Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mrs. Sanford H. Smith.

RARE BOOKS

Division SCC

Section 1697

Number

7/6

Ethan Smith's.

A

gift from the

Revd David Sanford

THE

GLORY OF CHRIST

AS

GOD-MAN

DISPLAYED,

IN

Three Discourses.

VIZ.

Disc. I. A Survey of the visible Appearances of Christ, as God, before his Incarnation; with some Observations on the Texts of the Old Testament applied to Christ.

Disc. II. An Inquiry into the extensive Powers of the Human Nature of Christ in its present glorified State, with several Testimonies annexed.

Disc. III. An Argument tracing out the early Existence of the Human Soul of Christ, even before the Creation of the World.

WITH

An APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

An Abridgment of Dr. Thomas Goodwin's Discourse of the Glories and Royalties of CHRIST, in his Works in Folio, Vol. II. Book III.

By ISAAC WATTS, D. D.

Matt. xxviii. 18. All Power is given to me in Heaven and in Earth.
Colos. iii. 11. Christ is all and in all.
John viii. 58. Before Abraham was, I am.

BOSTON:
PRINTED BY MANNING AND LORING,
For DAVID WEST, No. 36, Marlborough-Street.

1795.

THE

PREFACE.

OUR Lord Jesus Christ is the Author, the Foundation, and the glory of our religion. The scripture teaches us to describe this blessed Person two ways, i. e. as a *Man* who is one with God, or as *God* who is one with Man.

He is called sometimes 'God with us.' Mat. i. 23. 'God manifest in the flesh.' 1 Tim. iii. 16. i. e. God dwelling in our mortal nature. At other times he is described as the 'Man Christ Jesus, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' 1 Tim. ii. 5. and Col. ii. 9. A Man 'of the seed of David after the flesh, who is God over all, blessed for evermore.' Rom. ix. 5. A Man whose flesh Thomas the apostle saw and felt, and yet called him, 'My Lord and my God.' John xx. 27, 28. Upon such scriptures as these my faith is built.

And as it is the most general sentiment of the Christian world in our age, so I must acknowledge it is very evident to me, that our blessed Saviour is often represented in scripture as a complex Person, wherein *God* and *Man* are united, so as to make up one complex agent, one intellectual compound being, God joined with Man, so as to become one common principle of action and passion. Christ wrought miraculous works, and yet it is 'the Father,' or God 'in him, who doth these works.' John xiv. 10. The God and the Man are one.

And on this account the 'child Jeſus' may be well called the 'mighty God.' Iſai. ix. 6. And God himſelf is ſaid to 'redeem the church with his own blood.' Acts xx. 28. And to 'lay down his life for us.' 1 John iii. 16. This intimate or preſent union between God and Chriſt allows him to ſay, John x. 38, 'I am in the Father, and the Father in me.' And ver. 30, 'I and the Father are one.'

Since Chriſt Jeſus in his perſon and his offices hath ſo large a ſhare in our holy religion, we cannot be too well acquainted with his various glories. It is the ſtudy and joy of angels to pry into theſe wonders. 1 Pet. i. 12. And it is the duty of men 'to grow in the knowledge of Chriſt' their Lord, their God, and their Saviour. 2 Pet. iii. 18.

It is granted, that many things relating to the ever-bleſſed Trinity may have heights and depths in them which are unſearchable by our underſtandings. Though we learn from ſcripture, that true and proper Deity is aſcribed to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and that they are repreſented often in ſcripture as *diſtinct perſonal agents*; yet after all our inquiries and prayers, we may be ſtill much at a loſs to deſcribe exactly wherein this *diſtinct perſonality* conſiſts, and what is the diſtinct communion of each of them in the divine nature. We have never yet been able, with any ſtrong evidence and clear certainty, preciſely to adjuſt this ſacred difficulty, *how far they are one, and how far they are three.* Several ſchemes and hypotheſes have been invented for this purpoſe, and the beſt of them falls ſhort of ſolving all queſtions relating to this doctrine completely to our ſatisfaction, though ſome of them are evidently much more agreeable to ſcripture than others.

As it is our great happineſs, that the knowledge of any ſuch particular ſchemes of explication are not neceſſary to the ſalvation of men, ſo neither are any of

of thoſe different ſchemes of the Trinity at all needful to our preſent inquiries concerning that glory of Chriſt, which is the ſubject of this Treatiſe.

Let no humble Chriſtian therefore be jealous of loſing his own form of explaining the Trinity by reading theſe Diſcourſes, nor let him be afraid of being led into any particular human ſchemes or explications of that divine doctrine. I have ſo far laid them all aſide in this book, that there is ſcarce any hint of any of them, and that in a very ſlight and tranſient manner.

The glories of Chriſt, both in his divine and human nature, which are here unfolded, are not neceſſarily confined to any particular ſchemes or hypotheſes of the Trinity. All that I pretend to maintain here is, that our bleſſed Saviour muſt be *God*, and he muſt be *Man*; *God and Man in two diſtinct natures, and one perſon*, i. e. one complex perſonal agent. Thoſe who believe this doctrine may read theſe Treatiſes without danger or fear; for I would always endeavour to ſearch out divine truth, and promote the knowledge of Chriſt (as far as poſſible) without offence to the bulk of the Chriſtian world, or any of the truly pious and religious of every party.

Theſe three Diſcourſes were written at three diſtant and different times: I hope therefore my readers will be ſo candid as to bear with a ſmall repetition of the ſame thoughts, or with references from one Diſcourſe to another, though not expreſſed in ſo regular a manner as though I had all three conſtantly in one view.

Though the order in which theſe Diſcourſes ſtand be not adjuſted according to chronology, yet it is ſuch an order as I thought moſt proper to lead my reader by degrees into theſe diſcoveries of the glory of Chriſt.

In

In the firſt of theſe Diſcourſes I have maintained the *Godhead of Chriſt in his appearances under the Old Teſtament.* The doctrine itſelf is entirely agreeable to the common ſentiments of all our divines, and I have confirmed it by ſuch arguments as ſeem to me moſt effectual and convincing. I perſuade myſelf the generality of my readers will concur with me in theſe ſentiments, though I will not ſay I have borrowed my method of argument and vindication from any but the ſacred writers.

In the ſecond and third Diſcourſes perhaps they will find ſome things, which though they are derived from ſcripture, yet appear to be more uncommon, and which have not been taken notice of by many authors. With regard to theſe, I beg leave to make theſe few requeſts to thoſe who will ſeriouſly, and with an honeſt heart peruſe what I have here written.

1. That they would ſuffer themſelves to believe with me that we have not yet attained all knowledge, nor particularly apprehended all thoſe things that may be learned from the Bible concerning our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: and that they would permit themſelves alſo to think with me, that we are all fallible creatures, and that it is poſſible for us to have been miſtaken in ſome points (at leaſt of leſſer moment) which we have been taught to believe before we were capable of ſearching the word of God for ourſelves: for the beſt of men who have been our teachers 'know but in part,' and therefore they could 'propheſy' or inſtruct others 'but in part.' 1 Cor. xiii. 9. Though they have ſpoken the truth, yet perhaps they have not ſpoken all the truth which lies hid in the holy ſcriptures.

2. That my readers would not be ſtartled and diſcompoſed at any thing which may ſeem new and ſtrange to them at firſt appearance, nor be frighted at

at a ſentence, as though hereſy were in it, becauſe it may differ a little from the ſentiments which they have hitherto received. That very ſame notion in any ſcience whatſoever, which may perhaps ſurpriſe us at firſt, by reading further onward may become plain and eaſy and certain : and I can aſſure them, that there is not one ſentence in all theſe Diſcourſes, but what is very conſiſtent with a firm belief of the Divinity of Chriſt, and a juſt and ſincere concern for the moſt eminent and glorious truths of the goſpel, as they are profeſſed by Proteſtants among us againſt the Socinian and Arian errors.

3. That they would not raſhly conclude that any Chriſtian doctrine is loſt, or any article of their faith endangered, or the proper Deity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt dropped or neglected, if they ſhould be led to interpret a few texts of ſcripture in another manner than they themſelves have been formerly uſed to explain them : for it muſt be acknowledged, that ſome pious and zealous writers for the truth have muſtered together out of all the Bible whatſoever texts could poſſibly be turned by art or force to ſupport any one doctrine which they undertook to defend, juſt as ancient heretics have done to ſupport their errors. Now among this great number of ſcriptures, it may be eaſily ſuppoſed, that there is here and there one which is not ſo fit and appoſite to their purpoſe, and which does not carry in it naturally that ſenſe which has been impoſed upon it, or at leaſt which does not contain that force of argument which has been generally believed ; and yet the ſame point of doctrine may remain unmoveable, without the help of that particular text.

Now, though they have been learned and wiſe and pious men that have uſed theſe ſcriptures to ſupport ſome particular doctrine of ſcripture or article of faith, yet it is poſſible they may have been miſtaken

miſtaken in the application of them. Later days, and the maturer age of the world, have given light to many paſſages of the Bible which were not well underſtood in the days of the fathers: and though I read their writings with ſincere reverence, yet not with an abſolute ſubmiſſion to their dictates. The ſame doctrines and articles of faith which they eſpouſed and defended in their time, may be ſtill eſpouſed and defended with as much zeal and ſucceſs in our day by ſome new arguments brought to ſupport them, though in reaſon and juſtice we are conſtrained to drop ſome of the old ones.

Beſides, there is more honour done to the cauſe of Chriſtianity and the goſpel, by building all the articles of it upon ſuch ſcriptures only as are firm and unſhaken to ſupport them, than by multiplying feeble ſhews and ſhadows of defence. We expoſe ourſelves and our faith at once to the inſult and ridicule of our adverſaries, by perſiſting in a miſtaken expoſition of ſcripture, and by maintaining every colour or falſe appearance of argument, even though it be in the defence of the moſt important truth. We ought to make uſe of all the advantages of increaſing light, nor continue in a wrong application of ſcriptures to ſupport any point of our faith in oppoſition to their moſt open and evident meaning. Though truth is infinitely preferable to error, yet men may uſe inſufficient arguments for one as well as the other. And in our days, I conceive a wiſe and thoughtful man will not be charmed at once with a title-page, merely becauſe it pretends to many hundred proofs of the Godhead of Chriſt.

4. I requeſt that they would conſult their Bible with diligence, as I have done, eſpecially in the places which I have cited, and like honeſt Engliſh readers would look only at the ſenſe as it lies before them, and neither conſider nor care whether it be

new

new or *old*, ſo it be *true*: for he that does this, is much more likely to be led into the truth than a greater ſcholar, full of his own notions which he has learned in the ſchools, who brings his own opinions always to direct and determine his own interpretation of ſcripture whenſoever he reads it; and thus he interprets every text, not ſo much according to the plain, obvious, and eaſy ſenſe of it, and in correſpondence with the context, as he does in correſpondence with his own opinions and his learned ſchemes.

5. That they would ſuffer themſelves to yield to truth whereſoever they find it, and imagine that the loſs of an old opinion by the force and evidence of truth is a victory gained over error, and an honourable advancement in their own knowledge in the things of God.

6. That they would apply themſelves with ſincere diligence to conſider the evidence of ſcripture for any of the opinions that I have propoſed or maintained, rather than labour to invent objections as faſt as ever they can againſt it, as though they knew it was falſe beforehand; for if we read a treatiſe which contains never ſo much truth, with a previous averſion to the doctrines of it, and a reſolution beforehand to object againſt it all the way, we hinder ourſelves from attending to the force of reaſon, and prevent our minds from taking in the evidence on which any doctrine is founded.

I grant it is neceſſary that all juſt objections ſhould have their due weight, and they ought to be well conſidered in our inquiries after truth; yet when any doctrine has many and ſtrong arguments from ſcripture and reaſon advanced to ſupport it, one difficulty or two which at preſent ſeem hard to be ſolved, ſhould not utterly forbid our aſſent, ſince, (as biſhop Fowler well obſerves) "There are ſcarce any

any notions ſo plain as to be uncapable of being obſcured and called in queſtion, except the firſt and ſelf-evident principles, or the immediate conſequences of them." Becauſe we underſtand not what is difficult, we muſt not merely for that reaſon deny that which is clear and plain; and if we will refuſe to believe any propoſition till we are perfectly able to maſter all objections againſt it, we may be ſceptics all our days, both in matters of philoſophy and religion, and even in ſome doctrines of the higheſt importance; and with all our pretences to learning, may finiſh our lives like mere fools.

7. That they would acknowledge that the glories of our bleſſed Lord are ſo many, ſo various, and ſo ſublime, that there is but very little of them yet known, in compariſon of the unknown glories which he poſſeſſes; and that a ſincere love to Chriſt and a zeal for his honour, ſhould lead them out with pleaſure and expectation to meet any further diſcoveries of this kind, which may be drawn from the word of God. That they would withhold themſelves from a haſty refuſal to receive all ſuch manifeſtations, leſt they ſhould prevent the growing honours of their Saviour.

8. While I am tracing theſe early and ſublime glories of our bleſſed Redeemer, by the gleams or the rays of light which are ſcattered in ſeveral parts of his word, I entreat my friends, that they would not be too ſevere in their cenſures of any miſtaken ſtep, while I own myſelf fallible, and am ready to retract any miſtake.

If they ſhould meet with any expreſſions which in their opinion do not ſtand ſo perfectly juſt and ſquare with other of my ſentiments in ſome diſtant parts of theſe Eſſays, I would perſuade myſelf they will be ſo candid as to interpret them in a conſiſtence with the general ſcope and deſign of my argument,

gument, and with my avowed ſenſe of things in the more important points of religion.

It is an eaſy matter to be led a little aſtray in purſuing ſuch an uncommon track through the third heavens, the preſent exalted reſidence of our glorified Saviour; and in tracing the footſteps of our bleſſed Lord through long paſt ages of his pre-exiſtent ſtate, be they never ſo certain, which commenced before theſe lower heavens were formed, or time was meaſured by the ſun and moon. Succeeding writers may more happily conduct themſelves in ſo glorious an inquiry, and correct my wanderings: but I am perſuaded my gracious Redeemer will forgive what errors he remarks in theſe ſincere attempts to advance his honour; and I hope my pious readers will find ſome degrees of entertainment, as well as improvement, and feel ſome devout thoughts awakened in them ſufficient to influence their charity and candour.

9. That they would not imagine that all theſe notions and opinions which may be ſomething new and ſtrange to them, are pure inventions of my own, and mere ſallies of imagination.

I muſt acknowledge indeed that I have endeavoured to carry on the hints I have met with in ſome great and honoured writers to a further length, and to trace the golden thread of theſe diſcoveries through far diſtant ſcenes and ages, by the light both of reaſon and ſcripture: but as I have no ambition to aſſume theſe diſcoveries to myſelf, ſo I ought in juſtice to ſtand ſecure from theſe cenſures which a heated and warm zeal for ancient land-marks, is ready to throw upon every thing that bears the appearance of novelty,

I have therefore, in the end of ſome of theſe diſcourſes or inquiries, cited ſeveral writers of name and eminence, and called in the aſſiſtance of their authority

thority to cover theſe Eſſays from the ſudden and ſevere reproaches of thoſe who reverence the names of thoſe great, and learned, and pious men. And what ſuch venerable authors thought very conſiſtent with orthodox doctrine, and ſo uſeful and neceſſary to ſupport the honours of our bleſſed Lord, I humbly hope and requeſt that my readers will not haſtily abandon and reject as hereſy, and renounce it at once without due conſideration of the arguments.

And as for thoſe who have a great regard for the writings of ſo ingenious and ſo pious a man, ſo evangelical an author, and ſo great a divine as Dr. THOMAS GOODWIN, I might recommend to them the peruſal of his Treatiſe of the *Royalty of Jeſus Chriſt, as God-Man*, which I have abridged here; and before they read theſe Eſſays I might entreat them to read this Abridgment, though I dare not pretend to give my aſſent to all his opinions in theſe papers, or ſupport them.

Give me leave to finiſh this Preface (ſo far as it relates to the Diſcourſes on the pre-exiſtent ſoul of Chriſt, and the extenſive powers of his glorified human nature) in the modeſt and amiable language of that ingenious gentleman who wrote many years ago of the *Progreſſive Knowledge of Souls in the future State*. "If any thing ſhould drop from my pen in the progreſs of this Diſcourſe which may ſeem too affirmative, and hardly reconcileable with a becoming modeſty and jealouſy, I deſire thoſe luxuriances of expreſſion may receive ſome abatements, and be made fairly agreeable thereunto. For although I may poſſibly be indifferently well perſuaded of the truth of what I ſhall diſcourſe, yet I am not certain: it is not improbable that I ſhould be miſtaken: I am of human race, and have no privilege of exemption from human infirmities and errors."

"Whether

"Whether the proofs that I ſhall make of this propoſed theme be valid or invalid, the reader muſt determine when he hath weighed and conſidered them. I am content that they be eſteemed juſt as they are. If my arguments be thought invalid, and my opinion rejected, it will be no matter of provocation to me. If they be thought cogent, and my opinion worthy of acceptation with pious and ingenious men, perchance I may be a little pleaſed therein. But if it may advance [the honour and] the love of God [my Saviour] and make heaven the more acceptable to the thoughts and meditations of Chriſtians [becauſe we have ſo glorious a Mediator dwelling there] I am ſure I ſhall greatly rejoice."

CONTENTS.

CONTENTS.

DISCOURSE I.

Page

A SURVEY of the visible Appearances of Christ, as God, before his Incarnation, 17

SECT. I. *An Historical Account of these Appearances, together with some occasional Remarks upon them by the way, and Inferences from them in the close,* - - - - 17

SECT. II. *The Difficulties relating to this Account of the Appearances of God under the Old Testament, relieved and adjusted,* - 62

APPENDIX. *Some Observations on the Texts of the Old Testament, applied to Christ,* - 88

DISCOURSE II.

An Inquiry into the extensive Powers of the Human Nature of Christ in its present glorified State, - - - - - 99

SECT. I. *The Introduction,* - - 99

SECT. II. *Scriptural Proofs of the Exaltation of the Human Nature of Christ, and the extensive Capacities and Powers of his Soul in his glorified State,* - - - - - - 103

SECT. III. *A rational Account how the Man Jesus Christ, united to God, may be vested with such extensive Powers,* - - 125

SECT. IV. *Testimonies from other Writers,* 154

DISCOURSE

DISCOURSE III.

Page

An Argument tracing the early Exiſtence of the Human Soul of Chriſt before the Creation of the World, - - - 160

SECT. I. *Introduction*, - - - 160

SECT. II. *Some Propoſitions leading to the Proof of the Doctrine propoſed*, - - 162

SECT. III. *Arguments for the Pre-exiſtence of Chriſt's Human Soul, drawn from various Conſiderations of ſome Things inferior to Godhead, which are aſcribed to him in Scripture, before and at his Incarnation*, - 168

SECT. IV. *Miſcellaneous Arguments to prove the ſame Doctrine*, - - - 190

SECT. V. *A Confirmation of this Doctrine by Arguments drawn from the happy Conſequences thereof, and the various Advantages of it in the Chriſtian Religion*, - - - 203

SECT. VI. *Objections anſwered*, - 245

APPENDIX;

Or a ſhort Abridgment of that excellent Diſcourſe of the late Rev. Dr. Thomas Goodwin, on the Glories and Royalties that belong to Jeſus Chriſt, conſidered as God-Man, in his Third Book of the Knowledge of God the Father, and his Son Jeſus Chriſt, p. 95, in the Second Volume of his Works, - - - 269

DISCOURSE

DISCOURSE I.

The GLORY *of* CHRIST *as* GOD-MAN *displayed,*

BY A SURVEY OF THE VISIBLE APPEARANCES OF CHRIST AS GOD, BEFORE HIS INCARNATION.

SECT. I.

An Hiſtorical Account of theſe Appearances.

SINCE the Socinian doctrines have been effectually refuted by many learned writers, eſpecially in the laſt century, it is now, I hope, confeſſed almoſt univerſally, that our bleſſed Saviour had a real exiſtence long before he appeared in fleſh and blood, and dwelt among men. It is alſo generally acknowledged, that he often appeared in a viſible manner under the patriarchal and Moſaical diſpenſations, aſſuming the names, and ſuſtaining the character and perſon of the great and bleſſed God. Yet it has been a matter of conteſt in theſe latter years, as well as in the ancient days of Arius, whether Chriſt, in his complex perſon, include Godhead or not: or whether he being nothing elſe but a creature or a mere contingent being, and is only called God, as ſuſtaining and repreſenting the character and perſon of one who is infinitely above him, even the great and eternal God. This is the great and important queſtion of the age.

Now that this matter may be determined with more evidence and certainty, let us firſt trace out the account which the Old Teſtament gives us of the various ſeaſons and occaſions on which *God*, *the Lord*,* *the Lord God*, *Jehovah*, *the Almighty*, *the God of Abraham*, &c. is ſaid to appear amongſt men, with a few remarks on them in paſſing; and afterward we ſhall be enabled to draw more particular inferences from theſe ſcriptures, concerning the Deity of Chriſt and his appearances before his incarnation.

Whoſoever will read the four firſt chapters of Geneſis with due attention, will find a very plain and eaſy repreſentation of the great God, firſt creating all things, and afterwards appearing to Adam, Eve, and Cain, and converſing with them with a human voice, and very probably in a human ſhape too. I am well aſſured that any common reader, who begins the bible without prejudices or prepoſſeſſions of any kind, would naturally frame this idea under the words and expreſſions of Moſes, the ſacred writer.

In the firſt place, God repreſents his own deſign of creating man in this manner, viz.

Gen.

* Let the unlearned reader take notice, that there are two Hebrew words, viz. *Jehovah*, and *Adon* or *Adonai*, both which our tranſlators render *Lord*. The firſt, viz. *Jehovah*, ſignifies the *Eternal* or *Unchangeable*, and has been ſufficiently proved to be the proper name of the great God, the God of Iſrael, peculiar to him and incommunicable to creatures; and it is written always in capital letters LORD, for diſtinction ſake. *Thou, whoſe name alone is* JEHOVAH, *art the moſt high over all the earth.* Pſal. lxxxiii. 18. Though it had been much better if the Hebrew name, *Jehovah* itſelf, had been always written in our Engliſh bibles, that the hearer might diſtinguiſh it as well as the reader. The other name viz. *Adon* or *Adonai* is alſo tranſlated *Lord*, and written in ſmall letters, becauſe it is not the proper name of the great God; it ſignifies his *lordſhip* or *dominion*, and is not ſo peculiar nor incommunicable.

Now let it be obſerved, that in almoſt every place which I have cited to ſhow the various appearances of the LORD to men, it is the name *Jehovah* is uſed, which the reader will find diſtinguiſhed by capital letters in the Engliſh bible.

Gen. i. 26. 'And God ſaid, Let us make man in our image, after our likeneſs; and let them have dominion over the fiſh of the ſea,' &c. Ver. 27. 'So God created man after his own image: in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God bleſſed them, and ſaid unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply,' &c. Ver. 29. 'And God ſaid, Behold I have given you every herb bearing ſeed, to you it ſhall be for meat, and to every beaſt of the earth, and to every fowl of the air,' &c.

Now it is very probable, that when God had made man, he appeared to him in man's own ſhape, and thus made it known to Adam, that he had formed him in his own image, even as to his body; that is, in ſuch a form or figure as God himſelf did, and would frequently aſſume, in order to converſe with man. And perhaps God alſo might acquaint Adam with the natural and moral perfections of his own ſoul, viz. knowledge, righteouſneſs and holineſs, wherein he reſembled his Maker, and bare his likeneſs, as well as that God himſelf ſometimes aſſumed the figure of a man.

Let it be noted here alſo, that when God bleſſed ſome part of the animal creation, it is expreſſed only, God ſaid, (but not *to them* as hearers) 'be fruitful and multiply,' as ver. 22; that is, God put forth a divine volition or command concerning the multiplication of inferior creatures; but he ſpake to Adam and Eve directly as his hearers, and moſt likely with a human voice, for 'he ſaid unto them, Be fruitful and multiply;' and told them, that he had given them the fruits of the earth for their food, and that he had given it alſo to the fowls and the beaſts: whereas God is not ſaid to ſpeak thus concerning food to the beaſts or to the fowls themſelves, but only told Adam what he had appointed for their common food. This looks like a human appearance con-

verſing with him, and will appear more evidently in what follows.

Gen. ii. 16. 'And the Lord God commanded the man, ſaying, Of every tree in the garden thou mayeſt freely eat; but the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou ſhalt not eat of it.' Ver. 19. 'And the Lord God brought every beaſt of the field and every fowl of the air to Adam, to ſee what he would call them.' Ver. 22. 'And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man made he a woman, and brought her unto the man.' All this ſeems to be the tranſactions and language of the Lord God appearing in human ſhape, and with human voice to Adam.

Gen. iii. 8. 'And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day, and Adam and his wife hid themſelves from the preſence of the Lord God amongſt the trees of the garden.' 9. 'And the Lord God called unto Adam, and ſaid unto him, Where art thou?' 10. 'And he ſaid, I heard thy voice in the garden and I was afraid, becauſe I was naked, and I hid myſelf.' 11. 'And he ſaid, Who told thee that thou waſt naked?' &c. Ver. 13. 'And the Lord God ſaid unto the woman, What is this that thou haſt done? and the woman ſaid, The ſerpent beguiled me, and I did eat.' Ver. 21. 'Unto Adam and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of ſkins, and clothed them,' &c.

I think there is a very plain deſcription of a viſible appearance and a human voice in this ſcene and theſe dialogues. Adam and his wife could never be ſaid to 'hide themſelves from the preſence of the Lord,' if he had not before manifeſted a viſible preſence to them; nor could they 'know his voice,' if he had not converſed with them by a human voice before: this is a pretty plain proof that God converſed with them in a human manner in the foregoing inſtances. Nor yet could they have hid themſelves from a mere

voice

voice 'among trees,' nor could they have been 'aſhamed of their nakedneſs' before a mere voice, if they had not known God before by a viſible preſence and appearance, whoſe face they now avoided among the trees.

It is probable that God not only converſed with Adam and Eve, but with their children and family in the ſame manner in the beginning of the world: for you read a plain dialogue between God and Cain, Gen. iv. 6. 'And the Lord ſaid unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? If thou doſt well, ſhalt thou not be accepted? And the Lord ſaid unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? And Cain ſaid, I know not: am I my brother's keeper?' And God replied again, 'What haſt thou done? the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground,' &c. 'A fugitive and a vagabond ſhalt thou be in the earth. And Cain ſaid unto the Lord, My puniſhment is greater than I can bear. Behold, thou haſt driven me out this day from the face of the earth, and from thy face I ſhall be hid.' Ver. 16. 'And Cain went out from the preſence of the Lord.' Surely every reader among the Jews, for whom Moſes wrote this, would have an idea of the great God's appearing and converſing with Adam and his houſehold in human ſhape, and after the manner of men: and then 'Cain went out from the preſence of God.'

But whatſoever ſhape appeared to them, I think it muſt be granted, that God appeared in a viſible manner, where the expreſſions are ſo plain and ſo ſtrong, where the repetitions are ſo many, that the Lord, i. e. Jehovah, the Lord God, appeared, and ſat or walked, and did and ſpake this or that. In ſo many tranſactions and dialogues it is very hard to ſuppoſe that there was nothing elſe but a created angel came aſſuming the name of God. Surely ſuch ſort

of

of representations would lead all common readers into a gross mistake, if God himself were not here at all in a special and visible manner.

It is very probable there might be some glorious light, some awful brightness, that frequently surrounded and invested this human form in which God appeared and conversed with man, and which might be called his *divine form*, that he might be thereby in some measure distinguished and well known as God. Doubtless the Lord, Jehovah, when he came down to visit men, carried some ensign of divine majesty with him, some splendid cloud or luminous rays about him, when he designed that men should know *God was there*. It was such a light appeared often at the door of the tabernacle, and fixed its abode on the ark between the cherubims, and by the Jews was called the *Shecinah*, i. e. the habitation of God. And thence God is described in scripture as 'dwelling in light,' and 'clothed with light as with a garment:' but in the midst of this brightness there seems to have been sometimes a human shape and figure. And probably this heavenly brightness was that divine clothing, that 'form of God,' of which Christ divested himself when he came to *tabernacle*, or *dwell in flesh*, with a design of humiliation, though he might converse with men heretofore arrayed in this lightsome robe, this covering or habitation of God, which also he put on at his transfiguration in the mount, when 'his garments were white' as the light; and at his ascension to heaven, when a 'bright cloud received' or invested him, and when he appeared to John, Rev. i. 13.

And as God visibly conversed with Adam and his family, so also with several of the patriarchs. He was seen often by them, especially such of them as were most eminent for holiness, in a degenerate age, and

and converſed familiarly with them in a *viſible manner:* and thence probably came the phraſe, 'Enoch walked with God,' Gen. v. 22, 24. and 'Noah walked with God,' Gen. vi. 9. which in proceſs of time became a common phraſe to ſignify a pious man, who converſed much with God in a *ſpiritual manner*, though thoſe viſible appearances were not then vouchſafed to him.

When God had choſen Abraham to be his peculiar favourite, he appeared to him frequently. Acts vii. 2. 'The God of glory appeared to our father Abraham, when he was in Meſopotamia, and ſaid unto him, Get thee out of thy country,' &c. And when he came into the land of Canaan, Gen. xii. 11. 'The Lord appeared unto Abraham and ſaid, Unto thy ſeed will I give this land; and there he built an altar unto the Lord, who appeared unto him;' or, as the Hebrew expreſſes it, 'who was ſeen by him.' Theſe ſeem to be viſible appearances ſurrounded with light or glory, and therefore it is ſaid, 'the God of glory appeared to him.'

Gen. xv. 1. 'After theſe things the word of the Lord came unto Abraham in a viſion, ſaying, Fear not, Abraham, I am thy ſhield and thy exceeding great reward: and Abraham ſaid, Lord God, what wilt thou give me?' &c. Here was a viſion, and here was a voice; the perſon that appeared was the Lord God, or Jehovah Elohim: and yet it is ſaid, 'The word of the Lord came to him in a viſion:' probably this ſignifies Jeſus Chriſt, the *Logos, or Word of God.* And yet, ver. 7. he aſſumes the name of *Jehovah*, 'I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees:' and ver. 17. 'a ſmoaking furnace and a burning lamp paſſed between the pieces' of the divided ſacrifice, in token of God's making a covenant with Abraham; as it follows, ver. 18. 'In that

that same day the Lord,' or Jehovah, 'made a covenant with Abraham.'*

Gen. xvi. 7. 'The Angel of the Lord *found* Hagar in the wilderness, and said unto her, I will multiply thy seed exceedingly:' and though he be called the *Angel of the Lord*, in four places in this narrative, yet, ver. 13. 'She called the name of the Lord,' or Jehovah, 'that spake to her, *Thou God seest me.*' The person who appeared therefore seems to be one who was *an Angel of the Lord*, and was also the *Lord*, or *Jehovah*.

Gen. xvii. 1. 'When Abraham was ninety years old and nine, the Lord,' or Jehovah, 'appeared to him and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect.' Ver. 3. 'And Abraham

* Here let it be observed, that the ancient Jews, such as the Targumists or commentators on scripture, and Philo, represent the *Memra*, the *Logos*, that is the *Word of the Lord*, as appearing to the patriarchs in almost all these places where God is said to appear: and of this Divine Word they give us two different ideas, as I have shown elsewhere: the one is, that it signifies something in and of the true and eternal Godhead, some distinct principle in the Divine Nature itself, which is called the *Word* or *Wisdom of God*, whereby God revealed himself to men. The other is the idea of some *most excellent Angel* in whom God resided, and by whom God manifested himself, and who was upon that account called the *Word of God*. Their writings lead us plainly to both these ideas: nor is it at all unreasonable to suppose, that both these ideas may be united in one, and thus compose a sort of complex person, an angel inhabited by true Godhead under the idea of *Divine Wisdom*. Some have called this person a *God-Angel* in all these visible appearances; and why may not our blessed Saviour be this *God-Angel* by reason of his human soul pre-existent and united to Godhead in its unincarnate or angelic state, i. e. before he became complete *God-Man*, and afterward he was *made a little lower than the angels* by dwelling in flesh and blood? See more of this matter in other writings. But this I do but just mention as I pass along, and in the margin only, because I would not enter into any *modus* of explaining the internal distinctions in the Godhead in these discourses: especially since these discourses agree well enough with any known scheme of internal distinctions in the Godhead.

ham fell on his face: and God talked with him, saying, Behold my covenant is with thee,' &c. 'to be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee,' &c. 'and I will be their God.' Here is another dialogue; 'and God said unto Abraham,—and Abraham said unto God,' ver. 9, 15, 18. and in ver. 22, 'he left off talking with him, and God went up from Abraham,' i. e. the visible appearance ascended out of Abraham's sight.

Gen. xviii. 1. 'And the Lord,' Jehovah, 'appeared unto him in the plains of Mamre; and he sat in the tent-door in the heat of the day, and he lift up his eyes and looked, and lo, three men stood before him; and when he saw them, he ran to meet them from the tent-door, and bowed himself toward the ground; and said, My Lord, if now I have found favour in thy sight, pass not away, I pray thee, from thy servant.' His first address was made to one of the three, who seemed to bear superior glory; afterward he invites them all to eat, and 'he took butter and milk,' ver. 8. 'and the calf which he had dressed, and set it before them; and he stood by them under the tree, and they did eat. And he said, Sarah thy wife shall have a son:' at which tidings, when 'Sarah laughed within herself, the Lord,' or Jehovah, 'said unto Abraham, Wherefore did Sarah laugh?' ver. 13. 'Is any thing too hard for the Lord,' or Jehovah? Now I think it is evident that one of these three men was expressly called *Jehovah:* two of them went onward toward Sodom, but he that is called Jehovah seemed to stay behind; ver. 16, 17, and 22, 'the men,' i. e. the two men, 'turned their faces from thence, and went towards Sodom, but Abraham stood yet before Jehovah.' And a long dialogue there ensues between Abraham and the Lord, or Jehovah, about the sparing of Sodom, wherein Abraham addresses him as the *true God,* in ver. 33. 'The Lord,' Jehovah, 'went his

his way as ſoon as he had left communing with Abraham, and Abraham returned to his place.' And, Gen. xix. 1. 'There came two angels to Sodom at even,' which moſt probably were the two men that left Abraham while Jehovah tarried and talked with him. Now it is evident in the converſation, that neither of theſe two angels aſſumed the name of Jehovah; for, ver. 13. they ſay, 'the cry of the men of Sodom is waxen great before the face of the Lord,' i. e. Jehovah, 'and Jehovah hath ſent us to deſtroy it.' This narrative gives us a plain account of the great God appearing to Abraham, and converſing with him in the form of a man; for it is ſaid, He 'appeared to Abraham,' or 'was ſeen of him, talked with him,' and 'went up from him.'

Gen. xxi. 17. 'God heard the voice of the lad,' Iſhmael, 'and the Angel of God called unto Hagar out of heaven, Ariſe, lift up the lad, for I will make him a great nation. And God opened her eyes, and ſhe ſaw a well of water.' Here is a perſon ſpeaking, who ſeems to aſſume ſomething of Godhead, who yet is called *the Angel of God:* but whether there was any viſible appearance, the ſcripture ſaith not.

Gen. xxii. 11. 'The Angel of the Lord called to Abraham out of heaven, and ſaid, Lay not thine hand upon the lad,' that is Iſaac, 'for now I know that thou feareſt God, ſeeing thou haſt not withheld thy ſon, thine only ſon from me.' Ver. 14. 'And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-jireh.' Ver. 15. 'And the Angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the ſecond time,' and ſaid, 'By myſelf have I ſworn, ſaith the Lord, that in bleſſing I will bleſs thee, becauſe thou haſt obeyed my voice.' Here alſo is *an angel of Jehovah*, who ſeems to aſſume the character of Deity; but whether there was a viſible appearance, or only a voice, is not certain.

Gen.

Gen. xxvi. 2. 'And the Lord,' Jehovah, 'appeared unto Iſaac and ſaid, Go not down into the land of Egypt; ſojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and I will bleſs thee, I will perform the oath which I ſware unto Abraham thy father.' Ver. 24. And when Iſaac went to Beerſheba, 'the Lord appeared to him the ſame night, and ſaid, I am the God of Abraham thy father: fear not, for I am with thee.' Beſides theſe two, I remember not any other appearance of God to Iſaac.

The two firſt appearances which we read, that God made unto Jacob, were both in a dream: one in Gen. xxviii. 12. 'The angels of God aſcending and deſcending on a ladder,' ſet up on the earth and reaching to heaven; 'and behold the Lord,' or Jehovah, 'ſtood above it, and ſaid, I am Jehovah, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Iſaac.' Gen. xxviii. 12, 13. and ver. 16. 'Jacob ſaid, Surely the Lord is in this place.' Gen. xxxi. 11, 13. And 'the Angel of God ſpake unto me in a dream, ſaying, Jacob; and I ſaid, here am I: and he ſaid, I am the God of Bethel, where thou vowedſt a vow unto me.' Here is an angel, in a divine or inſpired dream, calling himſelf *the God of Bethel.* And ver. 24. 'God came to Laban the Syrian by night in a dream, and ſaid to him, Take heed that thou ſpeak not to Jacob neither good or bad.' Doubtleſs theſe ancients had ſufficient rules of diſtinction to know when ſuch a dream was divine.

Gen. xxxii. 24. 'And Jacob was left alone,' when his wives and children were gone over the ford, 'and there wreſtled a man with him until the breaking of the day: and he ſaid, Let me go, for the day breaketh:' and Jacob replied, 'I will not let thee go except thou bleſs me: and he ſaid, Thy name ſhall be called no more Jacob, but Iſrael, for as a prince haſt thou power with God, and with men, and haſt prevailed; and

and Jacob called the name of that place, Peniel, for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved.'* Now if we compare this history with Hosea xii. 3, 4, 5. we shall find that this person who wrestled with Jacob, and is here called a *Man*, and also *God*, is by the prophet called *God*, and an *Angel*, and the *Lord God of Hosts*, *even Jehovah*. The words are these, 'By his strength he had power with God, yea, he had power over the Angel, and prevailed; he wept, and made supplication unto him, he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us; even the Lord God of Hosts, Jehovah is his memorial.'

Gen. xxxv. 9. 'And God appeared unto Jacob again when he came out of Padanaram, and blessed him. And God said, I am God Almighty, be fruitful and multiply,' &c. And God went up from him in the place where he talked with him. And Jacob called the name of the place where God spake with him, Bethel.

Gen. xlvi. 2. 'God spake unto Israel in the visions of the night, and said, I am God, the God of thy father, fear not to go down into Egypt.' In Gen. xlviii. 3. Jacob rehearsed the former appearance of God to him; 'God Almighty appeared to me at Luz in the land of Canaan, and blessed me.' And ver. 15. he blesses Joseph thus, '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,' that is, the sons of Joseph. And in this recognition of the former appearances, and favours of God, Jacob seems to make the *God of his fathers*, Abraham and

* We find here it was a very ancient opinion, that *no man could bear the sight of God and live*: what is the true meaning of it, see in the following reflections on the appearance of the glory of God to Moses at the giving of the law, Exod. xix, and xx. and in the hole of the rock. Exod. xxxiii. 9.

and Iſaac, to be the ſame perſon with the *Angel that redeemed him from all evil.*

After this I find no more ſuch appearances of God unto men, until that glorious apparition to Moſes in the burning buſh.

Exod. ii. 2, 3. '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.' Ver. 3. 'And Moſes ſaid, I will now turn aſide, and ſee this great ſight, why the buſh is not burnt.' Ver. 4. 'And when the Lord ſaw that he turned aſide to ſee, God called to him out of the middle of the buſh, and ſaid, Moſes, Moſes. And he ſaid, Here am I.' Ver. 5. 'And he ſaid, Draw not nigh hither: put off thy ſhoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou ſtandeſt is holy ground.' Ver. 6. 'Moreover he ſaid, I am the God of thy father, 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.' Ver. 7. 'And the Lord ſaid, I have ſurely ſeen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt,' &c. Ver. 13. 'And Moſes ſaid unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Iſrael, and ſhall ſay unto them, The God of your fathers hath ſent me unto you; and they ſhall ſay to me, What is his name? What ſhall I ſay unto them?' Ver. 14. 'And God ſaid unto Moſes, I AM THAT I AM: and he ſaid, Thus ſhalt thou ſay unto the children of Iſrael, I AM hath ſent me unto you.' Ver. 15. 'And God ſaid moreover unto Moſes, Thus ſhalt thou ſay unto the children of Iſrael, the Lord 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.' Chap. iv. 1. 'And Moſes anſwered and ſaid, But behold, they will ſay, The Lord hath not

not appeared unto thee.' And in order to prove that the Lord, or Jehovah, had appeared unto him, 'The Lord said unto him, Cast thy rod on the ground,' &c. Ver. 5. 'That they may believe that the Lord God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath appeared unto thee.' And thus the sacred dialogue between God and Moses proceeds. This same history is briefly repeated by Stephen, Acts vii. 30,—36.

Whoever reads this narrative, will plainly find, that this person who appeared to Moses, was both the *Angel of the Lord*, and was *God* himself: for it is said, 'Moses was afraid to look upon God.' He is called an angel by the sacred writer at his first appearance, but he is also called in the succeeding parts of the narrative, *God the Lord*, *Jehovah*, *the God of Abraham*, &c. The sacred historian calls him so frequently, and he himself roundly and strongly calls himself so. He assumes the highest names and titles of the supreme God, *I am that I am*, &c. and that in the most solemn and majestic manner that it is possible God himself could do, if he designed never so plainly to declare his own personal presence.

Now I would humbly propose these questions to every reader, whether if he should put himself as it were in the place of Moses, he would not have been fully convinced, and believed that the great and eternal God was the person actually immediately present in the burning bush in an extraordinary manner? Whether he could avoid believing that the person who spake to him was really the true and eternal God? And though he might suppose that it was an angel that appeared there, whether such strong, express and solemn assumptions of the divine nature would not lead him to believe that God and this angel, at least in that season, and for that purpose were so far united as to become as it were one agent,

agent, one ſpeaker, one complex perſon? And whether Moſes himſelf could have any other idea of this appearance, but as God, the great and bleſſed God, dwelling or reſiding in, and acting and ſpeaking by this angel? Whether the mere idea of a creature, an angel ſent as a vicegerent or deputy to ſpeak in the name of God, could anſwer theſe ſublime aſſertions of the ſacred writer, and theſe divine characters ſo ſtrongly aſſumed by the angel? And whether any unprejudiced reader could underſtand this to be the mere meſſenger of an abſent God, ſince there is no notice through all this narrative, that he was *merely an angel* ſent from God (conſidered as abſent) to carry a meſſage to Moſes, but rather many notices given, both by the perſon appearing in the buſh, and by the ſacred hiſtorian, that *God himſelf* was there, or ſuch an angel who was alſo the great and bleſſed God?

Exod. iv. 24. 'And it came to paſs by the way in the inn, that the Lord met Moſes, and ſought to kill him,' upon which Zipporah circumciſed her ſon. This ſeems to be an apparition of the Lord, or Jehovah, in the form of a man, ſomething like God's wreſtling with Jacob, and giving Moſes a terrible reproof, becauſe he had neglected to make his ſon paſs under that ſacred rite of circumciſion.

Exod. vi. 2. 'And God ſpake unto Moſes, and ſaid unto him, I am the Lord: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Iſaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name of Jehovah was I not known to them.' Can any thing more ſtrongly expreſs the ancient appearance of the true God himſelf to the patriarchs, who alſo appeared lately to Moſes under a new name?

After this you have a multitude of inſtances, wherein the Lord, or Jehovah, converſed freely with Moſes upon every occaſion: whether under any viſible

ble appearance or figure, the ſcripture does not acquaint us, except in the following inſtances.

Exod. xiii. 21. 'And the Lord,' or Jehovah, 'went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud to lead them in the way, and by night in a pillar of fire to give them light.' Who, in Exod. xiv. 19, is called the 'Angel of God which went before the camp of Iſrael;' he now removed 'and went behind them, and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and ſtood behind them.' And in the 24th verſe of this chapter he is again called Jehovah: 'It came to paſs in the morning-watch, the Lord,' i. e. Jehovah, 'looked unto the hoſt of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud.'

Exod. xvi. 9. Moſes bid Aaron ſay to the people, 'Come near before the Lord;' and 'as Aaron ſpake to the whole congregation, behold the glory of the Lord appeared in the cloud. And the Lord ſpake unto Moſes, ſaying, I have heard the murmurings of the children of Iſrael,——and ye ſhall know that I am the Lord your God.'

Exod. xvii. 5, 6, 7. 'The Lord ſaid to Moſes, Go on before the people, and take with thee the elders of Iſrael. Behold, I will ſtand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb, and thou ſhalt ſmite the rock, and there ſhall come water out of it. And he called the name of the place Maſſah and Meribah, becauſe of the chiding of the children of Iſrael, and becauſe they tempted the Lord.' Here God promiſes to ſtand before Moſes on the rock, and the Iſraelites are ſaid to tempt the Lord, which is applied to Chriſt, 1 Cor. x. 4. This *rock* on which God ſtood is called *Chriſt*, i. e. the type of Chriſt in whom God dwelt. And ver. 9. they are ſaid to tempt Chriſt, i. e. they tempted God, appearing in a viſible manner as ſtanding on a rock.

The

The other place where they tempted God, is, Deut. xxi. 5, 6. for want of bread and water, and 'the Lord ſent fiery ſerpents,' &c. Both theſe are joined together, Deut. viii. 15. And in both places we may juſtly ſay 'Chriſt was tempted,' i. e. God appearing as the Leader of Iſrael in the wilderneſs: For if it is expreſsly aſſerted 'they tempted Chriſt' when the ſerpents ſlew them, where there is not any expreſs account of a viſible appearance of God in the hiſtory, much more may it be ſaid 'they tempted Chriſt' when Moſes ſmote the rock, where there was a viſible appearance of 'God as ſtanding on the rock.'

Exod. xix. 2, 3. 'Iſrael camped before the mount Sinai, and Moſes went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain.' Ver. 9. 'And the Lord ſaid unto Moſes, Behold, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I ſpeak with thee.' Ver. 18. 'And Mount Sinai was altogether on a ſmoak, becauſe the Lord deſcended upon it in fire.' Ver. 19. 'Moſes ſpake, and God anſwered him by a voice.' Ver. 20. 'And the Lord called Moſes up to the top of the mount, and Moſes went up.' Exod. xx. 1. '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. Ver. 19. 'And the people ſaid to Moſes, Let not God ſpeak to us, leſt we die.' Ver. 21. 'And the people ſtood afar off, and Moſes drew near unto the thick darkneſs where God was: and the Lord ſaid unto Moſes, Thus ſhalt thou ſay unto the children of Iſrael, Ye have ſeen that I have talked with you from heaven.' Thus God gave his laws to his people from Mount Sinai; but neither Moſes nor the people did at this time ſee any ſimilitude or figure; for ſo Moſes tells

them, Deut. iv. 12. 'And the Lord spake unto him out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words; but ye saw no similitude, only ye heard a voice.'

And indeed it is probable that Moses never saw any form of the countenance, or face of a man, in all the appearances of God to him: and though it be said, Deut. xxxiv. 10. 'There arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face,' yet we know that the same expression is used concerning the people of Israel, Deut. v. 4. 'The Lord talked with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire.' Therefore this can mean no more than that God spake with Moses and with the people as one man does to another, when they mutually see each other's faces; though the favour and intimacy to which Moses was admitted, was much greater than what God bestowed on the people; because Moses held long dialogues with God several times, and could go and ask him any thing, almost upon every occasion. But still it seems probable, I think, that Moses never saw any human face in his converses with God; for when Moses, in Exod. xxxiii. 18. desired to 'see the glory of God,' God denied his request, and said, 'Thou canst not see my face, for there shall no man see me and live.' Upon the whole therefore, this expression, *face to face*, in these texts, must signify no more, than a condescending manner of conversing with men by a voice, as one man converses with another, when they see each other's faces: though it is abundantly evident, that some of the more ancient patriarchs conversed with God in the form of a man, and probably saw a human face, at least in a confused vision, and as has been before declared.

Yet there remains some difficulty still in what sense God said, 'Thou canst not see my face; for there

there ſhall no man ſee me and live,' when it is probable that Abraham and Jacob long before, and afterward Joſhua and Gideon ſaw the face of that angel who is called *Jehovah:* and my reaſon for it is this, becauſe they took him to be a man when they firſt ſaw and ſpake with him, and therefore at firſt, perhaps, there was no peculiar luſtre of glory, or cloud, to conceal his face, and diſtinguiſh him from a common man.

Anſw. 1. It is granted that this expreſſion cannot ſignify that no living man ſhould ever ſee an apparition of God with a human face, at leaſt in a general glimpſe, for the reaſons which are juſt now mentioned. 2. Nor can this awful expreſſion of 'not ſeeing the face of God and live,' ſignify that no living man can ſee 'the eſſence of God as he is a ſpirit,' and inviſible to bodily eyes; for in this ſenſe angels and human ſouls are inviſible as well as God himſelf. Therefore, 3. I think it muſt intend that no man in this mortal ſtate can bear the ſight of ſuch intenſe rays of light and glory as perhaps he aſſumes in heaven, and as would become the great God to aſſume on earth, if he appeared in all the corporeal ſplendor due to divine majeſty appearing among men, as in Chriſt's appearance to John, Rev. i. 17. 'he fell down as dead.' And this expoſition is yet more probable, if we conſider that St. Paul deſcribes God 'as dwelling in that light which no man can approach unto;' and upon this account it is added, 'whom no man hath ſeen nor can ſee.' 1 Tim. vi. 16. For in this ſenſe, 'our God would be a conſuming fire.' Heb. 10. ult. and that in the moſt literal ſenſe.

It is very probable, that the unſufferable blaze of the glory on the mercy-ſeat was always allayed with the cloud intervening, which might be an emblem or type of 'God manifeſt in the fleſh;' i. e. God

dwelling perſonally in the man Jeſus, or in the fleſh at his incarnation. And it is probable alſo for this reaſon, that the high prieſt, when he went into the moſt holy place, was to make the ſmoak of the incenſe ariſe between this glory and himſelf, that he might not die by his curioſity, or too near approach.

Exod. xxiii. 20. 'God ſays unto Moſes, Behold I ſend an angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. 21. Beware of him, and obey his voice; provoke him not; for he will not pardon your tranſgreſſions, for my name is in him.' Here ſome critical writers have remarked two things, 1. That the *name of God* is ſometimes put for *God himſelf*, as Pſal. ii. 21. 'The name of the God of Jacob defend thee:' So that God himſelf moſt probably dwelt in this angel. 2. It is ſaid, 'my name is in the midſt of him בקרבו,' which intimates a real indwelling; which alſo further appears, becauſe it is ſaid, 'he will not pardon your tranſgreſſions.' Now an authority to forgive, or not to forgive ſins, is a prerogative of God. And why may we not ſuppoſe the 'fulneſs of the Godhead' dwelling in this angel, who was a ſpirit, as well as the 'fulneſs of the Godhead dwelling bodily' in the complete human nature of Jeſus Chriſt when he took a body? as Col. ii. 9. I add yet further, that we have much reaſon to believe that this is the ſame angel that ſo often aſſumed the ſublimeſt names of God, in his appearing both to Moſes and to the patriarchs.

Exod. xxiv. 9. 'Then went up Moſes and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and ſeventy of the elders of Iſrael.' Ver. 10. And 'they ſaw the God of Iſrael, and there was under his feet, as it were a paved work of a ſapphire ſtone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearneſs.' Ver. 11. 'And upon the nobles of the children of Iſrael he laid not his hand:' (i. e. he did not deſtroy them, though they ſaw God) and

and it follows, 'Alſo they ſaw God, and did eat and drink.' Here it is probable they ſaw nothing but a very bright or fiery cloud, as in ver 16. But out of the midſt of it God perhaps might converſe with Moſes; otherwiſe how could they know that this was the *God of Iſrael?* But I am inclined to believe they ſaw nothing of any human form; though indeed it is expreſt, 'there was a paved work of ſapphire under his feet,' which may ſignify only *beneath him*, i.e. beneath this fiery cloud: but it is certain, his face they ſaw not. The children of Iſrael were ſo prone to idolatry, that God never gave them (nor perhaps even to Moſes) the ſight of an human face in all their viſions, that there might be no foundation for framing an image like him. Deut. iv. 16. And it is evident that when 'Moſes went up into the mount,' Exod. xxiv. 16. it was only a 'cloud covered the mount, and the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai; and the ſight of the glory of God was like devouring fire on the top of the mount;' whence probably St. Paul might derive that expreſſion, Heb. xii. 29. 'Our God is a conſuming fire.'

Exod. xxv. 21. 'And thou ſhalt put the mercy-ſeat above upon the ark.' Ver. 22. 'And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee, from above the mercy-ſeat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the teſtimony.' Exod. xxviii. 30, 35. When Aaron goes into the holy place where the mercy-ſeat ſtood, he is ſaid 'to go in before the Lord.' Upon this account the Lord of Hoſts is ſaid 'to dwell between the cherubims.' 1 Sam. iv. 4. and 2 Sam. vi. 2. and Pſal. lxxx. 1. and Pſal. xcix. 1. On this account alſo, when the ark was moved from place to place, God himſelf is ſaid to remove. Pſal. xlvii. When David carried the ark into Zion, ver. 5. 'God is gone up with a ſhout, the Lord with the ſound of a trumpet.' And when the

the ark came into the tabernacle or temple, Psal. xxiv. 7. 'Lift up your heads, O ye gates; be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in: the Lord of Hosts, he is the King of Glory.' And when Solomon built the temple, and brought in the ark of God to it, 2 Chron. vi. 41. Solomon said, 'Arise, O Lord God, into thy resting place, thou and the ark of thy strength:' which is repeated, Psal. cxxxii. 8.

And concerning Zion it is said, Psalm. lxviii. 16. 'This is the hill which God desireth to dwell in.' Ver. 17. 'The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the Lord is among them as in Sinai, in the holy place.' As God appeared on Sinai in a visible cloud, in fire or glory, where thousands of angels surrounded him, so God dwelt in Zion over the mercy-seat, in a visible and bright cloud, between the cherubims, representing the attendance of angels. Then follows, ver. 18. 'Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led captivity captive,' which is applied to Christ, Ephes. iv. Thus the ascent of the ark of God to Zion, was a type of the ascension of Christ to heaven. For as God dwelt upon the ark between the cherubims in a bright cloud, under the Jewish dispensation, and thence communicated his mind to men, and was there solemnly invoked and worshipped, so the 'fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily' in the man Christ Jesus, and thus 'God in Christ' reveals himself to us, and is worshipped and invoked by us under the Christian dispensation; but still with this difference, that the union between God and man in Christ Jesus is much more near, more intimate and glorious, so as to make one complex person or God-Man, and it is so constant as never to be dissolved; for Christ, who is 'of the seed of David after the flesh,' is by this union 'God over all blessed for evermore.' See Rom. ix. 5.

Exod.

Exod. xxxi. 18. When 'God had made an end of communing with Moſes on mount Sinai, he gave unto him two tables of teſtimony, tables of ſtone written with the finger of God.' This ſeems to intimate a human ſhape giving the tables to Moſes, but not the viſion of a human face.

In Exod. xxxii. 2. When Iſrael had offended God by the golden calf, he ſaid, 'I will ſend an angel before thee, and I will drive out the Canaanites,' &c. 'for I will not go up in the midſt of thee, for thou art a ſtiff-necked people, leſt I conſume thee in the way.'

It is the opinion of Dr. Owen on this place, that the angel which God in his anger told them he would ſend before them, when he himſelf refuſed to go up in the midſt of them, was different from that angel whom he promiſed to them, Exod. xxiii. 20. 'in whom the name of God was:' but upon their mourning and repentance, and upon the interceſſion of Moſes, ver. 4. and 14. God ſays, 'My preſence ſhall go with thee, and I will give thee reſt;' which is much the ſame thing as if he had ſaid, 'the angel of my preſence ſhall go with thee;' for ſo this angel in whom the 'name of God' dwelt, is called, Iſai. lxiii. 9. 'In all their afflictions he was afflicted, and the angel of his preſence ſaved them.'

Exod. xxxiii. 9. 'Moſes entered into the tabernacle, and the cloudy pillar deſcended and ſtood at the door of the tabernacle, and *the Lord** talked with

* Note, *The Lord* is not in the original in this place; and this is the only place that occurs to me——where the nominative caſe is wanting, when God or the angel is ſaid to talk with Moſes out of the cloud; but ver. 11. immediately it is ſaid, 'The Lord,' i. e. Jehovah, 'ſpake to Moſes face to face.' And Exod. xxxiv. 5. it is ſaid, 'The Lord deſcended in the cloud, and ſtood with Moſes there,' &c. So that this ſingle ellipſis or ſubintellection of the nominative caſe *Lord*, ver. 9. ought not to be conſtrued in oppoſition to all other places where the Lord himſelf is ſaid to ſpeak with Moſes.

with Moſes, and all the people ſaw the cloudy pillar ſtand at the tabernacle door, and all the people roſe up and worſhipped, every man in his tent-door.' Ver. 11. 'And the Lord ſpake unto Moſes face to face, as a man ſpeaketh unto his friend.' Yet (as I before intimated) perhaps this ſignifies only free mutual diſcourſe, like human and friendly converſation; for a few verſes afterwards, God refuſed to let Moſes ſee his face, ver. 20. 'Thou canſt not ſee my face, for there ſhall no man ſee me and live.'

Upon this account it may be queried, whether Moſes ever ſaw the likeneſs of a human face in all the appearances of God to him: yet there ſeems to be the ſimilitude of the back of a man as to the ſhape of his body, in which God appeared to Moſes at his requeſt; for the Lord ſaid, ver. 21. 'Behold there is a place by me, and thou ſhalt ſtand upon a rock.' Ver. 22. 'And it ſhall come to paſs, while my glory paſſeth by, that I will put thee into a clift of the rock, and I will cover thee with my hand while I paſs by.' Ver. 23. 'And I will take away mine hand, and thou ſhalt ſee my back parts, but my face ſhall not be ſeen.'

And accordingly in Exod. xxxiv. 5. 'The Lord deſcended in the cloud, and ſtood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the Lord.' Ver. 6. 'And the Lord paſſed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-ſuffering,' &c. 'And Moſes made haſte, and bowed his head toward the earth, and worſhipped.' Ver. 14. And the Lord ſaid, 'Thou ſhalt worſhip no other god, for the Lord,' Jehovah, 'whoſe name is Jealous, is a jealous God.'

It is poſſible that theſe expreſſions of God's 'covering Moſes with his hand,' while 'the glory of God paſſed by,' and Moſes 'ſeeing the back parts of God,' may ſignify no more than this, that in this particular

lar appearance of God, he arrayed himſelf in beams of light of ſuch unſufferable ſplendor, that it would have deſtroyed the body of Moſes, had not God ſheltered and protected him; and that the 'back parts' which Moſes ſaw, may only ſignify this ſame bright appearance after it was gone to a ſafer diſtance. Or we may ſuppoſe that there was a human form in this appearance, darting unſufferable light from his face, which for that reaſon could not be ſeen; and that Moſes ſaw the ſimilitude of the back of a man, after he was paſt to ſome diſtance from him.

It is not improbable but that in ſome of the other diſcoveries of God to Moſes, he might appear in the eyes of Moſes in a human form, with a bright, but not unſufferable ſhine of glory covering all his ſtature, even as the face of Moſes himſelf might appear in the eyes of the children of Iſrael, when 'the ſkin of his face ſhone,' ſo much that 'they were afraid to come nigh him.' Exod. xxxiv. 30. And there is a great probability of it, if we conſider, that God ſaid concerning Moſes, Numb. xii. 8. 'the ſimilitude of the Lord ſhall he behold;' i. e. God in the figure of a man, though not his face.

God had promiſed, in Exod. xxix. 42. that 'at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation I will meet with the children of Iſrael, and the tabernacle ſhall be ſanctified by my glory.' This promiſe was accompliſhed, Exod. xl. 34. When the tabernacle was erected, then 'a cloud covered the tent of the congregation, and the glory of God filled the tabernacle.' Ver. 35. 'And Moſes was not able' at that time 'to enter into the tabernacle of the congregation, becauſe the cloud abode thereon, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle.

Lev. ix. 1, 4. 'Moſes called Aaron and his ſons and the elders of Iſrael,' and ſaid, 'To-day the Lord will appear unto you.' Ver. 5. 'And all the congregation

gation drew near and stood before the Lord.' Ver. 6. 'And Moses said, This is the thing which the Lord commanded, that ye should do. And the glory of the Lord shall appear unto you.' And when Aaron had offered the appointed offerings for himself and for the people, ver. 23. 'Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle of the congregation, and came out and blessed the people: and the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people.' Ver. 24. 'And there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat, which when all the people saw they shouted, and fell on their faces.' Here it may be observed, that the Lord is said to appear to them, ver. 4. when ver. 23. it was 'the glory of the Lord appearing to the people,' that is, a bright light and a consuming fire. Ver. 23, 24.

Numb. xii. 5. 'And the Lord came down in the pillar of a cloud, and stood in the door of the tabernacle, and called Aaron and Miriam, and they came forth.' Ver. 6. 'And he said, Hear now my words: If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream.' Ver. 7. 'My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house.' Ver. 8. 'With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold: Wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against my servant Moses?' Ver. 9. 'And the anger of the Lord was kindled against them, and he departed.' Ver. 10. 'And the cloud departed from off the tabernacle, and behold Miriam became leprous white as snow.'

It is not easy to say what the precise difference is between the various ways of God's ancient discoveries of himself to men; but I think thus much is very plain, which I before hinted, that though the common

mon method of God's converſe with the people and with Aaron was by a voice proceeding from the bright cloud, or Shechinah, yet that Moſes was admitted to a more intimate converſe with God in a way of dialogue, as one man talks freely with another, which the ſcripture calls *face to face*, and *mouth to mouth*. And on ſome particular occaſions, he beheld God in the ſhape or likeneſs of the body of a man; for it is ſaid, 'He ſhall behold the ſimilitude of the Lord;' though perhaps a cloud of glory might always cover his face, becauſe the face of God was not to be ſeen by him.

Numb. xxii. 9. 'And God came unto Balaam, and ſaid, What men are theſe with thee? And Balaam ſaid unto God, Balak the king of Moab hath ſent unto me, ſaying, Come now, curſe the people,' that is, Iſrael. Ver. 12. 'And God ſaid unto Balaam, Thou ſhalt not go with them, thou ſhalt not curſe the people; and Balaam ſaid to the princes of Balak, The Lord,' or Jehovah, 'refuſeth to give me leave to go with you.' And ver. 22, &c. there is the angel of the Lord meeting Balaam on the road to Moab, and converſing with him; but I do not find that this angel either aſſumes the name of the Lord, or is ſo called by the ſacred writer: unleſs we may infer thus much by comparing what the angel ſaid unto Balaam, ver. 25. 'The word that I ſhall ſpeak unto thee, that ſhalt thou ſpeak;' with chap. xxiii. 3, 4. 'Balaam ſaid to Balak, Peradventure the Lord will come to me: and God met Balaam.' Ver. 5. 'And the Lord,' or Jehovah, 'put a word in Balaam's mouth, and ſaid, Return unto Balak, and thus ſhalt thou ſpeak,' &c. Again, ver. 16. 'And the Lord,' or Jehovah, 'met Balaam, and put a word in his mouth,' &c. Chap. xxiv. 2. 'And Balaam lift up his eyes, and the Spirit of God came upon him, and he took up his parable, and ſaid,

said, The man who heard the words of God, who saw the vision of the Almighty, having his eyes opened, hath said, How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob?' &c. Whether this be sufficient to determine this angel to be Jehovah, I leave to the reader.

Deut. xxxii. 33. 'The Lord your God went in the way before you in fire by night, to shew you by what way you should go, and in a cloud by day.' Deut. iv. 12. 'The Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of words, but saw no similitude, only a voice.' Ver. 16. 'Lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure the likeness of male or female.'

Deut. xxiii. 13. 'Thou shalt have a paddle upon thy weapon, and thou shalt dig therewith, and cover that which cometh from thee: for the Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp to deliver thee; therefore shall thy camp be holy, that he see no unclean thing in thee.' This text does not indeed prove any appearance of God, but may be only a representation of God walking through their camp after the manner of men, to impress a more awful idea of the presence of God upon the people of Israel, that they might abstain from all legal impurities of every kind.

Joshua v. 13. 'When Joshua was by Jericho, he lifted 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?' Ver. 14. 'And he said, Nay, but as the captain of the host of the Lord am I now come: and Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my Lord unto his servant?' Ver. 15. 'And the captain of the Lord's host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot, for the

the place whereon thou ſtandeſt is holy; and Joſhua did ſo.' Chap. vi. 2. And 'the Lord ſaid unto Joſhua, See I have given into thine hand Jericho,' &c. Here it ſeems evident that the captain of the hoſt of the Lord is alſo called the *Lord*, or *Jehovah*: and Joſhua is commanded, juſt as Moſes was, to 'looſe his ſhoe from his foot,' becauſe the 'place was holy,' that is, becauſe God himſelf was preſent there.

Judges ii. 1. 'And an angel of the Lord came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and ſaid, I made you go up out of Egypt, and have brought you unto the land which I ſware unto your fathers, and I ſaid I will never break my covenant with you.' This was certainly a human appearance; for the angel came from Gilgal to Bochim, which plainly intimates a viſible perſon moving or paſſing from one place to another: yet the words are as plainly the language of God; ſo that, in all probability, this was alſo the *angel of God's preſence*.

Judges vi. 11. 'And there came an angel of the Lord, and ſat under an oak which was in Ophra: and Gideon threſhed wheat by the wine-preſs.' Ver. 12. 'And the angel of the Lord appeared to him, and ſaid unto him, The Lord,' Jehovah, 'is with thee, thou mighty man of valour.' Ver. 13. 'And Gideon ſaid' unto him, 'O my Lord, if the Lord,' Jehovah, 'be with us, why is all this befallen us?' Ver. 14. 'And the Lord,' Jehovah, 'looked upon him, and ſaid, Go in this thy might, and thou ſhalt ſave Iſrael from the hand of the Midianites: have not I ſent thee?' Here is a long dialogue between the Lord and Gideon. Ver. 20. 'And the angel of God ſaid unto him, Take the fleſh and unleavened cakes, and lay them upon this rock, and pour out the broth; and he did ſo.' Ver. 21. 'Then the angel of the Lord put forth the end of the ſtaff that

was

was in his hand, and touched the flesh and unleavened cakes, and there rose up fire out of the rock and consumed the flesh and the cakes: and the angel of the Lord departed out of his sight.' Ver. 22. And when 'Gideon perceived that he was an angel,' Gideon said, 'Alas, O Lord God, for because I have seen an angel of the Lord face to face.' Ver. 23. 'And the Lord said unto him, Peace be unto thee; fear not, thou shalt not die.'

On this transaction I make these few remarks.

1. This angel had doubtless a human shape, figure and voice, for he sat under an oak: and Gideon brought him a present of flesh and cakes to eat, thinking at first it might have been a man of God or a prophet; though when the angel bid him offer it in sacrifice, and then consumed it by a miraculous fire, 'he perceived that it was' no man, but 'an angel of God:' and it is hardly to be supposed, but that Gideon saw his face.

2. Here is an angel of the Lord, who by the sacred writer is several times called Jehovah: for these names the *Lord*, or *Jehovah*, and the *Angel of the Lord*, are used promiscuously by the historian, though Gideon did not know it was God himself.

3. The language which this angel speaks, is not such as would immediately determine Gideon to believe it was Jehovah, or God himself, who appeared; and therefore we find Gideon does not worship him, nor address him as Jehovah.

4. Though Gideon does not expressly call this angel, God, or Jehovah, but only 'perceived' at last 'that he had seen an angel of the Lord,' yet we may suppose that in his recollection he took it to be that peculiar angel in whom God resided or dwelt, for he feared he should die because he had seen him. Now, though there was an ancient and current opinion among the Israelites, that 'none could see the face of God

God and live,' yet there does not ſeem to have been any ſuch notion that death would enſue upon the ſight of a common angel.

But however, whether Gideon ſuppoſed this angel to be inhabited by Jehovah or not, it is plain that the ſacred hiſtorian calls him Jehovah.

Judges xiii. 3. 'The angel of the Lord appeared to the wife of Manoah, and ſaid unto her, Thou ſhalt conceive and bear a ſon,' &c. Ver. 6. 'The woman came and told her huſband, ſaying, A man of God came to me, and his countenance was like the countenance of an angel of God, very terrible,' &c. Ver. 8. 'And Manoah entreated the Lord,' or Jehovah, 'and ſaid, Let the man of God which thou didſt ſend, come again to us.' Ver. 9. 'And God hearkened to the voice of Manoah, and the angel of God came again to the woman: ſhe called her huſband, and Manoah ſaid unto him, Art thou the man, that ſpakeſt unto the woman? and he ſaid, I am.' Ver. 15. 'And Manoah ſaid unto the angel of the Lord, Let us make ready a kid for thee.' Ver. 16. 'And the angel of the Lord ſaid unto Manoah, I will not eat of thy bread, and if thou wilt offer a burnt-offering, thou muſt offer it unto the Lord; for Manoah knew not that he was an angel of the Lord.' Ver. 17. 'And Manoah ſaid to the angel of the Lord, What is thy name? and the angel ſaid unto him, Why aſkeſt thou after my name, ſince it is a ſecret, פלא or Wonderful?' The ſame name which is given to Chriſt, Iſa. ix. 6. 'His name ſhall be called, Wonderful.' Ver. 19. 'So Manoah took a kid, with a meat-offering, and offered it to the Lord: and the angel of the Lord aſcended in the flame of the altar.' Ver. 21. 'Then Manoah knew that he was an angel of the Lord.' Ver. 22. 'And Manoah ſaid to his wife, We ſhall ſurely die, becauſe we have ſeen God.' Here alſo is ſuch an angel in whom

whom God is supposed to reside, for Manoah said, 'We have seen God,' and therefore he thought that they should both die.

I do not remember any appearance of God to David. He 'saw the angel of the Lord,' that was sent to spread a pestilence among the people, 'by the threshing-place of Araunah the Jebusite.' 2 Sam. xxiv. 16. And 'David spake unto the Lord,' or Jehovah, 'when he saw the angel that smote the people, and said, Lo, I have sinned, and done wickedly.' But it does not plainly appear by all the circumstances of the history, that this was that peculiar angel in whom God dwelt, or that the angel was called Jehovah.

The Lord appeared also to Solomon, 1 Kings iii. 5. and ix. 2. but it was 'in a dream by night,' whence therefore I derive no inferences at present.

1 Kings xxii. 19. The prophet Micaiah said, 'I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand, and on his left: and the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab?' &c. But this seems to be a vision divinely represented to the imagination of the prophet, from whence therefore I infer nothing concerning God's real appearances.

Job iv. 13. 'When Eliphaz represents the apparition of a 'spirit before his face in thoughts from the visions of the night,' he does not give us sufficient ground to form any conclusions concerning the real appearance either of God or an angel, in a book of such sublime poetry, wherein this is introduced in the manner of what the poets call a machine.

Isa. vi. 1. 'In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple.' Ver. 2. 'Above it stood the seraphims, each one had six wings,' &c. Ver. 3. 'And one cried unto another, and said, Holy,

Holy, holy, holy is the LORD of Hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory.' Ver. 5. 'Then said I, Wo is me, for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips, and dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips, for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts.' Ver. 8. 'Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I, send me.' Ver. 9. 'And he said, Go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not.' This appearance of the Lord, or Jehovah, to Isaiah, in his glory, is expressly attributed to Christ by the Apostle; John xii. 39, 40, 41. 'These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory and spake of him.'

It has been objected indeed, that the word *Lord*, in the first and eighth verses, is not *Jehovah* in the Hebrew, but *Adonai*; but it is evident, that the word in the fifth verse is Jehovah. When the prophet says, 'Mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts,' Jehovah Tzebaoth; the person therefore whom Isaiah saw was Jehovah.

Ezekiel often had the sight of God or of Jehovah: In chap. i. and iii. and viii. and x. &c. But as it is expressly said in Ezekiel i. 1. 'As I was by the river of Chebar, the heavens were opened, and I saw the visions of God;' so whether all these appearances were not purely visionary, may be questioned; however, it may not be amiss to transcribe a few expressions of the sacred writer on this subject. Ezek. i. 26. 'Above the firmament that was over the heads of the living creatures was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone, and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it, from his loins upward and downward, as it were the appearance of fire, and the appearance of a rainbow round about. This was the

appearance of the likeneſs of the glory of the Lord,' or Jehovah. 'And when I ſaw it, I fell upon my face, and I heard a voice of one that ſpake.' Ezek. iii. 22. 'And the hand of the Lord was upon me, and he ſaid, Ariſe, go forth into the plain, and I will there talk with thee: then I aroſe and went forth into the plain, and behold the glory of the Lord ſtood there, as the glory which I ſaw by the river of Chebar.' Ezek. viii. 1. 'As I ſat in mine houſe and the elders of Judah ſat before me, the hand of the Lord God fell there upon me; then I beheld, and lo, a likeneſs as the appearance of fire from his loins downward and upward,' &c. 'And he put forth the form of an hand, and took me by a lock of mine head, and the Spirit lift me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the viſions of God to Jeruſalem: and behold, the glory of the God of Iſrael was there, according to that viſion I ſaw in the plain.' Ezek. x. 18. 'Then the glory of the Lord departed from off the threſhold of the houſe, and ſtood over the cherubim.' Ver. 20. 'This is the living creature that I ſaw under the God of Iſrael by the river Chebar,' &c.

Dan. iii. 25. Nebuchadnezzar, when he had caſt the three Jews bound into the fiery furnace, ſaid, 'Lo, I ſee four men looſe walking in the midſt of the fire, and they have no hurt, and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.' It is not to be ſuppoſed here that Nebuchadnezzar knew the Meſſiah, or Chriſt, who was the Son of God, but he means to expreſs a divine and god-like form,* which, ver. 28. he calls 'the angel

* It is ſufficiently known to the learned, that in the oriental ways of ſpeaking, almoſt every thing may be called a *father*, a *ſon*, or a *daughter*; the *ſon of pride*, for a proud man; the *ſon of wickedneſs*, for a wicked man; the *ſons of the mighty*, for mighty men; and the word *god* is alſo uſed to aggrandize any idea; the *trees of God*, for noble fair trees, &c. ſo that in Nebuchadnezzar's mouth this phraſe, the *Son of God*, can only mean a very glorious perſon above the appearance of mankind.

angel of the God of Shadrach,' &c. though probably it might be the peculiar angel of God's preſence, in whom was the name of God, and who is the only begotten Son of God.

Daniel had ſeveral viſions, and in ſome of them God appeared to him, or Jeſus Chriſt in the form of a man. Dan. vii. 9, 10, 13, 14. 'I beheld till the thrones were caſt down, and the Ancient of Days did ſit, whoſe garment was white as ſnow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery ſtream iſſued and came forth from before him, thouſands of thouſands miniſtered unto him, and ten thouſand times ten thouſand ſtood before him; the judgment was ſet, and the books were opened. I ſaw in the night viſions, and behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him.' And 'there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages ſhould ſerve him: his dominion is an everlaſting dominion, which ſhall not paſs away, and his kingdom that which ſhall not be deſtroyed.' Let it be obſerved here, that I do not number this among the proper and real appearances of Chriſt, or God; for it is called a dream which Daniel had, and the 'viſions of his head upon his bed,' as ver. 7, 13. yet it was a dream divinely inſpired. Here the 'Ancient of Days' repreſents the Divine Being, or God himſelf, clothed in light or brightneſs white as ſnow or wool; 'one like the Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven,' ſeems to be the Son of God or Jeſus Chriſt, who is alſo 'the Son of Man, aſcending in the clouds of heaven;' and he came to the 'Ancient of Days,' that is, to God the Father, and received his dominion, glory and exaltation at his aſcenſion into heaven in a bright cloud.

And it is probable, that from the language of this dream or vision, Christ borrows his name, 'the Son of Man;' and it is evident that our Saviour's description of his own future appearance as 'the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven,' Matt. xxvi. 64. is borrowed from this vision; and his real ascension to heaven, and his exaltation there, is but an accomplishment of this prophetical scene.

Dan. viii. 15. Daniel had seen a vision just before, and while he was seeking for the meaning of it, 'Behold,' said he, 'there stood before me as the appearance of a man, and I heard a man's voice which called and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision.' Surely this man who appeared seems to be Jesus Christ, who had command over Gabriel, one of the chief angels.

Dan. x. 5. 'I lift up mine eyes and looked, and behold a certain man clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with fine gold,' &c. Here is the description of an appearance very like the appearance of Christ to the apostle John, Rev. i. 13. but whether this was the angel of God's presence, viz. Christ, or another angel, is hard to determine. Ver. 10. 'Behold an hand touched me, and set me upon my knees, and upon the palms of my hands; and he said unto me, O Daniel, a man greatly beloved,—stand upright, for unto thee am I now sent——Fear not, for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand and chasten thyself before God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words. But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days: but lo, Michael, one (or the first) of the chief princes came to help me, and I remained there with the kings of Persia. Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befal thy people in the latter days.' Ver. 20. 'Then said he, Now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia:——

there

there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince.' Here it is very probable, that 'the prince of the kingdom of Persia' is one of those fallen angels, principalities and powers of darkness, who by divine permission governed the heathen nations, and were worshipped amongst them as gods; for the Apostle tells the Christians, that the 'Gentiles sacrificed to devils,' 1 Cor. x. 20. all under Satan their sovereign, who is the 'god of this world,' until Christ at his resurrection and ascension 'spoiled these principalities and powers,' and dispossessed them of their dominions, Col. ii. 15. and 'led them captive,' Psal. lxviii. 18. and took the heathen world 'for his possession,' and into his own government. It cannot be a good angel, because he withstood the good angel that was sent to Daniel with a divine commission twenty-one days; and because the angel who was sent to Daniel went afterwards to fight with this prince of Persia.

It is also very probable, that Michael is Jesus Christ, because he is called 'your prince,' that is, the Prince of the Jews, and one, or the 'first of the princes,' that is, the prime archangel.* And in Dan. xii. 1. he is called 'Michael the great prince, which standeth for the children of thy people,' that is, the Prince or 'King of the Jews,' for such was Jesus Christ under the ancient dispensation; this was the known character of the Messiah among the Jews; and as 'King of the Jews' he was sent into this world, then he 'came to his own, yet his own received him not.' John i. 11.

What confirms this sentiment is, that in Rev. xii. 7. when 'there was war in heaven, Michael and his

* Yet it has been observed, that though some of the fathers, and our later divines, speak of several archangels, the scripture uses the word but twice, viz. Jude 9. and 1 Thess. iv. 16. and both times in the singular number. Perhaps this Michael, i. e. Christ the King of the Jews, is the only archangel, or prince and head of all angels.

his angels fought against the dragon and his angels,' Christ as the head of the good angels, and satan as the head of the evil angels, maintained a war in heaven, i. e. in the church, till the 'great dragon was cast out' of the church, 'that old serpent called the devil and satan, which deceiveth the whole world.' Then follows 'a loud voice in heaven,' i. e. the church, 'saying, Now is come salvation and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ;' that is, the power of Michael prevailing over the dragon; 'for the accuser of the brethren, who accused them before God day and night, is cast down' by the prevalent intercession of Christ pleading for them, and by his dominion over all things, which God gave him at his ascension into heaven.

Amos vii. 7, 8. 'Behold the Lord stood upon a wall made by a plumb-line, with a plumb-line in his hand, and the Lord,' Jehovah 'said unto me, Amos, what seest thou? And I said, a plumb-line. Then said the Lord, Behold, I will set a plumb-line in the midst of my people Israel, and I will not again pass by them any more.' Here God appears evidently in a human figure to the prophet Amos, and the same human form seems to appear again to Amos, chap. ix. 1. 'I saw the Lord,' Jehovah, 'standing upon the altar, and he said, Smite the lintel of the door, that the posts may shake.' Ver. 2. 'Though they dig into hell, thence shall mine hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down. And to make it appear that *Jehovah* is the peculiar name of the great God, he repeats, ver. 6. what he had before said in chap. v. ver. 8. 'He that calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth; the Lord,' or Jehovah, 'is his name.'

In many of the writings of the prophets it is said, 'The Word of the Lord came unto them;' very frequently

quently to Ezekiel, and sometimes to Jeremiah and others; when there is no evidence of any personal appearances to them at that time; though it is not improbable but at some of those seasons our blessed Saviour, who is called the λογος, or the *Word of God*, might appear to them in a human form, and dictate a divine message. And some think those words of our Saviour, John x. 35. 'If he called them gods unto whom the Word of God came;' may have a reference to Christ's own appearance to the prophets, as this glorious person called the *Word*.

I do not remember any places which seem to favour this sentiment so much as these three, viz. 1. Gen. xv. 1. 'The Word of the Lord came unto Abraham in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abraham, I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward.' 2. Gen. xxxii. 24, 28. 'There wrestled a man with Jacob till the breaking of the day; and he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel.' Concerning which appearance, it is recorded, 1 Kings xviii. 31. 'The Word of the Lord came to Jacob, saying, Israel shall be thy name.' And 3. In the beginning of the book of Jonah, Chap. i. ver. 1, 2, 3. 'Now the Word of the Lord came unto Jonah the son of Amittai, saying, Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it. But Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord, and he found a ship, and went down into it to go unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord.' Now if Jonah had only an inward inspiration and no vision, how could he imagine that he could flee from this inspiration by changing his place? and why should it be expressed that 'he fled from the presence of the Lord,' unless God had manifested some visible presence to him?

Yet on the other hand, when I read, Micah i. 1. 'The word of the Lord which came unto Micah, which

which he saw concerning Samaria and Jerusalem ;' and when I read also, Amos i. 1. 'The words of Amos which he saw concerning Israel ;' I am a little inclined to think that this expression in Jonah might be an Hebrew idiom of speech among the prophets, attributing a sort of visible presence metaphorically to the 'word' or 'words of God' which came to them by inward inspiration, or perhaps by a voice : or it may be, the things themselves which they foretold, were represented to their imagination, and on this account the 'word' or 'words of God' may be represented as visible. But I leave this matter as a point of difficulty not sufficiently determined.

Zech. i. 7. 'In the second year of Darius came the word of the Lord unto Zechariah, saying,' ver. 8. 'I saw by night, and behold a man riding upon a red horse, and he stood amongst the myrtle trees, and behind him were red horses speckled and white.' Ver. 9. 'Then said I, O my Lord, what are these ? And the angel that talked with me said, I will shew thee what these be.' Ver. 10. 'And the man that stood among the myrtle trees said, These are they whom the Lord hath sent to walk to and fro through the earth.' Ver. 11. 'And they answered the angel of the Lord that stood among the myrtle trees, and said, We have walked to and fro through the earth, and behold all the earth sitteth still, and is at rest.' Ver. 12. 'Then the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these three-score and ten years ?' Ver. 13. 'And the Lord,' that is, Jehovah, 'answered the angel that talked with me with good words and comfortable words.' Ver. 14. 'So the angel that communed with me said unto me, Cry thou, saying, Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, I am jealous for Jerusalem,' &c. Here observe, this angel

angel of the Lord that ſtood among the myrtle trees had the form of a man, ver. 8. and is not called Jehovah. He ſeems to be our bleſſed Saviour interceding for Jeruſalem; for we do not find common angels introduced as interceſſors in ſcripture; 'there is but one mediator between God and man, the man Chriſt Jeſus.' And the Lord, or Jehovah, anſwered him comfortably. Perhaps this anſwer of the Lord, or Jehovah, was a voice without any figure or appearance: but after all, it is difficult preciſely to repreſent this whole ſcene, and to adjuſt every part of theſe tranſactions. There ſeems to us to be ſome confuſion in it, for want of knowing the various ways and methods of God's diſcovery of himſelf and his mind to the prophets.

Zech. iii. 1. 'And he' (that is, one of the angels whom he ſpake of, chap. ii. 4.) 'ſhewed me Joſhua the high prieſt ſtanding before the angel of the Lord, and ſatan ſtanding at his right hand to reſiſt him.' Ver. 2. 'And the Lord,' Jehovah 'ſaid to ſatan, the Lord,' Jehovah, 'rebuke thee, O ſatan, even the Lord,' Jehovah, 'that hath choſen Jeruſalem, rebuke thee.' Ver. 3. 'Now Joſhua was clothed with filthy garments, and ſtood before the angel.' Ver. 4. 'And he anſwered and ſpake unto thoſe that ſtood before him, ſaying, Take away the filthy garments from him; and unto Joſhua he ſaid, Behold I have cauſed thine iniquity to paſs from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment,' &c. Whether here was an appearance of Jehovah, or whether our Saviour appeared here only as a man or an angel, does not ſeem plainly determined by the words.

Having thus given a brief abridgment or hiſtorical narrative of the ſeveral appearances of God to men in the Old Teſtament, I proceed to make theſe few obſervations or remarks upon them, or rather to ſet forth in one ſhort view the occaſional obſervations which I made as I paſt along. I. It

I. It is evident that the great and blessed God appeared several times of old in the form of 'a bright cloud' or 'flame of fire,' and from this cloud or fire proceeded a voice, assuming the most glorious and awful names of God, viz. *the Lord*, *Jehovah*, *the God of Abraham*, *I am that I am*, &c. whence all that saw and heard it must naturally infer, that the great God dwelt in a most eminent manner, and resided in that bright cloud or fire.

II. Sometimes this great and blessed God appeared in the form of a man or an angel. And indeed when the apparition is called an angel, in several places, it was the real form of a man, because at first when the spectator saw it, he took it to be a man indeed. So 'Abraham saw three men,' so 'Jacob wrestled with a man,' so Joshua and Gideon and Manoah and his wife thought at first that they saw and spoke with a 'man,' who afterwards appeared to be an 'angel of the Lord.' But it is evident that the true God resided or dwelt in this man or this angel, because sometimes he calls himself God, and assumes the highest names and characters of Godhead; and sometimes the spectator calls him *Lord* or *Jehovah*, and *God*; and sometimes the sacred historian calls him *Jehovah* and *God*. And there are some instances wherein all these concur, as Gen. xxviii. and Gen. xxxii. compared with Hos. xi. and Exod. iii. Now if these things are a proof that the true God resided in the bright cloud or the fire, when he spoke from thence, it is at least as good a proof that the same great God resided in the angel to whom the same things are attributed.

III. There are several instances of the appearance of angels who do not assume to themselves any of the names or characters of God; so that it is evident that it was not the custom of common angels when sent by the great God to carry messages to men to assume

aſſume divine titles, or ſpeak with an air of divine authority in themſelves, without the preface of—'Thus ſaith the Lord:' but there was one angel peculiarly diſtinguiſhed from the reſt 'in whom the name of God was,' as Exod. xxiii. and who is properly called the 'angel of God's preſence.' Iſai. lxiii. and 'the preſence of God.' Exod. xxiii. and 'the angel' emphatically, as in Eccleſ. v. 6. and who is very probably the ſame with the meſſenger or 'angel of the covenant.' Mal. iii. 1. And this alſo was the common opinion of the ancient Jews, as is ſhewn in a Diſſertation on the *Logos*.

It may be further obſerved alſo under this head, that ſince our bleſſed Saviour, who is the 'angel of the covenant,' came in the fleſh, there have been many appearances of other angels, viz. to the ſhepherds, to Joſeph, to Chriſt himſelf: to the diſciples, viz. to women at the reſurrection of Chriſt, and men at his aſcenſion, to St. Peter, to St. Paul, to St. John, to Cornelius, and perhaps to others; but not one of them ever aſſumed the names, titles, characters, or worſhip belonging to God.

Thence we may confirm this inference, that the 'angel' who under the Old Teſtament aſſumed divine titles, and accepted religious worſhip, was that peculiar 'angel of God's preſence' in whom God reſided, or who was united to the Godhead in a peculiar manner, even the pre-exiſtent ſoul of Chriſt, who afterward took fleſh and blood upon him, and was called Jeſus Chriſt on earth.

And therefore ſince his incarnation no angel has ever appeared that durſt call himſelf God, and aſſume divine titles, or accept of worſhip; but has rather expreſsly forbid the worſhip of him; as Rev. xix. 10. and xxii. 9.

IV. It is very plain and obvious to every reader, that one of the moſt glorious and illuſtrious appari-

tions

tions of the great God (even that wherein the seraphs adore him as the 'Lord of the whole earth,' and who 'filled the earth with his glory,' and wherein Isaiah calls him, 'the King, the Lord of Hosts') is expressly applied to our Lord Jesus Christ in the New Testament, John xii. 'These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory and spake of him.' Now this may be a key to explain the rest, and makes it very probable that Christ was the person who thus often appeared.

V. It is generally agreed by all Christian writers, even from the most primitive times, that God, considered under the idea and character of paternity, and in the person of the Father, is always represented as invisible, 'whom no man hath seen nor can see:' but Jesus Christ is described as 'the image of the invisible God, the brightness of his Father's glory, the express image of his person,' he in whom the Father dwells. ('I am in the Father, and the Father in me.') He is that 'Word of God' by whom the great and blessed God manifests himself, and his mind and will, as a man manifests his mind or will by his word. He represents himself one with God the Father; 'I and the Father are one.' And St. Paul calls him 'God manifest in the flesh.' Now as the prophet Isaiah and the apostle John, compared together, assure us that Christ was the person who appeared in one of these most glorious and illustrious appearances of God under the Old Testament; so there is the most abundant probability from all these things considered, that Jesus Christ was that angel who generally appeared in ancient times to the patriarchs and to the Jews, assuming the peculiar and incommunicable names of God, and manifesting the invisible God to men.

That expression of St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 9. adds weight to this argument, 'Neither let us tempt Christ

Christ as some of them tempted, and were destroyed by serpents.' St. Paul well knew, that when God sent his angel to lead Israel in the wilderness, he bid them 'Beware of him, provoke him not, he will not pardon your sins, for my name is in him.' And the Apostle here seems plainly to refer to this same person, this angel, even Christ, whom they 'tempted' or 'provoked,' and he 'did not pardon' them, but sent 'serpents to destroy' them; and yet the person who was thus tempted and provoked, is also called the 'Lord God.' Deut. vi. 16. 'Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted him in Massah.'

VI. Thence also I think we may infer, that there is such a peculiar union between the great God and the man Jesus Christ, in his angelic, as well as in his incarnate state, as that he is properly represented as God-Man in one complex person. He that was 'the angel of the presence of God,' and in whom God dwelt under the ancient dispensations, has now took flesh and blood upon him, and is 'God manifest in the flesh;' he that is of 'the seed of David,' was and 'is God over all blessed for ever. Amen.'

To all this let me subjoin some testimonies, both of ancients and moderns, as they are cited by Bishop Bull in his Defence of the Nicene Faith, Sect. 1. Chap. 1. § 11.

Trypho, the Jew, in his dialogue with Justin Martyr maintains, that there were two present in the appearance made to Moses in the burning bush, viz. God and an angel; that the angel appeared in the flame of fire, and that God in the angel spake with Moses. To which Justin replies, that that may very well be granted according to the Christian doctrine. And indeed Trypho's opinion seems to have been generally received and approved amongst the more ancient Jews; for Stephen teaches us, it was an angel who appeared to Moses in the bush, Acts vii. 30.

and

and yet that God himself spake these words to Moses, ver. 31, 32, 33. 'I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham, &c. compare Exodus 3. 2. with ver. 4, 5, 6.

Athanasius, Orat. 4. *contra Arianos.* He that appeared was an angel, but God spoke in him.

Clemens Alexandrinus. The Son of God who led Moses was an angel, bringing with him the evangelical and principal power of the Word: a little after he adds, the *Logos*, or *Word*, was an angel: and he calls the Son of God *the mystical Angel.*

Austin contra *Maxim.* Lib. 3. says, I ask who appeared to Moses in the fire? The scripture itself declares it was an angel appeared; but that God was in that angel, who can doubt?

Gregory, in his preface to Job 2d, says, The angel who appeared to Moses is sometimes called an angel, and sometimes God; when he that speaks outwardly is governed by him that is within, he is called an *angel*, to signify his obedience, and the *Lord*, to denote the inspiration.

And Grotius himself, on Gal. iii. 19. confesses that he who gave the law in Sinai was a singular or special angel, attended by other angels; yet not a mere angel, but one with whom the Logos was present. Now it is well known, that by the *Logos*, Grotius means the *Divine Word*, or *Wisdom.*

SECT. II.

The Difficulties relating to this Account of the Appearances of God under the Old Testament, relieved and adjusted.

Object. 1. SINCE the true God appeared and resided in the fiery bush, in the flame on Mount Sinai, in the pillar of cloud and fire that conducted the

the Iſraelites, and in the bright light that ſhone ſometimes at the door of the tabernacle, and then dwelt on the mercy-ſeat between the cherubim; the Socinians ſay, Why may not any of theſe things be called the *true God*, or *Jehovah*, as well as the angel in whom God dwelt? And eſpecially ſince God ſpake out of the midſt of this cloud or fire, as well as he ſpake by the angel, ſo that all theſe were repreſentatives, ſymbols, or tokens of the preſence of the true God.

And this objection of the Socinians may be further enforced, when we conſider, that when this bright cloud moved, God is ſaid to move; where this bright cloud dwelt or reſted, God is ſaid to dwell or reſt. God himſelf is ſaid to 'go before the Iſraelites' in the wilderneſs when the cloud went before them. 'God dwelt in the buſh' when the fire was there. God is ſaid to 'dwell between the cherubim,' Pſal. lxxx. 1. becauſe the bright light was there. 'God is gone up with a ſhout, the Lord,' i. e. Jehovah, 'with the ſound of a trumpet,' Pſal. xlvii. 5. when the ark where God dwelt was carried up to Sion: and upon this occaſion David addreſſes God, Pſal. lxviii. 18. 'Thou haſt aſcended on high,' when the ark was carried up to the 'hill which God deſired to dwell in,' ver. 16. What more than this can be ſaid concerning the angel? Or what greater reaſons can be given why this angel ſhould be called God, rather than the cloud or fire, which alſo might be called God in a figurative ſenſe, becauſe they were ſymbols of the divine preſence?

Anſw. In order to ſet this matter in a true light, we may conſider the following things.

1. Whatſoever be our conception of the diſtinct perſonalities in the divine nature, yet the Godhead has been generally allowed to be one and the ſame in all the three perſons. If therefore Chriſt be God, he

he is the same one God as the Father, i. e. he has the same, and not another Godhead.

2. Whensoever this great God is said to appear in scripture, it is generally attributed to Jesus Christ, or the second person in the sacred Three. This is agreed both by Arians and Athanasians: and there is this reason for it, that God under the personality of the Father may always maintain the character of 'the invisible God.' The ancients of all parties were united in this sentiment.

3. God frequently manifested himself or appeared to men under the Old Testament in and by a corporeal resemblance, as inhabiting in a cloud, or light, or fire, and sometimes he manifested himself also to men as residing in or inhabiting a man or an angel under the Old Testament; for so he appeared to Abraham, to Jacob, &c. Whatsoever created being God resided in, this was called the Shechinah, or habitation of God. If it was a bright light or fire, it was a corporeal Shechinah. If it was a man or an angel, it might be called an intellectual Shechinah, and most probably in an human form.*

4. Whatsoever

* The Hebrew word *Shechinah* signifies a habitation or dwelling, and it was the name which the ancient Jews gave to that bright cloud or fire wherein God dwelt upon the ark between the cherubim, and in which he often appeared to the patriarchs and to Moses. They also gave the same name of Shechinah to the glorious Spirit in and by which God acted or manifested himself to men, whether in a visible or invisible manner; that is, whether he came with a cloud of light, or with a voice, or only by silent and secret influences: for they call this Shechinah by the names of *Mamre*, *Logos*, or *the Word of God*, and they not only suppose this Shechinah to take possession of the tabernacle and the temple, and to reside there in the form of light, but it was a saying among them, 'That where two or three are met together to read or study the law, the Shechinah is with them,' (though in an invisible manner;) which is parallel to the words of Christ, 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,' Matt. xviii. 20. See Dissert. 4. on the *Logos*, Sect. iii. p. 25.

4. Whatsoever habitation God assumed, that habitation itself (whether corporeal or intellectual) is not called God merely upon the account that God resided there, unless you include also the divine inhabitant, that is, God himself: So that neither the cloud, nor the bush, nor the fire, nor the man, or angel, are ever represented as God, or called Jehovah, without including the idea of that Godhead that resided or inhabited in them. So when it is said, 'God is gone up with a shout,' Psal. xlvii. it doth not mean merely the ark which was carried up to Zion, but God dwelling on the ark of the mercy-seat. And in the same manner the gestures, motions and appearances are ascribed to God, which were visible in that body in which God at that time resided, and which he made the symbol of his presence: but this body is never called God when taken alone, without including the present Godhead or almighty Spirit residing there.

5. Hence it will follow, that the words *God*, *Lord*, *Almighty*, *Jehovah*, which are used in Scripture on these occasions, are not sunk into a figurative or diminutive sense on purpose to be applied metaphorically to a cloud, a fire, or an angel, as a resemblance or emblem of the true God, or as a symbol of his presence; but these divine names and titles are preserved in their original and most sublime and divine sense, and applied to God himself, considered in and together with these his habitations or places of residence.

6. It is very probable that the great God never resided (if I may so speak) immediately in any corporeal habitation without the medium of an angelic * or

* Note, Though in several places I represent Christ in his pre-existent state as an angel according to scripture, yet I always suppose this pre-existent soul of Christ to be a proper human spirit, i. e. such a spirit as by its own nature is suited to act in vital union with a

or intellectual being by whom he spoke and acted, and by whom he moved this corporeal habitation as he pleased. We have good reason to suppose that the 'angel of God's presence,' the 'angel of the covenant,' 'the angel in whom was the name of God,' was still the more immediate Shechinah or residence of God, whether he dwelt mediately in a cloud, or light, or fire, or a human shape. And on this account in the narration of the same transaction it is expressed sometimes that the 'angel of the Lord appeared,' and sometimes the 'Lord God' himself 'appeared,' ex. gr. to Moses in the bush, to Abraham, &c. The names *God*, or the *Lord*, or the *angel*, are used promiscuously in these narratives.

Thus it was not properly the cloud, light, or fire, but the angel who was intimately and immediately united to Godhead; and it was this angel who assumed the names, titles and characters of *God*, *Lord*, and *Jehovah:* for we may reasonably suppose that the union between God and this glorious angel, (that is, the pre-existent soul of Jesus Christ in its non-incarnate or angelic state) was incomparably more near and intimate than the union of the great God with a pillar of cloud or fire: and upon this account

human animal body. These things are proved at large in the last of these discourses. The reason why he is called an angel, is partly because he was then an unbodied spirit, and lived as angels do, not united to an animal body; and partly because he was sent as the Father's messenger, which is the meaning of the word *angel* in the original languages, Greek and Hebrew.

Note further, That this does not at all hinder the human soul of Christ from having intellectual capacities and powers vastly superior to any other human soul, or to any angel in heaven, even as the capacities and intellectual powers of one man are vastly superior to another, as the soul of Milton or Sir Isaac Newton to an ideot; and especially while we consider this human soul as constantly inhabited by, and personally united to the eternal Godhead, we have abundant reason to suppose his human faculties superior to those of any other creature.

account the angel may be called God in a more proper manner than the fire, cloud or bush could ever be, because of the intimacy of the union which made God and this angel one complex person.

7. None of the corporeal appearances, or habitations of God, viz. the cloud, the light, the fire, are said in scripture to speak to man, it is only said, that 'God spake out of them.' The cloud, the fire, the bush, are never said to assume these names or titles, 'I am the Lord, I am God Almighty, I am the God of Israel.' But now the angel who appeared speaks to men, and he assumes these divine names and titles in the Old Testament, as is abundantly evident in Exod. iii. and in other places; and so doth Jesus Christ in the New Testament, Rev. i. and ii. and iii. 'I am the Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last,' &c. Thence we may justly infer, there was a nearer and more intimate union, between the Godhead and that angel than between God and the cloud, or fire, &c. even such an union as may be called personal, whereby God and the angel may be looked upon as one complex intelligent agent or person; and thus Christ may be called (as I remember one or more of those learned writers have called him) the God-Angel, before he was complete God-Man.

8. None of these corporeal appearances or habitations of God, neither the cloud, nor the fire, nor the bright light, are expressly and directly called *God* by the holy writers in a categorical and express manner. He is 'Emanuel,' or 'God with us:' He is 'Jehovah our righteousness:' He is 'God over all, blessed for ever:' which further shews a more intimate union between the Godhead and the man Jesus, than there was between God and the cloud or fire; and it shews also that Christ is a complex person or God-Man.

9. Obſerve alſo, that God did not always or conſtantly dwell in the ſame corporeal habitation, i. e. cloud, or fire, but God conſtantly reſided in this 'angel of the covenant,' this 'angel of his preſence,' who was his own Son. He kept the ſame intellectual habitation always, though he frequently changed his corporeal habitation. God, who was always united to this unbodied human ſpirit or angel, did alſo ſometimes aſſume a cloud, a fire, a buſh, or the figure of a man, to appear in under the Old Teſtament, but it was only for a ſeaſon; and theſe were only ſo many different *præludiums* to his future incarnation, or dwelling in fleſh: ſo that the angel of God's preſence, or human ſoul of Chriſt in his angelic ſtate, who was the conſtant Shechinah or habitation of the Godhead, was 'one with God,' and might be much better called God than the cloud or fire, which were but occaſional habitations.

10. When this glorious angel, (the human ſpirit or ſoul of Chriſt) together with his divine inhabitant the indwelling Godhead, deſcended from his angelic ſtate, and was made actual 'partaker of fleſh and blood,' he was then 'made a little lower than the angels,' Heb. ii. 9. He took human fleſh into a conſtant partnerſhip of his perſon, and became a man. 'The Word' who 'was God, was made fleſh,' John i. 1, 14. This never was ſaid, nor could it ever properly be ſaid, concerning the cloud or the fire. When God was manifeſt in the fleſh, this fleſh was united into one perſon with the angel, and became the human or bodily Shechinah, or conſtant habitation of God. 'In him dwelt all the fulneſs of the Godhead bodily.' Col. ii. Then Jeſus Chriſt, who was in all former ages the God-Angel in a proper and complete ſenſe, became God-Man.

Though the cloud or the fire could not properly be called God, becauſe they were not thus united into

to one person with God, nor in the angel in whom God dwelt, yet the man Jesus, as united in a personal manner to the divine nature, might properly be called the true God. It could not be said concerning the cloud or fire, that they were assumed to be parts of the person of Christ, but it might be said concerning this angel, i. e. the soul of Christ, and concerning his body, they were parts of his complex person; and thus Christ in his complex person hath the names of Deity and humanity given him; he that is of 'the seed of David after the flesh,' is God over all, blessed for evermore. Amen.' Rom. ix. 3, 4, 5.

Object. 2. Doth not the Apostle to the Hebrews, chap. i. ver. 1, 2. sufficiently intimate, that this angel by whom God conversed with men was not his own Son Jesus, when he says, 'God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son?' Does not this imply that God did not speak 'by his Son' under the Old Testament?

Anf. 1. We may answer this difficulty thus: Though the angel who revealed the will of God to the patriarchs and prophets was really Jesus Christ the Son of God, yet he then spake by a corporeal medium and organs, which he assumed for that occasion to form a voice, which medium was not part of his person, or personally united to him: therefore the Son of God did not speak immediately to men by himself, i. e. by his own person, but spake by the prophets, and by corporeal shapes, &c. Yet when he assumed flesh and blood actually into a personal union with himself, when he made this flesh a part of his person, and became a complete man by a miraculous conception, then he was more completely the Son of God both in soul and body, and then as

the

the Son of God he ſpake immediately by himſelf, by his own complete perſon, (i. e. ſoul and body) to mankind; or God ſpake to mankind by the very perſon of his Son, which was never done in the ſame manner under the Old Teſtament.

Nor is this any ſtrange expoſition, for the ancient fathers are wont to ſpeak to the ſame purpoſe: Juſtin Martyr ſpeaks thus in his apology, "The Word foretold things to come by the prophets heretofore, but when he was made like unto us, he taught us theſe things by himſelf." So Clemens Alexandrinus ſays, "The Lord was truly the inſtructor of the ancient people by Moſes, but he is the guide of his new people by himſelf face to face." See Biſhop Bull's Defence of the Nicene faith, Sect. i. Chap. i.

Anſ. 2. But I give yet a further anſwer to this objection in the following manner, viz. Though the angel by whom God ſpake to the prophets and to the patriarchs was really Jeſus Chriſt or the Son of God, yet he did not appear at that time under his filial character as God's own Son, but he appeared in his angelic character, or as a heavenly meſſenger, which was ſuited to the pre-exiſtent ſtate of the ſoul of Chriſt; whereas under the New Teſtament God ſpeaks to us by his Son Jeſus Chriſt under the ſpecial and known character of 'his own Son,' as being now revealed to have been the 'only begotten Son of God' in his pre-exiſtent ſtate, John i. 14, 18. and as having a more conſpicuous or ſenſible character of his divine Sonſhip added to him, by his being born of a virgin without an earthly father, by the immediate influence of the Spirit of God, Luke i. 35. and was named the Son of God on this account; and had alſo a further claim to this honourable title, *Son of God*, when he was raiſed from the dead, as St. Paul explains that expreſſion of the Pſalmiſt, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,' Pſalm ii. 6. compared

compared with Acts xiii. 33. and is therefore called by the same Apostle, 'The first-born from the dead,' Col. i. 15. It is plain, therefore, that though Christ was the Son of God in his pre-existent state, yet he appeared and acted rather under the character of an angel of old, and not under the character of a Son till the days of the gospel.

It is the frequent custom of scripture to speak of things as they appear to men, and not always just as they are in themselves, for this is most suited to the bulk of mankind. Therefore the scripture speaks of the 'sun's rising and going down' and its 'rejoicing to run a race,' and of the 'heavens being fixed upon pillars,' &c. which are all modes of expression according to appearance, and not according to the reality of things. So when the angel who is called God, 'wrestled with Jacob,' it is said, 'a man wrestled with him,' because he appeared as a man. Gen. iii. 24. So 'three men came to Abraham,' Gen. xviii. 2. because they appeared as men, though one of them afterward evidently was known to be God, and the other two were angels. And so Christ never appearing to the patriarchs and prophets, and instructing them under the character of the Son of God in the Old Testament; and being much unknown to the world under that name, it was no wonder that the Apostle should represent God as beginning to speak to us 'by his Son' under the New Testament.* This method of solving the difficulty will have an happy influence also to remove the following objection.

Object. 3. Though this angel spake oftentimes in the name of God under the Old Testament, though he

* The Arians themselves in their scheme seem to be as much puzzled with this difficulty, how to suppose that Christ as an angel gave the law, and yet that God spake not by his Son till under the gospel: and some of them are forced to accept of this sort of solution. See *Modest Plea*, Part I. So that they have no reason to object it against us.

he aſſumed the glorious titles of God, and ſpoke words which muſt properly belong to God, yet it does not follow, that this angel was the true God, or that there was any ſuch perſonal union between the divine nature and this angel, becauſe there are other inſtances wherein the titles and names of God are aſſumed, and words proper to God are ſpoken, wherein it is very evident from ſcripture that God was not the ſpeaker. Conſider what the ſcripture declares concerning the giving of the law at Mount Sinai: It is expreſsly ſaid, Exod. xx. 1, 2. And 'God ſpake all theſe words, ſaying, I am the Lord thy God,' &c. Yet St. Stephen tells them, Acts vii. 53. 'They received the law by the diſpoſition of angels.' And St. Paul, Gal. iii. 19. ſays, 'The law was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.' And Heb. ii. 2. it is expreſsly called, 'The word ſpoken by angels,' and diſtinguiſhed from the 'word ſpoken by Chriſt.' '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 firſt began to be ſpoken by the Lord?' Now if the words at the giving of the law were ſpoken either by the perſon of the Father, or by the perſon of the Son of God, then the Apoſtle's argument is loſt, ſince it is built upon this ſuppoſition, that the goſpel is publiſhed by a perſon ſuperior to him, or them, who publiſhed the law. But the Apoſtle's argument is certainly ſtrong, and thence it will follow, that the angel who ſpoke the law was neither God himſelf, nor Jeſus Chriſt, and yet he aſſumes divine language, 'I am the Lord thy God,' &c.

Anſ. It was not only the ſenſe of all the ancient writers, the moſt primitive fathers of the Chriſtian church, but it is allowed by moſt of the Arians themſelves who make this objection, that Chriſt himſelf was preſent at Sinai, and was employed in giving the law.

law. Pſal. lxviii. 17. 'The Lord is among them as in Sinai,' even he who 'aſcended on high, and led captivity captive.' Eph. iv. Now the law may ſtill be ſaid to be 'given,' declared or publiſhed 'by angels' who attended by thouſands as miniſtering ſpirits on the Lord Chriſt, and yet the words might be ſpoken by Chriſt himſelf, the great God-Man, or God-Angel, (or the 'angel in whom God dwelt') at the head of them; for he appeared there, not as the Son of God, (for he was then utterly unknown under that filial name or character) but he appeared in his angelic character as the great, the peculiar, the extraordinary 'angel' or meſſenger 'of the covenant,' the 'angel of God's preſence,' the 'angel who ſpake to Moſes in Mount Sinai,' Acts i. 7, 8. and ſpake to the people alſo, as the 'angel in whom God dwelt,' or (which is much the ſame) as the great God dwelling in an angel.

Now in the New Teſtament, when this glorious perſon appeared amongſt men as the Son of God, when he was diſcovered to be ſo in his body by his extraordinary conception, Luke i. 35. when he was further made the Son of God by his being 'begotten from the dead,' as St. Paul explains David, Acts xiii. 33. Col. i. 18. and declared 'with power to be the Son of God by his reſurrection from the dead,' Rom. i. 4. when he was preached by the Apoſtles as the 'only begotten Son of God,' both in his incarnate and in his pre-exiſtent ſtate, John i. 14, 18. he ſuſtains hereby a ſuperior character to that of an angel, a ſervant, or mere meſſenger of God, even that of 'God's own Son:' and if 'the word ſpoken by angels,' (or by Chriſt himſelf in his angelic ſtate and character, attended by miniſtering angels) if this 'word be ſtedfaſt,' and if all tranſgreſſions againſt it were ſeverely puniſhed, 'how ſhall we eſcape if we neglect ſo great a ſalvation, which began to be ſpoken

ken by the Lord?' i. e. by the same angel in his character of Lordship, since he appeared to be God's own Son, and the Heir and Lord of all, not as an angel or messenger, but as sovereign Lord of his church. The very same person may have much greater authority and influence when he sustains a new and superior character.

Perhaps you will say then, Why did not the Apostle represent it thus? If Christ was that angel, why does he so apparently distinguish him from the 'angels who spake the law?' I answer, Because, though the Apostle might know he was the same person, yet the bulk of the people to whom he wrote might not know it, nor understand these distinct characters of the same person, and it would take up too much time and pains to prove that notion to them in that place, nor would it answer any valuable purpose at that time sufficient for such a digression.

That Christ himself was the speaker of the law at Mount Sinai, may be further evinced out of Heb. xii. 25, 26. 'See that ye refuse not him that speaketh,' that is, Christ; 'for if they escaped not that refused him that spake on earth,' i. e. Moses, ('for he that despised Moses's law died without mercy) much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven,' that is, Christ; for it was he who came personally down from heaven, which Moses did not; and it was he who after his death spake by an audible voice to St. Paul from heaven, and by his Spirit to all the Apostles. Christ therefore is he that speaketh from heaven.*

Now

* A great and ingenious writer has very lately, in his *Essay on the various Dispensations of God*, p. 135—141. asserted, that he who 'spoke on earth,' means not Moses, but Christ himself, in his pre-existent state under the character of an angel; and that he who 'now speaks from heaven' is the same person, even Christ, under the exalted and superior character of a Son; this is very agreeable to the sentiments

Now it follows, ver. 26. 'Whoſe voice then ſhook the earth,' that is, the voice of Chriſt, and not Moſes, which ſhook Mount Sinai, which 'quaked greatly when the Lord,' or Jehovah, 'deſcended upon it in the fire.' Exod. xix. 18. And it is the ſame perſon who in Haggai ii. 6. hath now promiſed (as the Apoſtle cites them) ſaying, 'Yet once more I ſhake not the earth only, but alſo the heavens;' and the prophets tell us, this is the Lord of Hoſts. The perſon therefore who ſpake at Mount Sinai, was both Chriſt and the Lord of Hoſts.

Thus we ſee that the author of the epiſtle to the Hebrews, is ſo far from denying that Chriſt ſpake heretofore in giving the law, that he declares, 'it was his voice that ſhook the earth' at Mount Sinai: and by this view of things it appears, that we have no need to allow common angels to aſſume the name, title and words of the great God to themſelves. And thus the argument ſtands firm ſtill, whereby we prove that this 'angel of the covenant,' Chriſt Jeſus, is God himſelf, is intimately and perſonally united to Godhead, and is one with God, becauſe he aſſumes divine names and titles, and ſpeaks the words which can belong only to God.

It might be added alſo, that it is expreſſed ſo often and ſo ſtrongly by the ſacred hiſtorian, that 'God ſpake the words' of the law, that the Iſraelites 'heard God ſpeaking to them out of the fire,' and that it 'was the voice of God,' that 'out of heaven God made them to hear his voice,' and that they might know that 'Jehovah he is God in heaven above,' Exod. xx. Deut. iv. 10, 12, 33—39. that all things concur

timents advanced under the anſwers to the ſecond and third objection; and perhaps may be the very truth. But ſtill it is Chriſt who is that Jehovah, who ſpake in fire, and 'ſhook the earth' at Mount Sinai, and who 'now ſpeaks from heaven.' This that learned author maintains againſt Mr. Pierce with great evidence, p. 136—144. and againſt another conſiderable writer, p. 146—156.

concur to perſuade us that the angel who ſpake the words was alſo Jehovah, or the God of Iſrael.

Object. 4. Is there any neceſſity that we ſhould ſuppoſe God himſelf to be thus perſonally united to this angel who appeared under the Old Teſtament? Is it not ſufficient to ſuppoſe, that a glorious angel might come as a repreſentative and deputy of the great God? and being clothed with divine authority, and repreſenting the ſacred majeſty of God, might he not aſſume the incommunicable names and titles and worſhip of God, as being God's repreſentative or ambaſſador to the children of men?

And this objection is yet enforced from this conſideration, that ſome perſons have pretended, that in the eaſtern parts ſuch as delivered meſſages from others, did uſe to ſpeak in the ſame manner as thoſe very perſons would have done in whoſe name they came, for which ſome have cited one or two hiſtorical paſſages out of the bible.

Anſ. See this ſort of objection very well anſwered by the ingenious Mr. John Hughes, of Ware, in his remarks on Dr. Bennet's Diſcourſe on the Trinity, p. 47. And many other authors treating on this ſubject, have given ſome good ſolutions to this pretence. The ſubſtance of what I have to ſay at preſent is chiefly borrowed from others, and ſhall be diſpoſed under the following heads, whereby I think this difficulty will be effectually removed.

1. The inſtances which have been brought from the ſcripture hiſtory of "meſſengers ſpeaking in the name of their principals, without any diſtinguiſhing preface," have been happily expounded in another manner by learned critics, ſo as to cut off all pretences of this kind, and all foundation for this objection, which would be too large to repeat at preſent. See Mr. Hughes's remarks.

2. Suppoſing

2. Supposing that such a conduct might be customary between man and man in common affairs of life, yet when was it known that the ambassador of an earthly monarch ever took so much upon him, or spoke in this language? What ambassador ever said, *I am the king of France or Spain*, or, *I am the king of Egypt or of Babylon?* What ambassador did ever receive such honours, as that his master could receive no higher if he were personally present? What prince would ever endure any thing like this to be done by or to his representative? When Rabshakeh was sent with a threatening commission from Nebuchadnezzar, he does not himself assume the words of his prince, Isai. xxxvi. 4, 12, 13. for 'Rabshakeh said, Thus saith the great king, the king of Assyria, What confidence is this wherein thou trustest?' and again, 'Hear ye the words of the great king, the king of Assyria:' and again, 'My master hath sent me to speak these words.' Thus neither in eastern nor western nations do we find ambassadors use the style and assume the name and honour of their princes to themselves: and who can believe that the only ambassador that calls himself by his master's name, assumes his master's titles and style to himself, and receives the homage that is due to him, should be the ambassador of the great God, the Creator and Lord of the world? But this leads me to the third consideration.

3. If this were ever practised by the ambassadors of earthly princes, yet it would by no means follow, that a messenger from the great and eternal God, the King of heaven, should personate this great God himself in delivering his errands, without any evident hints to distinguish the ambassador from God himself. There is an infinite distance between the great God and a mere creature, even the most excellent creature, and that when it is employed as an ambassador

ſador for God. There is ſome proportion between the higheſt prince and the loweſt of mankind; and therefore, though one man may perſonate another, yet no creature can with ſafety to God's honour or to man's duty perſonate the great God. There is a much greater danger in miſtaking a creature for God, and paying that worſhip to a creature which is appropriated to God, than there is in miſtaking the meaneſt man for the greateſt monarch: one would be a miſdemeanor between man and man, the other ſeems to be plain idolatry, and paying the peculiar honours of God to a creature.

And yet ſuch a miſtake ſeems to be unavoidable, if a creature might thus aſſume divine names and titles to himſelf: for it may readily be ſuppoſed that God himſelf might alſo aſſume a viſible appearance like that of an angel, and by conſequence, without an expreſs revelation, in ſuch a caſe, it would be impoſſible to diſtinguiſh the one from the other, i. e. to know which was God in the form of an angel, and which was the angel perſonating God. Now in this view of things, religious worſhip muſt have been either neglected to the real Deity, or elſe muſt have been paid to an angel. Therefore it ſeems no way likely that the great God, who is all-wiſe and all-good, ſhould ſo little conſult his own honour, or the happineſs and duty of mankind, as to indulge ſuch a miſtake, or to lay unavoidable foundations for it, and temptations to it.

4. If it were poſſible in the nature of things, that the great God ſhould depute a creature for his ambaſſador or repreſentative, and give him a commiſſion to aſſume divine titles, and to receive divine worſhip, yet God ſeems to have declared in his word that 'he will not do it,' for he hath declared himſelf to be a jealous God, jealous of his own name and honour, and to that degree, that he borrows one of his glori-

ous

ous titles from this his jealousy, Exod. xxxiv. 14. 'Thou shalt worship no other God, for the Lord thy God, whose name is JEALOUS, is a jealous God.' See Exod. xx. 5. Deut. iv. 24. and v. 9. and vi. 15. And he is resolved he will not give away his name and glory, nor the glory of his name to any other being. Isai. xlii. 8. 'I am Jehovah, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another.' Mankind who are led by their senses are so prone to idolatry, that they have been always very ready to take occasion to idolize and worship any sensible appearances which have looked any thing like divine; and the great God our Creator knows our infirmity, and therefore he hath declared, that he 'would not give his name and glory to another,' especially not to any sensible appearance, lest he should give too strong a temptation to men to practise idol-worship, and pay divine honours to a creature.

5. Mr. Hughes, in his dispute with Dr. Bennet on this subject, p. 53, declares, that, "after all that flourish the Doctor had made upon this notion of his, that "divine angels were wont to personate the Deity," he hath not in reality furnished out one single proof thereof: his instances among men being mere oversights, and his instances among the angels are by himself declared to be meant only of Christ, the 'angel of the covenant,' the 'angel of God's presence.' He acknowledges it was Christ who personated the Divine Majesty at those times, which we do not find (saith he) that any other angel ever did, though so many of them have been employed as the very or true God's ambassadors to men."

6. The ancient Jews would by no means allow of this notion of a mere angel's assuming the names and titles of God. It is plain by the opinion of Trypho, which Justin Martyr relates, that the ancient Jews supposed "God himself to be present with this angel;"

gel;" for that they never dared to imagine that a mere angel would call himſelf the God of Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob, and would admit ſuch divine honours as Moſes and Abraham and Joſhua paid to him in the name of God. "Such an opinion was too abſurd and horrid for them to entertain," as Biſhop Bull expreſſes it; and he adds, "It is a ſort of impiety to imagine that angels would ever aſſume ſuch a dignity, or that God would communicate his incommunicable name to them, or any authority for ſuch a repreſentation of himſelf, in which a mere creature aſſumed to himſelf all thoſe things which belonged to God."

The learned Camero, in his Annotations on the Hebrews, Chap. ii. ver. 2. very well expreſſes it; "Though lawyers may put on the perſons of their clients, yet it was never heard that an ambaſſador when he delivers the commands of his prince, ever ſpoke otherwiſe than in the third perſon, My prince ſpeaks this. The prophets give us an illuſtrious teſtimony of this matter, who continually introduce this ſolemn form, *Thus ſaith the Lord.* And in viſions angels profeſs themſelves to be ſent of God." Grotius himſelf confeſſes, that it "was not a mere angel gave the law in Sinai, but an angel with whom the *Logos*, or Divine Word, was preſent."

This objection has been indeed carried on further by a late ingenious writer, by way of ſimilitude. "Suppoſe we hear of king George's ſpeech to the parliament, we know that king George doth not ſpeak it himſelf, but gives the ſpeech to my Lord Chancellor, and he reads it: now if a man, upon hearing my Lord Chancellor ſpeak thoſe words to the parliament, ſhould conclude that he is king George, he would certainly be miſtaken:" and therefore though an angel who repreſents God aſſumes divine titles, we cannot infer that he is God.

Anſ.

Anſ. 1. It is ſufficiently and publickly known, that King George gives the ſpeech to my Lord Chancellor, and that King George himſelf alſo is preſent there, and viſible on the throne; and on both theſe accounts there is no manner of danger of our miſtaking the one for the other. But if King George were inviſible, or did not appear, and my Lord Chancellor, arrayed in royal robes, aſſumed the title and uſed the very words of the King, without any preface or intimation that King George ſent him to ſpeak thus, how ſhould any ſtrangers know (unleſs they were told) that this was not the King himſelf? And how could the people of Iſrael know, that it was not God who ſpoke the words of the law to them, when the bright array, and the title of God are aſſumed, and the language is properly the language of God.

But I add, ſecondly, if the Lord Chancellor not only ſpoke words belonging to the King without any ſuch preface, as, *Thus ſaith the King*; if he not only aſſumed the proper name and the titles of King George, the King himſelf being abſent or inviſible, but if the hiſtorians alſo declared that it was King George that ſpoke theſe words; if they called it the voice of King George, and if the ſpectators called him King, addreſſed to him as King, and worſhipped him as ſuch, would there not be abundant ground for a moſt pernicious miſtake among all thoſe who in after-ages ſhould read this hiſtory? Now this is the preſent caſe; Jehovah or God himſelf is inviſible, and was not ſeen by eyes of fleſh; and not only the angel who appeared in the Old Teſtament aſſumed the divine names and titles of Jehovah or God himſelf, without any diſtinguiſhing preface of *Thus ſaith the Lord*, but the ſacred hiſtorian declares to us, it was 'God appeared,' and it was 'God ſpake,' it was 'the voice of God,' even of Jehovah, the God

of Israel; and the persons also with whom he conversed, viz. Abraham, Moses, and the children of Israel, &c. called him *God* and *Lord*, and worshipped him as such. Now let us put all these things together, and there seems to be an unavoidable occasion given for a very dangerous mistake to all the readers of this history, if God himself, even Jehovah, the God of Israel, did not appear, if the angel who appeared and spake was not so inhabited by God, so united to God and so intimately one with God, as to lay a foundation for all this representation of things.

All these considerations joined together in this view, appear to me richly sufficient to answer the present objection, and to preclude the notion of a common angel sent in the name of God and assuming the peculiar titles of Godhead. Surely this angel or spirit was God himself, i. e. was intimately and personally united to the God of Israel, and thereby became one complex person in two distinct natures, one common principle of intelligent action, and had a right to those divine titles according to the forms of language in all nations.

Object. V. Though it should be allowed that God was present with this angel, and resided in him, and spake by him, yet is this sufficient to make a personal union between God and the angel? or is it ground enough to say that God and the angel were one complex person?

Answ. The most common and most familiar idea that we have of a complex person, is human nature or man, who is made up of a soul and body. Let us now consider whether most of those mutual relations or communications between soul and body which render man a complex person, are not found in this glorious person composed of the great God and this angel.

Has the body of a man a nearer relation to his soul than any other body in the world? So had this angel

angel a nearer relation to God than any other creature whatsoever. Is the soul said to inhabit the body or reside in it constantly during the whole term of life? So did God constantly reside in this glorious angel. Does the soul influence the body to its chief human actions? So did God influence this angel. Is the body the constant and immediate instrument of the soul, whereby it speaks and acts and conveys its mind to men? Such was this angel to the great God, who dwelt in him. Is the body obedient to the volitions of the indwelling soul? Much more is this angel to the indwelling God. Is the soul immediately conscious of many of the motions of the body? Much more is God immediately conscious of every motion, action and occurrence that relates to this angel? Are the properties and actions of the body sometimes attributed to the soul, and the properties and actions of the soul sometimes to the body, in the common language of men? So in the language of scripture, the names, titles and properties of the great God are attributed to this angel; the appearances, speeches, voice, words, motions and actions of this angel are attributed to God. And if man upon these accounts be called a complex person, made up of soul and body, for the same reason we may suppose that the great God and this 'angel of his presence,' make up a complex person also; and this is properly called a personal union.

Object. VI. If it was Christ himself who spoke to Moses, Deut. xviii. 18. when 'the Lord said, I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee;' if it was Christ himself said in Exod. xxiii. 20. 'Behold I send an Angel before thee, beware of him, provoke him not, for my name is in him;' if it was Christ who spake to the prophets, 'Behold, saith the Lord, I will raise up to David a righteous Branch.' Jer. xxiii. 5. And if Christ be

this very 'Prophet,' this 'Angel,' this 'righteous Branch,' then it muſt be interpreted that Chriſt ſays, 'I will raiſe up' myſelf 'a Prophet,' &c. 'I will ſend' myſelf 'an Angel before thee,' and 'I will raiſe up' myſelf 'a righteous Branch to David;' which ſeem to be ſtrange ſort of interpretations.

Anſw. If we conſider that throughout all the Old Teſtament our bleſſed Saviour is ſuppoſed to be a complex perſon, and if we conceive of him as the ſoul of Chriſt in its angelic ſtate united to and inhabited by God himſelf, it is very eaſy to ſuppoſe this glorious perſon ſpeaking in the name of the indwelling Godhead, which is his ſuperior nature, and foretelling futurities concerning himſelf in his inferior nature, and declaring what he ſhould be in his inferior economical characters. Or we may ſuppoſe the angel in whom God dwelt, ſpeaks in the name of God the Father, as the great fountain and author of all; and yet this angel may foretel his own future appearances and tranſactions as an 'Angel,' as a 'Prophet,' as a 'Branch of righteouſneſs,' as the 'Servant' and 'Meſſenger' of God the Father, and the appointed 'Mediator' between God and man. Here is no manner of darkneſs nor difficulty in theſe ideas, nor has this interpretation any thing ſtrange or harſh in it.

Object. VII. If this angel who appeared and aſſumed divine names and titles, were ſo really and intimately united to the true God, as to become one complex perſon, and all this were ſo plain and ſo evident as you repreſent it to be; then the Jewiſh church could not but have as clear a knowledge as we have of this doctrine, that the two perſons, viz. the Father and the Son, were the one true God; and then the knowledge of this article is not the peculiar privilege of Chriſtians.

Anſw. I am perſuaded that ſome of the ancient Jews and the patriarchs did believe that this was an angel

angel in whom the great God or Jehovah reſided or inhabited in a peculiar manner: particularly when Jacob ſaid, 'I have ſeen God,' when 'Moſes was afraid to look upon God,' when Abraham ſpoke to him as to the great God: but there were ſeveral things wherein their light was deficient and very imperfect if compared with ours.

1. The patriarchs might not know that this angel in whom God dwelt, and who was thus united to God, was Chriſt the Son of God, or the Meſſiah, the great Mediator between God and men appointed for the reconciliation and ſalvation of the world.

2. They might not know whether this union between God and the angel was conſtant, or only occaſional. Though they might ſuppoſe him to be an angel of ſuperior rank, by his being made ſuch a glorious medium of God's converſing and tranſacting with men at ſpecial ſeaſons, yet they might not know that he was aſſumed into ſo conſtant and everlaſting an union, and withal ſo very near and ſo very intimate, that this complex perſon ſhould be called 'God over all bleſſed for evermore,' and that there ſhould be a conſtant and mutual communication of properties between the one and the other in ſpeaking or writing of them.

3. The Jews in the days of the prophets did not know half ſo many texts of the Old Teſtament to belong to Chriſt as the apoſtles have taught us.

4. I might add alſo, that the Jewiſh writers in later ages by degrees came to obtain a confuſed notion of God's tranſacting his affairs with men, and manifeſting himſelf to them, by his *Logos* or *Word*, which ſometimes they interpreted as his own eſſential wiſdom, or the idea, ſcheme, decree of all things that was in God; and ſometimes they made it to ſignify a very glorious angel, the firſt-born of every creature, in whom God dwelt, and by whom he tranſacted his

his affairs with the children of men. And though they had not the ſame clear and diſtinct ideas of theſe matters as the New Teſtament reveals to us concerning the union of God and man in one complex perſon, yet in their writings there appear many hints and intimations of this kind, as I have proved in a diſſertation on the Logos.

And indeed I know not any thing beſides this ſuppoſition that can give ſo fair and reaſonable an account how it comes to paſs that both the Gentiles and Jews, in the firſt age of Chriſtianity, did not raiſe perpetual objections againſt the doctrine of Chriſt's Deity, i. e. his being ſometimes repreſented under the characters and names of the true God; and why they did not always quarrel with the apoſtles for citing ſuch texts of ſcripture as plainly refer to the true and eſſential God in the Old Teſtament, and apply them to Chriſt in the New Teſtament; as in Rom. x. Eph. iv. Heb. i. &c. But this ſuppoſition gives a very fair ſolution of it, viz. that as God appeared and reſided in an angel heretofore, ſo Chriſt or the Meſſiah was underſtood to be a glorious perſon or ſpirit incarnate, who was ſpecially inhabited by God, or in whom Godhead dwelt in a peculiar manner, and in and by whom God was to reveal himſelf to men in the latter times.*

As

* It may not be improper in this place to repeat the paraphraſe of one of the targumiſts, viz. Jonathan Ben Uzziel on Gen. iv. 1. where Eve ſaid, 'I have gotten a man from the Lord,' איש את יהוה that is, 'a man the Lord:' By which words our mother Eve, in the opinion of many commentators, expreſſed an apprehenſion that ſhe had brought forth him who was the Man-God, the promiſed ſeed, who ſhould 'break the ſerpent's head.' The words of the targum are, 'And Adam knew his wife, and ſhe conceived and bore Cain, and ſaid, I have obtained a man the angel of the Lord.' See Dr. Owen on the Hebrews, Vol. I. p. 89. So that it was ſuppoſed from the beginning of the world that the Meſſiah was to be a man and an angel, who might be called *God* or the *Lord*, becauſe of God's peculiar indwelling in him.

As it was by degrees that the apostles preached up the peculiar presence and union of God with the man Christ Jesus, and afterward came to call Christ God more freely, and applied divine characters and descriptions to him, cited out of the Old Testament; so it was by degrees that the Jews and Gentiles received the doctrine of a peculiar union of Godhead to the man Jesus, learned the idea of such a complex person as 'God with us,' as 'God manifest in the flesh,' and that he who 'was of the seed of David after the flesh,' was also 'God over all blessed forever.'

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX

To the FIRST DISCOURSE.

Some Obſervations on the Texts of the Old Teſtament applied to Chriſt by the Chriſtian Fathers, and by the Jews as well as by the ſacred Writers.

Obſerv. I. WHERESOEVER the writers of the New Teſtament find the *Almighty God, the Creator and Lord of all, the only true God, Jehovah, the God of Iſrael,* repreſented in the Old Teſtament as appearing to men in a viſible manner, or whereſoever they find him deſcribed as bringing ſalvation to the Jews, but eſpecially to the Gentiles, they ſeem to make no ſcruple to cite any of thoſe texts upon a proper occaſion, and apply them to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Now it is worth our inquiry whether theſe citations will not prove Chriſt to be God incarnate, to be this Jehovah, this God appearing amongſt men, and as the Saviour of mankind bringing the Gentiles into his church. Let us take notice of a few inſtances.

Pſalm lxviii. 7, 8. 'God went forth before his people, and marched through the wilderneſs,' dwelling in the pillar of cloud and fire: 'the earth ſhook, the heavens dropped, at the preſence of God. Sinai itſelf was moved at the preſence of the God of Iſrael,' when he came down upon mount Sinai in fire, ver. 16, 17. 'God hath deſired to dwell in Zion, yea the Lord,' Jehovah, 'will dwell in it forever: The Lord is there even as in Sinai in the holy place,'

i. e.

i. e. in the visible glory upon the mercy-seat even as in fire upon mount Sinai, ver. 18. 'Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, and received gifts for men, yea for the rebellious also,' i. e. probably for the heathen world, 'that the Lord God might dwell amongst them.' This is plainly applied to Christ, Ephes. iv. 'When he ascended on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. Now he that ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?' which most evidently intends our blessed Saviour.

Psalm xcvii. 1. 'The Lord,' Jehovah, 'reigneth, let the earth rejoice, let the multitude of isles be glad.' This evidently declares the Lord coming to bring salvation to the Gentiles, and he is called, ver. 5. 'the Lord of the whole earth;' whereas, Psal. xcix. 1, 2. 'The Lord' who 'is great in Zion,' and who 'sits between the cherubims,' is considered as the God of the Jews: then it is said, 'the Lord reigneth; let the people' or Gentile nations 'tremble.' Well then, since the xcviith. Psalm speaks of Jehovah as bringing salvation to the Gentiles, it follows, ver. 7. 'Confounded be they that serve graven images: worship him, all ye gods.' The idolatry of the Gentiles is now to be abolished, and even the 'angels of God' as well as the 'princes of the earth,' who are called gods, are required to worship him. This is directly applied to Christ, and interpreted of him, Heb. i. 6. 'Let all the angels of God worship him.' Christ is this Jehovah.

Psalm cii. 15. 'The heathen shall fear the name of the Lord, and all the kings of the earth thy glory:' and probably the recalling the Jews follows, ver. 16. 'When the Lord shall build up Zion, he will appear in his glory: The Lord shall declare his name in Zion, and his praise in Jerusalem, when the people

people are gathered together, and the kingdoms' (that is, of the Gentiles) 'to ſerve the Lord.' Ver. 25. 'Of old thou haſt laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands: they ſhall periſh, but thou art the ſame,' &c. This is expreſsly attributed to Chriſt, Heb. i. 10, 11. The apoſtle introduces it to prove his dignity above angels, and ſhews that he is the Jehovah, that God who created the heavens and the earth, &c.

Iſai. vi. 1. 'I ſaw the Lord ſitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple,' &c. ver. 5. 'Mine eyes have ſeen the King, the Lord of hoſts,' &c. which is a narrative of ſome viſible appearance of God. And the holy evangeliſt interprets it concerning our Saviour, John xii. 41. 'Theſe things ſaid Eſaias, when he ſaw his glory and ſpake of him.' Here is the great God appearing in a viſible manner, and Chriſt is that God or Lord of hoſts.

Iſai. xxxv. 1, 2. &c. 'The wilderneſs and the ſolitary place ſhall be glad, the deſart ſhall rejoice and bloſſom as the roſe. The glory of Lebanon ſhall be given to it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon:' that is, the Gentiles ſhall have the glory of being a church of God, even as the land of Iſrael had been: 'They ſhall ſee the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God. Your God will come with a recompenſe; he will come and ſave you. Then the eyes of the blind ſhall be opened, and the ears of the deaf ſhall be unſtopped, the lame man ſhall leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb ſhall ſing: for in the wilderneſs ſhall waters break out, and ſtreams in the deſart,' &c. Compare this with Iſai. xxxii. 1, 2, 3. 'A King ſhall reign in righteouſneſs, a man ſhall be as an hiding-place from the wind and a covert from the tempeſt, and

and the eyes of them that see shall not be dim, and the ears of them that hear shall hearken,' &c. The same things are here foretold concerning the appearance of God, and the appearance of a man, which plainly refer to the miracles which were wrought when Christ appeared, who is *God* and *man*, or *God dwelling in man*, and it is applied to Christ's appearance on earth by himself, Matth. xi. 4, 5. where he sends word to John, that these evidences attended him, which are the characters of the Messiah, and which were foretold. Now there is no place in the Old Testament more plainly foretels them than the words I have cited.

Isai. xl. 3. 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desart an high way for our God: the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.' Here the glory of God is foretold to become visible, and that 'all flesh shall see his glory.' This is plainly applied to Christ, where John the Baptist is said to 'prepare the way for the Lord,' Matth. iii. 3. Mark i. 3. Luke i. 16, 17. even 'for the Lord,' Jehovah, 'that all flesh might see' him, i. e. Jews and Gentiles, who include all nations.

I might proceed to the 9th, 10th and 11th verses, 'Say to the cities of Judah, Behold your God: Behold the Lord God will come, and his reward is with him and his work before him: he shall feed his flock like a shepherd:' which words seem to refer to Christ who is Immanuel, God with us, whom 'the cities of Judah' did 'behold,' even 'God manifest in the flesh,' and becoming visible, who assumes the character of a '*shepherd*,' John x. and of whom it is said, 'Behold, he comes, and his reward is with him.' Rev. xxii. 12. and who in the next verse calls himself 'the Alpha and Omega,' &c.

Isai. xlv. 21, 22. &c. 'There is no God else besides me, a just God and a Saviour: Look unto me and

and be ye ſaved all the ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none elſe.' Here God is evidently repreſented as a Saviour of the Gentiles: 'Unto me ſhall every knee bow, and every tongue ſhall ſwear: Surely, ſhall one ſay, in the Lord have I righteouſneſs and ſtrength, in the Lord ſhall all the ſeed of Iſrael be juſtified and ſhall glory.' Now, that this belongs to Chriſt eminently appears, 1ſt. becauſe this prophecy of Chriſt, as 'Jehovah our righteouſneſs,' is repeated twice by the prophet Jeremiah, chap. xxiii. 6. and xxxiii. 16. And the doctrine of Chriſt as our righteouſneſs is frequently taught us in the New Teſtament, particularly 1 Cor. i. 30, 31. 'Chriſt is made unto us righteouſneſs,' and 2d. it may be remarked that the ſame inference is made, viz. 'that according as it is written, he that glorieth let him glory in the Lord:' and, 3d. this ſame prophecy of the exaltation of Chriſt, 'that every knee ſhould bow to him,' is expreſsly explained, Rom. xiv. 9, 10, 11. and Philip. ii. 9. and is applied to Chriſt in both places.

If it ſhould be objected here, that Chriſt is repreſented in both thoſe epiſtles as exalted to this honour by the Father, upon the account of his ſufferings, and therefore it cannot belong to Godhead, whoſe honour is originally and eternally due to the very nature of God; it is granted that the human nature is thus exalted by the Father as a reward of his death, in Philip. ii. and in Rom. xiv. it is alſo granted, that 'Chriſt died, and roſe and revived, that he might be Lord of the dead and the living.' But ſince the ſame words are uſed in both places, and this prophecy of Iſaiah is expreſsly cited, Rom. xiv. 11. and applied to Chriſt, it may primarily ſignify the eternal glory of the Godhead, as united to the man Jeſus, or 'God manifeſt in the fleſh;' and in a ſecondary ſenſe, it may imply all the ſhare of

theſe

these honours that the human nature of Christ which suffered and died, is capable of receiving, by its personal union with the divine, which honour can belong to no other creature, because no other being is thus united to God, or *one with God.*

Joel ii. 28, 32. 'I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh,' &c. 'and whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord,' Jehovah, 'shall be delivered; for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call:' which probably means the Gentile church. Now this text is expressly interpreted concerning Christ, Rom. x. 12, 13. 'There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him: for whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved,' i. e. upon the name of Christ; for this is the very scope of the place, and this the next verse proves: 'How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe on him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?' all which plainly refers to our blessed Saviour.

Observ. II. The primitive fathers of the Christian church, even the very earliest writers, such as Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, &c. copy after the sacred writers of the New Testament: and wheresoever they find the 'great God, the Creator of all, Jehovah, the Lord God of Israel,' represented as becoming a Saviour to men, and especially where he is described as becoming visible, either in the ancient dispensations, or under the New Testament, or in the day of judgment; they make no scruple at all to apply these texts to our Lord Jesus Christ. Instances of this kind are very numerous in the writings even of the three first centuries. Justin Martyr affords us several citations to this purpose; and

and while I have been reading him as well as Irenæus, I have wondered how it could be denied, that either of them profeſſed Chriſt to be the true God. Juſtin interprets the following ſcriptures with reference to Chriſt.

Gen. xviii. 1. 'And the Lord appeared to Abraham in the plains of Mamre.' Gen. xix. 27. 'And Abraham ſtood before the Lord.' Gen. xxviii. 13. 'And behold the Lord ſtood above it and ſaid, I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Iſaac.' Gen. xxxi. 13. 'I am the God of Bethel, where thou anointedſt the pillar.' Exod. iii. 4, 8. 'God called to him out of the midſt of the buſh,—he ſaid, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob.' Exod. vi. 30. 'I appeared unto Abraham, unto Iſaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of GOD ALMIGHTY, but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.' Pſal. xxiv. 8, 10. 'The Lord ſtrong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle: The Lord of Hoſts, he is the King of Glory.' In this pſalm, God is deſcribed as reſiding in the ark, and aſcending to Zion, to dwell there in a viſible manner in the bright cloud. The ſame may be ſaid concerning Pſal. xlvii. 5. 'God is gone up with a ſhout, the Lord with the ſound of a trumpet.' All are interpreted concerning Chriſt by Juſtin Martyr.

Irenæus explains many of the ſame texts in the ſame manner, and ſeveral others, viz. Gen. iii. 9. 'The Lord came to Adam in the evening, and called him, and ſaid, Where art thou? becauſe in the latter days this very ſame word of God comes to call man.' Pſal. l. 1. 'The mighty God, even the Lord hath ſpoken,' whom Irenæus calls, 'the God of gods. What God is this? Even he of whom he ſaid, God ſhall come viſibly, even our God, and will not be ſilent. This is the Son.' Pſal. lxxvi. 1. 'In Judah God

God is known, and his name is great in Iſrael.' Iſai. lxv. 1. 'I was made manifeſt to them that aſked not after me,' that is to the Gentiles. Iſai. xxxv. 4. 'Behold your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompenſe, he will come and ſave you.' All theſe places Irenæus applies to Jeſus Chriſt, and a great many others may be found in ſeveral of the primitive fathers, ſome of which are cited by the learned Dr. Waterland in his firſt Defence of the Queries concerning the Divinity of Chriſt, Query 2d, p. 28, &c. and in Mr. Alexander's Eſſay on Irenæus, Chap. 6.

Object. I. One pretence of the Arians againſt theſe writers' belief of the Divinity of Chriſt, as expreſſed in theſe texts, is, that they ſuppoſe Chriſt in theſe places is introduced only in the perſon of the Father, and as his meſſenger and deputy.

Anſw. This pretence Dr. Waterland has ſufficiently obviated in the following pages, 33—46, wherein he ſhews by ſome expreſs citations, that the fathers ſpake of Chriſt in his own perſon, though in ſome places he may be deſcribed as the Father's meſſenger, and as coming in his name.

Object. II. It may be objected further, that however this may be the moſt plain and moſt obvious meaning of the primitive fathers in ſome places of their writings, viz. That *Chriſt* or the *Logos* is *Jehovah* or the *true God*, the *God of Iſrael*, yet in other places they plainly deſcribe the *Logos* as a derived being, and as having many characters of inferiority, both as to his original, his exiſtence, and his actions; and therefore when thoſe divine titles are aſcribed to Chriſt, they muſt be interpreted into ſome inferior or diminutive ſenſe, that they may be reconciled to the inferior characters given to that *Logos*, and ſo may be attributed to an inferior being.

Anſw. 1. Some great divines have attempted to reconcile theſe inferior characters of the *Logos* to true

true and eternal Godhead, by supposing that both a real derivation and some natural as well as economical inferiority may be allowed to belong to the *Logos*, even in his divine nature. But this I leave to those who can defend the doctrine of a derived God.

Answ. 2. These inferior characters of the *Logos* may belong to the human soul of Christ, supposing it to be the first of all creatures, and from its earliest existence to be intimately united to eternal Godhead: and thus the supreme and divine character may belong to this complex person Jesus Christ, who is both God and a creature; though I cannot say many of the fathers did profess this notion.

Answ. 3. Whether the different expressions of the fathers in different parts of their writings can be reconciled or not, yet this is plain, that in some places they do in the most evident and obvious manner interpret and ascribe the supreme scriptural titles of *Jehovah*, *Lord of Hosts*, the *God of Israel*, &c. to the *Logos*, or to the *Son of God*; and this is all that I insist upon here.

Observ. III. The ancient Jews in their interpretations of scripture practised the same thing as the apostles and the Christian fathers; and where God is represented in a visible manner conversing with men, or coming to save them, they make no manner of scruple to ascribe these expressions of scripture to the *Word of God*, the *Memra* or *Logos*, and sometimes to the *Messiah*. This may be seen abundantly in several parts of Dr. Allix's Judgment of the Jewish Church against the Unitarians, Chap. 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 26. And in Dr. Owen's Exercitations on the epistle to the Hebrews, Numb. 9, 10, 11.

Now amongst the ancient Jews, the *Memra* or *Logos* (that is, the *Word of God*) often signifies *God himself*, or *something in and of God*, some divine principle belonging to the essence of God, whereby he transacts

tranſacts his affairs with creatures; and it alſo ſignifies ſometimes in their writings a very glorious archangel, or a ſpirit ſuperior to all angels, in whom God put his name, and in whom the true God reſided in a peculiar manner, as in his houſe or his habitation, which they called the *Shechinah*. This I have ſhown at large in my Diſſertation concerning the *Logos*; and I have there made it appear how both thoſe ideas may be united in one Meſſiah.

But however that matter ſtands, yet thus much is evident, that thoſe ſcriptures where God is repreſented in a viſible manner, or where he is repreſented eminently as a Saviour, or bringing ſalvation to his people both Jews and Gentiles, have been interpreted concerning *Chriſt* or the *Word* by the ancient Jewiſh church, by the apoſtles, and by the primitive Chriſtian writers; whence I think we may infer theſe three things.

1. That Jeſus Chriſt, in the ſenſe of all theſe writers, has true and eternal Godhead belonging to him, as part of his complex perſon: for the ancient Jews and the primitive Chriſtians, and eſpecially the ſacred writers, had ſuch an awful ſenſe of the tranſcendent excellency of the great God, and of his jealouſy for his own name and honour, that they would not dare to attribute his moſt ſublime titles, characters and glories to a mere creature, or to any thing which had not true Godhead.

2. That the Godhead of Chriſt is the very ſame with the Godhead of the Father; and that his divine nature is the ſame infinite and eternal being, the ſame *Jehovah* or *God of Iſrael* to whom all the higheſt titles in the Old Teſtament are aſcribed, as Chriſt himſelf ſays, John x. 'I and my Father are one.' The Father and Son are not two infinite Spirits, or two Gods, but one and the ſame God.

3. That the denying of these glorious and sublime titles of *Jehovah*, the *Lord God*, the *God of Israel*, &c. to belong to Christ, or the interpreting of them into such a diminished and inferior sense as may belong to a mere inferior spirit, a contingent or created being, without any such personal union to Godhead, seems to run contrary to the most plain and obvious sense and meaning both of the sacred writers, of the ancient Jews, and the primitive Christians.

DISCOURSE

DISCOURSE II.

The GLORY *of* CHRIST *as* GOD-MAN *displayed,*

BY AN INQUIRY INTO THE EXTENSIVE POWERS OF HIS HUMAN NATURE IN ITS PRESENT GLORIFIED STATE.

SECT. I.

INTRODUCTION.

GOD united to man, and dwelling in a human body, is one of the myſterious glories of our religion. It was ſo 'without controverſy' amongſt the primitive Chriſtians, as St. Paul acquaints young Timothy the evangeliſt, 1 Tim. iii. ult. 'Great is the myſtery of godlineſs, God manifeſt in the fleſh.' The union of the divine and human natures in the complete perſon of Chriſt the Mediator, is one of thoſe ſublime wonders which could never have been found out by the reaſon of man, and which were revealed ſlowly to the church in ſucceſſive ages. There were types and emblems and glimpſes of it in ancient days; but the fuller diſcovery of this myſtery is reſerved to adorn the New Teſtament. In theſe latter days we have a moſt evident and certain revelation made to us, that Chriſt Jeſus the Mediator, who was 'of the ſeed of David according to the fleſh,' is 'God over all, bleſſed forever.' Rom. ix. 5.

Yet the glories that ſpring from this ſacred union are too bright to be all unveiled before us in the preſent ſtate of infirmity. They are too vaſt and extenſive to be received by the narrowneſs of our apprehenſions, while our ſouls are confined in fleſh and blood. The rays of Godhead once broke through the human nature of Chriſt on the mount of tranſfiguration, but the diſciples were not able to bear them. It is by degrees we muſt gain acquaintance with this divine perſon; and as his divinity is all light and ſplendor, ſo his human nature, which is a creature, has doubtleſs in itſelf many peculiar excellencies and prerogatives, that it might be fit to be ſo nearly allied to Godhead with decency and honour. And doubtleſs alſo it has acquired moſt aſtoniſhing advancement, both in power, capacity and glory, by this ſacred and admirable alliance, as well as by its preſent exaltation in heaven.

The moſt neceſſary and important doctrines of the goſpel concerning the perſon of Chriſt are plainly written in the word of God, that the weakeſt Chriſtians may read and learn them, and be ſaved. Theſe have been known and acknowledged by all true Chriſtians in all ages of the church. But there are others alſo of ſome importance, which are contained in ſcripture, and yet may not have been univerſally received among Chriſtians. Some of theſe perhaps have not been obſerved in our reading the Bible hitherto, becauſe our education has given us no hint of them: theſe may become the ſubjects of our delightful ſearch and profitable inquiry, when we meet with the firſt notices of them in the world. It is our duty to 'grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt,' 2 Peter iii. ult. and to ſeek what further acquaintance with him we may gain by an honeſt and impartial ſearch into the word of God. This will carry ſeveral advantages with it, viz. 1. This

1. This will be for the exaltation of Chriſt himſelf; for we ſhall pay him more juſt honour in every reſpect, when we know more of him, and are better acquainted with the various excellencies of his ſacred perſon.

2. This will tend to the illuſtration of the goſpel, and the confirmation of our faith; for the whole ſcheme of Chriſtianity, and particularly all that doctrine that relates to the perſon of Chriſt, is ſo harmoniouſly connected, that when we gain further light into any one part of it, it ſheds ſome degrees of divine brightneſs over all the reſt.

3. This will better furniſh us with anſwers to the adverſaries of our religion; for the more we know, the better we can defend our knowledge, ſupport our profeſſion, and vindicate the name and honour of our bleſſed Saviour.

4. This will render the word of God itſelf more glorious, both in our own eſteem, and in the eyes of the world, when we ſee the darker and more perplexed paſſages of it unfolded, when we find a way to ſolve thoſe difficulties which have often puzzled us and our forefathers, and when we remove thoſe incumbrances which have given our adverſaries a handle to aſſault our faith, and to depreciate the word of God as a volume of obſcure and inconſiſtent things.

Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, conſidered in his complete perſon, has the divine nature joined to the human; this has been proved with abundant evidence in ancient and modern writings. Now as the divine nature is all over glorious, ſo there are ſome glories which are peculiar and proper to his human nature: ſome of theſe are native honours and excellencies that belong to the human ſoul and body of Chriſt, and there are other ſurpriſing powers and dignities which are derived to the Man Jeſus, partly by his exaltation to the throne in heaven, and partly by virtue of his union with the Godhead, as was hinted before.

In

In many inſtances, it muſt be confeſſed, it is difficult, if not impoſſible, for us to ſay exactly how far the human nature is the immediate ſubject of ſome ſublime honours and actions, and how far they muſt be aſcribed to the indwelling Deity: to find the preciſe limits of the agencies or honours of the two natures in Chriſt in every reſpect, is a myſtery too deep for our preſent penetration. Yet ſince the ſcripture has abundantly manifeſted the exaltation of the Man Jeſus to the right hand of God, to enjoy unconceivable degrees of power, authority and ſplendor, it is proper for us to do ſo much honour to the Man whom God the Father delights to honour, as to read and underſtand, as far as we can, the peculiar glories of his ſpecial advancement.

It has been a common practice with us, becauſe we know that Jeſus Chriſt is true God, and that his human nature is united to the divine; therefore, whenſoever we read any glorious and ſublime attributions to our bleſſed Redeemer in ſcripture, we content ourſelves immediately to refer them all to his divine nature, as being all-ſufficient to ſupport them; not conſidering that we may perhaps by this means ſwallow up and bury ſome of the moſt illuſtrious excellencies and honours of the Man Chriſt Jeſus, nor ſuffer his human nature to receive that due ſhare of glory and dignity to which the Father has advanced it. We are ſometimes afraid to exalt the Man whom the Father has exalted, leſt we ſhould be thought to derogate from his Godhead. We are afraid to read the human name of Jeſus in ſome ſcriptures which highly exalt the Son of God, leſt we ſhould be thought to weaken the force of any of thoſe texts which are uſually amaſſed together to prove the Deity of Chriſt, or leſt we ſhould withhold any of them from this ſervice.

I grant that the ſacred doctrine of the Divinity, united to the human nature in Chriſt, ought to be ſupported

ſupported by all juſt expoſitions of ſcripture. It is an article that we cannot part with out of our religion, without ſhaking the foundation. But Jeſus Chriſt, our Lord and our God, never requires us to ſtrain one line of his word, or turn it aſide from the natural ſenſe, in order to ſupport his deity. There are many paſſages, both of the Old and New Teſtament, that declare and confirm this great article; and many of thoſe ſcriptures alſo wherein the human nature of Chriſt is jointly honoured, do yet carry in them a plain proof of the united Godhead. But ſince there are ſome ſcriptures, which in their moſt natural and obvious ſenſe ſpeak chiefly of the honours of his Godhead, and others chiefly deſcribe the exaltation of his humanity, let us do ſo much juſtice to our bleſſed Saviour, as to read the diſtinct honours of both his natures in thoſe very places of ſcripture where he has written them, that ſo we may pay him the full glory due to his ſacred and complex perſon as God-Man.

Nor can it any way leſſen the glory of our bleſſed Mediator, nor derogate from the honour of his divine nature, to ſhew what capacious powers and ſublime dignities are derived to the Man Jeſus, either by his preſent exalted ſtate, or by the influence of that Godhead which has aſſumed him into ſo near an union, ſince we ſtill ſecure to the bleſſed Godhead all its own eminence and infinite ſuperiority to the Man.

SECT. II.

Scriptural Proofs of the Exaltation of the human Nature of CHRIST, *and the extenſive Capacities and Powers of his Soul in his glorified State.*

THAT the great and bleſſed God condeſcended to aſſume any human ſoul and body into a perſonal

perſonal union with himſelf, was a matter of free and ſovereign favour: and that he ſhould chuſe this one human ſpirit, and this body which was born of the virgin Mary, to be the ſubjects of this privilege, was the effect of the ſame goodneſs and the ſame ſovereignty; 'God ſpake in viſion to his Holy One, and ſaid, I have exalted one choſen out of the people,' Pſal. lxxxix. 19. It is a favour at firſt altogether unmerited, and which the Man Jeſus could not claim. 'It pleaſed the Father that in him all the fulneſs of the Godhead ſhould dwell bodily,' Col. i. 19. and ii. 9. It was a matter of divine good pleaſure, that God ſhould 'dwell in' that particular ſpirit, and be manifeſt in that particular fleſh and blood which was born at Bethlehem.

Thence it will follow, that the influences and privileges derived from this union are limited by the will and pleaſure of God: and the honours and powers which accrue to the human nature on this account are ſuſpended or beſtowed, increaſed and diminiſhed, according to the wiſe counſels and determinations of the divine will.

It ſeems to be one of the ſacred laws of this ineffable union, that the Man Jeſus ſhould have ideas and influences, knowledge and power, communicated to him by the indwelling Godhead, in ſuch meaſures and at ſuch ſucceſſive ſeaſons as he ſtood in need of them, for his ſeveral offices and operations in the divine economy. The human ſoul of Chriſt cannot receive and retain all poſſible ideas conſtantly and ſimultaneouſly: This would be to ſuppoſe the Man really endowed with the properties of Godhead. But as faſt as the indwelling Godhead ſees it proper to furniſh him with new and larger ideas and powers, ſo faſt is he made capable of receiving and exerting them, both in his ſtate of humiliation and exaltation.

This

This will appear, if we conſider that Chriſt was God-Man in the days of his humiliation: He was 'Immanuel,' or 'God with us:' He was 'God manifeſt in the fleſh:' He was that 'Word' who 'was God, made fleſh:' And our divines very juſtly affirm, it was the ſame Godhead which is in the Father that dwelt in Chriſt: 'I am in the Father,' ſays our Lord, 'and the Father in me,' John xiv. 10. 'I and the Father are one,' John x. 30. Yet while he lived upon earth, this divine union did not exert its influences to the utmoſt, neither as to knowledge, or power, or authority; for the child 'Jeſus grew in wiſdom' as well as 'ſtature,' Luke ii. 52. and the 'day of judgment,' which was known to the Father, was unknown to the Son at that time, Mark xiii. 32. 'Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, neither the Son, but the Father.' His knowledge was imperfect; and his authority on earth, before his death, appeared rather the authority of a prophet than a king: In his younger years he was ſubject to the commands of his parents, Luke ii. 51. And when he appeared in the world, it was as a man, ſent from God, to reveal his will and to obey or fulfil it. He declared he was no king on earth, i. e. a temporal king, for 'his kingdom was not of this world.' He paid tribute to Cæſar; he would not be the divider of an inheritance among contending brethren; 'he had not where to lay his head.' The Man Jeſus here on earth lived among men, and had not complete knowledge, nor could he have complete power.

It pleaſed the Father, and it was agreed in the covenant of redemption, that the Man Jeſus ſhould arrive at his exaltation by degrees: It was agreed that he ſhould practiſe the moſt profound inſtances of humility and ſubmiſſion to God, as well as the moſt aſtoniſhing act of pity and charity toward men, in

in becoming a ſacrifice for their ſins and dying upon the croſs, before he was to receive his promiſed honours. The Father thought it proper to beſtow the moſt ſublime advancement upon him as a reward of his ſufferings; and to ſuſpend his rich reward till his work was done, that he might at once diſplay his own grace, his equity and his truth, in the glorification of the human nature of his Son Jeſus, and that he might be a more proper pattern for all his followers. This doctrine runs through many pages in the Old Teſtament and in the New.

But when Chriſt had finiſhed his work, he then prayed for the promiſed glory. John xvii. 5. 'Father, glorify thy Son; I have finiſhed the work which thou gaveſt me to do.' And when he aſcended to heaven, and was ſeated at the right hand of God, then he that was 'of the ſeed of David' more eminently appeared to be 'God over all, bleſſed forever,' as Rom. ix. 4, 5. Then the influences of this ſacred union were exerted in an high degree, and honours and dignities were conferred upon him in abundance, with intellectual and operative powers ſuited to this advancement. 'God manifeſt in the fleſh' was received up to heaven in glory, 1 Tim. iii. 16. And there the human nature lives and acts, ſhines and reigns, in a manner becoming its high privilege of union to Godhead.

In order to purſue my preſent deſign, I ſhall do theſe two things—Firſt, I ſhall endeavour to prove from ſcripture, that it is the human nature of Chriſt that was peculiarly exalted after his ſufferings; and then ſet before you a more particular detail of the inſtances wherein this exaltation conſiſts.

Firſt, The reaſons to prove that it is the Man Chriſt who is exalted by God the Father, are ſuch as theſe:

1. St. Peter gives us an account in his firſt ſermon,

mon, Acts ii. 33. of Christ 'exalted by the right hand of God.' If we inquire more particularly of the person who is thus exalted, the context assures us, it is 'Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God.' ver. 22. It is that very Man of 'the seed of David according to the flesh' who was appointed 'to sit on his throne,' ver. 30. It was the Man 'that was taken and crucified and slain,' ver. 23. The Man 'whom God raised from the dead,' ver. 32. who was thus 'exalted by the right hand of God,' ver. 33.

2. It is a *real* exaltation of Christ by the will or good pleasure of God, which is expressed in many scriptures, and not merely a *manifestative* exaltation. It is an advancement to new degrees of knowledge, to a real increase of capacity, to new powers and advantages, which he had not on earth, as well as to new dignities. But the divine nature is eternal and self-sufficient, full in itself of all real and possible powers and dignities, nor can it receive any new powers, nor can it have any real advancement. Godhead cannot be any otherwise exalted, than by having its own original and eternal powers, or the exercise of them, manifested or discovered to his creatures; it must be therefore a creature, even the Man Jesus, who receives this real advancement.

3. It is the human nature of Christ which is properly exalted, because it is the Man who is expressly called 'the Mediator' in scripture, whereas he is never expressly called Mediator as God. 1 Tim. ii. 5. 'There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus.' Now it was for the most part mediatorial honours and powers which he received at his exaltation; and partly with this design, that he might better fulfil the remaining part of his work as Mediator, that the Man Jesus might reign over the nations and judge this world. Acts xi. 36, 38. Acts xvii. 31.

4. His

4. His exaltation is repreſented as the reward of his ſufferings and labours in many places of ſcripture. Iſai. liii. 10, 12. 'Therefore ſhall he divide the ſpoil with the great, becauſe he poured out his ſoul unto death.' Phil. ii. 8. 'He humbled himſelf, and became obedient to death, wherefore God hath alſo highly exalted him.' Rev. v. 9. 'Thou art worthy to take the book,' &c. 'for thou waſt ſlain, and haſt redeemed us.' Now it is not ſo proper to ſay, the divine nature in Chriſt, or his indwelling Godhead, is rewarded; becauſe his human nature laboured and ſuffered and died. The Godhead in Chriſt is properly uncapable of receiving any rewards from God the Father, for it is one and the ſame Godhead or divine nature in both perſons; nor indeed can a God be properly rewarded at all.

This argument will be further enforced, if we conſider, that his exaltation after his labours and ſufferings, is repreſented and propoſed to us as a pledge and pattern of our exaltation after we have laboured and ſuffered, on purpoſe to encourage us in our labours and ſufferings. Now this muſt be the exaltation of his human nature or the Man Jeſus, who did both labour and ſuffer as well as we.

I will ſay no more in this place, becauſe this doctrine will appear more evident all the way as we proceed: Yet if we had nothing further to ſay for it, I think upon the whole we might venture to conclude, that as the humiliation of Chriſt the Mediator has a more peculiar reſpect to his human nature, ſo it is the human nature is more eſpecially exalted by the Father, but ſtill conſidered in union with the divine, and under the character of Mediator.

My ſecond general head of diſcourſe is to give ſome ſpecial inſtances wherein the exaltation of Chriſt in his human nature conſiſts; and this appears eminently in the following particulars.

I. The

I. The Man Chriſt Jeſus united to the divine nature is admitted to the knowledge of many of the decrees and the ſecret counſels of God. He that knew not the day of judgment here on earth, has now the ſcene of all futurities ſpread open before him; and he communicated them in viſions and figures to John the apoſtle, that he might publiſh them to the churches. The book of the Revelation begins with this aſſertion, that 'God gave to Jeſus Chriſt the knowledge of things that muſt ſhortly come to paſs:' And in Rev. v. 5. 'The Lion of the tribe of Judah hath prevailed to open the book, and to looſe the ſeven ſeals thereof.' Ver. 6. 'The Lamb, as it had been ſlain, having ſeven horns and ſeven eyes, which are the ſeven ſpirits of God, came and took the book out of the right hand of him that ſat on the throne, and opened the ſeals thereof.' Here is the human nature of Chriſt, the Lamb, repreſented with unknown powers, viz. 'ſeven horns and ſeven eyes, which are the ſeven ſpirits of God.' The ſeven horns might ſignify perfect might, and the ſeven eyes perfect knowledge; and by virtue of his union to the divine nature, this may include his power to ſend the Spirit of God, or to give forth his gifts or graces. He opens the book of divine counſels, by which the church and the nations are to be governed to the end of the world.

Now the divine nature of Chriſt knew all that was written in this book while it was ſealed; but after the ſufferings of Chriſt on earth, his human nature was admitted to this privilege: and having power given him to rule the world, it was neceſſary he ſhould know thoſe counſels and decrees of the Father by which the world is to be ruled.

Obſerve alſo that he is made and declared 'worthy to take this book and to open the ſeals of it, becauſe he was ſlain, and has redeemed his ſaints to God

God by his blood,' ver. 9. Surely it was not the Godhead, but the Man Jeſus who was ſlain; and it is the Man (not the Godhead) who is become worthy on this account to read this book of divine counſels. This is that 'Revelation which God gave unto Jeſus Chriſt, to ſhew unto his ſervants things which muſt ſhortly come to paſs, and he ſent and ſignified it by his angel unto his ſervant John.' Rev. i. 1.

II. The human nature of Chriſt, as united to God, is exalted to the government of heaven and earth. Matt. xxviii. 18. Jeſus, juſt before his aſcenſion, ſpake unto them, ſaying, 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.' And Epheſ. i. 20. St. Paul tells us it was God's 'mighty power, which he wrought in Chriſt when he raiſed him from the dead and ſet him at his own right hand in heavenly places, far above all principality and power, might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but alſo in the world to come, and hath put all things under his feet.'

I know this ſort of expreſſion in ſcripture is wont to be applied expreſsly to the character of Chriſt as Mediator, for it is uſually ſaid, Though his divine nature, abſolutely conſidered, had all this dominion before, yet as Mediator it was now given to him.

But let us conſider theſe three things:

1. Since the human nature of Chriſt at leaſt muſt be allowed in ſome ſenſe to complete the perſon of the Mediator, and it is his human nature that is thus 'raiſed from the dead by the mighty power of God, and ſet at the right hand of God in heavenly places,' it is but reaſonable to conceive that the human nature receives this exaltation, this power and dominion over all things, though I grant it muſt be conſidered in union with the divine: but if we do not ſuppoſe it to be the human nature which is thus

dignified and endued with authority, then we ſhall be forced to interpret this text thus, viz. that God raiſed his human nature from the dead, and ſet his human nature at his own right hand, i. e. on high above the clouds: but has put all things under the feet of his divine nature, conſidered as Mediator; which ſeems to be but a ſhifting and evaſive expoſition, if the words will admit a ſenſe that is plainer and eaſier: and no man who reads it with an unbiaſſed mind would put this ſtrained interpretation upon it.

2. Of what uſe is the frequent declaration of this power and government conferred upon Chriſt after his aſcenſion, if it be not conferred on his human nature, and if his human nature does not exerciſe it? The divine nature of Chriſt had this power, and exerciſed this government before: as God, he always did, and always will govern the world, though there had not been a word ſpoken in ſcripture of any exaltation of Chriſt to this government: And ſince Godhead is united to the Man Jeſus, Godhead in this united ſtate would continue to govern the world as before, and that even during all the humiliation of Chriſt: What alteration then does ariſe from this declared exaltation of Chriſt, after his labours and ſufferings?

And beſides, 3. What new advantage, what benefit, what gift or reward can it be to the human nature of Chriſt, that his divine nature ſhould be made governor of all things? Or that the divine nature ſhould exert that authority, dominion and power which it had inherent in itſelf, originally, neceſſarily, and without any gift? This government of Chriſt is frequently repreſented as a gift and a reward, and therefore muſt belong eminently to the inferior nature, which alone is capable of rewards and gifts from God.

The

The ſame argument may be drawn from Rom. xiv. 9. 'To this end Chriſt both died and roſe and revived,' or lived again, 'that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living.' His death and reſurrection belong to his human nature; he died as man, he roſe as man, that he might as man rule over the dead and the living; for it is hardly to be ſuppoſed that St. Paul could mean, "He died and roſe as man, that his Godhead might obtain this dominion, when his Godhead had this dominion eternal and unalienable in itſelf, and needed no ſuch new title to dominion:" For his coming into fleſh could never diveſt him of it, nor could his human ſufferings repurchaſe ſuch a divine claim and power if he had diveſted himſelf.

Yet here I would give notice once for all, that I do not exclude this ſort of ſcriptures from an economical ſenſe: I mean thus, they may have a reſpect to Chriſt in his complete perſon, as God-Man, and as Mediator; or as a man united to Godhead: and they may and muſt ſignify his exaltation in his mediatorial character to theſe honours and authorities; without the indwelling Godhead, ſeveral of them ſeem to be too ſublime for a man. But ſtill the moſt natural, obvious, and primary meaning of them, refers to that human nature, which alone can be the proper ſubject of real abaſement and advancement, which alone could really ſuffer, and which alone could receive real exaltation; for the divine nature in itſelf is utterly uncapable of either. It is the Man who is exalted, even the Man Jeſus who is called the Mediator, but it is the Man who is one with God. He obeyed and ſuffered and died as man, but united to God: He roſe and was exalted as man, but ſtill united to God. I beg pardon if I have dwelt too long on this point, or repeated any thing which I had ſaid before. The doctrine itſelf ſeems

to

to require it of me, that if possible I might leave no scruple on the minds of pious readers who are honestly searching out the truth, and would secure the honours of their blessed Redeemer.

It may be inquired here, What acts can the Man Jesus put forth in his human nature toward the government of heaven and earth?

I answer—As he is now let into the counsels and decrees of God, and by his immediate union with the divine nature he now receives perpetual notice of all the affairs in the upper and lower worlds, so he can give his orders to the millions of attending angels to execute works of judgment and mercy; they are all ministering spirits to him. He can manage the affairs of providence by angels as his instruments for the government of the nations and the good of his saints. And he that has led captivity captive, and subdued the prince of darkness, with all the armies of hell into slavery to himself, he can give them permission to exercise their rage amongst mankind, under such limitations and restraints as he sees proper. Thus he may govern all things by the angels or devils, as his mediums, or instruments: and he may do it also by himself in a more immediate manner.

Let me ask, May not Christ keep the wheels of nature in their courses, and administer the providential kingdom by virtue derived from the indwelling Godhead? May he not exert his dominion amongst all the material elements, and the inhabitants of air, earth and water, as well as amongst the spirits of the invisible world? Shall prophets and apostles and captains have a resemblance of such power given them on earth, and shall not Jesus the Son of God have the substance and plenitude of it, especially now in heaven? Could a Moses divide the sea with his rod, and turn flints into rivers of water? Could a

Joſhua ſay to the ſun, Stand thou ſtill, and forbid the moon to move? Could a Paul make fevers and dropſies depart at his word, and flee at the appearance of his handkerchief, Acts xix. 12.? Could Peter heal the ſick with his ſhadow paſſing over them, Acts xv. 15. and command Tabitha to ariſe from the dead? And ſhall we not ſuppoſe the Man Chriſt Jeſus in his exalted ſtate, with all the power and glory of indwelling and united Godhead; I ſay, ſhall we not ſuppoſe him able to rule time and nature as he pleaſes, and to manage all things in heaven and earth, all things mortal and immortal?

Or if we lift our thoughts to the angelic legions and ſurvey their powers, muſt we not ſuppoſe the power communicated to our exalted Saviour to be far ſuperior to theirs? Shall it be within the power of a ſingle angel, when ſent with a peſtilence, to deſtroy ſeventy thouſands of Iſrael in order to puniſh David's ſin, 2 Sam. xxiv. 15, 16? or to ſlay a hundred and fourſcore and five thouſand Aſſyrian ſoldiers in the camp of Sennacherib in one night, 2 Kings xix. 35? or ſhall it be within the reach of Satan's power and commiſſion, as he is the 'prince of the powers of the air,' to raiſe ſtorms and hurricanes, and to ſend lightning from heaven, Job i. 16, 19? and ſhall not the bleſſed ſoul of our exalted Redeemer have more tranſcendent power than angels or devils? Why ſhould it not be within the reach of his human will, by methods of unknown influence, to govern the winds and the waters, the earthly and the heavenly bodies, to ſubſerve the counſels of his Father and his own gracious purpoſes towards his people?

Or if it ſhould be doubted at preſent by any of my readers, whether Chriſt's own human power reaches to an immediate management of all theſe affairs at ſo prodigious diſtances, yet we may be aſſured, as I hinted

hinted before, it is not above the power of human nature, so exalted and so nearly united to God, to give orders of this kind to the standing or fallen angels, which the divine nature has taken care shall be punctually and exactly fulfilled: and thus 'he shall reign till he has brought all his enemies under his feet,' 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25. But a farther pursuit of this subject is reserved to the following section.

I proceed now to the third instance of power and dignity to which the human nature of Christ is exalted.

III. Christ as man united to God is 'exalted to become a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins,' Acts v. 31. This scripture must certainly include and chiefly regard the manhood of Christ, for it is that same 'Jesus,' saith St. Peter to the Jews, 'whom ye slew and hanged on a tree,' that the 'God of our fathers hath raised up' and exalted to this dignity.

Besides, it is impossible that the divine nature should be really and properly 'exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour,' &c. for it would be humiliation, and not exaltation, for the pure divine nature to accept of these titles and perform these offices even by way of deputation and vicegerency to the Father, when it had supreme authority originally and eternally in itself without any donation or deputation.

It will be said here, What can the Man Jesus do toward the giving repentance and forgiveness?

I would humbly inquire whether it were not his human nature sent forth his apostles when he was here on earth? And is it not the Man Jesus who sends his ministers abroad into the nations in his present exaltation in heaven? Is it not still the Man in whom Godhead dwells? Is it not he who 'gives apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers' to publish this doctrine of repentance and forgiveness

in his name? 'He that aſcended on high' after he had 'deſcended into the lower parts of the earth?' He that 'received gifts for men,' Pſalm lxviii. 18. and gave theſe gifts unto men 'for the perfecting the ſaints, for the work of the miniſtry, and for the edifying his body,' Eph. iv. 8, 12.?

And though we may reaſonably ſuppoſe the Man Jeſus conſidered alone has not now, nor could ever have ſufficient power in himſelf, abſtracted from Deity, to change the hearts of men, make obſtinate ſinners become penitent, and ſeal the forgiveneſs of ſins with comfort to their conſciences; yet the Man Jeſus may ſay, Father, I will that this and the other obdurate ſinner be reclaimed, ſoftened and ſanctified: Father, I will that his ſins be forgiven him: and hereupon the bleſſed Spirit of God works this divine change in the ſinner, and ſeals this forgiveneſs to the ſoul. Why may not Jeſus work wonders of grace on the ſouls of men, in the ſame way as he wrought miracles of healing on their bodies?

I add further, the man Jeſus may exert a volition that ſuch and ſuch a rebellious ſinner be converted, ſoftened and pardoned; and according to the ſacred and unſearchable laws of the union between his divine and human nature, the effect may be wrought and the bleſſing given by the omnipotence and authority of the indwelling Godhead: and in this ſenſe the exalted human nature exerting ſuch a volition becomes a conſcious inſtrument or agent in beſtowing theſe divine favours. You will ſay, perhaps, was it not ſo in his ſtate of humiliation as well as now? And what advantage then has Chriſt exalted? Did not the Godhead work the miracle by the intervening act of Chriſt's human will?

I anſwer, yes certainly: but the difference between his agency in his exalted and in his humbled ſtate ſeems to be this: while our Redeemer was on earth

earth in his humbled state, he seems to live by more apparent, constant, immediate and actual addresses to and dependence on the Godhead for every single miracle he wrought, than perhaps he does now. This dependence was sometimes manifested to the spectators, by praying to his Father when he was to work a miracle, as in raising Lazarus from the dead. John xi. 41. He said 'Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me,' and yet then he spake his will with authority, ver. 43. 'Lazarus, come forth.' At other times, this actual dependence was constantly practised, though he did not manifest it to the spectators: so when Christ healed the leper, Matth. viii. the Man Jesus said, 'I will, be thou clean;' and immediately the miracle was wrought. By the intervening volition of Christ as man, the dead was raised and the leper was cleansed; but it was the power of God was present with the will of the man to heal the sick and to raise the dead, as it is expressed in Luke v. 17.

And thus the Man Jesus, being now exalted to a more sovereign sort of agency, to 'quicken whom he will,' John v. 21. hath a special interest in those titles, a 'Prince and a Saviour,' and in bestowing 'repentance and forgiveness,' Acts ii. 31, 32, 33. because his will is made as it were the agent. He ascended to heaven, he received the promise of the Spirit, he poured down those gifts of the Spirit on his apostles and the primitive Christians, for the ordinary and extraordinary works of grace, for it is by his will these things were done.

IV. The human nature of our Lord Jesus Christ has some influence in the succour and support of tempted Christians, Heb. iv. 15. The apostle assures us, 'We have an High Priest who was tempted in all points as we are, but without sin; and he can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities,' i. e.

he

he has a human ſympathy ariſing from his human ſufferings, and therefore we are encouraged to 'come to the throne of grace to find help.' And, chap. ii. v. 18. 'in that he himſelf has ſuffered being tempted, he is able to ſuccour them that are tempted.' Now ſince his ability to ſuccour tempted ſouls does ariſe in part from his human ſympathy, and from his own experience of ſufferings and temptations in his human nature, it leads us naturally to conceive that even his human ſoul has ſome hand in the ſuccour of tempted ſaints.

1. Becauſe the divine nature is not rendered more able to ſuccour them by all the temptations that the human nature ſuſtained. The divine nature is infinitely and eternally able to ſuccour, without any regard at all to the human nature, whether that had been tempted or not.

2. It is the deſign of this chapter to ſpeak of the human nature, or rather the incarnation of Chriſt, v. 17. He muſt become like us in 'fleſh and blood, that he might be a merciful High Prieſt to make reconciliation:' now here the human nature is the chief agent, or rather patient, in making atonement and reconciliation, though the dignity and complete merit ariſeth from its union to the divine nature. Then in the next verſe his human nature having been tempted, is fitted and enabled to ſuccour them that are tempted, by its own ſympathy with them, as he was man, but ſtill ſuppoſing him united to Deity. This is the moſt natural and neceſſary ſenſe of the words.

Obſerve further, that Chriſt is repreſented as the head of the church in many ſcriptures, and the ſaints as his members; now this headſhip muſt be referred ſpecially to his human nature, though not excluding the divine, becauſe the members and head muſt be of the ſame nature. The 2d chapter to the Hebrews,

brews, seems to be written with this design, to shew the necessity of Christ's incarnation, in order to sustain the proper and appointed relations to his own people, viz. 'Because the children were partakers of flesh and blood, therefore he took part of the same,' that he might be a Brother, a Priest, a Father, a Succourer of the tempted, &c. Nor can any relation seem more necessarily to require his having a human nature, than that of head and members. Now in what sense can the Man Jesus bear the relation of such a vital or sympathising head united to his body, the church, if he has no particular knowledge of the wants, sorrows and sufferings of his particular members; if he has only a mere general confused knowledge that he has members on earth who endure sorrow and suffering, though he knows not how many, nor which they be, nor is he able, as man, to do any thing for their particular relief? Would it not be strange to say, he has the most near and intimate relation of headship to his members, as he is man, and of the same nature with them, and yet he cannot do any thing for the support or succour of any of them, by the powers of the very nature, whereby he sustains this relation, and whereby chiefly he becomes their head? It is granted that the indwelling Godhead capacitates him for the supply of the wants of his members, by furnishing him with all grace; but I think that human nature by which he eminently sustains this relation and becomes a head, may be allowed to be an intelligent and conscious medium of conveying these supplies.

V. If it should not be allowed that Jesus Christ, as man, can bestow effectual succour and relief on his tempted saints, yet surely he is able to make particular intercession for them. It is upon this account he is declared 'able to save to the uttermost those that come to God by him, because he ever lives to make

make interceſſion for them,' Heb. vii. 25. Now we cannot ſuppoſe it is the divine nature which properly and directly intercedes or pleads for us in heaven, but the Man Jeſus, who gave us a pattern of that interceſſion here on earth, John xvii. though it may be the divine nature united that renders this interceſſion ſo univerſally powerful and prevalent.

Nor can we ſuppoſe that Chriſt intercedes merely in general for all his ſaints, without knowledge of their particular perſons, or their preſent particular circumſtances; for this is no more than every Chriſtian on earth does or ſhould do: we ſhould all intercede or plead in that manner 'for all the ſaints,' Epheſ. vi. 18. though our pleadings have not the ſame efficacy as his, nor are we ſuppoſed to have the ſame knowledge of their wants.

When we are told that our great High Prieſt, whoſe ſpecial work and office in heaven is to make interceſſion for us, 'is paſſed into the heavens,' and that he 'can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, having himſelf been tempted as we are;' can we ever imagine that this does not refer to the human nature of Chriſt, ſince none of theſe expreſſions are applicable to his deity? And can we think that the ſcripture would repreſent our encouragements to apply ourſelves to him as an interceſſor in ſuch tender and ſympathetic language, if he knew only in general that there were thouſands of tempted ſaints on earth, but had no particular knowledge of their perſons, their ſpecial kinds of temptation and preſent diſtreſs, which might awaken this ſympathy, and engage his ſpecial repreſentation of their caſes to the Father?

VI. The human nature of Chriſt united to his Godhead is exalted to receive honours from men and angels in the upper and lower worlds, upon the account of its obedience, ſorrows and ſufferings.

It

It is one part of the reward promised to men of piety, that they shall enjoy glory and honour, as well as immortality and peace, Rom. ii. 7, 10. And surely our blessed Saviour has at least a right to share in the general promise made to men, and to have his transcendent and perfect piety rewarded with transcendent honours and glories.

Therefore when the apostle had described him as 'man,' or the 'Son of man,' or the 'second Adam,' in Hebrews ii. 9. he adds, 'We see him for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour:' for these sufferings and this death he voluntarily sustained, as a piece of the most submissive obedience to his heavenly Father, and most amazing charity to mankind; therefore, he was entitled to the glorious recompense.

You find these honours paid to him in heaven, according to the Father's promise and appointment. Not only the saints, who were redeemed by the blood of Christ, but the 'angels round about the throne, say with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing,' Rev. v. 11, 12. 'and every creature in heaven, on earth, and in the sea, join their honours and their blessings to him that sits upon the throne, and to the Lamb forever,' ver. 13. As the man is assumed into union with the Godhead, so the whole person of Christ the Mediator or God-Man becomes the object of adoration, as our best divines generally agree.

Read what the apostle declares, Philip. ii. 9, 10, 11. 'Christ humbled himself and became obedient to the death of the cross; wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him 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,

earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the glory of the Father.' Surely it is the human nature that ſeems to be exalted here to this dignity, as it ſtands united to the divine; and this is manifeſt, not only becauſe the divine nature could not receive this exaltation, having an original and underived right to worſhip, but alſo becauſe his human ſufferings are the reaſon of his exaltation.

I am ready to believe that the human nature of Chriſt knows and beholds all the knees bowing to him, and hears all the tongues confeſſing him, or elſe how can this be a proper recompenſe for the ſufferings of Chriſt in his human nature? Does the Godhead derive recompenſes from the ſufferings of the man? or can God be ſaid thus to exalt the pure divine nature to be the object of adoration? Has the human nature of Chriſt no ſhare in this reward? or is the human nature of Chriſt recompenſed ſome other way, i. e. by making a luminous figure in heaven, arrayed in bright ornaments above the clouds or ſtars, but ignorant of the honours done him by the church on earth, while yet theſe very honours done him on earth are declared to be his appointed recompenſe? How unreaſonable and abſurd is ſuch a ſuppoſition!

It will be objected here indeed, How can any thing that is not pure God be made any part of the object of religious worſhip? Is not this contrary to the firſt command, and to the general law of worſhip in the Old and New Teſtament, which directs it to be paid to God only?

Anſw. I think the human nature of Chriſt is no otherwiſe capable of religious worſhip, according to the ſtatutes of heaven, but by being thus gloriouſly united to the divine: but when it is thus united, the whole complex perſon may be made the object of religious

religious worship, if God see fit, since the person who is worshipped is really one with God, and has personal communion with the divine nature. But for the further removal of these objections and all the difficulties of this kind, see my Dissertation on the Worship of Christ as God-Man and Mediator, Diss. 3. Prop. 8, 9. where I have not only proved it from scripture, but cited the testimony of some of our greatest writers to support it, such as Turretine and Dr. Owen.

VII. Christ as man (but in union with God) is constituted Judge of the world. This is often repeated in scripture: Acts xvii. 31. 'God hath appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteousness by that MAN whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.' This is part of St. Paul's sermon to the Athenians. And St. Peter, in his sermon to Cornelius, Acts x. 38, &c. says, concerning 'Jesus of Nazareth, who was anointed with the Holy Ghost, and whom God raised from the dead, he has commanded us to preach to the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the judge of the quick and the dead.' It is he, even the Man Jesus, who lived at Nazareth, shall be the judge: it is the Man Christ Jesus who 'descends from heaven with a shout, and with the sound of a trumpet,' shall 'send his angels and gather his elect from every quarter of the earth;' he shall call to the dead, and they 'that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God and live;' for all 'judgment is committed to him,' John v. 27. 'because he is the Son of man,' i. e. the Man the Messiah.

I cannot think that the manhood of Christ would have been so expressly and peculiarly represented under this character and office of the final judge of the

the world, if the affairs of that awful and ſolemn day were not committed to him, and if the cognizance of the hearts and actions of men, ſo far as to decide their eternal ſtates juſtly, were not communicated to the Man Jeſus by his perſonal union with the divine nature. Surely he ſhall not ſit upon that tribunal like a glorious or ſhining cypher, or make a bright unactive figure there. No, by no means. The buſineſs of the judgment muſt paſs through his hands and his head, as Dr. Goodwin expreſſes it, concerning the government of the world, when he explains that text, Matth. xxviii. 18. And when he ſpeaks of the judgment of mankind by Jeſus Chriſt, he ſpeaks more highly and honourably of the influence that the human nature of Chriſt will have in it, than I dare venture to do here. See Vol. II. Book 3. Chap. ult. And indeed I may ſupport the boldeſt language I uſe in any part of this diſcourſe concerning the moſt extenſive powers of the Man Jeſus in his glorified ſtate, by ſuch a venerable precedent: the authority of that great and excellent man will abundantly excuſe and defend me among all thoſe who have an eſteem for his valuable writings.

VIII. It might be added in the laſt place, that our bleſſed Saviour, conſidered as man, has ſome unknown and moſt extenſive ways of communicating his preſence, his influence and his glory to all the millions of ſaints in the heavenly world; for the heaven of each of them conſiſts partly in being 'preſent with Chriſt,' 2 Cor. v. 8. 'and beholding his glory which the Father gave him;' i. e. the glory of his human nature, or at leaſt as God-Man. John xiv. 3. and xvii. 24. Now it is but a poor, low, and carnal idea of the heavenly ſtate and bleſſedneſs, if we conceive the common rank of ſaints to have no nearer acceſs to Chriſt, and no more participation

participation of his presence, or views of his glory, than merely to dwell in the same spacious regions of heaven, and to behold a man afar off raised on a high throne, and arrayed in light at a great distance. Surely the immediate presence of the Man Christ, and immediate communion with him, shall be something more near, more intimate, and more blissful than such a distant sight of him.

Shall it be said, that the powers of every glorified saint shall be vastly enlarged, to take in the blessed prospect and enjoyment, though the object may be afar off? And may it not be said also with more reason, that the powers of our glorified Saviour shall be much more enlarged to communicate himself and his glories to the meanest and most distant inhabitants of heaven? May he not make himself, even in his human nature as well as his divine, immediately present with them all, by a most extensive diffusion of his human as well as his divine glories?

SECT. III.

A rational Account how the Man Jesus Christ may be vested with such extensive Powers.

THE great difficulty of receiving this doctrine, still lies here—How is it possible that a human spirit should be endued with powers of so vast an extent? Can it ever be supposed that a human soul, a man, should know all things that are done in this earth? that he should be acquainted with the hearts and thoughts of all men? and should take a sufficient cognizance of every minute affair that passes through the hands and the hearts of all human creatures, in order to govern and judge so large a part of the creation.

Answ.

Anſw. 1. Perhaps it may not be abſolutely neceſſary that every ſingle thought, word, or action of every particular creature ſhould be known to the human ſoul of Chriſt, in order to fulfil his part or province in governing and judging mankind: but all the greater, more general, and more conſiderable affairs and tranſactions of nations, churches and particular perſons, may be made known to the Man Jeſus, ſo far, that in union with the Godhead he may be properly called the governor and the judge, and may execute and fulfil thoſe glorious offices: and if he ſhould not in an immediate manner be actually conſcious of, or actually influence the minuteſt circumſtances and actions of men, yet he may have ſufficient powers to know and influence all thoſe greater affairs, in which the leſſer and more minute circumſtances are alſo involved.

An earthly king may be properly ſaid to govern and judge his people, who are ſpread through many large provinces, without the particular knowledge of all the minuter concerns of his ſubjects: yet if he apply himſelf with diligence to fulfil his office, he may obtain a particular acquaintance with ten thouſand affairs that relate to the various provinces of his dominion; and he may employ proper agents to execute all his orders in the ſeveral towns and villages of his government, which his own eyes or his own hands perhaps cannot reach. Now ſurely we may juſtly believe that the intellectual powers of our glorified Saviour in heaven, extend vaſtly beyond the natural or acquired capacities of the greateſt prince on earth; it is not impoſſible but that the Man Jeſus may not only know every ſaint around him in the heavenly regions, but that every ſaint and ſinner alſo in this world, with all their biggeſt turns of life and concerns of mind, may come within his notice. Did king Cyrus know the face and the name

name of every ſoldier in his large army, and ſhall not Jeſus the King of kings be ſuppoſed to have underſtanding large enough to take in all the moſt important affairs of this lower world, and perhaps every perſon that is under his government, though his knowledge ſhould not reach all leſſer circumſtances?

Why may not the human ſoul of Chriſt be as well appointed to govern the world as the ſoul of man is appointed to govern his body, when it is evident that the ſoul of man does not know one thouſandth part of the fine branchings of the muſcles and nerves, and the more refined vapour or animal ſpirits, which are parts of this body? When the ſoul of man gives order to the groſſer limbs to move; all theſe minute and ſubtle parts and powers exert their regular operations by an original divine influence and appointment, though the ſoul has not a particular conſciouſneſs of theſe minute parts or their ſubtle operations. So our bleſſed Saviour's humanity may be veſted with the proper title and real powers of a governor of the world, without an explicit knowledge of every ſingle atom of it; all which infinite number of atoms, may only be under the eye and influence of Godhead.

The human ſoul of Chriſt is the brighteſt image or copy of the divine nature that is found among mere creatures; and though it may not receive all the infinite variety of particular ideas of human affairs, which are in the divine mind, yet it may receive as a tranſcript from the divine mind, ſo many of the largeſt and ſtrongeſt of thoſe ideas which relate to human affairs as may be ſufficient to qualify him for the Judge of all, under the immediate influence of indwelling Deity. So a man may tranſcribe a copy of the Hebrew bible, viz. all the letters or conſonants of it, ſufficient for himſelf to read and underſtand it, though

though he leave out every point, vowel, and accent, which ſometimes may be more in number than the letters themſelves.

It will be objected further, that every thought, word and action of human life, may ſome way or other have influence on the particularities of the final judgment, to diverſify, enlarge or diminiſh the rewards and puniſhments of men in the future ſtate; and if Chriſt as man knows not the minuteſt turns of thought in every heart, he cannot be a ſufficient judge, nor award proper recompenſes to every one according to their works.

I anſwer—If this be ſo, yet ſince the human ſoul of Chriſt can do ſo much as I have mentioned toward the cognizance and judgment of mankind, he may juſtly have this work aſſigned to him, conſidering its union to Godhead; and where the faculties of the human ſoul of Chriſt are exerted to their utmoſt, and yet fall ſhort, the divine nature, which is always preſent, abundantly ſupplies all that defect, by a conſtant, immediate and unknown monition and influence. 'God has ordained a man to judge the world,' and yet 'God is Judge himſelf. Selah.' Acts xvii. and Pſal. l.

And here let it be obſerved once for all, that I can hardly give myſelf leave to think that any created ſpirit whatſoever ſhould know every individual circumſtance of every being, and every action both in the world of bodies and the world of ſouls. Though Dr. Goodwin ſuppoſes the Man Jeſus capable of all this, I rather ſuppoſe it belongs only to the omniſcience of God himſelf, to take in, with one infinite, ſimultaneous and extenſive view, all the ſhapes, ſizes, ſituations and motions of every ſingle atom of which this whole globe of earth is compoſed, with all its animal and vegetable productions, and all the other planetary worlds, the ſun, moon and ſtars, with

with every action and circumſtance of all their inhabitants. I content myſelf rather to think it is a prerogative only of God the Creator, the infinite Spirit, to be perfectly acquainted with every motion of the mind, every inward thought and manner of action that belongs to all the innumerable inhabitants of the intellectual world, both men and angels. Should it be granted that any creature could overſee and overrule every minute affair that relates to the worlds of mind and matter, and every thought and atom that belongs to them all, ſometimes I think this would approach ſo near to the diſtinguiſhing properties and prerogatives which God hath aſſumed and peculiarized to himſelf in this world, that it would ſeem to take away that plain and obvious diſtinction between God and the creature which ought to be maintained ſacred and inviolable. Scripture ſeems to limit my thoughts about a creature's power in this manner.

Whatſoever therefore I may ſpeak in this treatiſe according to the moſt raiſed apprehenſions I have of the extent of the human intellectual powers of Chriſt, I can hardly ſuppoſe them to reach any farther than to take a juſt cogniſance of all thoſe greater and more important motions and actions, circumſtances and relations of the material and immaterial worlds on which the government of them chiefly depends; and perhaps alſo even this may be impoſſible without his peculiar union to the divine nature. He may thus have a ſimultaneous and comprehenſive view of all the greater affairs of every inhabitant of the upper and lower worlds, and may alſo have a ſucceſſive and particular knowledge of any minuter circumſtances that attend them, whenever the indwelling Deity ſees it neceſſary to communicate it to him for any ſpecial occaſions. As the general of an army ſtanding on an hill ſurveys the troops en-

gaged in battle, he can diſtinguiſh perhaps every regiment, and their changes of ground, when they charge, and when they retreat, but cannot know every ſword that is drawn, nor hear every groan; yet ſome particulars of this kind which relate to the ſingle ſoldiers may be diſtinctly told him. Where that great author, Dr. Goodwin, whoſe opinions I cite at the end of this book, indulges his imagination to fly beyond theſe limits, I am conſtrained to leave him, leſt I ſhould ſeem to deify a creature, and intrench upon the ſupreme majeſty of God.

Anſw. II. To make it appear that our bleſſed Lord in his human nature may poſſibly be capable of knowing all the moſt conſiderable affairs and circumſtances of mankind, let us conſider how far the mere native capacities of a human ſpirit may extend. We muſt not judge of the innate powers and natural capacities of the ſoul of the Meſſiah, by the ſcanty meaſures of our own ſouls and their native powers. The ſoul of Chriſt may be reaſonably ſuppoſed in its own nature to tranſcend the powers of all other ſouls as far as an angel exceeds an idiot, and yet be but a human ſoul ſtill; for *gradus non mutant ſpeciem*, different degrees do not change the kind or nature.

When we narrow and limit our conceptions of the extenſive powers of the ſoul of Jeſus, and bring them down too near to our own, it is becauſe we have too high a conceit of ourſelves, and too low an idea of the great and glorious God. We are ready to fancy the difference between God and ourſelves ſo ſmall, as that a mind ſo vaſtly ſuperior to our own as I have deſcribed, muſt be raiſed immediately to Godhead: whereas by the view of the powers of angels (which I have hinted before) it is poſſible there may be endowments and excellencies equal to all the millions of men on earth united in one ſpirit, which may be yet but a created being, and infinitely inferi-

or

or to the great God. And ſurely if there be ſuch a ſpirit of ſuch extenſive excellencies and endowments, it is divinely proper that this ſpirit ſhould be the ſoul of Jeſus, who is ſo intimately united to God, and who in all things muſt have the pre-eminence, Col. i. 18.

But let us proceed in this argument to raiſe our inquiries how great and glorious a creature may be formed by the Almighty Creator.

If I might venture to ſpeak here in the language of philoſophy, it is exceedingly hard for us to determine what is the *maximum* or *minimum*, the greateſt or the leaſt thing in nature. That matter is infinitely diviſible, is a doctrine now univerſally received and maintained without controverſy. Now if we cannot limit the poſſible ſmallneſs of corporeal beings, how can we limit the poſſible greatneſs of them? Even in the animal world, there are creatures whoſe particular limbs eſcape the niceſt microſcope, and are perhaps a thouſand times leſs than the ſmalleſt viſible grain of ſand. What amazing difference is betwixt the bulk of theſe diminutive animals and the bulk of an elephant or a whale? And yet the Almighty Creator may form animals as much ſuperior in bulk to a whale or an elephant, as theſe huge creatures exceed thoſe inviſible mites, when he had formed a world of air, earth and water fit for them. And why may not the ſame God perform the ſame wonders in the world of ſpirits? Can he not form a ſpirit of ſuch extenſive capacities as may be equal to a million of common human ſouls?

Let us think again, what ſtrange difference there is between the life and activity of an eagle and an oyſter, or between a grey hound and a ſnail, and yet both are animals. May not therefore the ſoul of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt exceed common ſouls, both in the activity and extent of its powers, as much as

the moſt ſprightly animal exceeds the dulleſt and moſt ſtupid? As far as ſun-beams exceed ſmoak and aſhes, or as far as the ſun exceeds our common fires? 'For in all things he muſt have the pre-eminence.'

Again—Cannot the Maker of all things create a new world of material beings, vaſtly ſuperior both in bulk and in powers, to this our earth, and the inhabitants of it? Cannot an architect build a royal palace larger and more exquiſitely adorned than his own little model of it? May he not form the model at the proportion of an inch to a thouſand yards? And why may not the Creator of all things as much exceed our uſual ideas alſo in forming a ſpirit of moſt extenſive and ſurpriſing capacities above all other ſpirits? It is too aſſuming for us to meaſure all poſſibilities by our common conceptions.

But even our common conceptions will furniſh us with ſome examples fit to perſuade us of the vaſt and extenſive power of a creature. Could we ever think of the pupil of the eye, that it ſhould take in a whole hemiſphere of ſtars, each of which is bigger than the globe of our earth, if every night's experience did not convince us? And yet this hemiſphere, ſo vaſt as it is, is but one of the ideas of a human ſoul. There are millions of ideas beſides this, which are contained in the ſoul or memory of every modern philoſopher or ingenious mechanic. Many of theſe our ideas indeed are ſucceſſive: but why may not the ſoul of Chriſt be large enough in its native capacity to take in all at once what we take in by long ſucceſſion, or what would coſt us the labour of ages?

Such a glorious created mind as belongs to the Son of God may be capable, for aught we know, of extending its thoughts backward to far diſtant ages, and forward beyond time, and reach far into eternity, and may alſo ſpread them abroad over the nations

tions of mankind, and all their chief affairs, and yet not be perfectly infinite as the knowledge of God is ;* for divine knowledge extends at once infinitely backward and forward through both eternities, and reaches to all possibles, as well as to what is actually past and future.

How do we know to what prodigious distances the presence, the consciousness and agency of the human soul of Christ may be extended ? We are sure this presence is not infinite ; but while we suppose it to be short of infinity, what other limits can our reason certainly set to it ? How can we tell to what amazing lengths, and heights, and breadths, and depths, his immediate consciousness and immediate agency may reach ? Wheresoever scripture sets limits to a creature's power, let our inquiring thoughts stop short and lie silent ; but reason hardly knows where to stop, while it inquires how powerful and knowing a creature the great God can make.

Surely we have good reason to believe that the soul of Christ is the most intelligent, the most knowing and active creature that God ever made, and has the largest native powers : and it seems divinely agreeable that it should be so, that he might be a proper subject for the favour of a personal union with the Godhead, and a proper medium whereby the great God might with honour transact his affairs among the children of men, as well as that he might be a most suitable mirror to display the divine perfections

* It is worthy of our observation how Mr. Locke, in the Essay on the Human Understanding, describes the largeness of a man or an angel's memory, Book II. Chap. 10. Sect. 9. " It is reported of that prodigy of parts, monsieur Pascal, that till the decay of his health had impaired his memory, he forgot nothing of what he had done, read or thought in any part of his rational age. The several degrees of angels may probably have larger views, and some of them be endowed with capacities able to retain together, and constantly set before them as in one picture all their past knowledge at once."

perfections in their faireſt and ſtrongeſt light. Surely there is no created nature which in itſelf comes nearer to the perfections of God, than the Man Chriſt Jeſus. No creature is a fairer image of God than the ſoul of Chriſt is, and thereby it becomes the fitteſt inſtrument for an indwelling God to act by, and yet it is infinitely inferior to Godhead.

Anſw. III. But if the native powers of the ſoul of Chriſt in its firſt formation, or during its abode on earth in a humbled eſtate, were not ſufficient for theſe purpoſes of government and judgment, yet may they not be ſufficient in its preſent glorified ſtate? The powers of a ſoul confined in fleſh and blood may be but of narrow extent, in compariſon of thoſe extenſive powers which are aſcribed to the Man Jeſus Chriſt now in heaven.

Who knows what amazing enlargement may attend all the natural powers of man, when advanced to a ſtate of glory? Perhaps a common ſpirit releaſed from fleſh and blood, and exalted to a glorified ſtate, may extend its powers a thouſand times farther than the greateſt ſpirit dwelling in fleſh can do.

And we may ſuppoſe alſo, that when this ſpirit is again united to a glorified body, its own powers of activity, knowledge and influence, may be yet farther enlarged abundantly, rather than confined, by having ſuch a glorious inſtrument to aſſiſt its operations. So a loadſtone naked will draw iron; but when it is armed with ſteel, it will draw a hundred times as much as before, though the ſteel without the loadſtone has no attractive power at all. Thus may the ſoul be in a glorified body: and indeed were it not ſo in ſome meaſure, why ſhould the glorified ſpirits of the ſaints ever be united to bodies again? The reſurrection of the body would be no bleſſing, if it did not add ſome new powers and advantages to the ſaints beyond thoſe of a ſeparate ſpirit.

Our

Our Saviour, who once dwelt in fleſh and blood, is now in a glorified ſtate, united to the moſt perfect glorified body; and what vaſt additions may be made to his knowledge and power, beyond what he enjoyed in the days of his humiliation and confinement to a mortal body, it is hard for us to determine. When ſuch a capacious ſoul is united to a glorified body, the extent of its native powers may receive an additional increaſe beyond what common ſouls even in glory can ever arrive at, as much as its native excellencies are ſuperior to theirs.

The very extent of the power and preſence of a glorified body itſelf may be prodigiouſly large in compariſon of our bodies of fleſh and blood. A drop of oil may be contained in a pepper-corn, and not extend its influence beyond it; but place this drop on a burning lamp, and the blaze will diffuſe its particles of light, when it is thus kindled, perhaps to two miles diſtance, in a dark night; thence it is evident, that theſe diffuſive particles of oil will fill a ſphere of four miles diameter: a moſt amazing enlargement of a ſingle drop! And why may not a glorified body, eſpecially when it ſhall be called a ſpiritual body, as much exceed fleſh and blood in its extent of powers, as a drop of oil kindled into a blaze ſtretches itſelf beyond its own firſt or native dimenſions?

Behold our bleſſed Lord after his reſurrection, even before he was fully glorified, comes with his body twice 'into the midſt of his diſciples when the doors were ſhut',* John xx. 19, 26. Much leſs doth a glorified body ſeem to be ſubject to the preſent

* Whatever other ſenſes may be put upon theſe words, I think our common tranſlation is the moſt natural, and the text ſeems to intimate that it was miraculous.

ent laws, reſtraints and limitations of corporeal motions.

What if we ſhould ſuppoſe a glorified ſoul to have as ſovereign and immediate an influence over every atom of its own glorified body, as our ſouls at preſent have over our groſſer limbs? What if it be made capable of ranging and diſpoſing the atoms, of which the body is compounded, in what form it pleaſe, and of diffuſing them through unknown ſpaces? Hence would evidently reſult the ſafety and immortality of that body, and its prodigious vital activity on the material world. Our ſafety would be in our own power, and our influence amazing, if we could place every atom of our bodies in what form we chooſe, and keep it there during our pleaſure.

And then ſurely we may allow the glorified ſoul of our bleſſed Saviour to be poſſeſſed of this power in a much ſuperior degree, and to exert it in a far more tranſcendent manner: and thus the Sun of righteouſneſs, even in the operations of his human nature, may anſwer all the parallels of this illuſtrious metaphor.

The natural powers of his body, thus ſublimated and refined, may move, for aught we know, as ſwift as ſun-beams, which may travel many thouſands of miles in a minute: it may diffuſe its influences like the ſun in a moſt extenſive ſphere: it may reach our world and the moon almoſt in the ſame moment, and penetrate earth to the centre.

If the face of our Lord on the mount of transfiguration did 'ſhine as the ſun, and his raiment was white as the light,' Matth. xvii. 2. if his body appearing to St. Paul was dreſſed in ſuch 'a light from heaven as exceeded the brightneſs of the ſun at midday,' Acts xxvi. 13. what diffuſive and diſtant influences may ſuch a glorified body be capable of on the

the elementary world of air, earth and water, under the command of ſuch a glorified ſoul as that of our Saviour.

I cannot deny myſelf in this place the pleaſure of publiſhing to the world a very beautiful reſemblance, the firſt hints and notices whereof I received formerly in converſation from my Rev. and worthy friend Mr. Robert Bragge, whereby the perſon of Chriſt as God-Man in his exalted ſtate may be happily repreſented. The ſun in the heavens is the moſt glorious of all viſible beings: his ſovereign influence has a moſt aſtoniſhing extent through all the planetary globes, and beſtows light and heat upon all of them. It is the ſun that gives life and motion to all the infinite varieties of the animal world in the earth, air and water: it draws out the vegetable juices from the earth, and covers the ſurface of it with trees, herbs and flowers: it is the ſun that gives beauty and colour to all the millions of bodies round the globe, and by its pervading power perhaps it forms minerals and metals under the earth. Its happy effects are innumerable; they reach certainly to every thing that has life and motion, or that gives life, ſupport or pleaſure to mankind.

Now ſuppoſe God ſhould create a moſt illuſtrious ſpirit and unite it to the body of the ſun, as a human ſoul is united to a human body: ſuppoſe this ſpirit had a perceptive power, capacious enough to become conſcious of every ſun-beam, and all the influences and effects of this vaſt ſhining globe, both in its light, heat and motion even to the remoteſt regions: and ſuppoſe at the ſame time it was able by an act of its will to ſend out or withhold every ſun-beam as it pleaſed, and thereby to give light and darkneſs, life and death in a ſovereign manner to all the animal inhabitants of this our earth, or even of all the planetary worlds. Such may be the glorified human ſoul of our

our bleſſed Redeemer united to his glorified body; and perhaps his knowledge and his power may be as extenſive as this ſimilitude repreſents; eſpecially when we conſider this ſoul and body as perſonally united to the divine nature, and as one with God.

Now this noble thought may be ſupported by ſuch conſiderations as theſe.

As our ſouls are conſcious of the light, ſhape, motions, &c. of ſuch diſtant bodies as the planet Saturn or the fixed ſtars, becauſe our eyes receive rays from thence; ſo may not a human ſoul united to a body as eaſily be ſuppoſed to have a conſciouſneſs of any thing whereſoever it can ſend out rays or emit either floods or atoms from its own body? May not the ſun, for inſtance, if a ſoul were united to it, become thereby ſo glorious a complex being, as to ſend out every ray with knowledge, and have a conſciouſneſs of every thing whereſoever it ſends its direct or reflected rays? And may not the human ſoul of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt have a conſciouſneſs of every thing whereſoever it can ſend direct or reflected rays from his own ſhining and glorified body?

To add yet to the wonder, we may ſuppoſe, that theſe rays may be ſubtle as magnetic beams which penetrate braſs and ſtone as eaſily as light doth glaſs; and at the ſame time they may be ſwift as light, which reaches the moſt amazing diſtance of ſeveral millions of miles in a minute. By this means, ſince the light of the ſun pervades all ſecret chambers in our hemiſphere at once, and fills all places with direct and reflected beams, if conſciouſneſs belonged to all thoſe beams, what a ſort of omniſcient being would the ſun be? I mean omniſcient in its own ſphere. And why may not the human ſoul and body of our glorified Saviour be thus furniſhed with ſuch an amazing extent of knowledge and power, and yet not be truly infinite?

Let

Let us dwell a little longer upon theſe delightful contemplations.

If a ſoul had but a full knowledge and command of all the atoms of one ſolid foot of matter, (which according to modern philoſophy is infinitely diviſible) what ſtrange and aſtoniſhing influences would it have over this world of ours? What confuſions might it raiſe in diſtant nations, ſending peſtilential ſteams into a thouſand bodies, and deſtroying armies at once? And it might ſcatter benign or healing and vital influences to as large a circumference. If our bleſſed Lord in the days of his humiliation could ſend virtue out of him to heal a poor diſeaſed woman who touched the hem of his garment with a finger, who knows what healing atoms or what killing influences he may ſend from his dwelling in glory to the remoteſt diſtances of our world, to execute his Father's counſels of judgment or mercy? It is not impoſſible, ſo far as I can judge, that the ſoul of Chriſt in its glorified ſtate may have as much command over our heavens and our earth, and all things contained in them, as our ſouls in the preſent ſtate have over our own limbs and muſcles to move them at pleaſure.

Let us remember that it is now found out and agreed in the new philoſophy of Sir Iſaac Newton, that the diſtances are prodigious to which the powerful influence of the ſun reaches in the centre of our planetary ſyſtem. It is the ſun who holds and reſtrains all the planets in their ſeveral orbits, and keeps in thoſe vaſt bodies of Jupiter and Saturn in their conſtant revolutions; one at the diſtance of four hundred and twenty-four millions, and the other at the diſtance of ſeven hundred and ſeventy-ſeven millions of miles; beſides all the other influences it has upon every thing that may live and grow in thoſe planetary worlds.

It

It is the ſun who reduces the long wanderings of the comets back again near to himſelf from diſtances more immenſely great than thoſe of Saturn and Jupiter: and why may not the human nature of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, both in ſoul and body, have a dominion given him by the Father, larger than the ſun in the firmament? Why may not the Son of God be endued with an immediate conſciouſneſs and agency to a far greater diſtance?

Thus if we conceive of the human ſoul of Chriſt, either in the amazing extent of its own native powers, or in the additional acquirements of a glorified ſtate, we ſee reaſon to believe that its capacities are far above our old uſual conceptions, and may be raiſed and exalted to a degree of knowledge, power and glory ſuitable and equal to his operations and offices, ſo far as they are attributed to his human nature in the word of God? But I proceed further.

Anſw. IV. But if the ſoul of Chriſt, conſidered ſingly in its native powers, or even in its glorified ſtate, be not capable of ſuch extenſive knowledge and influence, yet, conſidered in its perſonal union with the divine nature, its capacities muſt be enlarged to an unknown degree. And though it is my judgment, that, abſtracted from his Godhead, the Man Jeſus could not fulfil and ſuſtain all the ſacred offices and honours of the Meſſiah, yet united to his divine nature, he may thereby become in a ſenſe ſufficient for all this work.

It may be inquired here, what influence this perſonal union with the Godhead can have upon a human mind, to enlarge its knowledge and intellectual faculties and its effective powers to ſo amazing an extent?

In anſwer to this, we muſt all confeſs that the doctrine of unions is one of the moſt unknown and unſearchable difficulties in natural philoſophy. Our underſtandings

underſtandings are nonpluſſed when we conſider but the union of the parts of matter among themſelves, which no philoſophy has ever yet fully accounted for; and much more are we puzzled when we think of the union of matter and mind in every human perſon, and the ſtrange amazing influences which the one hath upon the other by means of this union. But when we attempt to conceive of the moſt intimate union, into which the great and bleſſed God may aſſume a creature, and join it to himſelf, our thoughts are loſt and overwhelmed with this myſtery: and that, not only as to the mode or manner of it, which is unſearchable, but as to the extent of the influences and effects of it, which are aſtoniſhing, and beyond all our preſent powers to determine.

Yet ſince we are thus far aſſured by the word of God that there is a glorious union between the Man Chriſt, and the divine nature, we may attempt to explain our beſt conceptions about the effects of it, firſt as to the communications of knowledge, and then of effective power.

I. As to the communication of knowledge to the Man Chriſt by his union with the Deity. We may try to illuſtrate this matter by the ſimilitude of the union of a human ſoul to a body. Suppoſe a learned philoſopher be alſo a ſkilful divine, and a great linguiſt; we may reaſonably conclude that there are ſome millions of words and phraſes (if taken together with all the various ſenſes of them) which are depoſited in his brain as in a repoſitory, by means of ſome correſpondent traces or ſignatures; we may ſuppoſe alſo millions of ideas of things, human and divine, treaſured up in various traces or ſignatures in the ſame brain: nay, each organ of ſenſe may impreſs on the brain millions of traces belonging to the particular objects of that ſenſe; eſpecially the two ſenſes of diſcipline, the eye and the ear: the pictures, the

the images, the colours, and the ſounds that are reſerved in this repoſitory of the brain, by ſome correſpondent impreſſions or traces are little leſs than infinite: now the human ſoul of the philoſopher, by being united to this brain, this well-furniſhed repoſitory, knows all theſe names, words, ſounds, images, lines, figures, colours, notions and ſenſations. It receives all theſe ideas, and is, as it were, miſtreſs of them all. The very opening of the eye impreſſes thouſands of ideas at once upon ſuch a ſoul united to a human brain; and what unknown millions of ideas may be impreſſed on it or conveyed to it in ſucceſſive ſeaſons, whenſoever ſhe ſtands in need of them, and that by the means of this union to the brain, is beyond our capacity to think or number.

Let us now conceive the divine mind or wiſdom as a repoſitory ſtored with infinite ideas of things paſt, preſent and future; ſuppoſe a created ſpirit of moſt extenſive capacity intimately united to this divine mind or wiſdom; may it not by this means, by divine appointment become capable of receiving ſo many of thoſe ideas, and ſo much knowledge, as are neceſſary for the government and the judgment of all nations? And this may be done two ways, viz. either by the immediate application of itſelf (as it were by inquiry) to the divine mind, to which it is thus united, or by the immediate actual influences and impreſſions which the divine mind may make of theſe ideas on the human ſoul, as faſt as ever it can ſtand in need of them for theſe glorious purpoſes.

Since a human brain, which is mere matter, and which contains only ſome ſtrokes and traces and corporeal ſignatures of ideas, can convey to a human ſoul united to it, many millions of ideas, as faſt as it needs them for any purpoſes of human life; how much more may the infinite God, or divine mind

or

or wiſdom, which hath actually all real and poſſible ideas in it, in the moſt perfect manner, communicate to a human ſoul united to this divine wiſdom, a far greater number of ideas than a human brain can receive; even as many as the affairs of governing and judging this world may require.

This may be repreſented and illuſtrated by another ſimilitude thus: ſuppoſe there were a ſpherical looking-glaſs or mirror vaſt as this earth is, on which millions of corporeal objects appeared in miniature on all ſides of it impreſt or repreſented there, by a thouſand planetary and ſtarry worlds ſurrounding this vaſt mirror; ſuppoſe a capacious human ſpirit united to this mirror, as the ſoul is to the body; what an unknown multitude of ideas would this mirror convey to that human ſpirit in ſucceſſive ſeaſons? Or perhaps this ſpirit might receive all theſe ideas at once, and be conſcious of the millions of things repreſented all round the mirror. This mirror may repreſent the Deity: the human ſpirit taking in theſe ideas ſucceſſively, or conſcious of them all at once, may repreſent to us the ſoul of Chriſt receiving (either in a ſimultaneous view, or in a ſucceſſive way) unknown myriads of ideas by its union to Godhead: though it muſt be owned it can never receive all the ideas which are in the divine mind.

II. Having ſhewn how the human ſoul of Chriſt, by virtue of its union with the divine nature, may be furniſhed with moſt amazing treaſures of knowledge, I proceed now to inquire how the human nature of Chriſt may attain vaſt effective powers, and may be ſaid to have a hand in bringing about the various revolutions of Providence, in managing the affairs of the government of the world, and forming the wondrous ſcenes of the laſt judgment; and all this by virtue of its union to the divine nature.

Let

Let us conſider what power or influence the human nature of Chriſt might have upon the miracles which he wrought whilſt he was here on earth. It is very probable and almoſt certain, that it was a part of his divine furniture and commiſſion from the Father, that whenſoever he prayed for, and then willed or commanded any ſuch ſort of ſupernatural event, the effect ſhould as certainly follow his volition or his command as the human limbs obey the ſoul when it wills to move them. The caſe of the apoſtles was not ſo; they had not a perſonal union with indwelling Godhead; they tried once, or perhaps oftener, to caſt out devils, and could not do it. But as where our ſoul wills, our limbs always move at its command, ſo whenſoever Chriſt the Man willed to work a miracle, the ſupernatural effects followed, if not by human, yet by divine agency. Obſerve this in a few inſtances.

When he cleanſed the leper, Matth. viii. his ſoul willed that leproſy ſhould depart, and his tongue pronounced theſe words, 'I will; be thou clean;' and immediately the effect followed, the leper was healed. Whether the human ſoul of Chriſt had in that day ſufficient knowledge and power given it to change the craſis of the blood, to remove the tainted atoms from the body of the man, and to place all the fibres of the diſeaſed fleſh in a proper and healthy form, this may be matter of doubtful inquiry: but if the divine power united to the manhood made this ſovereign and healing change, and was pleaſed to make uſe of the intermediate volition of the human will, and language of the human tongue for this purpoſe, ſtill the Man Chriſt Jeſus has his ſhare of agency in this work; and therefore he is ſaid to go about 'working wonders and healing diſeaſes, for God was with him,' Acts x. 38.

Again,

Again, in the midst of a storm when he bid the winds be silent, and commanded the waves to be still, it is probable that his human soul and body might not in themselves at that time have direct and proper sufficient influence on the winds and the waves, to produce such a miraculous calm and silence; but the divine nature or indwelling Godhead, by its infinite power suppressed these tumultuous elements at the will and word of Christ, which rebuked the storm: and since the Man Jesus was made the intelligent medium or instrument of this command, the winds and the seas are said to pay obedience to him, Mark iv. 41. 'What manner of man is this, that the winds and seas obey him?'

It was much the same thing when he cast out devils, and commanded them to depart from the bodies which they possessed. Whether it was the terror of his known character that fell upon them and frighted them, or the compulsive power of his deity drove them out, this may perhaps be doubted. But suppose the demoniacs were dispossessed by divine agency, yet the Man Jesus has the honour of this miracle, as being the conscious instrument of his Godhead therein. It was 'Jesus of Nazareth who healed those who were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him,' Acts x. 38.

Yet we should take notice, that in the days of his humiliation on earth his power was limited; for he had not the knowledge of all God's counsels, (he knew not the day of judgment) and therefore could not govern the world till his resurrection and ascension, when the Father 'delivered all things into his hands,' Matth. xxviii. and gave him the book of his decrees, Rev. v. We may observe also, that when he raised Lazarus, he prayed to the Father for that miracle, John xi. 41. as acknowledging publickly a particular dependence for each miraculous operation;

tion; 'I know that thou heareſt me always, and I thank thee that thou haſt now heard me.'

But perhaps it is otherwiſe in his glorified ſtate. Imagine our Saviour in heaven as having received full and abſolute 'powers over all things in heaven and earth,' Matth. xxviii. 18. ſuppoſe him now reſiding in the upper world, and by his own moſt extenſive capacity of mind and by the indwelling Deity; ſuppoſe him conſtantly acquainted with the various counſels of God for the government of the world and the church, as particularly as he was acquainted with each ſingle occaſion of working a miracle here on earth; ſuppoſe alſo his commiſſion in his exalted ſtate to be ſo general and extenſive, and that according to every emergency he gives commands to the angels or devils, to the earth, air and ſeas, to perform ſuch peculiar ſervices for his people, and to bring diſtreſs upon his adverſaries; now if all the infinite variety of effects preſently appear and anſwer his command, (though really performed by divine power) he may properly be ſaid to have 'all power in heaven and in earth put into his hands,' and to govern all things in the upper and lower regions; for as much as the indwelling Godhead makes uſe of the human nature as its glorious and conſcious medium, to exert its ſovereign authority and divine power; and the Man Jeſus, conſidered in union with Godhead, gives forth the commands, ſees them all executed, and receives the honours and adorations of ſaints and angels, as their Governor and their Judge.

Thus if the exalted powers of the Man Jeſus in glory are not conceived to be ſufficient in themſelves for the complete execution of thoſe great offices to which he is advanced, yet his human ſoul being united to his Godhead, and always under the infallible influence of divine wiſdom and counſel, and having ſuch a moſt extenſive acquaintance with the affairs

affairs of the upper and lower worlds, the Man Chriſt may give forth all the commands of God whereby the world is governed, 'and every knee may bow to him, and every tongue confeſs that Chriſt is Lord to the glory of the Father.'

If any perſon ſhould inquire here, May not any of our ſouls be thus aſſumed into union with the divine nature, and by this union be made capable of the ſame powers and dignities? I anſwer, By no means: for though the capacity of our ſouls may be largely extended in a future world, yet I am verily perſuaded they can never be dilated or enlarged to the amazing comprehenſion which the ſoul of our bleſſed Saviour poſſeſſes. Our ſouls in their native conſtitution are vaſtly inferior to his. As a veſſel of clay can never be enlarged by all the art of man to ſuch a prodigious capacity as a veſſel of gold, ſo nor the ſoul of an ideot to contain the ideas of a Milton or a Newton; nor any other created ſpirit to know and do what the bleſſed ſoul of Jeſus knows and does.

Perhaps the powers of any other human ſoul would be diſſolved and deſtroyed under ſuch impreſſions from indwelling Godhead as the ſoul of Chriſt conſtantly receives, and by which he is fitted for his high poſt of mediation and government. Were it poſſible that the Divine Power ſhould continually condeſcend to effect whatſoever a common human ſoul willed, yet this human ſoul perhaps has not natural powers ſufficiently large to be made a conſcious inſtrument of one thouſandth part of what the ſoul of Jeſus knows and wills, and does by virtue of the indwelling Godhead. 'In all things he muſt have the pre-eminence.' Col. i. 15—18.

Upon this repreſentation of things, the various language of ſcripture appears to be true, and is made very intelligible. Chriſt ſays, 'he can do nothing of himſelf, he knew not the day of judgment' when he

was here on earth, &c. and yet he is ſaid to 'know the hearts of men,' and to 'know all things;' for as faſt as the Divine Mind united to him was pleaſed to communicate all theſe ideas, ſo faſt was his human nature capable of receiving them. 'The Father,' in ſucceſſion of ſeaſons, 'ſhews the Son all things that himſelf doth.' John v. 20. But God had ſhewn him but ſome leſſer things comparatively at the time when Chriſt ſpake this; for at that time he aſſures the Jews, that 'the Father would' afterwards 'ſhew him greater works than theſe.' Thus, as I have ſhewn before, the union of the human nature to the divine being purely arbitrary, or owing to the will of God, the ſeaſons and meaſures of divine communications made to the Man Jeſus muſt be arbitrary alſo, and limited or enlarged according to divine will and appointment.

Upon this ſame repreſentation of things alſo it may be juſtly ſaid in ſcripture, that 'God governs the world, God only knows the hearts of all men,' and 'God himſelf is the judge,' and yet Chriſt is the 'Searcher of hearts,' the 'Judge and Lord of all;' becauſe, though the Man Jeſus may have theſe titles and characters attributed to him, yet it is not merely the man, conſidered abſtractedly in himſelf, but it is the Man united to God, it is the perſon of God-Man: or you may ſay, the Divine Nature, or the Godhead, acting in and by the Man Jeſus, who performs all theſe wonders, and which makes the Man Jeſus the conſcious and intelligent medium of theſe performances; and thus he gives him the honour of being the agent.

By this account of things, there is a fair anſwer given to the objection that might be ſtarted againſt the firſt part of this ſection, viz. If the human ſoul of Chriſt, which is but a creature, may have ſuch a vaſt and aſtoniſhing extent of knowledge and power,

does

does not this represent a creature approaching too near to the idea of God? Does it not invest a creature with some of those prerogatives which are mentioned in scripture, as peculiar and appropriate to Deity? And does it not thus take away the distinction which God has given between himself and creatures, as well as enervate several of our scripture proofs of the divinity of Christ?

I have indeed, in some measure, anticipated this objection, when I limited the knowledge and power of the Man Jesus, only to the greater and more important concerns and actions of the material and intellectual worlds, on which the government of them chiefly depends: and even this must be a very amazing and comprehensive knowledge and power for a creature to possess: but every thought, and every motion, and every atom of the worlds of souls and bodies, in my opinion, is known only to God, and belongs to infinite Omniscience alone.

But to remove this difficulty and danger yet farther, let us always remember, that the human nature of Christ, which is so exalted, has the fulness of the Godhead dwelling in it, or is personally united to Deity. Thence it follows, that when these most extensive powers are attributed to the Man Jesus, it is by virtue of the divine nature that dwells in him: and therefore the complex person of our blessed Saviour may justly have these divine prerogatives of knowledge and power ascribed to him. They being given us to distinguish God from a mere creature, cannot be applied by the word of a true and faithful God to any person who has not Godhead in him; and upon this account they continue their assistance to prove the deity of Christ.

If it were possible that a mere creature could be framed by divine power, capable in itself of some of

of thoſe operations which God has aſſumed to himſelf, as his own prerogatives, ſuch as governing and judging the world, ſearching and ſanctifying the hearts of men, &c. yet ſince the great God, who is jealous of his own honour, has appropriated theſe characters and operations to himſelf alone, I think we may be aſſured that he would never form ſuch a creature with theſe characters and operations; or at leaſt, that he would never diſcover ſuch a creature to us in our world, leſt he ſhould thereby take away the inviolable criteria or ſigns which himſelf has given us, to diſtinguiſh between God and creatures. Or if ever ſuch a glorious creature were formed and diſcovered to us, he would certainly be intimately and perſonally united to the divine nature; and thus have proper Godhead dwelling in him, leſt we ſhould be unavoidably expoſed to the danger of taking one for God who was not God, and paying divine honours to a perſon who was not divine.

Perhaps while we dwell on earth, there will always remain ſome difficulty in adjuſting ſeveral particulars that relate to the perſon, the offices and the operations of our bleſſed Saviour: but ſince we firmly believe that his name is Immanuel, or God with us, and that God and Man are united to conſtitute the complete perſon of our Mediator; ſince we are perſuaded alſo that the characters and offices which he ſuſtains, require powers ſuperior to all created nature for the moſt complete execution of them; therefore where we are at a loſs in determining how far the divine nature operates, and how far the human, in any ſpecial part of his offices, we may refer it in general to the complex perſon of the Mediator as God-Man. In this perſon we are ſure there are powers abundantly ſufficient to anſwer all the neceſſities and demands of every office which he ſuſtains. When we conſider him as God, it is as God united

to

to man: when we conſider him as man, it is as man united to God; and his perſon as God-Man, our Governor and our Judge demands our adoration, and faith, and love.

To conclude this ſubject, though ſuch ſpeculations as I have indulged in this Diſcourſe, are by no means neceſſary to our ſalvation, yet they may be applied to ſeveral excellent purpoſes in Chriſtianity. They may cure us of our old narrow conceptions of the glories of the exalted human nature of Chriſt, and raiſe in us nobler ideas of that illuſtrious perſon, whom God the Father hath advanced to ſo ſublime a degree of power and majeſty at his own right hand.

Theſe ſpeculations may give us a much higher eſteem of our bleſſed Saviour, and a more affecting ſenſe of his ſorrows and ſufferings in the value and dignity of them, when we obſerve how glorious a perſon he is in himſelf, and what a rich and ſurpriſing recompenſe God the Father has made him upon this account. They may teach us to pay more juſt and agreeable honours to the perſon of our Redeemer God-Man, and excite us to a nobler practice of gratitude, to do and ſuffer any thing for his ſake, who has done and ſuffered ſo much for us on earth, and who continues to do ſo much for us in heaven. Sure it muſt be a culpable defect in us, willingly to withhold any part of that eſteem, affection and love from the Man Chriſt Jeſus, which he has ſo richly merited at our hands by his amazing condeſcenſion, by his former mortal agonies, and by his preſent extenſive benefits. We would not willingly treat any of our fellow-creatures at ſo low and unworthy a rate, as too often we treat the Son of God who died for us, and is exalted to the Father's throne. Rev. iii. 27. and iv. 21.

It has pleaſed the Father that all the fulneſs of Godhead ſhould dwell bodily in the Man Jeſus, that there

there ſhould be a perſonal union between God and man, that ſo the human nature being a part of the complex perſon of the Mediator, it might be aſſumed into the complex object of worſhip: and indeed if we do not include the human nature of Chriſt in the honours which we pay him, I think we can be hardly ſaid to give him any of that ſpecial honour in a proper ſenſe, to which the Father has advanced him by this union: and we ſeem to deprive his ſacred perſon alſo of that peculiar glory which he received from the Father by way of gift or reward for his ſufferings. For it is not the divine nature properly, but the human, which endured the ſufferings, and is entitled to the reward. Whatſoever ſublime honours therefore we pay to the pure Godhead of Chriſt, while we have no actual regard to the Man Jeſus who is united to the Deity, we ſeem to neglect that peculiar honour due to him, for which we have perhaps the moſt frequent precepts and examples in the New Teſtament, i. e. the honour due to him as God-Man and Mediator.

I grant that we muſt not ſeparate the divine nature of Chriſt from the human, while we addreſs him with religious worſhip; for the mere Man abſtracted from Godhead doth not ſeem a proper object, nor juſtly capable of it, according to the rules of ſcripture; yet while we direct our devotions to his whole ſacred perſon, our forms of addreſs may and ought to have frequent reſpect to the paſt ſorrows and the preſent glories and powers of his human nature: this is to worſhip him, according to the patterns of worſhip paid to him, which ſtand recorded in ſcripture for our imitation. See Rev. i. 5, 6. and v. 9. and vii. 9, 10.

All the honour which we pay to the Man Jeſus, muſt redound to the glory of the indwelling Godhead, and to the honour of the Father; yet we ſhould

ſhould look upon ourſelves under ſpecial obligations, to pay particular honour and love to whom honour and love are due, and not forget the intereſt of the human nature of Chriſt in the ſmart of his ſufferings, and in the glory of his exaltation, when we pay religious worſhip to our Immanuel, or God with us. See theſe things more diſcourſed at large in my third Diſſertation on the Trinity.

Such raiſed ſentiments as theſe concerning the power and dignity of our exalted Redeemer, may diſcover to us the ſenſe and beauty of ſeveral expreſſions of ſcripture which before were unobſerved or unknown; and may make it appear with what propriety the ſcripture ſpeaks concerning the rewards and recompenſes which Chriſt received, on the account of his ſufferings: it diſcovers alſo the diſtinct capacities with which he is furniſhed to fulfil thoſe glorious offices of government and judgment, that the Father has inveſted him with.

While we give a ſacred freedom to our meditations on this ſubject, we may feel ourſelves inſpired with holy breathings toward the upper world, where the perſon of our great Redeemer dwells at the right hand of God. Such an elevation of thought may awaken in us yet further degrees of humble and ſacred curioſity to arrive at a better acquaintance with the great Theanthropos, or God in our nature, 'whom having not ſeen we love,' and 'in whom, though now we ſee him not, yet believing we rejoice.' This ſhould make us long till the time comes, when our doubtful and imperfect gueſſes at his glory ſhall vaniſh; when we ſhall view him no longer through the darkneſs of a glaſs, but ſee him as he is, and behold him face to face. Then ſhall it appear, that eternal life in our poſſeſſion of it, as well as in our way to it, conſiſts in the knowledge of the one true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom he has ſent. John xvii.

xvii. 3. Then ſhall the Son of God himſelf, and all his ſaints together, rejoice in the accompliſhment of that glorious language of his interceſſion; John xvii. 24. '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:' and this will be a great part of our heaven. Amen.

SECT. IV.

Teſtimonies from other Writers.

SINCE I have finiſhed this Diſcourſe, I have met with ſeveral authors who were zealous and hearty friends of the doctrine of the Deity of Chriſt, and yet have raiſed their meditations to a ſublime degree concerning the extenſive powers and capacities of his human nature now glorified. Perhaps it will allure ſome readers into a more favourable ſentiment of this doctrine, when they ſhall find that it is not a looſe and wild flight of imagination, but the ſettled and ſedate judgment of former writers of worth and eminency; and for this reaſon I have made the following citations.

If we were to conſult the writings of the ancient fathers, Dr. Whitby* aſſures us in his Annotations on Philip. ii. 9. that "They refer this high exaltation of Chriſt, not to his divine but human nature; and that the apoſtle ſpeaks not here of the exaltation of his divine nature by the manifeſtation of his concealed glory and power, but of the exaltation of

* However Dr. Whitby in his latter days fell in pretty much with Dr. Samuel Clarke's opinion; yet when he wrote his Annotations, he was zealous againſt Arianiſm, and a fervent defender of the proper Deity of Chriſt, ſo that his ſenſe on this point cannot be ſuſpected here.

of that nature which had ſuffered, for this is repreſented in ſcripture as the reward of his paſſion. Heb. ii. 9. We ſee him, ſaith the apoſtle, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the ſuffering of death crowned with glory and honour. And again, The elders about the throne ſaid, 'Worthy is the Lamb that was ſlain to receive power and riches.' Rev. v. 27. Though it was given to the Man Chriſt Jeſus, becauſe the fulneſs of the Godhead dwelt in him."

He adds alſo, at ver. 11. "Seeing the Father thus exalted the humanity of Chriſt, ſince he united the *Logos* to the human nature; what hinders that this exaltation ſhould be ſaid, to be to the glory of the Father, from whom he received even the divine nature?"

I might cite ſeveral other teſtimonies from Dr. Whitby's Annotations, and every learned reader knows that in thoſe Annotations he is zealous upon all occaſions to oppoſe the Arian doctrine.

As the fathers ſuppoſe this exaltation to the government and judgment of the world to belong to the human nature of Chriſt, ſo the ſchool-men are zealous for the communication of ſuch a moſt extenſive knowledge to the Man Chriſt Jeſus, as renders him capable of theſe offices; and yet the ſchoolmen are well known to be as zealous defenders of the divinity of our bleſſed Saviour, as any Chriſtian writers whatſoever.

The Lutherans are as hearty believers that Chriſt is true God, and that they ſuppoſe his human nature to be advanced now in glory to an univerſal knowledge of all things in heaven and in earth, and that by union with his deity; ſo that he has a ſort of omnipreſence and omniſcience.

If you conſult the remonſtrant divines, they have the ſame opinion of the matter; ſee Limborch's Theology

Theology in Latin, book 5. chap. xviii. "Though we have excluded all creatures from being the object of divine worſhip, yet this muſt not exclude our Lord Jeſus Chriſt the Mediator; for though as he is man he is a creature, yet by means of his mediatory office he is ſo highly exalted above all creatures, that religious honour muſt be given him as 'Lord of all." And in ſection 13th, "If it be objected, that omniſcience and omnipotence are required in order to render any being adorable, I anſwer, Not eſſential and abſolute omnipotence and omniſcience, but ſo much as is neceſſary to know all the thoughts and prayers of the worſhippers, and to ſupply all their neceſſities; but we have ſhown that both theſe belong to Jeſus Chriſt as Mediator." Yet this author is an hearty defender of the bleſſed doctrine of the Trinity according to the common ſentiments of Chriſtianity, as appears in book 3d. chap. xviith.

A very ingenious gentleman of the church of England, who has diſcourſed of the future ſtate, and the progreſſive knowledge of the ſaints there, p. 46. writes thus; "Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt remains a true man in his glorified ſtate, and yet certainly his preſence is much more extenſive than when he dwelt on earth. He may perhaps as eaſily inſpect the whole globe of this earth, and the heavens that encompaſs and ſurround it, as any of us can view a globe or circumference of an inch diameter; for he is the Sovereign of mankind. He is the Prince of the kings of the earth. He is the Governor of the world. The laws by which they ought to live, and by which they muſt be judged, are his laws.

"Beſides, he is our great Interceſſor with God Almighty; but how can he intercede for what he knows not, or know what he does not hear? How can all the prayers of his people come before him, unleſs his preſence be very diffuſive, and extend with

with the fabric of earth and heaven? I am not about to affirm the ubiquity of Christ's bodily presence, nor to determine the manner how he is present; but that Jesus Christ, even in his human nature, does view and take cognisance of the affairs of man, I think cannot be doubted. Page 49. Christ Jesus is the head of his church even in his human nature: how can he know the usefulness and the necessity of special communications to the several and single members of his body, without a largeness of presence?"

"In brief, Christ Jesus considered as Man and Mediator, is the great and general Administrator of all the affairs of this human world; whatever is done in it, he does it, for 'all power in heaven and in earth is given unto him.' 'Great is the mystery of godliness;' and certainly, even the Man Christ Jesus is a far more glorious person than the most of Christians, yea, or of Christian divines, do conceive or apprehend. He is called the Sun of righteousness, and compared to light, and doth enlighten all the intellectual world. He is the express image of his Father's person: that is, perhaps, the most lively character and expression of the Deity, that is among created beings. He is sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high: that is, he is next the pure Godhead, the most illustrious essence in the world.

"Let no man misunderstand me in what I have said concerning the human nature of Christ Jesus. I do not deny his divine nature, nor the union thereof to the human: I extend the presence of his human nature no farther than the nature of his mediatory office doth require it. And touching the doctrine of the Trinity, and the union of the eternal Word with the human nature, I esteem it the great essential,

eſſential, as well as the great myſtery of the Chriſtian religion, and do very heartily believe it."

Dr. Thomas Goodwin in his Treatiſe of the heart of Chriſt in heaven, part 3d, ſays, "The underſtanding of the human nature of Chriſt hath notice and cogniſance of all the occurrences that befall his members here. And for this the text is clear; for the apoſtle ſpeaks this for our encouragement, that Chriſt is touched with the feeling of our infirmities. Which could not be a relief to us, if it ſuppoſed not this, that he particularly and diſtinctly knew them; and if not all as well as ſome, we ſhould want relief in all, as not knowing which he knew, and which he knew not. And the apoſtle affirms this of his human nature, (as was ſaid) for he ſpeaks of that nature that was tempted here below. As 'all power in heaven and earth is committed unto him' as Son of Man, (as the ſcripture ſpeaks) ſo all knowledge is given him of all things done in heaven and earth, and this as Son of Man too, his knowledge and power being of equal extent. He is the Sun as well in reſpect of knowledge, as of righteouſneſs, and there is nothing hid from his light and beams, which do pierce the darkeſt corners of the hearts of the ſons of men; he knows the ſores and diſtreſſes of their hearts. Like as a looking-glaſs made into the form of a round globe, and hung in the midſt of a room takes in all the ſpecies of things done, or that are therein at once; ſo doth the enlarged underſtanding of Chriſt's human nature take in the affairs of this world, (which he is appointed to govern) eſpecially the miſeries of his members, and this at once."

The ſame author in his ſecond Vol. in fol. book 3d. page 95. has a large treatiſe upon the extenſive glories and powers of Chriſt conſidered as God-Man, wherein

wherein he exalts his human nature to a most amazing degree.

Mr. Baxter in his Annotations on Phil. ii. 9. affirms "God highly exalted him in the manhood in which he suffered, and hath given him greater dignity and honour and renown than any creature ever had; that to his dignity and power all creatures should be subject, and angels, and men, and devils should, by their submission respectively, honour his name." And in his paraphrase on Heb. ii. 9. "As his death was suffered in the common nature of man, so he died to bring man to glory with himself, and therefore this text may be well understood of the advancement of man both in Christ and in his church.

Thus we find there are some learned writers of most of the sects and parties in the Christian world who have declared themselves freely to embrace this opinion, and to believe the most extensive knowledge and power of the human nature of Christ in his present glorified state.

DISCOURSE

DISCOURSE III.

The GLORIES *of* CHRIST *as* GOD-MAN *displayed,*

BY TRACING OUT THE EARLY EXISTENCE OF HIS HUMAN NATURE AS THE FIRST-BORN OF GOD, OR AS THE FIRST OF ALL CREATURES, BEFORE THE FORMATION OF THIS WORLD.

SECT. I.

INTRODUCTION.

THE various glories of our bleſſed Lord are the ſubject of our holy meditation and our joy. There are wonders enough in his perſon, his characters and offices, to raiſe our ſacred curioſity, and to entertain our delightful inquiries in time and eternity. Many of theſe are diſplayed by the goſpel in an open and illuſtrious light: others are yet unrevealed, and reſerved till we ſhall ſee him face to face: and there are alſo ſome which are revealed, but with leſs glaring evidence, and are contained like hidden treaſures in the mines of ſcripture, to awaken our diligence in the purſuit of this divine knowledge: and there is reaſon to hope, that every ſpark of new-diſcovered glory will richly recompenſe the labour of our inquiries.

The

The foregoing Diſcourſe hath led us to find ſome ſurpriſing powers and excellencies in the Man Chriſt Jeſus, which perhaps have not been much known or commonly obſerved. It is pleaſant and aſtoniſhing to think how far the human ſoul of our exalted Lord, under the conduct of his divine nature, may have a hand in the government of the nations and the judgment of the world. This invites our faith to look forward to the great reſurrection-day with holy pleaſure and expectation. And if we turn our eyes backward to the beginning of all things, and read the ſcripture with ſtudious ſearch, perhaps we may ſpy ſome early glories attending his ſacred perſon, which we never thought of before.

Now, if by a more careful inſpection into the word of God, we ſhall find it revealed there with unexpected evidence, that the human ſoul of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt had an exiſtence, and was perſonally united to the divine nature, long before it came to dwell in fleſh and blood; and that by this glorious perſon, God the Father managed the affairs of his ancient church, as his own ſupreme miniſter, and as the great Mediator and King of his people, and that at a certain appointed period of time God ſent down this bleſſed ſoul, willingly diveſted of primitive joys and glories, to take fleſh in the womb of the virgin, to dwell in the body of an infant, and grow up by degrees to the perfection of a man, and in this body to ſuffer a thouſand indignities and injuries from men and devils, and to ſuſtain intenſe pains or agonies from ſome unknown manifeſtations of the wrath of God againſt ſin, and at laſt ſubmit to death and the grave; I ſay, if we ſhould find ſuch a doctrine contained in the ſcripture, will not ſuch thoughts as theſe ſpread a new luſtre over all our former ideas of the glory of Chriſt, even in his human nature, and add to the conde-

ſcenſions of our bleſſed Saviour, conſidered as God and Man in one perſon? How happily will it make the whole ſcheme of our religion, and the book of God which reveals it, more intelligible and delightful to all thoſe who love Chriſtianity? And it will render this ſacred volume much more defenſible againſt the men who doubt or deny the bleſſed doctrines of it.

But that I may not anticipate my deſign, let us proceed to unfold this doctrine by degrees, according to the following propoſitions.

SECT. II.

Some Propoſitions leading to the Proof of the Doctrine propoſed.

Prop. I. IT is evident from many places of ſcripture, that Chriſt had an exiſtence before he took fleſh upon him, and came into this world.

John i. 1. 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.'

Ver. 3. 'All things were made by him.'

Ver. 14. 'And the Word was made fleſh, and dwelt among us.'

John xii. 41. 'Theſe things ſaid Eſaias when he ſaw his glory, and ſpake of him:' Wherein the apoſtle John attributes to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt that actual glorious appearance which Iſaiah ſaw of the Lord of Hoſts, Chap. vi.

John iii. 13. 'No man hath aſcended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven:' ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, or, *which was in heaven*, for both ſenſes are agreeable to the Greek.

John viii. 58. 'Before Abraham was, I am.'

John

John i. 15. 'He that cometh after me is preferred before me,' says John the baptist, 'because he was before me:' εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν ὁτι πρωτος μου ην. One of these words which we render *before me*, seem necessarily to signify a priority of time, and it is hard to say which of both of them cannot do so, but the same thing cannot be proved by itself. The verse may be construed thus, *This is he of whom I said, he that comes after me had a being before me, for* indeed *he was before me*, that is, *he is more excellent than I*; or thus, *he was preferred before me, because he had his being before I had mine*, though as to his natural birth as man, Christ was six months younger than John. So Dr. Goodwin and many others interpret this text.

But I proceed to other scriptures, which prove the existence of Christ before his incarnation.

John iii. 30, 31. 'He that cometh from above, is above all; he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from above, is above all.'

1 Cor. xv. 47. 'The first man was of the earth earthly: the second man was the Lord from heaven.'

John vi. 33. 'The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.'

Ver. 38. 'I came down from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me.'

Ver. 51. 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven.'

Ver. 62. 'What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend where he was before?'

John xvi. 28. 'I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.'

John xvii. 5. 'Glorify thou me, O Father, with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.' 1 Cor.

1 Cor. x. 9. 'Neither let us tempt Chriſt as ſome of them alſo tempted, and were deſtroyed of ſerpents.'

2 Cor. viii. 9. 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that though he was rich, yet for your ſakes he became poor.'

Philip. ii. 6, 7. 'Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himſelf of no reputation, and was made in the likeneſs of man.'

Col. i. 15. 'Who is the image of the inviſible God, the firſt-born of every creature, for by him were all things created, &c. and he is before all things.'

Heb. i. 2. 'His Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom alſo he made the worlds.'

1 John iv. 2, 3. 'Every ſpirit which confeſſeth that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is of God; and every ſpirit that confeſſeth not that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is not of God.'

Rev. iii. 14. Chriſt is called 'the beginning of the creation of God.' Αρχη της κτισεως τε Θεε.

I might alſo cite other ſcriptures from the Old Teſtament, where Chriſt is repreſented ſometimes as 'Jehovah,' or 'God Almighty;' and ſometimes as the 'Angel of the Lord,' and as the 'Captain of the Lord's hoſt,' appearing to the patriarchs, converſing with Abraham, wreſtling with Jacob, giving orders to Moſes, encouraging Joſhua and Gideon, &c. But I ſhall have occaſion to mention them immediately, and therefore I omit the citations here.

Prop. II. Among thoſe expreſſions of ſcripture which diſcover the pre-exiſtence of Chriſt, there are ſeveral from whence we may derive a certain proof that he has the divine nature in him, and is true God.

Such

Such are thoſe places of the Old Teſtament where the angel that appeared to the ancients is called 'God,' the 'Almighty God,' 'Jehovah,' the 'Lord of Hoſts,' 'I am that I am,' &c.

Such are thoſe places in ſcripture in the Old and New Teſtament where he is called 'God' or 'Jehovah,' and is ſaid expreſsly to 'create the world.' John i. 1, 2, 3. Rom. ix. 5. Heb. i. 10, 11, &c. with ſome others.

It appears probable to me alſo, that when our Lord ſays, John viii. 58. 'Before Abraham was, I am,' he does not only mean to expreſs his pre-exiſtence, but his divine nature alſo, I AM being the name of God, Exod. iii. 14. And the great modern refiner of the Arian ſcheme, Dr. Samuel Clarke, allows ſo much as this, viz. That from our Saviour's uſing the words *I am*, inſtead of *I was*, he might poſſibly intend to inſinuate that he was the perſon in whom the name of God was, viz. 'Jehovah,' or, 'I am:' and he adds, "this indeed cannot be denied;" though he will not allow him here to deſcribe himſelf as the ſelf-exiſtent being. See Dr. Clarke's Script. Doctr. Chap. 2. Sect. 3. Numb. 591.

But there are many more proofs of the divinity of Chriſt which are recited, and confirmed under the eighth and ninth propoſitions of the Diſcourſe on the Chriſtian Doctrine of the Trinity, and which are needleſs to be repeated here.

Prop. III. There are other ſcriptures which denote the pre-exiſtence of Chriſt, and may alſo perhaps include a reference to his divine nature, but carry not with them ſuch a full and convincing evidence of his Godhead as utterly to exclude all other interpretations.

Such are theſe, John iii. 31. 'He that cometh from above is above all,' &c. 1 Cor. xv. 47. 'The firſt man is of the earth earthly, the ſecond man is the Lord from

from heaven.' John iii. 13. 'No man hath aſcended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven.'*

Prop. IV. But there are ſome texts which inſinuate the exiſtence of Chriſt before he came into the fleſh, which in their moſt natural, obvious and evident ſenſe ſeem to refer to ſome intelligent nature belonging to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which is inferior to Godhead.

This will be made evident under the following propoſition.

Prop. V. Whatſoever ſcriptures repreſent Chriſt as exiſtent before his incarnation in a nature inferior to Godhead, do moſt naturally lead us to the belief of the pre-exiſtence of his human ſoul.

If there be any ſuch ſcriptures, they muſt refer either to the human ſoul of Chriſt (which was afterward united to his human body) or to ſome other ſuper-

* I confeſs I have cited this text in a former treatiſe to prove the omnipreſence of Chriſt as God, and perhaps that may be part of the true meaning of it: but I have lately found two or three writers of name who heartily believed the Godhead of Chriſt, and yet ſuppoſe this text may refer to his pre-exiſtent ſoul, becauſe ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, which we render *who is in heaven*, may be as well rendered *who was in heaven*, the particle ὢν being equally capable of the paſt as well as of the preſent tenſe or time. So St. John himſelf expreſſeth the time paſt, *he was*, by ὤν, Chap. ix. 25. where the blind man cured by our Lord, ſays, *I was blind*, τυφλὸς ὤν. And St. Paul expreſſeth *(who was)* in the ſame manner twice, ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκρούς, Eph. ii. 1. and ver. 5. 'you who were dead.' Beza himſelf inclines to conſtrue this word, *who was in heaven* in this text. Upon the whole, I doubt whether this text will certainly prove Chriſt's divinity, and whether it may not more directly refer to his pre-exiſtent ſoul. For ſince there are proofs enough of the divinity of Chriſt, which are ſtrong in my opinion and unanſwerable, I would not conſtrain ſuch paſſages of ſcripture into this ſervice whoſe force and ſenſe are rendered doubtful by any juſt rules of criticiſm.

ſuper-angelical nature, as ſome call it, which might belong to our Saviour, beſides his human ſoul.

And this is evident, that this very notion of ſome perſons concerning a ſuper-angelical ſpirit belonging to him* beſide his human ſoul, aroſe from thoſe many expreſſions concerning him before his incarnation which ſeem inferior to Deity. Some writers ſaw theſe ſort of expreſſions ſo ſtrong in ſcripture, that they would venture to introduce three intellectual beings into the perſon of Chriſt, rather than not yield to the apparent force of theſe expreſſions.

But ſurely it is not worthy of a philoſopher or a divine to multiply natures in our Lord Jeſus without reaſon, and to aſcribe to him any ſuch third intellectual nature, if the expreſſions of ſcripture on this head may be moſt evidently explained without it, and may be better applied to his human ſoul.

Now that there are ſuch expreſſions that ſeem to intimate a nature inferior to God, belonging to Chriſt before he came in the fleſh, will appear by the following conſiderations: and they may all be explained in the eaſieſt manner, by applying them to the human ſoul of Chriſt.

* Note, if in this or any other of my writings I ſpeak of the ſoul of Chriſt as being an angel, or an angelic ſpirit, or in an angelic ſtate, I mean nothing elſe but his exiſting without a body, as angels do, or his being a meſſenger of God the Father as they are: and in this ſenſe the ſcripture calls him an angel ſeveral times. Or if I ſpeak of him as a ſuper-angelic ſpirit, I intend no more than his having both natural and deputed powers far ſuperior to angels: for I always ſuppoſe this ſoul to be truly and properly a human ſpirit in its own nature, i. e. a ſpirit ſuited to the ſtate of union with a human body, and to all the natural acts and effects, appetites and paſſions derived from ſuch a union.

SECT.

SECT. III.

Arguments for the Pre-exiſtence of Chriſt's Human Soul, drawn from various Conſiderations of ſomething inferior to Godhead aſcribed to him before and at his Incarnation.

THE firſt ſet of arguments I ſhall uſe ariſes from ſeveral things aſcribed to Chriſt, before and at his incarnation, which ſeem to be of too low a nature for pure Godhead.

Conſideration I. Chriſt is repreſented as his Father's meſſenger, miniſter, or angel, that was a diſtinct being from his Father, ſent by his Father to perform ſuch actions and ſuch ſervices for his people long before his incarnation, ſome of which ſeem too low for the dignity of pure Godhead.

The appearances of Chriſt to the patriarchs are deſcribed like the appearances of an angel, or a man, a glorious man really diſtinct from God, and yet ſuch a one in whom 'God,' or 'Jehovah' had a peculiar indwelling, or with whom the divine nature had a perſonal union. When the angel of the Lord viſited Abraham, and talked with him, when the 'man wreſtled with Jacob till break of day,' when the angel converſed with Moſes and with Joſhua, and yet calls himſelf, or is by the holy writers called 'Jehovah,' the 'Almighty,' the 'Lord,' the 'God of Abraham,' &c. the moſt natural and obvious idea which they could have of the perſon appearing to them, was the idea of ſome glorious being or ſpirit that belonged to the other world, and in whom the great God had a peculiar dwelling, and by whom the great God pronounced thoſe words or converſed with them.

That

That text, Exod. xxiii. 20, 21, very naturally leads us to this sense: God says to Moses, 'Behold I send an angel before thee to keep thee in the way,' &c. 'obey his voice, provoke him not, for he will not pardon your transgressions, for my name is in him.' Here is an angel or messenger sent by God the Father; that is certainly an inferior character; yet he is 'to be obeyed' with reverence, for 'he can punish,' or 'pardon sins.' This is a divine prerogative; and how does this angel come by it? It is not as he is an angel, or in his angelic nature, but it is because 'God's name is in him,' i. e. his divine power, his Godhead, is in him; this is given as the reason of this high prerogative: God is united to this glorious spirit or this human soul of Christ: now it is plain that Christ is called an angel in other places. He is the 'Messenger' or 'Angel of the covenant,' he is 'the Angel of God's presence,' so he is called Mal. iii. 1. and Isa. lxiii. 9.

Let us argue a little farther on these appearances of Christ to the patriarchs: does it not seem more congruous that a human soul should animate that human body which ate and drank with Abraham under a tree, and should actuate those human limbs, when a man wrestled with Jacob? Is it not beneath the grandeur, decency and dignity of the supreme Majesty of heaven, to supply the place of such a human soul for the purposes or actions of animal nature? And that the great and eternal God himself in an immediate manner should converse in so humane and familiar a way as this angel did with several of the patriarchs? That the glorious and almighty Godhead should itself animate a human body to visit Abraham, and tarry with him some hours under a tree, while his wife made cakes, and dressed the flesh of a calf for God to eat? That the eternal God animating a body should 'eat of the calf' which

was

was 'dreſſed with milk and butter,' Gen. xviii. 1, 2, &c. ? That the almighty and ever bleſſed God himſelf ſhould immediately 'wreſtle with Jacob' in human limbs, which he aſſumed, and that a good part of the night ſhould be ſpent thus wreſtling 'until break of day,' Gen. xxxii. 24, &c. ? That the eternal Godhead itſelf ſhould talk ſo familiarly with Gideon, and let Gideon uſe ſuch a familiar way of talking with God, as is recorded Judges vi. 1—11 ? Doth this ſuit with the ſupreme glory and dignity of eternal Godhead and pure divinity ? Doth it not ſeem more agreeable that God ſhould do all this by the intermediation of a human ſoul, appearing in a viſible ſhape, than that the infinite majeſty of God ſhould immediately abaſe itſelf in ſuch a manner ?

Is it not much more natural and eaſy, and more condecent in itſelf, as well as more agreeable to the words of ſcripture, to ſuppoſe that it was the human ſoul of Chriſt, aſſuming a body at that time for thoſe human purpoſes ? And thus he might be called the 'angel' or 'meſſenger of God,' becauſe God ſent him ; for the word *angel* doth not ſignify originally the name of a *nature* but of an *office*.

He might alſo upon this ſuppoſition, with more juſtneſs and propriety of ſpeech, be called a man, when he appears in the form of a man, and with the appetites, paſſions and actions of a man : Gen. xviii. 2, 4, 5, 8, 17. and xxxii. 24. for the ſoul is the chief part of a man, and eſpecially when that ſoul appeared in a human body.

And yet at the ſame time he might be properly called 'God,' 'the Lord,' and 'Jehovah ;' for this man or angel, this human ſoul in an aſſumed body, was perſonally united to God, or had the 'fulneſs of the Godhead dwelling in him' by a perſonal union ; though the more immediate agent in theſe animal and

and common actions of life was the human ſoul, rather than the eternal and bleſſed God.

The ſame things may be ſaid concerning the viſions which the prophets Amos and Zechariah had of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, when he 'ſtood upon the wall with a plumb-line in his hand.' Amos vii. 7. And when he 'ſtood on the altar.' Amos ix. 1. Or when 'Joſhua the high-prieſt ſtood before him, and Satan at his right hand to reſiſt him.' Zech. iii. 1, Theſe corporeal ſcenes ſeem better to befit the human ſoul of Chriſt than pure Godhead, though in theſe appearances he is ſometimes called the 'Angel of the Lord', and ſometimes 'the Lord,' or 'Jehovah,' for the reaſon before given, viz. becauſe he is one with God by ſo intimate a union.

Conſid. II. Chriſt, when he came into this world, is ſaid to empty and diveſt himſelf of ſome glory which he had before his incarnation, in ſeveral places of ſcripture. Now if nothing but his divine nature exiſted before this time, this divine nature could not properly empty or diveſt itſelf of any glory: therefore it muſt be his inferior nature, or his human ſoul, which did then exiſt and diveſt itſelf of its ancient glory for a ſeaſon.

The firſt text I ſhall mention is that famous one in the prayer of Chriſt, John xvii. 4, 5. 'I have glorified thee on the 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.' It ſeems very plain from theſe words, that Chriſt parted with ſome glory which he had in heaven, when he came down to finiſh the work which God gave him to do on earth, and he prays to be reſtored to it again. I appeal to every reader, whether this is not the moſt obvious and natural ſenſe.

Now

Now the glory which belongs to God is either eſſential or manifeſtative. The divine nature of Chriſt could not loſe or part with any eſſential glories; for they are the very nature and eſſence of God: nor had the divine nature any manifeſtative glories before the world was, which it loſt at the incarnation: for,

1. It had no manifeſtative glories at all, if there were no angels, no creatures to which they could be manifeſted.

Or 2. If it be ſuppoſed that angels were before this lower world was, and that the Godhead of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt might then be known and glorified by angels, it may be juſtly replied, That ſuppoſe this be true, yet he did not part with that glory at his coming into our world, for the angels did not forget his dignity; they continued to know and glorify Chriſt; they worſhipped him on earth, Heb. 1. 6. and miniſtred unto him as their ſovereign on various occaſions.

Since therefore it cannot be the divine nature that parted with this glory, nor can the divine nature pray for the reſtoration of it, then it follows that the human nature had ſuch an early exiſtence, and ſuch glory; for we cannot ſuppoſe the human nature in this place prays for a glory which it never had. This ſeems contrary to the moſt obvious ſenſe of the text.

Or, ſhall we ſay as the Socinians do, that the human nature prays for a glory which it had in the eternal counſels and decrees of God? But all the elect of God had alſo glory before the world was, in this ſenſe, viz. in the eternal decrees and counſels: and how very forced and unnatural an interpretation is this? Yet it is ſuch as the Socinians are conſtrained to take up with, though without any reaſon: beſides, how unhappily would ſuch an expoſition tend to

to support the Antinomian language of our justification from eternity, &c.*

But how easy, plain and obvious is the sense of these words, if we suppose the soul of our Lord Jesus Christ to be the first-born of every creature, as Col. i. 15 and thus to enjoy real glory and dignity in the Father's presence before the world was, as well as in all the following ages, till he emptied himself of it at his incarnation? And then he prays thus; "Father, I have finished the work on earth, which thou gavest me to do in my state of humiliation here; and now, O Father, take me to thyself in heaven, where I once was, and glorify me with the real glory which I had there before the creation: my days of appointed abasement are past, therefore let the power, splendour and dignity which I possessed

* Since this Treatise was written, I have met with another explication of this text, in opposition to the sense I have given, and which I confess may seem something more plausible than the rest, viz. That the human nature or person of Christ does not here pray for any glory to be restored which was lost, but for the present manifestation of the glory of his Godhead to mankind, which glory was really eternal, and before the creation: or he prays, that the human nature may have its due share of honour, upon the account of its union to the divine nature, which had a glory before the world was; which honour was withheld from the human nature in a great measure till his sufferings were finished: so that with regard to his divine nature, he prays only for the manifestation of the glory; but in respect of his human nature, he prays for the real communication of that glory which might belong to such a sublime union with the eternal Godhead.

All that I shall reply to this at present is, that it is so much more difficult and intricate for any reader to find out this exposition than that which I have given, that I leave any impartial person to judge which is the most natural and easy sense, and which must the apostles most naturally receive and understand when these words were spoken in their hearing. Indeed, all other expositions besides this which I here support, are forced and strained, and distant from the natural ideas which occur to every reader. And all divines who believe not the doctrine of Christ's pre-existent soul, have been always puzzled to find any tolerable sense to put upon these words.

ed in thy preſence before the world was, be reſtored to me."

The words, 'with thine own ſelf,' in our Saviour's prayer, ſeem to determine it to be a real glory which he once had in God's own preſence. This ſeems ſo evidently to be the ſenſe and meaning of our Lord in his prayer, that if perſons were not unacquainted with this doctrine of the pre-exiſtence of the ſoul of Chriſt, or if they had not ſome prejudice againſt it, one would think that every reader ſhould naturally and neceſſarily take it in this ſenſe.

That it is the human nature of Chriſt that was thus glorified in its pre-exiſtent ſtate, may be confirmed from ver. 24. 'Thou lovedſt me before the foundation of the world.' Now this would be a very ſmall thing for Chriſt to ſay, as to his divine nature or Godhead, that the Father 'loved him before the creation;' but it is great and glorious, and every way ſuitable to his purpoſe, to be ſpoken by him as a *man*, referring to his pre-exiſtent ſtate and nature, for it gives a grand idea of him as the early and ancient object of his Father's love.

Nor can this ancient love be referred only to the decree of God, for this decretal love of God may be ſpoken of the ſaints alſo; the Father loved them as foreſeen in his eternal decrees: whereas the plain deſign of Chriſt is, to requeſt that enjoyment of divine love for the ſaints in their meaſure, which he himſelf actually taſted and enjoyed before the foundation of the world.

Note further; he does not pray for the diſciples that they may enjoy ſuch love as is ſuppoſed to be peculiar to the internal diſtinctions in the Godhead, but ſuch ſort of love in their degree as he himſelf enjoyed in his pre-exiſtent ſoul; which expoſition alſo renders all the latter verſes of this chapter more intelligible: ver. 21, 22, &c. 'that they may be one

one as we are one,' and—' thou haſt loved them as thou haſt loved me.' The love which the great God bears to Chriſt as Man, and the union of Chriſt as Man to the Godhead, is made a pattern of the union of the ſaints to God, and the love of God to them: But we can hardly ſuppoſe the ineffable, eternal and eſſential, and neceſſary union and love between the ſacred diſtinctions in the Godhead itſelf, can be a pattern of the unneceſſary, uneſſential and voluntary union and love between God and his ſaints. Yet the union and love between Chriſt as Man, and God his Father, may be made a pattern of the love and union between God and believers; though we muſt always maintain a high ſenſe of the unknown and ſublime difference between the union of the Man Chriſt to the divine nature, (or to any particular diſtinction in it) and the union of the ſaints to God: the one is ſo near, as that what God himſelf ſpeaks and does is attributed to Chriſt; but it would be blaſphemy to attribute this to the beſt of ſaints.

It is a certain and excellent rule for the interpretation of ſcripture, laid down by all judicious men, and particularly by a great adverſary of this doctrine, Dr. Sherlock, that "we ſhould never have recourſe to a ſtrained and metaphorical ſenſe, but when we know that either the nature of the thing, or ſome other revelation of ſcripture, will not admit of a proper one;" and that "we muſt underſtand words in a proper and natural ſenſe, where there is no apparent reaſon of a figure." Now there is nothing either in nature or in ſcripture that forbids this literal expoſition, as will more abundantly appear in the following part of this Diſcourſe.

The ſecond ſcripture I ſhall cite for this purpoſe, to ſhew that ſome things inferior to Godhead are aſcribed to Chriſt before and at his incarnation, is

in

in Philip. ii. 5, 6, 7. 'Let this mind be in you, which was alſo in Chriſt Jeſus,' ver. 6. 'who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God;' ver. 7. 'but made himſelf of no reputation,' (εαυτον εκενωσε, which is more exactly tranſlated, *he emptied himſelf**) 'and took upon him the form of a ſervant, being made in the likeneſs of men,' as it is in the Greek, εν ομοιωματι ανθρωπων γενομενος.

Here the apoſtle's deſign is to ſet Chriſt before them as a pattern of humility; and this he doth by aggrandizing his former ſtate and circumſtances, and repreſenting how he 'emptied himſelf' of them, and appeared on earth in a very mean and low eſtate. Therefore he ſaith, 'Who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God;' i. e. his human ſoul, which is the chief part of the man, being in union with his Godhead, was veſted with a god-like form and glory in all former ages; thus he oftentimes appeared to the patriarchs, as the 'Angel of the Lord,' and as 'God' or 'Jehovah,' with a heavenly brightneſs about him, or clothed with the divine Shechinah, the robe of light, and ſpake and acted like God himſelf. This ſeems to be the 'form of God,' which the apoſtle ſpeaks of; nor 'did he think it any robbery' or ſinful preſumption ſo to do, i. e. to appear and act as God, ſince he was united to the divine nature, and was in that ſenſe one with God:† yet *he*

* See Dr. Goodwin's expoſition of this text in a few pages following.

† I might have omitted the paraphraſe of theſe words, 'who thought it not robbery to be equal with God,' ſince I am conſtrained to confeſs that I am not fully ſatisfied in the true meaning of them. Thoſe who will read with an impartial eye what Dr. Whitby has written in his Annotations on this text, (even while he was zealous againſt the Arian doctrines, and took all opportunities

he emptied himself, i. e. he divested himself of this godlike form or appearance, this divine *Shechinah*, and coming into flesh, he consented to be made 'in the likeness of' other 'men;' nay, he took upon him 'the form of a servant' instead of the 'form of a God,' i. e. instead of the glorious vestment of light in which he once appeared and acted as God, he now came in a mean servile form, and 'humbled himself even to death,' &c. as it follows.

Now that this text is most naturally interpreted concerning the pre-existent soul of Christ and its humiliation, and not concerning the abasement of his divine nature, will appear, if we attend to these things.

1. It is the chief design of this scripture to propose to the Philippians a wondrous example of humility and self-denial. Now a great and pious writer

ties in his Comments to refute them) and who consider at the same time what sense the ancient Greek heathen writer Heliodorus in several places, and the Greek fathers, generally put upon this phrase, will be ready to believe they signify, that Christ did not think equality with God to be αρπαγμον a thing to be seized, a thing to be assumed by him, he did not think proper to appear like God, or assume equality to God in his humbled estate: and so this sentence expresses one part of his humility. On the other hand, he that peruses what the learned Dr. Waterland has written in his sermon on this text, may be inclined to doubt of this exposition of Dr. Whitby and the fathers, and to construe these words as part of the most exalted dignity of Christ, according to our English translation; though Dr. Waterland himself does not deny that the ancient Greek writer Heliodorus, and most of the ancient fathers, expounded it in the sense which Dr. Whitby gives of it.

However, I have here followed our English translation, and paraphrased it as expressive of Christ's most exalted character and Godhead, that it may evidently appear that the other parts of this verse are most happily applied to the pre-existence and the incarnation of the human soul of Christ, even though these controverted words should be referred to his divine nature: and that this doctrine of Christ's pre-existent soul does not want any change in the common English translation, nor the sense of this phrase to be altered in order to support it.

ter of this age has obſerved, that we never find the divine nature, or Godhead, propounded to us as an example of ſelf-denial or humility in all the bible; though God commands our conformity to himſelf, in holineſs, love and beneficence. Therefore it muſt be ſome inferior nature, or Chriſt's human ſoul is propoſed as an example of humility, and ſelf-denial; and a glorious example it was, when it diveſted itſelf of ſuch a godlike form, and ſuch a pre-exiſtent glory.

2. Chriſt's 'being in the form of God,' cannot here neceſſarily ſignify his Godhead, becauſe it is repreſented as inconſiſtent with the ſtate of his humiliation; for he ſeems to put off this 'form of God,' or he *emptied* himſelf of it, and put on the oppoſite form, viz. the 'form of a ſervant,' when he became incarnate, or was 'made in the likeneſs of men.' But it is plain that he could not put off his Godhead when he became incarnate: therefore it muſt refer to his human ſoul which was in the 'form of God,' or which made theſe god-like appearances before his incarnation, and he put off this divine form, when he took on him 'the faſhion of a man,' and the 'form of a ſervant.'

Beſides, the 'form of God' can never be proved to ſignify his divine nature in this place; for there is no expreſſion like it in ſcripture, that ſignifies proper divinity. Nor indeed does μορφη properly ſignify *nature* or *eſſence* any where in the bible, that I can find, but only *appearance*, *ſhape* or *likeneſs*. See the large citation out of Dr. Thomas Goodwin, within a few pages following.

Obſerve alſo that the 'form of God' ſtands here expreſsly oppoſed to the 'form of a ſervant:' now Chriſt was not directly and expreſsly in the condition of a ſervant in the civil life here on earth, though he "condeſcended to perform ſervile offices upon ſome occaſions; but at the ſame time he claimed

claimed the authority of a master, over those very persons for, or towards whom he performed servile offices: the condition of our Saviour therefore, whilst on earth, though it was always mean, yet was not properly that of a servant; and consequently, since his being in the form of a servant cannot possibly signify more than his acting sometimes as a servant, though he was not such by condition of life, it is plain that his being in the form of God cannot possibly signify his being by nature the very God." (But rather his appearing sometimes heretofore and acting as God.) So Dr. Bennet on the Trinity, Chap. vii. p. 45—50. who is a zealous defender of the deity of Christ against Dr. Clarke.

3. Consider further, it seems to be that same nature *emptied itself* which was afterwards filled with glory as a recompense: and it is the same nature that is said to *humble itself*, which was afterwards highly exalted by God: now this was not the divine nature of Christ, but the human; therefore it must be the human nature of Christ that emptied itself in this text: because it appears very incongruous for the apostle to say, that the divine nature emptied and abased itself, and that the human nature was exalted as a recompense of this abasement.

I grant it was great condescension in the divine nature of Christ to unite itself to a creature, such as the human soul of Christ was, how glorious soever that creature might be; and it is yet greater condescension in the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, thus united to the human soul to take human flesh upon it, or flesh in union with that soul, and for God himself to be thus 'manifested in the flesh:' and in my judgment the infinite merit of his sufferings arises from the union of his divine nature to the soul, and thereby to the body of the

Man Jeſus: but this does not ſeem to be the preciſe meaning of the apoſtle in this place; for he rather ſets before us an example of the humility of the Man Jeſus Chriſt, who exiſted as a ſpirit perſonally united to God, or one with God in all former ages, and was dreſt in glories ſuitable to this union; yet he laid aſide thoſe glories, and waved the reſplendence of his character and perſon, when he joined himſelf to fleſh and blood: he laid aſide the god-like forms and appearances, which perhaps he had worn both in heaven and on earth in times paſt, and *emptied himſelf* when he came now into the world to be incarnate, i. e. when he came into the complete 'likeneſs and faſhion of a man;' for he appeared in a mean form, like a ſervant, and 'humbled himſelf even to the curſed death of the croſs.'

Leſt any of my readers ſhould be offended with my expoſition of this text, I will here add Dr. Thomas Goodwin's interpretation of it, Vol. III. Book iii. Chap. vii. p. 106. "That nature or creature which the Son of God ſhall aſſume (be it man or angel) muſt by inheritance exiſt in 'the form of God,' Phil. ii. 6, 7. which 'form of God' I here take not to be put for the eſſence of God, neither is the 'form of a ſervant' taken for the nature of a man. The 'form of God' here is that god-like glory, and that manifeſtation of the Godhead which was, and muſt needs be due, to appear in the nature aſſumed: for *form* is put for outward appearance and manifeſtation, in reſpect of which, Chriſt as God-Man is called the 'brightneſs of his Father's glory,' Heb. i. 2. Brightneſs you know is not the ſubſtance of the light, but the appearance of it. And in this reſpect Chriſt, God-Man, may be ſaid in a ſafe ſenſe to be equal with God, as here in the text; not in eſſence, but in a communication of privileges, that as God hath life in himſelf alone, (which is a royalty

royalty incommunicable to any mere creature) so this Son of Man, when once united unto the Godhead, is also said 'to have life in himself;' John v. 26. this *equality*, or ἰσότης, not being to be understood of equality in proportion, but of likeness; his privileges were such by the union with the second person, that he had a true kind of partnership with God the Father in his privileges, and such as did arise to a likeness, though not to an essential equality." And Chap. viii. p. 110. he adds, "The first ingredient into the satisfaction of Christ lies in the laying aside the glory due to the second person, when he should dwell in an human nature, and instead thereof taking on him the 'form of a servant.' God will have him *emptied*, the Messiah shall have nothing left, not a grain or mite of the riches of his glory." And in Vol. II. *Of the knowledge of God*, Book iii. p. 201. he adds, "He that had all fulness had nothing left, no comfort in God or in any creature: he might say as Naomi saith, *The Lord hath dealt bitterly with me, I came from heaven full, but he brought me to earth empty*, and emptied of all." Thus far that eminent and pious writer.

But after all, if any humble Christians should be afraid to admit my exposition of this text, (which is so plain and natural) lest they should seem to weaken one supposed proof of the divinity of Christ, yet the next scripture is as plain for my purpose, and will lead into no such danger.

And that is, 2 Cor. viii. 9. 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that you through his poverty might be made rich.'

I know not how this can be well interpreted any other way than by supposing our Lord Jesus Christ as Man, or his human soul to pre-exist in a former state, wherein 'he was rich' indeed, and endowed with

with many real glories and privileges; and yet he diveſted himſelf of them, and 'became poor for our ſakes,' when he became incarnate, a helpleſs infant who lay in a manger, and was the ſon of a carpenter.

It cannot be ſaid of God, or the divine nature, that he 'became poor,' who is infinitely ſelf-ſufficient, and who is neceſſarily and eternally rich in perfections and glories, and in the indefeaſible poſſeſſion of all things: nor can it be ſaid of Chriſt as Man, that he ever 'was rich,' if he were never in a richer ſtate before than while he was here on earth: for during that time he was always extremely poor; 'the Son of Man had not where to lay his head:' and he could not be in a richer ſtate as man before, if nothing of this manhood exiſted before his incarnation.

But if to evade this any one will ſay, that he was *rich as God*, and became *poor as man*; biſhop Fowler anſwers, that this is "ſuch a ſtrain and force upon the words of ſcripture, that it looks like laying hold upon any thing to help at a dead lift."

It appears then that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt really emptied himſelf of ſome peculiar glories that belonged to him, and which he poſſeſſed in a pre-exiſtent ſtate before he came to dwell in our world, and to take fleſh upon him.

But I know and lament the unhappy force of prejudice. I have felt and feel it too often, and therefore wonder not at other men. A mind pre-engaged cannot eaſily yield to the force of plain expreſſions and the literal ſenſe of ſcripture; therefore ſome will ſay, that Chriſt, as God-Man, in the beginning of the union of the two natures, emptied or diveſted himſelf of the riches and glory which he ſhould have had, and which were his *dejure*, though not *de facto*; i. e. which he might juſtly have aſſumed and poſſeſſed, though he did not actually aſſume

and

and poſſeſs them. But I reply, Why ſhould this ſcripture be ſo ſtrained, ſince this cannot be the ſenſe of other ſcriptures which are parallel to this? particularly John xvii. 5. which ſpeaks expreſsly of glory which Chriſt had with the Father before the world was. And as for the other texts, viz. Philip. ii. and 2 Cor. viii. they intimate more than a mere right to glorious riches, and plainly refer to a former actual poſſeſſion of thoſe riches and glories of which he actually diſpoſſeſſed himſelf. This is the moſt literal and obvious ſenſe of the apoſtle, nor ſhould we ſtrain it to a tropical meaning without evident neceſſity.

The whole current of ſcripture (as well as theſe particular texts) ſeems to lead us ſo naturally into this ſentiment, that divines are frequently ready to deſcribe God the Father as parting with his only Son out of his boſom, when he took fleſh upon him: and they repreſent Chriſt, or the Son of God when he became incarnate, as leaving the boſom of his Father, quitting the felicities of the upper world, laying by his glorious eſtate, and parting with heaven for a ſeaſon, &c. which language cannot be true nor proper when it is applied to the Godhead of Chriſt; but would moſt appoſitely denote and expreſs the real humiliation of his pre-exiſtent ſoul.

Conſid. III. That very being which came down from heaven and was ſent of God into the world, is repreſented as capable of having a will different from the will of God the Father, and therefore it muſt be inferior to Godhead: now this could be no other but the will of his human ſoul.

Our Lord Jeſus declares, that he 'came down from heaven, not to do his own, but his Father's will.' John vi. 38. It is manifeſt here that the very ſame being which came down from heaven, ſought not by his deſcent to fulfil his own will, but his Father's. Now

Now it is evident that at his agonies and paſſion he had ſuch a will different from the will of his Father, when he manifeſts an innocent reluctance of human nature at firſt, but afterward ſays, 'Father, not my will, but thy will be done;' and you ſee he uſes the ſame ſort of language to expreſs his incarnation and miſſion, though without any reluctance. 'I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that ſent me.' Now would it not ſound very harſh to ſuppoſe the Godhead of Chriſt ſaying, 'I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that ſent me,' when it is utterly and eternally impoſſible that the Godhead of Chriſt ſhould have any will different from God the Father?

It is in the ſame manner that our Lord ſpeaks in prophecy concerning himſelf, Pſal. xl. 8. 'I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart.' Now that this refers to his incarnation in an eſpecial manner, we may learn from the epiſtle to the Hebrews, where this prophecy is cited and explained, chap. x. 5. 'When he cometh into the world, he ſaith, Sacrifice and burnt-offering thou wouldſt not, but a body haſt thou prepared me; lo I come to do thy will, O God.' This ſeems to be the proper language of his human ſoul, and not of pure Godhead.

Thoſe who refuſe to expound this concerning Chriſt's pre-exiſtent ſoul, apply it to his inferior and delegated character as Mediator, and as the Father's ſervant employed in this great errand. But I appeal to every one who reads the words, whether this language does not naturally ſeem much rather to belong to an inferior being, than to the eternal Godhead aſſuming an inferior character.

Conſid. IV. Chriſt repreſents his own coming into the world, and being ſent hither by the Father, in

in such a manner as naturally leads one to suppose he had a real and proper dwelling in another place* and in another manner before he came into this world, and that he then changed his place and company and manner of life; all which seem more agreeable to a human spirit than to a divine person.

The mere repetition of our Saviour's own language in several scriptures would naturally lead one to these ideas. John vi. 38. 'I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.' Ver. 51. 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven,' in imitation of the manna which came from the clouds. Ver. 62. 'What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?'† John viii. 14. 'I know whence I came, and whither I go.'

John xvi. 28. 'I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father. In which words, his being with the Father, and his being in the world, seem to be two opposite states, and are represented as inconsistent with each other in that sense in which Christ speaks of his Father's company and absence; but

* I do not here enter into that philosophical question, whether separate souls have proper places or not, or any local motion, but I speak after the common manner of speech, and the language of scripture.

† Some may object against this text, and say, that it cannot mean that the human soul ascended where it was before, for the human soul in its pre-existent state cannot be called the 'Son of Man.' I answer, 1. That the name, 'Son of Man,' ordinarily signifies no more than man, or some considerable man, and when applied to Christ, it means the Messiah. 2. It is at least a more proper term to signify Christ's human soul, than it is to signify his divine nature, and to say, 'What if ye shall see the Son of Man,' i. e. the human nature, 'ascend where the Son of Man,' i. e. the divine nature, 'was before?' And yet this must be the exposition of the place, if Christ had no pre-existent soul, and I am sure this is much harder and more catachrestical than the sense I have given.

but the pure divine nature can hardly be repreſented as abſent from the Father, even while it reſides in this world, nor as returning to him afterwards.

Let it be noted alſo, that as ſoon as Chriſt had ſpoke theſe words, his diſciples anſwer, 'Lo, now thou ſpeakeſt plainly, and ſpeakeſt no parable;' i. e. there is no difficulty or obſcurity in theſe words. No enigmatical or allegorical ſpeech (ſaith Beza.) But ſurely there is difficulty and obſcurity in them, if we muſt conſtrue them by figures, and not in the obvious ſenſe; eſpecially if his 'coming from the Father,' i. e. as God, muſt be taken in a figurative ſenſe, and his going to the Father, i. e. as man, in a literal.

"There are other expreſſions of ſcripture to the ſame purpoſe. John iii. 13. 'No man hath aſcended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man, who is,' or *was*, 'in heaven,' as the Greek particle ὢν may be properly interpreted in the time paſt or preſent; and thus it may be conſtrued to ſignify either the divinity of Chriſt, or rather his pre-exiſtent ſoul."*

John

* This text is ſeized by the Socinians, and preſt by them to ſupport their invention of Chriſt's aſcending locally to heaven after his baptiſm, there to receive more complete inſtructions from God. But the learned Mr. Fleming replies thus—"There can be no juſt inference from his denying the Jews to have aſcended into heaven, that he had aſcended thither himſelf, any more than if a native of Japan ſhould come now to England, and ſpeak to us after this manner; Ye have reaſon to believe what I ſay of my own country, for I ſpeak what I have ſeen there, and do exactly know it. And none of you did ever go to Japan, excepting me only, who have my (original) reſidence there, and am a native of the place, and am come from thence hither. Would theſe words neceſſarily infer, that he muſt have gone from England to Japan before he came from thence, becauſe perhaps the connexion of the words does not run in our uſual mode of ſpeaking?" Thus that author.

I might

John iii. 31. 'He that is of the earth is earthly, and ſpeaketh of the earth. He that cometh from heaven is above all.' John xiii. 3. 'Jeſus knowing that he was come from God, and was going to God.' Eph. iv. 9, 10. 'Now that he aſcended, what is it, but that he alſo deſcended firſt into the lower parts of the earth?' This perhaps may be better interpreted concerning his deſcent into the womb of the virgin, than into the grave, for David uſes the ſame expreſſion, Pſal. cxxxix. 15. where he ſays, 'His ſubſtance was made in ſecret, and curiouſly wrought in the loweſt parts of the earth.' Beſides, it was the ſoul of Chriſt that deſcended from heaven, but not into the grave. 'Now,' ſaith the apoſtle, 'he that deſcended thus, is the ſame alſo that aſcended up far above all heavens;' i. e. the ſoul deſcended to aſſume a body, and then being embodied, it aſcended above the heavens.

Object. There are expreſſions in the Old Teſtament which repreſent God as 'coming down upon earth' to viſit the affairs of men; and in this analogical ſenſe the Godhead of Chriſt may be ſaid to aſcend and deſcend, ſo that theſe words need not to be applied to any pre-exiſtent ſoul of Chriſt.

Anſw. 1. When this manner of ſpeech is uſed concerning God, it muſt be interpreted figuratively or analogically, becauſe the literal ſenſe cannot be true: but where the literal ſenſe is juſt and plain and eaſy, there is no need to run to figures.

Anſw. 2. Let it be noted alſo, that when God is ſaid to 'deſcend from heaven,' or 'aſcend thither' in the

I might ſubjoin alſo, that the exaltation of Chriſt's human ſoul to the heavenly world immediately upon its firſt exiſtence may be well enough called an aſcent into heaven, when it is evident that the ſcripture uſes many expreſſions as diſtant as this is from their grammatical meaning, in order to form a *paronomaſia* or chime of words, with an antitheſis of ſenſe, which were Eaſtern beauties of ſpeech.

the Old Teſtament, perhaps it is ſo expreſſed to ſhew that this God is Jeſus Chriſt, or the human ſoul of Chriſt, united to the Godhead in the pre-exiſtent ſtate, (as ſhall be ſhown hereafter) by whoſe ſervice God the Father managed a thouſand affairs of the ancient ages, and more eſpecially ſuch as had any relation to the welfare of the church, or the holy ſeed.

Anſw. 3. But beſides, when we conſider the frequency of theſe expreſſions, 'Chriſt's coming down from heaven,' 'coming from the Father, and coming into this world,' they ſeem to bear a plain and juſt antitheſis to his 'departing from the world,' his 'returning to the Father,' his 'aſcending into heaven,' which are mentioned at the ſame time: now all theſe latter expreſſions are plainly underſtood by every reader concerning the human nature of Chriſt, and give us good ground to infer that the former expreſſions concerning his deſcent from heaven ſhould be attributed to his human nature too; that is, to his human ſoul, which is the chief part of it.

Under this head, biſhop Fowler adds for a further proof of it, 1 Cor. xv. 47. 'The firſt man is of the earth, earthy; the ſecond man is the Lord from heaven;' "Which (ſays he) the apoſtle ſpeaks of Chriſt's original in oppoſition to Adam's thus; his ſoul was created on earth, a body being made out of the earth for it; but the ſoul of Chriſt was created in heaven, (and therefore he is called 'the Lord from heaven.') This is abundantly more intelligible (to me at leaſt) than how the eternal Word ſhould come down from heaven, otherwiſe than as in union with the ſoul of Chriſt; ſince the eternal Word ever filled all things with his preſence, and therefore could never for a moment leave heaven," i. e. really and properly, but only in an analogical ſenſe.

I add

I add also, that the following words confirm this sense. Ver. 49. 'As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly;' i. e. our souls are made now on earth and joined to bodies, to frail and feeble bodies, capable of disease and corruption, as was the soul of Adam, which was made on earth after his body was formed: but as the soul of Christ came down from heaven, and assumed a body upon earth, so the souls of the saints at the resurrection shall come down from heaven, and assume their immortal bodies upon earth: and in this sense Christ the second Adam, the 'Lord from heaven,' is the pattern of the saints resurrection much rather than the first; and the parallel which the apostle represents of our bearing the image of the earthy and the heavenly Adam, is much more just, perfect and natural, if we take in this part of the resemblance as well as others.

Some would construe these words, 'the Lord from heaven,' to signify the divine nature of Christ. But let it be observed, that the apostle's design here is only to show how the Man Christ Jesus shall be the pattern of saints raised in glory; and it is no part of his purpose here to represent saints as bearing the image of God, or his divine nature, but only the image of his glorified human nature; and therefore these glorious expressions rather refer to his human soul.

Now put all these things together, and we can hardly suppose our blessed Lord or his apostles should express his real and proper human descent from heaven in plainer words than those which have been cited, or in words more fitted to lead every common reader into this plain and easy sense.

To conclude this Section, if the most natural and obvious sense of scripture leads us to believe, that there was a glorious being who is sometimes called an

an angel, and ſometimes a man under the Old Teſtament, who was clothed with peculiar rays of glory, and aſſumed divine prerogatives, and yet in other parts of his character and conduct appears much inferior to the majeſty of pure Godhead; and that this illuſtrious being emptied and diveſted himſelf of his peculiar riches and glory when he came to dwell in fleſh; that he was capable of having a will different from the will of his Father, as appears in thoſe words of his, 'Father, not my will, but thy will be done;' and that he did really leave his dwelling with the Father, and come down into our world; I know not to what ſubject all this can be ſo well applied as to the human ſoul of Chriſt, and its exiſtence before his incarnation.

SECT. IV.

Miſcellaneous Arguments to prove the ſame Doctrine.

THOUGH the conſiderations already offered carry with them a good force of argument, yet all the reaſons which ſupport the doctrine of Chriſt's pre-exiſtent ſoul cannot be reduced to one general head. There are ſeveral others which are not ſo eaſily ranged under any head, that give their aſſiſtance to this work; and therefore I call them miſcellaneous, and propoſe them thus.

Argument I. It ſeems needful that the ſoul of Chriſt ſhould be pre-exiſtent, that it might have opportunity to give its previous actual conſent to the great and painful undertaking of atonement for our ſins.

It was the human ſoul of Chriſt that endured all the weakneſs, poverty and pain of his infant ſtate, that

that ſuſtained all the labours and fatigues of life, that felt the bitter reproaches of men, and the ſufferings of a ſhameful and bloody death, as well as the buffetings of devils, and the painful inflictions of the juſtice of God. This is evident, for neither the divine nature, nor the mere fleſh or body abſtractly conſidered, are capable of pain nor ſhame without the human ſoul. Surely then it ſeems to be requiſite that the ſoul of Chriſt ſhould give its actual free conſent to this undertaking before his labours, pains or ſorrows began, which was as ſoon as ever he was born.

One cannot but think it very congruous and highly reaſonable, that he who was to undergo ſo much for our ſakes ſhould not be taken from his childhood in a mere paſſive manner into this difficult and tremendous work, and afterwards only give his conſent to it when he was grown up a man, upon a ſecret divine intimation that he was born for this purpoſe. It looks moſt likely and condecent in reſpect of the nature of things, and the juſtice of God, that Chriſt's human ſoul which endured all the pains, ſhould well know beforehand what the glorious work of mediation would coſt him, and that he ſhould voluntarily accept the propoſal from the Father: otherwiſe it rather ſeems a taſk impoſed upon him, than an original and voluntary engagement of his own: whereas ſuch an impoſition would ſeem to diminiſh the merit and glory of this noble undertaking, and is alſo contrary to ſcripture in itſelf.

But if we ſuppoſe the human ſoul (united to the divine nature at its firſt creation, and being thereby fully capacitated for this amazing work) receiving the propoſal with cheerfulneſs from God his Father from the foundation of the world, and then from an inward delight to glorify his Father, and from a compaſſionate

compaſſionate principle to the children of men, undertaking this difficult and bloody ſervice, and coming down into a human body to fulfil it; this highly exalts the merit of his love, and the condeſcending glory of his labours and his ſufferings.

And indeed this voluntary conſent of his to become incarnate and to ſuffer, is plainly repreſented in ſeveral places of ſcripture; Pſal. xl. 6, 7. Heb. x. 5. 'Sacrifice and offering thou didſt not deſire,' theſe were not ſufficient to expiate the ſin of man; 'Thou haſt prepared a body for me; then ſaid I, Lo I come,' i. e. to dwell in this body, to undertake this work; 'I delight to do thy will, O my God.' "And theſe two expreſſions, Pſal. xl. 'My ears haſt thou bored,' and 'Thy law is in my heart,' are more proper (ſaith Dr. Goodwin, Vol. III. Book iv. p. 142, 143.) to apply to the ſoul of this human nature, and to be underſtood to be the voice of his human nature, rather than of the divine: He was willing and obedient to do God's will, as a ſervant to do his maſter's." And this great author thought this conſent ſo neceſſary, that he rather ventures to introduce a moſt miraculous ſcene, than to have this early conſent of Chriſt as Man omitted; and therefore he ſuppoſes that in a miraculous way the human ſoul of Chriſt did give itſelf up to this work from his very birth.

His own free conſent appears plainly in theſe words, 'He humbled himſelf.' Phil. ii. He emptied himſelf of glory when he became man, and died for ſinners. And 'he himſelf took part of fleſh and blood' with this deſign, that he might die, 'that he might through his death deſtroy the works of the devil.' Heb. ii. 14. He declares further his own free conſent, John vi. 38. 'I came down from heaven to do my Father's will.' And John x. 17, 18. 'Therefore doth my Father love me, becauſe I lay

I lay down my life that I might take it again.' 'No man taketh my life from me,' that is, againſt my free conſent; but 'I lay it down myſelf,' that is, of my own choice and voluntary engagement. "This thought I propoſe (ſays the defender of biſhop Fowler's diſcourſe) to be well conſidered by all free and ingenuous minds, and by all thoſe who would not in the leaſt derogate from the honour of their bleſſed Mediator Chriſt Jeſus," and the amazing love that appears in his mighty undertaking.

Arg. II. The covenant betwixt God the Father and his Son Jeſus Chriſt for the redemption of mankind, is repreſented in ſcripture as being made and agreed upon from or before the foundation of the world. Is it not then moſt proper that both real parties ſhould be actually preſent, and that this ſhould not be tranſacted merely within the divine eſſence by ſuch ſort of diſtinct perſonalities as have no diſtinct mind and will? The eſſence of God is generally agreed by our Proteſtant divines to be the ſame ſingle numerical eſſence in all three perſonalities, and therefore it can be but one conſcious mind or ſpirit. Now can one ſingle underſtanding and will make ſuch a covenant as ſcripture repreſents?

I grant the divine nature which is in Chriſt from eternity contrived and agreed all the parts of this covenant. But does it not add a luſtre and glory, and more conſpicuous equity, to this covenant, to ſuppoſe the Man Chriſt Jeſus (who is moſt properly the Mediator according to 1 Tim. ii. 5.) to be alſo preſent before the world was made, to be choſen and appointed as the Redeemer or Reconciler of mankind, to be then ordained the head of his future people, to receive promiſes, grace and bleſſings in their name, and to accept the ſolemn and weighty truſt from the hand of his Father, i. e. to take care of millions of ſouls? Read the following ſcriptures,

and ſee whether they do not imply thus much: 1 Tim. ii. 5. 'There is one Mediator between God and man, even the Man Chriſt Jeſus.' Epheſ. i. 34. 'Bleſſed be the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who hath bleſſed us with all ſpiritual bleſſings in heavenly places in Chriſt, according as he hath choſen us in him before the foundation of the world.' 2 Tim. i. 8, 9, 10. 'God hath ſaved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpoſe and grace which was given us in Chriſt Jeſus before the world began.' Tit. i. 2. 'Eternal life which God that cannot lie promiſed before the world began.' Now to whom could this promiſe be made but to Jeſus Chriſt, and to us in him, as the great patron and repreſentative of believers? Rev. xiii. 8. 'All that dwell on earth ſhall worſhip the beaſt, whoſe names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb ſlain from the foundation of the world.' Whether theſe words, 'from the foundation of the world,' refer to the 'ſlaying of the Lamb' by way of anticipation, or rather to 'writing of the book of life,' yet they certainly refer to the tranſaction of this important affair with the Lamb, and therefore this expreſſion is uſed ſeveral times in the book of the Revelations.

It was by virtue of this covenant, and the ſacrifice of his own blood which Chriſt was to offer in due time, that all the benefits of this covenant were derived upon mankind in the various ages of it ever ſince the fall of man; therefore Chriſt was a Saviour from the beginning of the world; and thoſe who apply all theſe things merely to the divine nature of Chriſt, as conſenting to this covenant upon the propoſal of the Father, yet they ſuppoſe the human nature of Chriſt to be included in it in the view of God the Father, by way of prolepſis

ſis or anticipation. But ſurely it ſeems much more proper to explain theſe things concerning the human ſoul of Chriſt as actually united to the divine nature, and actually conſenting to this covenant, ſince the human nature was to endure the ſufferings; and then we need not be conſtrained to recur to ſuch proleptical figures of ſpeech to interpret the language of ſcripture, ſince the literal ſenſe is juſt and true.

Thus it appears, if we conſider this covenant as made betwixt God the Father and his Son, (and as it is uſually called the covenant of redemption) it ſeems to require the pre-exiſtence of the ſoul of Chriſt. Or if we conſider the covenant of grace as it has been propoſed to men in all ages ſince the fall, the exiſtence of Chriſt as God-Man appears requiſite alſo to conſtitute him a proper Mediator. It does not ſeem to be ſo agreeable a ſuppoſition to make this covenant for the ſalvation of men from the vengeance of God to run on for the ſpace of four thouſand years together, that is, from the creation and fall of man to the incarnation of Chriſt, without any proper or ſuitable mediator or undertaker on the part of man. This covenant of the goſpel, or of God in Chriſt, includes in the very nature and theory of it two real diſtinct parties, God and man; ſo that the title of Mediator ſeems to require that man ſhould be repreſented by the Mediator as well as God, and that the complete perſon of the Mediator ſhould have ſome affinity to both parties, and actually agree to this covenant in that whole perſon before the communication of the benefits of it to the earlieſt ages of mankind.

Obſerve alſo, (what was intimated before) that this one Mediator is particularly called 'The Man Chriſt Jeſus,' 1 Tim. ii. 5. that the human nature may appear to be ſignally concerned in the media-

tion: and for the ſame reaſon, the book of life is ſaid to belong to the Lamb, which name is applied to the human nature of Chriſt, in union with the divine, with much more propriety than it can be applied merely to the divine nature without ſuch an union.

Arg. III. Another argument for this doctrine of the exiſtence of the ſoul of Chriſt before his incarnation may be derived from the ſcriptural deſcriptions of Chriſt's coming into the world. This is always expreſſed in ſome corporeal language, ſuch as denotes his taking on him animal nature, or body, or fleſh, without the leaſt mention of taking a ſoul. Read the following ſcriptures: John i. 14. 'The Word was made fleſh, and dwelt among us.' Rom. i. 3. 'He was made of the ſeed of David, according to the fleſh.' Rom. viii. 3. 'God ſending his Son in the likeneſs of ſinful fleſh.' Gal. iv. 3. 'God ſent forth his Son made of a woman.' This *Word* cannot neceſſarily imply the ſoul, for his ſoul could not be made of the ſoul or body of the virgin Mary, but his fleſh or blood was made out of hers.

Phil. ii. 7, 8. 'He was made in the likeneſs of men, and was found in faſhion as a man.' Now ſhape or faſhion peculiarly refer to the body rather than the ſoul.

And in the 2d chapter to the Hebrews, where the apoſtle treats profeſſedly of the incarnation of Chriſt, he ſeems to ſuppoſe that his ſoul exiſted before, and that he was like the children of God already in that reſpect; but ver. 14. 'For as much as the children were partakers of fleſh and blood, he alſo himſelf likewiſe took part of the ſame, that he might in all things be like his brethren,' as ver. 17. And if he be ſaid to 'take on him the ſeed of Abraham,' ver. 16. yet it is certain that the human body of Chriſt has a very proper and literal right to that name,

name, rather than the ſoul, though the word *feed* may more frequently include both.

Again, it is ſaid by the ſame apoſtle in Heb. v. 7. 'In the days of his fleſh he offered up prayers and ſupplications with ſtrong crying and tears,' i. e. when he had taken fleſh upon him, and dwelt in it. And in Heb. x. when God the Father ſends his Son into the world, he is ſaid to 'prepare a body for him,' but not a *human ſoul*; ver. 5. 'A body haſt thou prepared me.'

The apoſtle John ſpeaks ſeveral times of 'Jeſus Chriſt being come in the fleſh,' to ſignify his coming into the world, in his firſt and ſecond epiſtles, intimating that the perſon who is veſted with the name and character of Jeſus and Chriſt, had every thing beſides fleſh before.

On the other hand, if Chriſt did take a human ſoul upon him (or the whole complex nature of man) at the ſame time when he was born of the virgin, it is a wonder that there ſhould not be any one ſcripture, neither in the Old or New Teſtament, which ſhould give ſuch a hint to us, that he then took a reaſonable ſoul as well as a body; or ſhould tell us at leaſt that he expreſsly aſſumed human nature, which might include both fleſh and ſpirit; but that it ſhould always uſe ſuch words as chiefly and directly denote the body. This ſeems to carry ſome evident intimation that his human ſoul exiſted before.

Perhaps it will be objected here, that the word *fleſh* in many places of ſcripture ſignifies mankind or human nature, by the figure *ſynecdoche* including the ſoul alſo.

It is granted that *fleſh* doth ſometimes ſignify mankind, and this objection might be good if the ſcriptural language never uſed any thing but the word fleſh to denote human nature, and never diſtinguiſhed

tinguiſhed the fleſh and the ſoul: but ſince there are a great number of ſcriptures where the fleſh or body is diſtinguiſhed from the ſoul or ſpirit of man on many occaſions, it ſeems very natural and reaſonable to expect there ſhould be ſome one paſſage at leaſt in all the bible wherein the divine nature of Chriſt ſhould be ſaid to aſſume a human ſoul as well as a body of fleſh, when he came into our world, if this ſpirit or ſoul had no exiſtence before the incarnation.

And we have the more reaſon to expect this alſo when we obſerve, that there is mention made of the ſoul of Chriſt himſelf in ſeveral places of ſcripture on other occaſions, as Iſai. liii. 10. 'Thou ſhalt make his ſoul an offering for ſin.' Ver. 11. 'He ſhall ſee of the travail of his ſoul.' Luke xxiii. 46. 'Father, into thy hands I commend my ſpirit.' Acts ii. 31. 'His ſoul was not left in hell.' John xii. 27. 'Now is my ſoul troubled.' Matt. xxvi. 38. 'My ſoul is exceeding ſorrowful.' Luke x. 21. 'Jeſus rejoiced in ſpirit.' John xi. 33. and xiii. 21. 'Jeſus was troubled in ſpirit.' Now, ſince we have the human ſoul or ſpirit of Chriſt mentioned ſeveral times in ſcripture on other occaſions, and yet never once mentioned with relation to his incarnation, but always find his coming into our world deſcribed by taking 'fleſh and blood,' 'body,' the 'faſhion of a man,' the 'likeneſs of ſinful fleſh,' &c. there is much reaſon to ſuppoſe that Chriſt had a human ſoul before, and did not then begin to have it.

Arg. IV. Though the Jews were much at a loſs in our Saviour's time in their ſentiments of the Meſſiah, and had very various and confuſed notions of him, yet it is certain that amongſt many of the learned of that nation (and probably amongſt many of the vulgar too) there was a tradition of the preexiſtence of the ſoul of the Meſſiah. Philo, the Jew,

Jew, who lived very near the time of our Saviour, interprets several of those scriptures of the Old Testament concerning the Mediator or *Logos* which we do: he calls him the *Son of God*, and yet he makes him expressly a *Man*, the *Prince of the angels*, the *Prophet of God*, the *Light of the people*; and though he talks with some confusion on this subject, and gives him some such characters as seem to make this *Logos* truly divine, and one with God, yet other characters also are such as seem to be inferior to Godhead, and very happily agree with this doctrine of the pre-existent soul of Christ in union with his divine nature, as will plainly appear in what follows.

In some parts of his works, Philo describes the *Logos* as a particular divine power, δυναμις, which he also calls σοφια, or *Wisdom*, (as Solomon does in the eighth of Proverbs) and he attributes to this *Wisdom* or *Word*, an existence before any creature, the contrivance of the creation of the world and all things in it, with other divine and incommunicable ascriptions. Sometimes the ancient Jews make it the same with God himself; so the Targums do (which are Jewish commentaries upon scripture) when they speak of the *Memra* or *Word*, thereby representing either divine powers or properties in a personal manner, or the divine nature itself in a particular manner of agency, relation or subsistence.

In other places, Philo makes the *Logos* or *Word* to signify that glorious arch-angel which the ancient Jews suppose to be the supreme of creatures, formed before all the angels and all the other parts of the creation, 'in whom was the name of God,' who was sent to conduct Moses and the Jews into Canaan. Exod. xxiii. 20. This glorious spirit Philo calls "the most honourable *Logos*, the Arch-Angel, Prince of the angels and stars, High-Priest in this temple of God the world, who stands in the limits between the creature

creature and the Creator, the eldeſt, the firſt-begotten of the ſons of God, who under God governs the world, and who doth humbly mediate for us mortals with him that is immortal."

The ſeventy Jewiſh interpreters ſeem to have had ſome notion that this arch-angel was the Meſſiah, when they call the 'Child born,' the 'Son given,' in Iſa. ix. 6. Μεγαλης βαλης Αγγελος, *the Angel of the great Counſel*, even as Chriſt is called an angel. Iſa. lxiii. 9. Mal. iii. 1. Exod. xxiii. 20. And it was a general opinion of the ancient Jews that there was one glorious angel ſuperior to all the reſt, by whom God made his viſits to the patriarchs, and declared his will to Abraham, Jacob, Moſes, Joſhua, &c.

I confeſs theſe ancient Jews ſpeak variouſly and with ſome darkneſs and confuſion on theſe ſubjects, that we cannot gather any ſteady or certain inferences that they generally believed either of theſe two *Logos*'s to be the very perſon of their expected Meſſiah: yet a Chriſtian, who has the clearer light of the New Teſtament, may from their writings eaſily and naturally trace and infer the doctrine of the uncreated *Logos*, that is, the divine *Word*, or *Wiſdom*, united to the created *Logos*, that is, the great Arch-Angel, becauſe theſe ancient Jews aſcribe to the *Logos* ſo many things which are truly divine, and ſo many things inferior to divinity.

But they ſpeak in ſome confuſion, becauſe they ſeem not to have had a clear idea of this perſonal union between God and a creature. Whereas Chriſtians being inſtructed in this doctrine by the New Teſtament, may clearly underſtand how by this glorious Being, this complex perſon, viz. our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, God created the world and God governed the affairs of his ancient church: and that ſtanding in the limits betwixt God and the creature,

creature, both by his nature as well as his office he becomes the High-Prieſt, and mediates between mortal men, and God, who is immortal, according to the language of the ancient Jews.

What I have cited already, diſcovers the acknowledged ſenſe and opinion of the ancient Jews both philoſophers and commentators on this ſubject. See much more to this purpoſe in my diſſertation on the *Logos* or *Word of God.*

If we ſearch among other of the Jewiſh writers, we may find more intimations of this doctrine.

Biſhop Fowler cites ſome notable traditions of the Jewiſh Rabbies to this purpoſe; one in an ancient book amongſt the Jews called *Peſikta*, viz. That "after God had created the world, he put his hand under the throne of his glory, and brought out the ſoul of the Meſſiah, with all his attendants, and ſaid unto him, Wilt thou heal and redeem my ſons after 6000 years? He anſwered, I am willing ſo to do. Again therefore, ſaid God unto him, And art thou willing to ſuffer chaſtiſements, for the purging away their iniquities? And the ſoul of the Meſſiah anſwered, I will ſuffer them, and that with all my heart."

"And there is," ſaith he, "a cabbaliſtical repreſentation of their expected Meſſiah's being in heaven, in another old book of high eſteem among the Jews, entitled Midraſh Conen, viz. "In the fifth houſe ſits the Meſſiah, ſon of David; and Elias of bleſſed memory ſaid to this Meſſiah, Bear the ſtroke and judgment of the Lord, which he inflicts on thee for the ſin of Iſrael, as it is written by Iſaiah, 'He was wounded becauſe of our tranſgreſſions," &c. Now, though we allow no more credit to theſe traditions than to other Jewiſh tales, yet it diſcovers their ancient notion of the pre-exiſtence of the ſoul of the Meſſiah: and the learned Mr. Fleming tells us, that

that it was an inducement to him to favour this opinion, becauſe the Jews ſeemed to have laid down this as an undoubted maxim in all ages, that the ſoul of the Meſſiah was made before all creatures, as all muſt own that are in the leaſt acquainted with their opinions and writings. Chriſtology, Book iii. Chap. 5. p. 457. That this was an ancient opinion of the Jews is confirmed by other writers alſo.

And it is no wonder if many of the common people, as well as the learned, had alſo this notion of the ſoul of Chriſt, ſince it appears, John ix. 2. that they had a belief of the pre-exiſtence of all human ſouls, for which opinion I think there is neither in ſcripture nor in reaſon any juſt foundation; nor doth the pre-exiſtence of the ſoul of Chriſt at all infer the doctrine of the pre-exiſtence of other ſouls, but rather the contrary, as will appear under the next particular.

Arg. V. Since it pleaſed the Father to prepare a body for our Lord Jeſus Chriſt by the over-ſhadowing of the Holy Ghoſt, and by a peculiar manner of conception, that his body might have ſome peculiar prerogative, and that he might be the Son of God in a ſuperior ſenſe with regard to his fleſh, (as Luke i. 35.) ſo it is not unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that the ſoul of Chriſt alſo, which was to be united to Godhead, ſhould have this peculiar prerogative, to be derived immediately from God before any creature was made, and to enjoy this union with the divine nature, and glories ſuitable thereto, before its union with an earthly body; and thus in conſideration of its formation before all creatures in a moſt immediate manner by the will of God, as well as its neareſt reſemblance to God himſelf above all other ſpirits, this human ſoul might be called alſo the Son of God and his only begotten Son, in a tranſcendent manner above all other beings, whether men or angels,

gels, who are ſometimes called *ſons of God.* But this thought perhaps will be ſet in a clearer light, when we come to explain a variety of ſcriptures according to this hypotheſis in the next ſection; and it may be yet made plainer ſtill, whenſoever I ſhall publiſh another diſſertation which I have written on the name, *Son of God.*

SECT. V.

A Confirmation of this Doctrine by Arguments drawn from the happy Conſequences, and the various Advantages of it.

I THINK the reaſon and conſiderations mentioned in the two foregoing ſections have ſome weight in them: but the argument will receive new ſtrength, if we ſurvey the various advantages that attend this opinion of the pre-exiſtent ſoul of Chriſt.

I. *Advantage.* This doctrine caſts a ſurpriſing light upon many dark paſſages in the word of God; it does very naturally and eaſily explain and reconcile ſeveral difficult places both of the Old and New Teſtament, which are very hard to be accounted for any other way. Some of theſe I have already mentioned, and I think they appear in a fairer light by the help of this doctrine. Other paſſages there are which ſpeak of Chriſt as the true God, and yet at the ſame time in the context attribute ſuch properties and characters to him as are very hard to be reconciled and applied to pure Godhead; but are explained with utmoſt eaſe to us, and honour to Chriſt, by ſuppoſing his pre-exiſtent ſoul even then united to his divine nature.

Let us ſurvey ſome of theſe portions of ſcripture. Firſt text, Col. i. 15, &c. Chriſt is deſcribed as the 'image

'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,' &c. 'All things were created by him and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things conſiſt; and he is the head of the body the church, the beginning, the firſt-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence; for it pleaſed the Father that in him ſhould all fulneſs dwell,' or as it is expreſſed in the ſecond chapter, ver. 9. 'for in him dwelleth all the fulneſs of the Godhead bodily.' Here are ſome expreſſions which ſeem too ſublime for any mere creature, viz. 'All things are created, by him and for him, and by him all things conſiſt.' But when it is ſaid, 'He is the image of the inviſible God,' this cannot refer merely to his divine nature, for that is as inviſible in the Son as it is in the Father; therefore it ſeems to refer to his pre-exiſtent ſoul in union with his Godhead, who is the brighteſt, the faireſt and moſt glorious image of God; and ſo he appears to the world of angels in heaven, and by his frequent aſſuming a viſible ſhape heretofore, became the image of the inviſible God to men, and dwelt here for a ſeaſon on earth.

He is ſaid alſo to be 'the firſt-born of every creature. There has been much labour and art of criticiſm employed to apply theſe words merely to the divine nature of Chriſt, by giving them a metaphorical or ſome unuſual ſenſe: but if we ſuppoſe this ſoul of Chriſt to exiſt thus early, then he is properly the 'firſt-born of every creature' in the literal ſenſe of the words; and in this ſenſe he may be literally called 'the beginning of the creation of God, as he ſtyles himſelf, Rev. iii. 14.

If we join the expreſſions of the firſt and ſecond chapters to the Coloſſians together, we may explain the one by the other. 'He is the image of the inviſible

visible God; by him and for him were all things created, and in him all things consist, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence,' &c. 'for it pleased the Father that in him should dwell all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' All the Godhead dwelt in him as a spirit, or *spiritually* before the incarnation, and *bodily* since; thus the 19th ver. of Chap. i. comes in properly as a reason for all those attributions both supreme and inferior, viz. because God was pleased to ordain that the divine nature should be united to this glorious being, the human soul of Christ, now appearing in a body.

Dr. Thomas Goodwin was a learned, a laborious and a successful inquirer into all those scriptures that treat of our Lord Jesus Christ in order to aggrandize his character; and when he interprets these verses, in Vol. II. *Of the knowledge of God*, &c. he finds himself constrained to explain the expressions concerning the divine nature of Christ, as united to man by way of anticipation, or as considered in its future union with the Man Jesus, and argues strongly for this exposition. But there is no need to bring in such a figure as *prolepsis* or the anticipation of things future, since the real and actual existence of the soul of Christ before the creation makes all this language of scripture just and plain in the literal sense. And what that pious and ingenious author declares upon this subject, almost persuades me to believe that had he lived in our day, he would have been a hearty defender of the doctrine which I propose.

IId *Text.* The next scripture I shall cite for this purpose is that illustrious description of our Lord Jesus in the 1st. chap. of the epistle to the Hebrews, wherein there are sufficient evidences of his divine nature: but there are some such expressions as seem to imply also a nature inferior and dependent. He is represented as 'laying the foundations of the earth, and

and the heavens are the work of his hands;' 'he upholds all things by the word of his power:' which expreſſions carry in them an idea too ſublime for any mere created nature. And the citation of the firſt of them from the ciid. Pſalm, proves yet further that Chriſt is Jehovah the Creator.

But when he is called a 'Son,' a 'begotten Son,' this ſeems to imply derivation and dependency: and perhaps the Sonſhip of Chriſt, and his being the 'only begotten of the Father,' may be better explained by attributing it to his human ſoul exiſting by ſome peculiar and immediate manner of creation, formation, or derivation from the Father before other creatures were formed; eſpecially if we include in the ſame idea of Sonſhip (as Dr. Goodwin does) his union to the divine nature, and if we add alſo his exaltation to the office of the Meſſiah as king and lord of all; which ſome zealous Trinitarians ſuppoſe to be the chief thing meant when God ſaith, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.'

Now this matter being ſet in a fair and full light, and eſtabliſhed by juſt arguments from ſcripture, would take off the force of many Arian pretences againſt the Trinity, viz. ſuch pretences as ariſe from the ſuppoſed derivation of one perſon from another in pure Godhead, and a ſuppoſed eternal act of generation producing a co-eſſential Son, which things are not plainly expreſſed in any part of the bible, and which are acknowledged on all ſides to be great and incomprehenſible difficulties.

Heb. i. 3. Perhaps theſe words, 'The brightneſs of his Father's glory, and the expreſs image of his perſon,' may be better explained, if we ſuppoſe the divine nature of Chriſt to be united to his pre-exiſtent ſoul, when it was firſt created: this human ſoul of Chriſt was then like a glaſs through which the Godhead ſhone with inimitable ſplendour in all the

the perfections of it, wisdom, power, holiness and goodness: thus Christ was his Father's most perfect image or copy, both in his own native excellencies, bearing the nearest resemblance to God, as an only begotten Son, and he was also 'the brightness of his glory;' because the perfections of the Father shone through him with more illustrious rays than it was possible for any mere creature to represent or transmit them, who was not thus united to a divine nature.

I cannot forbear to illustrate this by a similitude which I think has been somewhere used by Dr. Goodwin: suppose it possible for a hollow globe of crystal to be made so vast as to inclose the sun; this globe of crystal, considered in itself, would have many properties in it, perhaps, resembling the sun in a more perfect manner than any other being: but if it were also inhabited by the sun itself, and thus transmitted the glories of the sun to men, how express an image would it be of that bright luminary, and would it not be the most happy medium by which the sun could exert its powers of light and heat? Such is Jesus the Man, who is the Son of God inhabited by the divine nature, and the fairest image of God.

Besides, let it be yet further considered, that when Christ is called in Coloss. i. 'The image of the invisible God,' and in Heb. i. 'The express image of his Father's person,' it must be understood either of his divine nature or his human. If it be understood of his divine nature, it must mean that he is the image of the Father's essence or of his personality, for the personality together with the essence, make up the complete character of God the Father.

But the divine nature of Christ cannot properly be the image of his Father's nature or essence; for the essence of Godhead, or the divine nature both

in

in the Father and in the Son, is one and the ſame individual nature or eſſence, which cannot properly be the image of itſelf, nor can the ſame individual eſſence be both the original and the image at the ſame time. When we conceive of the ſelf-ſame body, or the ſelf-ſame man, or the ſelf-ſame angel, in different poſitions or ſituations, circumſtances, relations or appearances, we never ſay that the ſelf-ſame thing is the image of itſelf. Thus Chriſt in his divine eſſence cannot be the image of the Father's eſſence, when it is the ſame individual eſſence with that of the Father. The eſſence of God in the perſon of the Son cannot properly be the image of that eſſence in the perſon of the Father, ſince it is the ſame individual eſſence.

Nor is Chriſt in his divine nature an expreſs image of the perſonality of the Father. Sonſhip is no image of paternity: a derived property or ſubſiſtence is no image of an underived property or ſubſiſtence, but juſt the reverſe or directly contrary to it.

Since therefore Chriſt in his divine nature is neither the image of his Father's eſſence, nor of his Father's perſonality, theſe words muſt be ſpoken with regard to Chriſt's human nature; and in this reſpect he is the 'expreſs image of his Father,' or the 'image of the inviſible God;' and that, theſe three ways.

1. As the human ſoul of Chriſt is a creature, which has the neareſt likeneſs to its Creator. This Son of God is a moſt glorious ſpirit, the brighteſt and neareſt image to the Father, the eternal glorious Spirit; far nearer than the angels, who are alſo the ſons of God, or than Adam who was the ſon of God too; for his properties and perfections are much greater than theirs, and bear a much nearer reſemblance to the properties and perfections of God the Father.

2. The

2. The human nature of Christ is the image of the invisible God the Father, as he often assumed a visible form under the Old Testament, and appeared and spake and acted as God in a visible glory; and so he is the proper 'image of the invisible God.' Col. i.

3. As he took upon him, in the fulness of time, a visible body of flesh and blood, and therein appeared as one 'in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily,' the visible image of his invisible Father.

But I proceed. The holy writer in Heb. i. adds further, that 'he was appointed heir of all things,' which seems to be not so applicable to the pure Godhead of Christ; for Godhead has an original and eternal right to all things, and does not come at it by way of inheritance or derivation, much less by being an appointed heir. Dr. Goodwin is so well persuaded of the sense of these words, that they are not properly applicable to pure Godhead, that he again supposes the holy writer to speak by way of anticipation, and to view the divine nature of Christ in union with the man, though he acknowledges the things which are now spoken of were transacted before the world was.

There are other expressions in this chapter which seem to refer to some being inferior to Godhead. Ver. 4. 'Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.' Ver. 9. 'Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity, and therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows;' i. e. has given thee the Holy Spirit as a comforter, in a superior measure. These things cannot be supposed to be spoken of the Godhead of Christ: and yet they seem to be spoken concerning Christ before his incarnation, and then

they point out to us the pre-exiſtence of his human ſoul: whereas if they are ſpoken of him after his incarnation, then they prove nothing of his pre-exiſtent glory, which ſeems to be the deſign of this chapter.

Since the deſign of the ſecond chapter to the Hebrews is, to prove the incarnation of Chriſt, and his taking upon him a human body, I might here aſk, whether the deſign of the firſt chapter may not be to repreſent our bleſſed Lord in his pre-exiſtent ſtate, both divine and human, i. e. to ſet forth the glory of this human ſpirit both in its own excellencies and in its original union with the divine nature. And this appears the more probable, becauſe the author in the firſt chapter is frequently comparing him with angels, and ſets him above them in ſeveral compariſons; now this would be but a low and diminutive account of the Godhead of Chriſt, to raiſe him above angels; but it is a glorious and ſublime account of his human ſoul, conſidered as united to Godhead, and one with God.

And ſince there are ſo many expreſſions in the firſt chapter which aſcribe ideas to Chriſt which are inferior to Godhead, as well as ſome ſublimer expreſſions which appear incommunicable to any but God; I would inquire whether the introduction of this pre-exiſtent ſoul of Chriſt here may not be a happy clue to lead us into the very mind and meaning of this portion of ſcripture, rather than to ſuppoſe the Godhead of Chriſt is always intended here: for by ſo doing we embarraſs ourſelves with this difficulty (which the Arians frequently fling upon us) of attributing ſomething derivative and dependent to the Divine Nature, and aſcribing ſomething too low and mean to the Godhead of Chriſt.

I might

I might add alſo in confirmation of this thought, that had the ſacred writer's only deſign been to prove the divine nature of Chriſt, there are ſeveral paſſages in the Old Teſtament which are of equal force and ſignificancy with any which he has cited, and which are more evidently applied to the Meſſiah by the prophets themſelves: but if we ſuppoſe him to ſpeak of the whole pre-exiſtent glory of Chriſt, then the citations ſeem to be well choſen and well mingled to repreſent his two natures, both divine and human, and the glory of his ſacred perſon reſulting thence.

That noble expoſitor on the epiſtle to the Hebrews, Dr. Owen, being ſenſible that all theſe expreſſions in this chapter can never be applied to the divine nature of Chriſt, aſſerts, that "it is not the direct and immediate deſign of the apoſtle in this place to treat abſolutely of either nature of Chriſt, either divine or human, but only of his perſon: and though ſome things here expreſſed belong to his divine nature, ſome to his human; yet none of them are ſpoken as ſuch, but are all conſidered as belonging to his perſon." See his expoſition on the Hebrews, ver. 3. p. 52. So that I have thoſe two great and excellent writers, Dr. Goodwin and Dr. Owen, concurring with me in this ſentiment, that it is not the prime deſign of this firſt chapter to the Hebrews to prove the Deity of Chriſt, but the glory of his perſon conſidered as God-Man: and in this view ſeveral expreſſions of the apoſtle are moſt appoſitely adapted to repreſent the glory of the human ſoul of Chriſt in its pre-exiſtent ſtate, and in its union to the divine nature.

III. *Text.* Another difficult ſcripture which is made more eaſy and plain by this doctrine, is the eighth of Proverbs, ver. 22, &c. where 'Wiſdom' is repreſented as 'brought forth,' and 'dwelling with

God before the world was.' May not this be happily attributed to Chriſt's pre-exiſtent ſoul united to the divine nature, or the perſon of the Mediator God-Man? for it is ſaid, 'The Lord poſſeſſed me in the beginning of his ways, before his works of old: I was ſet up from everlaſting: before the hills was I brought forth: I was by him, and was daily his delight.' Theſe words admit of two or three remarks.

1. Theſe expreſſions, I was 'poſſeſſed' or acquired, 'I was ſet up, I was brought forth,' ſeem to expreſs and imply ſomething inferior to pure Godhead, which is underived and independent; yet it ſeems to be the proper deſcription of a being diſtinct from God the Father in the literal ſenſe,* for theſe words intimate ſo much, 'I was by him as one brought up with him, I was daily his delight, I rejoiced before him, and my delights were with the ſons of men.' If theſe things be taken literally, they mean a real perſon inferior and diſtinct from God.

2. The original Hebrew does not ſay, 'the Lord poſſeſſed me *in* the beginning of his ways,' but קנני, acquired, or aſſumed, or 'poſſeſſed me the beginning of his ways,' not בדשית but דשית, which gives a fair ground for this interpretation, viz. that the divine nature acquired, aſſumed, or poſſeſſed himſelf of the human ſoul of Chriſt as the beginning, head and foundation of all his works and ways, both of creation and providence: ſo, Rev. iii. 14. Chriſt is called

* I readily grant that divine wiſdom may be here repreſented, after the manner of the eaſtern writers, as the counſel, contrivance, and the decretive power or will of God in a perſonal character, as being preſent with God in the creation of the world, and as produced or brought forth by him; but even this wiſdom may be ſuppoſed to make the pre-exiſtent ſoul of Chriſt, in ſome unknown manner, its inſtrument of operation (as Dr. Goodwin uſes the word) and when the ſacred writer adds, 'I rejoiced daily before him in the habitable parts of his earth; and my delights were with the ſons of men;' this ſeems to caſt a ſtronger aſpect upon ſome real proper perſon diſtinct from Godhead.

called the beginning or head of the creation of God.

Mr. Fleming citing these verses at large, Christology, Book 3. chap. 5. p. 469. adds, "What we render in ver. 24 and 25. 'brought forth,' the Targum renders, by *being born* in the first verse, and by *being created*, in the next. But the Hebrew word is the same in both, and is justly rendered by Arias Montanus, *formata*; i. e. framed, formed, or made: as the Septuagint to the same purpose renders it by ποιησαι, which is of the same import. And what else can he mean, when in the 30th verse he represents himself, as *one brought up with God*, or as the Targum says, *as one nourished up at his side?* Surely, if this be meant of the first created spirit who is now the soul of the Messiah, no expressions can be more plain as well as natural: whereas if we understand them immediately of the *Logos*, as the second Person of the Trinity, we must get over abundance of figures, that can never, I think, be properly either explained or accommodated; besides our being involved in endless criticisms about words."

Dr. Goodwin also is positive that these expressions cannot refer to the second Person considered in his eternal generation, but they must be referred to Christ as God-Man, because they denote an act of the divine will. Goodwin of the *Knowledge of God*, Vol. II. p. 111 and 189.

The learned Dr. Knight supposes this birth of divine Wisdom is her coming forth into a human figure and subsistence, or her entrance into the substance of the first created nature, (that is, the human soul of Jesus Christ) at the moment of its creation. By this means the Word as man became the head of mankind, who were to be made by him after his image and likeness; and as first-begotten, he had the right of primogeniture or government over

over the reſt. See his *Conſiderations on Whiſton*, &c. p. 108, 109, &c.

3. I remark alſo, that though the Hebrew language may expreſs the eternity of God, by ſaying, 'Before the mountains and the hills,' &c. yet ſince we ſuppoſe the ſoul of Chriſt to be the firſt of the works or ways of God, this manner of expreſſion may more particularly and expreſsly deſcribe the date of his exiſtence before this world was made, though it be not co-eval and co-eternal with the Godhead.

But I proceed, fourthly, to mention ſome other difficult texts which may derive light from this doctrine.

If we can but ſuffer ourſelves to believe what I have intimated before, that the Sonſhip of Chriſt does not belong to his divine nature, but rather to his human ſoul conſidered in its original derivation from God the Father, and in its being appointed to the ſacred office of the Meſſiah; then we have a moſt evident and obvious interpretation of thoſe ſcriptures in the New Teſtament, which have been attended with ſo much darkneſs and difficulty, and have given ſo much anxiety and pains to our divines, viz. John v. 19. 'The Son can do nothing of himſelf.' Matt. xxiv. 36. Mark xiii. 32. 'But of that day knoweth no man, neither the angels in heaven nor the Son, but the Father.' Heb. v. 8. 'Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he ſuffered.' Now this Sonſhip refers to ver. 5. 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.' 1 Cor. xv. 28. 'Then ſhall the Son alſo himſelf be ſubject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.' Theſe expreſſions ſound very harſh if applied to the divine nature of Chriſt, but are very naturally applicable to a being or ſpirit inferior to Godhead.

To

To these expressions I might add, John xiv. 28. 'The Father is greater than I;' which is very hard to apply to the divine nature of Christ, and to make a greater and lesser God: and yet it seems but a poor low assertion if our Saviour spoke it of himself as a mere common man, who begun to exist thirty-four years ago: it was no strange thing that God should be greater than a man. But if we suppose it refers to Christ's glorious human soul, which was the first-born of every creature, it carries in it something grand and august, and he pays hereby a sublimer honour to God his Father.

All other places of scripture wherein the Son of God is represented, either as receiving or invested with sublime powers from God, or as bearing any inferior characters, have a most natural and easy explication if they are applied to this glorious human spirit, sometimes considered as distinguished from the divine nature, sometimes as personally united to it, and that either in its own existence before its incarnation, or in its incarnate state, according as the context requires: for since both natures have their part and share in man's redemption, they are thus distinguished in the holy scripture, some expressions relating more properly to the one nature, some to the other, and some including both natures united. There is no need of paraphrasing these scriptures at large, and giving an example how these texts may then be interpreted, since this key being given, the way lies open for every unlearned Christian to penetrate into the sense of them, and to explain many other scriptures besides those I have cited, by the help of the same doctrine.

Advan. II. This doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul of Christ not only explains dark and difficult scriptures, but it discovers to us many beauties and proprieties of expression in the word of God, and

and caſts a luſtre upon ſome of thoſe paſſages whoſe juſtneſs and beauty were not before obſerved. Let me mention a few of them.

1. When man is ſaid to be 'created in the image of God,' Gen. i. 2. it may refer to the God-Man, to Chriſt in his pre-exiſtent ſtate. God ſays, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeneſs;' the word is redoubled, perhaps to intimate that Adam was made in the likeneſs of the human ſoul of Chriſt, who was the firſt of God's creation, as well as that he bore ſomething of the image or reſemblance of the divine nature itſelf: and hereby Chriſt has the honour of being ſet up as the firſt and faireſt image of God, and the grand pattern of all human ſouls who were to bear his likeneſs.

2. Again, when God is ſaid to 'grieve,' to 'repent,' to 'be angry,' to 'come down from heaven,' to 'ſtand,' to 'ſpeak,' to 'receive' and aſſume to himſelf many of the actions and paſſions of human nature, we are wont to explain them as mere figures of ſpeech, employing human expreſſions to repreſent divine actions: but if we ſuppoſe the divine nature of Chriſt united to this pre-exiſtent ſoul, then theſe expreſſions perhaps may be taken in a more literal ſenſe than we imagined; when he that was true God, by virtue of this union, 'came down from heaven, ſtood, ſpake, grieved, rejoiced,' and 'was pleaſed,' or 'angry' at the view he took of the affairs of men. Dr. Owen in his *Meditations on the Glory of Chriſt*, aſſerts, that "it had been abſurd to bring in God under perpetual *anthropopathies*, as grieving, repenting, being angry, well pleaſed, and the like, were it not but that the divine Perſon intended was to take on him the nature wherein ſuch affections do dwell."

3. And not only human actions are attributed to God, but even the very name of man is given to that

that glorious Being which visited the patriarchs of old: he assumed a human shape and appeared as a man; and even the soul itself might be so called by *synecdoche*, which puts a part for the whole. And yet this glorious appearance is also called 'God,' and the 'Lord' or 'Jehovah.' It was a Man that 'wrestled with Jacob,' Gen. xxxi. and yet he is acknowledged and adored as God. That extraordinary Man, who is called the 'Man of God,' when he appeared to Manoah, Judges xiii. is supposed to be the Messiah: his countenance is described 'like an angel of God,' and his name is called 'Secret' or 'Wonderful,' ver. 6. 18.* So in Ezekiel's vision, chap. i. 26. 'upon the likeness of the throne was the appearance of a man above:' and in the prophecy of Daniel we meet with several of his appearances in the form of a man: chap. iii. 25. 'The fourth *Man* walking in the midst of the burning fiery furnace was like the Son of God.' So, chap. viii. ver. 15, 16. 'There stood before me as the appearance of a man,' and this Man bid Gabriel make Daniel understand the vision: and chap. x. 5. 'A certain Man clothed in linen, whose loins were girt with gold,' is described very nearly in the same form and dress as Christ appeared in to St. John, Rev. i. 13. and chap. vii. 13. 'One like the Son of Man came to him that sat on the throne.' &c. which is parallel to Rev. i. 7. It is probable that most times when the angel (who is also called God) favoured the patriarchs with a visit, he appeared in the form of a man. Thus the great *Theanthropos* or *God-Man* put on a human shape frequently as a preludium, figure and prophecy of his own incarnation.

Nor

* It is the same word פלא *Wonderful*, which is attributed to Christ as one of his names, in Isa. vi. 9. which the angel here assumes when Manoah asks his name.

Nor can it be objected here that a human ſoul is not a man; for ſurely it may be called a man as well as Chriſt may be called an angel, as he is often in ſcripture; and better than the pure divine nature may be called a man; which yet is the ſenſe of thoſe who will not allow Chriſt's human ſoul to be here meant. The ſoul is the chief part of the man, and St. Paul calls his own ſoul by this name, viz. a man. See 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3. 'I knew a man,' i. e. his ſoul, 'whether in the body or out of the body I cannot tell.'

4. Another inſtance of the juſtneſs and beauty of ſcriptural language we find in Zech. xiii. 7. where the Man Chriſt is called the 'neighbour of God,' or the 'man who is near him,' as it may be beſt rendered; 'Awake, O ſword, againſt my Shepherd, and againſt the man that is my fellow' or neighbour, 'ſaith the Lord of hoſts.' The word עמיתי, which we render *my fellow*, does never ſignify any ſort of equality, but conjunction, nearneſs or neighbourhood: it is often rendered *neighbour* in ſcripture. It denotes the man that was with God, or near to God, by the intimate union of the human ſoul to the Godhead, and was the ſhepherd of the flock of God, or the keeper of Iſrael in all former ages. So the vulgar Latin renders it, *Cohærentem mihi*, cleaving to me; and becauſe of the union between the divine and human nature it may be very properly expreſſed, *my neighbour*.

I might take occaſion here to remark alſo how appoſitely God himſelf is ſometimes called the 'Shepherd of Iſrael,' Pſal. xxiii. 1. Pſal. lxxx. 1. 'He ſhall feed his flock like a ſhepherd, he ſhall gather the lambs in his arm, and carry them in his boſom,' Iſai. xl. 11. which is a prophecy of Chriſt, though he is called the Lord God in the foregoing verſe. This language has great propriety in it when we conſider

consider the human soul of Christ united to Godhead, acting the part of a shepherd towards the Jewish nation, 'leading them through the wilderness like a flock,' and watching over them as a shepherd in the land of Canaan. How beautiful is this idea, when we observe that both in prophecy and in history, in the Old Testament and in the New, this office is appropriated to Christ, Ezekiel xxxiv. 23. 'I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David.' John x. 14. Jesus calls himself 'the good Shepherd;' and St. Peter echoes to the voice of Christ, and calls him 'the chief Sehpherd,' and the 'Bishop of souls,' 1 Pet. ii. 25. and v. 4.

This seems to carry something of evidence with it, that the human soul of Christ had an existence before; and therefore the scripture was careful to use human language, to express his offices as well as his person and actions. This will further appear by what follows.

5. This doctrine of the pre-existence of the human soul of Christ affords us a plain reason why he is called Christ or the Messiah, in those many places of scripture which represent transactions before his incarnation, to shew that this very person was anointed to his offices of old. So in 1 Cor. x. 9. 'Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them (i. e. Israelites) tempted him, and were destroyed.' Eph. iii. 8. 'God created all things by Jesus Christ.' 2. Tim. i. 9. 'Grace was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.' 1 Pet. i. 11. 'Searching what manner of time the Spirit of Christ, which was in the prophets, did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ.' 1 Pet. iii. 19. 'By which also he (i. e. Christ) went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which were disobedient in the days of Noah.' Heb. xi. 26. 'Moses esteemed the reproach

proach of Chriſt greater riches than the treaſures in Egypt.' The word *Chriſt*, (which is the ſame with *Meſſiah* or *Anointed)* implies a connexion of the divine and human nature; at leaſt it ſeems to import his human nature in an eſpecial manner: for 'there is one Mediator between God and men, the Man Chriſt Jeſus.' 1 Tim. ii. 5. The manhood is eminently repreſented in the perſon of the Mediator, though the Godhead being united, rendered all his actions infinitely efficacious and powerful.

6. It preſents us alſo with a fair and rational account why God himſelf was called 'the King of Iſrael,' and took upon him the political government of that peculiar nation; and we learn why the Meſſiah had alſo this title given him, 'the King of the Jews,' when we conſider the pre-exiſtent ſoul of the Meſſiah perſonally united to the divine nature. That God was often called the King of Iſrael, is ſufficiently manifeſt in many places. 1 Sam. xii. 12. Samuel reproved them when they wanted another king to reign over them, 'while the Lord their God was their king.' David and Iſaiah often called God the 'Creator of Iſrael and their King,' 'the Redeemer of Jacob and his King,' 'the Holy One of Iſrael and his King.' Pſal. lxxxix. 18. Iſai. xli. 21. Iſai. xliii. 15. And in the viſion of Iſaiah, chap. vi. ver. 5. the prophet ſays, 'Mine eyes have ſeen the King, the Lord of hoſts,' which is properly applied to Chriſt by John the evangeliſt, chap. xii. ver. 41. He is called the 'King of glory.' Pſal. xxiv. 7, 9, 10. When the ark was brought up to Zion, he is entitled the 'King of Zion,' Zech. ix. 9. which is attributed to Chriſt. John xii. 25. and the common name of the Meſſiah was the King of Iſrael. John i. 49. Nathanael ſaith to Chriſt, 'Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Iſrael.' All theſe expreſſions are very natural, and juſt, and proper when we

we consider the soul of Christ in its pre-existent state united to the divine nature, and becoming a patron and protector of the holy seed, assuming the Jews, above any other nation, into a peculiar relation to himself. And upon this account it is said in John i. 11. 'He came to his own,' εις τα ιδια, to his own property or possession, to his own people the Jews, but the Jews, his own subjects, received him not.

Now if we suppose the soul of our blessed Redeemer in union with his Godhead to be the appointed or anointed King of the Jewish church and nation, through all the ages of that economy, and if we consider that when he took flesh upon him and came down to dwell in the midst of them, (according to the prophecies of the Old Testament) he was renounced, disowned, scorned, reproached, scourged and crucified by his rebellious subjects; and when we remember that all these sorrows were sustained in obedience to the will of his heavenly Father, and in compassion to sinful man; how just and meritorious a foundation does this lay for his exaltation to a greater and more extensive kingdom, even to be raised to the government of all churches and all nations! He was King of the Jews for many ages before he came in the flesh: and when he rose from the dead, he became King of the Gentiles, and Lord of all things in heaven and earth, as a reward of his sufferings. Phil. ii. 8. &c. God at first 'set his King' of Israel 'on his holy hill of Zion.' Psal. ii. 6. and when he had declared him to be his Son at his resurrection, he says, 'Ask of me and I will give thee,' &c. So at his request he 'gave him the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost ends of the earth for his possession.' Psal. ii. 8. He was of old the 'King of Jacob,' and when he had 'washed us from our sins in his own blood,' and became the 'first-begotten from the dead,' he had then a 'new name' given him,

him, 'King of kings, and Lord of lords,' and 'Prince of the kings of the earth;' ſee Rev. i. 5. and xix. 16. And though ſome of theſe titles are divine, and belong to the divine nature of Chriſt originally, yet here they are aſcribed to him as 'God manifeſt in the fleſh,' or as a man united to God; nor are they too high for that whole perſon who was God as well as man. Beſides, when his human nature had ſuffered, it was then exalted to a greater participation of, or a nearer reſemblance to divine honours than before.

Let us dwell a little longer on this ſacred ſubject, the enlargement of the kingdom of Chriſt.

Is there not ſome ground from ſcripture to believe, that the great God governs the world by the intervening agency and miniſtration of good and evil angels? As his Son Jeſus Chriſt was King of the Jews, ſo the good angels were eſpecially employed under Chriſt to do good offices for his people. And may we not ſuppoſe that the Gentile countries, thoſe ſinful nations of the earth, were diſtributed by divine providence under the dominion or government of ſeveral evil angels in the times of God's ancient diſpenſation before the coming of Chriſt? Is there not reaſon to think that the heathen nations for their abominable iniquities, might be ſo far judicially abandoned of God, as to be left very much under the dominion, poſſeſſion and power of evil angels, ſince they 'ſacrificed to devils.' Deut. xxxii. 17. 1 Cor. x. 20. and choſe devils for their gods? Beelzebub is the known god of Ekron. 2 Kings i. 2, 3. who is called 'the prince of devils.' Matth. xii. 24. And other names of the gods of the Gentiles are probably the names that ſeveral devils might aſſume to themſelves, and teach the Gentiles to worſhip them under thoſe names. And ſince Satan is called the 'god of this world,' 2 Cor. iv. 4. i. e. the

the being whom the heathen world worſhipped, and ſince he is called the 'prince of this world.' John xii. 31. and xiv. 30. i. e. he whom the heathen and ſinful part of mankind obeyed; may not evil angels be thoſe 'principalities and powers,' thoſe 'ſpiritual wickedneſſes in high places.' Epheſ. vi. 12. who are the rulers of the darkneſs of this world, i. e. of the dark and miſerable heathen world?

Do not the princes of Perſia and Grecia ſeem to be ſuch evil angels. Dan. x. 13.? For the prince of Perſia withſtood that glorious perſon (whom I take to be the angel Gabriel who talked with Daniel for one and twenty days) when Michael the arch-angel helped him. And when this glorious perſon returned from Daniel, he 'went to fight with the prince of Perſia,' ver. 20. therefore the prince of Perſia could not be a good angel. And it appears yet further, that all theſe angel-princes of the nations were evil angels, becauſe 'none of them held with' this glorious perſon, i. e. with Gabriel, 'none beſides Michael your prince,' i. e. the angel-governor of Iſrael.

Though the heathen nations were left under the dominion of evil angels, yet ſince Iſrael was God's peculiar people, may we not reaſonably ſuppoſe God ſet a good angel over them to be a prince, even his own Son in his pre-exiſtent nature, who was 'the angel of the covenant.' Mal. iii. 1. and the 'angel of God's preſence,' Iſai. lxiii. 9. and the 'angel in whom his name was.' Exod. xxiii. 21.? And may not Chriſt himſelf be this Michael the arch-angel, the Prince of Iſrael? It has been obſerved by ſome writers, that the ſcripture never ſpeaks of arch-angels in the plural number: perhaps there is but one arch-angel, and that is Chriſt.

Obſerve further, that Chriſt's kingdom is directly oppoſite to the devil's kingdom. His grand deſign

is

is to oppoſe and deſtroy the work and power of the devil: and this ſeems to be Michael's appointed work in ſcripture, for he is ſometimes brought in as 'contending with devils.' Jude ix. Rev. xii. and as he has other angels under him to 'fight againſt the dragon' or devil, ver. 7. ſo has Chriſt. And as he is called the Prince of Daniel's people. Dan. x. 21. that is, the Prince or King of Iſrael; ſo is Chriſt. Obſerve alſo, that Michael is called 'one,' or rather the 'firſt of the chief princes,' as it is in the margin, Dan. x. 13. which is very agreeable to the character of Chriſt, who is the firſt and ſupreme Angel-governor, and the Prince of Iſrael, who were God's own kingdom or people.*

Now in this view of things, when we conſider our bleſſed Lord as having his dominion extended from ſea to ſea, and reigning over the Gentile nations even to the ends of the earth ſince his aſcenſion to heaven, may we not juſtly ſuppoſe this is one part of his exaltation, that by him 'the prince of this world ſhould be caſt out,' i. e. turned out and deſpoiled of his old dominion among the nations, as well as out of the ſouls of men, according to John xii. 31.? And that all theſe evil angels, who by divine permiſſion were formerly governors of heathen kingdoms, were then captivated, ſpoiled and diſpoſſeſſed of their government, and made ſlaves

* Some think the glorious perſon who appeared and talked with Daniel, chap. x. 5. was not Gabriel, but Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe he is deſcribed much in the ſame manner as Chriſt is deſcribed, Rev. i. in his appearance to John: and if ſo, then Michael cannot be Chriſt, but muſt be his prime miniſter in the government of Iſrael. But by compariſon of theſe chapters, it is plain that this glorious perſon may much better be ſuppoſed to be Gabriel who converſed with Daniel, chap. ix. 21. and who is there called 'the man Gabriel whom he had ſeen in the viſion at the beginning,' which probably refers to the viſion of the man Gabriel in Dan. viii. 15. and then Michael the arch-angel muſt be Chriſt the King or Prince of Iſrael.

ſlaves to the ſovereign will of Chriſt? Is there not reaſon to conceive that theſe are thoſe 'principalities and powers' which 'he ſpoiled' of their dominions, and 'made a ſhew of them openly' to the inviſible world, 'triumphing over them?' Col. ii. 15.* Is not this the 'captivity which he led captive, when he aſcended on high far above all heavens, that he might fill all things,' i. e. with his influence, and ſo might govern all nations. Eph. iv. 8, 10.? Is it not upon this account that he is deſcribed in that magnificence of glory by the prophet David, Pſal. lxviii. 17, 18. 'The chariots of God are twenty thouſand, even thouſands of angels. The Lord is among them as in Sinai, in his holy place. Thou haſt aſcended on high, thou haſt led captivity captive, thou haſt received gifts for men, even for the rebellious alſo, that the Lord God might dwell among them.' Was not this the day of his triumph over Satan and his angels, who had been gods and kings, princes and lords

* See the expoſition of this text in the moſt and the beſt of our commentators: there is ſcarce any thing they ſay upon it but is very conſiſtent with the ſenſe I give it in this place, and with the ſcheme of my diſcourſe.

I confeſs Mr. Pierce ſuppoſes theſe principalities and powers muſt mean good angels, whom he believes to have been governors of the Gentile nations till Chriſt's time: and the chief reaſon he gives for it is, that the Coloſſians are forbid to worſhip them, ver. 18. for they are diſpoſſeſſed of their government by the exaltation of Chriſt: whereas had they been evil angels or devils, there would have been no need of forbidding the Chriſtian Coloſſians to worſhip them.

To this I anſwer, that theſe Coloſſians were but young converts, and might not know that theſe were evil ſpirits whom they were tempted to worſhip, but only ſome inviſible powers by whom God governed the nations in former times; and let it be obſerved too, that the apoſtle in the courſe of his argument excludes all angels from worſhip, ver. 10, and 18, 19. and not merely evil angels, ver. 15.

lords* of the nations, when thouſands of holy angels are repreſented as the chariots of God attending him in that ſolemnity? Then he 'led captive' a great 'captivity,' even thoſe 'principalities and powers' that had been the 'rulers of the darkneſs of the' heathen 'world:' then 'he received gifts for men,' and that not only for his ancient ſubjects the Jews, but for the rebellious Gentiles alſo, who had been the ſubjects of Satan, under the power of the devil, 'led captive by him at his pleaſure.' And the Pſalmiſt ſays it was all done with this deſign, 'that the Lord might dwell among them,' i. e. that the heathens might become the people, the kingdom, the habitation and ſanctuary of God, as the nation of the Jews had been before; that Chriſt who is God-Man, and who was 'King of the ſaints' or the holy nation of Iſrael, might become 'King of all nations.'

Now what a glorious ſcene of things opens itſelf to us by this interpretation of a few ſcriptures? How naturally and how eaſily do all things coincide and lead us to this amazing proſpect of the victory of Chriſt over the devil? How illuſtrious does he appear in this diſpoſſeſſion of evil angels of their dominions on earth, at leaſt ſo far as to make them become his ſlaves, and act peculiarly by his permiſſion? How magnificent does this doctrine repreſent the aſcenſion and exaltation of our bleſſed Saviour? And how glorioufly does the God-Man Chriſt Jeſus, who in ancient ages was the 'King of Iſrael,' aggrandize and extend his preſent title and dominion as 'King of nations,' and 'Lord of all,' ſince his death and aſcenſion to heaven?

7. This

* The heathen idols or devils whom they worſhipped, had ſuch names as ſignify their dominion; Baal and Bel denote a lord, Moloch denotes a king, Adrammelech and Anammelech denote kings, &c.

7. This opinion of the pre-existent soul of Christ is made use of by Dr. Kn—— (in his *Primitive Christianity vindicated against Mr. Whiston*, p. 85.) to explain those reproofs given to Job by Eliphaz, Job xv. 7. 'Art thou the first man that was born? Wast thou made before the hills? Hast thou heard the secret of God? And dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself?' Let us consider each of these four sentences distinctly.

'Art thou the first man that was born?' Μη πρωτος ανθρωπων εγεννηθης; 'Wast thou born the first of men?' as it is in the septuagint. Art thou that primitive Spirit, 'the first-born of the creation?' Col. i. 15.

'Wast thou made before the hills?' Adam was formed after the hills, but this first Man the Messiah, speaking of himself in the person of *Wisdom*, says, 'Before the hills was I born, or brought forth,' Prov. viii. 25. which in the Hebrew are the very words of Job applied to the first Man, with only a change of the second to the first person: the first Man then and the divine *Wisdom*, or *Messiah*, are all one, i. e. by the personal union of this first Man to the divine *Word* or *Wisdom*.

'Hast thou heard the secret of God?' The septuagint adds to it, 'Did God use thee as a counsellor?' But the Messiah by way of eminence is called 'The Counsellor,' Isai. ix. 6. in the septuagint, 'The Angel of the great council;' and perhaps it is he to whom God said, 'Let us make man.' Gen. i. 26.

'And dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself?' Does all divine wisdom dwell in thee? It is only in the Messiah in the person of Christ 'are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.' Col. ii. 3. From these interrogatories put to Job, Dr. Kn—— infers, that the ancients had a notion of such a wonderful being, such a glorious and first-created human

ſpirit. As for myſelf, I dare not ſay, this interpretation carries full and ſufficient conviction with it; yet both the ſacred penmen of this book, as well as the ſeventy Jewiſh interpreters, in this paſſage may be fairly explained in this manner, and caſt no unfavourable aſpect on the pre-exiſtence of the ſoul of Chriſt.

8. This doctrine in the judgment of ſome great authors gives us a fair idea of thoſe paſſages of ſcripture wherein God is ſaid 'to create all things by Jeſus Chriſt.' Epheſ. iii. 9. not merely by his divine nature, but by him conſidered as God-Man, and called by the names Jeſus and Chriſt. This I confeſs has ſomething ſo ſublime in it, that I dare not indulge my own thoughts too far on this ſubject. Creation is a divine work, and the ſcripture always deſcribes it as the prerogative of God to create. Nor can I believe that the real and proper power of forming any thing out of nothing is leſs than infinite, or that it can be communicated to any creature whatſoever. The light of nature and ſcripture fully agree in making this work an incommunicable prerogative of Godhead: nor can I perſuade myſelf that God would give ſo much as a ſhadow of this glory to a mere creature who was not perſonally united to God, and thereby became one with God, leſt it ſhould too much entrench upon thoſe divine titles, prerogatives and operations, whereby he diſtinguiſhes himſelf from his creatures. And upon this account I think it is a good proof that Chriſt is God, becauſe the ſcripture joins him with the Father in the work of creation.

Yet there may be ſome proprieties and condecencies in it, that when this firſt-created ſpirit or ſoul of Chriſt was framed, and united to the divine nature, he ſhould not be a mere idle or unactive ſpectator of the firſt works of God. But I chooſe to repreſent

represent this matter here no further in my own language, but propose it as it is represented by two great divines, Dr. Thomas Goodwin and Mr. Robert Fleming.

Dr. Goodwin in his treatise of the *Knowledge of God*, page 177, asserts, that all things were created by Christ, "he having been some way the instrument, as he is Christ God-Man (anointed) of the creation as well as (actually) of redemption." And though the Doctor supposes the human nature to be then united to the Godhead only in decree, yet he says concerning Christ, page 178; "If he were at all to be made a creature, it was his due personal privilege to have been first himself made, and himself to have been God's instrument in creation, and to have uttered those words which were spoken by God, 'Let there be light:' but for other ends it was suspended." The same author makes it the title of Chap. xi. page 180, "That Christ as God-Man is the Creator of all things, proved by scripture, viz. 1 Cor. viii. 6. 'by whom are all things.' John i. 1, 2, 3. 'All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made that was made.' That the *Logos* or Word con-notes the person sustaining before God the personage of God-Man, by whom, as such, all things were created." And he interprets the eighth of Proverbs to the same sense.

If it be inquired, how it is possible that the human nature of Christ (even though it be united to the Godhead) can have any thing to do in the work of creation, I might give an answer to it out of this author's own words, page 178; that is, Christ might utter those words, 'Let there be light:' and as God's word and instrument might create all things, as he wrought miracles here on earth. Now to speak that word, 'Let there be light,' which the almighty power of God attended with divine efficacy,

cy, was a moſt illuſtrious honour put upon the human nature or ſoul of Chriſt; but ſurely it is not above the power of a creature to ſpeak ſuch a word.

It may be objected, That no words could be ſpoken when there was no air to form the ſound of a voice; therefore in the deſcription of Moſes this language is metaphorical, and ſignifies the act of the will, or a volition that there ſhould be light.

But as the Doctor explains Chriſt's inſtrumentality in the creation of the world by his way of working miracles, this may as well be applied to a volition of the ſoul, as to a word of the tongue. We may ſuppoſe his human ſpirit might as well will there ſhould '*be light*,' as when he cleanſed the leper, Matt. viii. 3. he ſaid, 'I will, be thou clean.' As in that miracle the human ſoul put forth this volition, and the divine power performed the cure; ſo in the creation, this ſame glorious ſpirit might have this honour put on it, as to exert ſuch a volition concerning the ſeveral creatures, and the almighty power or Godhead united to it ſeconded this volition with its own creative efficacy.

Though the will of this human ſoul might have no more real influence in cauſing creatures to exiſt than the tongue of Jeſus had in curing the leper, yet God may be ſaid to 'create all things by Jeſus Chriſt,' even as he wrought miracles by him; and Jeſus Chriſt himſelf alſo may be properly called the Creator, inaſmuch as the divine nature, being perſonally united to the human ſoul, performed this work. Now the Godhead cannot be ſaid to give away any of its own incommunicable prerogatives to a mere creature by any ſublime expreſſions of this kind, which attribute the creation to Chriſt, becauſe the ſoul of Chriſt is not a mere creature; for by its near and intimate union to the divine nature, it becomes one

one with God: which honour is not given to any creature whatsoever, but to the Man Christ Jesus.

This representation of things perhaps may prevent the surprising and offensive ideas which Dr. Goodwin's expressions may raise on a sudden in the minds of those who are affrighted at every sound they have not been accustomed to hear.

Now surely if Christ, considered as God-Man by way of anticipation, or in the decree of God, be vested with this due dignity, and thus employed in creation, it can never be supposed that the actual existence of his human spirit, at that time in union with his Godhead, should impair or diminish the dueness of this privilege: and I am well assured, there is much more evidence in scripture that his soul was actually the first-born of the creation, than there is that it was to have been so, and that this right was suspended 4000 years, which is Dr. Goodwin's sense of the matter.

Mr. Fleming in his Christology, Book III. Chap. v. page 451, humbly supposes that the second person of the Trinity was from all eternity pitched upon to be the grand organ of all the divine operations, *ad extra:* but since the second person is equally infinite as the Father and Holy Spirit, it is inconceivable that he should be the immediate organ of the production of finite beings, any more than the other persons: therefore a creature was formed that should have as much of Divinity as was possible to be imparted to it; and since the very notion of a creature includes imperfection when compared with the Creator, therefore this creature was personally united to the Son of God, and by virtue of this union and relation it has the name and designation of the Son of God. Hence it comes to pass, that sometimes the person of the Son of God is denoted by these names, *Logos*, *Shechinah*, *Memra*; at other times this organized

organized creature is repreſented as the Son of God: then he ſuppoſes the angels themſelves, as well as Adam, were created by the ſecond perſon acting through this glorious creature as an organ, and made after the image of this *Shechinah*, or original Man, though with various degrees of perfection and reſemblance. Thus 'God made man in his own likeneſs.' This was that intelligent being that appeared to angels, to Adam, to Moſes, to the three martyrs in the fiery furnace, and he appeared in the ſame bright figure to the three apoſtles in the mount of transfiguration.

But rather than follow theſe great men all this length, and ſet my ſeal to every thing they propoſe, I chooſe at preſent to ſay in the words of Mr. Fleming, that to give a nice or exact adjuſtment of all theſe things, may be reſerved to Chriſt, to teach us when we come to heaven. And as I am well aſſured of the doctrine of the Deity of Chriſt from many ſcriptures, ſo if there be any thing which I have aſſerted that runs counter to that doctrine, I deſire it to be expunged and forgiven.

Thus I have reckoned up two conſiderable advantages which may be derived from this doctrine of the pre-exiſtent ſoul of Chriſt, viz. That it explains and reconciles many dark and difficult paſſages of ſcripture, and it caſts a new luſtre upon other texts, whoſe beauty, juſtneſs and propriety were not before ſo much obſerved. I proceed now to mention ſome other advantages of it.

Advant. III. Another argument for this doctrine, drawn from the conſequences of it, is, That it does exceedingly aggrandize the perſonal glory and dignity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, of whom we never can have too high an eſteem, while we keep within the bounds of ſcripture.

This

This ſuppoſition admits and confirms all the honours paid him by other hypotheſes, and adds yet other honours to him. It allows him all the ſupreme dignity and perfection of the divine nature, and the titles and attributes of true God by virtue of the perſonal union, and it alſo better ſecures and maintains the honour of his Deity, by guarding it from thoſe inferior attributions and characters, which otherwiſe muſt be aſcribed to it before his appearance in fleſh; and this it doth by propoſing a nature below Godhead, which is a fitter ſubject of theſe attributions.

It allows him alſo all the honourable and peculiar prerogatives of his conception and the birth of his body, upon which account, as well as others, he was called the Son of God.

And beſides this, it ſuppoſes his human ſoul to be a moſt illuſtrious ſpirit, which had a long, prior, glorious exiſtence before his incarnation, and to be the firſt-born of the creation of God, and to have been preſent with the Father, ſurveying and approving of his works of creation, and perhaps alſo employed by him in adorning and diſpoſing various parts of the new created world, ſo far as any thing below pure Godhead was capable of being employed in that work.

Perhaps it will be objected, That this exalts his human nature indeed, and raiſes it as high as the Arians have raiſed the notion of their *Logos* or ſoul of Chriſt, which they ſuppoſe to be the ſublimeſt nature he has, and call it his Godhead or Divinity.

But it may be eaſily replied here, And what if we do take in all the advantages which the Arians ſo much boaſt of, and thereby ſupport our own faith more honourably? This will bereave their ſcheme of its faireſt allurements and ſtrongeſt ſupports. What if we do advance the human nature of Chriſt as high

as

as their *Logos?* Yet whilſt we ſtrenuouſly maintain the neceſſity of true and proper Godhead to belong to the perſon of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, in order to anſwer the many divine names, titles, attributes, operations and worſhip, which are aſcribed to him in ſcripture, we can be in no danger of compliance with the Arian error, which attributes all theſe divine characters to the Man Chriſt Jeſus, and denies his perſonal union to the Godhead.

The aggrandizing of the Man Jeſus has not been eſteemed diſhonourable to his Deity. Dr. John Owen affirms the nature of the Man Chriſt Jeſus to be filled with all the divine graces and perfections whereof a limited created nature is capable. *Meditations on the Glory of Chriſt*, page 112; and Dr. Thomas Goodwin aſſerts the Man Jeſus, by virtue of union to the divine nature, to be as glorious a creature as can poſſibly be made by God. Vol. III. Book 3. Chap. vii. page 104.

And what injury can it be to our holy religion, or what hurt can it do the goſpel of Chriſt, to ſuppoſe his ſoul to be as glorious and ſublime a being as any thing can be which is not God? This is doing honour to the Man whom God the Father delights to honour, and in whom the Godhead dwells bodily: and while it wonderfully exalts our eſteem of the human nature of Chriſt, it does not diminiſh the leaſt degree of honour or adoration due to his Deity.

Nor can any danger ariſe to the ſacred doctrine of the ſatisfaction and atonement of Chriſt, from this exaltation of his perſonal excellencies and honours; but rather it ſheds a new glory upon this doctrine, and renders our bleſſed Saviour ſo much the fitter to undertake that great, that glorious and dreadful work. Suppoſe it ſhould be ſaid that this human ſoul, this Man Jeſus (according to this opinion) is worth ten thouſand of us, (as the people ſaid to David.)

vid.) Then certainly he is ſo much the more proper perſon to become a ſurety for ten thouſands of ſinners; his life is the more valuable ſacrifice to redeem millions of lives; and the death of a man ſo tranſcendently excellent is a fitter price to ranſom innumerable multitudes of men from death. Yet the infinite merit of his ſufferings to ſatisfy for the infinite offences of mankind, in my judgment, ariſes ſtill from the dignity of his whole perſon, who is God as well as Man, and includes in it the infinite Deity united to a finite or created nature; and probably for this reaſon, was that expreſſion uſed, Acts xx. 28. 'God purchaſed the church with his own blood.'

Advant. IV. This doctrine greatly magnifies the ſelf-denial and the condeſcending love of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, in his ſtate of humiliation and death; it caſts a thouſand rays of glory upon all the ſcenes of his humbled eſtate; it makes his ſubjection and obedience to the will of the Father appear much more illuſtrious, and his charity and compaſſion to periſhing mankind ſtand in a very ſurpriſing light.

Conceive of this glorious human ſpirit, the only begotten Son of God, who was veſted with ſuch dignity before the creation of the world, united perſonally to the divine nature, and thus adored by angels, appearing often to the patriarchs in the form of God, with rays of divine majeſty, and governing the nation of Iſrael, or church of God, during all the former ages: behold this holy and happy ſpirit deſcending from heaven, to take upon him, not fleſh only, but the likeneſs of SINFUL fleſh; and according to the ancient covenant between him and his father, now uniting himſelf to animal nature in very mean and deſpicable circumſtances, and actually, really and ſenſibly feeling the hardſhips of poverty and a low eſtate: ſee that illuſtrious being who had been ſurrounded with miniſtering angels for many ages, coming

ing into our world with all the marks of poverty and meanneſs: behold one higher than angels, ſupreme above principalities and powers, thrones and heavenly dignities, made a 'little lower' than angels, by being confined to fleſh and blood, or *made for a little while* (βραχυ τι) * *lower than* the angels, and even below the common rank of men, brought forth in a ſtable, beſide the ox and the aſs; this very being himſelf was united to the fleſh and limbs of an helpleſs infant, wrapt in ſwaddling bands, and laid to ſleep in a manger: ſee this glorious ſpirit, who was repleniſhed with all the treaſures of wiſdom and knowledge neceſſary for his illuſtrious pre-exiſtent ſtate, cramped and confined in its operations by the feeble engine of the body of a babe, and willingly ſubmitting to have a veil of darkneſs caſt over its moſt ſublime intellectual qualifications, and recover his ideas by human degrees: for the child 'Jeſus grew in wiſdom and knowledge, as he grew in ſtature.' Luke ii. Contemplate this moſt excellent being enduring all the feeble and innocent frailties of an infant ſtate, wearing out the years of childhood among the poor and neceſſitous children in the lower ranks of life, himſelf the reputed ſon of a carpenter, and ſubject to his earthly parents; he that was with God when he built the heavens, and ſaid, 'Let there be light;' the firſt among thoſe 'ſons of God who ſhouted for joy when he laid the foundations of the earth,' behold him now perhaps ſweating and toiling with the ſaw and the hammer (as tradition tells us) to make ploughs and harrows and yokes for oxen: conſider this bleſſed ſoul, the ancient ornament of heaven, and the brighteſt created ſpirit there, now ſpending thirty years together in utmoſt obſcurity, who had lived for four thouſand years in the midſt of divine ſplendours: trace him wandering through the

* It is either for a ſhort ſeaſon, or in a ſmall degree.

the villages from town to town, hungry, thirsty, and weary: follow this illustrious man travelling on foot to preach the gospel, attended with a few poor fishermen, instead of the chariots of God and the legions of angels, legions and chariots that waited on him at Mount Sinai, when in majesty and terror he delivered the law: consider this very person abused, reproached, and called a blasphemer and a devil, who was the fairest image, and the delight of God his Father, and rejoicing always in his presence before the earth or her mountains were made: look upon this innocent, this holy soul arraigned at the impious tribunal of Pilate, and condemned to the shameful cross as a scandalous malefactor.

See the ancient and original King of Israel, who had made David and Solomon, and all their race, his deputies for many generations; see him crowned with thorns instead of glory; see him scourged, buffetted, nailed to the cursed tree between two thieves, his hands and feet pierced, his limbs stretched out in grievous torture, and himself groaning and expiring in blood and anguish.

Behold this original favourite forsaken of God his Father in that dreadful hour of darkness, and assaulted by the armies of hell with rage and impudence and horrid temptations: think of this holy soul just departing, his soul by the force of exquisite torment perhaps driven out of the sacred mansion of his flesh, even that 'body' which the Father 'had prepared for him;' he was banished out of this world by those very criminals, those merciless rebels for whose salvation he came down to dwell in it.

Think of that ancient darling of heaven, now made the sport of the Jewish rabble, a sacrifice both to the fury of men and to the arrows of vindictive justice, while he was amazed with inward agonies,

and

and 'his ſoul exceeding ſorrowful even unto death,' when 'the ſword of God awoke againſt the ſhepherd of' his Iſrael, 'againſt the man that was his neighbour, his companion' before the angels were made.

Collect all theſe ſtrange and aſtoniſhing ideas together, ſurvey them in one view, and ſay, how divinely glorious was the love of God in parting with ſuch a Son from his boſom! How amazing was the condeſcenſion and ſelf-denial of this glorious Saviour in giving himſelf for us! How inimitable was his ſubmiſſion to his heavenly Father's will! His zeal for his Father's honour, and his godlike charity and compaſſion to ſinful man! When we contemplate his holy ſoul in his pre-exiſtent and exalted ſtate, foreknowing and ſurveying all theſe indignities, theſe agonies and deaths, and yet reſolving to deſcend into fleſh at his Father's propoſal, and to endure them all for the redemption of ſinners, to what an inconceivable height of ſacred aſtoniſhment doth this raiſe all the wonders of his painful life and his love! and how doth it awaken all that is tender in the boſom of a Chriſtian, and penetrate the very heart with divine affection and gratitude to the Son of God his Saviour!

When we conceive of this pre-exiſtent ſoul of Chriſt, this glorious, this holy and happy ſpirit, with pleaſure conſenting to his Father's propoſal of this moſt ſurpriſing abaſement and bloody agonies, it gives us an example of ſuch profound humility, ſuch abſolute obedience to God his Father, and ſuch unſpeakable love to ſinful men, as far ſurpaſſes the greateſt inſtances that he ever gave, or ever was capable of giving while he was here upon earth, if we ſuppoſe, (according to the common opinion) that he was merely born, and trained up for this ſervice without his own previous conſent. This idea

idea of the love of Christ answers those sublime characters which the apostle gives of it, Ephes. iii. 18, 19. It is a love that has lengths and breadths in it, that has heights and depths; it is a love that passes knowledge.

You will reply perhaps, That most part of this representation is true in some sense, if you only suppose the divine nature of our Lord Jesus Christ existent before his incarnation, and consenting that his human nature should suffer all this.

I answer, Many of these things, by the help of tropes and figures, may be said concerning the Deity of Christ, or 'God manifest in the flesh;' but if we leave out the figure of communication of properties, and speak in such plain and natural terms as scripture seems to use generally on this occasion, it signifies only God's will that the Man Christ should suffer these sorrows, and that the Man Jesus passively consented to suffer them when it was revealed to him, that he was born and made for this purpose. But the divine nature itself could really suffer nothing of all this; the utmost condescension of the Godhead was, that it stood related to the Man who endured these sufferings: (and infinite condescension it was indeed, for 'God manifest in the flesh' to be thus dishonoured and unglorified.) But the Godhead itself is impassible still, and cannot really suffer pain or loss; nor undergo proper sensible humiliation, shame or sorrow.

Whereas by aggrandizing the human nature of Christ, by this doctrine of his pre-existent state, we see that very same glorious being itself who suffered all this, actually leaving the bosom or beatifying presence of his Father, really divesting himself of his primeval glories and joys in the literal sense, and without a figure, and freely devoting his very self to all these calamitous circumstances: we see that very

very ſame ſpirit deſcending from heaven to take a body upon him that he might be capable of all theſe various ſtages of miſery, and of ſuſtaining theſe ſcenes of ſorrow, anguiſh and death, perſevering in his reſolutions till the dreadful work was all finiſhed.

Now, where we can explain the language of ſcripture in a literal and proper ſenſe, where we can alſo by this literal ſenſe do unſpeakable honour to God the Father, and his love in ſending ſuch a Son, to Jeſus the Saviour, and his grace in coming down from heaven to ſuffer ſuch ſorrows, and at the ſame time, can lay a juſt foundation for raiſing our own love, and zeal, and gratitude both to the Father and the Son, to ſuch unknown and ſuperior degrees, and can ſet before our eyes ſuch an aſtoniſhing example of humility, charity, and ſelf-denial; ſurely theſe are ſuch advantage to the Chriſtian ſcheme, and ſuch honours to the bleſſed goſpel, as ſhould not be ſlightly rejected.

It ſhould be alſo conſidered that the Arians raiſe a very common and plauſible objection againſt the vulgar explication of the Trinity and the divinity of Chriſt, becauſe that ſcheme allows no real ſelf-emptying, no literal and proper abaſement and ſuffering of the Son of God, but only a relative abaſement by being united to the Man who did ſuffer. The author of the *Sober Appeal to a Turk or an Indian*, endeavours to expoſe the common ſcheme of the doctrine of the Trinity; becauſe it ſuppoſes only a "relative humiliation, a relative or nominal ſuffering of the Son of God by his uniting himſelf to a man, while he himſelf really ſuffered nothing, underwent no diminution, but was all the while poſſeſſed of the higheſt glory and of the ſame unchangeable bleſſedneſs." Page 145. Whereas this doctrine of the pre-exiſtence of the ſoul of Chriſt ſets the whole ſcheme

ſcheme of the ſelf-denial and ſufferings of Chriſt, in as glorious and advantageous a light as their doctrine can pretend to do; and yet at the ſame time ſecures the Divinity of Chriſt, together with all the honours of its condeſcending grace, by ſuppoſing this pre-exiſtent ſoul always perſonally united to his divine nature. Thus all this ſort of pretences for the ſupport of the Arian error is deſtroyed at once, by admitting this doctrine.

Advan. V. This doctrine of the pre-exiſtent ſoul of Chriſt, not only caſts a new luſtre upon ſeveral parts of the goſpel, and diſplays the glories of the perſon of Chriſt, and the wonders of his love in a fairer light, but it alſo enables us to defend the doctrine of the Deity of Chriſt with greater juſtice and ſucceſs againſt many other cavils of the Socinian and Arian writers: for while we keep this doctrine in our eye, we are by no means conſtrained to interpret any expreſſion in the Old Teſtament concerning the divine nature of Chriſt, which carries in it ſomething inferior to the majeſty of Godhead: here we have a ſubject proper to receive theſe meaner attributions. There is no need to call the mere Godhead of Chriſt a *Man*, an *Angel*, a *Meſſenger*; there is no need to animate a human ſhape with pure Deity in order to wreſtle with Jacob, to eat and drink with Abraham, to appear in the form of a flame in the buſh to Moſes, to travel through the wilderneſs on a cloudy pillar in the ſight of all Iſrael, in order to direct the motion of their camp: there is no need to ſuppoſe the pure Godhead talking with Joſhua, and converſing familiarly with Gideon, nor holding a plumb-line in his hand while he ſtood upon the wall in the view of Amos.

The Arian will tell us, that theſe things ſeem to be too mean and low condeſcenſions for the great

God of heaven and earth to practiſe; and thence they infer, that the perſon to whom theſe things are aſcribed cannot be true God. Behold then this glorious Spirit, the Son of God, the ſoul of Jeſus Chriſt, the Man perſonally united to the divine nature appearing to perform theſe actions, to ſuſtain theſe inferior characters, and to ſolve all this difficulty; and yet he is rightly called *God*, *Lord*, *Jehovah*, and has the perfections and honours of Godhead aſcribed to him; for he is God as well as man, though his human nature is the immediate agent in theſe inferior tranſactions.

Advan. VI. As this doctrine caſts a beauty upon various paſſages of ſcripture, and upon the whole ſcheme of the Chriſtian faith, ſo there is not one ſcripture, nor one point or article of our faith that can receive any evil influence from it, no dangerous conſequences (that I know of) can poſſibly attend it. Some of the moſt zealous and learned defenders of the ſacred Trinity have acknowledged to me, that they could ſee no danger of hereſy in it, nor any injury to ſacred truth, though they themſelves had not ſeen this doctrine yet in a convincing light.

And as there is no article of the Chriſtian faith that is endangered by it, ſo neither does it alter any of the particular ſchemes of doctrine which divines of various parties have eſpouſed. You may ſtill follow the ſentiments of John Calvin, or Arminius, or the intermediate ſchemes of Monſieur Amyrald and Mr. Baxter; for this doctrine makes no innovation in all the peculiar matters of diſpute between theſe great men, but ſets the whole contrivance of our ſalvation according to any of their ſchemes in a better light, and throws perhaps an impartial brightneſs upon the goſpel, though it ſhould be explained in any of their particular methods.

Nor

Nor does it in the leaſt interfere with any particular ſchemes which men have invented to ſolve the difficulties of the bleſſed doctrine of the Trinity. If this ſentiment of pre-exiſtence be allowed, the Godhead of the ſacred perſons may ſtill be explained, either according to the ancient Athanaſian ſcheme, (which biſhop Pearſon and biſhop Bull have defended) or according to the modern or ſcholaſtic Athanaſianiſm, (which Dr. Cheynell, Dr. Owen, Dr. South, biſhop Stillingfleet, and others, have well diſplayed) or according to the hypotheſis of Dr. Fowler, the late biſhop of Glouceſter, or that of the late learned Mr. John Howe, or according to the ſentiments of the great and learned Dr. John Wallis, an eminent member of the aſſembly of divines. This ſentiment of the pre-exiſtent ſoul of Chriſt has a friendly aſpect upon any ſcheme that maintains the Godhead of the ſacred Three: and may be eaſily aſſumed and engrafted into any one of them: but the Socinian and Arian errors are inconſiſtent with it, as I have explained it.

To conclude this laſt ſet of arguments on this ſubject, I beg leave briefly to recapitulate them in this manner. There are many dark and difficult texts of ſcripture which have puzzled interpreters in ſeveral ages, and which have hung heavy upon the various ſchemes that ſupport the doctrine of the Deity of Chriſt. Now ſuppoſe there could be one ſingle clue found out, which leads us into ſuch a ſolution of all theſe difficulties, and ſuch an interpretation of theſe ſcriptures, which has the following advantages attending it, viz.

1. Which gives the moſt natural and obvious, and literal ſenſe; ſo that every common reader that had no preconceived notions or ſchemes of thought, would readily run into at the very hearing of it:

2. Which puts learned men to no trouble of figures and metaphors, ſuch as *prolepſes*; i. e. ſpeaking of things before they are done; or *catachreſes*, i. e. calling the eternal God, without actual union to human nature, a *Man*, or an *Angel*, or a *Meſſenger*, a *Captain*, &c.

3. Which is moſt conſiſtent with, and moſt agreeable to all other parts of the word of God, both in the Old Teſtament and in the New, and renders the expoſition of many other texts eaſier and plainer than before, and ſets the ſeveral parts of ſcripture in a beautiful harmony:

4. Which interferes with no particular ſcheme of divinity, nor makes any alterations in the important articles of our faith; and thus it does not widen the common differences of the ſeveral parties of Chriſtians, but freely allows each of them their own ſentiments in the common controverſies of religion: and yet,

5. Which aſſiſts us to anſwer the objections of our opponents againſt the Divinity of our bleſſed Saviour, and alſo allures them to embrace the truth:

6. Which aggrandizes the perſonal glories of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and raiſes his condeſcenſion and his love to moſt amazing degrees:

7. Which ſpreads a new luſtre over the whole goſpel of Chriſt, and the various tranſactions recorded in the word of God:

I ſay, ſuppoſe ſuch a ſingle clue were found out to lead us into the underſtanding of the holy ſcripture in ſuch a manner as I have deſcribed, I would humbly aſk, whether it does not bid fair for the truth of the goſpel, and the very meaning of the ſacred writers? And whether it has not ſufficient force and allurement in it to invite our aſſent? Such is the doctrine of the pre-exiſtence of the human ſoul of Chriſt.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

Objections answered.

WHEN any doctrine has been proved by sufficient force of argument, there may be still various difficulties that remain to perplex it. But if those difficulties are not of equal force or evidence with the arguments that have been before produced for the support of it, we may reasonably give our assent to the doctrine, and wait till Providence may afford a fairer light to scatter the clouds that hang upon it. There is one learned author,* who has written upon this subject, speaks with so much freedom as to tell us, that in this doctrine of the pre-existent soul of Christ, the difficulty of every thing vanishes, except that of bringing men off from expounding the scripture by human authorities as the key of divine oracles; and without doubt (saith he) there the difficulty will lie, when all is said. So confident is he of the truth of it, and that on solid and sufficient reason.

However, that I may make it appear that the difficulties or objections which attend this doctrine may have a fair solution given them, I have left the last section for this purpose, in which they are ranged in a fair, just order; and I hope the opposers, if any such be found, will have no reason to complain that I have not displayed them in their complete light and strength; and perhaps by this means the tender and scrupulous Christian may have some stumbling-blocks removed, that lay in his way, and be more easily induced to receive this doctrine and to pay proper honour to our blessed Lord.

Object.

* Mr. Jos. Hussey, who was really a man of learning, though he had some odd and peculiar sentiments.

Object. I. Is not Chriſt frequently in ſcripture called a *man?* Now this glorious being with ſuch extenſive powers as you deſcribe, is ſomething above a human ſoul; it is far above angels, and therefore, though it be united to a body, it will not make a man.

Anſw. 1. The name of *man* denotes a nature, which is made up of a mind or ſpirit united to an animal body in human ſhape. But the name *angel* ſignifies originally a meſſenger, and denotes the character of an office ſuſtained by a ſpirit, either with, or rather without a human body, and is moſt frequently ſo uſed in ſcripture; though angels have often appeared in human ſhapes, being appointed by the great God to aſſume ſuch a ſhape on proper occaſions.

Anſw. 2. All the idea which I have of a human ſoul, is this, viz. a created mind or ſpirit which hath underſtanding and will, and rational powers, and which is fit to be united to a human body, in ſuch a manner as to exert the powers of a man, to feel the appetites and ſenſibilities and paſſions of a man, as to receive impreſſions or ſenſations (whether pleaſant or painful) by the means of that body, and is alſo able to actuate and influence all the animal powers of that body in a way agreeable to human nature. Now, though the powers of the human ſoul of Chriſt may be as much ſuperior to the moſt exalted man or angel, as the powers of the moſt exalted man are ſuperior to the powers of an ideot; yet this does not hinder it from being properly called a human ſoul, ſuppoſing it ſtill capable of, and fit for ſuch an union to a human body, as I have deſcribed.

Anſw. 3. The powers of the human ſoul of Chriſt, in his now glorified ſtate, are repreſented in the word of God to be ſo extenſive beyond and above

above men or angels, that might give as juſt an occaſion for this objection as any thing I have aſſerted concerning his pre-exiſtent ſtate, and yet he is ſtill a man. What large and comprehenſive faculties of underſtanding and will may be communicated to a glorified creature, is far above our ſkill to determine: now Chriſt was 'in glory,' or was a glorified creature, before he was 'in fleſh,' even before the world was made. John xvii. 5. And therefore his ancient powers in the pre-exiſtent ſtate might be very great, and yet his ſoul might ſtill be a human ſoul.

But if no mere creature were capable of ſuch powers and honours as are attributed to Chriſt in his exalted ſtate, yet we cannot determine what vaſt and amazing capacities ſuch a creature may be endued with, who was always perſonally united to God; and it is in this view, it is Chriſt as a man united to Godhead, who has ſuch extenſive powers as may fit him to govern, and to judge the world, as I have ſhewn in a former diſcourſe, to which I refer the reader.

I add further, that it was the peruſal and ſtudy of ſome of thoſe ſcriptures wherein ſo vaſt and extenſive a knowledge and power are attributed to the Man Jeſus in his preſent glorified ſtate, that led the way to my more eaſy belief of the powers and glories of his ancient ſtate of pre-exiſtence: and thence I thought I might infer, that ſince the Man who has theſe amazing glories and powers now, was once without them here on earth; therefore that ſame human ſoul might be with God the Father from the beginning of the world; might enjoy ſome part of theſe powers and glories, and yet for a ſeaſon diveſt himſelf of them at his incarnation, and then be reſtored to them again with a moſt illuſtrious

luſtrious addition as a reward of his ſufferings. John xvii. 5.

Object. II. Some perſons have been ready to cry out againſt this doctrine, as though it ſuppoſed the pre-exiſtent nature or natures of Chriſt to be united to a mere carcaſs, if it were united only to an animal body without a ſoul or ſpirit.

Anſw. 1. In ancient and more ignorant ages, this might perhaps be a ſtumbling-block to ſome weaker philoſophers, who would mingle their miſtaken philoſophy with their Chriſtianity, and falſely imagined that an animal body was a mere dead carcaſs, without ſome immaterial being in it, ſome ſuperior vital ſoul or ſpirit: but in the preſent age, when it is generally believed by the beſt philoſophers, that animal bodies may have animal life in and of themſelves, and all correſpondent animal motions and powers, without any ſpiritual intelligent thinking ſubſtance ſuperadded to them, this objection vaniſhes. Chriſt's pre-exiſtent ſoul (united to his divine nature) aſſumed a living animal human body when he became incarnate; for it is now agreed that the human, thinking, rational ſoul does not give animal life to the organized body, which life ariſes from the circulation of the blood, inſpiration and exſpiration of air, &c.

Anſw. 2. But ſuppoſe the human body were lifeleſs, without a rational ſoul, why may not Chriſt's rational pre-exiſtent ſoul be united to this body, and give life to it as well as a new created ſoul? Therefore this objection vaniſhes in all the views of it.

Object. III. How can you ſuppoſe ſo glorious a being as you have deſcribed, who was preſent at the creation of the world, who governed the nation of Iſrael, and tranſacted the affairs of the church for four thouſand years, ſhould loſe all its vaſt treaſure of

of ideas and its extenſive faculties, and become ignorant as an human infant, and grow up by degrees to knowledge and wiſdom? Yet this is aſſerted concerning Chriſt in his childhood. Luke ii. 52. 'Jeſus increaſed in wiſdom and ſtature.'

Anſw. If ſuch a ſentiment as this is can be fairly accounted for according to reaſon and ſcripture, then the objectors muſt allow that it adds a moſt aſtoniſhing luſtre to the humility, condeſcenſion, ſelf-denial and love of our bleſſed Lord. Now let us ſee whether it may not be explained according to the common laws of union between a human ſoul and body.

Amongſt theſe laws of this union, which are appointed by God our Creator, it is evident from manifold experience that this is one, viz. That though the ſoul may have in itſelf never ſo rich ideas, or powers never ſo glorious and extenſive, yet while it is united to animal nature in this manner, it can exert them no farther than the organs of the animal will admit, or than thoſe organs are fit to aſſiſt in ſuch operations. There have been many inſtances wherein perſons of eminence and ſkill in arts or ſciences, have had the brain, with all the traces and images which were impreſſed upon it, ſo confounded by ſome diſeaſe, that they have loſt almoſt all their ideas, and all their ſkill; they have forgot even their native language, and they knew not their own names: ſometimes by ſlow degrees they have recovered their ideas and words again, and perhaps in ſome years have arrived at their former excellencies; the brain has recovered its old traces and images again, and the ſoul has recognized them with pleaſure, and that in much leſs time than it was firſt employed in acquiring them.*

Yet

* This may be repreſented by an eaſy ſimilitude. Suppoſe an organiſt of exquiſite ſkill in muſic ſhould have all the pipes of his inſtrument

Yet further, let us ſuppoſe the ſoul of the greateſt philoſopher or mathematician united to the body of a new-born infant; this ſoul would find no images or traces on the brain of the babe correſpondent to his ancient ideas; but on the other hand, it would receive inceſſant impreſſions and ſenſations from this infant brain (according to the laws of union) derived from the ſenſible objects around it, or the natural inward motions and appetites that attend the infant ſtate; and thus all its ancient and learned ideas would be as it were obliterated for a ſeaſon, or rather concealed and overwhelmed, or buried by the perpetual and impetuous impreſſions of animal nature, and by the conſtant importunity of ſuch ſenſations and images as belong to a new-born child.

It is true indeed that ſuch a learned ſoul would recover its own ideas by much ſwifter degrees than one that had never poſſeſſed them; and it would form proper traces and images on the young human brain with much greater ſpeed and facility than other children could attain them, whoſe ſouls never had theſe learned ideas.

And is it not poſſible that this may be the caſe of the holy child Jeſus? His glorious ſoul might ſubmit to have its former numerous and ſublime ideas at its firſt union to animal nature, ſo concealed and overwhelmed by the importunate and overbearing impreſſions of infant-animal nature, that it might recover them again only by ſuch degrees as fleſh and blood would admit; and thus he was ‘made

inſtrument filled with mud, he could neither excite with his hand, nor receive with his ear any of thoſe rich varieties of ſound which belong to the organ, till by degrees the bellows and pipes were cleanſed; and thus by degrees he would form and hear broken pieces of tunes, till the muddy obſtacle being quite removed, the grateful harmony will be recovered, and the former ſkill of the organiſt appear.

'made for a little while lower than angels,' as Heb. ii. 9. and so might 'grow in wisdom and knowledge and stature' together, as in Luke ii. 52. And indeed, if we compare this with Isa. ix. 6. and Isa. vii. 14, 15. those verses may be naturally explained to this sense. He was a 'child born,' he was 'a son given;' 'a virgin conceived and bare a son, and called his name Immanuel: butter and honey did he eat, that he might know to refuse the evil and choose the good;' i. e. he was nourished with the common food which they gave young children, that he might grow up by degrees to human understanding, and knowledge of distinction between good and evil.

It seems also agreeable to the history of the gospel, that our blessed Lord attained the knowledge of things by much swifter degrees, and far greater facility than common children; for at twelve years old he was found discoursing with the doctors in the temple; and when he first preached to the Jews, they wondered how this man should 'know letters, having never learned.' John vii. 15. And then in his manly state, he knew his near relation to God, and his pre-existent glory, as many of his own speeches testify. According to this representation, Mr. Fleming in his Christology, Book iii. p. 455. supposes "the notices of former things to be so far obliterated from the memory of this glorious spirit, as was just necessary to his being fitted for a state of trial in a human body. But he did so far remember his former exaltation and glory in general, as frequently to mention it, and to plead it sometimes in prayer to his Father;" particularly in John xvii. 5.

I am not so fond of this representation of things as to persuade myself that my readers will readily receive such a strange alteration of scenes passing over the soul of our blessed Lord; especially if they have never

never accuſtomed their underſtandings to indulge any opinion different from the common track: yet I can declare ſolemnly, that after my beſt ſearches into the word of God, I can ſee nothing unſcriptural, abſurd or dangerous in ſuch a repreſentation; and I am well aſſured it gives the higheſt honour to our bleſſed Redeemer for this ſurpriſing inſtance of his obedience to his Father, and condeſcending love to mankind: nor is there any thing we can imagine that will ſet his admirable ſelf-denial and humility, and his inimitable love in a nobler light; or more aggrandize the love of the Father in parting with ſuch a Son out of his boſom, and confining him to ſuch a ſtate of union to a body, and ſuch amazing humiliation.

Object. IV. Is it not ſaid frequently in the New Teſtament, that Chriſt was exalted to glory and honour, and to the government of all things after his reſurrection, as a reward of his ſufferings and death? Now if the human ſoul of Chriſt in its pre-exiſtent ſtate, being in union with the divine nature, had glory and happineſs before the world was, and might be employed in moſt glorious works, even at the creation of the world, and afterwards in the works of Providence; then how can this excellent ſpirit be ſaid to be exalted as a reward of his ſufferings, by having the government of the world given to him after his reſurrection, or by being advanced to glory and honour and happineſs in heaven?

Anſw. 1. I have already ſhown, that how great and glorious ſoever the powers of Chriſt were before his incarnation, yet he might be made governor only of the church, or of God's choſen people the Jews, during all former ages of his pre-exiſtent ſtate, and thus he was called 'the King of the Jews;' but after his ſufferings, he was advanced to ſovereignty over all nations, and made 'head over all things, and all nations

nations of mankind for the church's ſake.' Eph. i. penult.

Anſw. 2. What affairs he tranſacted, and what honours he received during his pre-exiſtent ſtate among the children of men, was, for the moſt part, in his Father's name, and as ſuſtaining the character and perſon of God his Father: now ſince his ſufferings and death, he is advanced to receive theſe honours in his own name, as well as raiſed to a government of much larger extent. Before the creation he had no honour from creatures, and after the creation he had not ſuch ſublime and diſtinct honours paid to his human nature before his incarnation, as he has now in heaven.

Anſw. 3. It is very plain, that though the human ſoul of Chriſt might enjoy a glorious degree of honour and happineſs before his incarnation, yet having properly the nature of a human ſoul, it could not arrive at its perfection of appointed happineſs, but by its union with a human body; even as the ſpirits of departed ſaints enjoy a glorious degree of honour and happineſs in the world of ſpirits; yet neither their honour nor happineſs is complete till the reſurrection, when they ſhall be rejoined to immortal bodies, and their happineſs and honour ſhall be completed by unknown ſenſations of pleaſure. Beſides that ſenſible ſurvey, thoſe various ſenſations and eye-ſight of their own exaltation, which they acquire by the means of their union to a glorified body, is a farther kind of honour and happineſs than in a ſeparate ſtate they were capable of.

Thus the human ſoul of Chriſt, having paſſed through the ſorrows of life, and the painful ſenſations that aroſe from its union to our fleſh in ſuch poor and infirm circumſtances, having ſuffering ſhame and reproach, and a thouſand indignities from men, and having felt the agonies of death as a ranſom for

for them, was exalted both to greater honour and greater happineſs at his reſurrection and aſcenſion, by being united to a body raiſed in power and in glory, than he could have been without it.

1. He was exalted to greater degrees of happineſs, by receiving all that intenſe pleaſure, and thoſe unknown ſenſations of delight, which are capable of being conveyed to a ſpirit by the medium of a body, a glorious body; and this as a reward of his ſenſations of pain in the body of his humiliation.

2. It is moſt probable that he is and ſhall be exalted alſo to greater degrees of honour, by ſeeing and hearing, or taking in perhaps by ſome corporeal methods, all the honours done to him by the whole human and material creation, and in beholding with a vaſt and comprehenſive ſurvey, all the ſubjection and obedience of the known and unknown worlds of ſpirits dwelling in fleſh, paid to him; and particularly, all the acclamations and worſhip of all the glorified ſaints paid to his divine perſon as dwelling in a human body, and this as a reward of that ſhame and reproach, and thoſe uneaſy paſſions which he might ſuſtain in animal nature in his humbled ſtate.

Thus it appears how the ſoul of Jeſus Chriſt, though it had very great powers and dignities and bleſſedneſs in its pre-exiſtent ſtate, yet may receive a moſt ſenſible addition to its honours and happineſſes when he was raiſed from the dead and aſcended to heaven in a glorified body. There are parallel inſtances in ſcripture which confirm this account of things. John xvii. 22. our Saviour ſays, the Father 'loved him before the foundation of the world;' and yet his Father's love is ſaid to be continued to him, and to be beſtowed on him on the account of this obedience. John xiv. 10. 'If ye keep my commandments ye ſhall abide in my love, even

even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love.' John x. 17. 'Therefore doth my Father love me, becauſe I lay down my life.' We muſt naturally ſuppoſe this to imply ſome additional inſtances and effects of the Father's love beſtowed, or to be beſtowed on Chriſt, becauſe of his obedience unto death: and what additional inſtances, manifeſtations or effects of the Father's love did the Man Jeſus receive, if his exaltation to ſuperior degrees of honour and glory in heaven be not reckoned among them?

Object. V. If the human ſoul of Chriſt had a being before his incarnation, how comes it to be expreſſed, that God was 'manifeſt in the fleſh,' and that 'the Word was God,' and this 'Word was made fleſh?' Would it not have been much more proper to ſay, the ſoul of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt was thus made fleſh, or manifeſted in fleſh?

Anſw. 1. The moſt uſual way of expreſſing the incarnation of Chriſt is, by repreſenting the Son of God as coming in the fleſh, Chriſt coming into the world, the Son of God made of a woman, the Son of God ſent into this world, &c. This is the moſt frequent language of the New Teſtament: now theſe words do moſt properly include, if not chiefly denote, the ſoul of Chriſt under the character of the Meſſiah. This was the Son of God which was intimately united to fleſh and blood. It is poſſible that the name, *Son of God*, may not ſo directly refer to the Godhead of Chriſt, as it does to his human ſoul and his body; for ſince the idea of ſonſhip carries in it the notion of derivation and dependence, and inferiority, we ſhould not without great neceſſity apply ſuch ideas to Godhead, whoſe very nature is to be ſupreme, underived and independent. This hath been made to appear more at large in an eſſay on that name, *the Son of God.*

It

It is granted there are two or three places which repreſent the divine nature, or God himſelf, as appearing in the fleſh; and this may be written in thoſe few places, with a ſpecial deſign to aggrandize the myſtery of the incarnation, and ſpread a divine glory over it: always remembering that it is a great truth that God himſelf was incarnate, though the more immediate ſubject of union to fleſh was the human ſoul.

Anſw. 2. It might be noted alſo, that that evangelical interpreter of ſcripture, Dr. Goodwin, explains the *Logos* or *Word* (even as it is deſcribed in the firſt chapter of St. John's goſpel) ſo as to include the idea of God-Man, and to take in the human nature of Chriſt as well as the divine, when 'the Word was with God,' and when 'all things were made by him.' That author indeed ſuppoſes the human nature to be united at that time only in the divine idea, and by way of *prolepſis* or anticipation: but if we ſuppoſe the term *Logos* or *Word* to include the human ſoul then actually united to the divine nature, (which Dr. Goodwin takes only *proleptically*) then it will follow, that when the evangeliſt adds, ver. 14. 'The Word was made fleſh,' or took a body upon him, he plainly includes the incarnation both of the human ſoul and the Godhead together. The *Logos*, i. e. the human ſoul united to Godhead, or if you chooſe rather to ſay, the eternal Word in union with the human ſoul, became incarnate.

Object. VI. This doctrine expounds ſome of thoſe ſcriptures to another ſenſe, which were wont to be employed for the defence of the Divinity of Chriſt, and that by applying them to his pre-exiſtent ſoul: it exalts his human nature indeed, but perhaps it weakens the ſacred article of his divine nature, by withdrawing ſome of the proofs of it.

Anſw.

Answ. There are many and sufficient arguments drawn from the word of God to support the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, which cannot with any evidence or truth or justice be turned to another sense; and indeed it is by such arguments as these that doctrine must be established; for if it be possible, with fairness or justice to the text and context, to interpret a scripture otherwise, and apply it merely to the pre-existent soul of Christ, it can never be a convincing and effectual proof of his Divinity.

It is no injury to any cause to remove those arguments from it which are in themselves feeble and unsupporting, lest when the adversary finds several of them trifling and utterly insufficient, he should be tempted to despise all the rest. If there be any of those scriptures which are used to prove any doctrine, that in their most natural, most proper, and most rational sense, and in their relation to the context, do rather signify something else, then they had much better be dropt or left out in the proof of that doctrine.

So if these scriptures cited in this discourse are in a much more natural and proper, easy and obvious manner applied to the pre-existent soul of Christ than they are or can be to the pure divine nature, then it is better to drop them in that argument than to insist upon them, for all the reason in the world will lead us to give them the most obvious and natural exposition, and apply them to this pre-existent spirit. We ought not to deal falsely with the word of God, nor give it an unfair and improbable sense under pretence of supporting the greatest truth. The gospel of Christ needs not our feeble artifices.

It should be observed also, that several of those passages of scripture, which may be applied to the pre-existent soul of Christ, cannot properly be applied to it considered alone by itself, without the personal

union to his Godhead; ſuch are thoſe, Col. i. Heb. i. Prov. viii. &c. And in this view they continue to ſupport the Divinity of Chriſt, as well as they did before: and in my opinion, when they are ſet in this light, they render theſe proofs of his Divinity more defenſible, and at once maintain the ſacred idea of Chriſt our Mediator as the great *Theanthropos*, or God-Man.

Object. VII. Some may imagine, and have been ready to object, that this notion paves the way to lead us into the Arian camp, ſince it agrees in ſo many parts with their ſentiments of their *Logos*, which they call the divine nature of Chriſt.

Anſw. This objection has been anſwered in part already; nor is there any ſuch danger while we maintain the neceſſity of the union of the divine nature to this pre-exiſtent ſpirit in order to make it capable of ſeveral names, titles, honours and prerogatives that are aſcribed to it in ſcripture, which are incommunicably divine.

But on the other hand, why may not the charity of a reader give it another turn, and ſay, it paves the way for the Arians to come into the ſentiments of the orthodox, and believe the Divinity of Chriſt, ſince it removes ſome of their greateſt bars and objections againſt our common faith? It tranſplants their ſtrongeſt allurements and faireſt colours of argument into our own doctrine, and thereby renders their pretences to ſupport their own ſcheme more feeble, ineffectual and needleſs. It enjoys the advantages which their ſcheme pretends to, without any of thoſe difficulties and inconveniencies with which their opinion is encumbered.

And I cannot but hope, that if ever the modern refiners of the Arian error are allured and drawn to receive the truth, it muſt be by the means of this doctrine, and the happy conſequences which attend it.

it. Perhaps if this doctrine had been ſet in its faireſt light, and publiſhed to the world in the days of the Nicene council, it might have prevented the fatal and bloody conteſts that ſucceeded in the following ages; it might have been a happy medium in the providence of God to have reconciled the ancient Arians to the Catholic faith. This is the ſentiment of the late reverend and learned writer, Mr. Robert Fleming, in his diſcourſe on this ſubject, in his third volume of *Chriſtology*.

Object. VIII. Could ſuch a doctrine as this be true, and yet the diſciples of Chriſt know nothing of it in our Saviour's life-time, nor the apoſtles expreſs it in plainer language in their writings, nor the primitive fathers declare it as the ſentiment of the church, nor even our own divines in theſe enlightened days ſince the reformation proclaim it to the world?

Anſw. As for the diſciples during the life of Chriſt, they may be ſuppoſed to have the ſame opinions concerning the ſoul of the Meſſiah which many of the Jews had in and before their times; and that was, that the Meſſiah's ſoul was formed from the beginning of the world:* and if they thought all human

* Biſhop Fowler cites this paſſage from an ancient book of the Jews, called Peſikta; "After God had created the world, he put his hand upon the throne of his glory, and brought out the ſoul of the Meſſiah, with all his attendants, and ſaid to him, Wilt thou heal and redeem my ſons after ſix thouſand years? He anſwered, I am willing ſo to do. Again therefore God ſaid unto him, And art thou willing to ſuffer chaſtiſements for the purging away of their iniquities? And the ſoul of the Meſſiah anſwered, I will ſuffer them, and that with all my heart."

The late Dr. Thomas Burnet, of the Charter-houſe, in his book *De Statu Mortuorum & Reſurgentium*, p. 249. ſpeaks thus; *Judæi & inter Patres, &c.* i. e. the Jews and ſome among the Chriſtian fathers have determined, that the ſoul of the Meſſiah had an exiſtence before his incarnation, and before the very origin of the Jewiſh nation, before the law, and through the whole economy of

man ſouls had a pre-exiſtence, (which ſome learned men ſuppoſe) then doubtleſs they believed the ſoul of Chriſt to have the ſame prerogative.

Beſides the ſeveral expreſſions which our Saviour uſed concerning his 'coming down from heaven,' 'his returning thither again,' 'his being ſent by the Father not to do his own will,' his praying for the reſtoration of a 'glory which he had before the world was,' and his ſpeaking of the love of God which he enjoyed 'before the foundations of the world,' all theſe expreſſions might juſtly and naturally lead them into the idea of the pre-exiſtent ſoul of Chriſt, ſince it is pretty evident that they had but very little thought or belief of his divine nature before his reſurrection. Some of their own expreſſions ſeem to intimate their aſſent to this doctrine of his pre-exiſtent ſoul, when they tell him, 'Now we are ſure that thou cameſt forth from God.' John xvi. 28, 29, 30. And they ſeemed to underſtand him in the literal ſenſe, and without a parable or figure, when he told them, he 'came forth from the Father, and came into this world,' but he was now 'leaving this world, and returning to the Father.'

As for the writings of the apoſtles St. Peter and Paul, theſe ſeem to manifeſt this doctrine, if the expoſition which I have given of various parts of their

the law and the prophets. Now if they ſuppoſed this ſoul joined with the *Logos*, (by which he means his divine nature) they might well agree that this was the *Shechinah* of the patriarchs and the prophets, and that theſe motions and returns from heaven to earth, and his appearances whether in human ſhape or not, may be attributed to the Meſſiah, which can never belong to mere Divinity. And indeed I can ſcarce underſtand Juſtin Martyr and other of the fathers, who from the inviſibility, infinity and omnipreſence of God the Father would prove that he never appeared, neither could he deſcend or aſcend, or change his place: for unleſs the ſoul of the Meſſiah did pre-exiſt in union with the *Logos* (that is, his Divinity) I cannot ſee how theſe arguments, drawn from inviſibility and omnipreſence, can be of any force with regard to God the Father any more than to God the Son.

their epiſtles be juſt and true. The apoſtle John ſpeaking ſo often of 'Chriſt's coming in the fleſh,' ſeems to manifeſt that this was his conception of the matter, as though he ſuppoſed his ſoul to have an exiſtence before.

As for the primitive writers of Chriſtianity of the firſt two or three hundred years, they expreſs themſelves in ſo inaccurate and confuſed a manner concerning the pre-exiſtent nature of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that it is hard to ſay what was their ſenſe, or whether they had any uniform, regular and ſettled ideas on this ſubject. Sometimes their language plainly denotes ſome pre-exiſtent nature of Chriſt to be truly divine, and part of the very eſſence of God the Father, even his *mind*, his *wiſdom*, &c. others of their ſpeeches ſeem to ſink it far below the dignity of Godhead, when they ſpeak of his temporal generation and derivation from God as the author and cauſe of his being, from which the Arian writers have taken occaſion to ſuppoſe they were engaged on their ſide. Now, as this doctrine of the pre-exiſtent ſoul of Chriſt united to true Godhead, happily reconciles many difficult places of ſcripture, ſo perhaps if it were wiſely applied upon a diligent review of the writings of ſome of the fathers, this ſame doctrine might reconcile ſome of their ſtrange expreſſions which ſeem contradictory and inconſiſtent: at leaſt I am ſure it would have ſecured them from ſome of the abſurdities which they ſeem to have fallen into.

It is worthy of our notice, that many if not moſt of the ancient Antenicene fathers, when they ſpake of the generation of the Son, underſtand by it a voluntary generation or manifeſtation ſome time before the world began, in order to create that world: though they ſuppoſe the divine *Logos*, or *Word*, to exiſt in God, or in and with the Father from all eternity.

eternity. That great and zealous defender of the Athanaſian faith, the learned Dr. Waterland, allows this in his citation from ſeveral of thoſe fathers; ſee 2d *Defence of the Queries*, ſee p. 104, 107, 283—292, and his 3d. *Defence*, p. 25. Particularly Ignatius had this idea of the generation of the Son. Juſtin Martyr ſpeaks of no generation higher than that voluntary antemundane generation, otherwiſe called manifeſtation. The *Logos* became a Son according to Juſtin, by voluntary appointment; it is the proceſſion makes him a Son, and that was voluntary. The Son proceeded light of light in time according to Juſtin, and according to many more beſide him, particularly Hippolytus, and perhaps even the Nicene fathers. Tatian, who was Juſtin's ſcholar, ſpeaks only of a temporal generation or proceſſion. And Athenagoras and Theophilus ſpeak of no higher generation than this. Clemens, of Alexandria, and Tertullian, may be both allowed to go upon the ſame hypotheſis; and Hippolytus was undoubtedly of the ſame mind; for he ſays, "The Father begat the Son when he willed and as he willed," that is, ſent or ſhewed him to the world. Tertullian ſuppoſes the Sonſhip properly to commence with his proceſſion, ſo that the *Logos* became a Son in time, and was not yet a Son till he came out to create.

We might aſk here now, whether all theſe expreſſions may not be reconciled, if we ſuppoſe the Deity of the ſecond perſon of the Trinity (as ſome perſons have done) to be an *eternal Divine Principle* in Godhead, which is repreſented in ſcripture as a perſon called his *Logos*, or *Sophia*, his *Word*, or his *Wiſdom*: and that ſome time before the creation of the world, God created, generated, or cauſed to exiſt, the human ſoul of Jeſus Chriſt, in an immediate union with this *Word*, or *Divine Principle*, and gave the whole *Complexum* the ſame name, viz. the *Logos*, or *Word*, and

and ordained this glorious being, viz. his own divine *Word*, or *Logos*, united to the human ſpirit, to operate in creating and adorning the world, the human ſpirit having a ſubſerviency herein to the Divine Principle, ſo far as it was poſſible for any thing beneath God to be employed in an inferior or miniſterial manner in ſuch ſublime and divine work. Does not this give a fair, a natural and eaſy explication of theſe glorious expreſſions of ſcripture concerning our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that 'by him God made the worlds, and created all things by him, and without him was nothing made that was made?' For the name, Jeſus Chriſt, ſeems to imply ſomething more than the mere Divine Power or Principle called the *Word*.

But I retreat, and mention no more of any attempt to give a particular idea of the divine nature of Chriſt, ſince this doctrine of his human ſoul's early exiſtence is conſiſtent with any known ſcheme of explaining his true and real Deity.

Origen ſeems to be a believer of the pre-exiſtent ſoul of Chriſt, when he ſays, "Perhaps the ſoul of the Son in its perfection was in God and his fulneſs, and coming out thence when he was ſent by the Father, took a body of Mary;" and again, upon theſe words of John the Baptiſt, 'After me cometh a man which is preferred before me, for he was before me,' John i. 30. he ſays thus, "that it is ſpoken of Chriſt, that we may learn that the man [or manhood] alſo of the Son of God, mixed with his Divinity, had a prior ſubſiſtence to his birth of the virgin." Origen alſo ſeems to allow this human ſoul to be the firſt created; for ſpeaking of the formation of *Wiſdom* before the world, he ſays, God created Εμψυχον Σοφιαν, *an animated Wiſdom*, or *Wiſdom with a ſoul*. And this opinion appeared ſo very reaſonable, that we find ſome marks of it in the later centuries.

centuries. For the author of the Meditations, called St. Auſtin's, diſtinguiſhes between *Eternal Wiſdom*, the Son of God, and the *firſt created Wiſdom:* which he makes to be a rational and intellectual mind. See more of this kind in the learned Dr. Knight's *Primitive Chriſtianity vindicated*, in anſwer to Mr. Whiſton, p. 45.

But after all, though it be a doctrine that has ſo many happy advantages attending it, yet it is not neceſſary in order to make a man a Chriſtian, and therefore many primitive Chriſtians might not believe it. It caſts a beauty indeed upon the whole Chriſtian faith, but it does not make a part of the eſſence of it. Now there are many ſuch beautiful doctrines which might have a vail of darkneſs or confuſion thrown upon them very early in the Chriſtian church, eſpecially amidſt the reign of antichriſt, and again after ſome ages may emerge into light, and entertain the Chriſtians of ſuch a later age with the brightneſs and pleaſure of them: how was the doctrine of the Millennium long obſcured, i. e. the happy ſtate of the church before the end of the world? It was known and believed in the firſt centuries, but after the third it was counted a ſort of hereſy for ſeveral ages; and yet now it has ariſen into further evidence, and has obtained almoſt univerſal aſſent; ſo this doctrine of Chriſt's pre-exiſtent ſoul, though it might have lain dormant ſeveral ages, yet ſince that excellent man, Dr. Henry More, has publiſhed it, near threeſcore years ago, in his *Great Myſtery of Godlineſs*, it has been embraced, as biſhop Fowler aſſerts, "by many of our greateſt divines, as valuable men as our church can boaſt of; though moſt of them have been too ſparing in owning it, for fear, I ſuppoſe, of having their orthodoxy called in queſtion."

The

The most modern authors and writings which have professed this doctrine publickly, are these that follow.*

1. Dr. Henry More, of the mystery of godliness.

2. Dr. Edward Fowler, bishop of Gloucester, in his discourse of the descent of the Man Christ Jesus from heaven, and his reflections on the examiner of this discourse.

3. A defence of the bishop's discourse, by a presbyter of the church of England.

4. A second defence, by the publisher of the first.

5. Mr. Robert Fleming, in his first and third volumes of Christology.

6. A very great man cited (but nameless) by bishop Fowler, in his reflections, &c. p. 111.

7. Mr. Joseph Hussey, in his treatise of the Glory-Man.

8. Dr. Francis Gastrell, bishop of Chester, in his remarks on Dr. Clarke's scripture doctrine of the Trinity, p. 47.

9. Mr. Nelson's learned friend, in answer to Dr. Clarke, p. 65, 103.

10. Dr. Thomas Bennet, in his discourse of the Trinity in unity.

11. The learned Dr. Thomas Burnet, of the Charter-house, in his book *De Statu Mortuorum & Resurgentium*, published after his death.

12. The doctrine of the Trinity intelligibly explained by Dr. Thomas Burnet, rector of Westkington in Wiltshire.

13. Dr. Knight's Primitive Christianity vindicated, in answer to Mr. Whiston's bold assertions.

In three of these books I confess this opinion is but just mentioned, as the certain and probable opinion

* Note, This was written at least twenty or thirty years ago, many more persons may be now found who have acknowledged it.

ion of the author; but in the reſt it is ſtrenuouſly aſſerted and maintained, and in ſome of them with great degrees of aſſurance: and I think every one of them do profeſs and maintain the real and proper Deity of Chriſt in that or other parts of their works, ſo that there is no Arian among them all.

After authors of ſuch learning and reputation in the world, as ſome of theſe which are named, I have ventured to propoſe this doctrine once more to the public. It is attended with a variety of arguments drawn from the holy ſcripture for the ſupport of it, and I have ſtated much ſtronger objections than I have ever met with in oppoſition to it from any Engliſh or foreign writers, and I do not find them impoſſible to be anſwered.

I dare not aſſume that air of aſſurance which biſhop Fowler has done in ſeveral parts of his writings on this ſubject, when he tells us, "that there is no Chriſtian doctrine more clearly delivered than this, and even immediately by our Saviour himſelf, and often repeated by him: and let the oppoſers of it be as magiſterially poſitive as they will, yet there is not more plain and undeniable evidence for any one article of faith than there is for this doctrine; and that this is the ſenſe in which moſt certainly the diſciples of our Lord underſtood his declarations." See his *Reflections on his Oppoſer*, p. 3. and 23. Yet I think I can join him when he aſſerts, that "our Saviour never ſaid a ſyllable which ſo much as ſeems to contradict the plain literal natural ſenſe of the words by which he choſe to expreſs this doctrine; and that it is worthy of our obſervation, that there is no one text in the Bible, (that the biſhop knows of) whoſe plain and natural ſenſe ſo much as ſeems to thwart the plain ſenſe of thoſe ſcriptures that he has produced to ſupport it;" and he adds, "What

"What controverted point is there in religion of which we can say the like?"

I easily persuade myself that most Christians will agree with me thus far, that if this doctrine be true, it gives a natural and easy solution of a great number of difficulties in the word of God, it adds beauty as well as clearness to many expressions in the New and Old Testament, and it enables us to answer many inconveniences and appearing absurdities which the Arians fling upon the common explications of the Trinity. But if there be any sufficient argument to refute this doctrine and to prove it false, I am not so fond of it as to persist obstinately in the defence, nor make all things truckle and yield to this supposition.

The great doctrine of the Deity of Christ, and his sacred office of Mediator, may perhaps be maintained without it, but then we must return again to explain some of these difficult texts of scripture by hard tropes and figures; we must speak of Christ as God-Man before his taking our nature upon him by way of *prolepsis* or anticipation. We must apply many inferior expressions of scripture to the divine person of Christ, considered in his office as Mediator, which might otherwise and much better be applied to his human soul; we must construe some phrases into truth economically which can never be true in their real and natural sense. We must indulge some *catachreses* or improprieties of language in the Bible, which might be literally and properly expounded by the scheme now proposed: we must solve other expressions by the doctrine of communication of properties between the divine and human natures of Christ, in the same manner as we did before; some of which solutions, I confess, are certainly necessary, and always will be so, to explain some scriptures that relate to the person of our Lord

Lord Jeſus Chriſt, according to the well-known methods of ſpeech in all nations and ages. But we would never chooſe theſe interpretations, where there is a more plain literal ſenſe which is perfectly accommodated to the text.

As this doctrine, ſo far as we have gone in explaining it, has given abundant light to many ſcriptures, there are alſo other texts, which, if we drop this doctrine, we muſt leave under a heavy cloud ſtill, among the ἀλυτα and δυσνοητα, the unſolvables and the things hard to be underſtood; and we muſt ſtill be daily waiting upon the Father of lights, till he ſhall give us further diſcoveries of his own meaning in thoſe paſſages of his holy word, which I think are made ſufficiently plain in and by this ſcheme: we muſt wait till providence and grace ſhall join to furniſh us with a better clue than this to lead us into the myſterious glories of the perſon of our bleſſed Redeemer, the more complete knowledge whereof is reſerved to entertain ſaints and angels in the future ages of bleſſedneſs. There, it is certain, if we ſhall be ſo happy as to accept of his goſpel, we ſhall 'ſee him as he is,' and behold him 'face to face;' then 'ſhadows ſhall flee away,' and darkneſs vaniſh forever, for 'in his light we ſhall ſee light.' Amen.

APPENDIX:

APPENDIX:

OR,

A short ABRIDGMENT *of that excellent Discourse of the late Rev. Dr.* THOMAS GOODWIN, *on the Glories and Royalties that belong to Jesus Christ considered as God-Man, in his Third Book of his* Knowledge of God the Father and his Son Jesus Christ. *Page* 85, *in the Second Volume of his Works.*

HAVING found occasion, in several parts of the foregoing discourse, to cite some passages out of this learned and pious writer, (who soars far higher than I dare to do, in describing the glories due to the human nature of Christ Jesus) I thought it might be very entertaining to many of my readers, as well as serviceable to the doctrine here proposed, to draw out an abridgment of that discourse which he wrote concerning the glories of Christ as God-Man, so far as it relates to this doctrine.

Hereby the pious reader will easily perceive, that the manner in which I have expounded many scriptures, is nobly patronized and supported by this great author, whose name and memory are honoured among evangelical writers, and continue in high esteem among many private Christians of the present age; and whose special character it is to have searched deep into the hidden treasures of the word of God, and drawn out thence many peculiar glories which belong to the person and offices of our blessed Saviour.

Though

Though I call this an *Abridgment* of Dr. Goodwin's diſcourſe, yet it is neceſſary I ſhould tell the world that it may rather be called a *Collection of his ſentiments in his own words*; for I have never added or altered any words but where it was neceſſary to make the ſenſe plain, and to connect the ſentences: ſo that both the ſentiments and the language are all his own.

In Chap. I. page 95. he lays the foundation of his diſcourſe on Col. i. 15—19, and tranſcribes all the verſes. '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: And he is before all things, and by him all things conſiſt: And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the firſt-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleaſed the Father that in him ſhould all fulneſs dwell.' Then he writes thus; All this fulneſs, and the particulars thereof mentioned in this text, are attributed to Chriſt as God-Man, either as actually united or to be united in one perſon.

To take off prejudices (ſaith he) it is meet the reader ſhould know how that holy and greateſt light of the reformed churches, Calvin, interprets the firſt paſſage, 'He is the image of the inviſible God,' viz. "It is he alone by whom God, who is otherwiſe inviſible, is manifeſted to us: I know how the ancients are wont to expound this, becauſe they had a controverſy with the Arians, who held Chriſt to be a mere creature; they urge this place for Chriſt's being of the ſame eſſence or nature with the Father; but in the mean time they omitted what was the chief thing in the words, namely, how the Father hath

hath exhibited himſelf in Chriſt to be known by us."

Then the Doctor adds, page 101, that all and every one of theſe particulars before rehearſed are thoſe glories, which as ſo many ſeveral pieces do make up this pre-eminence, and are parts of that fulneſs which is ſaid to dwell in him: and the apoſtle makes all this fulneſs to reſide in Chriſt by an act of God's good pleaſure. Hence I infer of all theſe parts and pieces, that they muſt be underſtood of him as God-Man; for had they been ſpoken of him ſingly as God, they are natural to Chriſt, and not at all ſubjected to God's good will. Page 102. But take all theſe as ſpoken of Chriſt as ordained to be God-Man, all this might indeed be the object of God's decree, and the act of his good pleaſure, and it was the higheſt act of grace and God's good pleaſure to ordain that Man to ſuch an union.

Chap. II. page 103, 104. Chriſt 'is the image of the inviſible God;' which words are reſolved into this aſſertion, that in that Man, Jeſus Chriſt, by virtue of his union with the Godhead, there is inherent a fulneſs of all divine perfections, which may make up an image of the attributes of the Godhead, in ſo tranſcendent a way of excellency and eminency, as is incompatible and incommunicable to any mere creature remaining ſuch.

The Godhead of Chriſt is as inviſible as the Godhead of the Father; but Chriſt is ſuch an image as makes the Godhead manifeſt and viſible. In Chriſt, as man united to the ſecond perſon, there is a reſultance, an edition of the Godhead in all the perfections of it. He is the 'expreſs image' or 'engraven image.' Heb. i. 3. The 'ſhine,' 'the brightneſs of his Father's glory;' as the beams of the ſun are to the body of the ſun, ſo is Chriſt God's image; and this ſimilitude the apoſtle there uſeth and applies it

it to him as he was man, namely, as he was 'appointed heir of all;' which phraſe, as he is merely the ſecond perſon, might be uſed of him: Thus Beza, Cameron and others have underſtood it.

This image is ſuch a ſyſtem or fulneſs of perfections really inherent and appertaining unto the manhood, by virtue of that its union with the divine nature, as although infinitely coming ſhort of the attributes that are eſſential to the Godhead, yet is the completeſt image of them, and ſuch as no mere creature is capable of. This in general may be made out of that parentheſis in John i. 14. 'And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten Son of God.'

Page 105. To give two or three inſtances of ſome of theſe perfections peculiarly and incommunicably dwelling in the human nature of Chriſt; as wiſdom, power, independency, and ſovereignty.

1. There is a wiſdom in Chriſt's human nature which is ſo high an imitation of the attribute of wiſdom in God, as no creature, nor all creatures could reach to, nor have attained; and therefore they, though they be called 'wiſe,' yet not 'wiſdom,' as Chriſt God-Man is called, 1 Cor. i. 24. And the reaſon why ſo tranſcendent a wiſdom is in him as man, is given Col. ii. 3. 'In Chriſt are hid all the treaſures of wiſdom and knowledge:' not objectively only, but ſubjectively alſo, as whoſe knowledge in himſelf inherent contains in it 'all treaſures of wiſdom.' Now the reaſon of all this fulneſs of wiſdom in Chriſt is there given, ver. 9. that 'in him dwells the fulneſs of the Godhead bodily.'

Chriſt is not omniſcient as God is, but it is a "ſimilitudinary omniſcience," as Zanchy calls it, an image of God's omniſciency. God's knowledge extends itſelf not only to all that is made or to be done, but to all that he can make or do; which is

an

an infinity. Christ's human nature, now glorified, knows all that God hath done or meant to do. It had, by virtue of its union with the divine nature, a right to know both things past, present and to come; and so it is in a sense a kind of omniscicency, incommunicable to any other.

2. The same holds in his power. It is not equal with God's: Yet there is a similitudinary omnipotency in Christ's human nature, both in that he can do whatsoever he will, (his will agreeing with God's in every thing) and in that all that God will ever pitch upon to be done, he is an instrument of. Matt. xxviii. 18. All the businesses of the world run through his hands and his head: and therefore he is called 'the power of God.' 1 Cor. i. 24; and the 'arm of the Lord.' Isai. liii. 1.

John v. 19, 20. 'The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; and whatever the Father doth, the Son doth likewise. For the Father loves the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doth.' Here we have, 1. That whatever God doth, or means to do, the Son hath a hand in it. 2. That the Son knows all that is done by the Father. Here is both the omniscicency we speak of, and the omnipotency, in the terms we stated it, as respecting all God's works, *ad extra*, even all that ever was done. And this, 3. in an incommunicable way to any mere creature; for this is given him that he 'might be honoured even as the Father is honoured;' ver. 23. And this, 4. in a similitudinary way, ομοιως, *likewise*, or *in like manner*: And, 5. all this Christ speaks of himself as the Son of Man; and it is one of the greatest keys to John's gospel, that multitudes of such speeches are spoken of him, both as God, and a God-Man. But to put it out of all doubt, he speaks of himself in this discourse as he is the Son of Man united to God, he himself in

the close of all expressly explains it so. Ver. 27. 'The Father has given the Son authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man.'

3. Another attribute in Christ, which is such an image of what is in God as is incommunicable to any mere creatures, is independency and sovereignty. This is one of the chiefest flowers in that crown of his glory. God might annihilate creatures at pleasure, and yet in so doing rob them of nothing, which they can lay a just claim to as their own: but it is not thus with Christ's human nature, now it is assumed into union with the second person; for it is invested with the royal prerogatives of the persons with whom it is one; it hath an independency like unto God's; such as is communicable to no creature: therefore, says Christ, ver. 26. 'As the Father hath life in himself, so he hath given the Son to have life in himself.' It is said to be 'given him,' but by this union he is invested with this indisposable prerogative to have 'life in himself,' and not to hold it by gift, though at first it were obtained so. Indeed it was a free act of grace in God at first, but in doing of it God did a wonder in the world, of all, the greatest: for he sets up an independent creature, a creature backed with such a right to his being, that now himself cannot pull him down, nor dissolve that union again. And what a glorious image of God's independency is this?

I might show the like also in holiness and all other attributes; and it is a noble subject to spend pains upon, to set forth and cut out every limb of this vast image of all God's attributes that are in Christ merely upon his personal union. I have limb'd out only these two or three parts of it, that by the like proportion we might infer the vastness of all the rest.

Chap. III. page 109. 'Christ is the first-born of every creature.' This is not spoken of him simply as

as ſecond perſon only, ſo as that his eternal generation as Son of God ſhould be only intended; yet it does eſtabliſh his Godhead; for theſe things could not have been ſaid of him had he not been God. The 'firſt-born' or 'firſt-begotten of every creature' is ſpoken of him as he is admitted into the catalogue or ſociety of the creatures, or as he is become one of them. Or take him as he is the Son of God ordained to human nature, and then to have his name ſtand higheſt among the reſt of the creatures. It is ſpoken of him in reſpect of a dignity and birthright that this God-Man hath at that inſtant he is admitted amongſt the creatures. Pſal. lxxxix. 27. 'I will make him my firſt-born, higher than the kings of the earth.' Prov. viii. 23. 'I was ſet up from everlaſting.' The phraſe, 'I was ſet up,' will leſs permit us to underſtand it of his eternal generation, for that was an act of God's will.

Page 113. 'For whom all things were created.' Col. i. 16. Chriſt as God-Man is ſet up as an univerſal end of the whole creation of God. His perſon, decreed to ſubſiſt in man's nature, was conſidered by God to be of that worth and diſtance above the creatures, that their very being and exiſting was to become abſolutely and ſimply his propriety, of which prerogative no mere creature is capable. Page 114. Suppoſe God would decree him to be God-Man, and to ſubſiſt in an human nature, and likewiſe withal would ordain multitudes of other things, viz. angels and men, &c. then it becomes the neceſſary due of this Chriſt, and that as God-Man, to be ſet up by God in his decrees as the end of all thoſe things. This did become that man's due and the neceſſary conſequent of that union with God's Son; and accordingly that God ſhould caſt his decrees for Chriſt's glory as well as for his own. Hence we read, Heb. i. 2. 'He is appointed the heir of all things.' And

And if it be affirmed, that then Chriſt needed not to have merited any glory to himſelf, this ſurely is a truth, though it may not be made uſe of to exclude another title unto this his own glory, namely, that of purchaſe; for it is no diſhonour to him to have two claims. Page 116. It is certain that all God's works, *ad extra*, whereof the union of the divine and human nature of Chriſt is one, are the objects of God's decrees. Col. i. 19. 'It pleaſed the Father that all fulneſs ſhould dwell in him.' And again, Pſal. ii. 6, 7. I will publiſh the decree, I have ſet my King on my holy hill Zion;' and upon this decree his kingdom over all is his due and inheritance.

Chap. IV. page 120. This human nature is made God's 'Fellow,' as Zechariah calls him. Zech. xiii. 7. 'The Man,' God's 'Fellow,' is advanced to a fellowſhip in this ſociety of the Trinity, and therefore to him God communicates proportionably without meaſure, as John iii. Page 121. By means of taking up one reaſonable creature, a man, into this higheſt union, he communicates the riches of his knowledge and wiſdom, to the utmoſt that they are communicable to that creature ſo united; for it is his due to know more at the firſt inſtant of that his union than all the angels: for by virtue of that union he is preſently in his Father's boſom. John i. 18. 'The only begotten Son which is in the boſom of the Father, he hath declared him.' God can hide nothing from him which he means to do; he draws nearer to God infinitely than Moſes did, or angels ever did or ſhall.

Chap. V. Wherein the Doctor ſhows, that the glory which Chriſt, as God-Man, had aſſigned him before the world was in his election by the Father ſignified in John xvii. 5. 'Glorify me now with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.'

Page

Page 124. It is not the glory of the ſecond perſon ſimply or alone conſidered, for this was not a thing to be prayed for, it is naturally and eſſentially his due; and he had it as much now at the time when he prayed as he had from everlaſting: the word, 'Now glorify me,' neceſſarily implies a ſuſpenſion of a glory due before; and it argues a glory to be given in time; for both which reaſons it concerns the human nature, not the divine. The ſubject of the glory prayed for is the Man. Auſtin was convinced of this, though he was engaged againſt the Arians as much as any in his time. It is the Man, or rather the Perſon of God-Man in union together, is rather the ſubject prayed for: it is the petition of the Perſon who had been humbled, who had glorified God on earth, and had finiſhed his work and waited for this glory until now; and it is a glory ſuſpended till this work was done. This will never be unriddled, ſays the Doctor, page 126, ſo fairly any other way, as by predeſtination, that is, the glory he was ordained to, as God-Man; for he had, before the world was, the title of *God-Man elect*, although not of *God-Man united*, or *made fleſh*. He bore the title and repute of it, and went under that name with God the Father. Ver. 24. is explained to the ſame purpoſe, and muſt be interpreted of Chriſt as God-Man, when he ſays, 'The glory which thou gaveſt me, for thou lovedſt me from the foundation of the world.'

Chap. VI. page 151. The author declares that Chriſt, being the ſecond perſon, did bear and ſuſtain the glory of being God-Man, all along from his predeſtination thereunto, and as an officer elect; he hath the title and honour accordingly, and had the glory of it before his Father.

When he appeared to the patriarchs, and was with the people of God in the wilderneſs, and appeared as

as Captain of the hoſt of Iſrael, theſe acts were done as bearing the perſonage of God-Man, and all along from everlaſting he acted as ſuch in that capacity together with his Father.

Iſai. ix. 6. One of his names is the 'everlaſting Father,' that is, 'a Father from everlaſting,' and therefore he muſt be ſaid to have borne that relation of a Father to us from that time. In the Trinity, take them conſidered as mere perſons, there is but one Father; therefore this title muſt be given to Chriſt in God's decrees, upon the conſideration of his being God-Man in his undertaking and acting accordingly. Paul tells us, Heb. ii. that Chriſt is a Father conſidered as he is a man, ver. 13. 'Lo I, and the children thou haſt given me.' And Iſaiah tells us he was this 'from everlaſting,' before he actually aſſumed the ſame nature: he muſt be the everlaſting Father, repreſentatively, by bearing the perſonage of God-Man, afore his Father, and undertaking that relation.

Chap. X. page 173. Col. i. 16. 'For by him were all things created than are in heaven, and that are in earth,' &c. 'all things were created by him and for him.' Page 177. His ſubſerviency to God in the creation is ſet forth here in three particles, εν αυτω *in him*, δι αυτε *by him*, and εις αυτον *for him*.

1. 'In him,' as the exemplary cauſe; that is, God ſet up Chriſt as the pattern of all perfection; for ſo that human nature united and quickened by the Godhead, muſt needs be even above the angels themſelves; and he drew in ſcattered pieces in the reſt of the creation, the ſeveral perfections met in that human nature as a pattern. And in man's creation this ſeems to have been conſidered by God in that ſpeech, 'Let us make man according to our image;' that is, after that Man who was to be united to God, whom we in our decrees have ſet up as the

the pattern and expreſs image of the inviſible Godhead.

2. 'By him all things were created;' he having been ſome way the inſtrument of the creation as he is Chriſt God-Man anointed, as well as he is actually of redemption. And page 168. Chriſt is the medium of God's creation. Page 178. If he were at all to be made a creature, it was his due perſonal privilege to have been himſelf firſt made, and to have been God's inſtrument in creation, and to have uttered thoſe words which were ſpoken by God, 'Let there be light, let there be ſun, moon,' &c. even as it was his due when he aſſumed our nature, to have been filled with all that perſonal glory which he hath now in heaven. But for the accompliſhment of other ends this was ſuſpended, namely, that he might firſt become ſin and a curſe for us; ſo I ſay, it was his due to have exiſted in his human nature firſt, and then as God's Word and inſtrument, he ſhould have created all things, as he wrought miracles when he was here on earth; and though it was ſuſpended for glorious ends, yet God gives him the glory of creation virtually, that he 'created all things by him,' and by virtue of his incarnation. And in creating, (to ſhow that he ſhould have done it as his *Logos*, or *Word* to be made fleſh) he accordingly acts his part, as in Gen. i. 'God ſaid, Let there be light,' which but for this very myſtery needed not have been. Yea, ſuch ſeems to have been his ſubſerviency to God herein, that John contents not himſelf only to have ſaid, that 'all things were made by him;' but further adds, 'without him nothing was made that was made.'

Chap. XI. page 189. Chriſt as God-Man is the Creator of all things, proved by 1 Cor. viii. 6. 'One Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things.' P. 181. This is not attributed to him as Man, ſingly conſidered;

ſidered; nor is it a property of God, conſidered ſingly as God only, but as a Man who was one perſon with God, or God-Man; nor are theſe things attributed to him merely by way of communication of properties, whereby what was proper only to the divine nature is attributed to the manhood; but theſe all by way of influence and virtual efficacy, are attributed to him as God-Man, as truly as the works of redemption, mediation, &c.

Page 183. His being appointed Lord, will ſend us to a higher date than his actual aſcenſion to heaven, even to afore the creation; yea, even to eternity. Heb. i. 2. '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;' yea, and becauſe as God-Man he was appointed Lord of them, therefore it was alſo that God commiſſioned him to make them, conſidered as God-Man, to make his title of Lordſhip even as Son of Man proper and direct, and adequately full to him, and there needs no more to verify this, viz. That as God-Man he made the worlds, and virtually as Man, as well as efficiently, both as God and Man in the ſenſe it hath been explained in.

Chap. XII. page 184. That Chriſt, as God-Man, is the Creator of all things, is further proved from John i. 1, 2, 3. 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The ſame was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him,' &c. This name, the 'Word of God,' imports both his being the image of God the Father, as the ſecond perſon, and the image or manifeſtation of God to us in human nature. Many of our Proteſtant divines have altogether declined the firſt ſenſe, and betaken themſelves to the latter, viz. That Chriſt is called the *Word*, in relation to his being manifeſted in an human nature,

and

and therein to manifeſt the whole of God unto us. This is not appropriated to him only as the Son of God and ſecond perſon; but as united to human nature. Rev. xix. 13. 'He was clothed with a veſture dipt in blood, and his name is called the Word of God.' Page 187. That repetition in the ſecond verſe, viz. John i. 2. 'The ſame was in the beginning with God,' imports that the ſecond perſon did then ſuſtain, and take on him another relation, even the perſon of the Mediator, and enter upon the office, acting the part and ſuſtaining the place and reputation of it.

Page 189. Compare this with Prov. viii. and the titles, 'The Word' and 'Wiſdom' are in effect and ſignificancy the ſame in the original languages. Solomon ſpeaks but the ſame things of him there that John doth here: 'The Word was with God in the beginning,' that is, 'the Lord poſſeſſed me in the beginning of his way, I was by him, rejoicing before him;' and ſo it may explain what is meant by the 'beginning' here, namely, 'the beginning of creation,' and therefore is not meant of his eternal generation; for ſo Chriſt is not the beginning of God's ways, for the ways of God are his 'goings forth' toward his creatures. That ſpeech is all one with Col. i. 15. 'The firſt-born of every creature,' being in God's decree of creation the firſt, the corner-ſtone, and beginning of the reſt, ſo as it muſt be meant of Chriſt, as God-Man.

Page 190. We find, 1 Cor. i. 24. that Chriſt is ſaid to be 'the Power of God, and the Wiſdom of God;' both which are ſpoken of him, not as they are eſſential attributes in God's nature; for the perſon of Chriſt (as a perſon) is diſtinct from the attributes, which are common to all three; and ſo, he is not ſtyled the *attribute of wiſdom*, but they are thus ſpoken of Chriſt manifeſtatively, and inſtrumentally, and

and executively, and as he is from God, and made uſe of by God toward us, and in things that concern us, to be the whole ſcene and manifeſtation of God's wiſdom, and *ſubſtratum* of his counſels concerning us. And ſo alſo the executive Power by whom God effects all he doth. That obſervation evidently demonſtrates this, (which Cameron, and many others, have made, by comparing Moſes, Gen. i. and this firſt of John together) which many things parallel lead to: That whereas Moſes in the creation mentions God the Father and the Spirit, two of the perſons, yet he veils the Son under that ſo often-repeated ſpeech uſed of the creation, that, God ſaid, 'Let there be light;' God ſaid, 'Let there be a firmament,' which could not be without myſtery; and what other myſtery could it be, than that Chriſt was that *Word* by whom God created all things? When therefore Chriſt is termed the *Word of God*, the meaning is, he is the *Power* of God, in being his inſtrument and agent in all he doth, or means to do.

Page 191. Thus God elected us and beſtowed all things upon us before the world was, even 'in Jeſus Chriſt.' Eph. i. 4. as then bearing this perſon of God-Man. And thus all the promiſes which the written word of God contains, were made for us unto Chriſt, as really bearing that perſon; and 2 Tim. i. 9. 'They were given us in Chriſt before the world began.' Notable to this purpoſe is that place, Tit. i. 2, 3. where the apoſtle firſt ſays, that 'God promiſed eternal life before the world began.' A promiſe is a word given forth, and is more than a purpoſe with one's ſelf; for it is to another: there was a promiſe made to Chriſt as then, with God. Now merely as ſecond perſon, he is capable of no promiſes, but only as he is God-Man. It is the Son of God as he is 'Jeſus Chriſt in whom all promiſes are, yea, and amen.' 2 Cor. xix. 20. Page

Page 192. When God came to make creatures, he did it by Jeſus Chriſt, as ſuſtaining this perſon of God-Man. Eph. iii. 9. 'God created all things by Jeſus Chriſt;' and John adds, 'Nothing was made without him that was made;' merely to ſhew the inſtrumental general dependence God had of him in this work: he was all in all, as we ſay of one that is a right hand to another; he does nothing without him: ſuch was Chriſt to God: not that God had not power eſſential to have created without him; for it is by that power that Chriſt did it; but that this power, God's will, would never have put forth, but for his aſſuming to be God-Man.

Chap. XIII. page 197. Chriſt God-Man is ſubſervient to God in all the works of his providence; he upholds and ſupports all things; he governs the world, and he ſhall judge it.

1*ſt*. For the upholding all things. That is evident in this text of Col. i. 17. 'By him do all things conſiſt;' he is the corner-ſtone that keeps the building and all the parts of it together. Heb. i. 2, 3. it is ſaid, 'He upholds all things by the word of his power,' and it is ſpoken of him not ſimply conſidered as a ſecond perſon, but as God-Man, for ſo he is 'Heir appointed.'

2*dly*. Whilſt the world ſtands, he governs it, eaſeth God of that burthen, and is his *prorex* for him: 'All judgment is committed to the Son.' John v. 22. 'For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son:' and the 'government is upon his ſhoulders.' Iſa. ix. 6.

And then 3*dly*. When he hath thus governed the world with a greater advantage unto God, then this Man Chriſt Jeſus will judge it alſo at the laſt, and give all men their accounts. Acts xvii. 31. 'He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world, by that Man whom he hath ordained.' God would not employ a mere creature in this work, it

was

was too great an honour; and yet it was meet it ſhould be done viſibly and audibly, and to the ſatisfaction of all men's conſciences, both concerning themſelves and others. God would have a perſon in the Trinity manifeſt in a creature like unto us to do it, armed with power and authority, becauſe he is God; and yet a Man that ſhould deal with creatures in their own way; in a rational and audible way convince them, and viſibly ſentence them, ſo as they ſhould be able to ſee and hear their Judge as man, and yet fear and dread him as being God. And this is an high and great ſervice, which Chriſt as man ſhall do for God; for a man in a vocal manner to be able to clear the accounts of the world, which, how entangled are they! and punctually to give every man his due in righteouſneſs! a Man, that ſhall be able to convince all God's enemies of all their hard ſpeeches they have ſpoken againſt him, as 'Enoch the ſeventh from Adam propheſied;' able to give a full and ſatisfactory account of all God's ways and proceedings, which men cavil at; to juſtify God's decrees, which men quarrel with, and think much at; and his children, whom men deſpiſe and bear down: one able to bring to light the ſecrets of all hearts, ſo as all men ſhall judge of every man. 1 Cor. iv. 5. 'Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkneſs, and will make manifeſt the counſels of the hearts: and then ſhall every man have praiſe of God.' One able to ſearch the deep things of God, and bring forth his counſels, for the 'books are then opened.' Rev. xx. 12.

Laſtly, after all this, Chriſt is the founder of that other world into which he brings his children. That perſonal fulneſs that is in God-Man is reſerved by God as a ſubject of that depth and glory to take up (together with his own perfections) the thoughts of men and angels forever. Rev. xxi. 23. 'That city had

had no need of the ſun nor moon to ſhine in it, for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.' When thoſe two great volumes, this of his word, and that of his world, which now in this life are put into our hands, to read the characters of his glory in by faith, when both theſe ſhall be folded up and clean laid aſide, then will the perſon of Chriſt, God-Man, be ſet forth to us to entertain us forever with the ſight of the glory of God in the face of Chriſt.

Having drawn out this little Abridgment of this excellent Treatiſe, I take the freedom to make theſe few remarks on it.

1. This learned and pious author plainly manifeſts, that he could not expound ſeveral ſcriptures which ſpeak of Chriſt both in the Old Teſtament and the New, without taking in his human nature to be the joint ſubject of ſuch aſcriptions, becauſe there are ſo many things expreſſed in them below the dignity of Godhead: and therefore he ſuppoſes the human nature of Chriſt to exiſt in the veiw or idea of the Father from everlaſting, and to have all thoſe glorious actions and characters aſcribed to him as Man united to God, or as God united to Man. And it is to be obſerved, that he does this not in one ſentence or two, or in one page or two, but it is the chief deſign of that whole diſcourſe of the *Glories and Royalties that belong to Jeſus Chriſt conſidered as God-Man*, which fills up more than a hundred pages in folio.

2. He ſuppoſes the Man Chriſt Jeſus not only to have an exiſtence in the divine idea through all the various ancient tranſactions of creation, providence, &c. but he aſſerts that he ought actually to have exiſted the firſt of all creatures, and to have been as it were an under-agent in the creation of the world; but that this actual glory was ſuſpended for four thouſand

thouſand years, merely becauſe he was to bear ſin and the curſe for the redemption of men.

3. He riſes much higher in his aſcriptions to the Man Jeſus Chriſt, than I have dared to do in any part of my Diſcourſe, and inveſts him with much more ſublime powers than any angelic ſpirit; and yet he ſuppoſes his ſoul to be a human ſoul ſtill, and calls him a man: he gives him moſt illuſtrious prerogative, on the account of his virtual union to his divine nature, all which he aſſerts to be his early due, had he actually then exiſted.

4. The actual pre-exiſtence of the Man Jeſus, or the human ſoul of Chriſt, and his actual union to his divine nature can never withhold or diminiſh any of thoſe ſublime characters, thoſe illuſtrious honours or prerogatives which this author ſaith were his due, had he then exiſted, and which he ſuppoſes to be attributed to him in ſcripture by the figure *prolepſis*, and by way of anticipation, and which were given him by God the Father, as ſuppoſing him then to exiſt in his idea long before his actual exiſtence.

5. The expoſition of all theſe ſcriptures will appear much more natural, eaſy and plain by the doctrine of the actual pre-exiſtence of the ſoul of Chriſt, than by the mere decree of his exiſtence or ſuppoſition of it only in the idea and foreknowledge of God. In the *proleptical* ſenſe, only learned men can find the meaning of them. In this ſenſe of actual exiſtence, the meaneſt Chriſtian may read and underſtand what he reads. And it is a general rule among divines for the interpretation of ſcripture, never to introduce figures of ſpeech, nor to explain the word of God in a figurative ſenſe; but where the plain obvious literal ſenſe has ſomething in it inconſiſtent or improper.

6. There is not one ſcripture in all the Bible which denies the actual exiſtence of Chriſt's human ſoul before the foundation of the world, but there are many which in this author's judgment cannot be explained

explained without the ſuppoſition of his virtual exiſtence then in the idea of God, and therefore they are ſuppoſed to be ſpoken of him as though he did actually exiſt by the help of tropes and figures.

Now I leave it to the judgment of any candid reader, whether thoſe ſcriptures, which are written for the uſe of the unlearned, ought not much rather to be explained in their moſt eaſy and obvious ſenſe, than to ſpread ſo many and ſuch hard figures of ſpeech almoſt all over the Bible, the Old Teſtament and the New, without evident neceſſity: and it is very reaſonable to believe, that had this evangelical writer lived in an age when the doctrine of the preexiſtence of the ſoul of Chriſt had been freely propoſed to the world, he would have embraced it with great readineſs and pleaſure.

7. Though theſe more elevated ſentiments and bolder expreſſions which I have cited from ſo great an author are by no means the ſtandard of truth, nor indeed can I follow him in ſome of theſe ſublimities, neither do I cite his magnificent expreſſions concerning the Man Jeſus Chriſt, nor his expoſitions of ſcripture as a ſufficient proof of what I have advanced; yet it will appear to the world by this collection, that I have not ventured upon ſuch expoſitions of the Bible, nor ſuch exalted ſentiments and language concerning Chriſt's human nature, without an honourable precedent. If I miſtake, yet I may reaſonably hope that while I have erred and wandered under ſuch a leader, and in ſo good company, the cenſure will be but light and gentle, ſince moſt of the reproaches which may be caſt on me on this account will fall heavy on this venerable author, whoſe name has been honourable, and his praiſe great among the churches.

FINIS.