the WORD was quiescent in the Man Christ Jesus.

SECONDLY, I must now shew, that during the Time of our Savior's Ministry, the WORD was quiescent in the Man Christ Jesus.

Now when I assert, that the WORD was *quiescent* (for I chuse to continue the Use of that Term, which (a) *Irenæus* first introduc'd, and is consequently almost as old as Christianity it self) my Meaning is, that the WORD did, notwithstanding the Personal Union, forbear to communicat his extraordinary Influences (to wit, such as other Mortals, who are not Personally united to the WORD, do not receive from him; I say, the WORD forbore to communicat those his extraor-

(a) "Ὡσαύτως γὰρ ἦν ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα παύσῃ, ἔτω καὶ λόγος, ἵνα δοξασθῇ· ἡσυχάζοντος μὲν τοῦ λόγου ἐν τῷ παύσῃ, καὶ ἀπαιτήσῃ, καὶ ἀποδηήσκειν, συγγινόμενος δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν τῷ ἕνωσιν, καὶ ὑπομένειν, καὶ ἡσυχάζειν, καὶ ἀνίστασθαι, καὶ ἀναλαμβάνειν. Adv. Hær. lib. 3. cap. 21. p. 250. Edit. Grab.

dinary Influences) to the Man Christ Jesus, during that Space.

Wherefore I can by no means be understood to affirm, that the WORD ceas'd, during that Space, in any Measure or Degree, to enjoy his own former essential Wisdom or Power; or that the Original Splendor and Blifs of the WORD were at all eclips'd or diminish'd *by* or *during* the aforesaid Quiescence. For doubtless the WORD retain'd, and still continued to display, all his glorious Attributes, and enjoy'd the Perfection and Happiness of his own Nature, just as he did before his personal Union with the Man Christ Jesus. For the Actions of the WORD did not depend upon that Union, nor was the Felicity of the WORD either increas'd or lessen'd thereby. I only assert, that during the aforesaid Space, the Human Nature of Christ did not receive and feel those extraordinary Influences, which its personal Union with the WORD must of Necessity bestow on it, whensoever the Wisdom and other Excellences of the WORD, should be fully, freely and perfectly communicated to, and shine through, the Man Christ Jesus, by a reciprocal uninterrupted Intercourse of the Divine and Human Natures. This Quiescence of the WORD therefore, was not *absolute*, but *relative*. 'Twas not a Quiescence in the WORD himself; but a Quiescence in relation to that Man, with whom he was personally united. Nor was it a Quiescence as to those ordinary Influences of the WORD, who is the Creator of all Things, which the Man Christ Jesus enjoy'd in Common with all other Men in general: but a Quiescence as to those peculiar and extraordinary Influences on the Man Christ Jesus in particular, which no other Man ever did enjoy, and which he could not
derive

derive from the WORD otherwise than by a personal Union with him.

Now that the WORD was thus quiescent during our Savior's Ministry, I shall evince by the following Considerations.

1. Whatever the WORD is (whether the Very God, or a Being inferior to the Very God) yet since we are assur'd, that *the WORD was made flesh, and dwelt among us*, John 1. 14. 'tis plain, that the WORD was Personally united to the Man Christ Jesus in his Infancy, even from his very Birth. Again we are assur'd, that *Jesus increased in Wisdom*, as truly and properly, and in the same Sense, as he increased in Stature, *Luke 2. 52*. Now none can believe, that the Man Christ Jesus was, as soon as ever he was born, endued with that Wisdom, which the WORD was undoubtedly possess'd of from the Beginning: or that he ever did or could, notwithstanding he increas'd in Wisdom as well as in Stature, attain to greater Wisdom, than the WORD (who was the Architect of the Universe, and Maker of all created Beings) had in himself, before he became united to the Human Nature. 'Tis therefore demonstrably plain, that the Man Christ Jesus was for some while Personally united to the WORD, even tho' that Wisdom, which was in the WORD, before the Personal Union with Christ's Human Nature commenc'd, was not at that Time communicated to him. And therefore,

2. 'Tis evident, that notwithstanding the personal Union, the WORD might be quiescent in the Man Christ Jesus at any time during his Ministry. For since I have already shewn, that the WORD was quiescent during his Infancy, and the time of his Increase in Wisdom: it can't be question'd, but that

that, it being very possible in the Nature of the Thing, therefore there might be in Fact, if God pleas'd, such a Quiescence of the WORD in the Man Christ Jesus, at any other time during his Humiliation, and consequently at any time during his Ministry. Now,

3. It can't be demonstrated from the Scriptures, that the WORD was never in Fact quiescent during our Savior's Ministry. For I have fully shewn, that during his Ministry, our Lord never perform'd any one Miracle, but what might be perform'd by a mere Man conducted and assisted by the Spirit of God; and that all his Miracles are expressly attributed to the Spirit of God. And therefore it can't be demonstrated, that the WORD did ever exert himself in all that Space. So that the Scriptures do permit us to suppose, that the WORD might as well be quiescent at any time during his Ministry, as it undoubtedly was before it. Wherefore,

4. If we can't give any tolerable Account of our Savior's not knowing the Day of Judgment, without supposing the Quiescence of the WORD; and if all the Difficulty that can be pretended, does instantly vanish upon the Admission of that single Supposition: 'tis certainly our Duty to embrace it heartily, and without any Hesitation to believe and maintain, that the WORD was quiescent in our Savior, when he declar'd, that he knew not the Day of Judgment. But I need not insist upon this (tho' this alone were sufficient) For,

5. The History of our Savior, as recorded in the Holy Scriptures, affords us positive Evidence (not only upon my Principles, who believe the WORD to be Very God; but even upon your own, who believe him inferior to the Very God) that the
WORD

WORD was sometimes (at least) quiescent in the Man Christ Jesus, between his Baptism and his Death, that is, during his Ministry.

To set this matter in a true Light, I must premise (what every body will grant) that if the WORD was not at all quiescent during our Savior's Ministry; then there must constantly have been, during that whole Period, such a full, free, and perfect Intercourse, and reciprocal Communication between the WORD and the Man Christ Jesus, that the essential Wisdom and Power of the WORD, must have been imparted to, and exercised by and through, the Man Christ Jesus. And consequently all the Actions of Christ, during his Ministry, must have proceeded from, and ought to be imputed to, the God-Man, as being either the Principle, the Subject, or the Object of them all. This is so manifest, that I need not prove it, or enlarge upon it. Let us therefore see, whether this be consistent with some Particulars, which were certainly don or said, by or to, our Savior in the Portion of Time before mention'd.

I begin with his Temptation, which immediatly follow'd his Baptism. We are told, that the Devil prompted him to turn Stones into Bread for the Relief of his Hunger. Let us therefore consider this Proposal. Could the Devil (think you) make it to the Creator of all things, even to the Author of his own Being? Could he doubt of the WORD's Ability to turn Stones into Bread? Could he imagine, that he who first produced all Matter, and formed it into such a Variety of Shapes, was not able to alter the Texture of its Parts? On the other hand, if the WORD was quiescent, the Devil's Project was very well contriv'd. For he might plausibly tempt the Blessed Jesus, whose

Ability to work Miracles at other times he did not question, to try, whether God would empower him to support himself under that particular Necessity, by turning Stones into Bread.

Afterwards the Devil placed our Savior upon a Pinnacle of the Temple, and prompted him to cast himself down from thence, quoting to him that Text of the Psalmist, *He shall give his Angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall hold thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.* But could the Devil say this to the WORD? Did the Devil conceit, that the Angels could prevent the WORD's falling into Mischief? Or did he fancy, that the WORD could not, or would not, secure the Man Christ Jesus (tho' at that very time he was hypostatically united to him) without the Angels Assistance? On the other hand, if the WORD was quiescent, the Devil's Procedure is perfectly natural and intelligible.

At length the Devil took our Lord up into an exceeding high Mountain, and shew'd him all the Kingdoms of the World, and the Glory of them, saying, *All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me,* Matt. 4. 9. But could Satan tempt the WORD, who made all those Kingdoms, and all the Glory of them, even all created Beings in Heaven and Earth; I say, could Satan tempt the WORD with such a Bait as this? And could he tempt him with such Trifles to worship the Work of his own Hands? Were the Devil capable of tempting at this silly rate, I think, a Man of common Sense might bid Defiance to all his Temptations. Whereas, if the WORD was quiescent, every thing is plain. For then the Devil's Bait was a proper Allurement to the Man Christ Jesus, who
was

was actually laboring under the greatest Straits and Afflictions.

'Twill be pleaded perhaps in Excuse for the Devil, that he did not know the Union of the two Natures, and that he was not aware of his having a God-Man to deal with. But how does this appear? Have we any Proof, that the Devil was thus ignorant? 'Tis plain, that the Devil pretended to know him. For the unclean Spirit cry'd out, *I know thee who thou art, the holy one of God*, Mark 1. 24. and Devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, *Thou art Christ the son of God*, Luke 4. 41.

'Twill be said perhaps, that we have only the Devil's Word for this Extent of his Knowledge. I add therefore, that Christ suffered not the Devils to speak, because they knew him, Mark 1. 34. and he rebuking them, suffered them not to speak; for they knew that he was Christ; Luke 4. 41. For I think the (b) Original will not fairly admit the Readings, which our Translators have put in the Margin of those Places; as if the Words did not imply, that the Devils really knew him; but that our Savior wou'd not suffer them to say, that they did so.

But if the Devil did really know him, it may still be urged, that he only knew him to be the Messiah; and might therefore notwithstanding be ignorant of the Union of the WORD with the Man Christ Jesus. Now the truth is, when I reflect upon the Manner of the Devil's tempting Mankind, which is certainly don (in too many Instances) by such an Influence upon our Souls, as

(b) Καὶ ἐκ ἡφίε λέγειν τὰ δαιμόνια, ὅτι ἤδειπαν αὐτόν. Our Margin reads, *To say that they knew him.*

Καὶ ὁππῶς ἐκ εἰς αὐτὰ λέγειν, ὅτι ἤδειπαν ἢ χριστὸν αὐτὸν ἰδῆ. Our Margin reads, *To say that they knew him to be Christ.*

must needs imply a thorough Knowledge of them, and Acquaintance with them; I can't conceive, that Satan cou'd be ignorant of that full, free and perfect Intercourse, and reciprocal Communication, between the WORD and our Savior's Soul, which those Persons must necessarily grant, who deny the WORD's Quiescence. For surely that intimat Correspondence between the Divine and Human Natures, when exerted in an uninterrupted Series of Actions (which is now supposed) could not but discover that Union which was the Foundation of it, to a Being which understands, and can (as we find by woful Experience) operate on, human Minds. And therefore, unless you suppose the WORD to have been quiescent during the Temptation, the Devil could not but know, not only that the Man Christ Jesus was united to the WORD, but also that he was so perfectly wrought on, and actuated by, that Divine Principle, that no Temptation could possibly affect him. And whether the Devil could be foolish enough to tempt our Savior, when he knew him to be so impreguably fortify'd, I'm content that any Person of common Sense should determine.

However, if it be insisted on, that the Devil did not know, that the WORD was united to the Man Christ Jesus; then it must be confess'd, that my Arguments from the Devil's Way of tempting our Lord, will not be conclusive in the Opinion of those, who may be resolv'd to shelter themselves under the Devil's (supposed) Ignorance; which as they themselves can't evince, so 'twill be difficult for me demonstrably to disprove.

Let us therefore consider, how our Savior behav'd himself under these Tryals. When the Devil prompted him to turn Stones into Bread for the Relief

Relief of his Hunger, he answer'd, *It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God, Matt. 4. 4.* But could this Answer proceed from the WORD? Could the WORD give such an Answer, as suited none but a mere Man? Could the WORD comfort himself with such a Text of Scripture, as is expressly restrain'd to mere Men, and applicable to none besides? Whereas, if the WORD was quiescent, this Difficulty vanishes. For then our Lord might rationally reply as a mere Man, and stop the Tempter's Mouth with such a Text, as was strictly pertinent to his Case.

Again, when the Devil placed him upon a Pinnacle of the Temple, and prompted him to cast himself down from thence, quoting to him that Text of the Psalmist, *He shall give his Angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone;* our Lord replies, *It is written, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.* But could this Reply become the WORD? Certainly, if the WORD had not been quiescent, Christ could not but have spoken to this Purpose, *I who made all Things, can prevent my being in Danger, or receiving Mischief, in any respect whatsoever. Nor do I need the Assistance of any Angels (for they are all but my Creatures) to secure my self.* On the other hand, if the WORD was quiescent, our our Savior's Reply was perfectly Natural, and such as his Duty obliged him to make.

Lastly, when the Devil took our Lord up into an exceeding high Mountain, and shewed him all the Kingdoms of the World, and the Glory of them, saying, *All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me, Matt. 4. 8, 9.* What did Christ reply? He said, *Get thee hence, Satan.*

For it is written, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*, Matt. 4. 10. Does he not withstand the Tempter with a Command given to mere Men? Would the WORD have answer'd thus? Or rather, was it possible, that the WORD, if he had not been quiescent, should never exert or discover himself in this whole Affair of no less than forty Days Continuance? Whereas, if we suppose, that the WORD was quiescent, every thing is easy; and our Lord's Reply was the very same, which a good Man, tempted to Idolatry in exceedingly hard Circumstances, ought to make.

In short, if the Devil be supposed (tho' against all Reason) to have been at that time utterly ignorant of the Union of the two Natures; yet I can't conceive, that our Savior would act so odd a Part even by the Devil himself, as he must have done, upon Supposition, that the WORD was not quiescent in him during his Temptation. For tho' I will not say, that he was strictly obliged to acquaint the Devil with the Excellency of his Nature, and to quash his Temptation by declaring his own Omnipotence: yet certainly I may affirm, that if the WORD was not quiescent in him, it was rather beneath the Dignity of our Savior's Character, to encourage the Devil's Procedure, and invite him to fresh Attempts, by personating, for the Space of no less than forty Days, what in reality he neither was nor could be, *viz.* a Man liable to those Temptations which the Devil offered. For, if the WORD was not at that time quiescent, our Savior was, and knew himself to be, beyond the reach of any Stratagems, which the Devil either actually used, or could possibly invent or employ. Whereas, on the other hand, if the WORD was quiescent in him, and he acted only as a mere
Man

Man conducted and assisted by the Spirit of God; he really was what he appeared, *viz.* liable to the Devil's Temptations. And consequently his whole Behavior was agreeable to his Character, and he acquitted himself, during the Course of that severe Tryal, in the manner which perfectly became him.

Hitherto I have been arguing from the respective Conduct of our Savior and the Devil in this remarkable Transaction. And the Considerations I have offer'd, are in my Opinion so strong, that if they do not strictly evince my Assertion, yet they make it at least highly probable, and are therefore (especially since nothing can be urged, with any Appearance of Strength, on the other side) sufficient to carry the Point, and challenge our Assent. But there still remains one other Observation, which alone determins the Controversy.

St. Matthew says, *Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil;* and St. Mark says, *The spirit driveth him (ἐκείνα, casteth him out) into the wilderness, and he was there in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan.*

By the way, upon Supposition that the WORD was not quiescent, it may be worth while to examine, how the Holy Spirit of God, which is upon your own Principles not superior to the WORD, could be said to *lead*, and even to *drive*, or *cast out*, the WORD into the Wilderness for this Purpose. Whereas no Difficulty can be imagined, if the WORD was quiescent. For then our Savior was intirely guided by the Spirit only, to which his Human Nature was undoubtedly inferior, and absolutely subject.

But what I insist upon, is this. The holy Spirit of God led Christ into the Wilderness for this very

End, that he might be tempted of the Devil; and Christ was accordingly in Fact tempted by him. Now, how ignorant soever the Devil might be of the Union of the Divine and Human Natures; how capable soever he might consequently be of attempting what could not possibly succeed; how little soever our Savior might think himself bound to discover and exert his own Excellency, and consequently how easily soever he might elude the Devil's Artifices: yet still it is certain, that he was actually tempted, and that those Instances which are particularly recorded, were true, real, and proper Temptations to him. And such they might well be, as every body will acknowledge, upon Supposition that the WORD was quiescent: Whereas, if the WORD was not quiescent, Christ was not capable of being tempted at all; much less could such things have been Temptations to him, as he is expressly said to have been tempted by.

For let us consider the Circumstances. If the WORD was quiescent, then the Man Christ Jesus was manifestly and confessedly liable to all Temporal Disasters, as much as other Mortals, notwithstanding his personal Union with the WORD: even as during his Infancy, he was subject to the usual Weaknesses and Imperfections of that State, altho' the WORD was, even during his Infancy, as certainly united to his Manhood, as during his Ministry. There is therefore no Difficulty upon this Hypothesis. But the Difficulties upon the other Hypothesis are insuperable. For if the WORD was not quiescent, but there was a full, free, and perfect Intercourse, and reciprocal Communication between the two Natures, and the Wisdom and Power of the WORD were imparted to, and exercised

cised by and through, the Man Christ Jesus : then the Man Christ Jesus, even all his Facultys and Powers both rational and corporeal, must have been more perfectly influenc'd, directed and actuated by, and more perfectly subject to, and more perfectly filled, comforted and supported with, the Divine WORD, than any other Man's corporeal Facultys and Powers can be influenced, directed and actuated by, subject to, filled, comforted and supported with, his rational Soul. What Temptation therefore could possibly affect the Man Christ Jesus in such a State ? He could not feel any Allurement to sin, but what must affect the WORD it self. For not only the WORD and the Man were inseparably one ; but the Man was so perfectly governed and actuated by the WORD, that he could not be for one single Moment liable to any Impression, but what the WORD did willingly admit of, and allow him to receive. The Man Christ Jesus must therefore have been absolutely impeccable (as he is undoubtedly in his present glorify'd State) and 'twould have been as impossible for him to chuse what the WORD could not approve, as 'twould be for any other Man's corporeal Facultys to make a voluntary Transgression, in spite of, and in direct Opposition to, his rational Soul. For, if the WORD were not quiescent, the Man Christ Jesus could no more act without the WORD's Concurrence, than any other Man can perform a voluntary Action by his barely corporeal Facultys, without the Concurrence of his Soul. And consequently the Man Christ Jesus could not possibly be tempted to sin, unless the WORD were quiescent in him. And yet the Holy Scriptures do expressly assure us, that he was actually and really tempted to Sin ; and consequently, tho' he did not
commit

commit it, yet he was capable of committing it, and of falling by it.

But farther, let us reflect upon the Nature of his Temptations. They were manifestly such, as demonstrat, that the WORD was quiescent, when they assaulted him. For the Purpose, he was tempted to turn Stones into Bread for the Relief of his Hunger, to cast himself down from the Temple, and to practise Idolatry for temporal Advantage. These were such Temptations, as he was certainly capable of, if the WORD was quiescent in him. But if the WORD was not quiescent, he was as certainly incapable of them. For could that Man who felt himself supported by a personal Union with an Almighty Being, could he thro' whom Omnipotence display'd it self, and who could consequently create in an Instant whatsoever he desired; be tempted to sin by the Cravings of his Stomach, or apprehend ill Consequences from a Fall, or worship the Devil for temporal Ends? Would you say, that a great Prince was *tempted*, if a Proposal was made him by his own Vassal to resign his Dominions for the Lucre of a Feather, or for a single Hair of his own Head, or for a puff of the Breath of his own Mouth? Is it possible for any Prince to accept such an Offer? Could it even induce him to deliberate upon it? And yet this very Offer might much more rationally be made to the greatest of Princes, and there would be juster Expectations of his closing with it; than could be supposed with respect to those Temptations, which the Devil ply'd our Savior with, upon Supposition that the WORD was not quiescent. For a Feather, a single Hair of his own Head, a puff of his own Breath, or any the meanest Trifle imaginable, is more desirable to the greatest Prince, and more

fit to be purchas'd by him at the most extravagant Rate, even at the Price of his whole Dominions; than a little Bread (for instance) or even the largest Empire, could be to him, thro' and by whom the Divine WORD did at that very time display his infinit Wisdom, Power, &c. and who consequently could every Moment speak into Being, whatsoever he wished, or had occasion for.

Briefly therefore, if the WORD was not quiescent, Christ was not capable of any Temptation whatsoever; much less could he be tempted by those Baits, which the Devil propos'd. And yet, if we may credit the Evangelists, Christ was truly, really and properly tempted by those very Baits: and tho' he piously withstood, and triumph'd over, his Adversary; yet he was undoubtedly under sore Tryals, and endured severe Conflicts with him. And consequently the WORD was quiescent, as long as the Course of Christ's Temptation lasted.

I proceed to the History of his Agony. He *kneel'd down, and prayed, saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine be don.* And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him. And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of bloud falling down to the ground, Luke 22. 41, 42, 43, 44. And we read in St. Matthew, that our Lord sayd, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death,* Matt. 26. 38. Now you will readily own, that if the WORD be Very God (which you know, I heartily believe and contend for) this Prayer could not proceed from the whole God-Man. For tho' the Man Christ Jesus might truly say, *Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless not my will, but thine be done:* yet the WORD could
not

not say the same. But you'll say, This pinches only those who believe the WORD to be Very God. True; what I insist upon therefore, is this.

We jointly acknowledge, that the WORD created the Angels. If therefore the WORD was not quiescent, I desire to be inform'd, how an Angel could strengthen him, or how the strengthening of an Angel could be needed by him, who incessantly felt and enjoy'd the full and free Comfort and Support of the WORD operating in him. Could a Man thus fortify'd by the Communication of the Wisdom and Power of the WORD, say, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death?* Or could a Man thus fortify'd feel such an Agony, as to sweat what was like great Drops of Blood falling to the Ground? And could an Angel administer Relief at last, even when his own indwelling WORD fail'd him? What inextricable Difficulties do such odd Fancies plunge Men into? Whereas, if the WORD be supposed quiescent, all is perfectly clear and easy. An Angel from Heaven was a very proper Comforter of a Person in such Distress as our Savior was in. For the plentiful Communication of the Spirit, which enabled him to work Miracles, and revele God's Will, is perfectly consistent with the lowest State of Temporal Afflictions: and that Person who is the most highly favor'd by God with the one, may be the most deeply afflicted by him with the other.

Again, when St. Peter cut off *Malchus's* Ear, our Lord said, *Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of Angels?* Matt. 26. 53. But could those Words be spoken by the Creator of Angels? Whereas, if the WORD, the Creator of Angels,
was

was quiescent; nothing could be more properly spoken by our blessed Lord.

Again, whilst he was hanging upon the accursed Tree, he cryed out, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Matt. 27. 46. This bitter Cry manifestly implys, that God had deliver'd him into the Hands of his Enemies; and left him utterly in their Power, to execute their Malice upon him. I need not observe to you, how impossible 'twas for those Words to proceed *from* the Very God *to* the Very God. I rather ask, how they could possibly proceed from such a Being, as you own the WORD to be. Was he that made all Creatures, given up by God into the Hands of his own Creatures? Or had those Men who crucify'd our Savior, an irresistible Power over their own Creator? Who can entertain such Absurdities? Whereas, if the WORD was quiescent, the Man Christ Jesus was truly, properly and strictly deserted at that time by God; that is, he was for a while deliver'd up to the Rage of his Enemys, whose malicious Vengeance God had not enabled him to escape or avoid.

Some Persons perhaps, not only of those who believe the WORD to be Very God, but also of those who believe the WORD to be inferior to the Very God (for you can't but perceive, that my present way of arguing reduces either sort to the very same Straits; I say, perhaps some Persons) may hope to account for all these remarkable Passages of our Savior's Life, by saying, that we may understand them to relate to, proceed from, or be transacted by, the Human Nature only; and suppose, that the WORD did not concur in them, nor was concerned about them. But in reality, the very same Difficulties will return; or else this *Non-concurrence* and *Unconcernment* of the WORD must mean,

mean, and be the very same, as what I call (in the Phrase of *Irenæus*) the WORD's Quiescence. For if the Human Nature of Christ did really act alone in those Instances; if those Actions did not proceed from, or appertain to, the Divine as well as the Human Nature: then, notwithstanding the Personal Union of the WORD and the Man, the extraordinary Influences of the WORD were not, in those Instances, communicated to the Man Christ Jesus; which is all that is meant by the WORD's Quiescence. But if, on the other hand, the Intercourse between the WORD and the Man was at that time free, full and perfect, and the Communication reciprocal; so that the WORD and the Man ought even then to be reputed as one Agent (which is the Opinion received by many on both sides, and the only Supposition that can be contradistinguished from the Quiescence of the WORD) then those who assert, that such Passages regard the Human Nature only, notwithstanding its intimate and uninterrupted Communication with the WORD, ought seriously to consider, that in Consequence of their Opinion they greatly injure our Savior, and charge that inimitable Pattern of all Goodness, particularly of Simplicity in Action, with such a Conduct, as is (to speak modestly) very unworthy of him.

For the Purpose, in the Affair of the Temptation, as they must make the Devil tempt the Man as distinct from the WORD; tho' at the same time the Man could not receive the Temptation without the WORD's Compliance, and was so fortified by the Wisdom and Power of the WORD, as not to be capable of listening to it, or falling by it (which would indeed be a likely Story, could they prove the Devil to be as stupidly foolish, as he is
eagerly

eagerly malicious) so on the other hand, they must make our Savior carry on a strange Collusion, and encourage the Tempter to proceed in his Attacks, by resisting him in a manner becoming none but a mere Man, and not discovering in the whole Space of forty Days Temptation (if the Devil himself could be all this while supposed ignorant of it) that his Human Nature was all that time absolutely secure, and incapable of any bad Impression, by reason of its unlimited Enjoyment of the irresistible Wisdom and Power of the WORD.

They must also turn the History of our Savior's Agony into a Scene of mere Grimace. For he who was utterly incapable of feeling an Agony, must seem to be deeply afflicted with one. He whose Happiness was so unspeakably great, that he could not sorrow at all; must declare himself exceeding sorrowful, even unto Death. He who was at perfect Ease, and whose infinit Strength was Proof against all Possibility of Pain; must send forth such Sweat, as should make others believe him to groan under the most insupportable Pressures. And to countenance this Train of false Appearances, an Angel must seem to strengthen him, who created the brightest Angels themselves. This is the Progress of what I can't but call a downright Imposture, upon those Principles. For I appeal to any Person of an honest Mind, whether he that actually enjoy'd, and incessantly felt, the free, full, and perfect Intercourse, and reciprocal Communication between the WORD and his own Human Nature (which is now supposed) could in any Sense, Measure or Degree, really endure, what our Lord Jesus Christ appeared to undergo, and (blessed be his unweary'd Love) did certainly suffer, to the utmost Extremity, and in the severest Truth.

Truth. For such Impressions, as really created him the most exquisit Tortures, and would have haras'd a Man of less Patience than our dear Redeemer even out of the World, without the additional Violence of a Crucifixion; I say, such Impressions could no more affect, or disturb the Felicity of, a Person so thoroughly elevated above the several Accidents of Human Nature, by a complete Enjoyment of the Wisdom and Power of the WORD, the Framer of all those Works which so loudly proclaim his own immense Glory; than the Breath of a Fly, for instance, can rend asunder the Firmament, or the Anger of a Worm can afflict an Archangel.

What has been already said, may be so easily apply'd to what our Savior spake to *St. Peter*, and to his bitter Cry on the Cross, that I forbear enlarging. The Truth is, I am utterly unwilling to repeat such Expressions, as I could not think it lawful to use so much as once, did I not know the absolute Necessity of them in order to clear the Truth, which (I hope) is sufficiently secured by what I have don already.

I will now subjoin one Argument of another Nature. We learn from the Author to the *Hebrews*, that our Lord was *made a little lower than the angels*, Heb. 2. 7, 9. Now the Dignity of the WORD (as this very Author has prov'd) was always superior to that of Angels. For the WORD made the Angels, as well as all other created Beings. And therefore ever since the WORD was made Flesh, the Dignity of our Savior's Person has been greater than that of any of his own Creatures. So that with respect to the Dignity of his Person he never was made *lower than the Angels*. The Apostle therefore means, that our Savior was made lower than the
Angels,

Angels, not as to the *Dignity*, but as to the *Condition* of his Person; that is, he was made lower than the Angels in Glory and Happiness.

Now his Condition of Glory and Happiness has ever since his Exaltation been manifestly superior to that of the Angels: and consequently, since the Apostle means his Condition after his Incarnation, 'tis plain, that our Savior was made lower than the Angels during the time of his Humiliation. From hence therefore I infer, that during his Humiliation (and consequently during the time of his Ministry) the WORD was quiescent. Because 'twas otherwise impossible for our Savior to be, during that Space, in a lower Degree of Glory and Happiness than the Angels.

For let any intelligent Person judge, whether a Man, that enjoy'd, as a Consequence of his personal Union therewith, a full, free, and perfect Intercourse, and reciprocal Communication, of the Wisdom and Power, of the WORD (supposing the WORD to be nothing greater than you your self allow) could possibly be in a lower Degree of Glory and Happiness than the Angels. For that Glory and Happiness, which the essential Splendor and Bliss of the WORD must necessarily create in a Man, who is throughly enrich'd with it, is such, as no Debasement whatsoever, which the Human Nature is capable of, can possibly so far qualify or diminish, as to render that Man's State of Glory and Happiness, upon the whole, inferior to the Glory and Happiness of Angels. Wherefore the WORD was certainly quiescent during the Humiliation (and consequently during his Ministry) when the Man Christ Jesus most certainly became lower in Glory and Happiness than the Angels, notwithstanding his personal Union with the

WORD. For tho' that Union rendred the Dignity of Christ's Person superior to that of the Angels: yet, because the Man Christ Jesus did not feel and enjoy the Splendor and Bliss of the WORD, to whom he was personally united; therefore as to State and Condition, as to Glory and Happiness, he was really made lower than the Angels.

If it be ask'd, whether this Quiescence of the WORD was total or partial; that is, whether the WORD, during the Time of his Ministry, did constantly forbear to communicat any particular Kind of his extraordinary Influences to the Man Christ Jesus; or whether he only forbore at certain Times to communicat them all; or whether at certain Times he communicat some of them, tho' at the same Times he forbore to communicat others: I answer, that I suppose (for I need not affect; because I shall build nothing upon the Determination of this Point; and therefore I shall only declare it to be in my Opinion highly probable) that the Quiescence was total during the whole Ministry. For, if it had been otherwise, I can't conceive, but that we must have had an Account of the WORD's discovering himself thro' the Man Christ Jesus at some time or other. Whereas I have largely demonstrat, that during that Space, our Lord Jesus Christ never did any thing, but what might be don by a mere Man conducted and assist'd by God's Spirit. 2. If the WORD did ever exert himself during that Space, I can't conceive, why our Savior should, or indeed how he could, be constantly represent'd as wholly under the Conduct of the Spirit. 3. Christ's State during his Ministry is represent'd as a State of Temptation. He says himself, *Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations*, Luke 22. 28. And the Author to the

the Hebrews says, *We have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities ; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin,* Heb. 4. 15. Now unless the WORD was totally quiescent, I believe 'twill not be possible to suppose Christ capable of Temptations, if what I have (c) already suggested, be duly consider'd. 4. Since there is full Proof of the WORD's Quiescence at certain Times, particularly at the beginning and close of his Ministry ; and not the least Intimation of the contrary at any time, in any one Part of the intermediat Space : 'tis reasonable to conclude, that the WORD was totally quiescent during the whole Period.

Whether you your self have written any thing, which implys your Acknowledgment of the Quiescence of the WORD, either total or partial ; I shall not inquire. I think, some of your Expressions seem to hint, that you believe at least a partial Quiescence : but if you do not allow our Savior an Human Soul, you can't possibly acknowledge a total Quiescence. I shall not therefore endeavor to ascertain, what were your Notions concerning this Point. But I am willing to hope, you are by this time convinc'd, that the Quiescence of the WORD, during Christ's Ministry, is evident from Holy Scripture. For we are therein assured, that the WORD was made Flesh ; and consequently was personally united to the Man Christ Jesus at his Incarnation ; and that accordingly that personal Union continued during the Ministry. But then it appears, that the Influences of the WORD were suspended, and did not shew themselves through the Man Christ Jesus. For as the rational Soul

(c) See p. 136, &c.

does not discover it self in a new born Child, but gradually exerts its Faculties, till at length it displays its whole Power; and even afterwards it is frequently suspended by Sleep, notwithstanding 'tis always personally united to the Flesh from the very Birth: even so we may conceive, that the WORD, tho' personally united to the Man Christ Jesus, forbore (so the Divine Wisdom thought good) to communicat his extraordinary Influences to him during the Space beforemention'd.

But after the Exaltation of the Man Christ Jesus, ever since the Very God govern'd the whole World by and through him; that Plenitude of Excellency, which is essential to, and inseparable from, the WORD, shines thro' the Man; and the Godhead not only does dwell, but is also known and appears to dwell, in the Man *σωμειπικῶς*, the Man Christ Jesus being, in Consequence of his personal Union with the WORD, much more strictly and properly the *Temple of God*, than we are able to comprehend. This Scheme, the Footsteps of which are so manifest and so easily traced in the Holy Scriptures, by an attentive Reader of them, exactly answers to all the Appearances of our Savior's Conduct and Circumstances, during his Abode upon Earth, and since his Ascension into Heaven.

Tho' I can't forbear adding, that the depth of his Humiliation ended at his Death. For his Resurrection opened a Way to the Possession of his present happy and glorious Condition. He declared, that he should raise himself from the Dead. For *Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body, John 2. 19, 20, 21. And again,*
Therefore

Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of my self: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father, John 10. 17, 18. I conceive therefore, that the Human Soul having been anointed with the Spirit in the most plentiful manner, had a Power of uniting it self to its former Body, given it by the Very God, who poured the Spirit on him. Nor is this, upon any account, more wonderful, than his being enabled during his Life time to raise others from the Dead. For his Soul, being the principal part of the Man Christ Jesus, might continue endued with this miraculous Power after its Separation from the Body, made by his Death upon the Cross, as well as during its Conjunction with it.

He seems, also to have been under the Conduct of the Spirit even till the time of his Ascension. For St. Luke says, *The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which he was taken up, after that he thro' the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the Apostles whom he had chosen,* Acts 1. 1, 2. So that he gave Commandments to his Apostles *through the Holy Ghost* after his Resurrection; and accordingly we have no Proof, that the WORD exerted himself before Christ's Ascension. And therefore, tho' he said before his Ascension, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth,* Matt. 28. 18. yet he did not actually exercise that Plenitude of Power, with which he was rewarded for his Sufferings, till he was actually ascended into Heaven, and placed at God's Right Hand; which Phrase manifestly signifies his being actually invested with the utmost

Authority, and being made the great Governor of all created Beings.

From this Ascension therefore we must date his Exaltation; the Space between his Resurrection and Ascension being, tho' not a State of Suffering, yet nothing more than an Introduction to immense Glory, and a gradual Discovery of that excellent Brightness, which would soon break forth in its full Lustre. And accordingly in this intermediat Space, *he spake of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, Acts 1. 3.* And beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures, the things concerning himself, *Luke 24. 27.* Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures; and said unto them, *Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem, v. 45, 46, 47.* Then did he, I presume, revele to them his Divine Nature, and the Excellency of his Person; insomuch that when *St. Thomas* was assured it was the blessed Jesus himself, he gave intire Credit to all that the Brethren had reported concerning him, and without any Hesitation cried out, *My Lord and my God, John 20. 28.* as he might justly do, when he knew that the WORD was in him, of which *St. John* affirms (I do not as yet inquire in what Sense) that it *was God, John 1. 1.*

C H A P. X.

Of our Savior's not knowing the Day of Judgment.

HAVING thus prepared the Way, by the Proof of the two foregoing Propositions, let us now examin the second of those Texts, which are supposed to teach, that the WORD or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, is inferior to the Very God. Our Lord says, *But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father,* Mark 13. 32. From hence it has been inferred, that since the Father, *viz.* the Very God, does know the Day of Judgment, and the Son does not know it; therefore our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Son, and consequently the WORD or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, is inferior to the Very God.

For the clearing of this Difficulty, I offer the following Particulars.

1. Mere Man can't by the Light of Reason know the Day of Judgment. And consequently the Man Christ Jesus, had he been neither united to the WORD, nor illuminated by the Holy Spirit, must necessarily have been ignorant of it.

2. Tho' an inspired Man may know the Day of Judgment, if God reveles it to him: yet plain Fact proves, 'that 'tis very possible for an inspired Man to be ignorant of it. For no inspired Person ever yet knew it. Nay, tho' our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Son of God, received the Holy Spirit *without measure*; yet he himself assures us, that he did not know it. That Expression therefore does by no means imply, that the Man Christ Jesus became

strictly Omniscient by the Revelation of the Spirit: but only imports, that the Spirit was given to him in a most plentiful manner; that is, in a manner so plentiful, that never did any other Mortal enjoy the like; tho' not so absolutely plentiful, but that God himself might have communicated something more to him, had it pleased him so to do. For the Father, *viz.* the Very God, who knew it himself, was certainly able, had he judged it fitting, to discover the Day of Judgment to the Man Christ Jesus.

3. Considering the Circumstances of the Man Christ Jesus during his Ministry, there was certainly no Necessity of his knowing the Day of Judgment, in order to any of those things which it behoved him to do or finish during that Space. Nay, had there been any such Necessity, doubtless God would have reveled it to him by the Spirit. And consequently the Man Christ Jesus could not possibly have been ignorant of it, even tho' it might be supposed, that the WORD does not essentially and necessarily know it.

4. Since the WORD, during our Savior's Ministry, was either totally (which is by much the most probable) or at least partially quiescent; the Man Christ Jesus might not know the Day of Judgment, even tho' the WORD himself did know it. Wherefore,

5. It does not follow, that the WORD did not know the Day of Judgment, because the Son, *viz.* the Man Christ Jesus, in whom the WORD was (sometimes at least) quiescent, did not know it. And therefore,

6. Since this Text does not teach, that the WORD did not know the Day of Judgment; 'tis plain, that this Text does not teach, that the
WORD

WORD is inferior to the Very God, even the Father, of whom it affirms, that he doth know that Day.

But 'twill be objected, that Christ is the Son of God, with respect to his Divine, as well as his Human Nature; and therefore since our Savior himself says, that the Son did not know the Day of Judgment, it follows, that neither the Divine, nor the Human Nature of the Son knew it. For otherwise Christ must have practis'd such an Equivocation, as was utterly unworthy of his holy Character. But I answer, that how certainly soever Christ may be the Son of God with respect to his Divine, as well as with respect to his Human Nature; yet he did notwithstanding mean nothing else but his Human Nature, when he declared, that the Son knew not the Day of Judgment; and that in so doing he used the utmost Sincerity and Plainness of Speech, and was consequently by no Means chargeable with the lowest Degree of Equivocation upon that Account.

To state this Matter truly, we must observe, that his Disciples inquired of him, when those Things which he had spoken, should come to pass; and what he says in this controverted Text, is part of the Answer he return'd to their Inquiry. Now 'twas his Human Nature alone that spake at that time, upon Supposition that the WORD was quiescent. And the Disciples did not then suspect, that the WORD was united to the Man Christ Jesus, or that he had any other than a merely Human Nature. Therefore, since our Savior and his Disciples did by *the Son* jointly understand the Human Nature only; well might our Savior affirm, that the Son knew not the Day of Judgment. For
he.

he used that Phrase in the same Sense, in which he was sure the Disciples would understand it.

'Twas not at that time our Savior's Duty or Intention to inform his Disciples, in how many different Senses he might be called the Son of God; or to make known to them the hypostatical Union of the WORD and the Man Christ Jesus, which Mystery they were as yet perfectly unacquainted with: but he resolved to return a proper and intelligible Answer to their Question. And accordingly he did not inform them, that *the Son*, when that Phrase is used in such a Sense as he had never once hitherto used it in; and consequently in such a Sense as his Disciples had never heard of, and were absolutely Strangers to, and would most certainly not understand him in; I say, our Savior did not inform them, that *the Son* in such a secret Sense, or that *the Son* in any possible Sense, knew not the Day of Judgment: but he plainly and roundly inform'd them, that *the Son*, in that Sense, which he therefore meant, because they would infallibly so understand him, that is, the Man Christ Jesus, knew it not.

Before I leave this Head, I shall touch upon one thing, which some Persons have esteem'd a considerable Difficulty. Our Savior's Words run thus, *Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father*, Mark 13. 32. So that the Son is placed after the Angels; and must therefore, in Conformity to our Savior's Climax, be supposed at that time superior to them. Whereas the Son, say they, was not at that time superior to the Angels otherwise than with respect to his Divine Nature. And consequently our Savior must mean, that the Divine Nature of the Son knew the Day of Judgment, no more

more than the Human Nature did. To this I return a double Answer.

1. One would think, that such Objectors have never read the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, wherein the Man Christ Jesus, upon the Account of his being appointed Heir of all Things (which manifestly relates to his Human Nature, which alone was exalted) is declared to have been, and consequently was when these Words were spoken, superior to the Angels in Dignity, tho' at that time he was inferior to them in State and Condition, in Glory and Happiness. And therefore our Lord's Gradation is strictly just, if the last must needs be esteemed the most worthy Person. But,

2. We ought to remember, that (to our own unspeakable Comfort) the Man Christ Jesus shall be our Judge at that great Day; and he constantly declar'd as much to his Disciples, even when they little thought of his having a Divine Nature. So that the Disciples might more reasonably expect to be inform'd by him, when the Day of Judgment should come, than by the most exalted Seraph; because it much more concerned him to know that Day, than the brightest Angel whatsoever. Our Lord's Gradation therefore is truly natural, even tho' the Son had not been at that time superior in Dignity to the Angels. For 'twas our Lord's Design to place that Person last, not barely who was superior in Dignity (tho' even that also was the Son's Right at that very Time) but who was most likely to be acquainted with that great Secret, and consequently might most probably have the Power of imparting it to them. His Words do not only bear, but necessarily require, this Sense. "Whereas ye desire to know the Day and Hour of Judgment, and that I should impart that Secret

"cret to you ; I assure you, that no Man knows
 "of that Day and that Hour. Neither do the
 "Angels themselves, which are in Heaven, and
 "always in God's Presence, and who may there-
 "fore be supposed in a great measure Partakers of
 "his Counsels ; even they do not know it. Nay,
 "what is still more surprizing, neither do I my
 "self, tho' I am the Son of God, and the very
 "Person who shall then judge the whole Race of
 "Mankind (and might for that Reason have that
 "Day and Hour imparted to me, rather than the
 "most glorious Angel that ever was created ; be-
 "cause that Day and Hour do concern me infinit-
 "ly more than any of those blessed Spirits) even I
 "my self do not know it. This Divine Decree
 "has never been communicated to any Being
 "whatsoever. None but God himself (whom you
 "have so often heard me call my Father) is ap-
 "priz'd of it.

C H A P. XI.

*Of Christ's saying, My Father is greater than I ;
 with Reflections upon diverse other Texts.*

THERE remain diverse other Texts, which
 are supposed to teach, that the WORD, or
 Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, is inferior
 to the Very God. These I shall briefly consider and
 explain.

3. Therefore, our Lord said; *My Father is greater
 than I*, John 14. 28. Now if the WORD was qui-
 escent, when this Declaration was made ; then it
 pro-

proceeded from the Human Nature only. And consequently, since the Disciples did not at that Time in the least suspect, that the WORD was united to the Man Christ Jesus; but esteem'd their Master to be a mere Man, only conducted and assisted by the Holy Spirit: why might not both our Savior mean, and his Disciples understand him to mean, that the Father or Very God was greater than the Man Christ Jesus?

You (a) tell us indeed, that this Exposition is *flat and insipid*. But for what Reason? Why, you (b) say, that *when any Person affirms another to be greater than himself, he must of necessity mean, greater than he himself is in his greatest Capacity*. But I pray, have you any where proved, that the aforesaid Declaration proceeded jointly from the Divine and Human Natures? Or that 'twas made by the WORD, as well as by the Man Christ Jesus? Or that the WORD was not at that time quiescent? Or that the Disciples could understand him otherwise than in this, which you esteem a *flat and insipid* Sense? Till you have evinc'd these things (the contrary to all which, I hope, has been evinc'd above) you will be obliged to grant, that the Exposition I contend for, is really just and true. For tho' he that then spake, must mean, that the Father was greater than himself in his greatest Capacity; yet it must be remembred, that 'twas only the Man that spake, the WORD being quiescent. And you will readily allow, that the Father, or Very God, was greater than the Man Christ Jesus in his greatest Capacity; even tho' he was at that

(a) Script. Doct. p. 157.

(b) Reply to Mr. Nelson's Friend, p. 172.

time so conducted and assisted by the Holy Spirit, as no other Man ever was or shall be.

You urge indeed, that tho' this is true, yet 'tis of no great Moment; for what Wonder is it, that God should be greater than a Man? I will therefore consider each Branch of this Plea. 1. Could not the Man Christ Jesus affirm this, *because 'tis no Wonder?* His own Practice answers the Question. He had said before, *My sheep hear my voice, and I know them; and they follow me. And I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand,* John 10. 27; 28^o; 29. I would fain know, whom he meant by the *all* and the *none*. He could not mean any thing greater than the Devil or wicked Men. Was it therefore any Wonder, that God should be greater than the Devil or wicked Men? And why might not the Man Christ Jesus, who was at that very time able by the Spirit's Assistance to vanquish even Devils, as well say, *My Father is greater than I*; as he did unquestionably declare, that the Father is greater than the Devil or wicked Men, when he said, *My Father is greater than all, &c.*? But, 2. could not the Man Christ Jesus affirm this, *because 'tis of no great Moment?* Surely 'tis sufficient, if 'twas pertinent; which can't be question'd. The truth is, this or any other known Maxim is always of great Moment to the Speaker, when it enforces an Argument for a Religious Practice; as even the most common and obvious Truths very often do. And accordingly, *Elibu*, whose Discourse you will not call *flat* or *insipid*, apply'd this very Maxim, saying, *Behold, in in this thou art not just: I will answer thee, that God is greater than man,* Job 33. 12.

I confess, had our Lord uttered these Words, *My Father is greater than I*, as some wonderful Secret; and offer'd it to his Disciples as a great Discovery, that God was greater than a Man: your Objection had been well grounded. But that can't be pretended. He only us'd that selfevident Proposition, as a Medium to prove something of great Consequence. He said, *Ye have heard, how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice; because I said, I go unto the Father. For my Father is greater than I.* The Father's being greater than the Man Christ Jesus, shew'd, that the Man Christ Jesus would be much advantaged by going to the Father. And therefore, if they loved their Master, *viz.* the Man Christ Jesus, they would rejoice at his going to the Father. Because he that loves another, will prefer the Increase of that Person's Happiness to his own present Satisfaction. You see therefore, that this Saying was really of great Moment. For 'twas the Foundation of our Savior's Argument, by which he evinc'd to his Disciples, how it became them to act in those Circumstances.

4. Our Lord is frequently represented during his Ministry, as inferior to the Father or Very God. For Instance; *And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me,* Luke 22. 29. *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand,* John 3. 35. *For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, John 5. 22. I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father that sent me,* John 5. 30. *Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth, and came from God; neither came I of my self, but he sent me,* John 8. 42. *Jesus knowing*

knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God, John 13. 3. For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God. I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world, and go to the Father, John 16. 27, 28. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent, John 17. 3. But these or the like Passages can create no Difficulty. For it can't be concluded from them, that the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, is inferior to the Very God; Because the WORD being then quiescent, they relate merely to the Man Christ Jesus.

5. Tho' our Lord is frequently represented, after not only his Ministry, but even his Ascension and Glorification, as inferior to the Father or Very God: yet 'twill plainly appear, that none of those Passages in which he is thus represented, can prove, that the WORD, or our Savior's Divine Nature, is inferior to the Father or the Very God, if the following Particulars be considered.

First, Our Lord is expressly stiled, even after his Ascension and Glorification, sometimes simply *God*, and sometimes simply *Man*. You own, that he is simply stiled *God*, Heb. 1. 8. where the Author of that Epistle applies to him that Passage of the Psalmist, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c.* and he is simply stiled *Man*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. where the Apostle assures us, that *there is one God, and one mediator between God and Men, the man Christ Jesus.*

Secondly, As he is expressly stiled *Man*, even after his Ascension and Glorification; so is he also called by other Names, which belong to his Human Nature. Particularly, 1. He is called *Jesus*, which is the Greek for *Joshuab*, a common Name of a Man amongst

amongst the *Jews*. And accordingly, tho' 'twas given our blessed Lord by Divine Command, because (as the Name *Jeshuah* imports *Salvation* or *Deliverance*) he should be a Deliverer or Savior in a most remarkable Sense (for he should *save his people from their sins*, Matt. 1. 21.) yet still it betokened that Man, whom the blessed Virgin miraculously brought into the World, and imply'd nothing of an incarnat God in the Notation of it. 2. The Name *Christ* or *Messiah*, tho' 'twas frequently given in the *Jewish* Church upon other Occasions, yet is certainly apply'd to the Blessed Jesus upon the account of that anointing with the Spirit, by which he was evidenc'd to be that very Christ or Messiah *מָשִׁיחַ*, or by way of Eminence, whose coming was foretold by the ancient Prophets, and was so impatiently expected by the *Jews*. And tho' the WORD was indeed, and ought to be (so the Divine Wisdom saw fit) united to the Man Christ Jesus; yet as that anointing was poured out on the Human Nature only (for the WORD was not capable of it) so the Name *Christ* or *Messiah* means no more, than that particular Man *Jesus*, who was thus wonderfully anointed by the Spirit without Measure, and who is accordingly called by St. Paul, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. in express Terms, *the man Christ Jesus*. 3. Our Lord (as I have shewn already) is also stiled *the Son of God* with respect to his Human Nature, *viz.* because he was in a miraculous Manner begotten by the Holy Ghost, and God was as truly and properly his Father, as a Man is the Father of his own Child. And accordingly, whensoever our Savior is stiled the Son of God, or God is stiled the Father of our Savior, that Appellation is (I think)

constantly given him upon the Account of his Human Nature.

For tho' I freely grant the Truth of what our Divines usually call the *Eternal* Generation of the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Lord ; yet I do not find, that in the Phrase of holy Scripture, our Savior is call'd the Son of God, or that God is said to be his Father, otherwise than upon the Account of his being Man, or an incarnat God. The Certainty of this Observation will appear by this one Consideration, *viz.* that as our blessed Savior is in the holy Scriptures confessedly called the Son of God, and God is also therein called his Father, upon the account of his Human Nature : so there is not one single Text of Scripture, wherein either our Savior is called God's Son, or God is called his Father, but what either necessarily must, or very fairly may, be understood with respect to his Incarnat State. And I dare say, you'll soon be convinced of this, if you search for a Text, wherein the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Savior, is called God's Son, or God is said to be the Father of the WORD, or Christ's Divine Nature, upon some Account antecedent to the Incarnation. Particularly you'll observe, that even in *Matt.* 28. 19. where the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are so expressly mentioned, the Son denotes the incarnat Messiah, whose Disciples we are as he was incarnat ; and consequently he is not even in that Text called the Son of the Father upon any Account antecedent to the Incarnation.

As for these Words, *who shall declare his Generation,* Acts 8. 33. and the Comparison of our Lord to *Melchizedech*, as being *Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end*
of

of life; but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually, Heb. 7. 3. these Texts do manifestly relate to Christ's Human Nature, the former of them being part of the Account of his Sufferings in the Flesh, and the latter affirming the same of *Melchizedech*, which is affirmed of Christ. And consequently neither of them can be strained to signify the Eternal Generation of the WORD, or Divine Nature of Christ.

Thirdly, Because our Lord, even after his Ascension and Glorification, is called sometimes *God* and sometimes *Man*, and at other Times denoted by such Titles, as belong to him respectively upon the account of either his Divine or his Human Nature; 'tis plain, that in his present exalted State neither of his Natures is destroy'd, nor are they confounded; but he continues perfect God and perfect Man. Wherefore,

Fourthly, Since the two Natures are still distinct and diverse in themselves, tho' so closely united to each other; therefore those things may still be spoken of him as Man, which can't be spoken of him as God; and those things may still be spoken of him as God, which can't be spoken of him as Man. And accordingly,

Fifthly, When any thing is spoken of him under the Name of Man, or under any of those Titles which belong to him as Man, we ought not to understand those things of, or apply them to, his Divine Nature: and when any thing is spoken of him under the Name of God, or under some Title which belongs to him as God, we ought not to understand those things of, or apply them to, his Human Nature. I say, we ought not to stretch what is thus respectively spoken, to that Nature which it is not

primarily applicable to, or grounded on; unless there be manifest Reason from the Context, or from the Nature of the things spoken, so to do. For,

Sixthly, By reason of the Union of the two Natures, some things are affirmed of the God, which are true of the Human Nature only; and other things are affirmed of the Man, which are true of the Divine Nature only. For Instance, 'tis affirmed of the God, that he was *received up into glory*, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. which evidently regards the Exaltation of the Man Christ Jesus, as I have (c) already shewn: and 'tis affirmed of him, *through whose blood we have redemption*, Col. 1. 14, 20. and who is *the first born from the dead*, v. 18. (which Particulars do manifestly point at, and belong to, Christ's Human Nature) that *by him were all things created*, Col. 1. 16. which was certainly don by the WORD or Divine Nature. In these Cases, the plain Meaning is, that such things are affirmed of that compounded Person, who because he has two Natures, is therefore signify'd by the Names or Titles of either of them, as the Divine Penmen thought most proper; there being no Name given to Christ by inspired Writers, which denotes both Natures united in one Person, such as *θεάνθρωπος*, *God-Man*, *λογάνθρωπος*, *Word-Man*, or the like. For tho' the Name *Emmanuel*, which seems pretty nearly to denote the two Natures united, is apply'd to our Lord, *Matt.* 1. 23. yet 'tis notorious, that he is not elsewhere called by that Name, or by any other of the same Import. But then,

(c) Chap. 6. p. 35.

Seventhly, It is to be noted, that when the inspired Writers speak of our holy Redeemer, they give him such a Name (whether implying his being God or Man) as the first thing they mention of him, does require, or the principal thing they have in view, directs them to. And whatever things are afterwards mentioned of him under the Name or Title of that Nature, to which they do not originally and properly belong, are (by a sort of Catachresis) predicated of the same Subject consider'd in a different Capacity, merely to avoid the Inconveniency of giving quite different Names or Titles to the same Subject, at the same time, upon the account of the different Capacity to be considered in.

An Example or two will make this Matter obvious to the meanest Reader. St. Paul says, *Without Controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory*, 1 Tim. 3. 16. In this Passage God is the Subject. For why? Being manifested in the Flesh is most truly affirmed of God; and in order to express this Affirmation, God must needs be the Subject. And the principal View the Apostle had, was to represent the Greatness of the Mystery of Godliness, of which the Manifestation of God in the Flesh was the most evident Demonstration. But then, because the Manifestation of God in the Flesh was not the whole of that Mystery, but diverse other Particulars did most justly deserve our Notice, which are all of them true of that compounded Person, who is justly stiled God by reason of his Divine Nature; therefore the Apostle continues the Predicat without altering the

Name of the Subject, and proceeds to affirm of him (tho' those Affirmations regard him not as God, but as Man; that is, because he was God manifested in the Flesh, or God-Man) that he was *justified in the Spirit, seen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory*; that is, the Man Christ Jesus (even the other Nature united to God, and become one and the same Person with God, and therefore sufficiently pointed at under the Name of the superior Nature) was justified, or demonstrated to be what he pretended, *in or by the Spirit, &c.*

Again, St. Paul says, that God hath translated us *into the kingdom of his dear Son. In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins. Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature. For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him, &c.* Col. 1. 13, &c. You see, the Subject is God's Son; and Christ is undoubtedly God's Son as to his Human Nature. And the first thing affirmed of God's Son is, that *in him we have redemption through his blood*, which manifestly relates to his Human Nature. 'Twas therefore necessary, that the Subject should be denoted by some Name or Title which belonged to him as Man. But then, because the principal View of the Apostle, in that glorious Character which follows, was to represent the Dignity of that Man, through whose Blood we have Redemption; therefore he proceeds to affirm (by way of Predicat to the same Subject) such things of God's Son, as manifestly relate to his Divine Nature, and can't possibly be understood of, or relate

late to, his Human Nature ; saying expressly, that *by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him.* That is, the Apostle affirms such things of him, whom he at first characterizes as a Man, which can be true of him only as he is God.

Briefly then, whensoever our Lord is spoken of under the Name or Title of a Man, we must understand his Human Nature only ; and when he is spoken of under the Name or Title of God, we must understand his Divine Nature only : except we are obliged to do otherwise for the Reasons already given. That is, we must always restrain (when the Context and Circumstances will permit) what is respectively spoken of each Nature, to the Nature it properly belongs to, considered not as actually separated from, but only as it is in it self really distinct from, tho' at the same time inseparably united to, the other Nature. For, as I have already observed, none of the several Names or Titles given in the Holy Scriptures to our Savior, does include or denote his two Natures united in one Person : but each of them does respectively signify that Nature, upon the account of which it does originally appertain to him.

By this great Numbers of Texts become perfectly intelligible, and considerable Difficultys are very easily removed. For if this Rule be duly observed, many Passages will instantly appear to be spoken of the Man Christ Jesus only, without any Regard to the WORD or Divine Nature, which, if understood of the WORD or Divine Nature, or of the whole God-Man, would really imply, that the

WORD, or Christ's Divine Nature, is inferior to the Very God. Such are these which follow. *And ye are Christ's: and Christ is God's*, 1 Cor. 3. 23. *But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him*, 1 Cor. 8. 6. *But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God*, 1 Cor. 11. 3. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is Death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all, 1 Cor. 15. 24—28. For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich, 2 Cor. 8. 9. Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended, is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things, Ephes. 4. 9, 10. For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified (viz. as you your self (d) explain it, Christ and all good Christians) are all of one (viz. as you rightly say, of God) for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, Heb. 2. 11. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats, should take away sins. Wherefore when

(d) *Script. Doct.* p. 189.

he cometh into the world, he saith, *Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure: Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God. Above, when he said, Sacrifice, and offering, and burnt offerings, and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein, (which are offered by the law) Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all, Heb. 10. 4——10.*

Thus also are those Texts to be understood, in which the Very God is styled *the God, the Father, or the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorifie God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Rom. 15. 6. *Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort, 2 Cor. 1. 3. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not, 2 Cor. 11. 31. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ, Ephes. 1. 3. That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the Spirit of wisdom and revelation, in the knowledge of him, v. 17. We give thanks to God, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you, Col. 1. 3. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, 1 Pet. 1. 3. And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen, Rev. 1. 6.*

Thus

Thus also is our blessed Savior himself to be understood in these remarkable Texts. *Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not : for I am not yet ascended to my Father : but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, and to my God, and your God, John 20. 17. Him that overcometh, will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out : and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God : and I will write upon him my new name, Rev. 3. 12.*

To these I may add the following Passages ; *And he was clothed with a vesture dipt in blood : and his name is called, The Word of God, Rev. 19. 13. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the Nations : and he shall rule them with a rod of iron : and he treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God, v. 15.*

I confess, there are some other Particulars affirmed of our blessed Lord with respect to his Human Nature, which have been too commonly understood of the W O R D or his Divine Nature ; and which wou'd, if that Interpretation were just, fairly prove, that the W O R D or Divine Nature of Christ, is inferior to the Very God. Upon these therefore I shall bestow a few Observations.

Our Lord is called *the Image of the Invisible God*, and *the first born of every Creature*, Col. 1. 15. But how does it certainly appear, that these Phrases relate to the W O R D or his Divine Nature ? God is said to have created Man *in his own image*, Gen. 1. 27. and he is accordingly *the image and glory of God*, 1 Cor. 11. 7. particularly as he is the Representative of God, exercising Authority in
God's

God's Name in this lower World; and thus is Christ *the image of God*, 2 Cor. 4. 4. even *the image of the invisible God*, Col. 1. 15. by being, even in his Human Nature, God's Representative; because, 1. His preexistent Soul did in the old Times personat the Divine Majesty; and 2. The Man Christ Jesus does now exercise God's Dominion over the whole Creation. And accordingly 'tis observable, that the Apostie styles Christ the Image of the *invisible* God, plainly intimating, that the Image it self is *visible*; and consequently that Phrase must be understood as I have already explained it. And as for the other Phrase, the Man Christ Jesus is most certainly *the first born of every creature*, not only, 1. because his Human Soul was created before all other Creatures, as I have (e) already said; but also, 2. because he is now instated in the actual Possession of the *first born* (which the WORD, or his Divine Nature, is essentially incapable of receiving) as being actually constituted, and in Fact become, what he was not before his Exaltation, *viz.* the Governor of all created Beings.

Again, 'tis affirmed of Christ, Col. 2. 9. that in him *dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead* *σωματικῶς* (that is, not as we translate it, *bodily*; but as *σῶμα* is opposed to *οὐρα*, v. 17.) *really or truly*. Now this may be most justly affirmed of the Man Christ Jesus. For if the Fulness of the Godhead signifys the WORD or Divine Nature; it really and truly dwells in the Man to whom 'tis personally united. But if *θεῖος* signifys the Dominion of God, as you (f) con-

(e) Chap. 7. p. 89.

(f) Reply to Bishop Gastrell, p. 283.

tend it does; 'tis certain, that the Man Christ Jesus does actually exercise it at present in the most ample Manner, as God's Vicegerent in his Kingdom of the Creation.

Again we read, that God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds. Who being the brightness of his Glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high: Being made so much better than the Angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent Name than they. For unto which of the Angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son? And again, when he bringeth in the first born into the World, he saith, And let all the Angels of God worship him. And of the Angels he saith, Who maketh his Angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom: Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God hath anointed thee with the oyl of gladness above thy fellows. And thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the Works of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a Garment; And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail. But to which of the Angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation? Heb. 1. 2—14.

Now,

Now, as I have already proved, that these Words, *Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God hath anointed thee with the oyl of gladness above thy Fellows,* v. 9. do relate to the Human Nature; so I grant, that these Expressions, *by whom also he made the Worlds,* v. 2. and those Quotations from the Psalmist, v. 6, 8, 10, 11, 12. do relate to the Divine Nature. And I am persuaded, nobody will pretend, that any of these Particulars do prove or imply, that the WORD, or Divine Nature, is inferior to the Very God. But then, as for the other Affirmations concerning the Son, let them never so plainly prove or imply an Inferiority to the Very God, yet they are most fairly and manifestly to be understood of the Man Christ Jesus.

For Instance, the Man Christ Jesus is God's Son, and is appointed heir of all things, v. 2. He is the ἀπαύρασμα, the brightness of God's glory, and the express image of his person or Substance; that is, he is the glorious visible Representative of the inviible Majesty of the Very God. And he upholds (or as *ἐπίστα* (g) ought in this Place to be rendred, *he governs*) all things by the word of his power, or his powerful Word; that is, the whole Creation is at his Command. He when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high: Being made so much better than the Angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they, v. 3, 4. By his Resurrection those Words of Psal. 2. 9. were verify'd, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* For St. Paul says, *We declare unto you glad tidings, how that*

(g) See *Grotius* on the Place.

the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,* Acts 13. 32, 33. To him those Words are apply'd, *I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son,* v. 5. To him God said, *Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool,* v. 13. For Christ himself has explained that Passage of his Human Nature, by saying to the Pharisees, *What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son?* Matt. 22. 42——45.

In fine, I must now take the Liberty of affirming, that there is not one Text, which speaks of our blessed Savior in such a manner, as implies his being inferior to the Very God, but what either necessarily must, or most fairly may, be understood of the Man Christ Jesus, or our Savior's Human Nature only. And therefore I conclude (and I hope you are by this time sensible) that the Holy Scriptures do not teach, that the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, is inferior to the Very God.

C H A P. XII.

That the Holy Scriptures do teach, that the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the Very God.

SECONDLY, I shall now prove, that the Holy Scriptures do teach, that the WORD, or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the Very God. And,

First, the Evangelist says, Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸ θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, *In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with God, and the WORD was God, John 1. 1.* That the one selfexistant Being is meant by θεός, *God*, in the second Member of this Verse, as you your self do grant, so no other Person denies, that I know of. And that the WORD is affirmed to be θεός, *God*, in the third Member of it, every Man's Eyes will demonstrat to him. But then it is questioned, what is the proper Signification of θεός, *God*. That the one selfexistant Being is infinitely perfect and glorious, the Author and Preserver, not only of Man, but also of all other Beings whatsoever; and that he is truly and properly called θεός, *God*; is confessed on all hands, particularly by your self and me: but then, whether the Name θεός, *God*, when given to the one selfexistant Being, does either, 1. imply his Selfexistence, or 2. denote the infinit Perfection and Glory of his Essence, or 3. expres his Relation to us, as our Creator, and consequently our Lord and Governor; I perceive, you and I shall not easily agree.

In

In your (a) Opinion, *The Word God, when spoken of the Father himself (viz. the one self-existent Being) is never intended in Scripture to express Philosophically his abstract Metaphysical Attributes: but to raise in us a Notion of his Attributes relative to us, his supreme Dominion, Authority, Power, Justice, Goodness, &c.* And again (b) you say, *That the Word $\alpha\epsilon\delta\varsigma$, God, has in Scripture, and in all the Books of Morality and Religion, a relative Signification; and not, as in Metaphysical Books, an absolute one. As is evident from the relative Terms, which in Moral Writings may always be joined with it. For Instance, in the same manner as we say, my Father, my King, and the like: so it is proper also to say, my God, the God of Israel, the God of the Universe, and the like; which Words are expressive of Dominion and Government. But in the Metaphysical Way it cannot be said, my infinite Substance, the infinite Substance of Israel, or the like.* Now whether this Notion of yours be true, I will not dispute. For indeed I need not do it.

You (c) own, that *the Scripture, when it mentions God absolutely and by way of Eminence, always means (what you call) the Person of the Father, that is, the one self-existent Being, whom I call the Very God.* Now be pleased to observe the following Particulars. *First*, The Scriptures of the Old Testament do all along declare, that there is but one God, viz. the one self-existent Being alone, whom the Jews worshipped. *Moses* assured them, that *the Lord he is God, and that there is none else besides him*, Deut. 4. 35. and *Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; there is none else*, v. 39. And

(a) Scripture Doctr. p. 296.

(b) Reply to Bishop Gastrell, p. 284.

(c) Scripture Doctr. p. 265.

he introduces God himself uttering these Words, *See now, that I, even I am he, and there is no God with me*, Deut. 32. 39. *Hannah* also says in her Prayer, *There is none holy as the Lord ; for there is none beside thee*, 1 Sam. 2. 2. And God himself says by the Prophet, *I am first, and I am the last ; and besides me there is no God*, Isa. 44. 6. and presently after, *Is there a God besides me ? Yea, there is no God. I know not any*, v. 8. And again, *I am the Lord, and there is none else ; there is no God besides me*, Isa. 45. 5. And again, *I am God, and there is none else ; I am God, and there is none like me*, Isa. 46. 9. Secondly, During the Time of his Ministry, our Savior himself declared, that his Father, *viz.* the God of the *Jews*, or the one self-existent Being, is the *only true God*, John 17. 3. Thirdly, After our Lord's Ascension, his Disciples every where preached, that there is but one God, *viz.* the self-existent Being. Particularly St. Paul says, *We know, that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. For tho' there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be Gods many, and Lords many) But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him : and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him*, 1 Cor. 8. 4, 5, 6.

You see, how fully and expressly it has been declared, both under the Law and under the Gospel, that there is but one God. And what must all these Declarations mean ? What is the natural Sense and Import of them ? Why, you would fain (*d*) persuade us, that *the Reason, why the Scripture, tho' it stiles the Father God, and also stiles the Son God ; yet at the same time always declares, there is but one God ; is because, in the Monarchy of the Universe, there is but one*

(d) Script. Doct. Part 2. Prop. 39. p. 332.

Authority, *Original in the Father, Derivative in the Son, &c.* Now by the *Father* you mean the self-existent Being, whom I call the Very God: and by the *Son* you mean our Savior Christ with respect to his Divine Nature, that is, the WORD. So that in your Opinion, the Reason why the Scripture, tho' it stiles the self-existent Being God, and also stiles the WORD God, yet at the same time always declares there is but one God; is because, in the Monarchy of the Universe, there is but one Authority, *Original in the self-existent Being, Derivative in the WORD, &c.* And consequently you would have us understand the several Passages before recited, not of a Numerical Unity of Being, but of an Unity of Authority; that is, you think, the Scriptures do permit us to believe, that there are in Number more Gods than one (the one Supreme, and the other Subordinat) tho' there is but one Authority in them, communicated from the one to the other.

But this Notion is utterly irreconcilable to the plain Words of Holy Writ. It must indeed be granted, that when there is a Subordination of Governors in a Monarchy, there is but one Authority in them all, original in the Monarch, and derivative in the inferior Magistrates, by what Names soever they may be called. And accordingly, if there were a Plurality and Subordination of Gods, there would be but one Authority in them all, tho' there would be more Gods than one in Number. But then, no Man knows better than your self, how great a difference there is between a Numerical Unity of Being, and an Unity of Authority. And in the several Passages before recited, the Unity ascrib'd to God is most manifestly, not an
Unity

Unity of Authority, but a Numerical Unity of Being. For 'tis not said, that the Authority of God is one, or that there is but one Authority of God; much less is it said, that there is but one Authority in diverse distinct Gods: but 'tis said, that God is one, and that there is but one God. Now the Word *God* does never signify God's Authority, nor can it be strained to such a Sense; much less can it signify an Authority vested in diverse distinct Gods, subordinat the one to the other. No; it constantly denotes the Being himself who is called God; and not what that Being who is called God, is endued or invested with, or what he possesses or enjoys. And therefore, when we are assured, that there is but one God; we are undoubtedly assured, not that there is but one Authority in diverse distinct Gods; or that of the Gods that are, there is but one Supreme: but (in direct Opposition to all Plurality, or even Duality of Gods, whether equal or subordinat the one to the other) that there is but one God in Number, *viz.* but one Being who is God.

But farther, if such an Interpretation were otherwise possible, and consistent with the Scriptural Use of the Word *God*; that is, if such Phrases as these, *there is but one God*, and the like, might signify (in spite of Common Sense) *there is an Unity of Authority in diverse distinct Gods, subordinat the one to the other*: yet the several Declarations before recited do flatly contradict your Notion, and assert a Numerical Unity of God, *viz.* that there is but one Being who is God. For it must be remembered, that those Declarations were made to such Persons, as either professed, or at least actually lived amongst those who did profess, a Plurality of Gods, tho' they allow'd a Subordination of the one to the other, and that there was but one Authority a-

mongst them all. Wherefore, when we are told, in Expressions directed to such Persons, and in such Circumstances, that there is but one God : we must understand, not that there is but one Authority in diverse distinct Gods, subordinat the one to the other (for the Idolatrous *Jews*, and even the Heathens themselves, readily own'd all this) but that there is but one God in Number, *viz.* but one Being who is God.

And indeed the Expressions of Scripture are such, as will admit no other Sense : nor could Words have been invented, which should more determinatly contain this Affirmation, *viz.* that there is in Number but one God, than those which are actually made use of in those Declarations. Nay, I appeal to your self, and intreat you to shew me, how it was possible, if it had been never so certainly intended, to teach us more clearly in Scripture Language (or indeed in any Language) the Numerical Unity of God, than we find it already don in the Texts before quoted. Be persuaded once more to read them carefully over, and to weigh them exactly. Does not *Moses* say, that *there is no God besides the Lord?* and that *there is none else besides him?* Does not the Very God say, that he himself *knows not any God besides himself?* Does not *Christ* say, that his Father (*viz.* the selfexistent Being) is *the only God?* Does not *St. Paul* say, that *there is no other God but one?* Can these Expressions mean, that tho' there are diverse distinct Gods, subordinat the one to the other ; yet there is but one Authority amongst them? If these Declarations do not demonstrat, that there is in Number but one God ; I am sure, 'tis impossible for Words to teach that Proposition.

Well then ; I hope I may now assert, that the Holy Scriptures assure us, that there is in Number
but

but one God, *viz.* the selfexistent Being. Now it must be noted farther, that this one God is described as the Creator of all Things, in both the Old and the New Testaments. Particularly, the selfexistent God declares concerning himself, that *in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is*, Exod. 20. 11. and St. Paul and St. Barnabas declare concerning the same God, that *he made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein*, Acts 14. 15. So that the whole Jewish and Christian Churches were settled upon this Foundation, and primary Article of Faith, *viz.* that there is but one God, one and the same Object of their Worship, and that he is the one selfexistent Being, who is the Author of all things.

Now after all this was don; after so great a Variety of Books was penned, and such repeated Declarations were made, both under the Law and under the Gospel, by God himself, by our Savior, and Persons Divinely inspired; and after this Doctrin was universally spread: we find even the beloved Apostle expressly teaching, that *In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with God, and the WORD was God*, John 1. 1. and then proceeding more particularly to affirm, that the WORD was the Creator of all things. For he says, *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made*, v. 3.

I beseech you to consider, how the Christian Church must needs understand these Passages of St. John, when he first published them. The self-existent God himself, and a vast Train of inspired Writers in all Ages down to those very Times, had most solemnly assured Mankind, that there is but one God, *viz.* the selfexistent God himself.

And St. *John*, who owns his Belief that the self-existent Being is God, adds in the very same Breath, even in the very next Words, *and the WORD was God*. Nay he particularly declares, that the WORD was God *in the beginning*, that is, even before the Creation, as you your self interpret that Phrase; and that *all things* were made by the WORD, without admitting the Exception of any one Particle of the whole Creation.

In these Circumstances, 'tis notorious, that the Church cou'd not but understand St. *John* to mean, that the WORD is the one self-existent Being. For since they knew, that there was but one God, St. *John's* affirming to them, that *the WORD was God*, and that he was God *in the Beginning*, nay, that he was the Creator of all things, was in their Opinion the very same, as if he had affirmed in Terms, that the WORD was the one God of the *Jews* and Christians, even the one self-existent Being. For they had received no Notion of any other God; nay, the Preachers and Writers of the Christian Church had assured them in the plainest Terms, that there was but one God. And St. *John* is so far from making known to them that Distinction which you so carefully inculcate, between the supreme and the subordinat God; and thereby introducing and opening to them a Doctrine, which was not only wholly new, and undiscover'd to either the *Jewish* or the Christian Church, but directly opposit to the primary Article of their Faith; that on the contrary he confirms the obvious meaning of his Words, and that sense in which they wou'd most certainly be understood by all his Readers, by subjoining, that the WORD (of which he had already affirmed, that it *was God*, even *in the Beginning*) created all things; which Creation of all things had

had been constantly attributed to the one selfexistent Being in both the Old and the New Testament, and was accordingly become the constant and known Character of the one selfexistent Being.

Wherefore they must necessarily believe, either that the WORD is the selfexistent Being, the one God of the *Jews* and Christians; or else that there was *in the Beginning* another God besides him, who was the God of the *Jews* and Christians, even besides the selfexistent Being. They must unavoidably conceive, either that the one selfexistent Being had spoken falsely, and directly against his own Knowledge, when he pretended, that there was no other God besides himself; and that he had purposely suborned a great number of inspired Witnesses to attest and propagat the same Untruth, both under the Law and under the Gospel, in every corner of the Earth: or else that St. *John's* new Doctrin of the WORD's being God, was a downright Imposture, because 'twas manifestly repugnant to the constantly received Faith of both *Jews* and Christians, in the grand and fundamental Article of it.

But farther, besides that there is a flat Contradiction between the whole Tenor of Scripture and the first Verse of St. *John's* Gospel, according to that Sense of it, which the Persons he wrote to, could not but understand him in, unless the WORD be the very God, or one selfexistent Being; I shall now shew, that unless you admit the aforesaid Doctrin, there is no possibility of reconciling this Text with the other Scriptures, whatsoever you suppose the Name *God* to signifie, when apply'd to the WORD.

For if you will not allow, that the Name *God*, when apply'd to the WORD, does mean the one selfexistent Being; then it must signifie a Being en-

dued with all those Perfections (setting apart Self-existence only) which the one self-existent Being is endued with. And the WORD must be termed *God*, as considered, either absolutely in himself, or (which is your Opinion) relatively to his Creatures, or both absolutely and relatively together. Now I affirm, that there is a flat Contradiction between the Doctrin of both the Testaments, and this Verse of St. *John*, whatsoever is meant by the Name *God*, when apply'd to the WORD, unless you will own the WORD to be the one self-existent Being, whom I call the very God.

For tho' $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, *God*, be supposed to signifie a Being endued with all those Perfections, which the one self-existent Being is endued with (except Self-existence it self, which is now supposed not to be included) and tho' it must indeed be granted, that two distinct Gods may then be imagined to exist without any Impossibility in the Nature of the Thing (because they are both equally *Gods*, in this supposed Sense of the Term, when possessed of the requisit Divine Perfections, notwithstanding the one derives them from the other; even as amongst our selves, a Father and his Son are equally Men) Yet still it must be remembred, that the one self-existent Being is truly and properly $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, a *God*: and that whether he is $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, a *God*, as considered absolutely, or relatively, or both; yet still he is $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, a *God*, in that Sense which constitutes him truly and properly such. Now the one self-existent Being, who is undoubtedly a *God*, and whom therefore we cannot but believe, expressly declares in his own Person, and his Writers of the Old and New Testaments expressly declare also, that there is no other *God* besides himself, in the Texts abovementioned. They never distinguish upon the matter; they do
not

not so much as once inform us, that tho' there is but one supreme, yet there is another subordinat or secondary *God*: but they roundly assure us, that there is no other God besides the selfexistent Being. The selfexistent Being himself says, *I know not any*. And consequently if the WORD be not the selfexistent Being, whom I call the very God; he is not *Deus*, a *God* at all. And yet St. *John* expressly declares, that he is *God*, and that he was such *in the Beginning*, even before the Creation. He must therefore be the very or selfexistent God.

But farther still, that this Contradiction, which your Doctrin introduces and makes, between the whole Tenor of Scripture, and this Verse of St. *John*, may appear yet more manifestly, even upon your own Principles; I beg you to consider what follows.

You would fain have us believe, that the Word *Deus*, *God*, does in Scripture Phrase denote the being 'tis predicated of, consider'd relatively to his Creatures. The Passages just now quoted abundantly prove this to be your Opinion; and indeed your Scheme of the Trinity requires you to be zealous for it. But then, if *Deus*, *God*, has this relative Signification; you'll do well to remember, that the WORD (whom you suppose a distinct Being, and consequently a really different God, from the one selfexistent Being, whom I call the Very God) could not but be *Deus*, a *God*, to the *Jews*, and must necessarily always have been so to the whole Creation. For St. *John* expressly declares, that *all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made*, v. 3. and St. *Paul* says of our Savior (with respect to the WORD doubtless; for it could not be meant of his Human Nature) that *by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and*
that

that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and for him, Col. 1. 16. And tho' the selfexistant God is said to have created all things; yet you rightly observe and own, that he did it by the WORD. For you (e) say, that by the Operation of the Son (you can mean nothing but the WORD) the Father (by whom you manifestly mean the selfexistant God) both made and governs the World.

Now I shall not inquire, whether (upon Supposition of the Truth of your Doctrin) the selfexistant God could so properly be said to create the World, and could consequently be so properly, in the relative Sense, *θεός*, a God, to Mankind, upon the account of the WORD's creating the World by a Power derived from the selfexistant God: but this is certain, that the WORD is, and ever was, truly and properly *θεός*, a God, to the Jews, and to the whole Creation, upon the account of that Relation, which the very Act of Creation gave him, and which no Consideration whatsoever can dissolve. Upon this Foundation the Law of Nature becomes the positive Law and Command of the Creator, as you your self have largely (f) demonstrated. And indeed, the Scriptures do expressly declare, that the selfexistant God himself is therefore to be worshipped by us, because we are his Creatures. For St. *John* himself, who in his Gospel attributes Creation to the WORD, does in his Revelation (when describing the Worship given to the selfexistant God) report, that *the four and twenty el-*

(e) Script. Doct. p. 297.

(f) Disc. concerning the unchangeable Obligations of Nat. Religion, Prop. 2.

ders fall down before him, that sat on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are, and were created, Rev. 4. 10. 11. And consequently the Law of Nature is the positive Law and Command of the WORD; and the WORD has an unalienable Right to the Worship of all his Creatures; because they are most certainly the Work of his Hands, and he is a God to them.

But will the Scriptures allow this, or can this be true, if the WORD be a different Being from the selfexistant God? Did the *Jews* ever worship the WORD, as well as the selfexistant God? And yet was not the WORD a God to the *Jews*? And did not the selfexistant God declare notwithstanding, that he himself was their *only* God? And did he not straitly charge them to worship *no other* God, saying in the very First Commandment, *Thou shalt have no other God but me*? And after all, when the WORD was made known under the Christian Dispensation, does not the New Testament declare, that we Christians have but *one* God, even the same God that the *Jews* had, *viz.* the selfexistant God? Must not we Christians therefore worship the WORD, notwithstanding we are so plainly told, that he *was* God, even in the beginning? Are we not permitted to worship him, who ever had an unalterable Right to the Homage of all Mankind by Creation, and whose Deity is now so fully manifested even by Revelation from the selfexistant God? Do we ever find a Distinction made, even in the Scriptures of the New Testament, between the two Gods, the one Supreme and the other Subordinat, the one Selfexistant and the other Derived? And
do

do they at the same time discharge us from the Worship of the one, and confine us to that of the other? Nay, these very Scriptures of the New Testament do always declare, that there is but one God, as fully as those of the Old Testament, or indeed as 'tis possible for Words to express.

Wherefore, since St. *John* expressly declares, that *in the beginning the WORD was God*, and attributes the Creation of all Things to him, which the self-existent God had all along claimed to himself, and which was constantly believed of him by his true Worshippers; he could not but be sensible, that those for whose sake he penn'd his Gospel, would understand him to mean, and consequently he himself must intend that they should believe, that the WORD was *in the beginning* the very or self-existent God. Nay, if the WORD was God in the Beginning, and his Creation of all Things gave him an indisputable Right to the Worship of all Mankind: either the self-existent Being, and his Scriptures of Truth (both of the Old and New Testament) must speak falsely, when they assure us, that of old there was, and still is, but one God; or else the Scriptures do teach us, that the WORD is that one God, even the self-existent Being, whom I call the Very God.

You tell us indeed, that this Exposition of St. *John's* Words (*g*) is a *Contradiction in Terms*. Now for my part, if there must needs be a Contradiction in the Case, I would as willingly suppose, that St. *John* wrote a Contradiction in Terms, as that he wrote a Contradiction to the whole Tenor of the other Scriptures, by asserting a Plurality of Gods (partly supreme, and partly subordinat) which

(g) Script. Doctr. p. 86.

the Writers of both the Testaments do so frequently, so unanimously, and so zealously deny and oppose, even after, as well as before, the great Mystery of the WORD's Incarnation was declared. And I must own to you, I'm fully convinced, that no possible Exposition or Sense of the Word *God* can reconcile the Contradiction, or clear the Inconsistency, between this Verse of St. *John* and the other Parts of the Bible, without admitting that the WORD is the very God, or selfexistent Being. So that either we must give up all the rest of the Canon of Scripture, or else we must reject the Gospel of St. *John*, as introducing what you justly call (b) *the Impiety of Polytheism, subverting the first and great Foundation of all Religion both Natural and Revealed, the Unity of God.*

But I pray, why must the aforesaid Exposition be a Contradiction in Terms? Even for this single Reason, it seems; because the Apostle says, that the WORD was *μετὰ τὸ θεόν, with God.* But will it follow from thence, that the WORD is a distinct Being from *θεός*, the selfexistent God? If we consider the Context, the WORD's being *μετὰ τὸ θεόν*, is opposed to his *Manifestation*; when *ὁ λόγος σαρκὶ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν*, the WORD was made flesh, and dwelt among us, v. 14, and when consequently the WORD was *μετὰς ἡμᾶς, with us.* The WORD was *μετὰ τὸ θεόν, with God*, till the Time when *θεὸς ἐφανερῶς ἐν σαρκί*, God was manifest in the flesh, 1 Tim. 3. 16. We know, that God is in himself *ἀόρατος, invisible*, 1 Tim. 1. 17. *he dwells in the light, which no man can approach unto*, and is one whom no man hath seen, nor can see, 1 Tim. 6. 16. But by the Incarnation of the WORD who is God, by the Union of the WORD to the Man

(b) *Ibid.*

Christ Jesus, God is become (in a Sense) visible, the Man Christ Jesus being *εικὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀορατοῦ*, the (visible) image (or resemblance) of the invisible God, Col. 1. 15. *ἀπαύλασμα τῆς δόξης*, the brightness of glory, or a glorious Beam shot forth from that essential Light which no Man can approach unto, as well as *χαρακτὴρ*, the representation or Picture τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, of his substance, who is the Majesty on high, and whom the Eyes of Mortals cannot behold in himself, tho' they can see him in such his Appearance. In short, the selfexistent Being became manifest, viiible and open to the Eyes of Men, by the Union of his WORD with the Man Christ Jesus; in Consequence of which Union, *θεός*, God was, because *λόγος*, the WORD was, *πρὸς ἡμᾶς*, with us; and our Savior justly deserved the Name of *Ἐμμανὴλ*, which being interpreted is *μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός*, God with us, Mat. 1. 23. And accordingly 'tis observable, that the same Apostle St. John says, *Eternal Life was πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*, in opposition to that Discovery of Eternal Life, which was made, when Eternal Life *ἐφανερώθη ἡμῶν*, Ep. 1. ch. 1. v. 2.

You see therefore, that there is no Necessity of making St. John's Expressions contain, either a Contradiction in Terms, or a Contradiction to the constant Doctrin of the other inspired Writers of the Old and New Testaments. For by granting that the WORD is the Very God, or the one selfexistent Being, we preserve the grand Article of the Unity of God, which the Holy Scriptures do so earnestly press and inculcat: Nor does his being *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, who is himself *θεός*, mean more, than that God was not as yet *πρὸς ἀνθρώπους*, as by the Incarnation of the WORD he certainly was, even *God manifest in the flesh*.

You

You will give me leave, I dare say, just to mention one Objection more ; which you indeed have passed over in silence, because (I am persuaded) you were sensible of its Weakness. It has been observed, that when St. *John* says, *the WORD was God*, there is no Article in the Original before $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, as there is very commonly when the self-existent God is meant. But I answer, that tho' the Article is often placed before $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, when the self-existent God is meant ; yet 'tis also omitted at other times, when $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ certainly and confessedly bears the very same sense ; particularly 'tis omitted no less than four times in this very Chapter, *viz.* in the sixth, twelfth, thirteenth and eighteenth Verses. And therefore notwithstanding this Remark, when the WORD is called $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, the meaning is, that he is the very or self-existent God.

Secondly, St. *Paul* says, *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. The Context and Scope of the Apostle shew, that by asserting there is $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, he means, that there is *but one* God, even as there is *but one* Mediator. So that $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is not barely *unus*, but *unicus* : not merely *one* (for the Heathens themselves had *one* God in that Sense, at the same time that they had so many more than one) but the only God, in contradistinction to a plurality of Gods. And accordingly the Apostle expresses himself more plainly in a parallel Place, saying, *There is none other God but one ; for tho' there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth (as there be Gods many, and Lords many) But to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him ; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom were all things, and we by him*, 1 Cor. 8. 4, 5, 6. The $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ therefore, the *one* God, signifies the self-existent

existent Being, as you your self (*i*) allow ; and the Apostle assures us, that the selfexistent Being is the only God. Now this one and only God, *viz.* the selfexistent Being, is declared to be the one and only God, in contradistinction to the one and only Mediator between God and Men, the MAN Christ Jesus. And therefore the Apostle can't mean, that there is but one supreme God, and that the WORD, who is personally united to the Man Christ Jesus, may notwithstanding be an inferior or subordinat God. For this express opposition of the only God, not to the WORD or Divine Nature of our Lord, but to the MAN Christ Jesus, does either deny that WORD is God, in direct contradiction to St. *John* 1. 1. or else demonstrat, that the WORD is the selfexistent and only God.

Thirdly, The Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* assures us, that three Passages of Scripture, which he particularly recites in his first Chapter, are meant of the Son, *viz.* our Lord Jesus Christ. These Passages, as I have already observed, do all of them relate to the WORD or Divine Nature of our Savior : but I chuse to argue from the last of them only, in which the Author asserts, that some Words of the 102d Psalm (*viz.* *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth : and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure : they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed : but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail*) are spoken of the Son, *v.* 25, 26, 27.

Now that the Passage above recited relates to the WORD, or Divine Nature of the Son, is evident from this Consideration, *viz.* that the Psalmist

(i) Script. Doct. p. 6, 36.

therein expressly attributes the Creation of the World to him, which evidently belongs to the WORD, or the Son's Divine Nature, and can't possibly be understood of the Son with respect to his Human Nature.

But I need not insist upon this. For in the *Hebrew* Text this Psalm is expressly address'd to *Jehovah*. Now *Jehovah* is the incommunicable Name of the selfexistent God, who was the God of *Israel*. Whatever latitude may be allow'd to *Deus*, yet *Jehovah* is appropriat to that one God alone, in contradistinction to all other *Dei*. This is the constant use of *Jehovah* in Scripture. Accordingly, *Moses* said, *Thou hast avouch'd (Jehovah, as 'tis in the Original, viz. the selfexistent Being, distinguish'd from all others by that Name; tho' we translate it) the LORD this day to be thy God, Deut. 26. 17. and again, The Lord (Jehovah, the same selfexistent God) hath avouch'd thee this day to be his peculiar people, ver. 18. Thus the Psalmist says to him, that his Name is Jehovah, Psal. 83. 18. Nay, God himself says, I am the Lord ('tis Jehovah in the Original) that is my Name. Is. 42. 8. And whereas, according to our Translation, God commanded Moses, saying, Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of Israel, The Lord God of your fathers, &c. we ought to read thus, according to the Original, Jehovah, even the God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: This is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all Generations, Exod. 3. 15. So that the Word *Jehovah* is the Memorial, or the Name by which God wou'd be called and known; and not the following Words, *the God of your Fathers, &c.* which are only affirmed of him, whose Memorial or proper Name is *Jehovah*. For so the Prophet explains it, saying (not as we translate it, even*

the Lord God of hosts, the Lord is his memorial; but) even *Jehovah*, the God of hosts; *Jehovah* is his memorial or peculiar Name, *Hos.* 12. 5. So that *Jehovah* does as strictly signify the self-existent God, as any one Name can possibly denote any one individual Being whatsoever.

I'm sensible, it has been thought, that God's Angel is sometimes styled *Jehovah*, upon the account of his acting with Mankind in God's Name; and even the Orthodox Writers about the Trinity have been grievously puzzled to explain the Passages urged for the Confirmation of that Notion. 'Twas indeed unhappy for them, that they were not sufficiently aware of that Custom, of Messengers speaking in the Words of their Principals, which is so notorious in the Scriptures, and of which I have largely treated (*k*) above. I dare promise, that whoever will be pleased to consider what I have written concerning that matter, will find no Difficulty in those Texts, in which it has been supposed, that an Angel is styled *Jehovah*: but readily grant, that *Jehovah* does, even in those Texts, as strictly denote the self-existent God, as in any one Text of the whole Bible.

I confess, God says, *Behold, I send an angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not: for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries. For mine angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Periz-*

(*k*) Chap. 7. p. 51, &c.

zites, and the Canaanites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites: and I will cut them off. Exod. 23. 20, 21, 22, 23. Now if any Person should imagin, that because God's Name may be *in* an Angel, therefore an Angel may be called *Jehovah*: I answer, that I will not dispute, whether *my Name* does in this Place signify *my Power*; or *my self*, or *the name Jehovah whereby I am called*; but supposing it to signify *the name Jehovah whereby I am called* (which is the very utmost that can be desired) still it does not follow, that a Being may be called *Jehovah*, merely because the Name *Jehovah* is said to be בקרבו *in the midst of him*, or *within him*, or (as our Translation words it) *in him*. For a Being's having a Name בקרבו never signifiys his being called by that Name. The utmost therefore that the Phrase can possibly import, is, that the selfexistent God *Jehovah* was with the Angel, enabling him to avenge the Transgressions of the *Israelites*. And this Interpretation is agreeable to the known Idiom of the Old and New Testaments.

Having thus shewn, that *Jehovah* is the incommunicable Name of the selfexistent God; let us now consider that Passage of the Psalmist, which is quoted by the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. It can't be pretended, that tho' the Psalmist directs himself, in this whole Passage, to the selfexistent God; yet he may be understood to speak therein concerning another distinct Being, who may be God in an inferior Sense. For 'tis manifest, that as the whole Passage is addressed to *Jehovah*; so it relates to him alone. As the Psalmist speaks *to* him, so he speaks *of* him, and not of any other Being that can be esteemed a subordinat God, in any part of it. From whence it follows, that the WORD, or Divine Nature of the Son, is

the very or selfexistant God. For the Question at present is not, whether the Son be God, or no (that being not only agreed between our selves, but also most expressly affirm'd of him by St. *John*) with respect to the WORD or Divine Nature united to the Man Christ Jesus: but the Question is, whether the WORD or Divine Nature of Christ Jesus, be the selfexistant God, or no. And the Psalmist has peremptorily determin'd this Question, by assuring us, that the Son (*viz.* the WORD, or Divine Nature of the Son) is *Jehovah*, which Name necessarily signifys, and is appropriat to, the one selfexistant God, even the God of the *Jewish* and Christian Churches, who has challeng'd that Name as his own Property, and never did or would suffer it to be given to any other Being whatsoever.

As for the two other Passages quoted by this Author in the same Chapter, and expressly apply'd therein to the Son; I have already declar'd my Opinion, that they relate to the WORD or the Son's Divine Nature. And if the former of them (quoted *v.* 6.) be taken from *Psal.* 97. 7. that Psalm is expressly directed to *Jehovah*; and consequently the WORD is thereby declar'd to be the Very God. And as for the latter of them (quoted *v.* 8, 9.) I have already (*l*) shewn, that that part of it which makes the 9th Verse, relates to Christ's Humanity: and if that that part of it which makes the 8th Verse, relates to his Divinity; as the Psalmist who wrote it, directed it to the selfexistant God, so the Author of this Epistle quotes it in the same manner. And accordingly you your self (*m*) allow,

(*l*) Chap. 6. p. 31, &c.

(*m*) Script. Doct. p. 89.

that the Son is called God in this Text ; which Concession, I think, is inconsistent with the Opinion of those who imagin, that the Psalmist originally meant this Verse, as he did certainly mean a great part of the Psalm, of King *Solomon*. But I need not enlarge any further upon the first and second of these three Quotations made by the Author of this Epistle. If what I have written concerning the third of them, holds good ; I dare trust any Man of common Sense with the first and second. For I am persuaded, he will not be at the trouble of wresting either of them to a different Sense. And those that will not yield to the Force of that Argument, which I have drawn from the third of these Quotations, I shall despair of convincing by any Argument that I can draw from the first or second, or indeed from any part of the inspired Word of God.

C H A P. XIII.

That the Holy Ghost is the Very God.

I Proceed now to the second Point in Controversy between us, which relates to the Holy Ghost or Spirit of God. And this I hope to bring to a much more speedy Issue than the former.

That the Holy Ghost is an intelligent Being, you all along declare ; but the Question is, whether he is one and the same Being with the selfexistent God, or no. I affirm, that he is : and that you do deny it, I heartily wish I could not prove.

To confirm the Truth of my Assertion, I shall argue from but two Places of Scripture.

I. Then, *St. Paul*, that he might satisfy his Disciples, how he came to know those Myſteries, which the greateſt Wits could not diſcover, ſays, *God hath reveled them unto us by his Spirit. For the Spirit ſearcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, ſave the ſpirit of man which is in him? even ſo the things of God knoweth (ſcils) none but the Spirit of God, 1 Cor. 2. 10, 11.* You ſee, he aſcribes his Knowledge of thoſe hidden things, thoſe Goſpel Myſteries, to the Holy Spirit, who imparted the Knowledge of them to him: and he ſhews the *Corinthians*, that the Spirit himſelf muſt therefore be ſuppoſed to know them, becauſe *the Spirit ſearcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God; that is, the Spirit knoweth even the greateſt Secrets of God himſelf.* But how does this appear? How are we ſure, that the Spirit knoweth God's greateſt Secrets? Why, the Apoſtle ſubjoins a Demonſtration, that it muſt needs be ſo, ſaying, *For what man knoweth the things of a man, ſave the ſpirit of man which is in him? Even ſo the things of God knoweth none but the Spirit of God; that is, as none knoweth the Secrets of any particular Man's Heart, ſave the Man's own Spirit, which is in him, or the Man himſelf; even ſo none knows the Secrets of God, ſave God's Spirit, or God himſelf.*

Now it muſt be obſerv'd, that when the Apoſtle ſays, *none knows the things of a man, ſave the man's own ſpirit; and conſequently when he ſuppoſes, that a Man's own Spirit does know the things of a Man, viz. the Secrets of his Heart: he certainly means a primary, immediat, and neceſſary Knowledge; and not a ſecondary or derived one.* For otherwiſe his Reasoning is manifeſtly wrong; becauſe any other Perſon beſides the Man himſelf does know a Man's Secrets, when the Man reveles them to him. And accordingly,

cordingly, in the opposit Branch of the Comparison, when the Apostle says, *none knows the things of God, but the Spirit of God*; he certainly means a primary, immediat, and necessary Knowledge, as contradistinguish'd from a secondary or deriv'd one. For (blessed be God) by a secondary or deriv'd Knowledge, not only St. Paul did, but even we our selves do, know the secret things of God.

When therefore St. Paul asserts, that the Spirit knows the secret things of God, even as a Man knows the secret things of his own Heart, *viz.* by a primary, immediat and necessary Knowledge, inherent in himself, and not derived from any other Being: he manifestly declares, that the Spirit of God is as much that God whose Spirit he is, as the Spirit of a Man is that Man in whom it is; and that the Spirit of God does therefore know the Secrets of that God whose Spirit he is, because he is that God himself, and not another or distinct Being, which cou'd not know God's Secrets, otherwise than by a derived Knowledge; even as the Spirit of a Man does therefore know the Secrets of the Man in whom it is, because the Spirit is the Man himself, and not another or distinct Being, which cou'd not know the Man's Secrets otherwise than by a derived Knowledge. And consequently, since the Word *God* in this Place does confessedly signify the selfexistent Being; 'tis evident, that the Spirit of God (because he is the same God who is here spoken of, and not another Being, which cou'd not know the Secrets of God otherwise than by a derived Knowledge) is the selfexistent Being, whom I call the very God.

If it should be objected, that the Spirit is said *ἰεὺδύειν*, to search or inquire into the deep things of God; and is consequently a different Being from that

God, whose deep things, tho' he does search or inquire into them, yet he has not a primary, immediat and necessary Knowledge of: I answer, 1. That whatever the original Notation of it is, yet the Word ἐρευνᾶν is sometimes used, when 'twould be Blasphemy to suppose any proper search or inquiry, or any thing less than a primary, immediat and necessary Knowledge. Particularly this very Apostle says, *Rom. 8. 27.* that God does ἐρευνᾶν (which must undoubtedly mean, that God does, not search or inquire into, but *thoroughly understand*, viz. by a primary, immediat and necessary Knowledge) the Hearts of Men. 2. 'Tis remarkable, that in this very Instance, the Apostle proves that the Spirit does ἐρευνᾶν the deep things of God, because he knows them as a Man knows his own secrets, viz. not by inquiry, but by a primary, immediat and necessary Knowledge. So that it may as well be pretended, that the Spirit of a Man is a different Being from the Man himself, because the Spirit of a Man knows the Secrets of a Man; as that the Spirit of God is a different Being from God, because he does ἐρευνᾶν the deep things of God.

2. The Angel told the blessed Virgin *Mary*, that her Son should be called *the Son of the Highest*, and *the Son of God*, that is, the Son of the selfexistent Being, *Luke 1. 32, 35.* And for what reason? Why, for that Reason which the Angel expressly gave, when he said, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God, v. 35.* You see, the Man Christ Jesus is therefore the Son of the most High God, because the Holy Ghost begat him.

Now if the Holy Ghost is not the very God himself, but another and different Being from him; then the Man Christ Jesus's Generation by the Holy Ghost made him no otherwise the Son of the very God, than you and I are. Because you and I were, as much as the Man Christ Jesus was (upon the aforesaid Supposition) begotten by the very God. For the very God did not (upon that Supposition) beget the Man Christ Jesus, otherwise than by the Mediation of another and different Being from God himself, which Being derived his Existence from God. And in that Sense you and I were begotten by God, and are his Sons. Neither the different Quality of the immediat Father, nor the number of intermediat Descents from the original selfexistent Cause of all things, does in any wise alter the Case. For in this Notion of Sonship, a Begger's Child is as much God's Son, as if the highest Angel had begotten him: and you and I are as much God's Sons, as *Cain* or *Abel*, whose immediat Father *Adam* was the first Man.

The selfexistent God therefore is the Father of the Man Christ Jesus by a *special* Paternity (as I distinguish'd in the beginning of this Discourse) and the Man Christ Jesus is accordingly the Son of the very God by a *special* Filiation, of which there is no other Instance. And for this reason is he called God's *only begotten* Son. This necessarily imports, that the selfexistent God was his Father in some sense, in which he was not a Father of any other Mortal. He was therefore the immediat Father of the Man Christ Jesus; that is, he begat him, not by the mediat operation of a Being different from himself (for in that sense he is every whit as much your Father, or mine) but by his own immediat act, even as a Man is the Father of his own Child.

Now

Now the Scriptures assure us, that the Foundation of this Relation between the Very God and the Man Christ Jesus, was the Generation of the Holy Ghost ; that is, the Very God was therefore the immediat Father of the Man Christ Jesus, because the Holy Ghost begat him. And consequently the Holy Ghost is not another different Being from the Very God, but the Very God himself, or the selfexistent Being, which is the Father of the Man Christ Jesus.

Till these two Arguments are fairly answer'd, I need not produce any others. I shall therefore now examin those Texts, which have been supposed to teach, that the Holy Ghost is a different Being from the Very God, derived from him, and subordinat to him.

1. He is called *the Spirit of God*, Matt. 3. 16. 1 Cor. 3. 16. and in diverse other Places. But this Phrase cannot import, that he is a different Being from the Very God, much less that he is derived from him, and subordinat to him ; unless it be also granted, that *the spirit of man*, 1 Cor. 2. 11. denotes a different Being, derived from, and subordinat to, the Man whose Spirit he is.

2. There are many Texts, which speak of the Spirit, as a Messenger sent from God, and sent by Christ. These are supposed to teach a Subordination of the Spirit to the selfexistent God, and to the Divine Nature of Christ ; and consequently, that the Spirit is not himself the selfexistent God.

For the right Explication of all such Texts it must be observed, that when the World lay in Darknes, God was pleased to enlighten them by that miraculous Effusion of the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost, whereby the Apostles were enabled and qualify'd for the In-

Instruction and Conversion of Mankind. The holy Spirit of God therefore, who always reveled his Will in old Times, but was now to do it in a most plentiful manner, is described (by a strong Allegory) as a Messenger sent forth by God for this great Purpose. And because the Effusion of the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost was not to be made till after Christ's Ascension; therefore Christ is represented as going to Heaven to dispatch away this Messenger, and send him abroad on his Errand. Therefore do we so often read of the holy Spirit's being sent *from* or *by* God and Christ. Therefore is he said to *go forth*, to *come*, and the like. But all this is mere Metaphor, according to the Usage of that Country and Age. For the plain meaning is, that those Gifts and Graces which proceed from the Spirit, or which God bestows by the Spirit, are then actually conferred by God on Men.

There is abundance of such strong Figures in Holy Scripture. The selfexistent God himself is said to *go down*, and *see what was done*, Gen. 18. 21. to *come down to deliver his people*, Exod. 3. 8. to *come down on mount Sinai*, Exod. 19. 20. to *write the ten Commandments in two tables of stone*, Deut. 5. 22. to *send his word*, Psal. 107. 20. to *send forth his commandment*, Psal. 147. 15. to *awake as one out of sleep, and like a giant refreshed with wine*, Psal. 78. 66. And Christ says, his Father (*viz.* the selfexistent God) and himself will *come to a Man, and make their abode with him*, John 14. 23. Nay, after his Ascension he says, *Behold, I stand at the door and knock. If any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come into him, and sup with him, and he with me*, Rev. 3. 20. But the most remarkable Instance, and that which comes nearest to this of the Spirit's Mission from God, is that admirable *Prosopopœia* of King Solomon, who introduces

ces God's Wisdom (which surely is not another and different being from himself) as crying in the Streets, &c. and, after many others, uttering these Words, *The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled; before the hills was I brought forth: While as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When he prepared the heavens, I was there; when he set a compass upon the face of the depth: When he established the clouds above; when he strengthened the fountains of the deep: When he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment; when he appointed the foundations of the earth: Then I was by him as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him: Rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth, and my delights were with the sons of men,* Prov. 8. 22—31. But what do all these, and innumerable other Examples of the same kind, imply? Shall we suppose, that such Expressions are literally true? Particularly, can those be understood literally, which relate to the self-existent God? You know the old Rule, *Quæ dicuntur ἀνθρώπων ἰσχυρῶς, intelligenda sunt θεοπεπῶς.*

Accordingly, tho' the Metaphors relating to the Spirit, and the Allegory arising from the whole Chain of them, are indeed very surprizing, after the Eastern manner; yet are they not more surprizing than others which frequently occur in the Bible, and are most expressly apply'd to the self-existent God himself. When therefore the Spirit is compared to a Messenger sent by God or Christ; we are to understand no more, than that God or Christ bestows the Gifts and Graces of the Spirit, that

that is, God confers, and Christ distributes, those Gifts and Graces, which come from God thro' the Spirit ; or the holy Spirit vouchsafes to shed his Influences according to the Will of the selfexistent Being, and the Man Christ Jesus disposes of them, as his Apostles also did ; that is, the Spirit imparts his Gifts in such Manner and Circumstances, that the Distribution of them is attributed to Men in the same Sense, in which Men are said to work those Miracles, which are notwithstanding wrought by the Spirit's Operation. Thus also, when the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily Shape on our Lord, the meaning is, that when that Appearance was made, the Gifts and Graces of the Spirit were actually imparted to the Man Christ Jesus ; as the Holy Ghost descended also on the Apostles, that is, the Gifts and Graces of the Holy Ghost were poured on them, when the Cloven Tongues sat on their Heads. Thus do all those Metaphors become perfectly easy ; nor does any one of them imply (in any the least measure or degree) such a Derivation, Subordination, or difference of Nature or Being, as those who deny the Spirit to be the selfexistent God, would fain infer from them.

3. The Consideration of this noble Allegory (wherein the Spirit is compared to a Messenger) which is so frequently touched upon in Scripture, enables us to explain a very difficult Passage, on which too many great Interpreters have written very odly, and from which some heterodox Writers have endeavor'd to prove, that the Holy Ghost is not the selfexistent God.

Our Lord says, *I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he the spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth. For he shall not speak of himself ; but whatsoever he shall hear,*
that

that shall he speak : and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me : for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath, are mine : therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you, John 16. 12----15. In this Passage Christ says of the Spirit, He shall not speak of himself ; and again, whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak ; and again, he shall receive of mine. And from thence the Spirit's Inferiority to the Very God, and his Subordination to Christ's Divine Nature, have been deduc'd. Whereas our Savior never meant any thing like it. For let us descend to Particulars.

Our Lord said to his Disciples, *I have yet (πολλά) many things to say unto you : but ye cannot bear them now ;* that is, I have many things relating to my Spiritual Kingdom to say unto you, which ye are not at present rightly disposed for the Reception of. *Howbeit, when he the spirit of truth (or the Veracious Spirit) is come, he will guide you into all truth ;* that is, he will teach you all those things relating to my Spiritual Kingdom, which I do not think it proper to deliver to you at present. Then our Lord proceeds to prove, that the Spirit of Truth, or the Veracious Spirit, should lead them into all Truth (or teach them such Particulars relating to his Spiritual Kingdom, as he at that time was pleased to conceal) by this Argument, *For he shall not speak of himself ; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak.*

For the Explication of which Reason here given by our Lord, we must have recourse to the Allegory of a Messenger. When a Messenger delivers what his Principal gives him in Charge, he is then a true, or veracious, and faithful Messenger : but when he devises things of his own Head, and delivers them in the Name of his Principal, he is said to *speak of himself*, and he is then an untrue, or lying,

ing, and unfaithful Messenger. Thus our Lord himself, the great Prophet or Messenger from God to Men, says, *if any Man will do his will, he shall know of the Doctrin, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of my self*, John 7. 17. In this Text *speaking of himself* is opposed to his Doctrin's being of God, who was Christ's Principal. Again, *he that speaketh of himself, seeketh his own Glory*, ver. 18. that is, a lying Messenger, who devises his own Message, seeketh his own Glory, and not the Glory of his Principal. Again, *the words that I speak unto you, I speak not of my self*, John 14. 10. that is, I did not invent my Doctrin; but I deliver to you what my Father gave me in charge. Accordingly, when Christ says of the Spirit, under the representation of God's Messenger, that *he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak*; the meaning is, that he should not impose upon them by delivering Falshoods of his own inventing, and so be a lying Messenger; but he should deliver to them what he should have heard from, and been intrusted with by, God his Principal; and consequently should be a faithful Messenger, and justly deserve the Character of the *Spirit of Truth*, or veracious Spirit.

This therefore is an evident Proof of what Christ had affirmed concerning him. He had assured his Disciples, that the Spirit should lead them into all Truth; that is, make known to them all things relating to his Spiritual Kingdom. For (as our Savior immediatly subjoins) *he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak*; that is, he shall faithfully discharge the Office of God's Messenger to you. Then Christ adds, *and he will shew you things to come*; that is, he will not only instruct you fully in matters relating to my spiritual Kingdom; but he will also make known to you fu-
ture

ture Transactions in the Church, and what shall come to pass in after Ages, the discovery of which shall evince that God employ'd and sent him.

These several Affirmations therefore concerning the Spirit do by no means imply, that he is a different Being from the self-existent God, and subordinat to him : but do only carry on that well known Allegory of the Spirit's being God's Messenger. And the plain Truth deliver'd under those Figures is, that when God shou'd by his Spirit pour forth those extraordinary Gifts and Graces, the Persons endued therewith should be thereby fully and faithfully instructed in all things relating to Christ's spiritual Kingdom, and should also be able to foretel such future contingent Events, as none but God is able to discover beforehand. By this means he should abundantly confirm the Truth of Christ's Mission. For our Lord knew beforehand what the Spirit should discover to them ; and the whole of it wou'd manifestly establish his Doctrin, and prove him to be the true Messiah ; and the Glory of the Spirit's Revelations wou'd consequently redound to our Lord.

His next Words are these ; *He shall glorify me. For he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath, are mine. Therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.* For the Explication of these Expressions it must be noted, that the Substantive to $\pi\delta\upsilon\tau\alpha$, which we translate *all things* in the fifteenth Verse, is manifestly the same as the Substantive to $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$, which we translate *many things* in the twelfth Verse, *viz.* the things relating to Christ's spiritual Kingdom . Wherefore, when Christ says, *All things that the Father hath, are mine*, his meaning is, that all things that God hath relating to Christ's spiritual Kingdom, are Christ's ;

Christ's ; that is, God hath fully communicated to Christ all that Power and Knowledge, which he ought to be endued with for the Management of his spiritual Kingdom, of which the Holy Ghost was to be, after Christ's Ascension, the prime Minister. So that whatsoever the Spirit should afterwards act or have in charge, was from Christ. And therefore Christ says, *he shall receive of mine* ; that is, he shall receive Instructions from me, and display that Power and Knowledge, which the Father has given to me, as being the principal Administrator of my spiritual Kingdom. *And he shall shew it*, or declare this Power and Knowledge, *unto you* my Disciples, by numberless Miracles and Revelations.

Thus our Lord's Expressions are clear. Says he, *He (viz. the Spirit) shall glorify me*, or make me appear truly glorious, by demonstrating that I truly am, what I have all along pretended to be. *For he*, whom I shall send unto you, and who will work so many Miracles among you, and so fully discover to you the whole Will of God, *shall receive of mine*, even of that Power and Knowledge which is already mine by the Gift of my Father, *and he shall shew it unto you* by exercising it among you. For you must understand, that *all things* relating to my spiritual Kingdom, *which the self-existent God, who is my Father, hath or possesseth, are mine*, being communicated by him to me. *Therefore said I, he shall take (or receive, for 'tis the same Verb in the Original, as in the 14th Verse) of that which is already mine* ; that is, he shall then have that Power and Knowledge entrusted with him by me, with which I am already entrusted by God ; *and shall shew it*, or make it evidently known, *unto you*.

4. The Spirit is called *the Spirit* τὸ ἐν τῷ θεῷ, *which is of God*, 1 Cor. 2. 12. This Expression does also relate to the Allegory of his Mission, being the same as τὸ ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἐκπεφύλακται. And therefore it can't imply, that he is a different Being from the Very God, much less derived from him, or subordinat to him.

5. As the Spirit is very frequently compared to a Messenger; so is he at other times compared to Water, or to Treasures. Therefore is he said to be *poured forth* or *given*; that is, his Gifts and Graces are bestowed, particularly either by God, or by the Man Christ Jesus, or by the Apostles. God has an original Power of bestowing the Gifts and Graces of the Spirit, that is, of conferring Gifts and Graces by his own Spirit: and the Man Christ Jesus, or his Disciples, are then said to bestow them, when the Spirit (or God by his Spirit) vouchsafes to confer them by their Ministration; even as they are said to have wrought Miracles, when the Spirit in Reality performed them. But surely these Figures don't prove, that the Spirit derives his Being from God, or is subordinat to him, or that he is a different Being from him.

6. The Apostle says, *The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all*, 2 Cor. 13. 14. In this Passage the Word *Spirit* does so manifestly signify the Gifts of the Spirit, and not that Being from whom they flow, that I can't forbear wondring at the Interpretation which is usually forced upon it. The plain Meaning is only this, *May the grace, Favor or Good Will, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and may also the love of God whom Jesus Christ has reconciled to us, and may also the communion or Participation of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, which Jesus Christ has purchased*

chased for us, and sheds upon the Members of his Church; May these inestimable and most desirable Blessings *be with you all*, by being bestowed upon, and continued with, you all. Wherefore no Derivation or Subordination of the Spirit can be inferr'd from this Passage.

7. Our Lord has commanded, that his Disciples should be baptiz'd *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, Matt. 28. 19. It may be urged therefore, that if the *Son* does in that Place betoken the Man Christ Jesus (as I have declared above) the Spirit must accordingly denote a Being as really distinct from the Very God (who must be meant by the Father) as the Son or Man Christ Jesus is. To which I answer, that being baptized *in the name of a Person*, does certainly denote being by Baptism made that Person's Disciple. This Notion I have establish'd (a) elsewhere. Our Savior's Meaning therefore is barely this, *viz.* That Men should by Baptism be made the Disciples of God (who is usually styled the Father) and of Christ, and of the Spirit; they should be by Baptism made Professors of that Religion, which is taught or made known by God, by the Ministration of the Messiah, during his abode upon Earth, and after his Ascension more completely reveled by the Effusion of the Spirit. Whatever Attempts have been made upon this Text, to serve the Ends of contending Parties, there is nothing more than this contained in it. Wherefore let any indifferent Person judge, whether the Spirit can be prov'd from hence to be a different Being from that God whose Spirit he is, because God does by the Ministration

(a) Confut. of *Quakerism*, Chap. 24. p. 287, &c.

of the Spirit (of which Metaphor I have already given an account) make known his Will to Mankind. The Son and the Spirit therefore are not distinctly enumerated here upon the account of the Diversity of their Beings, but upon the account of the Diversity of the Dispensation, or rather the Diversity of the Parts of the self same Dispensation, which was perfected by the Effusion of the Holy Spirit.

8. The Apostle says, *Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities. For we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit it self maketh intercession for us with groanings, which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts, knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit. Because he maketh intercession for the Saints according to the will of God,* Rom. 8. 26, 27. Now the Spirit in this Passage does not signify that Being who inspir'd the Prophets, &c. but only *the Spirit of adoption*, which tho' 'tis the Gift of the Spirit, yet I have (b) elsewhere proved to be nothing more than a Temper or Disposition of Mind becoming the adopted Sons of God. And consequently nothing in this Passage can be alleged to shew, that the Holy Ghost is a different Being from the Very God, or derived from him, or subordinat to him.

9. We read of the *Spirit of Christ*, the *Spirit of God's Son*, &c. Gal. 4. 6. Phil. 1. 19. and elsewhere. Now these and the like Phrases can import no more, than that Christ has Authority to confer the Spirit, viz. his Gifts and Graces, or that Christ himself enjoy'd the Spirit, viz. his Gifts and Graces, in the most plentiful manner. But nothing of this Nature

(b) See the *Confutation of Quakerism*, Chap. 6. p. 71, &c. And the *Discourse of the Gift of Prayer* (annex'd to the *Brief History of the joint Use of set Forms of Prayer*) Chap. 8. p. 424, &c.

can imply, that the Spirit himself, whose Gifts and Graces Christ either enjoy'd or bestow'd, as did also his Apostles, is a Being distinct from, or subordinat to, the Very God.

10. St. *John* wishes Grace and Peace to the seven Churches from him which is, which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne; and from *Jesus Christ*, &c. *Rev. i. 4, 5.* You have rightly (c) observed, that *whether this be meant of the Holy Ghost, is not agreed by Interpreters.* Now if this is not meant of the Holy Ghost, then no Argument can be drawn from hence in favor of your Doctrin, or against mine. But if it be meant of the Holy Ghost, yet it can't be inferr'd from hence, that the Holy Ghost is a Being distinct from God, notwithstanding the particular Enumeration of God, the Spirit, and *Jesus Christ*; any more than it can be inferr'd, that a particular Man's Spirit, Soul and Body are not one Being, because the Apostle says, *I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, 1 Thess. 5. 23.* It may indeed be rightly inferr'd, that there is a real Distinction in one and the same Being; as there is a real Distinction in the Man, who notwithstanding is one and the same Being: but it can't be inferr'd, that God and the Spirit are distinct and separat Beings; much less that the one is derived from, or subordinat to, the other.

11. We read, that *the Spirit and the bride say, Come, Rev. 22. 17.* From hence it has been inferr'd, that the Spirit is not the selfexistent God, but a being subordinat to him. But how does it appear, that

by *the Spirit* in this Place we must understand that Being who inspir'd the Prophets? 'Tis much more reasonable to understand it of the extraordinary Gifts and Graces of the Spirit, which the same Apostle (*d*) calls *the Unction*, which *taught* the Christians of those Days, 1 *John* 2. 20, 27. And consequently *the Spirit* may signify the Persons endued with the extraordinary Gifts and Graces of the Spirit, *viz.* the Teachers of the Church, as contradicting'd from their Flocks. So that the Meaning will be, that both the inspir'd Teachers, and also their People, *viz.* the Church which is *the Bride*, do say *come*; that is, they earnestly desire the Appearance of Christ. This Text therefore is foreign to the present Purpose.

What other Texts remain, may easily be reduc'd to some of the foregoing Heads; and the same Answer will serve. Wherefore (to avoid needless Repetitions) I shall add no more about this Point, which (I think) has been sufficiently clear'd already.

(*d*) Compare *Confut. of Quakerism*, Chap. 6. p. 61, &c.

C H A P. XIV.

Of the Trinity in Unity.

I HAVE hitherto been shewing (I hope, to your Satisfaction and Conviction) that, 1. the WORD or Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, 2. the Holy Spirit, are the self-existent or very God, and consequently one and the same Being.

But then 'tis evident, that the Holy Scriptures do notwithstanding manifestly distinguish the WORD from the Spirit. The whole Course of the New Testament is a continued Demonstration of this. However, let us reflect upon one Consideration.

The Apostle declares, that the WORD *was made flesh*, John 1. 14. So that the WORD was as truly united to the Man Christ Jesus, as the Spirit of a Man is united to his Body; And during the whole Course of his Ministry this Union lasted. And yet all this while, *the Holy Spirit*, as you truly (a) observe, *is describ'd in the New Testament as the immediate Author and Worker of all Miracles, even of those done by our Lord himself; and as the Conductor of Christ in all the Actions of his Life, during his State of Humiliation here upon Earth.* Again, 'twas not the WORD, but the Spirit, which preserved our Lord from Sin; for *thro' the eternal Spirit he offer'd himself without spot to God*, Heb. 9. 14. And tho' the Union of the WORD and the human Soul continued after the Separation of the Body from the Soul by Death; yet the WORD did not raise the Body again; but 'twas

(a) Script. Doct. p. 301.

quickned by the Spirit, 1 Pet. 3. 18. This clearly shews, that the WORD and the Spirit are as really distinct in the same selfexistent Being, or very God; as the Soul and the Body are really distinct in the same created Being, Man. For the WORD and the Spirit are constantly represented as distinct Principles of Action; and the Spirit acted, in the most eminent manner, in and thro' the Man Christ Jesus, at the same time, that the WORD was quiescent in him.

But farther, as the Holy Scriptures inform us, that the WORD and the Spirit are really distinct in the selfexistent Being or very God: so do they plainly distinguish the selfexistent Being, or very God, both from the WORD and from the Spirit. Particularly the WORD is called the *WORD of God*, 2 Pet. 3. 5. Rev. 19. 13. and the WORD is said to have been *with God in the beginning*, John. 1. 1. And as God made all things by or thro' our Lord, *viz.* his Divine Nature, 1 Cor. 8. 6. Col. 1. 16. Heb. 1. 2, 10. so God is said to have made all things by or thro' the WORD, *John* 1. 3, 10. The Spirit also is call'd the *Spirit of God*, and thereby distinguish'd from God, whose Spirit he is, in several Places. And consequently the WORD of God, and the Spirit of God, are in some Sense distinguish'd from God, whose they are.

From hence it follows, that tho' neither the WORD nor the Spirit is a distinct Being from that God, whose WORD and Spirit they are; any more than the Spirit of a Man is a distinct Being from the Man, whom the Spirit of a Man essentially belongs to: yet there is in the Divine Essence or Nature something distinct from the WORD and the Spirit; and which together with the WORD and the Spirit, constitutes the whole Divine Nature or Essence.

Now

Now it must be observ'd, that tho' the WORD and the Spirit are God, that is, essential to, and constitutive of, the selfexistent Being; yet that which together with the WORD and the Spirit does constitute the Divine Nature or Essence, is not known to us by any other Name, than such as expresses the selfexistent Being, which it (together with the coessential WORD and Spirit) constitutes, *viz.* by the Names *God, Father, &c.* And because the WORD was made Flesh, and personally united to the Man Christ Jesus, whose Generation by the Holy Ghost made him the Son of the selfexistent Being; therefore the WORD may well be term'd the Son of God upon the Account of this *temporal* Generation. And as for the *eternal* Generation of the WORD (tho' that Phrase is not found in Scripture, nor is God therein ever called the Father of the WORD, nor the WORD called the Son of God, upon any Account antecedent to the Incarnation: yet) because the WORD subsists eternally (because necessarily) in God, not as a distinct Being from God, but as one and the same Being with God; and because God (or that which, besides the WORD and the Spirit, is in God, or essential to God) is all along represented so, as that the WORD is his, and he is not the WORD's: therefore we justly think of the whole Divine Nature or Essence in such a manner, as that God, or (if you will suffer me so to speak; for our Ideas being so imperfect, and our Language so defective, I hope, I may be excused such a Figure or Similitude) so much of the Divine Nature or Essence, as is not by any more particular Name distinguish'd in Scripture from the WORD and the Spirit, and which is conceived by us as Prior in order of Consideration to both the WORD and the Spirit, is very properly term'd the eternal Father of the WORD,
which

which WORD is accordingly very properly term'd his eternal and coessential Son.

Now the *Father* (in the Sense just now admitted) the Son or WORD, and the Holy Spirit, are commonly called the Three Persons in the Godhead, or Divine Nature or Essence. What is the original Notation of the Word *Person*, what various Acceptations it has had, and in what Senses it has been apply'd to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; I shall not inquire: 'Tis true, the Word *Person*, when apply'd to the Son and Holy Ghost, does not signify a distinct intelligent Being separat from the Father. For tho' we can't exactly define what a Divine *Person* is, yet we can say what 'tis not. And consequently the three Persons of the Godhead are not three Persons in the same Sense, in which three Men are three Persons. There is therefore no Reason, why we should wrangle about a Phrase. The aforesaid Distinction in the Divine Nature or Essence, is what we mean by Personality: and the thing distinguish'd, is the Person. Whether the Terms are properly used, or no; 'tis needless to dispute. I only desire, that the use of them may be continued, till better can be substituted in their room. What is meant, is pretty generally agreed, *viz.* that the Father, the WORD, and the Spirit, tho' they are truly and really distinct, so that one is not the other, yet are not separat Beings, but one and the same Being, which Being is the selfexistent or very God.

Briefly therefore, the Father (in the Sense already given) the WORD, and the Spirit, are one and the same Being with each other. That is, tho' they are distinct in, yet they are coessential to, and necessarily constitutive of, one and the same Being. Even as the Soul and the Body are distinct in, tho' coessential to, and necessarily constitutive of, the same Being, Man. I do by no means say, that the
Father,

Father, the WORD, and the Spirit, are different Substances, as the Soul and the Body are in a Man (the Body being a material Substance, and the Soul an immaterial one) but surely if the Union of distinct Substances may constitute one and the same Being, Man: certainly the Father, the WORD, and the Spirit (of whose joint Substance I affirm nothing, because 'tis not known) may constitute one and the same most simple and uncompounded Being, *viz.* the very or self-existent God.

The manner of this Distinction in the very God, I think, 'tis impossible to assign or comprehend; because the Divine Substance is not understood by us. But since we know so little of the Substance of any thing; methinks, we should readily believe, what God himself has revealed concerning his own Substance; tho' at present perhaps our Faculties are not qualify'd to form any tolerable Idea of it. This we know, that God is immaterial. But Immateriality is only a Negation. There may be thousands of immaterial Beings, whose Substances may be as different, as the Substance of the human Soul is different from that of the Body. How then can we hope to find out the positive Substance of God?

Had we been as little acquainted with Matter, as we are with the positive Substance of God; and had a Triangle then been made known to us, not by a Name which expresses its positive Nature, but by some other Name as little expressive of its positive Nature, as Δ (for Instance) is of the positive Nature of God: I doubt not but we should have found it as difficult (tho' the Comparison is by no means adequate) to conceive the real Distinction of the Angles A, B, C, in the Unity of the Nature of the Triangle, to which each of them is coessential; as we do now find it to conceive the

the real Distinction of Father, WORD, and Spirit (the Three Persons of the Trinity) in the Unity of the Godhead, to which each is coessential.

The Simplicity of God's Nature can afford no Objection against what I have written. For God's Simplicity only denies and excludes a Composition of separable Parts: Whereas the Father, WORD, and Spirit, are necessarily inseparable and coessential to the Godhead; and may therefore constitute the most simple Being.

As for the Incarnation, it can by no means stagger the Faith of any reasonable Man. For since the Persons of the Everblessed Trinity are really distinct; the WORD, or second Person, might well be incarnat, altho' the Father and the Spirit, *viz.* the first and third Persons are not. God is indeed incarnat; but by his second Person only: Even as a Triangle touches a Point given, if B touches it, at the same time that A and C do not touch it; notwithstanding A and C, together with B, do coessentially constitute the Triangle. And why may not God, by his WORD, be united to a Man, as well as the Body and Soul are united in each of us? We readily allow the Union of the Body and Soul; tho' we can no more comprehend or account for the manner of it, than we can for that of the Union of the Divine and Human Natures. I think, I can as easily conceive, that God by his WORD, is personally united to the Man Christ Jesus, and now governs the whole World by and thro' his Human Nature; as I can conceive, that the Soul acts by and thro' the Body. Tho' God could, and did govern the World before the Incarnation, *immediately*; even as a Soul may act without the Body: yet God may also (and we contend, that he at present actually does) govern the World by and thro' the

the Man Christ Jesus, whom he has vouchsafed to unite to himself by the Incarnation of his WORD.

And in consequence of this Mediatorial Government, the Person of our Saviour Christ (he being Godman) is as truly an Object of Religious Adoration, as the Person of an earthly Prince is the Object of Civil Honor.

The Difficulty as to the Belief of the Trinity, when reveled (tho' tis still equally a Mystery as to our Comprehension of the *manner*) is in Reality none; unless we can find out some good Reason to affirm, that whatever the positive Substance of the selfexistent Being is, yet that Substance will not admit of any real Distinction internal and necessary (not *from*, but) *in* it self.

But I shall not enlarge. You are so good a Philosopher (not to mention your Skill in Divinity) that you can't need being convinc'd of the Reasonableness of believing what is above our Comprehension, or attended with such Difficulties as we are not able to clear. Nay, I do not remember any one Writer, that has express'd himself upon that Point, more fully and judiciously, than you your self have don in diverse of your Books. I will take the Liberty therefore (for the Reader will find cause to thank me for it) of reciting some of your Words, which tho' not penned with any View to the Doctrine of the Trinity, may notwithstanding be most properly apply'd upon this Occasion; because they do so exactly either obviat or answer the Cavils of those Smatterers in Knowledge, who love to decry all Mysterys in Religion, and pretend that we ought not to believe any more than we can frame adequate and complete Ideas of.

In your *Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God* (b), you have what follows. Since in all *Questions concerning the Nature and Perfections of God, or concerning any thing to which the Idea of Eternity or Infinity is joined*; tho' we can indeed demonstrate certain *Propositions to be true*; yet it is impossible for us to comprehend or frame any *adequate or compleat Ideas of the Manner, How the Things so demonstrated can be*: Therefore when once any *Proposition is clearly demonstrated to be true*; it ought not to disturb us, that there be perhaps perplexing *Objections on the other side, which for want of adequate Ideas of the Manner of the Existence of the Things demonstrated, are not easy to be answer'd*. Indeed were it possible there should be any *Proposition which could equally be Demonstrated on both sides of the Question, or which could on both sides be reduced to imply a Contradiction*; This it must be confessed, would alter the Case: Upon this absurd *Supposition, all Difference of True and False, all Thinking and Reasoning, and the use of all our Faculties, would be entirely at an end*. But when to *Demonstration on the one side, there are opposed on the other, only Objections raised from our want of having adequate Ideas of the Things themselves*; this ought not to be esteemed a *Real Difficulty*. 'Tis directly and clearly demonstrable, that *Something has been from Eternity*: All the *Objections therefore raised against the Eternity of any thing, grounded merely on our want of having an adequate Idea of Eternity, ought to be looked upon as of no real Solidity*. Thus in other the like *Instances*: 'Tis demonstrable, for Example, that *Something must be actually Infinite*: All the *Metaphysical Difficulties therefore, which arise usually from applying the Measures and Relations of Things Finite, to what is Infinite; and from supposing Finities to be Parts of Infinite, when in-*

(b) Prop. 1.

deed they are not properly so, but only as *Mathematical Points* to *Quantity*, which have no *Proportion* at all; ought to be esteemed *vain* and of no *Force*. Again, 'tis in like manner demonstrable, that *Quantity* is infinitely *Divisible*: All the *Objections* therefore raised by comparing the imaginary *Equality* or *Inequality* of the *Number* of the *Parts* of *Unequal Quantities*, whose *Parts* have really no *Number* at all, they all having *Parts* without *Number*; ought to be lookt upon as *weak* and altogether *inconclusive*.

In your second *Defense* of an *Argument* made use of in a *Letter* to *Mr. Dodwell*, you (c) write thus; there are many *Demonstrations* even in *abstract Mathematicks* themselves, which no *Man* who understands them, can in the least doubt of the *certainty* of, which yet are attended with *difficult Consequences* that cannot perfectly be cleared. The *infinite Divisibility* of *Quantity*, is an *Instance* of this kind. Also the *Eternity* of *God*, than which nothing is more *self-evident*; and yet the *Difficulties* consequent upon it, are such as have reduced most of the *Schoolmen* to entertain that *unintelligible Notion* of a *Nunc Stans*. And his *Immensity*, attended with much the like *Difficulties*.

And (d) again, Even *abstract Mathematical Demonstrations*; as those concerning the *Infinite Divisibility* of *Quantity*, the *Eternity* of *God*, and his *Immensity*; have almost *insuperable Difficulties* on the other side: And yet no *Man*, who understands those *Matters*, thinks that those *Difficulties* do at all weaken the *Force*, or diminish the *Certainty* of the *Demonstrations*.

In your third *Defense* of the same *Argument*, you (e) say; *Difficult Consequences* that cannot perfectly be cleared, may be, and very often are, found to attend *Things* which are *Demonstrated* to be *True*. The

(c) Pag. 38, 39. of the first Edition.

(d) Pag. 54.

(e) Pag. §2. of the first Edition.

Reason is ; because Difficulties that cannot perfectly be cleared, do not (like Absurdities and Contradictions) arise from a Perception of the Disagreement of Ideas, but barely from the Defect or Imperfectness of the Ideas themselves. Our Reason is able to apprehend clearly the Demonstration of the Certainty of the Existence of some Things, where the Imagination is not able to comprehend the Ideas of the Things themselves. This is plainly the Case of the infinite Divisibility of Quantity, of Infinity and Eternity in general, of the Actions of Immaterial Substances upon Matter, and of many other Things.

And in your fourth Defense of it, you (f) say ; *A Difficulty which cannot be perfectly cleared, is a Difficulty arising, not from the Perception of any Disagreement of Ideas, but from the Want or Defectiveness of Ideas in the Imagination ; which therefore we cannot compare so as to imagin distinctly how they agree, though we can by our Reason and Understanding demonstrate it is impossible they should disagree. This is plainly the Case in most Questions, concerning Eternity, Immensity, &c.*

These several Passages do abundantly demonstrate, that how widely soever we may differ in other Respects ; yet what I have advanc'd, ought not even in your own Opinion to be therefore rejected, because I don't pretend throughly to explain the Doctrin of the Trinity. 'Tis sufficient, if I have shewn, that the Holy Scriptures do teach it. For if that appears, I am sure, you are a better Scholar, as well as a better Christian, than to make any Objection against it, upon the account of such Difficulties, as this great Mystery must needs perplex us with, whose Capacities are so narrow, and whose

(f) Pag. 15. of the first Edition.

Facultys are so dull, that we are constantly puzzled even with those Objects which are most familiar to us, and which we have the best Opportunities of being intimately acquainted with. How then shou'd the wisest Man in the World throughly comprehend the Nature of the selfexistent and infinitely perfect God?

Thus, Dear Sir, have I given you my Thoughts upon this nice and important Subject; and I am willing to hope, that they may work that good Effect, for which, I can truly say, they are most sincerely intended.

Whether there be any Solidity in my Reasonings, and whether my Notions be true, as you must judge for your self, so the World must judge between us both. God grant, that when we are at any time busy'd in forming our Judgments, we may duly consider and remember, that we shall answer for our Opinions as well as our Practices (because Opinion is the Foundation of Practice) at his Tribunal, about whose Divinity you and I have been amicably contending; and who will pass a final Sentence upon us, according to, not the Strength of our Heads, but the Integrity of our Hearts.

Here I shou'd have released your Patience, had these Papers been communicated to you in a private manner. But since I am obliged to address them to you from the Press, I ought not to forget, that very few Readers have Abilitys equal to those which God has blessed you with; or will bestow such a measure of Attention, as you naturally afford even to Matters of far less concern. And therefore, tho' you wou'd easily apply what has been already said, to the several Parts of your own Scheme; and

wou'd instantly discern what my Sentiments are touching every Point of it: yet I can't but esteem it necessary, for the sake of most other Readers, to subjoin a short Examination of your Doctrin, and therein to signify what I think concerning each distinct Branch, referring backwards to those Places, in which I have more largely handled such Particulars, as we may happen to clash with each other about. By this means, what I have digested into a regular Discourse in a Systematical way, will be immediatly transform'd into a Personal Controversy with your self; and the meanest Reader will be able to find, without any Trouble or loss of Time, a distinct Reply to whatsoever you have advanced in opposition (as I verily think) to what the Holy Scriptures do teach concerning the Everblessed Trinity in Unity.

A N
E X A M I N A T I O N
O F
Dr. C L A R K E's
S c r i p t u r e D o c t r i n e
O F T H E
T R I N I T Y.

Of the Doctor's Preface.

YOUR Preface, as 'tis very short, so 'tis certainly very inoffensive, and what no honest Man can object against.

Of his Introduction.

Your Introduction is of considerable length. Touching the Contents of it I need only say,
1. That no Man does more heartily own the Holy Scriptures to be the Rule of Faith, than my self.

Q 2

2. That

2. That I have fully expressed my Mind as to the Point of Subscription to our Church's Articles, in my *Essay* on them. 3. As to our Compliance with other legal Forms, I shall wave all Discourse concerning it, for a Reason which I shall give, when I come to your Third Part.

Of his First Part.

Your Book is divided into Three Parts. You say (a), that in the First Part of it (that it might appear what was, not the Sound of single Texts, which may be easily mistaken, but the whole Tenour of Scripture) you have collected all the Texts that relate to the Doctrine of the Ever-blessed Trinity (which you are not sensible has been done before) and set them before the Reader in one View, with such References and critical Observations, as may 'tis hoped be of considerable Use towards the Understanding of their true Meaning. I shall therefore take no further notice of this First Part, than as I shall find my self obliged in the Examination of your Second, which refers backwards to, and depends upon, your First; and wherein, you (b) say, is collected into methodical Propositions the Sum of that Doctrine, which (upon the carefullest Consideration of the whole Matter) appears to you to be fully contained in the Texts cited in the First Part. So that by examining your Second Part, I shall of consequence examine your First also, as much as the Nature of my Design requires; which is to rectify your Notions relating to the Holy Trinity, and to shew what the Holy Scriptures do really teach concern-

(a) *Introduct.* p. 17.

(b) *Ibid.*

Of his Second Part.

Your Second Part consists of Fifty five Propositions, each of which I shall consider distinctly. Only I must advertise you of one thing.

You (c) say, You have illustrated each Proposition (you should have said, the greatest Number of them) with many Testimonies out of the antient Writers, both before and after the Council of Nice; especially out of Athanasius and Basil; of which are several not taken notice of either by Petavius or the Learned Bishop Bull. Concerning all which, you desire it may be observed, that they are not alledg'd as Proofs, of any of the Propositions (for Proofs are to be taken from the Scripture alone) but as Illustrations only; and to shew how easy and natural that Notion must be allowed to be, which so many Writers could not forbear expressing so clearly and distinctly, even frequent'y, when at the same time they were about to affirm, and endeavouring to prove, something not very consistent with it. Now, whether you have truly represented those Writers, whose Testimonys you have alleged, 'tis perfectly needless for me to inquire. For why should we argue about, or appeal to, the Testimonys of those Persons, whose Words you do not allege as Proofs, for the Establishment of any Proposition, and whose Judgment you are resolv'd beforehand not to abide by?

Wherefore, whether you have just Grounds to assert, that (d) the greatest part of the Writers before and at the time of the Council of Nice, were really of that

(c) *Introduct.* p. 17.

(d) *Introduct.* p. 18.

Opinion (tho' they do not always speak very clearly and consistently) which you have endeavour'd to set forth in your Second Part; I shall not examine for the Reason already given. Besides, what does a cloud of Witnesses signify, unless they are consistent? But as to the Writers after that Council, you (e) declare, that the Reader must not wonder, if many Passages not consistent with (nay, perhaps contrary to) those which are by you cited, shall by any one be alleged out of the same Authors. For, you say, you do not cite Places out of these Authors, so much to show what was the Opinion of the Writers themselves, as to shew how naturally Truth sometimes prevails by its own native Clearness and Evidence, even against the strongest and most settled Prejudices: according to that of Basil: I am persuaded (saith he, as quoted by you) that the Strength of the Doctrine deliver'd down to us, has often compelled Men to contradict their own Assertions. Now, if this be the Case with respect to those who wrote since the Council of Nice, then we may by your own Confession divide those Writers between us. And what will the Cause of Truth gain, by our sharing such opposit and selfcontradicting Authoritys?

You see therefore, that tho' I do by no means Give up either the *Antinicene* or *Postnicene* Writers; yet I justly wave an Inquiry into their Sentiments, purely to shorten our Dispute, and that I may speedily bring it to an Issue, and obtain a Verdict from the Word of God, which alone can infallibly decide the Difference between us.

(e) *Introduct.* p. 18.

Of the Doctor's First Proposition.

These things being premised, I shall now proceed to your several Propositions.

The First of them is contained in these Words ;

“ There is One Supreme Cause and Original of Things ;
 “ One simple, uncompounded, undivided, intelligent Being, or Person ; who is the Author of all Being, and
 “ the Fountain of all Power.

1. In this Proposition you manifestly make, as you do also elsewhere, *intelligent Being* and *Person* to be synonymous and convertible Terms. Now 'tis very true, that in common Speech Intelligent Being and Person are convertible Terms ; and in this sense the one supreme Cause of all things, whom I call the Very God, is undoubtedly a Person, and *but one* Person : but then the one supreme Cause or Very God may be, in a different sense, three distinct Persons, according to what has been already said in Chap. 14. p. 218. and in this sense, tho' the one supreme Cause of all things is an intelligent Being, yet he is *more than one* Person, even three Persons. Wherefore in your sense of the Word *Person*, I grant the Truth of your whole Proposition, which you justly say, is *the First Principle of Natural Religion, and every where supposed in the Scripture Revelation.*

2. I need not observe to you, that none of your References are intended to prove your sense of the Word *Person* ; and therefore none of them can furnish an Argument against my sense of the Word *Person.*

His Second Proposition.

“ With *this* First and supreme Cause or Father of all Things, there has existed from the Beginning, a Second Divine Person, which is his WORD or Son.

1. I have (*f*) already observed, that the WORD is never called *God's Son* in Holy Scripture; tho' I have (*g*) shewn, that that Way of speaking is allowable in other Writers.

2. That the WORD of God has existed from the Beginning, is unquestionably true.

3. 'Tis also equally true, that the WORD has existed from the Beginning *with* the first and supreme Cause or Father of all Things, *viz.* the Very God. But then I have (*b*) shewn, that the WORD's existing *with* God, does not in Scripture Phrase, import that he is a distinct Being from that God *with* whom he existed from the Beginning. On the contrary I have (*i*) proved from Scripture, that the WORD is one and the same Being with the Very God, *with* whom he always existed.

4. The WORD therefore is not a *second* Divine Person in your sense of the Word *Person*, that is, the WORD is not a second intelligent Being coexisting with the Very God, and distinct and separat from him: but yet the WORD is a *second* Divine Person in my sense of the Word *Person*, *viz.* as existing necessarily in, and coessential to, the Very God.

(*f*) Chap. 11. p. 161, &c.

(*g*) Chap. 14. p. 217.

(*k*) Chap. 12. p. 188, &c.

(*i*) Chap. 12. p. 175, &c.

5. The Texts you build this Proposition on, are,

N ^o 567	} which is	[John 1. 1, 2.]	} See above	[ch. 12. p. 175, &c.]
568, 569		[John 1. 18.]		8. 120, 121
574		[John 3. 13.]		8. 106
584		[John 6. 38.]		8. 107
586		[John 6. 51.]		8. 107
588		[John 6. 62.]		8. 107
591		[John 8. 58.]		8. 108
607		[John 17. 5.]		7. 87, &c.
612		[John 17. 24.]		7. 87, &c.
619		[Acts 8. 33.]		11. 162
638		[Phil. 2. 5--11.]		7. 39, &c.
658	[Heb. 7. 3.]	11. 163		

In short, all these Texts, except the first, do relate to Christ's Human Nature; and consequently they do none of them prove, what you have affirm'd, and I have deny'd. And as for the first of them, viz. *John* 1. 1, 2. I have largely explained it, and freed it from your Interpretation, in the Place refer'd to.

His Third Proposition.

“ With the Father and the Son there has existed from
 “ the Beginning a Third Divine Person, which is the
 “ Spirit of the Father and of the Son.

1. That the Spirit of the Father or Very God (who is also called the Spirit of the Son or the Man Christ Jesus, because he was most plentifully enjoyed, and is bestowed, by him, as I have observed above, *ch. 13. p. 203, 212.*) has existed from the Beginning, is granted. But that this Spirit is a third Divine Person in your sense of the Word *Person*,

son, that is, a third Being distinct from God and his WORD, I utterly deny; tho' I grant him to be a third Divine Person in my Sense of the Word *Person*, as existing necessarily in, and coessential to, the Very God.

2. The Scriptures do not say that the Spirit existed *with* the Father and the Son from the Beginning; tho' if they did, it would prove nothing for your Purpose, as is evident from what I have said about the WORD's being in the Beginning *with* God. See *Chap. 12. p. 188, &c.*

3. The Spirit's proceeding from the Father and the Son denotes his Temporal Mission: And I have largely explained the whole Allegory in *Chap. 13. p. 202, &c.*

4. As for the Texts you refer to, touching

N ^o 1124	} which is	{	<i>John</i> 15. 26.	} See above	{	<i>Ch.</i> 13. p. 202, &c.
1129			<i>I Cor.</i> 2. 10, 11.			13. 198, &c.
1148			<i>Matt.</i> 3. 16.			13. 202.

In Numb. 1132 *, which is *Heb.* 19. 14. he is only called *the Eternal Spirit*, which surely can't prove him a distinct Being from the Very God.

His Fourth Proposition.

“ *What the proper Metaphysical Nature, Essence, or*
 “ *Substance of any of these Divine Persons is, the Scri-*
 “ *pture has no where at all declared; but describes and di-*
 “ *stinguishes them always by their personal Characters,*
 “ *Offices, Powers and Attributes.*

To this Proposition (supposing the Word *Persons*, and consequently *personal*, to be taken in my sense; and

and you do not here offer any thing to establish your own sense of them) I oppose nothing.

His Fifth Proposition.

“ *The Father (or First Person) alone is selfex-*
“ *istent, underived, unoriginated, independent ;*
“ *made of none, begotten of none, proceeding*
“ *from none.*

This Proposition is certainly true of the Very God, whom you mean by *the Father*. But then, whereas you call him the *First Person*, I must observe, that the Very God is not a Person distinct from the WORD and the Spirit, in your sense of the Word *Person*, as signifying an intelligent Being ; and consequently the Father, as contradistinguished from the WORD and the Spirit, is not *alone* selfexistent, &c. But the Father, with his WORD and Spirit, as three coessential Persons, in my sense of the Word *Person*, is the Very God ; which Very God, who is three Persons, is alone (as contradistinguished from all other Beings) selfexistent, &c. .

His Sixth Proposition.

“ *The Father (or First Person) is the sole Origin*
“ *of all Power and Authority, and is the Author*
“ *and Principle of whatsoever is done by the Son or*
“ *by the Spirit.*

1. That the Very God, whom you mean by *the Father*, is the sole Origin of all Power and Authority, is certain.

2. Touching the *Father* as the *First Person*, see what I have said on the Fifth Proposition.

3. The

3. The Very God is undoubtedly the Author and Principle of whatsoever is done by the Son. For the Man Christ Jesus derived his Power from the Very God, who is his Father; and the Very God did whatsoever was done by the WORD or Divine Nature of the Son. For by the WORD God made all things. But it does not follow from thence, that the WORD is a distinct Being from the Father or Very God; any more than a Man's understanding by his Soul, or touching by his Body, proves that the Soul or the Body is a distinct Being from the Man.

4. The same may be said with respect to the Spirit.

5. Your Texts are very numerous under this Head, *viz.* from N^o 756 to N^o 995, which relate to the Son, and from N^o 1148 to N^o 1197, which relate to the Spirit. It may suffice however to note, that where the Son is represented as subordinat to the Father, the Human Nature of the Son, *viz.* the Man Christ Jesus, is manifestly meant; And that Index of Texts which I shall subjoin to these Papers, will readily refer to an Explication of any Text in which any Difficulty may be apprehended. And the 12th Chapter furnishes an Account of all those, which may seem to imply the Spirit's Subordination.

His Seventh Proposition.

“ *The Father (or First Person) alone, is in the highest, strict, and proper sense, absolutely Supreme over all.* ”

1. This is granted of the Very God, whom you mean by *the Father*.

2. Touch-

2. Touching the Father as *First Person*, see the Fifth Proposition.

His Eighth Proposition.

“ *The Father (or First Person) is, absolutely speaking, the God of the Universe; the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; the God of Israel; of Moses, of the Prophets and Apostles; and the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* ”

1. This also is granted of the Very God.
2. Touching the Father as the *First Person*, see the Fifth Proposition.
3. The Very God is never called the God and Father of the WORD, tho' he is undoubtedly the God and Father of the Man Christ Jesus, or the incarnat WORD.

His Ninth Proposition.

“ *The Scripture, when it mentions the one God, or the only God, always means the supreme Person of the Father.* ”

This is true of the Very God, who (as I have so often said) is three Persons, viz. the Father with his WORD and Spirit. See *Chap. 14. p. 218.*

His Tenth Proposition.

“ *Whenever the Word, God, is mentioned in Scripture with any high Epithet, Title, or Attribute annexed to it; it generally (if not always) means the Person of the Father.* ”

It always means the Very God, who is Three Persons, as in the Ninth Proposition.

His Eleventh Proposition.

“ *The Scripture, when it mentions GOD, absolutely*
 “ *and by way of Eminence, always means the Person*
 “ *of the Father.*

I answer as to the Ninth Proposition.

His Twelfth Proposition.

“ *The Son (or second Person) is not selfexistent,*
 “ *but derives his Being or Effence, and all his Attri-*
 “ *butes, from the Father, as from the supreme Cause.*

1. How the WORD may be called the Son of God, see *Chap. 14. p. 217.*

2. The WORD is the second Person (tho' not in your sense, as a distinct Being from the Very God, whom you mean by the Father) according to *Chap. 14. p. 218.*

3. Tho' the Human Nature of the Son, *viz.* the Man Christ Jesus, derives his Being or Effence, and all that he ever did or does enjoy, from the Very God, as from the supreme Cause; and consequently can't be imagined to be selfexistent: yet the WORD, or Divine Nature of the Son, is essential to, and necessarily exists in, the Very God; and is in that sense selfexistent; nor does he therefore, or can he, derive his Being or Effence, or any Attribute whatsoever, from the Very God, as from a distinct Being, or the supreme Cause of himself; he being one and the same Being with
 the

the Very God, who is the supreme Cause of all other Beings whatsoever.

4. Whereas you refer to

N ^o 619	} which is	[Acts 8. 33. Mark 1. 1. John 6. 57. John 7. 2, 8, 9. Col. 1. 15. Heb. 1. 3, &c. Heb. 2. 11. 1 John 5. 1. Rev. 3. 14.]	} see above	[Ch. II	p. 162	
769					II	161
798					II	159, 160
801					II	159, 160
937					II	159, 160
950					II	172, &c.
953					II	168
986					II	161
992				7	89	

His Thirteenth Proposition.

“ In what particular Metaphysical Manner, the
 “ Son derives Being or Essence from the Father, the Scri-
 “ pture has no where distinctly declared; and therefore
 “ Men ought not to presume to be able to define.

1. Till it be proved, that the WORD (for the Question is concerning the Son’s Divine Nature) does derive his Being at all from the Very God, whom you mean by the Father; this Proposition drops.

2. Touching

N ^o 619	} which is	[Acts 8. 33.]	} see	[ch. II.	p. 162
658					[Heb. 7. 3.]

His Fourteenth Proposition.

“ They are therefore equally worthy of Censure, who ei-
 “ ther on the one Hand presume to affirm, that the Son
 “ was

“ was made (*Ἔκ ἑνός*) out of Nothing ; or, on the
 “ other hand, that he is the selfexistent Substance.

They are certainly worthy of Censure, who presume to affirm, that the WORD (or Divine Nature of the Son) was made out of Nothing : but they are certainly in the Right, who say, that the WORD is essential to, or necessarily exists in, and in that sense is, the selfexistent Substance.

His Fifteenth Proposition.

“ The Scripture, in declaring the Son's Derivation
 “ from the Father, never makes mention of any Limitation
 “ of Time ; but always supposes and affirms him to
 “ have existed with the Father from the Beginning,
 “ and before all Worlds.

1. The Scripture never declares the WORD's Derivation from the Very God.

2. The Scripture supposes and affirms, that the WORD existed with, and is, the Very God, from the Beginning, and before all Worlds. See Chap. 12.

His Sixteenth Proposition.

“ They therefore have also justly been censured, who
 “ pretending to be wise above what is written, and intruding
 “ into things which they have not seen ; have
 “ presumed to affirm [*ὅτι ἦν ὅτε ἔκ ἑνός*] that there was
 “ a time when the Son was not.

I heartily assent to this, provided by the Son be meant the WORD, or the Son's Divine Nature.

His

His Seventeenth Proposition.

“ *Whether the Son derives his Being from the Father,*
 “ *by necessity of Nature, or by the Power of his*
 “ *Will, the Scripture hath no where expressly declared.*

The WORD does not derive his Being from the Very God, as from a Distinct Being ; but necessarily exists in him, and is essential to him.

His Eighteenth Proposition.

“ *The [λόγος, the] Word or Son of the Father,*
 “ *sent into the World to assume our Flesh, and die for the*
 “ *Sins of Mankind ; was not the [λόγος ἐνδιδακτός, the]*
 “ *internal Reason or Wisdom of God, an Attribute*
 “ *or Power of the Father ; but a real Person, the same*
 “ *who from the beginning had been the Word, or Re-*
 “ *vealer of the Will, of the Father to the World.*

1. The WORD of the Very God did assume our Flesh.

2. The Scriptures, tho' they declare that the Man Christ Jesus was sent, yet do never say that the WORD was sent.

3. The WORD, by reason of the Flesh he assumed, did die for the Sins of Mankind ; that is, the Human Nature of that Person, which was perfect God and perfect Man, did die for them.

4. I do not affirm, that the WORD is the internal Reason or Wisdom of God, an Attribute or Power of him ; because the Scriptures have not declared any such thing : but I deny his being, in your sense, a real Person, that is, a Being distinct from God ; tho' I own him a real Person in my
 R sense,

242 *An Examination of Dr. Clarke's*
 sense, as subsisting in the Very God. See *Chap. 14.*
p. 218.

5. It does not appear, that the WORD was from the beginning the Reveler of God's Will to the World. That Office was, in a great Measure at least, discharged by our Saviour's preexistent Human Soul. See *Chap. 7.* Thus I understand your

N^o 616 }
 617 } viz. *Acts 7. 30, 31, 32, 35, 38.* See *cb. 7. p. 51, &c.*
 618 }

6. Others also of your Texts relate, not to the WORD, but to Christ's preexistent Human Soul. For Instance, touching

N ^o 607	} which is	{	<i>John 17. 5.</i>	}	See above	{	<i>Ch. 7. p. 87, &c.</i>	
612			<i>John 17. 24.</i>				7	87, &c.
574			<i>John 3. 13.</i>				8	106
584			<i>John 6. 38.</i>				8	107
586			<i>John 6. 51.</i>				8	107
588		{	<i>John 6. 62.</i>	}		{	8	107

7. I have also largely shewn, in the Seventh Chapter, that N^o 628. which is *Phil. 2. 5---11.* relates not to the WORD, but to Christ's Human Nature.

8. So do diverse other Texts here quoted by you; particularly concerning

N ^o 631	} which is	{	<i>2 Cor. 4. 4.</i>	}	See above	{	<i>Ch. 11. p. 171.</i>	
641			<i>Col. 1. 15, 16.</i>				11	170.
652			<i>Heb. 1. 3, &c.</i>				11	172, 3.
672			<i>Rev. 3. 14.</i>				7	89

9. The

9. The same must be said of N^o 654. which is *Heb. 2. 16.* Compare what I have written in *Chap. 3. p. 11, &c.*

10. As also of N^o 569. which is *John 1. 18.* See *Chap. 8. p. 120, 121.*

11. There remain therefore but three of your whole Number, which relate to the WORD, or the Divine Nature of the Son.

The first is N^o 535. that is, *John 1. 1.* which proves that the WORD is the Very God; and consequently not a distinct Being from him. See the 12th Chapter, *p. 175, &c.*

To this may be reduc'd your second, *viz.* N^o 680. that is, *Rev. 19. 13.*

Your third is N^o 642. that is, *Col. 1. 17, 18, 19,* 20. of which see *Chap. 11. p. 164, 166, 171.*

In short, the Apostle there speaks partly of Christ's Human Nature, and partly of the WORD or his Divine Nature. But in all that he says of the Divine Nature, there is not the least Shadow of Proof, that 'tis a distinct Being from the Very God.

His Nineteenth Proposition.

“ *The Holy Spirit (or third Person) is not self-existent, but derives his Being or Essence from the Father (by the Son) as from the supreme Cause.*

1. The Holy Spirit is not the *Third Person* in your sense of the Word *Person*; that is, he is not a Being distinct and separat from the Very God and the WORD, but one and the same Being with the Very God and the WORD; that is, In the Very God there are (in my sense of the Word, already often mentioned) three Persons, *viz.* the Father,

the WORD and the Spirit ; all wick do necessarily exist in the Very God, and are coessential to each other.

2. The Holy Spirit therefore does not derive his Being from the Very God (whom you mean by the Father) as from the supreme Cause ; and consequently he does not so derive his Being from the Very God by the Son, or WORD : but is, in the sence before given, selfexistent ; that is, he exists necessarily in, and is coessential with, the Father and the WORD, in the same Very God.

3. Touching your

N^o 1148 } which is { *Matt.* 3. 16. } see { *ch.* 13. p. 202.
 1154 } { *John* 15. 26. } { 13. 202, &c.

4. Your other Texts, viz. from N^o 1149 to N^o 1197, are accounted for in *Chap.* 13.

His Twentieth Proposition.

“ *The Scripture, speaking of the Spirit of God, never*
 “ *mentions any Limitation of Time, when he derived*
 “ *his Being or Essence from the Father ; but supposes him*
 “ *to have existed with the Father from the Beginning.*

1. Since the Scripture never mentions the Spirit's deriving his Being or Essence from the Very God ; 'tis certain that it does not mention any Limitation of Time, when he derived it.

2. Of the Spirit's existing *with* the Father, see the Third Proposition.

His Twenty first Proposition.

“ *In what particular Metaphysical Manner the*
“ *Holy Spirit derives his Being from the Father, the Scri-*
“ *pture hath no where at all defined, and therefore Men*
“ *ought not to presume to be able to explain.*

Very true. For the Scripture says nothing of any Derivation at all. See the Nineteenth Proposition.

His Twenty second Proposition.

“ *The Holy Spirit of God does not in Scripture gene-*
“ *rally signify a mere Power or Operation of the Fa-*
“ *ther, but a real Person.*

1. I do by no means assert, that the Holy Spirit of God does in Scripture *generally* signify a mere Power or Operation of the Very God, whom you mean by the Father: but your own Expressions imply, what is indeed very true, *viz.* that *sometimes* it does.

2. That the Holy Spirit of God, even he who inspired the Prophets, conducted Christ, &c. does ever signify a *real Person* in your sense of the Word *Person*, that is, a distinct Being from the Very God whose Spirit he is; I utterly deny: tho' I grant it signifies a *real Person* in my sense of that Word, as existing necessarily in, and being coessential to, the Very God, according to what I have said in *Chap. 14. p. 218.*

3. Those of your Texts, which may be thought most plainly to prove, that the Spirit is an intelligent Being; yet can't be thought to prove him

246 *An Examination of Dr. Clarke's*
 a distinct Being from the Very God, whose Spirit
 he is. This is a sufficient Reply touching your

N ^o 1017	} which is	{ 1 Cor. 12. 8--11.		
1032		{ <i>John</i> 16. 13.		
1043		{ <i>Acts</i> 8. 29.		
1045		{ <i>Acts</i> 10. 19, 20.		
1046		{ <i>Acts</i> 11. 12.		
1048		{ <i>Acts</i> 13. 2.		
1059*		{ 1 Cor. 12. 11.		
1144	} { <i>Eph.</i> 4. 30.			
As for your N ^o 1129	} which is	{ 1 Cor. 2. 10, 11. }	} See above { <i>ch.</i> 13. p. 198, 199.	
1138		{ <i>Matt.</i> 28. 19. }		{ <i>ch.</i> 13. p. 211.
1143		{ 2 Cor. 13. 14. }		{ <i>ch.</i> 13. p. 210.
1147		{ <i>Rev.</i> 1. 4. }		{ <i>ch.</i> 13. p. 213.
1155		{ <i>John</i> 16. 13. }		{ <i>ch.</i> 13. p. 205, &c.
1171		{ <i>Rom.</i> 8. 26. }		{ <i>ch.</i> 13. p. 212.
1172	} { <i>Rom.</i> 8. 27. }	{ <i>ch.</i> 13. p. 212.		

As for N^o 1077, which is *John* 14. 16. consider
ch. 13. p. 202---209.

His Twenty third Proposition.

“ They who are not careful to maintain these personal
 “ Characters and Distinctions, but while they are solici-
 “ tous (on the one hand) to avoid the Errours of the Ari-
 “ ans, affirm (in the contrary Extreme) the Son and
 “ Holy Spirit to be (individually with the Father) the
 “ selfexistent Being: These, seeming in Words to
 “ magnify the Name of the Son and Holy Spirit, in Re-
 “ ality take away their very Existence; and so fall
 “ unawares into Sabellianism (which is the same with
 “ Socinianism.)

1. That the WORDS, or Divine Nature of
 Christ, and the Holy Spirit, are individually with
 the Father, or the first Person, the selfexistent
 Being;

Being; has been plainly proved in the 12th and 13th Chapters. Nor do the Holy Scriptures attribute to the WORD or Spirit any personal Characters or Distinctions repugnant to this Doctrin. And consequently we must not deny this Doctrin for the sake of any such pretended personal Characters or Distinctions, the belief of which (because the Holy Scriptures do not teach them) can't be either necessary or reasonable for the Maintenance of the Truth against any sort of Heretics.

2. Those who affirm the WORD and Spirit to be (individually with the Father) the selfexistent Being, do not in any wise take away the very Existence of the WORD and Spirit; unless affirming them to be Very God, or the selfexistent Being, can be construed a Denial of their very Existence; as if the Very God, or selfexistent Being, could not exist; which (I am sure) you will by no means say. I confess, those who affirm the WORD and Spirit to be (individually with the Father) the selfexistent Being, do *in Reality* (as in Reality they ought) take away their very Existence as Beings distinct and separat from the Very God or selfexistent Being: But surely the denying of their distinct and separat Existence, is not taking away their very Existence, or saying that they do not exist at all.

3. Whether *Sabellianism* be the same with *Socinianism*, I need not inquire. The Question at present is, not what the *Sabellians* or the *Socinians* teach, but what the Holy Scriptures teach.

4. If those who affirm the Doctrin above maintain'd, did really fall into *Sabellianism*; 'twou'd be no Argument against their Doctrin, provided the Holy Scriptures do warrant it. Nor would any Man that should revive the *Arian* Notions,

esteem it a good Argument against his Positions, that they were formerly maintained by *Arius*, and condemned by the Church as much as the Tenets of *Sabellius* were. He would say, and indeed justly, that we must receive for Truth, not what has been establish'd by Councils, but what the Inspir'd Writers have deliver'd ; and that we must not be afraid of owning the Truth, because it has been formerly condemned, and branded under the Name of some eminent Patron.

5. That the Doctrin abovemaintained is by no means *Sabellianism*, but a flat Contradiction to it, I could easily prove, were I not resolv'd to avoid all such Digressions, as will only amuse and prejudice the Reader, without shewing him what the Holy Scriptures do teach, which are the only Rule of Faith.

His Twenty fourth Proposition.

“ *The Word, God, in the New Testament, sometimes signifies the Person of the Son.*

1. The Word *God* does sometimes in the New Testament undoubtedly signify the WORD or Divine Nature of Christ ; and Christ the Son of God is sometimes in the New Testament undoubtedly called *God* upon the Account of his having the WORD, or his Divine Nature, united to his Human Nature.

2. Whether the Divine Nature of Christ be meant by the Word *God*, in all the several Texts by you refer'd to, it matters not. 'Tis sufficient, that 'tis certainly meant by that Word in some of them, particularly *John* 1. 1. which is your N^o 535.

His Twenty fifth Proposition.

“ *The Reason why the Son in the New Testament is*
“ *sometimes stiled God, is not so much upon account of his*
“ *Metaphysical Substance, how Divine soever ; as of*
“ *his relative Attributes and Divine Authority over*
“ *us.*

It is not worth while at present to inquire, upon what Account, or upon what Account *chiefly*, the WORD, or Divine Nature of Christ, is stiled God in the New Testament. 'Tis sufficient, that he is so stiled, and that his being so stiled impiys his having Authority over us ; whether the Appellation were originally given him upon that Account, or upon the Account *also*, or *chiefly*, of his Metaphysical Substance.

His Twenty sixth Proposition.

“ *By the Operation of the Son, the Father both made*
“ *and governs the World.*

By his WORD God made the World ; and God by Christ, that is, the God-Man, now governs the World.

His Twenty seventh Proposition.

“ *Concerning the Son, there are other the greatest*
“ *things spoken in Scripture, and the highest Titles*
“ *ascribed to him ; even such as include All divine Pow-*
“ *ers, excepting absolute Supremacy and Independen-*
“ *cy, which to suppose Communicable is an express*
“ *Contradiction in Terms.*

There

1. There are in Scripture such things spoken of, and such Titles ascribed to, the **W O R D**, or Divine Nature of Christ, as do include all Divine Powers. For he is expressly called *God*. See the 24th Proposition.

2. Absolute Supremacy and Independency are never deny'd of the **W O R D**, or Divine Nature of Christ, in the Holy Scriptures.

3. To suppose absolute Supremacy and Independency communicable from one Being to another distinct and separat Being, is an express Contradiction in Terms.

4. There may be, without any Appearance of a Contradiction, a **W O R D** and a Spirit, inseparable from, and coessential to, that Being which is selfexistent, and consequently absolutely supreme and independent.

5. Under this Proposition you have collected a great Number of Particulars, which are affirmed of Christ in Scripture. The far greatest part of them do not imply any Divine Power inherent in him: but manifestly relate to him, partly as the Messiah or Great Prophet, and partly as the great Governor of the World, which he most certainly is as God-Man. I need not distinctly prove this, and so go thro' all the Particulars you have collected; because I am persuaded, that Index of Scriptures which I shall annex, will be a sufficient Direction even to a mean Capacity. As for such Passages of Scripture as relate to the **W O R D** or Christ's Divine Nature, none of them does imply any Inferiority of it to the Very God, as will appear to any Person who considers what I have written in the 12th Chapter.

His Twenty eighth Proposition.

“ *The Holy Spirit is described in the New Testament,*
“ *as the immediate Author and Worker of All Mira-*
“ *cles, even of those done by our Lord himself; and as*
“ *the Conductor of Christ in all the Actions of his Life,*
“ *during his state of Humiliation here upon Earth.*

This Proposition is true. See the 8th Chapter.

His Twenty ninth Proposition.

“ *The Holy Spirit is declared in Scripture to be the In-*
“ *spirer of the Prophets and Apostles, and the great*
“ *Teacher and Director of the Apostles in the whole*
“ *Work of their Ministry.*

This Proposition is true.

His Thirtieth Proposition.

“ *The Holy Spirit is represented in the New Testa-*
“ *ment, as the Sanctifier of all Hearts, and the Sup-*
“ *porter and Comforter of Good Christians under all*
“ *their Difficulties.*

This Proposition is true.

His Thirty first Proposition.

“ *Concerning the Holy Spirit there are other greater*
“ *things spoken in Scripture, and higher Titles ascribed*
“ *to him, than to any Angel or other created Being*
“ *whatsoever.*

This Proposition is true.

His Thirty second Proposition.

“ *The Word, God, in Scripture, no where signifies the*
 “ *Person of the Holy Ghost.*

Of the *Person* of the Holy Ghost see Prop. 22.

Since I have shewn, that the Holy Ghost is Very God, it is not worth disputing, whether the Word *God* does any where in Scripture signify the Holy Ghost.

His Thirty third Proposition.

“ *The Word, God, in Scripture, never signifies a com-*
 “ *plex Notion of more Persons than one ; but always*
 “ *means one Person only, viz. either the Person of the*
 “ *Father singly, or the Person of the Son singly.*

The Word *God* in Scripture does indeed never signify a complex Notion of more Persons than one, in your sense of the Word *Person* ; that is, the Word *God* does never in Scripture signify a complex Notion of more Beings than one : but always means one Being only, viz. the Very God, or the WORD, who is one and the same Being with the Very God, as I have largely shewn.

I need not remind you, that I have shewn in Chap. 14. p. 218. how the Father and the WORD, tho' one and the same Being, are distinct Persons in my sense of the Word *Person*.

His Thirty fourth Proposition.

“ *The Son, whatever his Metaphysical Essence or Sub-*
 “ *stance be, and whatever Divine Greatness and Dignity*
 “ *is*

“ is ascribed to him in Scripture ; yet in this he is evident-
“ ly subordinate to the Father, that he derives his
“ Being and Attributes from the Father, the Father no-
“ thing from him.

See Prop. 6. Art. 5. and Prop. 12. Art. 3.

His Thirty fifth Proposition.

“ Every Action of the Son, both in making the
“ World, and in all other his Operations ; is only the
“ Exercise of the Father’s Power, communicated to him
“ after an ineffable manner.

See Prop. 6. Art. 3. and Prop. 12. Art. 1, 3.

His Thirty sixth Proposition.

“ The Son, whatever his Metaphysical Nature or Es-
“ sence be ; yet, in this whole Dispensation, in the Creation
“ and Redemption of the World, acts in all things accord-
“ ing to the Will, and by the Mission or Authority of
“ the Father.

1. God created the World by his WORD, which is the Divine Nature of the Son. But that the WORD created the World according to the Will, and by the Mission or Authority of the Father, is not the Language of Holy Scripture.

2. The Human Nature of the Son, viz. the Man Christ Jesus, did in the Redemption of the World, act in all things according to the Will, and by the Mission or Authority, of the Father, viz. the Very God.

His Thirty seventh Proposition.

“ *The Son, how great soever the Metaphysical Dignity*
 “ *of his Nature was, yet in the whole Dispensation entirely*
 “ *directed all his Actions to the Glory of the Father.*

This is true of the Human Nature of the Son,
viz. the Man Christ Jesus.

His Thirty eighth Proposition.

“ *Our Saviour, Jesus Christ ; as, before his Incarna-*
 “ *tion, he was sent forth by the Will and Good Pleasure,*
 “ *and with the Authority of the Father ; so in the Flesh,*
 “ *both before and after his Exaltation, notwithstanding*
 “ *that the Divinity of the Son was personally and insepa-*
 “ *rably united to it, he, in Acknowledgment of the Supre-*
 “ *macy of the Person of the Father, always prayed to*
 “ *him, and returned him Thanks, styling him his God,*
 “ *&c.*

1. We do not read, that God's WORD, or the Son's Divine Nature, was *sent forth* before the Incarnation, by the Will and good Pleasure, and with the Authority, of the Father.

2. The preexisting Human Soul of Christ was sent forth before the Incarnation by the Will and good Pleasure, and also *by* (for I do not care to say *with*) the Authority of the Father, or Very God.

3. The Man Christ Jesus, or the Son's Human Nature, during his Abode upon Earth, when the WORD was quiescent, did, notwithstanding that the Word was personally and inseparably united to him, pray, &c. to the Father or Very God.

4. The

4. The Scriptures do by no means teach, that the WORD, or the Son's Divine Nature, did ever pray, &c. to the Father or Very God, in Acknowledgment of his Supremacy.

His Thirty ninth Proposition.

“ *The reason why the Scripture, tho' it stiles the Father*
“ *God, and also stiles the Son God, yet at the same time*
“ *always declares there is but one God ; is because, in the*
“ *Monarchy of the Universe, there is but one Authority,*
“ *original in the Father, derivative in the Son :*
“ *the Power of the Son being, not another Power op-*
“ *posite to that of the Father, nor another Power co-*
“ *ordinate to that of the Father ; but it self The Pow-*
“ *er and Authority of the Father, communicated to,*
“ *manifested in, and exercised by the Son.*

1. The Scripture does therefore declare, that there is but one God, notwithstanding it stiles the Father *God*, and also the WORD (or Divine Nature of the Son) *God* ; because the Father and the WORD are, not distinct Gods, but one and the same God. See *Chap. 12. p. 177, &c.*

2. If by the *Son* we understand the Human Nature of Christ, which is personally united to the WORD, and exalted to the Dignity of being Vicegerent of the Father or Very God ; it is undoubtedly true, that in the Monarchy of the Universe there is but one Authority, original in the Father or Very God, derivative in the Mediator ; the Power of the Mediator being, not another Power opposit to that of God, nor another Power coordinat to that of God, but it self the Power and Authority of God, communicated to, manifested
in,

in, and exercised by, the one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus.

His Fortieth Proposition.

“ *The Holy Spirit, whatever his Metaphysical Nature, Essence or Substance be ; and whatever Divine Power or Dignity is ascribed to him in Scripture ; yet in this he is evidently subordinate to the Father ; that he derives his Being and Powers from the Father, the Father nothing from him.*

The Holy Spirit does not derive his Being and Powers from the Father or Very God (see Prop. 19.) but is one and the same Being with him, coessential, and consequently not subordinat to him.

His Forty first Proposition.

“ *The Holy Spirit, whatever his Metaphysical Nature, Essence or Substance be ; and whatever Divine Power or Dignity is ascribed to him in Scripture ; yet in the whole Dispensation of the Gospel, always acts by the Will of the Father, is given and sent by him, intercedes to him, &c.*

See the 14th Chapter.

His Forty second Proposition.

“ *The Holy Spirit, as he is subordinate to the Father ; so he is also in Scripture represented as subordinate to the Son, both by Nature and by the Will of the Father ; excepting only that he is described as being the Conductor and Guide of our Lord, during his state of Humiliation here upon Earth.*

1. The Holy Spirit is not subordinat to the Father, or to the W O R D. See *Prop.* 19, 40.

2. The Holy Spirit was the Conductor and Guide of the Man Christ Jesus during his State of Humiliation here upon Earth, when the W O R D was quiescent in him. See the 8th and 9th Chapters.

His Forty third Proposition.

“ Upon these Grounds, absolutely supreme Honour
“ is due to the Person of the Father singly, as being alone
“ the supreme Author of all Being and Power.

Absolutly supreme Honor is due (not to the Father, as distinguish'd from the W O R D and the Spirit ; but) to the Very God (in whom there are three coessential Persons, the Father, the WORD, and the Spirit) as being alone the supreme Author of all Being and Power.

His Forty fourth Proposition.

“ For the same Reason, all Prayers and Praises ought
“ primarily or ultimately to be directed to the Person of
“ the Father, as the Original and Primary Author
“ of all Good.

All Prayers and Praises ought primarily and ultimately to be directed to the Very God, in whom are three coessential Persons, as the Original and Primary Author of all Good.

His Forty fifth Proposition.

“ And upon the same Account, whatever Honour is
“ paid to the Son who redeemed, or to the Holy Spirit
“ who

“ who sanctifies us, must always be understood as tending
 “ finally to the Honour and Glory of the Father, by
 “ whose good Pleasure the Son redeemed, and the Holy
 “ Spirit sanctifies us.

1. Whatever Honor is paid to the Very God, is paid to the Father, WORD and Spirit, who are one and the same Being.

2. Whatever Honor is paid to the Son as Incarnat Mediator, that is, whatever Honor is paid to Christ, who redeemed us, and now governs the World as God's Vicegerent, must always be understood as tending finally to the Honor and Glory of the Very God, to whose WORD the Man Christ Jesus is personally united.

His Forty sixth Proposition.

“ For, the Great Oeconomy, or the whole Dispensation of God towards Mankind in Christ, consists and terminates in this; that as all Authority and Power is originally in the Father, and from him derived to the Son, and exercised according to the Will of the Father by the Operation of the Son, and by the Energy of the Holy Spirit; and all Communications from God to the Creature, are conveyed through the Intercession of the Son, and by the Inspiration and Sanctification of the Holy Spirit: So on the contrary, all Returns from the Creature, of Prayers and Praises, of Reconciliation and Obedience, of Honour and Duty to God; are made in and by the Guidance and Assistance of the Holy Spirit, through the Mediation of the Son, to the supreme Father and Author of all Things.

If (to avoid Ambiguity) instead of the Word *Father* you wou'd read *God*, and instead of the Word *Son* you wou'd read *Christ*, or *Mediator*, or *Man Christ Jesus*; this Proposition would be exactly true.

His Forty seventh Proposition.

“ *The Son, before his Incarnation, was with God,*
 “ *was in the Form of God, and had Glory with the*
 “ *Father.*

This Proposition is true of the God-man, with respect partly to his Divine, partly to his Human Nature. As for your

N ^o 567	} which is	{ <i>John</i> 1. 1, 2. }	} See above	{ <i>ch.</i> 12. p. 175--191.
574		3. 13.		8. 106.
584		6. 38.		8. 107.
586		51.		<i>ibid.</i>
588		62.		<i>ibid.</i>
591		8. 58.		8. 108.
607		17. 5.		{ 7. 76, 87.
612		24.		{ 8. 108.
616		<i>Acts</i> 7. 30, 31, 32.		{ 7. 51, &c. 65.
617		35.		{ 7. 39, &c.
618	38.			
638	{ <i>Phil.</i> 2. 5----11. }			

His Forty eighth Proposition.

“ *Yet he had not then distinct Worship paid to him*
 “ *in his own Person, but appeared only as the [Speci-*
 “ *nah or] Habitation of the Glory of the Father; in*
 “ *which, the Name of God was: The Distinctness*
 “ *and Dignity of his Person, and the true Nature of*
 “ *his Authority and Kingdom, not being yet revealed.*

1. No wonder, that the Son had not distinct Worship paid him in his own Person before the Incarnation. For the WORD, or Divine Nature of the Son, is not a different Being from God: but yet was certainly worshipped; because he was essentially in God, and the same Being with the Father, or Very God, who could not be worshipped separately from his WORD. And I dare say, nobody will imagin, that the Preexistent Soul of Christ, was an Object of Worship before the Incarnation.

2. The WORD was not, but Christ's Preexisting Soul was, before the Incarnation, the *Shacinal* or Habitation of the Glory of the Father, or Very God, in which the Name of God was. See *Chap. 7.*

3. The Distinctness of the WORD in the Very God, the Dignity of the God-man, and the true Nature of his Authority and Kingdom, were not fully and clearly reveled before the Incarnation.

His Forty ninth Proposition.

“ *At his Incarnation he emptied himself [ἐκένωσεν*
 “ *ἑαυτὸν] of the Glory, which he had with God be-*
 “ *fore the World was, and by Virtue of which he is*
 “ *described as having been in the Form of God: And*
 “ *in this State of Humiliation, suffered and died for the*
 “ *Sins of the World.*

1. How the Preexisting Human Soul of Christ emptied himself of his Glory, what Glory he had with God before the World was, and on what account he is said to have been in the Form of God, see *Chap. 7.*

2. Christ did in his State of Humiliation suffer and die for the Sins of the World. *His*

His Fiftieth Proposition.

“ After the Accomplishment of which Dispensation, he
 “ is described in Scripture as invested with distinct Wor-
 “ ship in his own Person; his Original Glory and
 “ Dignity being at the same time revealed, and his Ex-
 “ altation in the Human Nature to his Mediatorial
 “ Kingdom declared: Himself sitting upon his Father’s
 “ Throne, at the Right Hand of the Majesty of God;
 “ and receiving Prayers and Thanksgivings, from his
 “ Church.

This Proposition is true of the God-man, who was thus exalted with respect to his Human Nature only, the WORD not being capable of any such Exaltation. See Chap. 6.

His Fifty first Proposition.

“ This Honour the Scripture directs to be paid to Christ;
 “ not so much upon account of his Metaphysical Essence
 “ or Substance, and abstract Attributes; as of his
 “ Actions and Attributes relative to us; his Conde-
 “ scension in becoming Man, who was the Son of God;
 “ his redeeming, and interceding for, us; his Au-
 “ thority, Power, Dominion, and sitting upon the
 “ Throne of God his Father, as our Lawgiver, our
 “ King, our Judge, and our God.

1. Christ is to be honored as God; because the WORD is Very God, and has the Metaphysical Essence or Substance and abstract Attributes of the Selfexistent Being.

2. Christ is to be honored as Mediator upon the account of his Actions and Attributes relative to us, his Condescension in becoming Man, &c.

3. Christ is not called our God in Scripture upon any other Account, but that of his Divine Nature, the WORD being personally united to the Human Nature. Compare *Prop. 25.*

4. How Christ is the Son of God, see *Chap. 11. p. 161, 162.*

His Fifty second Proposition.

“ *The Honour paid in this manner to the Son, must*
 “ *(as before) always be understood as redounding ultimate-*
 “ *ly to the Glory of God the Father.*

The Honor paid to Christ as Mediator, redounds ultimately to the Glory of the Very God, whose WORD is personally united to the Man Christ Jesus.

His Fifty third Proposition.

“ *The Honour which Christians are bound to pay pe-*
 “ *culiarly to the Person of the Holy Spirit, is expressed in*
 “ *these Texts following; wherein we are directed, either by*
 “ *Precept, or by Example,*
 “ *To Baptize in his Name, &c.*

1. The Holy Spirit is not in your sense of the Word, a distinct Person, that is, a different Being from the Very God.

2. Wherefore, when the Very God is honored, the Holy Spirit is honored; even as when a Man is honored, his Spirit is honored, which is the same Person with himself.

3. Those

3. Those Texts, wherein we are directed, either by Precept, or by Example, to Baptize in the Spirit's Name, &c. do not infer any Honour peculiar to the Holy Spirit, as a distinct Being from the Very God; any more than mentioning the Spirit of a Man, or Actions relating to the Spirit of a Man, does imply, that the Spirit of a Man is a distinct Being from the Man whose the Spirit is.

His Fifty fourth Proposition.

“ For putting up Prayers and Supplications directly
“ and expressly to the Person of the Holy Spirit, it must
“ be acknowledged there is no clear Precept or Example
“ in Scripture.

See Prop. 53. Art. 1, 2.

His Fifty fifth Proposition.

“ The Titles given in the New Testament to the
“ Three Persons of the everblessed Trinity, when all
“ mentioned together; are as follows.

You then subjoin an enumeration of Particulars. What I shall remark, is only this. Of the Phrase *Three Persons*, see Prop. 33. Whether the Three Persons, in my sense of that Phrase, be mentioned in each of the Texts you quote, it matters not. 'Tis certain, that none of those Texts does prove, that the *Father, WORD and Spirit* are Three Persons in your sense of the Phrase.

Of his Third Part.

Nothing remains, but your Third and last Part ;
 “ wherein (you (a) say) is, first, brought together a
 “ great Number of Passages out of the Liturgy of the
 “ Church of England, wherein the Doctrine set forth in
 “ the former Parts is expressly affirmed ; and then in
 “ the next Place are collected the principal Passages, which
 “ may seem at first sight to differ from that Doctrine : and
 “ these latter (you say) you have endeavour'd to recon-
 “ cile with the former, by shewing how they may be un-
 “ derstood in a Sense consistent both with the Doctrine of
 “ Scripture, and with the other before cited Expressions of
 “ the Liturgy.

Now as to this Point much needs not to be said at present. For my Inquiry is, what the Holy Scriptures do teach concerning the Blessed Trinity in Unity ; and not what our Church has deliver'd concerning it. For tho' our Church teaches the very Truth ; yet her Public Forms are not the Standard of our Belief. For we are to believe what our Church professes, not because she professes it, but because the Holy Scriptures do teach it. Wherefore, if our Church did never so expressly affirm your Doctrine, yet I should oppose it notwithstanding ; because I esteem it (and I think I have proved it) to be inconsistent with the Holy Scriptures.

(a) *Introduct.* p. 19.

This were sufficient ; especially since I am of Opinion, that those who do not think your Doctrine contained in the Scriptures, will never fancy that they find it in our Church's Liturgy ; and that those who do think it contained in the Scriptures, will assert and defend it, even tho' they should chance to believe, that our Church Liturgy is a flat Contradiction to it. So that an Inquiry into the Consistency of our Church's Liturgy with what you have written concerning the Holy Trinity, cannot be at present esteem'd necessary.

But I will further add, in Justice to our Holy Mother, that (tho' I do not at present enter upon that Debate, because 'twould enlarge the Controversy to no great purpose ; yet) I am firmly persuaded, that ~~your~~ Doctrine is not either expressly affirm'd, or so much as intimated, in our Liturgy, and consequently there is no need of reconciling her Passages relating to the Trinity, either to the Scriptures, or to each other. And as I am firmly persuaded, you are a Person of so great Integrity, that you will not venture (notwithstanding your Attempt for explaining) to repeat your Subscription, &c. till you have altered your Sentiments touching these Points (which I pray God may be speedily effected) so I hope none of those Persons who espouse your present Sentiments, will be influenced by what you have written, to think your Sense of those Passages tolerable. I really tremble at the Apprehension of that Guilt, which such a Collusion must pollute them with ; and I can't but earnestly intreat you to do what lies in your Power, in the most public Manner, for preventing such an Interpretation of our Liturgy, as must (I fear) necessarily lay waste the Consciences of the Compliers, and pave the Way for a Man's subscribing

scribing and using such Forms of Devotion as thwart the Sense of his own Mind.

But I have don. May the God of Truth, and Lover of Souls, illuminate and direct us both; and may that Blessed Spirit, without whose Aid we can do nothing that is good, guide us by his Grace, and conduct us safely to that glorious State, in which, how much soever we differ in our Opinions here, we shall be perfectly united in holy Love to all Eternity. I am, with the sincerest Affection,

Your most Faithful Friend,

and most Humble Servant,

T H O. B E N N E T.

T H E E N D.

A N

I N D E X

Of the TEXTS Explain'd
in this BOOK.

GENESIS.	
Chap.	Pag.
1. 27.	170
16. 7--13.	55, 56
17.	63
18.	<i>ibid.</i>
18. 21.	203
21. 17, 18.	56
22. 11, 12.	<i>ibid.</i>
32. 3.	64
48. 15, 16.	56

Chap.	Pag.
32. 39.	177
33. 2.	66

JOSHUA.	
5. 13, 14, 15.	56, 57
6. 1, 2.	57

JUDGES.	
2. 1-4	55
6. 11-22.	57, 58

EXODUS.	
3. 2-10.	51, 52, 53
8.	203
15.	193
16.	44
7. 1, 2.	<i>ibid.</i>
19. 17-25.	53, 54
20.	203
20. 1, &c.	54
11.	181
23. 20-23.	62, 63, 102, 194, 195

I SAMUEL.	
2. 2.	177
25. 40, 41.	60, 61

II SAMUEL.	
14. 20.	93

I KINGS.	
14. 6.	98

II KINGS.	
5. 26.	99
6. 9, 10.	<i>ibid.</i>
12.	98

DEUTERONOMY.	
4. 12.	54
35.	176
39.	<i>ibid.</i>
5. 22.	203
26. 17, 18.	193
31. 23.	61

NEHEMIAH.	
9. 13.	54

J O B.

The INDEX.

JOB.

Chap.	Pag.
5. 14. }	
10. 10. }	
11. 12. }	
13. 12. }	
20. }	
15. 16. } —————	42
24. 20. }	
27. 16. }	
28. 2. }	
29. 14. }	
32. 12. —————	158
40. 15. —————	42

PSALMS.

1. 6. —————	111
68. 17. —————	66
78. 66. —————	203
83. 18. —————	193
97. 7. —————	196
107. 20. —————	203
133. 2. —————	96
147. 15. —————	203

PROVERBS.

8. 22—31. —————	204
-----------------	-----

ISAIAH.

42. 8. —————	193
44. 6, 8. —————	177
45. 5. —————	<i>ibid.</i>
46. 9. —————	<i>ibid.</i>
51. 23. —————	42
63. 9. —————	62

JEREMIAH.

1. 2, 4, 11. —————	44
5. 19. —————	61

HOSEA.

12. 5. —————	194
--------------	-----

ZECHARIAH.

3. 1—5. —————	58
---------------	----

MALACHI.

Chap.	Pag.
3. 1. —————	62, 64

WISDOM OF Solomon.

7. 1, 3. —————	42
----------------	----

MATTHEW.

1. 21. —————	161
23. —————	164, 190
3. 16. —————	202
17. —————	96
4. 1—11. —————	129, &c.
8. 5—13. —————	59, 60, 61
9. 2. —————	101
3. —————	102
4. —————	97
5. —————	101
8. —————	103
10. 1. —————	103
11. 10. —————	62, 64
27. —————	114
12. 6, 8. —————	<i>ibid.</i>
17—21. —————	95
25. —————	97
28. —————	100
16. 27. —————	27, 29
18. 20. —————	117
21. 25. —————	108
22. 42—5. —————	174
26. 38. —————	139, &c.
53. —————	140
27. 46. —————	141
28. 18. —————	26, 29, 149
19. —————	162, 211

MARK.

1. 2. —————	62
5. —————	101
12. —————	135
24. —————	131
34. —————	<i>ibid.</i>
2. 7. —————	102, 103
8. —————	97
	9.

The I N D E X.

Chap.	Pag.
2. 9.	101
32.	118
5. 27-30.	101
8. 38.	27
10. 35, 46.	101
10.	151, &c.
10. 19.	23

L U K E.

1. 16.	62
31.	16
32.	200, 201
34.	17
35.	17, 200, 201
2. 52.	127
3. 39.	108
4. 1, 2.	104
14.	105
16-21.	95
18.	113
41.	131
5. 20.	101
21.	102
22.	103
23.	101
6. 19.	101
7. 6, 7, 8.	59, 60, 61
27.	62
38, 39.	98, 99
9. 45.	118
47.	97
18. 34.	118
21. 14, 15.	115, 116
22. 28.	146
29.	159
41-44.	139, &c.
24. 27.	150
45, 46, 47.	<i>ibid.</i>
52.	24

J O H N.

1. 1.	7, 76, 150, 175, &c. 216
2.	189, 190

Chap.	Pag.
1. 3.	7, 37, 76, 181, 185, 216
10.	76, 216
14.	7, 127, 189, 215
15.	7
18.	51, 120, 121
32, 33.	96
34.	96, 100
48.	97
49.	100
2. 3, 4, 5.	97
19-23.	118, 148
3. 11.	113
13.	106
16, 18.	108
23, 24.	113
31.	106, 119
34.	96
35.	114, 119, 159
4. 18.	97
29.	<i>ibid.</i>
46.	101
5. 17.	122
18.	90, 122, 123
19.	100, 103, 112
21.	112
22.	27, 29, 68, 117, 159
23.	25, 29, 68, 117
25, 26.	114
27.	29
29.	100
30.	103, 159
6. 33.	107
38.	<i>ibid.</i>
40.	116
41, 42.	108
51.	107
54.	116
61.	97
62.	107
64.	97
7. 17.	207
18.	<i>ibid.</i>
8. 26.	113

The INDEX.

Chap.	Pag.	Chap.	Pag.
8. 28.	113	17. 24.	87, 108
38.	<i>ibid.</i>	20. 17.	170
40.	9, 113	23.	102
42.	94, 159	28.	150
58.	108	21. 17.	94
9. 25.	106		
10. 14, 15.	110		
17, 18.	149		
25.	100, 124		
27, 28.	158		
29.	124, 158		
30.	109, 110, 130		
31-6.	122		
33.	109, 122, 123		
34.	124		
35.	44, 124		
36.	124		
12. 49, 50.	113		
13. 3.	160		
11.	97		
14. 1.	30		
7-11.	111		
10.	100, 113, 207		
13, 14.	117		
20.	109		
23.	203		
25, 26.	118		
28.	156, &c.		
15. 15.	113		
16. 12, 13.	115, 118		
12-15.	205, &c.		
14.	115		
15.	114		
16-30.	91, &c.		
19.	97		
27, 28.	160		
17. 3.	111, 160, 177		
4.	76		
5.	76, 87, 108		
11.	29, 109, 110		
14.	29		
21.	29, 109, 110		
22.	109, 110		
23.	30, 109, 110		

ACTS.			
1. 1, 2.	149		
3.	150		
2. 22.	100		
36.	23		
5. 3, 4, 9.	98		
15.	101		
31.	23		
7. 31-35.	51, 52		
35.	65		
38.	53		
53.	53, 66		
55, 56.	23.		
59, 60.	24		
8. 17, 18, 19.	104		
21.	98		
33.	162		
10. 36.	23		
38.	95, 100		
42.	27		
44, 45, 46.	104		
13. 9, 10.	98		
32, 33.	174		
14. 9.	98		
15.	181		
17. 31.	10, 29		
19. 6.	104		
11, 12.	101		

ROMANS.			
1. 11.	104		
5. 15.	9		
6. 9, 10.	18, 19		
8. 4, 5, 6.	177		
17.	32		
26, 27.	212		
	27.		

The INDEX.

Chap.	Pag.	Chap.	Pag.
8. 27.	200	4. 9, 10.	168
34.	23, 24		
15. 6.	169		

I CORINTHIANS.

2 7.	89
10, 11	198, 199
12.	210
3. 16.	202
23.	168
8. 4, 5, 6.	191
5.	5
6.	168, 216
11. 3.	168
7.	170
12. 10.	97
15. 21, 22.	9
24—28.	168
24.	27
25, 26.	<i>ibid.</i>
27.	24, 27
28.	27
45.	9
47.	<i>ibid.</i>

II CORINTHIANS.

1. 3.	169
4. 4.	171
8. 9.	47, 168
11. 31.	169
13. 14	210

GALATIANS.

3. 19.	54, 66
26.	6
4. 1.	120
6.	212

EPHESIANS.

1. 3.	169
4.	88
20, 21, 22.	29
20—23.	24
2. 5.	106

PHILIPPIANS.

1. 2.	25
19.	212
2. 5—11.	39, &c.
15.	89
19.	26
24.	<i>ibid.</i>

COLOSSIANS.

1. 3.	169
13, &c.	166
14.	164
15.	170, 190
16.	78, 164, 186, 216
17.	78
18.	51, 164
20.	164
2. 9.	171
10.	24
17.	171
3. 1.	23

I THESSALONIANS.

5. 23.	213
--------	-----

II TIMOTHY.

2. 5.	10, 24, 29, 160, 161, 191
3. 16.	35, 78, 164, 165, 189
6. 16.	51, 189

II TIMOTHY.

1. 9.	88
2. 7.	93
4. 1.	27

TITUS.

1. 2.	89
4.	26

PHILEMON.

3.	26
----	----

HE-

The INDEX.

HEBREWS.

Chap.	_____	Pag.
1. 2.	_____	216
2-14.	_____	172, &c.
6.	_____	196
8.	_____ 31, &c.	160, 196
9.	_____ 31, &c.	196
10.	_____	216
25, 26, 27.	_____	192, &c.
2. 1.	_____	82
2.	_____ 54, 64, 66, 82.	
3.	_____ 64, 82	
5.	_____ 64, 85	
6.	_____ 11, 12, 30, 31, 85	
7.	_____ 11, 12, 30, 31, 85, 144,	145
8.	_____ 11, 12, 30, 31	
9.	_____ 11, 12, 30, 31, 144,	145
11.	_____	168
3. 14.	_____	32
17, 18.	_____	12, 13, 14
4. 15.	_____	14, 147
5. 1, 2.	_____	14
7. 3.	_____	163
8. 1.	_____	23
9. 14.	_____ 104,	215
23.	_____	66
10. 4-10.	_____	168, 169
12.	_____	23, 28
13.	_____	27
14.	_____	28

I PETER.

1. 3.	_____	169
19, 20.	_____	88
3. 18.	_____ 72,	216
19, 20.	_____	72
22.	_____ 23, 24,	28

II PETER.

Chap.	_____	Pag.
3. 5.	_____	216

I JOHN.

1. 2.	_____	190
2. 3.	_____	111
20.	_____ 93,	214
27.	_____	<i>ibid.</i>

II JOHN.

3.	_____	26
----	-------	----

REVELATIONS.

1. 4, 5.	_____	26, 213
5, 6.	_____	24, 25, 30
6.	_____	169
3. 4.	_____	89
12.	_____	170
20.	_____	203
21.	_____	24, 68
4. 10, 11.	_____	187
5. 6, 12.	_____	28
7-13.	_____	25
6. 10.	_____	<i>ibid.</i>
16, 17.	_____	26
7. 10.	_____	25
17.	_____	24
11. 15.	_____	26
12. 10.	_____	<i>ibid.</i>
19. 13.	_____	170
15.	_____	<i>ibid.</i>
16.	_____	26
23.	_____	216
22. 1.	_____	24, 28
3.	_____	<i>ibid.</i>
17.	_____	213, 214

THE END.









