37-5-

Theological
Seminary

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.
Case, SCC Divis
Shelf, 2033 Sec
Book, No,

AN

ILLUSTRATION

OF SEVERAL

TEXTS of SCRIPTURE,

PARTICULARLY

Thoſe in which the *LOGOS* occurs.

The Subſtance of Eight SERMONS Preached in the Cathedral Church of St. PAUL, in the Years 1764 and 1765.

At the Appointment of

Mr. HEATHCOTE,

by Permiſſion of the

Lord Biſhop of LONDON;

For the Lecture Founded by Lady MOYER.

To which are added

TWO TRACTS

Relative to an

INTERMEDIATE STATE.

By BENJAMIN DAWSON, L.L.D.
Rector of BURGH in SUFFOLK.

Prove all Things, hold faſt that which is Good. St. *Paul.*

LONDON:

Printed for the AUTHOR, and Sold by A. MILLAR, in the Strand; J. RIVINGTON, St. Paul's Church-yard; J. WAUGH, Lombard Street; J. DODSLEY, Pall-Mall; T. BECKET and P. DE HONDT, in the Strand. MDCCLXV.

TO

The Right Reverend Father in GOD,

PHILIP

LORD BISHOP of

NORWICH.

My LORD,

IN ſubmitting to the Peruſal of the Public the following Diſcourſes, which are the Sub-

Subſtance of the Lady *Moyer*'s Lectures, I have honoured myſelf with addreſſing them to your Lordſhip. I ſhould not have had the Aſſurance to do it, but after taking all due Pains with the Subject. Fully conſcious of this, I hope for your Lordſhip's Indulgence in what is meant for the Intereſt of Religion

in

in general, and the true Service of our Church in particular,

I am,

My LORD,

Your LORDSHIP'S

Moſt Obedient

and Moſt

Humble Servant

BENJAMIN DAWSON.

THE

PREFACE

TO THE

LECTURES.

IN the Courſe of the following Lectures I have undertaken to prove from Scripture theſe three Poſitions, 1. That He who *redeemed* us was *very* God, manifeſted in the Fleſh; not the Firſt of *created* Beings united to an human Body, nor a *mere* Man, in whom the *Fulneſs* of the Godhead dwelt not. 2. That *Jeſus Chriſt* was indeed *perfect* Man, "of a reaſonable Soul and human

"Fleſh

"Fleſh ſubſiſting;" but that Man in whom God *himſelf* and no other Being, in Nature inferior, dwelt. 3. That the *Holy Ghoſt* is of a Nature *perfectly* divine; not a diſtinct and *ſeparate* Being from the Father Almighty, inferior both to Him and the Son, but true and *very* God; or, in other Words, that He, who hath *ſanctified*, is one and the ſame God with Him that *created* and *redeemed* us. In proving theſe three Things and illuſtrating many Paſſages of Scripture relative thereto, I hope I ſhall be thought, if not to have defended, at leaſt to have proceeded upon

upon a Method, not leſs juſt than NEW, of defending the Doctrines of the Church of *England* on this leading Subject of our holy Religion. This I may hope for from a few candid and attentive Readers.

AT the ſame Time, in venturing a Performance of this Kind into the World, I am not inſenſible either to the Contempt, which, in the preſent Age, is like enough to be ſhewn for it, or to the ſevere Reflections which may be made upon it. But, though I ſhould ill bear the One or the Other from the ſenſible and judicious Reader, I am the leſs diſcouraged at the Proſ-

pect of meeting with both, on conſidering what Sort of Perſons I can poſſibly offend, and from whom *alone* Contempt ought to mortify an Author. Ill Nature only, or Bigotry, which perhaps is but a Species of ill Nature, can take Offence at any Thing I have ſaid; And, as for Contempt from that Quarter whence I moſt expect it, from thoſe, I mean, who, diſregarding all Religion, look upon all religious Subjects as equally contemptible, it requires no great Fortitude of Mind to ſuſtain it.

THERE is one Thing which may ſeem to the candid part of my Readers to

to want ſome Apology from me; This is, the Uſe of the Terms, *Arians*, *Socinians*, &c. for which I have this to ſay, that I uſe them not often, and *never* by way of Reproach upon thoſe Denominations of Chriſtians, but becauſe they ſerve to expreſs without a tedious Repetition the Doctrines under Conſideration.

THE

CONTENTS.

THAT the Being who ſpake and wrought in the Man *Chriſt Jeſus* had true and perfect Divinity.

ISAIAH xl. 3.

Prepare ye the Way of the Lord, make ſtraight in the Deſert a Highway for our God.

Page 1

The Divinity of our Redeemer.

MARK. i 2.

Behold, I ſend my Meſſenger before thy Face, which ſhall prepare thy Way before thee.

27

A Critical Diſſertation on the *Logos*.

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; and without Him was not any Thing made that was made. Page 55

The *Holy-Ghoſt* in Nature and Eſſence not inferior to *God*.

1 COR. xii. 4, 5, 6.

Now there are Diverſities of Gifts but the ſame Spirit.

And there are Differences of Adminiſtrations, but the ſame Lord.

And there are Diverſities of Operations, but it is the ſame God which worketh all in all.

143

The

CONTENTS.

The Human Nature of *Jesus Christ*.

1 TIM. ii. 5.

For There is One God, and one Mediator between God and Men; the Man Christ Jesus. Page 167

The proper Use of Reason in judging of revealed Doctrines, applied particularly to the Doctrine of the Church of *England* concerning the *Trinity*.

JOB xi. 7.

Canst Thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto Perfection. 211

Remarks on Mr. *Steffe*'s Letter, concerning the State of the Soul on Death, 245

Remarks on Mr. *Steffe*'s *Brief Defence*. 275

THE

DIVINITY

OF OUR

REDEEMER.

ISAIAH XL. 3.

Prepare ye the Way of the Lord, make ſtraight in the Deſert a High-way for our God.

ALL the Evangeliſts have quoted this Paſſage and applied it to Chriſt. The Titles therefore of *Lord* and *God* are given to the Perſon that *redeemed*,

 equally

equally with the Perſon that *created* us. And, that theſe Titles are given to him, not as a *mere* Man eminently diſtinguiſhed above his Fellows, as the Socinians hold; nor yet as a Being of a ſuperior Nature, above the Angels themſelves, and *inferior* only to God, but that they reſpect *God* himſelf, and no other *Being*, in this Application of them to the Perſon of our *Redeemer*, it ſhall be my Buſineſs in this Diſcourſe to prove.

LET it be obſerved then, that they are throughout Scripture appropriated to *God* alone, and intended to repreſent to the Minds of Men the *One* ſupreme Being. It is no juſt Objection to this Remark, that the former of theſe Titles is ſometimes uſed in addreſſing mere human Beings, diſtinguiſhed by their Station in Life; nor, that Magiſtrates, and thoſe to whom the Word of the Lord came, are ſometimes called *Gods*, ſo long as no one of the Scripture Worthies is to be found ſtiled

ſtiled in ſo abſolute a Manner as in my Text, *The* Lord, or, *Our* God. Here theſe Titles moſt manifeſtly reſpect the almighty Ruler of the World, the living and true God, beſides whom there is no other; and yet all the Evangeliſts, as I have obſerved, accommodate the Paſſage to the Coming of Chriſt. I ſhall only produce the Quotation of St. *Mark*; *The Beginning of the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, as it is written in the Prophets, Behold, I ſend my Meſſenger, before* thy *Face, which ſhall prepare* thy *way before* thee. *The Voice of one crying in the Wilderneſs, Prepare ye the Way of the* Lord, *make* his *Paths ſtraight*, Mark i. 1, 2, 3.

Both theſe Quotations reſpect the Manifeſtation of the Power of *God* himſelf. The former, as it ſtands in *Malachi* iii. 1. contains a Declaration of the Almighty, concerning *himſelf*. *Behold, I will ſend my Meſſenger, and he ſhall prepare the Way before*

me. But the Evangeliſt, you ſee, quotes this Paſſage, as the Words of the Father Almighty to his Son, the Chriſt. *I ſend my Meſſenger before* thy *Face which ſhall prepare* thy *Way before* thee. *John* the Baptiſt, therefore, was a Meſſenger before the *Lord*, to prepare *his* Way, to make ſtraight in the Deſert, a high Way for *our God*, as it is expreſſed in my Text, who was about to make known to Men that Goſpel of Grace, which had lain hid from the Foundation of the World. Theſe Titles, therefore, reſpect not Chriſt, as a *mere* Man, but *God* himſelf, as about to manifeſt himſelf in the *Fleſh*, that is, by the *Man*, Chriſt Jeſus.

Nor is the Notion of the Arians more ſolid; nay, to me it appears much more Fanciful and Chimerical, than that of the Socinians. They ſuppoſe that theſe Titles reſpect neither a *mere* Man, nor yet the *perfect* Divinity, but are applied to Chriſt Jeſus on

on Account of ſome very exalted Dignity which he held *under* the *Father* in a pre-exiſtent State. But the Scriptures repreſent not our Saviour under ſuch a Character, which indeed would ſuppoſe a *Plurality* of Gods, viz. One infinite and eternal, the other limited and originated. Nor can I ſee that ſuch a Scheme of Theology differs, * in this Reſpect, from that of the heathen World, who ſuppoſed that there was *one* God indeed *ſupreme*, but that there were other *Beings* alſo of a divine Nature, Agents in the Government of the World *under* him.

IT

* In *Degree* it doth, the Number of the Heathen Deities being much greater. The *Qualities* or moral *Attributes* moreover aſcribed to them, make an important and eſſential Difference, and the groſs Worſhip rendered to them in conſequence thereof, but this the two Schemes ſeem to me to have in Common, *viz.* what is *generally* underſtood by a *Plurality* of Gods.

The Arians indeed may argue that they acknowledge but *One* God, inaſmuch as they hold that the Father *only* is *unlimited* in Power, which Attribute is eſſential in the Idea of a *God*. But if ſo, then by parity of Argument, the Heathen Theology was not a Plurality of *Gods*; for all were eſteemed *ſubject* to the Will of *Jove*.

It will facilitate the Refutation of this Opinion to conſider the Ground of it, which I take to be this, *viz.* "that God is ſaid to "have *ſent* his Son into the *World*."

On this, and the like Expreſſions, the Arian Hypotheſis ſeems to be grounded; and, though attempted to be ſupported by various Texts, yet would never, I think, have been broached, or, indeed formed, had it not been for this. "If, they reaſon, God "*ſent* his Son into the *World*, then it is plain "that *ſome other Being* than God came into the "World; ſince it is abſurd to ſay, that God "*ſent* himſelf." But when the Scriptures ſpeak of Jeſus Chriſt being *ſent* into the *World*, they always refer to his *Commiſſion* from God to miniſter to the *World*, that is, to Men, and reſpect not the Time either of his *Birth* or *Conception*. In like manner, *John* the Baptiſt, is ſaid to be *ſent* from God, when he came to preach the Baptiſm of Repentance,

pentance. So that from an Expreſſion of this kind there is no Ground to ſuppoſe that any other Being than God himſelf, in the *Perſon* of Chriſt, wrought out our Salvation by his almighty Power manifeſted on Earth.

But having thus from a miſtaken Expreſſion once formed the Notion of Chriſt's exiſting in a prior State, a diſtinct *Being* from God, and *inferior* to him alone, they then fancied that theſe Titles of *Lord* and *God*, might with ſome Propriety be applied to him. Accordingly, they ſuppoſe that this exalted Perſonage was the ſame that appeared to *Abraham*, and the Patriarchs of old, and that he is ſtiled, the *Lord God*; or, (as they fancifully tranſlate *Jehovah Aleim*) the *Jehovah of* God; as if theſe Terms import two *diſtinct* and ſeparate *Beings*, viz. the one, the almighty

almighty Ruler of the World, the other, the Meſſiah, *inferior*, but next in Dignity to him: An Error of Interpretation, ſimilar to the above-mentioned; for, when God is ſaid to *appear* to any of the Patriarchs, we are not ſo to underſtand it, as if they had, or could have, a viſible Repreſentation of Him, but only that he ſignified his Will unto them, either in a Viſion, or by ſome Sign, or by an Angel. If they underſtood that the Meſſage was from Heaven, the *Lord God* was ſaid to have *appeared* to them; but that Appellation reſpects not the *Appearance* itſelf, the viſible Repreſentation, but is the Title of the *ſupreme* Being, whoſe Will was revealed unto them. Or, if the Tranſlation may be admitted, then the Jehovah *of* God, can mean only the Angel of the Lord, without any Foundation for ſuppoſing it to mean the Lord Chriſt.

Having

HAVING thus ſhewn, that the Titles which occur in my Text applied by the Evangeliſts to our *Redeemer*, always reſpect one and the ſame *Being*, even the *Supreme*; I ſhall now endeavour to ſhew that it was *God* himſelf, and not an *inferior* Being, that was manifeſted to the World in Fleſh. This I propoſe to evince,

I. FROM the Repreſentation given of what is generally termed, the *Incarnation* of the Son of God.

II. FROM the Teſtimony of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles; and

III. FROM the Teſtimony of Chriſt himſelf.

FOR the Firſt, *viz.* the *Incarnation*.

ST. *Matthew*'s Account thereof is as follows, *Now the Birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise. When as his Mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with Child of the* HOLY GHOST, *Matt.* i. 18. And again, *Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy Wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the* HOLY GHOST, *verse* 20.

THIS is a plain and simple Account of the Humanity of Christ. He was born of a Woman, partook of human Nature, and was made Flesh, that is, was perfect *Man*. Yes, the Arians will acknowledge that he was made *Flesh*; " but then to this *Flesh*, or Man, say they, was " united, a *Being* of a superior Nature to Man; " even *a* God, who was not indeed from all Eter- " nity, but before all other Beings whatsoever, " the Supreme alone excepted, to whom he is

" *in-*

" *inferior*,"—But, does this Account which St. *Matthew* gives of the Incarnation, ſuppoſe an Union of the *human* Nature with any ſuch Being? Is it not expreſly aſſerted, that that which was conceived in the Virgin *Mary*, was of the *Holy Ghoſt?* And again, at the 23d verſe, it is ſaid, They ſhall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted, *is God with us*. No Mention is here made of any other than two Natures, *viz.* the one *perfectly* Human, the other *perfectly* Divine.

ST. *Luke* gives much the ſame Account of the *Incarnation* of our Saviour. *The Angel anſwered and ſaid unto her, The* Holy Ghoſt *ſhall come upon thee, and the* Power *of the* Higheſt *ſhall overſhadow thee: therefore alſo that Holy Thing which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the Son of* God, Luke i. 35. Jeſus Chriſt in this Place is called the *Son* of God,

not on Account of any *ſecondary* Dignity which he held *under* God in a prior State of Exiſtence, or becauſe he was *created* by God before all other Beings, but becauſe he was *begotten* of the Virgin *Mary*, by the Power of the *Moſt High*. It was the *Moſt High* that raiſed up for us a ſpiritual Deliverer, even the Man Chriſt Jeſus, in whom alſo *He* was manifeſting himſelf to the World.

THUS it appears from the Account given us of the *Conception* and *Birth* of Chriſt, that there is no Ground for ſuppoſing, that a *Being*, who in a pre-exiſtent State was diſtinct from, and *inferior* to God, took our Nature upon him, or was united to *Humanity*.

LET us now conſider in the ſecond Place, Whether the Evangeliſts aſcribe our *Redemption*

tion to any other Being than to *God* himſelf, operating in the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus. And the Quotation of my Text by all the Evangeliſts, is one full Proof that they do not. For undoubtedly the Prophet ſpeaks of the *Moſt High* God, when he crieth out, *Prepare ye the Way of the* Lord; nor can we, without the greateſt Force upon the Words, ſuppoſe that *John* the Baptiſt meant any other *Being*, for whom the World was called upon to prepare a Way, than *Him*, who is ſpoken of by the Prophet *Iſaiah*, and who was about to manifeſt himſelf in the *Flesh*, even *God*, in Chriſt.

AGAIN, the Evangeliſts ever repreſent Jeſus Chriſt as working by the Power of *God alone*, and thoſe that believed on him, as convinced that *God* and no other *Being* was with him. Thus, when our Lord ſaid to the

the Man afflicted with the Palsy, *Son, thy Sins be forgiven thee*; they say, *Who can forgive Sins but* God *only?* Mark ii. 5, 7. They were sure that this was the Prerogative of the *Most High*, and therefore the Objection to the Words of Christ, as *blasphemous*, was well founded, if they were pronounced by One, that had not the Power of *God* himself. But when the People saw the Miracle, which Christ wrought on this Occasion, they were convinced that he had the Power of forgiving Sins, and accordingly glorified *God*. They were far from giving Glory to any other Being than to the *Most High*; nor could it ever enter their Heads, that it was not *God*, but some Angel or Demi-God, united to Humanity that wrought the Cure.

In another Place, when our *Saviour* restored a dead Person to Life, it is said, *that there came*

came a Fear on all; and they glorified God, *saying, That a great Prophet is risen up among us; and, That* God *hath* visited *his People*. Luke vii. 16. It was a *Man*, the Man Christ Jesus, that touched the Bier, and said, *Young Man arise*. But it was *God alone* that gave Life to the Dead. It was the Power of the *Almighty*, and not of any finite Being, which accompanied and gave Efficacy to the Command. Accordingly, the Power which manifested itself in Christ Jesus is stiled on another Occasion, the *mighty Power of* God. *And Jesus rebuked the unclean Spirit, and healed the Child, and delivered him again to his Father. And they were all amazed at the mighty Power of* God. Luke ix. 42, 43.

THERE is a still more remarkable Passage to this Purpose in the same Evangelist. *And one of them, when he saw that he*

was

was healed, turned back, and with a loud Voice, glorified GOD; *and fell on his Face at his Feet, giving him* Thanks. *Luke* xvii. 15. The Glory was not given to Chriſt, as a very great and mighty Being, *above* Man, but *inferior* to God. The Glory was given to *God*, to the *divine* Nature, *perfectly* Divine; and Gratitude was the Tribute which he payed to Chriſt as Man. *He fell down on his Face at his Feet, giving him Thanks.*

ST. *John* begins his Goſpel with this aſſertion, *viz. In the Beginning was the* Word, *and the* Word *was with God*, and the *Word was* God. Divines generally underſtand by the *Word*, the *Perſon* of Jeſus Chriſt. And, if this be the Meaning of it, then, one would think, nothing can be conceived to be a more expreſs Declaration of the Equality of the Son with the Father, as to his *Divinity*; ſince the

the Evangeliſt aſſerteth in plain Terms, the *Word* was *God.*

But, "No, (ſay the Arians) the *Word* "was not *equal* to the Father Almighty, "though he be aſſerted to be *God.* He had "a *divine* Nature, (they will allow) but not "One that was *perfectly* Divine, being *inferior* "in that reſpect to *God.*" If you aſk them the Reaſon for an Interpretation ſo incongruous with the Words of St. *John*, they think it a ſufficient Anſwer, "that it could never be "the Intention of the Evangeliſt to aſſert "that there are *two* Gods." But they ſhould conſider that he aſſerts no ſuch Thing, even ſuppoſing the Tranſlation to be juſt. For it is not ſaid, that the *Word* is a *different Being* from God, equal in every reſpect. *That* would be to aſſert the Exiſtence of two Gods.

But the Aſſertion of the Evangeliſt is, that the *Word* was that very *Being* whom we underſtand by the Term, *God*. I argue now on the Suppoſition, that the Tranſlation above mentioned, is the true One, and that by the *Word*, is meant, the *Perſon* of Chriſt, as moſt Divines both Trinitarians and Arians underſtand it. I think however, both have miſunderſtood this Paſſage. There is no Occaſion to take the *Word* here in a different Senſe from that which it bears in other Places of Scripture, *viz.* the *Goſpel*. And this Senſe of it, which is moſt natural, will leave the Arians no Advantage from this Quarter, and confirm the Doctrine of our Church, *viz.* that *God*, and no other Being, is our *Saviour*, and has been manifeſted to the World in the Fleſh, by the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus. But of this more fully in a future Diſcourſe.

Nic-

Nicodemus came to Jeſus and expreſſed his Belief that he had the Power of the *Almighty*. *Rabbi, we know that thou art a Teacher come from* God, that is, commiſſioned *of God* to teach. And how did he know this? *For no Man*, ſays he, *can do theſe Miracles that thou doſt, except* God *be with him.* John iii. 2. *Nicodemus* ſaw a Man work Miracles. He was ſure this could not be by any Power belonging to *mere* Humanity; he was convinced that it could not be but by the Power of the *Moſt High.* He had no Notion of any ſuperior *created* Being, reſiding in, or united to the Body of Chriſt, by whom theſe Works were done. It was evident to him that they were the Works of the *Almighty* himſelf.

From the Repreſentation therefore which the Evangeliſts have given us of Jeſus Chriſt

and the *Power* which manifeſted itſelf in him, it appears, that we have good Reaſon to aſcribe to the Author of our Salvation *eternal* Power and *Godhead.* The Socinians may declaim ever ſo much againſt rendering to a *mere* Mortal that Worſhip which is due to *God* alone; and they are juſtified in witholding it themſelves. But if they ſuppoſe that our Church Warrants ſuch kind of Worſhip, they are under a groſs Miſtake, and in repreſenting Her in ſo odious a Light, they want that Charity towards Her, which is above all Faith, being the Bond of Perfectneſs. The Church of *England* acknowledges no God but *One,* nor any Worſhip to be due but to the *One* only living and true *God.* She acknowledges the *Humanity* of Chriſt, and has ever ſtrenuouſly maintained that Doctrine; at the ſame Time ſhe diſallows of divine Honours being rendered to him on

that

that Account. Whatever Gratitude be due to him as Man (and the Higheſt, no doubt, is due) Her Adoration neither terminates in, nor is in any Meaſure directed to an Arm of Fleſh, but reſpects the *Divinity* itſelf, which was manifeſted in the Fleſh, even *Him*, by whoſe *Power* the Sick were healed, the Lame walked, the Blind ſaw, and the Deaf heard; *Him*, whoſe mighty Power ſtilled the raging of the Winds and the Waves by a Word, which called forth *Lazarus*, after four Days Interment, from the Grave, and (why need I mention any other Inſtance of its *perfectly* divine Efficacy?) which raiſed the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus from the Dead, and which He exerciſes with full Authority to the well governing of his Church *univerſal* both now and ever.

LET the Arians on the other Hand expreſs what Abhorrence they will of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, as Idolatrous, and ever ſo great Aſtoniſhment, that any ſhould believe it; it would be extremely aſtoniſhing (but that we ſee an intemperate Zeal will admit no cool Conſideration of any Point) that they ſhould conſider it in this unfavourable Light, and not ſee that their own Notion borders more upon the Error objected againſt. Which, I would ask, favours moſt of Polytheiſm? To ſuppoſe that there is *one* God, the great Creator and Father of all, that the *ſame* redeemed us in the *Perſon* of Chriſt, and *ſanctified* us by his *Holy Spirit*, being *one* and the ſame eternal and uncreated *Being?* Or, that theſe are three *diſtinct* Beings and ſeparately exiſtent, the *One* uncreated and eternal, *viz.* our *Creator*; the other, a *Creature*, next to God in Dignity,

Dignity, but not *perfect* God, *viz.* our *Redeemer*; and the Third, a ſtill *inferior* Being to either, yet above the Angels, *viz.* the Holy Ghoſt, our *Sanctifier?* I am ſure the former is the Doctrine of the Church of *England*; and, if the latter be not the Doctrine of the Arians, I ſhall be ſorry to have miſrepreſented them: For in this View of it, the Doctrine appears very *unſcriptural*, to ſay the leaſt of it. I mean not by this Repreſentation to retort the invidious Reflection which has been caſt upon our Church; nor, is it my Intention, my Brethren, in mentioning the ſame, to excite in you a Spirit of Retaliation, but only to guard you againſt being miſled by ſo injurious an Objection, importing the heavieſt of Charges, into unfavourable Sentiments of the eſtabliſhed Doctrines, which, rightly underſtood, will be found to be pure and ſcriptural. And it is your Duty there-

fore

fore to receive, what has been ſaid, in the Spirit of Meekneſs and Charity towards thoſe that differ from us. Let us hold our holy Faith, firm and unmoved by the ſubtle Devices of thoſe that would undermine it, or the bold Attacks of Infidelity. For be aſſured, our Faith, held in the Bonds of Peace and Love, will be ſafer and better ſecured to us, than it can be by the furious Tranſports of a blind Zeal. So pure a Faith deſerves our warm Attachment to it, and a jealous Concern for its Support under the continual and various Attacks of its Adverſaries. But let not a ſuſpicion of its Danger ever betray us into an uncharitable Opinion of our Opponents, and in Conſequence thereof, into unchriſtian and unwarrantable Meaſures of Defence; knowing this, that an Oppoſition to the moſt Orthodox Faith, grounded on Error alone, and not conducted by a Spirit of Con-

Contention, is far leſs culpable in the Sight of Almighty God, than the Maintenance of the ſame on the Principles of Perſecution.

Now to the *One* God, our Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier, be aſcribed all Honour, Might, Majeſty and Praiſe, World without end. *Amen.*

THE DIVINITY OF OUR REDEEMER.

MARK I. 2.

Behold I send my Messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy Way before thee.

THE Messenger here alluded to, is *John* the Baptist. But who is that *Being*, before whom he was sent to prepare the Way? Our *Saviour*, *God* himself, and no other *inferior* Being. But doth not the Almighty (for they

are his Words) ſpeak to ſome *Perſon diſtinct* from himſelf, when he ſaith, *Before* thy *Face which ſhall prepare* thy *Way before* thee? To this, I anſwer, that the Evangeliſt, no Doubt, by the Turn he has given to this Paſſage, quoted from the Prophets, has himſelf preſerved, and marks to us the juſt *Diſtinction* to be made between the *Perſon* of the *Father*, and *that* of the *Son*. Nevertheleſs, it cannot be his Intention, by this Diſtinction, to *divide* the *Godhead*, ſo as to repreſent the Father and the Son, as *two* Gods, nor yet to repreſent the latter as a *different Being* from God, *inferior* to him, though *ſuperior* to all others; nor laſtly, as a *mere* Man, in whom the *Fulneſs of the Godhead dwelt* not. For, the ſame *Being*, which the Prophet *Malachi* (from whom the Quotation is made) ſpeaks of, muſt be meant by St. *Mark*; and that *Being*, is God *himſelf*, and no *inferior* One, who was about to manifeſt himſelf in the Fleſh,

Fleſh, that is, by the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus. The Words of the Prophet, ſpeaking in the Name of the Lord, are as follows; *Behold, I will ſend my Meſſenger, and he ſhall prepare the Way before* me: which evidently reſpects the Manifeſtation of *Almighty God.*

I HAVE in a preceeding Diſcourſe adduced ſome Proofs of the Divinity of our Saviour; particularly from the *Titles* which are given to him, of *Lord*, and *God*; from the Account of the *Incarnation*, and the concurrent Teſtimony of the four Evangeliſts. In this I propoſe to purſue the Vindication of this great Doctrine of our Church on the Teſtimony of the Apoſtles.

ST. *Peter* ſaith, *Jeſus of Nazareth*, a Man *approved of God among you by Miracles, and Wonders, and Signs, which* God *did by him in the midſt of you, as you yourſelves alſo know,*

Acts

Acts ii. 22. Here then we have the Teſtimony of the Apoſtle for the *Perfect Humanity* of Chriſt Jeſus, and the *Perfect Divinity* of that Power which operated in Him. Accordingly, both *Peter* and *John*, when they had wrought a miraculous Cure on a lame Man in the *Name* of Jeſus Chriſt, diſclaim *all Power* in themſelves of working ſuch a Cure and aſcribe it wholly to the moſt *High God* and not to ſome inferior Being operating in the Man Chriſt Jeſus. *Why look ye ſo earneſtly on us as though by our own Power or Holineſs, we had made this Man to walk? The God of Abraham, and of Iſaac, and of Jacob, the* God *of our Fathers, has glorified his* Son Jeſus; *whom ye delivered up, &c.* Acts. iii. 12. And again; *Be it known unto you all, and to all the People of Iſrael, that by the* Name of Jeſus Chriſt *of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom* God *raiſed from the Dead, even by* Him *doth this Man ſtand here before you whole*, Acts iv. 10. So

that

that it was by the very ſame *Being* who raiſed the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus from the Dead, that this Miracle was wrought, and that is *God*, and not any other *Perſon* of an *intermediate Nature* between God and Man, united to Humanity.

To the ſame *Being* the Apoſtle means to aſcribe this Almighty Power, when he ſays of Chriſt in another Place, *He went about doing Good, and Healing all that were oppreſſed of the Devil*; *for* (he adds) God *was with him*, Acts. x. 38.

And thus we ſee, that though the Power of working Miracles is ſometimes aſcribed to *God* the *Father*, and at other Times to his *Son* the Chriſt, yet the Apoſtlesby this Diſtinction of the *Perſons* mean not to aſcribe it to any other than to the *One* ſupreme *Being*, the eternal and *undivided* Godhead. And we might

might with as much Reaſon attribute *One* Spirit to *Paul*, *that planted*, and *another* to *Apollos that watered* (though we are told it is God alone that giveth the Increaſe) as *divide* and *ſeparate* that eternal and unchangeable Eſſence, which is *one* and the *ſame Spirit*, the *ſame Lord*, and the *ſame God*, under all the *Diverſities* of Gifts, *Differences* of Adminiſtrations, or *Diverſities* of Operations; as St. *Paul* has expreſſed it, *Now there are* Diverſities *of Gifts but the* ſame Spirit. *And there are* Differences *of Adminiſtrations, but the* ſame Lord. *And there are* Diverſities *of Operations; but it is the* ſame God, *which worketh all in all*, 1 Cor. xii. 4.

The ſame Apoſtle has expreſly aſſerted, *that* God *was in* Chriſt, *reconciling the World unto himſelf*, 2 Cor. v. 19. Will it be ſaid here (as it hath been ſaid of another Text of Scripture)

Scripture) *John* i. 1. that the *ſupreme* Being is not meant, but ſome other Being, of a *Divine* Nature, and *next* indeed to, but not *perfect* God; for that the Greek Article ὁ would in that Caſe have been affixed to the Word Θεος? Were we to admit ſuch a Piece of Criticiſm as this, what an Abſurdity would riſe out of it to Diſgrace our Religion! For once, however, be it ſuppoſed to be juſt, that we may ſee the Conſequence. Not *God*, true and *very* God was in Chriſt, but only *a* God, that is to ſay, ſome Being, who, how great ſoever, was yet *inferior* to the *Supreme, and united to Humanity*. And what then (let me aſk) was this exalted Perſonage, this Demi-God doing in Chriſt? He was reconciling the World unto *Himſelf*. Needs ſuch an Objection to the Divinity of our Redeemer, founded on ſo futile a Criticiſm, be ſhewn in any other Light to expoſe the Weakneſs of it? For ſurely, it is to no other than

God himſelf, that Almighty Being whom we had offended, that we were reconciled by Chriſt; the ſame that is ſtiled, *the* God *of our* Lord Jeſus Chriſt, *the Father of Glory*; Eph. i. 17. whoſe *mighty* Power, the Apoſtle aſſerts *wrought in Chriſt, when he raiſed him from the Dead and ſet him at his own right Hand in the heavenly Places, far above all Principality, and Power, and Might, and Dominion, and every Name that is named, not only in this World, but alſo in that which is to come. And hath put all Things under his Feet; and gave him to be the Head over all Things to the Church, which is his Body, the Fulneſs of* Him *that filleth all in all*, ver. 20, &c. A Deſcription this of that mighty Power which wrought in Chriſt, and which is ſtill exerciſed by him to the governing his Church univerſal, that muſt convince every one (if it be in the Power of Language to do it) that it was the Attribute of

the

the Almighty himſelf, the *One* ever-living and true *God.*

But the moſt direct Teſtimony againſt the Arian Notion, that the Son of God was an exalted Perſonage of a Nature ſuperior to that of Men and Angels, but inferior to the Divine, is that which follows, viz. *There is* one God *and* one *Mediator between God and Men, the* Man *Chriſt Jeſus.* 1 Tim. ii. 5. There is no mention made, nay, there is an expreſs Negation in this Paſſage of any ſuch intermediate Being between God and the Angels, or rather, between the Father and the Holy Ghoſt. None other mediated between God and Men, than the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, *Perfect* Man, ανθρωπος, and in whom was no other than God, *Perfect* God. *For in him* dwelt the Fulneſs of the Godhead bodily, *Col.* ii. 9.

ACCORDINGLY, the ſame Apoſtle in his Epiſtle to *Titus*, attributeth our Salvation to *God* alone, to One and the ſame *Being*, giving the Title notwithſtanding of *Saviour*, both to the Father and the Son. *According to the Commandment* (ſays he) *of God* our Saviour.—*Grace, Mercy and Peace, from God the* Father *and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt* our Saviour, Tit. i. 3, 4. *That they may adorn the Doctrine of* God *our* Saviour *in all Things. For the Grace of* God *that bringeth* Salvation.—*Looking for that bleſſed Hope, and the glorious Appearing of the* great God, *and our* Saviour *Jeſus Chriſt*, Tit. ii. 10, 11—13.—*But after that the Kindneſs and Love of* God our Saviour *towards Men appeared; not by Works of Righteouſneſs which we have done, but according to his Mercy, he ſaved us by the waſhing of Regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt, which he ſhed on us abund-*

abundantly thro' Jeſus Chriſt *our* Saviour, *Tit.* iii. 4,5,6. God therefore is the Author of our Salvation; and ſhould it be made an Objection to this Doctrine, that *Chriſt* alſo is ſaid to be our *Saviour*, I anſwer, it is ſo ſaid, becauſe God ſaved us by being manifeſted in the Fleſh or by the Man Chriſt Jeſus. For we have not *two* Saviours in our Religion, one of which is *God*, and the other a *mere* Man, or ſome other Being of an Angelick Nature. We have *One* Saviour only, and that is *God* in Chriſt.

TIME would fail me to enumerate every Paſſage of Scripture to this Purpoſe. Nor need I quote more, if thoſe, which have been already adduced, appear (as I think, they muſt appear, the Force of them impartially conſidered) ſufficient Proofs of the Divinity of our Saviour. Other Texts more com-

commonly inſiſted upon in treating this Subject, I have purpoſely omitted; becauſe, how much ſtronger ſoever they may ſeem at firſt View, than thoſe I have produced in ſupport of this Tenet, yet the Tranſlation, the Genuineneſs of the Text, or the Senſe of them, has been with ſome Reaſon queſtioned by the Learned, and occaſioned, though without Reaſon, ſome Triumph to our Opponents. One of theſe is in the ninth Chapter of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, at the fifth Verſe; *Chriſt came, who is over all*, God *bleſſed for ever*, *Amen*. This Text, no Doubt, ſuppoſing the Reading to be genuine, and the Tranſlation juſt, is as ſtrong a Proof as can be brought, that Chriſt, as to his Divinity, is *perfect God*. But it becomes Weakneſs to urge it, after it has been obſerved by the learned *Grotius*, that the Word *(God)* is not in the Greek Copies uſed by the Author of the

the *Syriac*. The Copies of St. *Cyprian*, St. *Hilary*, and St. *Chryſoſtom*, want it. And granting it to be the genuine Reading, yet both *Eraſmus* and *Curcellæus* have tranſlated it, not, "Chriſt came, who is over all, *God* "bleſſed for ever;" but, "Chriſt came: "God who is over all be bleſſed for ever, "Amen." And indeed our Tranſlators have thus rendered ſeveral ſimilar Paſſages in the Original, 2 *Cor.* i. 3. *Eph.* i. 3.

WITH more Judgment has another Text been adduced by the Defenders of the Trinitarian Doctrine, viz. *God was manifeſt in the Fleſh*; 1 Tim. iii. 16. Yet as this has been queſtioned, with Reſpect to the Genuineneſs of the Reading, and even aſſerted to be a wilful Corruption (though, for my own Part I think without Reaſon) I have choſen to omit urging it in Proof of the Point in Queſtion; judging it much

much better to cut off all occaſion of Controverſy from our Adverſaries, and of Doubt from the unſettled, by inſiſting on ſuch Texts only (and enough of theſe there are) the true Senſe and Meaning of which is moſt obvious and certain, being conſiſtent with the plain Principles of Chriſtianity, and the general Tenor of the Goſpel. While there are ſo many other undoubted Proofs of this ſacred Doctrine, why need we give the Impugners of it the Pleaſure to obſerve on the laſt mentioned Paſſage, that the Reading is not, "*God* was manifeſted," but, "*which* was manifeſted," according to the *Syriac*, *Latin*, *Ethiopic*, *Armenian*, *Arabic*, and moſt ancient Greek Copies; that *Macedonius*, II. Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, corrupted this Text by a Subſtitution of the Word, (*God*,) inſtead of (*which*); and for this and other Matters was depoſed in an Epiſcopal Council and

and baniſhed by the Emperor *Anaſtaſius*, about the Year 512. Nay, and furthermore, that the Word, *God*, in this Place is rejected by the firſt Council of Nice?

It would be endleſs therefore, and can ſerve only as an Handle to keep up an Oppoſition to the eſtabliſhed Doctrines of the Church, to argue on dubious Authorities and diſputed Paſſages of Scripture. The Errors of our Opponents will be moſt effectually expoſed, when the Defence of our holy Doctrines, reſts not on the mere Sound of Words and Sentences, picked out here and there from the moſt obſcure and difficult Paſſages, but on the whole Authority of Scripture, on the general, conſtant Tenor of the Goſpel. For,

whatſoever is inconſiſtent with that muſt be falſe, as whatſoever is conſiſtent therewith is Truth; and Truth thus entrenched within the ſtrong Mounds of Scripture, which the Holy Spirit hath raiſed about her for her Defence, She may be annoyed now and then from the Out-Works of the Enemy, but is not to be circumvented by the ſubtile Stratagems, nor forced by the rudeſt Attacks of the Sons of Error and Infidelity.

SECURE therefore of our holy Faith on this firm Foundation, let us proceed to improve it to our Advantage by a practical Inference from what has been ſaid.

IF the Author of our Religion be *very* God, no other than that great and Almighty Being,

Being, who upholds univerſal Nature, then we may rejoice in this Reflection, that we have for our Saviour One, that is able to protect and enlarge the Religion He has given us againſt all Oppoſition. God is our Saviour. The ſame Almighty Being, who in the Beginning by the *Word* of his *Power* brought Order out of Confuſion and Light out of Darkneſs, has by the ſame *Word* created all Things anew. We are no longer Subjects and Slaves to the Prince of Darkneſs, but are begotten again to the glorious Light of the Goſpel, and to enjoy perfect Liberty and Security in the Kingdom of his Son. Jeſus is the mighty Captain of our Salvation. He has proved himſelf to be all-ſufficient for our Deliverance from or Support under all Trials and Temptations from the Enemies of our Religion. Under him we wage not a dubious War. But, having himſelf overcome

Death and the Powers of Darkneſs, we are as ſure to maintain through him our ſpiritual Rights and Priviledges, as we know that He has been able to obtain them for us. We may deſert them, it is true, if we can be ſo fooliſh, ſo brutiſhly regardleſs of them; but we cannot be deſpoiled of them againſt our Wills, and under his Guidance. We may quit his Kingdom, if we be ſo inclined, if we ſo much diſtaſte that Liberty wherewith He hath made us free, and baniſh ourſelves into the gloomy and diſtant Regions of Superſtition under the deſpotic Sway of Sin and Folly; but He wills not this diſgraceful Revolt of his Subjects, nor is his Arm ſhortened that He cannot protect them, that chuſe to live under his Government, againſt any that may riſe up to deſtroy or lye in wait to deceive them.

OUR

Our Lord, while on Earth, and after his Aſcenſion by the Holy Spirit manifeſted that He had all Power committed unto him, when He broke down the Powers in high Places, that oppoſed themſelves to his Religion; when He put down all Rule and all Authority, and built his Church on the Ruins of Idolatry and the Works of the Devil. And the ſame Almighty Power has manifeſted itſelf through ſucceeding Ages in its Support and Preſervation; if not, by the like ſignal Demonſtration of the Spirit, yet, by the regular and eſtabliſhed Courſe of Divine Providence. For, could a Religion, unpatronized of God, not only maintain its Ground for Centuries in the midſt of Generations, the moſt crooked, corrupted, and depraved, but even ſpread itſelf over the known World, in Oppoſition to Allurements from Senſe, and Trials from the bittereſt Perſecutions? Could this be effected without

without the Power of an Almighty Saviour, which, though no longer displayed in outward Signs and Wonders, was, nevertheless, invisibly exercised in his Church, and operating in Favour of the Truth from Heaven? The Heathen raged furiously, and the People imagined proud Things; but the Word of our *God* prevailed. If He humble his Church by Afflictions, it is, that He may exalt it in due Time. If He try it in the Fire of Persecution, it is, that it may come forth more pure and refined. For He that sendeth his Judgments among his People is mightier than they that execute them in the Earth; and He suffereth not the Wrath of Man to exceed the Purpose of his Will, which is ever the firmer Establishment, the greater Purity, or the more universal Spread of his Religion. He saw and suffered indeed the devouring Sword of the *Impostor* to extend a Lie and gross Delu-

sion

ſion among thoſe that were ready to believe a Lie; but He ſuffered it not to prevail over the true Faith, which without any outward Force to ſupport it, nay, in Oppoſition to all the Powers in high Places, was gaining a Reception in the Hearts of Men, by the Force alone of that pure and heavenly Truth, which the Holy Spirit of God did at firſt impreſs upon it.

Nor has our Almighty Saviour left us without a more recent Teſtimony of his Concern for the Intereſt of Truth, and his Ability to protect his Church from the Danger to which it may be expoſed, as well from the Degeneracy of its own Members, as the Violence of its profeſſed Enemies. For when, through a long Reſt from Trouble and Perſecution, and a continued Series of Prof-

Proſperity under the Patronage of Kings and the Mighty upon the Earth, its Members were become corrupt, and falling a Prey to their own Errors, and the Superſtition, Pride or Craft of their ſpiritual Guides, He ſent a Spirit of Reformation into the Hearts of his faithful Paſtors to call forth his Sons and Daughters from amidſt the Corruptions and Darkneſs in which they were held by the Tyranny of *Rome*, into the Light of that pure and bleſſed Faith of which we make Profeſſion. And, as he hath thus far preſerved his Church in Times of the moſt imminent Danger, brought it forth purified and refined from the Groſſneſs of Popiſh Superſtition, and eſtabliſhed it in this Kingdom on a juſt and equitable Foundation, ſo we may reſt aſſured that he is able to continue it to us and our Poſterity, ſafe from the Deſigns

ſigns and Devices of thoſe that wiſh and endeavour her overthrow.

But that we may reaſonably hope for this Bleſſing, it becomes us to implore it of our Almighty Saviour, and to behave ourſelves, worthy of it. For ſuch a Bleſſing deſerves not only our hearty Prayers, but, in this Day of Danger to the Church as well from Infidelity as Enthuſiaſm, the Exertion of our beſt Abilities and moſt prudent Endeavours, in Defence of our holy Doctrines; ever reſting our Defence and Recommendation of them on the firm and broad Bottom of Scripture, agreeably to the Maxim of our Church, "that nothing is to be required of any Man "to be believed that may not be proved "thereby."

And if to this deſerved Attachment to the Church eſtabliſhed, we add our beſt Endeavours to adorn her Doctrines by a venerable Piety towards Almighty God, Sanctity of Manners, an univerſal Benevolence and a Spirit of Charity, Forbearance and Moderation towards thoſe that differ from us, God will delight to be among us, to dwell with and to bleſs us. Thus built up in the Faith and Doctrine of Chriſt, we ſhall become a living, holy and well compacted Temple for the Reſidence of God our Saviour, who will keep it ſafe from the ſly and covert Approaches of Popiſh Emiſſaries; nor ſuffer it to be ſhaken and disjointed by the rude Breath of Faction and the boiſterous Storms which inceſſantly blow upon it from the peſtilent and infectious Quarters of *Fanaticiſm*.

Now

Now to God our Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier, be aſcribed all Glory and Honour, both now and for ever. *Amen.*

OF THE

LOGOS.

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; and without Him was not any Thing made that was made.

TRINITARIANS, Arians, Socinians and Sabellians, have adduced this Passage, each in Support of their peculiar Tenet concerning

cerning our Saviour Chriſt. The firſt ſay, that their Doctrine is expreſly aſſerted by the Evangeliſt in Declaring that "the Word was God." The ſecond ſay, that the Evangeliſt aſſerts only that "the Word was *a* God," that is, a Being inferior to God, but ſuperior to all other Beings. The third ſay, that the Aſſertion amounts to no more than this, "that the Word was a mere Man," entitled only to the Appellation of *a* God, on Account of the mighty Works which manifeſted themſelves in him. And the laſt ſay, that the Evangeliſt ſpeaks of an Attribute of the Almighty which is here called *God*, as Reaſon, or Wiſdom, or Power.

WERE theſe different Explications contended for by the Enemies of Revelation, if each of theſe Denominations endeavoured to expoſe the

the Opinions of the Reſt in order to expoſe the Weakneſs and Abſurdity of the Chriſtian Religion, this mutual Contradiction among our Adverſaries were not to be regretted. But it is painful to conſider that this Difference is among ourſelves. For many, a great many of each Claſs, it cannot be doubted, have been Well-Wiſhers to our holy Religion, and ſhewn themſelves not more zealous than able in the general Defence thereof. It were to be wiſhed therefore, that ſuch a Senſe could be clearly diſcovered to belong to this Paſſage as ſhould be liable to no Exception with any Denomination of ſincere Believers; and it is to be ſuſpected, from the great Difference among themſelves, that they are under one common Miſtake. This I ſhall endeavour to point out, and offer ſuch an Explication of the Paſſage, againſt which, in Point of Doctrine, no Objection can lie with thoſe who believe Chriſtianity at all.

1. THE *Word* here ſpoken of by the Evangeliſt is by all of them underſtood to relate to the *Perſon* of Chriſt. *The* Word *was God*, that is, (ſay they) *Jeſus Chriſt* was God, or, *a* God. But by the *Word*, I apprehend, the Evangeliſt means (what is meant by it in all other Places of Scripture) the *Goſpel*; and with a ſmall but material Variation of the Conſtruction of this ſo much diſputed Paſſage, the following natural and eaſy Senſe of it will appear, "That God is the original Author "of our Salvation."

*1. IN *the Beginning was the* Word, *and the*

*MR. *Dawſon*, in his Annotations on his Tranſlation of the three firſt Chapters of *Geneſis*, conjectures the right Tranſlation of this Verſe to be, "In the Beginning of the "Word's exiſting, the Word was with God." This, I doubt

the Word *was with God, and* † God *was the* Word.

I 2 2. It

doubt not, is the true rendering of the Hebraiſm here uſed by St. *John*; and the Senſe is very natural and eaſy, if we underſtand by the *Word* (Logos) the *Goſpel*; that is, "*When* " Jeſus Chriſt received the *Word* to Publiſh to the World, " he received *it* from God, with whom *it* was, in the " Beginning." But, taking the *Word* for the Perſon of Chriſt in a pre-exiſtent State, as Mr. *Dawſon* with moſt Divines doth, not only is the Metaphor extremely harſh, but a Doctrine alſo may be inferred from it which is certainly without Foundation in Scripture, *viz.* That Chriſt, as to his Divine Nature, had a *Beginning* of his Exiſtence. Or, if no great Force is to be laid on the Expreſſion, *in the Beginning*, and it may relate to Eternity as well as to Time, yet we cannot well ſuppoſe that it is the Deſign of the Evangeliſt to treat here of the metaphyſical Nature and Eſſence of the Divinity, but of the Relation in which he ſtands to us, as the Author of our ſpiritual Life. The Context elſe would be without any Connection.

† THE *Arians* and *Socinians* would have it rendered thus, "The Word was *a* God;" The former making Jeſus Chriſt, a *God*, literally ſpeaking, that is, a Being of a Divine Nature pre-exiſting before the Foundation of the World, but

but *inferior* to the ſupreme Being; the latter making him, a *God*, metaphorically ſpeaking, aſcribing to him no divine Nature and ſtiling him, a God, as the Jews would ſtile any of their Magiſtrates or Prophets, Gods, on account of the great Power and Authority they were endowed with. The Word, Θεος, ſtanding without the Article ο is thought ſufficient to juſtify ſo bold a Tranſlation. But, that no Dependance ſhould be placed upon ſuch a Circumſtance of Stile as this is, the Occurrence of this ſame Word without its Article no leſs than three Times in this very Chapter, and confeſſedly referring to the Supreme Being, will, without inſiſting longer upon it, ſuffice, to convince any one not previouſly biaſſed in his Judgment.

ANOTHER ſuch minute Circumſtance of Stile is made an Objection to the Tranſlation I have given of theſe Words, *viz.* That the *Subject* ſhould have had the Article prefixed to it, and the *Predicate* have wanted it. St. *John*, it is thought, if he had meant to ſay, that "God was the "Word," that is, the Author of it, would have written ο θεος ην λογος; as he writes (1 *John* i. 6.) ο θεος φως εστι, and (Ibid. iv. 8.) ο θεος αγαπη εστιν.

Let us ſee what Weight there is in this Objection. If ſuch a Circumſtance may be allowed any Weight, it appears to me altogether in Favour of, ſo far from being an Objection to, the Interpretation I have given.

FOR, it is uſual with St. *John*, (and indeed it is a Propriety of Stile) to omit prefixing the Article to the Predicate, when the Predicate is to be underſtood in a more

gene-

general or *indefinite* Senſe, and to prefix the Article, when it is to be taken in a more *particular* or *definite* Senſe. Thus, in the former of thoſe Inſtances brought to ſupport the Objection, God is ſtiled Light, φως, without the Article. Becauſe it is meant *indefinitely*, not reſtricted to any particular Object. But let us ſee how it is circumſtanced when the Evangeliſt uſes it *definitely*, and to ſignify a *particular* Light, for Example, the Light of the *Goſpel*. It is uſed in this definite Senſe at the 4th Verſe of Chap. 1ſt, η ζωη ην το φως των ανθρωπων. A ſtill more pertinent Example we find at Verſe 8 Ουκ ην εκεινος το φως. *He was not* the *Light*, *viz.* that particular Light which enlightened the World, that is, the *Goſpel-Light*. Here the Article is prefixed, and I believe it is to all Predicates throughout this Writer, which are under the ſame Circumſtance of *Definiteneſs* or *Reſtriction* to a particular Object, with Logos, in this Caſe. So that, ſuppoſing the Evangeliſt to mean the *Goſpel*, by this Word, Logos, it is quite agreeable to his Stile to prefix the Article to it. Out of the many Inſtances to this purpoſe, I ſhall produce, Chap. vi. 35. Εγω ειμι ο αρτος της ζωης. Ib. 48, 50, 51. In which Texts the Article ο ſerves to ſpecify or define the Word to which it is prefixed, juſt as the Engliſh Particle (*the*) does, and which for the ſame Reaſon we uſe in tranſlating it, *viz.* I am *the* Bread. But at the 55th Verſe of the ſame Chapter, where the Predicate is left more *indefinite* or *general*, the Greek Article is omitted; nor

2. IT ‡ *was in the Beginning with God.*

3. *All*

nor can we prefix the Engliſh one in the Tranſlation without altering the Senſe. Η σαρξ μου εστι βρωσις, αιμα μου εστι ποσις. Ibid. viii. 12. το φως. Ibid. xiv. 6. εγω ειμι η οδος, και η αληθεια, και η ζωη. 1 John v. 1. Ιησους εστιν ο Χριστος. 5. Ιησους εστιν ο υιος, which, according to the Objection, ſhould thus be rendered, "The Chriſt is Jeſus," "The "Son is Jeſus," if θεος ην ο λογος is not capable of any other rendering than, "The Word was God."

‡THE learned *Grotius*, aware of the Abſurdity of aſſerting that the *Word*, (meaning Chriſt in a pre-exiſtent State) was *God*, and yet that he was *with* God, as if there were two Gods, two diſtinct *Beings*, each of a perfectly divine Nature, ſcruples not to ſay, that it is the Intention of the Evangeliſt, by this Repetition of the foregoing Aſſertion, *viz.* that the Word was *with* God, to repreſent the *Word* or Chriſt, as ſomething *inferior* to God, not *altogether* and *conſummately* God. His Words are,

"REPETIT hoc, quia Deum jam vocaverit; hoc vo-"lens, ita Deum eſſe intelligendum, ut et illud maneat, "fuiſſe eum apud Deum; id eſt, ut non fuerit ο λογος, "omne id quod eſt Deus." *Grot.* in lib. Evan.

INTO ſo great a Difficulty do we ſee this learned Interpreter thrown by ſuppoſing *Logos* to mean in this Paſſage any Thing elſe than the *Goſpel*, that *Grace* and *Truth* which came to us from God, being in the Beginning with Him!

3. *All was* done *by Him*; *and without Him was not any Thing* done of that which has come to paſs.

THIS muſt be owned to be a more exact Tranſlation than the other, and is to be preferred on the Account above-mentioned, *viz.* that it doth not neceſſarily convey the Idea of any diſputable Doctrine, but may be underſtood in a Senſe to which no Perſon, that believes Chriſtianity at all, can have any Objection.

ST. *John* ſeems to mean no more by theſe Words than to preface his Account of the *Goſpel*, which he ſtiles, the *Word*, with the high Original of *it*. *This* was, he tells us, from God himſelf; for that *in the Beginning*, before *it* was publiſhed to the World,

it

it *was with God*; *God was the Word*, the original Author and Giver of it. It *was in the Beginning with God*, lay hid from the Foundation of the World in the eternal Counſels of the Almighty. *All was* done *by Him*, the Whole was from *God*; *and without* Him *was not any Thing* done of that which has come to paſs; that is, every Part of the *Goſpel Diſpenſation*, publiſhed by Jeſus Chriſt was from God; and whatever Works he wrought in Confirmation of it, not one of them ουδὲ ἓν was of himſelf or came to paſs χωρὶς τοῦ θεοῦ without God.

II. HAVING ſhewn what I apprehend to be the true Senſe of this Paſſage of Scripture, I propoſe in the next Place to obviate an Objection or two which may be made to it, and then produce from this Evangeliſt ſome of the many Texts which ſupport the Interpretation given, con-

continuing the Proof of the perfect Divinity of our Redeemer on the Teſtimony chiefly of Chriſt himſelf.

1. First then, it may be thought that, taking the *Word*, λογος, in the Senſe I have given of it, *viz.* for the *Goſpel* itſelf, it ſounds extremely harſh to ſay that *God was the Word.* To which, I anſwer, that the Harſhneſs objected to, ariſing from the Peculiarity of St. *John*'s Phraſeology, will be found to be in Favour of the Tranſlation which I have offered. For what is more common with this Writer than to ſay of God, that he is *Light*, or *Truth*, or *Love?* And alſo of Jeſus Chriſt, that he is the *Way*, the *Truth*, the *Life*, nay, the *Reſurrection?* To aſſert that *God was the Word*, is not more harſh then to ſay, *God is Love.* When St. *John* thus expreſſeth himſelf, he doth not mean to affirm, that God is that very

Thing by which he calls him, or that God and Love are the ſame Thing. We know very well, his Meaning is, that God is poſſeſſed of that Thing or Quality whereby he names him, in this Inſtance, of Love and good Will to his Creatures.

So again, when our Saviour according to this Evangeliſt ſaith, *I am the Reſurrection*, he means not to affirm, that he and the Reſurrection are one and the ſame Thing; but, that he is the *Author* of our Reſurrection to Life, ſome ſuch Word being always underſtood in this kind of Phraſeology. And therefore when it is here aſſerted, that *God was the Word*, the Meaning is natural and eaſy, *viz.* That he was the *Author* or Giver of the *Word* which came by Jeſus Chriſt.

ONCE more, with regard to the Harſhneſs of the Expreſſion, *God was the Word.* Is it more harſh than that we have in the Vulgar Tranſlation, *the Word was God?* So far from it, that, if we were not uſed to it, (and uſe will reconcile to any Thing) this laſt would appear intolerably uncouth; and, even under our preſent Prejudice from Cuſtom, will appear ſtrange enough on conſidering how thoſe other ſimilar Phraſes found conſtructed as this has been. Reverſe theſe Sentences, *God is Love*; *God is Light*; *Chriſt is the Reſurrection*; and read them thus, *Love is God*; *Light is God*; *the Reſurrection is Chriſt*; and then ſay, which of theſe Conſtructions ſound the moſt Harſh? Or whether the laſt be capable of any Senſe being affixed to it? The Caſe is juſt the ſame with Reſpect to the Expreſſion in the Text. If our Tranſlators had rendered it as they have all the other Phraſes ſimilar

to it, viz. *God was the Word*, we ſhould have more eaſily underſtood it and interpreted it in the ſame Manner with the other Texts, viz. God was the Author of the *Goſpel Diſpenſation*.

2. BUT it may be made an Objection that this *Word* is ſaid to have exiſted *in the Beginning*, which manner of ſpeaking may ſeem to be more agreeable to the common Interpretation and to refer to the Perſon of Chriſt; as the *Goſpel* did *not* exiſt till his Coming into the World, and therefore had not a Being, was not (as is here aſſerted of the *Word*) *in the Beginning*. To which I anſwer, that nothing is more common, with the Writers of the New Teſtament, than to repreſent thoſe Things as having had Exiſtence from the Beginning which were always deſigned by God to come to paſs and were promiſed in the Prophets.

And

And, as this was more eſpecially the Caſe of the *Goſpel*, ſo we find *it* repreſented throughout the Scripture as having exiſted in the eternal Counſels of the Almighty. Hence the *Goſpel* is called a *Kingdom prepared from the Foundation of the World*, Matt. xxv. 34. We are ſaid to *have been choſen in Chriſt before the Foundation of the World*, Eph. i. 4. St. *John* ſpeaks of the *Goſpel*, as *that which was from the Beginning*, and *that eternal Life which was with the Father*: 1 *John* i. 1,2. Expreſſions exactly ſimilar to thoſe in my Text. The Apoſtle *Paul* calls *it*, *the hidden Myſtery which God ordained before the World unto our Glory*, 1 Cor. ii. 7. In another Place, *the Myſtery which from the Beginning of the World hath been hid in God, who created* all *by Jeſus Chriſt*, Eph. iii. 9. Nay, *it* is repreſented as *the Grace* (of God) *which was* given *us in Chriſt Jeſus before the World began*, 2 Tim.

2 Tim. i. 9. And in the *Apocalypſe*, the Lamb is ſaid to be *ſlain from the Foundation of the World*, Rev. xiii. 8. All which Expreſſions amount to much the ſame with what the Evangeliſt has aſſerted in the Text, *In the Beginning was the* Word, *and the* Word *was with God.*

3. THERE is one Objection more which may be made, and that is, that this is not the only Place in which the *Word* (Logos) ſeems to relate to the Perſon of Chriſt, for that this Title is given to him both at the 14th Ver. of this Chap. and alſo in the *Apocalypſe* xix. 13.

BUT in both thoſe Places this Title is given him on Account of his being the *Miniſter* of the *Word* or *Goſpel* to Men, and relates not to his Dignity in a prior State of Exiſtence, but to his Office on Earth. This is extremely obvious in

in the laſt mentioned Paſſage from the Deſcription which preceeds the Title, *viz. He was cloathed with a Veſture dipt in Blood*; Here is a manifeſt Reference to his *Humanity*; *And his Name is called the* Word *of God*, ὁ λογος τȣ θεȣ. So that the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, is here ſtiled, *the Word of God*, as having been the Miniſter and Publiſher thereof to Men.

And this is quite agreeable to what the Evangeliſt has aſſerted in the other Paſſage, *viz.* at the 14th Verſe of the Chapter in which our Text is, not indeed according to the preſent Tranſlation, (*the* Word *was made Fleſh*) but according to one no leſs literal and more agreeable to the Original.

For

For by Fleſh σαρξ is plainly meant (and all agree in it) *Man*. It is equally evident, that the Word εγενετο here rendered, *was made*, might, more agreeably to the Original, have been rendered, *became*. This Verſe therefore may be full as literally, and more exactly tranſlated thus, *viz*. *And Fleſh* that is, *a Man*, became *the* Word *and dwelt among us*, &c. As God had before been ſtiled the *Word*, as being the *Author* of it, ſo Jeſus Chriſt is here ſtiled the *Word*, as being the *Publiſher* of it. The Evangeliſt had aſſerted that God was the original Author of the *Word*; that *He* did *all* that was done, properly ſpeaking; that without *Him* nothing came to paſs of that which was tranſacted; that in *Him* was that Life, that Word of Life, which was the Light of Men, bringing them to the Knowledge of God, whom, before, the World knew not, though

He

He was in the World and the World was made by *Him*. The Evangeliſt, I ſay, had aſſerted that God himſelf and no other was the Original of the *Word*; he now tells us, that it *came to paſs* that this *Word* of God was publiſhed to the World by a *Man*. The *Word* was ſtill the Word of God, and not of Man: But whereas, in the Beginning, *it* was *with* God, and no one elſe, *it* was now *with* Men, come forth, as it were, from God and come down from Heaven into the World being committed to a *Man*, the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, to publiſh *it* to the World. Accordingly, becoming the *Word*, he is ſaid in this ſame Verſe to be full of *Grace* and *Truth*. Now this Grace and Truth of which he was full, can mean nothing elſe than the *Goſpel*, the Word of God (ὁ λογος τȣ θεȣ;) for it is put in Oppoſition to the *Law*. *The Law was given by Moſes, but* Grace *and* Truth, or true Grace,

that is, the *Goſpel, came by Jeſus Chriſt*, (ver. 17.) Jeſus Chriſt therefore, at the 14th Verſe, is not called the *Word*, with reſpect to his *Perſon* in a pre-exiſtent State, but with reſpect to his *Office* in this; ſince the Evangeliſt is contraſting the *Law* given by *Moſes* with the *Word* which *came by Jeſus Chriſt*.

III. HAVING thus obviated all the Objections which I think can be made to the Interpretation given of this noted Paſſage of Scripture, I proceed to ſhew the Conſiſtency thereof with the whole Strain of the Goſpel according to this Evangeliſt, who has recorded more fully than the reſt the Teſtimony of our Lord himſelf concerning this Matter. The Paſſages to be adduced in ſupport of the Interpretation will at the ſame Time confirm the great Doctrine of our Church in the Defence of which I have engaged, "That our

"Re-

" Redeemer is *God*, *very God*, and not an " *inferior* Being, either united to Humanity " or *mere* Man."

CHAP. i. 18. *No Man hath ſeen God at any Time; the only begotten Son which is in the Boſom of the Father, he hath declared* him.

THE Expreſſion *which is in the Boſom of the Father*, if it be the proper Tranſlation, muſt mean the *Love* which the Father bears towards the Son, and is much the ſame with the Expreſſion which occurs in other Places of Scripture, viz. *only begotten and well-beloved Son*. But it may be rendered *who* was *in the Boſom of the Father*; and then it muſt ſignify the *intimate Knowledge* which Jeſus Chriſt had while upon Earth, of the Counſels and Will of his Father, that full and bright Revelation of himſelf

which God gave unto Chriſt to declare unto Men. In which everSenſe we take it, Chriſt is here ſaid to have *declared* or revealed God unto the World, which is much the ſame with being ſtiled the *Word* or Logos.

CHAP. iii. 2. *Rabbi, we know that thou art a Teacher come from God, for no Man can do theſe Miracles that thou doſt, except God be with him.*

NICODEMUS, convinced that the Miracles which Jeſus Chriſt had wrought were the Effect of the Power of God himſelf operating in Chriſt, acknowledges him to be a Teacher *come from God.* We ſee from hence what the Jews meant when they ſpake of a Perſon as *coming from God. Nicodemus* did not mean that Chriſt had come from God *locally*; that is, had exiſted with him in a pre-exiſtent

exiſtent State, a *ſeparate* and diſtinct Being from God, (as the *Arians* ſuppoſe,) inferior, but next in Dignity, and afterwards came into this World from God; for then the Reaſon he aſſigns for his Belief that he was come from God would not be to the Purpoſe, *viz. that no Man could work ſuch Miracles unleſs God was with him.* But the Miracles abundantly proved to *Nicodemus* that Chriſt was a Teacher *come from God*, in the Jewiſh Senſe of that Phraſe; becauſe they proved that God was *with* him, working in and ſpeaking by him. His *coming from God* therefore, and God's being *with* him, we ſee, are the ſame Thing; and *Nicodemus* meant to acknowledge that which St. *John* aſſerts in our Text, viz. That *God* was the *Word* originally, or that what Jeſus Chriſt had ſaid or done came not to paſs *without God*, χωρὶς τ θ.

Chap.

CHAP. iii. 13. *And no Man hath aſcended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in Heaven.*

WHEN our Saviour aſſerts here, that no Man hath aſcended up to Heaven, but excepts one Man, *viz.* himſelf, the Son of Man, who alſo is there, we cannot ſuppoſe him to ſpeak of his *literal* Aſcenſion or Aſſumption into Heaven, and Reſidence there, ſince he was not yet aſcended, but ſaid this of himſelf, while upon Earth, and even before his Crucifixion. To aſſert to *Nicodemus* that he had aſcended up to Heaven, and that he was in Heaven *then* at the very Time he was converſing with him on *Earth*, and this in the *literal* Senſe of theſe Expreſſions, appears too groſs a Contradiction in Terms to be ſuppoſed by any one, how ignorant or prejudiced ſoever in Favour

vour of literal Interpretations. He muſt mean therefore that no Man was acquainted perfectly with the Will of God but himſelf.

It is ſpoken in Alluſion to our Method of coming at the moſt certain Knowledge of any Thing. We go to the *Place* itſelf where the Thing is, and having ſeen it there, we can make Report of it to others on the moſt certain and undoubted Authority. The Alluſion being ſo familiar is eaſy enough of Conception. Heaven is repreſented as a certain *Place* above us, in which God has his Reſidence. Now we know very well, that the great God dwelleth not in any *determinate Place*, being every where and in all Places. To this *Place* however, our Saviour ſaith he aſcended, and came down from thence.

HIM alone had God admitted, as it were, into his Counſels, and taught the Things pertaining to the Kingdom of Heaven. He came forth into the World, not as other Prophets, declaring the Will of God in *part* only and *imperfectly*, but as from *Heaven* itſelf, taught of God *there*, honoured with a View and Inſpection, as it were, of heavenly and divine Things, ſo that he was qualified to teach and inſtruct Mankind *fully*, and from the moſt certain Knowledge that any Man can have of the Will of God. He was the Son of *Man*, as he calls himſelf; but *that* Son of Man, in whom *God* himſelf dwelt and ſpake to the World. The *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, *ſpake not of himſelf*; *his Doctrine was not his own*, *but* his *that ſent him*. He ſpake immediately from Heaven, from God himſelf. All which is perfectly agreeable to what the Evangeliſt has aſſerted in our Text, viz. *That the Word*

was

was with God, in the Beginning; but ver. 14. that God gave *it* to the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, ſo that he *became* the *Word* of God upon Earth. Conſidered therefore as the *Word*, he is with the utmoſt Propriety ſaid (and of him only can it be ſaid with Propriety) to be from God, to come forth from God, to come down from Heaven; not *locally*, not *literally*, as if the Divinity which was manifeſted in him being (as the *Arians* conceive) of a limited Nature, had actually removed from one *Place* to another, from *Heaven* to Earth; nor * yet by Converſion of the Godhead into

M Fleſh;

Dr. *South* ſaith, "We read of no Mediator to bring us "to Chriſt; for though, being *God* by Nature, He dwells in "the heighth of Majeſty, and the inacceſſible Glories of a "Deity; yet to keep off all Strangeneſs between himſelf "and the Sons of Men, He has condeſcended to a *Cognation* "and *Conſanguinity* with us; He hath cloathed himſelf "with Fleſh and Blood, that ſo he might ſubdue his "Glories to a Poſſibility of human Converſe." *South*'s Serm. vol. 2. page 64.

Fleſh; but God was then ſaid to deſcend on Earth, when he manifeſted himſelf to the World

THIS is a very harſh and improper Manner of repreſenting the Incarnation of Chriſt; as if God when he dwelt in and ſpake to the world by Fleſh, that is, the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, did for a while contract his Dignity, limit and leſſen his Glory thereby, and convert the Godhead into Fleſh. But what he ſaith a few Pages further on, is really ſhocking; "Chriſt, the Son of the moſt high God "the ſecond Perſon in the glorious Trinity, took upon "him our Nature, that he might give a great Inſtance and "example of this Virtue; and condeſcended to be a *Man* "only that he might be a Friend. Our Creator, our Lord "and King, he was before; but he would needs come down "from all this and in a Sort become our equal. Ib. page 88.

A STRANGE Converſion of the Godhead this indeed! was not God then our *Creator*, *Lord* and *King*, during Chriſt's abode on earth? No, according to this Account he was not; For "Chriſt, the ſecond Perſon in the glorious Trinity (who "was all this before) would needs come down from all "this." So that the World was left for about 30 years without a Creator, Lord and King. No doubt the Doctor meant not ſuch a Conſequence, but it really is deducible from his Aſſertion, and all the Uſe I would make of it is, as an Admonition againſt giving the Enemies of revealed Religion and of our Church in particular, any Advantage by ſuch unguarded Expreſſions.

World in the Fleſh or by the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus.

VER. 34. *For he whom God hath ſent ſpeaketh the Words of God: For God giveth not the Spirit by Meaſure* unto him.

THIS Teſtimony of the Baptiſt concerning our Saviour, *viz.* that *he ſpake the Words of God*, coincides with that of the Evangeliſt at Chap. i. 14. *viz.* that he *became the Word*, the Publiſher of the *Goſpel Diſpenſation*; and whereas the Baptiſt adds, *For God giveth not the Spirit by Meaſure* unto him, this is a Confirmation of the Senſe we have put upon the third Verſe of the ſame Chapter, in making the Word, *Him*, relate to *God* and not to, *the Word*; God being the Original of the *Word* and Chriſt Jeſus the Publiſher of *it* to the World, the *Man* by whom God ſpake and manifeſted himſelf to the World;

ſo that it was *God*, and no other Being diſtinct and *ſeparate* from him, that was manifeſted in the Fleſh, or by the *Man* Jeſus Chriſt. This * *Man* ſpake not of himſelf nor by the Dictate of any other Being than the ſupreme God. *All was done by* Him; *and without* Him *was not any Thing done*, (or delivered) *of that which has been done*, of that *Word* which came by Jeſus Chriſt.

CHAP. v. 22. *For the Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son.*

THIS

* IT ſhould not give any Offence that I ſpeak thus of our Saviour Chriſt. I mean not to repreſent him thereby as a *mere* Man, in whom the Fulneſs of the Godhead dwelt not, but as being really and truly *Man*. For aſſerting the *perfect* Manhood of Chriſt doth not derogate from that *perfectly* Divine Nature which manifeſted itſelf ſo fully in him; ſo far from this, that in aſſerting it, I mean to repreſent Chriſt as having no *middle* Nature between God and Man, that was united to Humanity. When I call him *Man* I ſpeak of him, as "of a reaſonable Soul, and human Fleſh "ſubſiſting;" and aſſert not, "as touching his Godhead, an Inferiority to the father," but only, "as touching his "Manhood."

THIS is perfectly consonant with the Interpretation given of the three first Verses, and the fourteenth of the first Chapter, *viz. that the Word was in the Beginning with God*; but that *it* was given to a Man, the *Man* Christ Jesus, to publish *it* to the World. But though he was *Man*, *perfect* Man, yet he was also the Son of *God*. He therefore in the next Verse claims that Honour and Respect which are due to him as such, due to him as that Man in whom God alone, *perfect* God, the Almighty himself wrought and spake, *viz. that all Men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father*. For on what other Footing could he claim this *equal* Honour? Could he claim it as a *mere* Man? for any natural Power belonging to Humanity? Not *Socinus* himself, nor even the most mistaken of his Followers would say this.

Doth

Doth he claim it as that great Perſonage whom the *Arians* ſuppoſe to have exiſted, before his Humanity, a diſtinct and *ſeparate* Being, next in Dignity but *inferior* to God himſelf? No. For he diſclaims this Honour on his own Account, teſtifying *that he can do nothing of himſelf*, that is, as a diſtinct and ſeparate Being from God; nor indeed could that Honour which is due to God *alone* be due to an inferior Perſonage how exalted ſoever ſuppoſed to be united to Humanity.

Does he claim it then as a Being in all reſpects *equal* with God, though a diſtinct Being from him, * *ſubſtantially* diſtinct, ſo that

* Doctor *Sherlock* in his Vindication of the Doctrine of the Holy and ever Bleſſed Trinity aſſerts that the Divine 'Perſons in the Godhead are "Real, Subſtantial Beings" are 'Three diſtinct and infinite Minds;" "Three Divine Per-'ſons *ſubſtantially* diſtinct;" "Theſe three infinite Minds 'are diſtinguiſhed, juſt as three finite and created Minds are 'by ſelf Conſciouſneſs."

Theſe

that the Father and the Son are as really two infinite Minds or Beings, as *Peter* and *John* are two finite Beings? This Opinion has been eſpouſed indeed by ſome zealous Defenders of the Trinity, but rejected with Abhorrence by others not leſs zealous in the Cauſe. Deſervedly rejected ſurely! For beſides that this would imply a *Diviſion* of the Godhead, Chriſt himſelf declares his Title to this Honour to be quite another Thing, *viz.* becauſe God has committed all Judgment to the Son. *The Father hath committed all Judgment*

THESE are very bold Aſſertions and have been animadverted upon by as Zealous an Aſſerter of the Trinity as himſelf. The learned Animadverter has ſufficiently expoſed the Abſurdity of them and their Inconſiſtency both with the Doctrine of the Church of *England* and the Senſe of the Ancient Fathers concerning the Divine Perſons, nor do I think in bringing his Charge of Tritheiſm againſt this Author's Explication of the Trinity he has gone too far, though much too far in his acrimonious Manner of doing it.

ment to the Son; that all Men ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. The Father therefore demands of all Men this Honour to the Son on Account of his having *all* Power both in Heaven and Earth. And although this Power was manifeſted in the *Perſon* of the Son and is ſtill exerciſed by him to the Advantage of the Church univerſal, yet it is the Power of *God* himſelf, and not of any inferior Being. By conſequence, the Honour and Worſhip due *on that Account* to the Father and Son, two diſtinct Perſons, are due and to be rendered to *One* and the ſame Divine Being, even to God Almighty. If we honour the Son on the abovementioned Account, we honour God alone, we reverence the Power and Word of God, and not the Power and Word of any *other* Being whatſoever. The Being that we worſhip is *one* and the ſame, though under *different* Perſons. And thus

thus we ſee that, although to the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus was given all Power and Authority in the Execution of his Office, yet *all was of* God *and without* Him *did not any Thing come to paſs of all that which hath been done*, ver 30, 32.

CHAP. vi. 32. *But my Father giveth you the true Bread from Heaven*, 33. *For the Bread of God is he which cometh down from Heaven and giveth Life unto the World*, 34. *Then ſaid they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this Bread*, 35. *And Jeſus ſaid unto them, I am the Bread of Life.*

HERE our Saviour ſtiles himſelf, *The Bread of Life which cometh down from Heaven.* That theſe Words are not to be underſtood of any *local* Deſcent of Chriſt Jeſus from Heaven, but of his *Word* and *Doctrine* being from

God or *heavenly*; not of any Being whatſoever, diſtinct and *ſeparately* exiſting from God, deſcending from Heaven, but of God himſelf deſcending, as it were, from Heaven and dwelling among us by his *Word* committed to a Man, is plain from what has been obſerved on Chap. iii. 2, 13. et ſeq. But this is ſtill more evident from our Saviour's own Explanation of all he had been ſaying from the 32d to the 62d Verſe of this Chapter.—His Followers, who had lately experienced his miraculous Power in the Diſtribution of the Loaves and Fiſhes, were hungering after more Miracles of the Sort. Our Lord, not ignorant of the real Motive of their Attendance upon him, having remarked upon their narrow and ſelfiſh Views, and the periſhable Nature of that which they ſought after, exhorts them to the Purſuit of that Food which periſheth not but endureth to

ever-

everlaſting Life. He tells them where they may find this heavenly Suſtenance, even in himſelf the Son of Man, who could give it to all them that ſhould believe on him, and that it was indeed their Duty to receive and believe on him whom God had ſent. They demand a Miracle in Proof of his Miſſion, and, their Minds ſtill running on *temporal* Food, mention, by way of challenge, as it were, to our Lord, the Manna which their Fathers did eat in the Deſart, quoting at the ſame Time this Scripture, *He gave them Bread from Heaven to eat*. Our Lord anſwers not their Demand. For what Purpoſe, ſince the Miracle of the Loaves and Fiſhes left them Unbelievers, would another of the ſame Kind ſerve, but to gratify their ſenſual Appetites? He judges it more proper to take Occaſion from the Scripture they had quoted to diſcourſe to them about the End and Deſign of

his Miſſion, which was to give them everlaſting Life, *ſpiritual Food* in alluſion to the Quotation; and by a Compariſon of the Nature of the Food which they meant with that which he profeſſed a Power to give them, to engage their Preference of the latter, and allure them to ſome Degree of Attention to their ſpiritual Intereſt. For this Purpoſe he tells them, that the Bread their Fathers eat was not *from Heaven* ἐκ τȣ̃ ȣ̓ρανȣ̃, that is, of an heavenly Nature. It fell by the good Providence of God indeed upon the Earth; but it was not, we ſee, according to our Saviour's Meaning in that Expreſſion, *from Heaven*, ἐκ τȣ̃ ȣ̓ρανȣ̃. But the Bread, which he had for them, the Bread, which God his Father was now ready to beſtow upon them that believed, was the *true Bread from Heaven*, that is, truly heavenly, of a divine Quality and Efficacy, ſuch

ſuch as could give Life unto the World. This Manner of Repreſentation had the Effect to keep up their Attention to him, and raiſe in them a Deſire of receiving ſo precious and extraordinary a Gift, as Bread, which could make them immortal. Accordingly, eager with the Expectation of enjoying a more delicious Repaſt as well as much more valuable in its Nature and Effects on the Conſtitution than that which he had already given them in the Diſtribution of the Loaves and Fiſhes, they requeſt of him that they may always receive that heavenly Bread of which he ſpake; *Lord, evermore give us that Bread.* To which he replies, *I am the Bread of Life.* And, going on with the Alluſion to the Manna from Heaven, he aſſerts, that he came down from *Heaven* at the Will of his Father. The Jews then murmured at

him

him *becauſe he ſaid, I am the Bread* * *which came down from Heaven.* Our Saviour, to ſilence

* FROM this and the like Expreſſions of our Lord, the *Socinians* have fancied that Jeſus Chriſt, before he entered upon his Miniſtry, and in order to be qualified for the Diſcharge of it, was actually taken up into Heaven in the Fleſh, and having been there taught of God, deſcended from thence as *Moſes* did from the Mount, with the Will of God.

The *Arians*, on the other Hand, have from the like Phraſes concluded that Chriſt came down from ſome Place above called *Heaven*, in which he had exiſted aforetime, a diſtinct and *ſeparate* Being from God, inferior to him, being limited and created, and was united to Humanity.

Now, in ſome ſuch Way as this did the Jews alſo underſtand our Saviour's Aſſertion, that he was "the Bread "which came down from Heaven." But is it not ſtrange in the laſt Degree that, when our Lord in his own Comment upon this Aſſertion ſhewed them their Miſtake, obviated their Murmurs againſt him on this Miſconſtruction of his Words, nay, and reproves his own Diſciples for interpreting them according to the Strictneſs of the Letter; is it not ſtrange, I ſay, that Chriſtians in after Ages ſhould fall into the ſame Error, and ſuppoſe that he ſpoke of his literally and locally deſcending from Heaven and not of his Word and Doctrine being from God or *heavenly?*

ſilence their Murmurs and Cavillings on that Account, diſclaims all Power and Authority in himſelf and refers all to God. Though he could give Life, yet it was only to them that were taught of God, to them that the Father ſhould draw to him, that is, to ſuch as were diſpoſed to receive the Word of God. Having thus obviated their Difficulty on this Head, he reſumes the Alluſion and calls himſelf, *The Bread of Life, The living Bread which came down from Heaven*, that Bread, *of which if any Man eat, he ſhall live for ever.* They muſt eat this *Bread*, he tells them, if they would have Life; they muſt eat *Him*, the Man Chriſt Jeſus, eat his Fleſh, and drink his Blood; for *this*, ſays he, *is that Bread which came down from Heaven: not as your Fathers did eat Manna, and are dead: He that eateth of this Bread ſhall live for ever:* This Saying appeared to many of his own

Diſ-

Diſciples very hard and unintelligible. Jeſus, perceiving it, explains himſelf freely to them, at the 61ſt Verſe, not without a Reproof for the Offence they had taken at his Diſcourſe, owing to their own abſurd Conceptions. *Doth this*, ſays he, *offend you? What and if you ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcend up where he was before?*" that is, Do you take Offence at my ſaying, *I am the Bread of Life which came down from Heaven*, and, *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you?* Doth this offend you? It is owing to your taking my Words in a Senſe ſo ſtrict and *literal* as it would be the groſſeſt Abſurdity to ſuppoſe them to contain. For, were you now, let me put the Caſe, to ſee the Son of Man aſcend up into Heaven from whence he hath ſaid that he came down; how would you underſtand my Diſcourſe to you then? Would you

you ſuppoſe this quickening Efficacy, whereby I aſcended, to be literally in my *Fleſh* and *Blood?* Would you ſuppoſe that, when I ſaid, *This is the Bread which came down from Heaven*, I could mean it *literally* of the Deſcent of the Son of Man from the *Heavens*, as Manna fell from thence to your Fathers to feed upon? Or, when you had ſeen the Son of Man taken up from among you, would you then ſuppoſe that I meant to aſſert that my Fleſh and my Blood *corporally* eaten and drank would quicken and raiſe you up at the laſt Day? You would not ſurely underſtand me ſo, when you had ſeen me actually and *bodily* removed from you; or, if I ſhould leave my Body with you, yet ſurely you muſt know that the *Fleſh* of it can profit you nothing. No. *It is the* Spirit *that quickeneth*; *the* Fleſh *profiteth nothing*: The Words *that*

I ſpeak unto you, they *are Spirit, and* they *are Life.*

THUS we ſee that our Saviour ſpeaks of his *Doctrine* and the Spirit of God which was given to him without Meaſure. The *Words* which Chriſt ſpake unto them, *they* were Spirit and Life. For he ſpake not of himſelf but as he was taught of his Father. The Word of God (λογος τυ θευ) was that Efficacious Principle of Life which he ſpake of. *This is the Bread of Life.* This is that *which came down from Heaven*, which whoſoever receiveth and retaineth hath eternal Life, and Chriſt will raiſe him up at the laſt Day. This is called eternal Life, from *Heaven*, from *God*; and the Man Chriſt Jeſus is therefore called, the *Word* of Life, and ſaid to *come* from Heaven, from God, to have *been with* God, to have come *forth* from God. This cannot be underſtood of his Fleſh,

of

of his human Nature, of him as the Son of Man, but of him as having the *Power* and *Word of God*, as the Logos τȣ Θεȣ. All theſe Expreſſions, I ſay, relate entirely to Chriſt as the *Word* of God; and cannot be underſtood, are really incompatible with our Ideas of Things, and inconſiſtent with, and contradictory to our Saviour's own Declaration and repeated Teſtimony of himſelf, on any other Suppoſition than this, *viz.* That it was *God* himſelf that ſpake and wrought in Chriſt Jeſus, that it was God himſelf that ſpake to the World and wrought our Salvation and Redemption, and no *other* Self-exiſtent, Almighty and Eternal Being, *ſubſtantially* diſtinct from him, nor any *other* next in Dignity to God, nor any *other* Being of *ſtill* inferior Dignity but in the Order of Angels.

Ver.

VER. 68. *Thou haſt the Words of eternal Life.*

THIS Expreſſion uſed by St. *Peter*, is agreeable to the Tranſlation we have given of the 14th Verſe of Chap. 1. *viz.* " And a *Man* " (the Man Chriſt Jeſus) became the *Word* and " dwelt among us"—*full of Grace and Truth.*

CHAP. vii. 16. *My Doctrine is not mine but his that ſent me.*

BY theſe Words our Saviour diſclaims being the *Word* in any other Senſe than as the *Publiſher* of it to the World. God was the *Word*, the original Author of it; and He gave it to the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus to publiſh to the World. Our Saviour therefore ſaith, in anſwer to the Jews who murmured at *his* pretending to teach, who was altogether an illiterate

illiterate Man, that he did not ſpeak to them Things, the Knowledge of which he had acquired by human Means, but Things which God himſelf taught him. He ſpake to them the *Word* of God, not the *Word* or Doctrine of himſelf, as the Son of Man or the Word of any *other* Being whatſoever.

ACCORDINGLY, in the Verſe following the Text above cited, he adds, *if any Man will do his Will, he ſhall know of the Doctrine, whether it be of God or whether I ſpeak of myſelf.*

CHAP. viii. 28. *Then ſaid Jeſus unto them, when ye have lift up the Son of Man, then ſhall ye know that I am* He, *and* that *I do nothing of myſelf; but as my Father hath taught me, I ſpeak theſe Things. And he that ſent me is with me.*

No

No Words ſurely can more ſtrongly expreſs the *perfect* Divinity of our Saviour, and that *perfect* Humanity in which it was manifeſt to Men than theſe. *When ye have lift up the Son of Man*; that is, when you have crucified and put him to Death (whereby his real and perfect Humanity will be demonſtrated) you will then acknowledge that he had that *divine* Power which he pretended to, even the Power of God himſelf, you will then acknowledge that what he did was not of himſelf, could not be executed by him as *Man*. For as ſuch *he could do nothing*. The mighty Works which manifeſted themſelves in him, you muſt then confeſs, could not have been wrought by any Power belonging to Humanity, by any Power belonging to that Nature which ſuffered Pain and underwent Death, but by a Power which belonged to a divine Nature, *perfectly* Divine, even to the *moſt high God*.

OUR Lord therefore always ſpeaks of himſelf as *Man* or with reſpect to his human Nature, whenever he teſtifieth his *Inferiority* to his Father, and his receiving any Commandment or Commiſſion from him.

CHAP. viii. 38. *I ſpeak that which I have ſeen with my Father; and ye do that which ye have ſeen with your Father.*

BY this we are not to underſtand our Saviour as aſſerting his having exiſted in a former State, a *diſtinct* and *different* Being from God, in which State he had ſeen ſomething which he now reveals, any more than we can ſuppoſe him to mean by the latter Clauſe, that the Jews had ſeen *(literally* ſpeaking) the Devil doing any Thing. It muſt mean, here, and in all thoſe Places where he ſpeaks of having

ſeen

ſeen God, and ſeen thoſe Things which he relates, the *moſt certain Knowledge* which he had of the Will of God, or the Things pertaining to the Kingdom of God, in Alluſion to that certain and ſatisfactory Knowledge which Men receive by ocular Inſpection and Intuition; Things which God gave him to reveal to Mankind, and which are good and true proceeding from God, as all bad and falſe Things are ſaid to proceed from the Devil.

It is very common with our Lord to diſtinguiſh himſelf as the Meſſiah by ſuch like Expreſſions as theſe, of having *ſeen* God, *learnt* of God, *proceeded* forth from God, *come down* from *Heaven*, &c. &c. Which Manner of ſpeaking has given Occaſion to Divines to buſy themſelves about the *metaphyſical* Nature and Exiſtence of Chriſt.

But

But it is very plain that theſe Expreſſions can have no Manner of Reference thereto, and that from theſe two Conſiderations; 1. Becauſe wherever they occur, the Context is ſure to determine that our Lord ſpeaks in Reference to his *Office* on Earth. 2. Becauſe to ſuppoſe theſe Expreſſions to relate to his *metaphyſical* Nature and Exiſtence, we muſt be forced to interpret them *literally*, which would make the greateſt Confuſion among our Ideas, and lay the Foundation of the moſt abſurd, impious and contradictory Opinions and Tenets. Our Lord therefore muſt mean by them to aſſert, that he alone had a *perfect* Knowledge of the Will and Counſels of God, which no Man before him ever had; that God committed to him alone the *full* Revelation of himſelf and enabled him to declare and manifeſt the one true God to the World, as clearly as if the Son of Man had actually aſcended up

into Heaven and there *ſeen* God and the Things of the heavenly World, and then had come down from Heaven with *Grace* and *Truth* as *Moſes* from the Mount, with the *Law*. Jeſus Chriſt having ſuch Knowledge and Revelation of the Will of God as this, together with all Power and Judgment, doth with the utmoſt Propriety uſe theſe Expreſſions concerning himſelf, and that by way of Appropriation and Prerogative not belonging to *Moſes*, *John* the Baptiſt, or any of the Prophets; who, though true Prophets, were ſtill not from *Heaven* but of the *Earth*; brought not that *heavenly Light* which was the *Life* of Men. In *God* only was this Life, and *with Him* was it hid from the Foundation of the World; neither did it ſhine forth to the World, till the Coming of Chriſt, or the Manifeſtation of *God* in the *Fleſh*.

VERSE

VERSE 42. *For I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself but He sent me.*

OUR Lord speaks here not in Reference to his *Divine* but *Human* Nature, not as a superior Being to *Man*, who, literally speaking, descended from a more exalted State and higher Region than this, but as *Man*. Otherwise no Sense can be made of this Passage. For the *Jews*, to whom it is addressed, had boasted that *Abraham* was their Father. No, says our Lord; *If you were Abraham's Children you would do the Works of Abraham.* He had acknowledged, that they were, *literally* speaking, the Children or Descendants of *Abraham*, but he denies it in the *moral* Sense of that Expression, *viz.* that they were Imitators of him in good Works. In this Sense,

he tells them, *they were the Children of another Father*; another Father! *We be not born of Fornication*, ſay they. *We have one Father, even God.* Jeſus ſaid unto them, *If God were your Father ye would love me*; that is, If He was your Father and you his Sons in the *moral* Meaning of that Relation; if you were truly good Men and ſincerely deſirous of doing the Will of God, you would love me. For I (the *Man* whom you perſecute and ſeek to kill) am come from him, to inſtruct you in his Will. I come not of myſelf, but He ſent me. I am commiſſioned of God my Father to deliver his Meſſage to you, and, in Duty and filial Obedience to him, I deliver it and tell you the Truth though I can expect nothing from you but Violence and Perſecution. This you ſee has plainly a Reference to his *Human* Nature.

But why need I multiply Words in Proof hereof, when our Lord himſelf has expreſly teſtified it in this Place, ſaying; *But now ye ſeek to kill me*, a Man, ανθρωπον *that has told you the Truth which I have heard of God?*

Verse 58. *Jeſus ſaid unto them, Verily, Verily, I ſay unto you, before Abraham was, I am.*

That our Saviour here ſpeaks of himſelf as, the *Word* of God, the Meſſenger of that *Word* which was *with* God προς τον θεον before the Foundation of the World, and had been promiſed to the Fathers, particularly to *Abraham*, is very plain. For he had ſaid that *Abraham* rejoiced to ſee his *Day*, not *Himſelf* in a pre-exiſtent State; which could have been ſuppoſed by none but ſuch abſurd and prejudiced People as his Enemies were,

to

to be his Meaning. The *Jews*, however, either miſunderſtood him or maliciouſly perverted his Words. For they ſay, *thou art not yet fifty Years old, and haſt thou ſeen Abraham?* Our Saviour had never mentioned ſeeing *Abraham*, but ſpoke of *Abraham*'s ſeeing his *Day*, that is, the *Goſpel Times*, in which Times, it was revealed to *Abraham*, that all Nations ſhould be happy in his Seed. He therefore anſwers them not according to *their* perverted Conſtruction, but according to the true and very obvious Meaning of *his own* Words, and tells them that *Abraham* might, and did ſee his *Day*, for that before *Abraham* was, He was, *viz. with* God, in the Counſels of the Almighty, who revealed his Miſſion to *Abraham*. Whom therefore does our Saviour call himſelf? Or what State doth he refer to, when he ſays, *I* * *am*, εγω ειμι? Moſt evidently to

* We cannot ſuppoſe that our Lord by this Expreſſion, intended to intimate to the Jews that he was that great Per-

to his State as the Son of Man. He declares himſelf to be that *Man*, that Seed of *Abraham* in whom all Nations ſhould be bleſſed, that Man, whoſe *Day Abraham* ſaw and rejoiced at the Proſpect of it; the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, who, before their Anceſtor *Abraham* was born, even from the Foundation of the World was appointed to be the *Word* of God to Men.

CHAP.

Perſonage who in the third Chapter of *Exodus*, at the 14th Verſe, calls himſelf, *I am*; Nor was it at this Expreſſion that their Indignation aroſe, but at his aſſerting that he was *before Abraham* exiſted. This is manifeſt from his uſing the ſame Expreſſion twice before in the ſame Chapter without their taking Offence at it, *viz.* at verſe 24. *If ye believe not that I am*, εγω ειμι; and again at the 28th Verſe *then ſhall ye know t'at I am*, εγω ειμι. In both theſe Places he means only to aſſert, that he was that Perſon whom God had ſanctified and ſent into the World, and who was appointed in the eternal Purpoſe of God to be the *Light* of the World, as will appear to any one on reviewing the Context from verſe 12th.

CHAP. xii. 49, 50. *For I have not ſpoken of myſelf but the Father which ſent me he gave me a Commandment what I ſhould ſay and what I ſhould ſpeak. Whatſoever I ſpeak therefore, even as the Father ſaid unto me, ſo I ſpeak.*

CAN any one doubt, after reading theſe Words, of the Propriety or Reaſon of the Evangeliſt's calling Chriſt, the *Word?* That Man was well intitled to this Appellation who ſpake to the World, not of himſelf but from God, not his own Doctrine, but the Word of God. He, this Man, the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, became the *Word*, being taught of God, having the *Word* which was in the beginning with God committed unto him, to publiſh and declare unto Men. This was the Son of Man who *aſcended up* into Heaven, as it were, and brought

brought us from thence that *Grace and Truth* which had laid hid for ages *with* God, and infinitely ſurpaſſed the *Law* given by *Moſes*. No Man could tell us of heavenly Things; for *no Man had aſcended up to Heaven, but the Son of Man*; *nor had any Man ſeen God at any Time, ſave the Son of Man*; He is ſaid to have *ſeen* God, and *as an only begotten Son, to have been in the* Boſom *of his Father*, (admitted into his moſt intimate Counſels) *and to have declared him* to the World. Can any one doubt that Jeſus Chriſt is called the *Word* by reaſon of the *Office* he ſuſtained upon Earth? and that the Evangeliſt cannot mean to apply it to him previous thereto, as to a Being that had a *ſeparate* and *diſtinct* Exiſtence from God, whether equal or inferior?—No ſurely; His Deſign in ſtiling him ſo muſt be the ſame with the Deſign of our Lord in the Text we are now upon, *viz.* to repreſent *God* himſelf as

being originally *the Word*, and the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, as becoming *the Word* at the Will and Commandment of God; to repreſent the *Goſpel* and the amazing Power which accompanied its Publication, as the *Word* and Power of *God* alone. For there cannot be a more expreſs Declaration of this, nor hardly a more literal one than what theſe Words of our Saviour contain. *I have not ſpoken of myſelf; But the Father which ſent me, he gave me a Commandment, what I ſhould ſay and what I ſhould ſpeak: whatſoever I ſpeak therefore even as the Father ſaid unto me, ſo I ſpeak.* This Declaration of our Lord concerning himſelf exactly correſponds with what the Evangeliſt has obſerved, *viz.* That *God* was the Word; that the Whole was done by *Him* and without *Him* was not *any* Thing done; that in *Him* was the Life, that *Word* of Life which was the Light of Men, directing them the Way to God.

God, whom the World was grosly ignorant of, till he manifested himself unto the World in the *Flesh*, appointing the Son of Man to be his *Word* to Men, one who partook of their own Natures, the *Man* Christ Jesus, who dwelt among them full of Grace and Truth, whose Glory and great Power also they beheld, such Glory and Power as manifested him to be the * *only begotten of* the Father, παρα πατρος.

CHAP xiv 23. *If a Man love me, he will keep my Words; and my Father will love him; and we will come unto him and make our abode with him.*

* Or one so intimately beloved of God, that God communicated to him all his Counsels, and gave him all Power in Heaven and Earth. Ως μονογενης παρα πατρος] יחיד "Quod Unigenam aut Unicum significat, Græci, sensum "respicientes, vertunt αγαπητον ut *Genes.* xxii. 2. 12. 16. "*Judic* xi. 34. *Jerem.* vi. 26. *Amos.* viii. 10. *Zach.* xii. 10. "Μονογενης ergo hic recte dicitur Christus eo quem "diximus significatu, et cui addi potest, quia singulari "modo a Deo processit." *Grot.* on the 14th Verse of the first Chapter of *John.*

OUR

Our Lord delivers theſe Words in Anſwer to *Judas*'s Queſtion, *viz. How Chriſt would manifeſt himſelf to his Apoſtles and not to the World?* — To which he anſwers, that this Manifeſtation conſiſted in the Honour which ſhould be conferred on them by the Father and himſelf, in making them Apoſtles and giving them the Word of God to propagate in the World, and this, becauſe they loved Chriſt. Our Lord, however, expreſſeth this in ſuch Terms as gave them not a clear Idea of the Nature of that Honour he ſpake of, but in ſuch as were very proper to engage and ſecure their Love and Attachment to, and ſupport their Faith and Confidence in him. He tells them, if they loved him and kept his Word, his Father would love them, and they would *come* and make their *Abode* with them. No doubt, they would be at a Loſs fully to comprehend

prehend this Honour; But our Saviour tells them they ſhould underſtand his Meaning, when the Holy Ghoſt was come upon them; And we know that God and Chriſt did make their *Abode* with them by the Spirit of Truth, or by giving them the *Word* of God to preach with *Power*. Thus was God and Chriſt manifeſted to them and not to the World. Chriſt could not mean that they ſhould have, here, upon Earth, a *viſible* Repreſentation of himſelf and his Father, who would *literally* deſcend from Heaven, and have a *local* Reſidence among them. It was meant therefore of the *Word* of God being in them, and the *Spirit* of Power which ſhould be given them, which *Word* and *Spirit*, being from God and granted to them at the Interceſſion of Chriſt, they might be ſaid to receive God and Chriſt, who were manifeſted thereby to them.

Now

Now what I would obſerve on this Paſſage of Scripture is, that Chriſt Jeſus here ſays, that He and his Father would *come* and *reſide* with his Apoſtles upon Earth, and yet no one thinks of interpreting this according to the *Letter*. Why ſhould we otherwiſe interpret thoſe Places of Scripture, in which He is ſaid * to have *come down* from Heaven, to have *come forth* from God, to

* What Confuſion and Inconſiſtency hath the literal Acceptation of ſuch Paſſages as this occaſioned concerning the Dignity of Jeſus Chriſt. When both Sides, *Trinitarians* and *Arians* adduce them in ſupport of their widely different Opinions, we may be pretty ſure that both Sides are under ſome *common* Error of Interpretation. The *Arians* interpret them as having a Reference to the Perſon of Chriſt in his *pre-exiſtent* State. And ſome *Trinitarians*, whoſe Zeal conſumes their Judgment, readily join iſſue with them and ſuffer the Cauſe to proceed on their Adverſaries own State of the Caſe. After this, in order to be conſiſtent with themſelves in this erroneous Interpretation of Scripture, they become totally inconſiſtent with themſelves in reconciling that Interpretation with the Doctrine of a Trinity in Unity.

Thus, Dr *Sherlock* (*in his Vindication of the Doctrine of the Holy and ever bleſſed Trinity*,) in order to account

to *be from* above, &c. &c? —Need we understand theſe Expreſſions as intended to convey any

count for the Poſſibility of Chriſt's being *ſent* from God, receiving *Commands* from him, and *interceeding* with him, is forced firſt into down right *Arianiſm*, and then, to mend the Matter, into *Sabellianiſm*. His Words are, "The "One ſupreme God can no more be ſent than he can be "begotten, can receive no Commands from any other, "cannot be given by any other; cannot be ſubject to any "other Will but his own, &c. But the Divine Perſons "may ſend and be ſent, and interceed with each other; "for though in the Unity of the Godhead they are all "the One Supreme God, yet there is a mutual Relation "and Subordination between the Divine Perſons." Here is a Diſtinction indeed of the One ſupreme God, from a Divine Perſon, and not without a *Difference*. The ſupreme God cannot be *ſent*, cannot be *commanded*, a Divine Perſon *may*. Why is the *firſt* a true Propoſition? Becauſe none other is greater than himſelf. How then can the *latter* be true? It cannot be true without acknowledging the Divine Perſon, who is commanded, to be leſs or *inferior* to him that commands, and this would be *Arianiſm*. Let us ſee then how this Author would extricate himſelf out of this Difficulty. "As to inſtance (he Subjoins) in "Interceſſion or Prayer for himſelf or others, which is a "Contradiction to the Notion of a ſupreme God, as it "is to the Notion of an abſolute and ſovereign Prince: "But yet a ſovereign Prince may interceed with himſelf;

"His

any other Meaning than, that Chriſt, while on Earth, had the *Word* and Spirit of God? that

" His own *Wiſdom*, his own Mercy, Clemency, and " Compaſſion may interceed with him and prevail too " without any Diminution to his ſovereign Power. Thus, " though the ſupreme God can interceed with no other " Being, yet the Son may interceed with the Father, " His own eternal and *begotten Wiſdom*, may interceed with " him and make Atonement and Expiation for Sinners, and " thus God interceeds with no *Body* but himſelf, for it is " his own *Wiſdom* which interceeds with him, and makes " the Atonement." Vind. p. 181. Not to admit, with this Author, the Divine Perſons in the Godhead to be *three* infinite Minds or Beings *ſubſtantially* diſtinct, he ſays is both Hereſy and Nonſenſe. Is the above Quotation either Senſe or Orthodox? If it be Senſe, I ſhould eſteem it *Sabellianiſm*. But, whatſoever elſe it may be, I am ſure of this, that it is totally inconſiſtent with his Notion of the Trinity as laid down in the other Part of his Vindication, and (which is all I want to obſerve) that he has been led into this remarkable Inconſiſtence with himſelf, by ſuppoſing ſome Paſſages of Scripture to refer to the Dignity of Chriſt in a *prior* State of Exiſtence, which refer only to his Office on *Earth*.

Dr. *South*, from the like Miſtake, repreſents Chriſt as *literally* and locally deſcending from Heaven, yea, and actually parting from ſome Bliſs and Glory, he before enjoyed,

That God operated and manifeſted himſelf to the World, in the *Fleſh*, by the Man Chriſt Jeſus?

R

enjoyed, as if the Divinity could do this. His Words are, "The ſecond Thing to be conſidered is the State or "Condition *from which* Chriſt came and that was from the "Boſom of the Father, *from* the incomprehenſible ſur-"priſing Glories of the Godhead, *from* an eternal Enjoy-"ment of an abſolute uninterrupted Bliſs and Pleaſure in "the mutual ineffable Intercourſe betwixt him and his "Father." This ſhocking and contradictory Repreſentation of the Divinity is owing to the Doctor's abſurd Interpretation of that Expreſſion uſed by St. *John*, viz. *Who was in the Boſom of the Father*.

In another Place, this Author has thus obnoxiouſly expreſſed himſelf concerning the Divinity, "And yet this "wonderful Almighty Perſon, whom the whole World "could not circumſcribe by reaſon of the Divinity and "Immenſity of his Being, had not ſo much in the ſame "World as where to lay his Head by reaſon of the *Mean-"neſs* of his Condition." It is certainly very abſurd to ſpeak of Chriſt as *God*, and yet to ſay, that he had not where to lay his Head. It was the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus that had not where to lay his Head. All ſuch Deſcriptions given of him by the Evangeliſt muſt have a Reference to his *Manhood* only; And can any Thing be more ridiculous than to ſpeak of the *Meanneſs* of the Condition of Almighty God? The Divinity is unchangeable in his Perfections, and his Bleſſedneſs ſuffered no diminution when he manifeſted himſelf to the World in the Fleſh.

Jeſus? That what he ſpake was not of himſelf but was the *Word* (Logos) of God, who dwelt in him, and no *other* Being whatſoever?

CHAP. xvi. 5. *He ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf; but whatſoever he ſhall hear that ſhall he ſpeak.*

14. *He ſhall glorify me, for he ſhall receive of mine and ſhall ſhew it unto you.*

15. *All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore ſaid I that he ſhall take of mine and ſhall ſhew it unto you.*

THIS Paſſage of Scripture plainly proves, that both what Chriſt and what the Spirit wrought was *all of God.* It was *One* and the *ſame* Being, *viz.* God, that operated by theſe Agents. Chriſt ſaith indeed, that the Spirit ſhould take of *His*; but then he explains himſelf

ſelf thus, *viz.* that what the Spirit ſhould take of him was the *Father*'s alſo. All therefore was of God. We may ſay, with Propriety enough, of theſe three *Perſons*, that the Father ſent the Son, and the Son ſent the Spirit upon his Apoſtles, and the Spirit ſanctified them; but the Effects proceeded not from theſe *Perſons*, as from three diſtinct and *ſeparate* Beings, either three *Gods* or any of them *leſs* than God, but they proceeded from one and the ſame Principle or efficient Cauſe, even from *One* God.

CHAP. xvii. 5. *And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own ſelf, with the Glory which I had with thee before the World was.*

THE *Arians* ſuppoſe, that Chriſt here prays the Father to raiſe him to the very ſame Dignity he had in his pre-exiſtent State in Heaven, *viz.* the greateſt, except that of the Father

Father himſelf. But, in all this Prayer to his Father, it is very evident, that our Saviour ſpeaks of himſelf as the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, who was to receive the Reward of his Obedience, the Glory which ſhould ſucceed his Sufferings and Death, Glory which is repreſented indeed as *appointed* from the Foundation of the World, but as nevertheleſs conſequent upon and *ſubſequent* to his ſuffering on Earth. It was to be conferred upon him, as *Man*, and for having glorified God on the Earth. *I Have glorified thee on the Earth; I have finiſhed the Work which thou gaveſt to me do. And now, O Father, glorify, &c.* This therefore doth not ſuppoſe him to have exiſted *another* and *different Being* from God in a State prior to this, in which State he had all the Glory that was conferred on him after his Humiliation. For how could it then be conſidered as a Reward for his Sufferings, or as merited by his Obedience?

dience? A Reward implies an *additional* Glory or Happineſs to what one had before. But, if we conſider this Glory as appointed from the Beginning for, and conferred in the Fulneſs of Time on him as *Man*, then we may have very clear and conſiſtent Notions of his Exaltation at the right Hand of God, of his being entered into his Reſt and Glory, of his being conſtituted the Head of the Church, of his coming again to judge the World, and of his being appointed to this high Office, becauſe he is the Son of *Man*. In this View, we acknowledge him a perfect *Man*, who died for us, without derogating from that Divine Nature and *perfect* Godhead, which was manifeſted by miraculous Operations.

CHAP. XX. 21. *As my Father hath ſent me, even ſo ſend I you.* 22. *And when he had ſaid this, he breathed on them and ſaith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt.*

FROM

FROM theſe Words (as above xvi. 13.) It is alſo very plain in what *Senſe* our Saviour was the *Word*. This Title doth not import, that he is a ſelf-exiſtent, independent, infinite, eternal Being, *ſeparate* and diſtinct from God, (which would import, that there were more Gods than *One*) nor that he exiſted, before his Miſſion, *dependent* indeed upon, but *next* in Dignity to *God*; but it imports, that God dwelt in, and gave us the *Goſpel* or *Word* by him. *God* is the *Word*. *It* is of the higheſt Extraction, even from the greateſt of *all* Beings. But as *He* ſent, and ſpake by, this *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, ſo *He*, God (the very *ſame* Being that created us and all Things) is our *Redeemer* and *Saviour*. The Redeemer and Saviour of the World, therefore, is not a diſtinct Being from God; but is *very God*; and ſo alſo is the *Comforter*, or Sanctifier of the World, the *Holy Ghoſt*, the Spirit of Truth, con-

conſidered as an *efficient* Cauſe, which, in its Effects, is repreſented here as *proceeding* forth, more immediately, from Chriſt, upon his Apoſtles. It is the ſame Being which operates in *them*, and makes *them* alſo *Sons* of God. As the Spirit, however, is not communicated to them but by the Interceſſion of Chriſt Jeſus, ſo he is at the Head. The Father has given *all* to him. He is therefore *the* Son of God, by way of Eminence, the *only* Son of God, being placed above all. He is conſtituted Head and Governor of the Church univerſal. All Gifts and Graces are beſtowed upon it in *his* Name, that all, even the Apoſtles themſelves, ſhould honour *him* as they honour the Father.

APPLI-

APPLICATION.

FROM the foregoing Quotations of Scripture in ſupport of the Interpretation of our Text, theſe doctrinal Points are inferred.

I. THAT *God* is the *original* Author of our Redemption.

II. THAT he has placed the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus at the Head of his Church, and given him *all* Power in Heaven and Earth, that *all* Men ſhould honour the Son as they honour the Father.

III. THAT

III. THAT there is but *One* God, our Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier. The God that *created* us is the ſame that *redeemed* us, and He that redeemed us is the ſame that *ſanctifies* us. He ſpake, firſt, by the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, to the World, his Goſpel of Grace: Afterwards, at the Interceſſion of the ſame, He ſpake by the *Apoſtles*, who preached Chriſt and planted his Doctrine in the World: And He continues to ſpeak unto us by his *Word* written, as he did at the firſt by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

IV. THEIR Explication of the *Trinitarian* Doctrine is unſcriptural, who aſſert*, that there are *Three* infinite, eternal, ſelf-exiſtent *Beings*, as diſtinct from each other, as *Three* Men are.

FOR this is to ſuppoſe *Three* Gods; each being aſſerted to be *diſtinctly a* God. Whereas

S the

* Dr *Sherlock* has aſſerted this. See Note p. 86. And the numerous Tribe of his Defenders, though all of them in a much more *cautious* Manner than the Doctor.

the Scripture ſays, there is but *One* God; which God, and no *other*, ſpake by his Son Chriſt Jeſus, being manifeſted in the *Fleſh*.

V. The Doctrine of *Arius* is unſcriptural, who held the Goſpel to have been given, or, at leaſt, to have been miniſtred to us by a Being *leſs* than God, but *greater* than any other.

For we have ſeen that no *ſuch* Being is aſſerted by the Evangeliſt to have been commiſſioned of God and ſent into the World from Heaven. He that was ſent into the World was *Man*, the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus; and this *Man* aſſerts over and over again, that *God*, and no *other inferior* Being, dwelt in him; and that He and the Father are *therefore* One.

As for thoſe, who are called *Socinians*, if they mean to repreſent our Saviour Chriſt as

a

a *mere* Man, and one in whom *God* did not ſpeak, but who ſpake and wrought by his own *Human* Spirit, and of his own Power as a Man, or who was taught of God but *partially*, as *Moſes* and the other Prophets, receiving the Spirit by *meaſure* only; the former Repreſentation of him is too abſurd to inſiſt upon, ſince, as *Nicodemus* ſaid to our Saviour, no Man could do theſe Works except God were with him. The latter, though far more rational and plauſible than the *Arian Doctrine*, and more conſiſtent with juſt Criticiſm on the *peculiar* Language of the New Teſtament, yet is certainly ſhort of thoſe Repreſentations of his Power, Doctrine, and Authority, which have been produced in the foregoing Quotations.

VI. FROM hence we may ſee how unjuſtly the Church of *England* has been charged with *Polytheiſm.*

FOR ſhe aſſerts the *Unity* of God in *expreſs* Terms. She makes not the Father and the Son to be *two Gods,* by repreſenting them as *different* Beings, each of *perfectly* divine Nature. She allows of no diſtinction or difference in their *divine* Nature and Eſſence, but only as to the *human* Nature of Chriſt. By *this alone* is he diſtinguiſhed from God, and not by any *divine* Nature *inferior* to that of God. One and the *ſame Divinity* was the Author of all that which our Evangeliſt has related as coming to paſs through the Mediation of Chriſt Jeſus. The *Word* which he publiſhed he ſpake not of *himſelf*; it was the Word of *God.* The *Works* which he wrought, were not

not wrought by the Power of Humanity, but by a Power *perfectly* divine, even by *God* himſelf and no *other* Being. Thoſe, that charge the Church of *England* with not holding the Doctrine of *One God*, miſrepreſent her Meaning, to ſay the leaſt of them. And indeed, how unhappily ſoever this Doctrine be expreſſed in *one* of her Creeds, yet, conſidering that even *there* the Doctrine of the *Unity* of God is expreſsly aſſerted, and the contrary as expreſsly denied, one can hardly be ſo charitable as to ſuppoſe, that ſuch Miſrepreſentation of her Meaning doth not ſometimes proceed from a Want of Charity.

VII. The laſt Inference from what has been ſaid, (and for the Sake of which it has been ſaid) is this; How high a Value we ſhould ſet upon a Religion whoſe Extraction is from *God* himſelf.

God did at ſundry Times indeed and in divers Manners ſpeak to the Fathers by his Prophets.

phets. But to us He ſpeaketh by his own Son Chriſt Jeſus, from *Heaven.* He is the *Light* of the *World*, directing *all* Men in the Way of Life. The Lights which ſhone, before this Sun of Righteouſneſs aroſe, were faint and glimmering, affording but Glances, as it were, into the celeſtial Regions, but, the *Light*, which hath beamed on us, ſhineth with a *full* and ſteady Luſtre, irradiating the *heavenly* World, and diſcovering the *Things* thereof to mortal Inſpection. The Vail, which for ages intercepted *them* from the View of the moſt enlightened of the human Race, hath Chriſt removed. He has ſhewn us the Father himſelf, whom the World knew not, cloathed not with Vengeance and rigorous Juſtice, but ſeated on a Throne of Grace and ſurrounded with Love and Mercy. At his Expiration on the Croſs, the Vail of the Temple was rent in twain from top to bottom; no longer, as it were, ſhading

from

from the Eyes of guilty Creatures the Mercy-ſeat of the moſt High, but dividing to diſplay the Riches of his Grace and afford Acceſs; that all may come boldly to the Throne of Grace, and, caſting off that fear of Death and Condemnation, which the Law and Sin had raiſed in them, may take of the Gift of Life freely.

Jesus, the Son of the moſt high God, has purchaſed this Gift for us of his Father, not *redeemable with corruptible Things as Silver and Gold, but with the precious Blood of himſelf, as of a Lamb without Blemiſh and without Spot.* Eternal Life is the Gift of *God* to us *through* Jeſus Chriſt, our Lord. It is the Gift of *God.* To *Him* we are indebted for it. For in *Him* was *that Life which was the Light of the World.* But, that He might endear it to us, and that we might

not

not want a Senſe of its ineſtimable Worth, He has beſtowed it in a Way the moſt ſuitable to our Natures, and the beſt adapted to work upon the Ingenuity of the human Heart. For this Purpoſe, while the Gift comes *freely* to us and without any *Purchaſe* on our Parts, He has graciouſly, and in great Wiſdom, appointed, that we ſhould receive it at the Hands of a *Mediator*, at the Hands of one who partook of *our* Natures, at the Hands of the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, who was in all Things tempted like us and yet yielded not to Sin, whoſe Obedience to the Will of God, even to extreme Suffering of Pain, Infamy and Death itſelf, might be ever before us. This Man did God ordain to be his *Word* to Men and to give *Life* to the World; One whoſe *perfect Obedience* might ſhew us what *only* was meritorious with God, and what is the moſt acceptable Service that we can ren-

der

der him; One, whoſe painful Sufferings for our Sake might for ever endear him to us, and be ſtampt on our Minds, as indelible Characters of his perfect good Will towards us; and One, whoſe Reſurrection to Life and Glory we might contemplate, both as the ſure Pledge of *our* Reſurrection, and as the happy Conſequence of his Love to the human Race, in laying down his Life for us, finiſhing and compleating the Work of Redemption by the Death of himſelf, that we through him might live.

But, *where* (will any one now ask?) is this Gift of eternal Life? *Who* among the Sons of *Adam* is poſſeſſed of it? Are not all mortal? Do they not all die? Yes; It is appointed to all *his* Sons once to die. But, we

T are

are the Sons of *God*. We are of the *ſecond Adam* over whom Death had not Power, to hold him in the Grave. Through *Him* we are paſſed from Death unto Life. Do you ask *where* this Gift of *God* is? The *Goſpel* of Chriſt, even *this*, is our Life. *The* Words *which he ſpeaks unto us*, they *are Spirit and* they *are Life*. *This* is our Pledge of Immortality. *This* is the grand Charter, if I may ſo expreſs myſelf, of our ſpiritual Liberty, containing our Privileges as the Sons of God. If we abide firm by *this*, our Title to Life is clear and undoubted. But, if we neglect and diſuſe it, Satan, ever on the Watch to regain his Dominion over us, will inſinuate himſelf into Power, make gradual Encroachments on our Liberty, and enſlave us again to Sin and Death. Let us be jealous of the leaſt Infringement of our immortal

Privi-

Priviledges. If we think no Care and Caution too great in ſecuring our Property on Earth, we ſhould not, in all Reaſon, uſe leſs in ſupporting our Claim to an Inheritance in Heaven. Let us think how abſurd it is to boaſt ſo hot a Zeal for our civil Liberty, that, in Defence thereof, we are ready to reſiſt even unto Blood, while we can tamely reſign up that Liberty of the Soul, wherewith Chriſt has made us free, ſuffer ourſelves to be disfranchiſed of our Citizenſhip in Heaven, and ſerve, in the heavy and diſgraceful Chains of Sin and Vice, the Prince of Darkneſs. If we would aſſert true Liberty, let us follow Chriſt our Head. He will lead us on ſucceſsfully againſt all the Powers of Darkneſs, and conduct us unhurt through the fiery Darts of the wicked One, to that bleſſed Country, where, in his Service, we ſhall be

ſecure from all Oppreſſion. For his Service is perfect Freedom, and we ſhall have our Fruit unto *Life*, the Gift of *God through* Jeſus Chriſt, our Lord.

THE

THE

DIVINITY

OF THE

HOLY-GHOST.

1 Cor. XII. 4, 5, 6.

Now there are Diverſities of Gifts but the ſame Spirit.

And there are Differences of Adminiſtrations, but the ſame Lord.

And there are Diverſities of Operations, but it is the ſame God which worketh all in all.

ALMIGHTY God, in Condeſcenſion to our Nature and utter Incapacity of knowing any Thing but by the Inlet of *Senſe*, hath

hath been pleaſed to manifeſt himſelf to us by *ſenſible* Repreſentations. This Method of Revelation, though the only one by which ſuch Creatures, as we are, could poſſibly arrive at the Knowledge of their Maker, hath become the Occaſion of various Opinions, and (what is more to be regretted) of much Strife and ſharp Litigation concerning the *Divine Eſſence*. Thoſe, who were left to trace the Divinity in the *natural* Manifeſtation of himſelf, (if I may ſo call the Works of Creation and Providence) wanted not Evidence, and accordingly did acknowledge the Exiſtence of ſome ſuperior Intelligence and Agency to that of Man. But we are not ignorant of the Effect, which the Variety of the Works of Nature, by which God manifeſted himſelf to the World, had upon the Fancy and Imagination of the Generality of Mankind. They ſoon made unto themſelves Gods, *of the Like-*

neſs

neſs of every Thing, both in Heaven and on the Earth, and in the Waters under the Earth.

THE World muſt have continued under this groſs Deluſion, and, in conſequence of it, their corrupt Practices, but for the Proviſion of God, as well in the *Jewiſh* Oeconomy, as in that more univerſal one of the Goſpel-Diſpenſation, in which the Almighty manifeſted himſelf by his *Son* in the Fleſh, and the *Holy Ghoſt* viſibly ſhed on the Apoſtles. But, though we are told, that God was reconciling the World unto himſelf by this Method, and are called, both by our Lord and his Apoſtles, to the Knowledge of the *One* only living and true God, our Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier, yet the *ſenſible* Repreſentation of the Divinity in this *threefold* View has induced ſome to think and hold as a neceſſary Article of Faith, " That *two other* Beings beſides

" God, of finite, though very exalted Natures,
" were manifeſted to the World, and claim
" a ſubordinate Veneration from us."

HAVING already proved the Divinity of our *Saviour*, or, that He that redeemed us in the *Perſon* of Jeſus Chriſt was *true* and *very* God, not a *mere* Man, nor any *created* Being of ever ſo great Excellence and Pre-eminence above Mortals, it remains to be ſhewn, that the *Holy Ghoſt* is not a diſtinct and *ſeparate* Being from God, of an *inferior* Nature both to the Father and the Son, but of *One* and the ſame eternal Eſſence, truly and *perfectly Divine*.

THE Words of my Text appear to me ſo expreſs a Teſtimony hereof, that I could almoſt think it unneceſſary, to do more for your Conviction than repeat them to you. *There are Diverſities of Gifts but the* ſame *Spirit*;

Spirit; and there are Differences of Adminiſtrations, but the ſame *Lord; and there are Diverſities of Operations, but it is the* ſame *God which worketh all in all.* It is the *ſame* God which worketh all in all! Theſe Gifts therefore, which the Apoſtles and firſt Chriſtians received, were not the Gifts of any *other* Being than the moſt *High God.* The *Gifts* themſelves are repreſented by the Apoſtle as *various*, of different degrees of Efficacy, and ſerving to ſeveral ſeparate Ends relative to the Propagation of the Goſpel; but the *Being* from whom they proceed, he aſſerts, at the eleventh Verſe of this Chapter, to be *One* and the ſame *undivided* Eſſence. *To one*, ſays he, *is given by the* Spirit *the Word of Wiſdom; to another, the Word of Knowledge by the* ſame *Spirit; to another, Faith by the* ſame *Spirit, to another, the Gifts of Healing by the* ſame *Spirit, to another, the working of Miracles; to another, Prophecy; to another, diſcerning of Spirits; to*

another, divers Kinds of Tongues; to another, the Interpretation of Tongues; But all theſe worketh that One and the ſelf ſame *Spirit, dividing to every Man ſeverally as he will.*

In my Text the ſame Operations, which are here attributed to the *Spirit*, are repreſented as the Operations of *God*. *There are Diverſities of Operations, but it is the* ſame God *which worketh all in all.* At the twenty eighth Verſe alſo of this Chapter, the *Perſon* from whom all theſe Gifts come, which are here ſaid to be the Gifts of the *Spirit*, is ſtiled *God*; and without Doubt or Controverſy from any Sect, the Title is underſtood of the *Moſt High*, true and *very* God. God *hath ſet ſome in the Church, firſt, Apoſtles, ſecondarily, Prophets, thirdly, Teachers, after that, Miracles; then Gifts of Healing, Helps, Governments, Diverſities of Tongues.* So that

theſe

theſe Gifts and Appointments, though in other Places repreſented as proceeding by Virtue of the Miniſtration peculiar to the *Holy Ghoſt*, are the Effects of *One* and the *ſame* Almighty Being or Eſſence.

In the firſt Chapter of St. *Luke*, at the thirty fifth Verſe, it is ſaid, Therefore *alſo that Holy Thing, which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the Son of* God. The Ground of this Title is given us in theſe Words, *The* Holy Ghoſt *ſhall come upon thee, and the Power of the* Higheſt *ſhall overſhadow thee*; *Therefore*, &c. The *Holy Ghoſt*, and the *Power of the Higheſt*, are equivalent Expreſſions; and, unleſs they were intended to repreſent the Power and Agency of the *Almighty* himſelf, they could not be made the Ground of our Saviour's Title, that he was the Son of *God*. If the *Holy Ghoſt* be a diſtinct Being from, and

inferior

inferior to God, with what Propriety could the Angel of the Lord announce to the Virgin *Mary* concerning that Holy Thing thus to be produced, that he ſhould be called the Son of *God*, becauſe the *Holy Ghoſt* ſhould come upon her? For, on this Suppoſition, the very Reaſon given for Jeſus Chriſt being called the Son of *God* is inconſiſtent with his Title, he being the Son of *another* and *inferior* Being.

In the twelfth Chapter of St. *Matthew*, at the twenty eighth Verſe, our Lord, refuting the malicious Accuſation brought againſt him of caſting out Devils by *Beelzebub* the Prince of Devils, ſaith, *But if I caſt out Devils by the* Spirit of God, *then the Kingdom of* God *is come unto you.* Now, when he ſaith, *by the* Spirit *of God,* he doth not mean, that he caſt them out by the Power of ſome

Spirit

Spirit which had a diſtinct and *ſeparate* Exiſtence from God, and a Nature *inferior* to his. It is evident, he means to ſatisfy the *Jews*, that he had the Power of the *Moſt High*. And they themſelves were very well ſatisfied, that *God* and no *inferior* Spirit was with him, as appears by our Saviour's Intimation to them afterwards of the heinous Sin of *Blaſphemy* of which they ſtood convicted. For their Guilt of *Blaſphemy* lay in this, *viz.* In attributing that Power, which they were convinced in their own Minds and Conſciences to be the Power of *God alone*, to a wicked Agent. In ſpeaking againſt the *Spirit*, therefore, or *Holy Ghoſt*, this powerful Agent in the Redemption of the World, they ſpake againſt *God*, and blaſphemed not a *Creature* but the *Creator* himſelf.

And, that our Lord, when he aſſerts his caſting out Devils by the *Spirit* of God, ſpeaks not of any *inferior* Agency to that of the Almighty Ruler of the World, is further evident from the different Manner in which this divine Power is expreſſed in St. *Luke* on the ſame Occaſion. *But if I, with the* Finger of God, *caſt out Devils*, xi. 20. No other Being is intended by, *the Spirit of God*, than what is meant here, *viz.* *God* himſelf, who, operating in the Son of Man, made the Devils themſelves ſubject to him. They were caſt out by the Power of the *Moſt High*, and not by any *inferior* and *limited* Being.

It is not leſs plain, that the Blaſphemy againſt the *Holy Ghoſt*, charged by our Saviour upon the *Jews*, was Blaſphemy againſt the *Divine Being*, from that remarkable Inſtance

ſtance of a Sin againſt the *Holy Ghoſt*, in the fifth Chapter of *Acts* at the third Verſe. *But Peter ſaid, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine Heart to lie to the* Holy Ghoſt? A little below, the Apoſtle calls this ſame Perſon, *God. Thou haſt not lied unto Men but unto* God. The *Holy Ghoſt*, therefore, is here repreſented as being the ſame with *God*, and, though diſtinctly characterized, in his *Miniſtration*, from the Father and the Son, yet, throughout Scripture, is repreſented, in *Nature* or *Eſſence*, as *undivided*, being of *one* Subſtance, Power and Glory.

STEPHEN, when ſuffering under the Rage of *Jewiſh* Perſecution for the Sake of the new Faith, compares the Conduct of his Perſecutors with that of their Fathers in the following Terms. *Ye ſtiff necked and uncircumciſed in Heart and Ears, ye do always reſiſt the* Holy Ghoſt; *as your Fathers did, ſo do ye.* It was *One* and the ſame Being that they and

their Fathers reſiſted, even the God of *Abraham, Iſaac* and *Jacob.*

St. *Paul,* in the twentieth Chapter of *Acts,* at the twenty eighth Verſe, thus exhorteth his Fellow-Labourers in the Work of the Miniſtry; *Take heed therefore unto yourſelves and to all the Flock, over the which the* Holy Ghoſt *hath made you Overſeers, to feed the Church of* God. The *Holy Ghoſt* is here ſaid to have made them *Overſeers* of the Church; *viz.* The *ſame* Being, who is ſtiled *God,* at the twenty eighth Verſe of the Chapter in which is our Text, to whom the *ſame* Thing is aſcribed; *viz.* God *hath ſet ſome in the Church, firſt, Apoſtles, ſecondarily, Prophets, thirdly, Teachers.*

So alſo the *ſame* Being is repreſented as having ſpoken in the Prophets, in the New Teſtament, by the Name and Title of the *Holy Ghoſt*; but, in the Old, by the *Lord* or God.

God. Thus, in the twenty eighth Chapter of *Acts* at the twenty fifth Verſe, *Well ſpake the* Holy Ghoſt *by Eſaias the Prophet unto our Fathers, ſaying, Go unto this People and ſay, Hearing ye ſhall hear, and ſhall not underſtand.* But, in the Old Teſtament, from whence this Paſſage is quoted, the Commandment which the Prophet received is repreſented as coming from *God. I heard the Voice of the* Lord *ſaying*, &c. Iſa. vi. 8.

But the *perfect* Divinity of the *Holy Ghoſt* in Eſſence and Attributes, is very particularly teſtified by the Apoſtle, in the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, the ſecond Chapter. The Demonſtration of the Spirit and of Power he calls, the Power of *God*, oppoſing it to the Wiſdom and Power of *Men. My Speech and my Preaching was not with enticing Words of* Man's *Wiſdom, but in Demonſtration of the*

Spirit, *and of Power*; *that your Faith ſhould not ſtand in the Wiſdom of* Men, *but in the Power of* God. And, at the tenth Verſe, he attributes to the *Spirit* the Knowledge of thoſe Things which had been hid not only from Mortals but the Angels themſelves; even, that hidden *Myſtery*, which ſuperior Spirits deſired to look into, but were not able to comprehend by their *finite* Intelligence. The Counſels of the Divinity are too deep for aught *finite* and of a *limited* Nature to fathom. *Infinity* alone is commenſurate (if I may ſo ſpeak) therewith. But the *Spirit*, the Apoſtle aſſerts, is ſufficient for this. *God hath revealed them unto us by his* Spirit, *for the* Spirit *ſearcheth* all Things, *yea, the deep Things of* God. This he repreſents to be as eſſential to the Nature of the *Divinity*, as intimate and perfectly acquainted with the Will of God and of Chriſt, as the Spirit of a Man is eſſential to

the

the *human* Nature and conſcious of every Tranſaction and Purpoſe of the Mind. *For what* Man *knoweth the Things of a* Man, *ſave the* Spirit *of Man which is in him? Even ſo the Things of* God *knoweth no Man, but the* Spirit *of God.*

ALTHOUGH the *Holy Ghoſt* or *Spirit*, therefore, be frequently characterized as a *Perſon* diſtinct from the *Perſon* of the Father and the Son, yet, we ſee, He is not to be conſidered as exiſting a *ſeparate* Being from God, of a Nature *inferior* or different, but the "*ſame* "in Subſtance; the Glory equal; the Majeſty "co-eternal."

INSTEAD of adducing more Paſſages in ſupport of this great Doctrine of the Unity of the Godhead and *divine* Agency of the *Spirit*, (which, I would hope, muſt now appear

pear unneceſſary,) I ſhall proceed to conſider briefly the Ground of the *Arian* Doctrine on this Head.

Those who hold the *Spirit* or Holy Ghoſt, to have a *ſeparate* Exiſtence from, and to be *inferior* to the Father Almighty, ſeem to me to be led into this Error by not diſtinguiſhing between the *Manifeſtation* of the Spirit and the Spirit *itſelf*, or, between the *Effect* and the *Efficient* Cauſe. In arguing for the Finiteneſs and limited Nature of the *Holy Ghoſt*, they ſeem to confine their Ideas to thoſe *Appearances* of it, which were given for the Information of the Senſes; ſome *ſenſible* Repreſentations being neceſſary (as I have already obſerved) to convey to us the Knowledge of Things *ſpiritual* and inviſible. But we are not to judge of its *Nature* and Eſſence by Senſe, ſo as to meaſure what is *ſpiritual* and

no

no Way an object of our Senſes by *that* which may be comprehended thereby. For thus we ſhould limit and circumſcribe the Deity, as the Heathens did, by our finite Ideas of his Works.

THE *Holy Ghoſt* was viſibly ſhed on the Apoſtles. The Repreſentation was *ſenſible*. *That*, which was an Object of *Senſe*, diſtinguiſhable to mortal Sight by Shape and Colour and to the Ear by Sound, as of a ruſhing Wind, was, no doubt, *finite* and circumſcribed. But the *Being* or *Principle*, from whence this Manifeſtation proceeded, is *infinite*, and uncircumſcribed, pervading Immenſity itſelf, preſent to all Things both viſible and inviſible, *ſearching even the deep Things of God*.

When we argue for the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, we would be underſtood to aſſert it, not of any *Degree* of Power, or Wiſdom, or Knowledge, conveyed to the Apoſtles and firſt Converts, but of the inviſible *Principle* from whence theſe extraordinary Gifts were derived. And, that this Principle is, in *Eſſence*, truly and perfectly divine, even *One* with God the Father of all, is plain from hence, that the *Father gave* the *Holy Ghoſt*, that is, the mighty Power which fell on the Apoſtles and all that believed, at the Interceſſion of the Son. *I will pray the Father, and* He *ſhall give you another Comforter that may abide with you for ever; even the* Spirit *of Truth.* John xiv. 16. And again, at the twenty ſixth Verſe of the ſame Chapter, *But when the* Comforter *is come, whom I will ſend to you,* from *the* Father, *even the* Spirit *of Truth, which* proceedeth from *the Father, He ſhall teſtify of me.* So that the

Spirit

Spirit itſelf, under whatever Character it is repreſented, whether as a Witneſs to the Son, as a Guide to Truth, or a Comforter in the Day of Trial and Temptation, is of the Eſſence of *God*, the Father Almighty. For though, as the Apoſtle expreſſeth it, *the* Manifeſtation *of the Spirit is given to profit withall, whether it be Wiſdom, Knowledge, Faith, Prophecy, Miracles, the Gifts of Healing or divers Kinds of Tongues, it is the* ſame God *which worketh all in all.*

Wherefore, with the Apoſtle, and on the Authority of ſacred Scripture in the univerſal Tenor thereof, let us aſcribe all that which hath been done for us, reſpecting the grand Work of Redemption, to the *One* God, manifeſting himſelf to the World by his Son, in the *Fleſh*, as well as by Demonſtration of the *Spirit* and Power. This is that *Catholick*

Faith, which was firſt delivered to the Saints by the holy Apoſtles, and which, it hath been the conſtant Endeavour of our Church, to maintain, and preſerve pure and uncorrupted, amidſt the Variety of Opinions and novel Doctrines, which, claſhing no leſs one with another than with the primitive Faith, have been attended with ſuch unhappy Conſequences to Religion, and ſo much Diſturbance of the Peace and Quiet of the Church. But, however great has been the Oppoſition which true and genuine Chriſtianity has met with, as well from the Quarters of *Deiſm*, as from the impertinent Zeal of *Fanaticiſm*, the Foundations of it have been preſerved ſafe and entire by that Almighty *Spirit*, which has never deſerted the Church of Chriſt under all her Trials and Temptations, beaming upon Her, through the Miſts of Error and Corruption, thoſe Rays of Truth and divine

Comfort

Comfort, which have kept Her in the right Way, and cauſeth Her to rejoice, though yet militant againſt the Errors and Vices of Mankind. Let us purſue the ſame heavenly Light, which ſhines upon this reformed Church with great Splendour, *not toſſed to and fro with every Wind of Doctrine*, but ſearching the Scriptures, the infallible Dictate of the *Spirit* of God, who alone is able to preſerve us from Error to perfect his Saints, and to bring us *in the Unity of the Faith and of the Knowledge of his Son, unto a perfect Man, unto the Meaſure of the Stature of the Fulneſs of Chriſt.*

Now to the One *God, our* Creator, Redeemer *and* Sanctifier, *be aſcribed everlaſting Praiſe. Amen.*

THE HUMAN NATURE OF JESUS CHRIST, CONSIDERED.

1 Tim. II. 5.

For there is One God, and one Mediator between God and Men; the Man Christ Jesus.

WE need not wonder, that Mankind, left to trace the Divinity in his Works of Creation and Providence, by their *natural* Powers alone, were involved in much Error and

and Confuſion. Indeed, all Nations ſeem to have embraced this general Truth, That there is an inviſible Power governing the World and diſpoſing Events according to Laws uncontroulable by Mortals. God has, in no Age, left his reaſonable Creatures without Witneſs of his Exiſtence. Notwithſtanding, if we reflect on the Weakneſs of human Nature, and on the great Diverſity of Men's Circumſtances and Conditions in Life, which are ſo many different Mediums through which Objects are viewed, it cannot appear ſtrange, that their Notions of the Divinity were very imperfect and very different. Every Country, every City, almoſt every Family, had its peculiar Deities.

The Almighty Ruler of the World, who beſt knows how and when to ſuit his Diſpenſations to the Circumſtances and Neceſſi-

ties

ties of his Creatures, was pleaſed to make himſelf known by a ſupernatural Diſplay of Power to the *Jews firſt*. Them he ſeparated from the Families of the Earth, and united in the Worſhip of *One* God. Afterwards, in the Fulneſs of Time, he manifeſted himſelf to the Gentile World in the *Fleſh*, that is, by the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus. For in *Him* were *all* Nations to be bleſſed with the Knowledge of the true God. The middle Wall of Partition, no longer neceſſary to confine to one Spot the true Faith, now too firmly rooted to be ſhaken by the Powers of Idolatry, was to be broken down, that God might become the Confidence of the Ends of the Earth.

THE uniting all Mankind in *One* Faith, and cementing, as it were, into one Body, of which Chriſt is the Head, all the Parts of the human Race, prepared and fitly framed by the Goſpel for this bleſſed Union, is a Subject

of Contemplation, which fills the Mind with the grandeſt Idea of divine Grace and Munificence. And, at the ſame Time that the Means of our Redemption are truly aſtoniſhing, and appear too magnificent a Diſplay to bear any Proportion to ſuch worthleſs Objects of it, as we are, yet, when we conſider the Plan in this extenſive View, as comprehending a whole Syſtem of reaſonable Beings to be united at laſt, by *one* common Faith, into *one* common Cauſe of Truth and Virtue, the Means muſt appear not more extraordinary than neceſſary to ſo great an End.

But, if this was the Deſign of Providence in the two grand Diſpenſations of the Law and the Goſpel, how are we to account for it, that there ſhould ſtill be ſuch a Difference of Opinion in Matters of Faith? We profeſs the ſame Religion, and yet we are ever at

Vari-

Variance about it. We break and divide into ſo many Sects and Parties, and maintain them with ſo hot a Zeal, that it could not be known from our *Conduct*, that we belong to *One* Maſter, or, that he hath delivered but *One* Syſtem of Faith to his Diſciples. The Truth is, Chriſtians are but Men; and the Infirmities of human Nature will betray themſelves under the moſt perfect Diſpenſation. The Effects of Religion on the *Underſtanding*, as well as on the Heart, operating in the ordinary Way, muſt be gradual. This is the Method of divine Providence in the natural as well as in the moral World. For, as the *outward* Frame and Conſtitution of Things was produced by a *ſupernatural* Exertion of Power, ſtanding forth inſtantaneouſly on the Command of the Creator, ſo was the *ſpiritual* Conſtitution (if I may ſo expreſs myſelf) of

this World effected, indeed, by a *miraculous* Exertion of Power. But, both Conſtitutions being once ſettled, the Ends of both are carried on according to the *natural* or ordinary Methods of Providence. God has created all Things anew in Chriſt Jeſus. But this new and ſpiritual Creation is ſtill under the Providence of God, governed by his good Spirit, which is ever exerciſed, not only to the Maintenance but to the Furtherance of the Faith. And we cannot well doubt, that the ſame Power, which hath already broken up the ſtrong Holds of Pagan Idolatry, is ſufficient to effect the Completion of the great Deſign of the Goſpel Revelation, which is, to bring *all* Men to the Acknowledgment of the true Faith, *That there is but* One *God, and* One *Mediator between God and Men, the* Man *Chriſt Jeſus.*

It is the laſt of theſe Poſitions which I propoſe to illuſtrate, the former having been already conſidered in the preceding Lectures. Our Mediator, it is aſſerted in the Text, was *Man*, ανθρωπος χριστος Ιησους, the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus. The *perfect Humanity* of Chriſt is as eſſential and fundamental an Article of our Faith, as that it was *God* himſelf, the *perfect* Divinity, who wrought and was manifeſt in Him. If we admit the Suppoſition, that he was not *really* and *truly* Man, but a Being of a *ſuperior*, though *limited* Nature, reſiding only in a human *Body* *, we can have no con-

* The *Arians* for the moſt Part ſcruple not to deny that *Jeſus Chriſt* had an *human Nature*, or was really and truly *Man*. But the more acute of them are too ſenſible of the Difficulties with which ſuch a Notion is attended, to avow it in expreſs Terms. Dr. *Nicol Scot*, in his Sermon on the Scripture Doctrine of the Incarnation, is at great Pains to reconcile the direct Aſſertions which occur in

conſiſtent Idea of the Account given us, either of the *Incarnation*, or of the *Mediatorial* Office of the Son of God.

I. FIRST,

in Scripture, of the Humanity of Jeſus Chriſt, with the *Arian* Hypotheſis of his being a Divinity dependent on God the Father. This, however, is not to be done without ſuch a Fetch from the Sound of Words, as is unworthy of, and very unuſual with this fair Writer, and manly Defender of our common Chriſtianity. "Should we "conſider, ſays he, the true Standard, or Definition of "the *Human Species*, we ſhall find a *Man* to be one "ſingle Spirit or intelligent Agent, animating a Body of "the ſame Form and Make with our's; and conſequent-"ly, were it the Will of God, that any Spirit, or intel-"ligent Agent whatever, ſhould animate a Body of the "ſame Form and Make with our's, he would become "a *Man*." But is this the true Standard and Definition of the *Human Species?* Is the *outward* Frame and Make of Man that which principally characterizeth and diſtinguiſheth our Species in the Scale of animated Beings? Is it by *this alone* we differ from the Brutes? If ANY Spirit *whatever*, animating a Body of the ſame Form and Make with our's, becomes a *Man*, then the Spirit of a Beaſt ſo circumſtanced would become a *Man*. This Author however

1. FIRST, for the Incarnation.

HE was born of a Woman, being conceiv-ed of the Holy Ghoſt; in other Words, the Power of the *moſt High* overſhadowing the Virgin.

ever in ſaying, *or intelligent Agent*, might mean only, that any *ſuperior* Spirits whatever, animating human Bodies, would become Men. Be this the Meaning, it may ſtill be aſked, Whether there be not eſſential Differences among thoſe intelligent Agents, in their Natures, conſtituting as diſtinct Species, as the Human Species is diſtinct from the Brute? If there are, (and that there are not, who will venture to aſſert?) then let us ſuppoſe two of theſe Spirits or intelligent Agents, very different in Nature, but, at the Will of God, animating each a Body of the ſame Form and Make, would this Sameneſs of external Form level their *Natures?* Would they not ſtill be, tho' in outward Appearance alike, Beings of a different Species? In ſhort, however difficult it may be to define the *Human Species*, yet it is very obvious, that the *Nature* or *Kind* of the Spirit, which animates, ought to be conſidered as well as the Form or Make of that, which is animated. And if Jeſus Chriſt, after his Incarnation, had not a *human* Spirit as well as a human Body, but one of a much ſuperior *Nature*, he could not, according to the Idea we have of Humanity, be *really* and *truly* a MAN.

Virgin. Now, I would aſk, is this Account of the Conception and Birth of Jeſus Chriſt at all conſiſtent with the Suppoſition, that, before this, He exiſted a diſtinct and *ſeparate* Being from, and *inferior* to God alone? Was it an *Angel* of a very exalted Dignity, even next to that of God himſelf, that was thus conceived of the Holy Ghoſt and born of a Woman? Was it not a *real* Child, but ſome angelic Being, of whom it is ſaid, *Ye ſhall find the* Babe *wrapped in ſwaddling Cloaths, lying in a Manger?* And again, *When eight Days were accompliſhed for the circumciſing of the* Child, *his Name was called, Jeſus?* Whom alſo his Parents, it is ſaid, *brought to Jeruſalem, to preſent him to the Lord, as it is written,* "Every *Male* that openeth the "Womb ſhall be called holy to the Lord?" For whom *they offered a Sacrifice according to that which is ſaid in the Law,* "A Pair of "Turtle

" Turtle Doves or two young Pidgeons ?", In ſhort, for whom *they performed all things, according to the Law of the Lord,* reſpecting the firſt born of *Male Children?* Luke ii. 12. & ſeq.

It is further ſaid, in the above-mentioned Chapter, that *the* Child *grew and waxed ſtrong in Spirit, filled with Wiſdom; and the Grace of God was upon him*; That, at twelve Years of Age, he *went up with his Parents to Jeruſalem, after the Cuſtom of the Feaſt*; *and the* Child (ſo he is again called) *tarried behind, and after three Days was found in the Temple, ſitting in the midſt of the Doctors, both hearing and asking Queſtions*; That from thence he *went down with his Parents to Nazareth and was ſubject unto them, encreaſing in* Wiſdom, *and* Stature, *and in* Favour *with God and Man.* Doth not the Evangeliſt, in this Deſcription, mark to us the natural Growth

and Progreſs of *Humanity?* The gradual, though, in this Inſtance, great Expanſion of the Faculties of *Mind* and *Body?* "of the reaſon-"able Soul and human Fleſh ſubſiſting?" When it is ſaid, *The Child grew*, can it be imagined, that the Evangeliſt would convey to us any other Idea than what we generally affix to thoſe Words? Or, that in ſaying, *The Child waxed ſtrong in Spirit*, he meant not an *human* Spirit, but would have us underſtand him of the gradual Expanſion of the Faculties of an *angelick* Soul, yea, and that the firſt of all created Beings, only encloſed for a while within the narrow Limits of an infantine Body? The Inconſiſtency of ſuch a Suppoſition with the Evangeliſt's Account, is ſurely too glaring to need more Words to expoſe it.

II. Nor

II. Nor doth it better conſiſt with the Idea of Chriſt's *Mediatorial* Office. For,

1. How are we to underſtand his firſt Sufferings immediately after his Baptiſm? It would be forcing common Senſe itſelf, to ſuppoſe it not a *real Man*, but a Perſonage of a much more exalted Nature, that was afflicted with the Senſation of extreme Hunger, that he might be induced to abuſe and miſapply the divine Power, of which he found himſelf poſſeſſed. As unnatural is it to ſuppoſe, that all the Glory of this terreſtrial Globe was preſented as a *Temptation* to One, who was of a Nature ſo far ſurpaſſing not only that of Men, but of Angels and all created Beings whatever. The Proſpect, how dazzling ſoever to *human* Senſe, could not poſſibly be a Trial to ſuch a Being. This Scene of Temptation was adapted to the Infirmities

of

of the *human Nature* alone. The Motives preſented were ſuch as were trying to a *Man*, in the higheſt Degree, being addreſſed to thoſe natural Appetites and Paſſions, which have ſo powerful a Sway in the Determination of the human Mind, but are not ſuppoſed to influence ſuperior Spirits.

2. It is in reſpect of his *human* Nature, that our Saviour is ſet before us, as a Pattern for our Imitation. His whole Deportment through Life witneſſed a ſtrong Senſe of Duty to his Father, and an unremitted Exerciſe of benevolent Affections towards the human Race. And as he lived, ſo are we exhorted to live. For, in Piety and true Goodneſs, we are capable of imitating him; Nor are we called upon to do more than it is our Duty to do; more than *human* Nature is capable of; more than what we know he, as *Man*, did; when

we

we are exhorted to live as he lived, *doing Juſtice, loving Mercy, and walking humbly before God.* But conceive him, with regard to his Behaviour under thoſe Circumſtances, which to us are Trials of Integrity, to have had a Nature *different* from, and far *ſuperior* to Our's, and you can no longer conſider him, as exemplifying our Duty by his own Conduct, or derive from it Encouragement to hope forSucceſs in the likeTemptations aſſaulting our weaker Nature. We may, on this Suppoſition, admire and adore his vaſtly ſuperior Excellence; but we ſhall be ever diſcouraged in the purſuit of Virtue through Difficulties, that are looked upon to require more than human Nature to ſtruggle under, with any Hope of Succeſs.

As an Encouragement, therefore, to us in the Day of Temptation, he is repreſented in Scripture

Scripture as having the ſame Nature with us, ſubject to the like Temptations, with this Difference only, that he yielded not to Sin. *It became him* (ſays the Author to the *Hebrews*) *for whom are all Things, and by whom are all Things, in bringing many Sons unto Glory, to make the Captain of their Salvation perfect through* Suffering, Heb. ii. 10. And the Neceſſity of his appearing in our Nature, and not in the Nature of Angels, is thus illuſtrated by the ſame Writer, viz. *Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his* Brethren; *that he might be a merciful and faithful High-Prieſt in things pertaining to God, to make Reconciliation for the Sins of the People. For in that he himſelf hath ſuffered, being tempted, he is able to ſuccour them that are tempted,* Heb. ii. 17. This is a direct Teſtimony of the *perfect* Humanity of Chriſt Jeſus, conſidering him in his *Mediatorial* Office.

There

There is ſo far from being any Intimation of an *angelick* Nature, united to the *Human*, that the ſacred Writer oppoſeth this laſt to the former, inſiſting upon the perfect Sameneſs of his Nature with Our's, to the total Excluſion of any other, than that truly and perfectly Divine Nature, whereby he was rendered perfect in his Mediation.

3. It is in this reſpect, *viz.* the *Humanity* of Chriſt Jeſus, that we view him exalted at the right Hand of God, as the Reward of his perfect Obedience; a Reward, not *prior* (which it would be moſt Inconſiſtent to ſuppoſe) but *ſubſequent* to his Suffering in our Nature. For, if he was exalted to the Glory alone, which he had before, to that ſame Dignity, which he is ſuppoſed to have ever held *under* the Supreme Being, the Scriptures would not have ſet it forth to us as an Inſtance

ſtance of divine Juſtice, in rewarding that Virtue and Piety, which ſtood the Teſt of the ſevereſt Trials. His perfect Obedience, in that Caſe, would have met with no Reward peculiar to itſelf; Nor, would the Glory of his Aſſumption into Heaven, have encouraged his Diſciples to follow him through Tribulation and Diſtreſs, if they conſidered it not conferred on their Maſter as a *Reward* of his Fidelity in doing his Father's Will. For his Sufferings and Death, for the Sake of Truth, he was crowned with Glory, which he *had before* with his Father, being reſerved for him from the Foundation of the World, but which he *reaped not* till the Time appointed of the Father.

Jesus Chriſt, therefore, our Mediator, was perfect Man, of "a reaſonable Soul and human Fleſh ſubſiſting." This Doctrine is agreeable,

agreeable, we find, to the univerſal Tenour of ſacred Writ. It conſiſts with the Account given by the Evangeliſts of the *Incarnation*, with their Deſcription of Chriſt from his *Birth* to the Time of his public *Miniſtration*, with the Account of his whole *Deportment* from that Time, more particularly, under the Weight of *Suffering*; with the Account of his *Death*, *Reſurrection*, the Manifeſtation of himſelf afterwards, to *Thomas* more particularly, and his Aſſumption into Heaven, the *Reward* of his Suffering in our Nature. The whole Doctrine of the Atonement as laid down by the Apoſtles, goes on the ſame ſuppoſition, *viz*; That he was *truly* Man, whoſe Obedience as ſuch was perfect, and the infinite Merits of which gained him that high Preeminence, of being made a Prince and a Saviour to all that confide in him.

We may therefore ſafely oppoſe the general Tenour of Scripture on this Head to the few Texts brought by the *Arians* in Support of their Tenet, " That our Mediator " had a Sort of *middle* Nature between the " Divine and the Human Nature." I have already remarked, * that this Notion is grounded chiefly on ſuch Texts, as relate to his being *ſent* from God, or *coming* down from Heaven into the *World*, and ſhewn that they have miſtaken thoſe Texts in ſuppoſing the Miſſion ſpoken of to refer to ſome Time *prior* to his Entrance on his Public Miniſtry †. The other Texts, from whence they would deduce this Opinion, are but few, and on a fair and impartial View of them, as they ſtand connected with their Contexts and the general

Tenour

* Serm. 1. pag. 6. † Logos. pag. 89. et Seq.

Tenour of Scripture, will appear foreign to the Doctrine they are brought to ſupport.

ONE of theſe is in the eighth Chapter of St. *Paul*'s firſt Epiſtle, at the ſixth Verſe. *But to us there is but One God the Father, of whom are all Things and we in him; and One Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all Things, and we by him.* This Paſſage is thought to relate to the firſt Formation of all Things, the Creation of the Heavens and the Earth, which the *Arians* attribute, indeed, to the *Will* of God, but ſuppoſe, that Jeſus Chriſt was the Agent *under* him, being himſelf firſt created. But,

1. SUCH a Suppoſition is not at all conſiſtent with the *Moſaick* Account of the Creation, from which we learn, that all Things were created by the immediate Power of God, without the Intervention of any ſuch a Being.

God ſpake, and all Things ſtood forth. God *ſaid, let there be Light, and there was Light.* This is the Language of Scripture concerning the Creation; Nor are we ever given to underſtand, that God firſt created a Being, of a very exalted Nature, and then *by* him the Heavens and the Earth.

2. SUCH a Notion doth not comport with the Deſign of the Apoſtle in this Place. So far from labouring to convince his Converts, that the Creation of the outward Frame of Things was effected by the Agency of any Being *inferior* to God, he endeavours to diſſuade them from holding any ſuch Doctrine, which might tally indeed with their *former* Profeſſion, but was inconſiſtent with their *new* Faith. Before they were *created anew* by Chriſt Jeſus, they had *Gods many, and Lords many.* But the Apoſtle reminds them of

of their *new* Faith, *new* Creation by Chriſt Jeſus, whereby they were brought to the Knowledge of God. Him alone therefore they ſhould now acknowledge; For *to them there was* now *but One God, of whom were* all Things, that is, all this Change and Renovation of Things; *and One Lord or Maſter Jeſus Chriſt, by whom* all Things *were, and they by him.* that is, by whoſe Mediation *all this* was brought about, *viz.* That they ſhould become the Sons of God. And,

3. THIS is agreeable to the Apoſtle's Manner of expreſſing himſelf in other Places. Thus, in the firſt Chapter of this Epiſtle, at the thirtieth Verſe, he ſaith, *But of Him are ye* in *Chriſt Jeſus, who* of God *is made unto us Wiſdom and Righteouſneſs, and Sanctification and Redemption.* And again, in the fifth Chapter of the ſecond Epiſtle, at the ſeventeenth

teenth Verſe, *If any Man be in Chriſt he is a* new Creature. *Old Things are paſſed away; behold* all Things *are become* new. *And* all Things *are of God who hath reconciled us to himſelf* by *Jeſus Chriſt.* Thus it is apparent, that the Creation of *all Things* by Chriſt Jeſus relates to the *new* Creation, the *ſpiritual* Formation or Renovation of Things according to the Goſpel Conſtitution. And, although it is ſaid, All Things *are by Chriſt Jeſus*, yet the Apoſtle intends not to include the *outward* Frame and Conſtitution of Things, the *natural* Heavens and Earth, but thoſe Things only which relate to his preſent Subject, *viz.* the Mediation of Chriſt, which had introduced a new Syſtem of Religion.

This Conſideration will ſerve to explain another Paſſage adduced by the *Arians*, and rectify the Interpretation given of it. *Who*

created

created all things *by Jeſus Chriſt.* Eph. iii. 9. That the *natural* Creation, or outward Frame of Things, is not meant here, is extremely plain from this, *viz.* That all theſe Things which are ſaid to be *created*, are repreſented as *not* exiſting, *not* produced, but lying hid in God *till* the Coming of Chriſt, which was long after the Heavens and the Earth were created. *That we ſhould preach among the Gentiles the unſearchable Riches of Chriſt; and to make all Men ſee, what is the Fellowſhip of the Myſtery, which from the Beginning of the World hath been* hid *in God, who created* All (for ſo πανϛα may be rendered) *by Jeſus Chriſt.* The Subject, on which the Apoſtle is writing, is plainly the *Goſpel-Conſtitution*, called here, a *Myſtery*, on account of its being *hid in God* before the Coming of Chriſt, by whom it was revealed. By *all Things*, therefore, is here meant all *theſe* Things, which came to

paſs

paſs through the Mediation of Chriſt, thoſe unſearchable Riches of Chriſt, of which the Gentiles were now made Partakers, *according to the eternal Purpoſe*, (as it follows in the Verſe but one below) *which he purpoſed in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord.* What the Almighty purpoſed in Chriſt Jeſus was our *Salvation*, or a new *Creation* of all things under the Goſpel-Diſpenſation, and not the *old* Creation or Formation of the *outward* and viſible World.

It is this Manner of ſpeaking concerning the Mediation of Chriſt, *viz.* in Alluſion to the Creation, which has occaſioned the like Error of Interpretation in the following Paſſage out of the ſame Writer. *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 the Earth,*

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, Col. i. 15. This Repreſentation of the Pre-eminence of Jeſus Chriſt is ſuppoſed to refer to that Dignity, which he is thought to have had *under* God, in a *prior* State of Exiſtence, and his being employed by the Almighty in *creating* the World. But, that the Creation here ſpoken of is not that of the *outward* Frame of the World, effected by Chriſt as the *firſt* of Creatures, but the *new* Creation according to the Goſpel-Conſtitution; and that it was effected by him as *Man*, will appear

1. From the Connection which this Paſſage has with what precedes and follows it.

2. FROM the Reaſon aſſigned by the Apoſtle for his being the Firſt-born from the Dead. And

3. FROM the Expreſſion made uſe of by the Apoſtle at the ſeventeenth Verſe, *viz. That by him all things* conſiſt.

FOR the Firſt.

THE Apoſtle, in the Verſe immediately preceding this Paſſage, ſpeaks of Chriſt in reference to his *Mediatorial* Office. *In whom*, ſays he, *we have Redemption through his Blood, even the Forgiveneſs of Sins.* And, in the Verſe immediately following this Paſſage, he ſpeaks of him as placed at the Head of the Church. *Who is the Beginning, the Firſt-born from the Dead.* Now, is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the Apoſtle has written ſo incoherently

herently, that, while he was treating of our Saviour's Merits in redeeming us by his Blood and, in conſequence thereof, his Exaltation to Glory, he ſhould inſert a Doctrine no way connected with the one or the other, either with his *Death*, mentioned in the Verſe preceding, or with his *Reſurrection*, mentioned in the Verſe following this Paſſage? Is it at all likely, that he ſhould ſtart, as it were, ſo ſuddenly from his Subject, *viz.* our Redemption by the Blood of Chriſt, to inform us, that he was the firſt Creature in the World, who created all other Things, and then reſume his Subject, and tell us, that God had exalted this Sufferer, raiſing him from the Dead and conſtituting him the Head of the Church? But,

2. This would not only be an egregious Incoherence in Writing, but a manifeſt In-

conſiſtency. For, if we ſo underſtand theſe Words, *All things were created by him and for him*; *and he is before all things*, as referring to his Pre-eminence, in a prior State of Exiſtence, above all Creatures, being himſelf the *Firſt*, how are we to underſtand the Apoſtle, when he ſaith, in the very next Verſe, that Chriſt was the *Firſt-born from the Dead*, that *he might have the Pre-eminence in all things?* Could this give him greater Pre-eminence than he is ſuppoſed to have had *before?* Was it not ſaid, that *all things were created by him and for him, and he is before all things?* How then was he raiſed from the Dead, *that* he might have the Pre-eminence?

The Truth is, the Creation here ſpoken of is the ſame with that we have before conſidered, *viz.* that *new* and ſpiritual Creation

tion or Renovation of all Things, which was brought about by our Mediator, the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus. He undertook to reconcile us unto God, and, to this End, ſuffered in *our Nature*, extreme Pain, Ignominy, and, at laſt, Death itſelf; in Recompence for which unreſerved Obedience to the Will of his Father, God raiſed him from the Dead, and placed him at the Head of the Church, giving him the *Pre-eminence* in all things. Thus underſtanding it, there is both Coherence and Conſiſtence in the Apoſtle's Account of Chriſt's Dignity and Pre-eminence.

IN Chriſt, he had ſaid, *we have Redemption through his Blood.* He then goes on to ſpeak of his Dignity after Death, and in conſequence of his Suffering for our Sakes; and he repreſents him as crowned for this with great Glory and Power, ſtiling him the *Image*

of

of the Inviſible God, at the Head of the WHOLE CREATION. For ſo πασης κτισεως ſhould be rendered, and not *every Creature.* And what further ſhews that he ſpeaks here of his Exaltation after Death, and not of his Glory in a pre-exiſtent State, the Apoſtle expreſſeth himſelf by the Word πρωτοτοκος, *Firſt-born*; alluding evidently enough to his Reſurrection from the Dead. So that it was the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, even he whom God raiſed from the Dead, and not an *Angel*, or the *firſt* of created Beings, that was placed at the Head of this new Syſtem of Things, which was all framed by him and *for* him; that is, ſo that it ſhould be *his*, under his Direction and Government, by whom all was done. Accordingly it is added,

3. *And by him all things* CONSIST.

Now,

Now, it muſt be allowed, that πανϛα (all things) ſhould be underſtood in as comprehenſive a Senſe *here*, as in the Verſe above. But *here* it cannot with any Propriety be extended to the firſt Formation of all things, having a manifeſt Connection with the Verſe following, and comprehending *thoſe* things only over which Chriſt is ſaid to be placed, *viz.* the Church. For the Word, συνεστηκε, (conſiſts) implies that all things were *compacted*, and put together by him, ſo as to make one *Body* or *Building*. By *all things*, therefore, muſt be meant all the *Parts* or *Members* of the Church, which, being compacted and fitly framed one to another by Jeſus Chriſt, are called by the Apoſtle a *Body*; and of this *Body*, even the *Church*, Chriſt is the Head, *Who is the Beginning, the Firſt-born* (πρωτοτοκος the ſame Word that was uſed at the 16th Verſe) *from the Dead, that in all things he*

might

might have the Pre-eminence. For it pleaſed the Father that in him ſhould all Fulneſs dwell. And (having made Peace through the Blood of his Croſs) to reconcile all things *unto himſelf; by him (I ſay) whether they be things in Earth or things in Heaven.* Here again, you ſee, *all things* παντα cannot relate to the outward Frame of things, although it be ſaid, *Whether they be Things in Earth or Things in Heaven*; becauſe they are repreſented as effected and formed by the *Mediation* of Chriſt, and through the Blood of his Croſs; whereas the firſt Formation of all things, as of the Sun, Moon and Stars, in the natural Heavens, or, of Animals, Vegitables and Foſſils, in the Earth, is never repreſented as coming to paſs by the Efficacy of the *Croſs* of Chriſt. Jeſus Chriſt, therefore, is, in this Paſſage, ſpoken of in Reference to his *human* Nature, even as that *Man* who ſhed his Blood upon the Croſs, and

by

by whom, raiſed from the Dead, God is now governing the Church Univerſal thus purchaſed.

THERE is but one Text more, which, I think, can be urged, with any Plauſibility, in Favour of the Doctrine, "That Jeſus Chriſt is "the firſt of all created Beings, who created "all others." This is in *Heb.* i, 1, 2, 3. As it is circumſtanced, however, much like the laſt Paſſage we have been conſidering, there is no Occaſion to enter into an Examination of it. What has been ſaid of *that*, will ſerve to illuſtrate the Senſe of *this*, and to refute the above-mentioned Doctrine inferred from it.

I SHALL conclude with two Obſervations reſpecting the Doctrine laid down by the Apoſtle, *viz. That there is but One Mediator between God and Men, the* Man *Chriſt Jeſus.*

1. OUR Faith reſts upon the firmeſt Foundation, and what will ſupport it to the lateſt Ages, *viz.* on the *Word* of God and the Power of the *moſt High*, manifeſting himſelf in the *Fleſh*, that is, by the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus The World could not be impoſed upon by this Method of Revelation. It carries not the Air of a Viſionary Deluſion. We are preſented with an Object of *Senſe* and not a Creature of the *Imagination*. A *Man* ανθρωπος, One whoſe Birth, daily Suſtenance, Sufferings and Death, witneſſed the common Condition of Humanity, himſelf teſtifying the ſame, with an ingenious Acknowledgment of an utter Inability to do any Thing of *himſelf*; This Perſon, I ſay, calls upon the World to believe in the One true God, as manifeſted in him. There could be no *Unrighteouſneſs* in him, that is, no Deceit or Deſign to impoſe on the Credulity

lity of Mankind, *who ſought not his own Glory but the Glory of him that ſent him.* He did not, in ſpeaking of *himſelf*, pretend to greater Abilities or more enlarged Faculties, than other Men. He did not call upon the World to believe him to be an *Angel*, or ſome ſuperior *finite* Spirit incarnate only for a While. When accuſed of this by the Jews, through a Miſunderſtanding or Perverſion of his Expreſſions, he immediately exculpated himſelf, diſclaiming any ſuch Pretenſions *.

Let us then put ourſelves in the Situation of his Hearers, and the Spectators of his Works, and conſider, what Effect the Sight of Miracles, and yet, our hearing him, that wrought them, acknowledge the ſame Nature with us, muſt have had upon us. No doubt, the very ſame Effect which it had on *Nicodemus*, who thus expreſſed his Convic-

* Vid. Diſſertation concerning the Logos; what has been there ſaid on Chap. vi. 32. & ſeq.

tion of the *Divinity* which manifeſted itſelf in the *Fleſh*, *No Man can do theſe Miracles that thou doſt, except* God *be with him.* The Viſion of an heavenly Hoſt dividing the Elements aſunder, and preſenting itſelf in full Splendour to mortal View, proclaiming with a Voice of Thunder the Beheſts of the Almighty, might more affect the *Imagination*, but could not ſo effectually convince the *Judgment*, nor reach ſo intimately the Underſtanding and Reaſon of Men, as the Divinity veiling itſelf in our Humanity, and accommodated (if I may be allowed the Expreſſion) to the Nature of Man. In ſhort; Set the Imagination to Work; frame every poſſible Method of revealing the Will of God to Mankind, and you will find yourſelves unable to fix upon any that would be ſo well adapted, either, to convince Men of the Truth of Religion, or, to endear it to their Minds,

Minds, and enforce the Practice of it, as *that* which hath taken Place. Nay rather, Chriſtians, inſtead of ſo fruitleſs a Search, ſuffer me to exhort you to employ that Time in contemplating the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God, in thus condeſcending to our imperfect Natures, and revealing himſelf unto us, not, as of old, in Fire and Blackneſs and Tempeſt, but in the milder Diſplay of that *Grace and Mercy which came by Jeſus Chriſt.*

2. I BEG leave to obſerve, that the Doctrine concerning the *Manhood* of Chriſt Jeſus, in his Mediatorial Office, is of great Importance towards the Maintenance of the true Faith and Worſhip reſpecting the *Divinity* which wrought in Him. For, if we can ſuppoſe that this was not *perfect* God, but a *Creature* of an angelic Nature, even the firſt of the Creation, we ſhall be in Danger of con-

conforming our religious Adorations to ſuch a Sentiment. I mean not to accuſe, or throw out an unfavourable Reflection upon, any Denomination of Chriſtians. Nor do I take upon me to aſſert, that they, who hold and contend for Chriſt's *Inferiority* to the Father in a pre-exiſtent State, entertain that Notion any otherwiſe than as a Matter of Speculation. This, however, it but becomes me to do, *viz.* to warn you of any Danger which I apprehend to lie in this Tenet, apparently Inconſiſtent with the general Tenour of Scripture; and, under this Apprehenſion, the more ſtrongly to recommend to your Eſteem the great Care, which the Compilers of our Liturgy have taken, that this Danger may be avoided. For, whatever *diſtinction* we are taught to make of the *Perſons* of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, we are moſt carefully warned againſt the *Diviſion* of the Godhead

head; and all our Devotions are addreſſed to *One* and the *ſame* God, through the Mediation of Chriſt Jeſus, agreeably to the whole Tenour of Scripture, and, particularly, to the Doctrine laid down in the plaineſt Terms in my Text, *That there is but* One *God and* One Mediator *between God and Men, the* Man *Chriſt Jeſus.*

Now, *to the only wiſe* God, *our* Creator, Redeemer *and* Sanctifier, *be aſcribed all Praiſe and Glory, World without End.* Amen.

THE

Proper Uſe of REASON

IN

Judging of REVEALED DOCTRINES,

Applied particularly to the

Doctrine of the Church of ENGLAND

CONCERNING THE

TRINITY.

JOB. XI. 7.

Canſt thou by ſearching find out God? Canſt thou find out the Almighty unto Perfection?

I DO not ſee why the Queſtion, as it is put in the former Clauſe of the Text, may not be anſwered, even by the moſt modeſt Enquirer after Truth in the Affirmative. But

then by, *finding out God,* muſt be underſtood the Diſcovery of a firſt Cauſe in general, or, in other Words, that there is ſome ſuperior Intelligence to that of Man, which made and ſuperintends all Things. Indeed, the Proofs hereof are ſo numerous, and they lie ſo obvious to the Senſe and Reaſon of Mankind, that, without the groſſeſt Neglect or Abuſe of both, no Man can well overlook them. Should any One, therefore, profeſs a doubt, concerning the Exiſtence of a God, it would be but a reaſonable Reproach upon his extreme Inattention, or Perverſion of his Underſtanding, to refer him to the Brute Creation in the Language of Holy *Job*; *Aſk now the* Beaſts, *and they ſhall teach thee*; *and the* Fowls *of the Air, and they ſhall tell thee: Or, ſpeak to the* Earth, *and it ſhall Teach thee*; *and the* Fiſhes *of the Sea, ſhall declare unto thee. Who knoweth not, in all theſe, that the Hand of the* Lord *hath wrought*

wrought this? In whoſe Hand is the Soul of every living Thing, and the Breath of all Mankind, Job. xii. 7.

The Being of a God, then, is diſcoverable by the Light of Nature, or, the Exerciſe of our rational Powers. We may go ſomething farther; and, without offending againſt Modeſty, ſo far aſſert the Dignity of our Nature, as to expect, upon a diligent and ſerious Application of the Faculties of the Mind, to form ſome juſt Concluſions and worthy Apprehenſions concerning the Divine Nature, Perfections and Providence. What the wiſeſt and moſt knowing among Men, however, can by their deepeſt Reſearches collect of the infinite Mind, is too Inconſiderable to allow to human Nature, a Claim to the Ability of finding out the Almighty to *Perfection.*

But

But what then?—Shall we be diſcouraged from purſuing our Enquiries into a Subject the moſt worthy of them?—Shall we be content to remain in a total Ignorance of our Maker, or, what is ſtill worſe, under falſe and unworthy Notions of Him, becauſe we cannot know *All?*—If what has been ſaid by ſome timid, ſervile Thinkers, but bold and free Declaimers againſt human Knowledge were juſt, this, without doubt, would be our Duty. We ſhould have nothing to do but to believe on, and reſt ſatisfied with our preſent Opinions, whatever they are, and however we have come by them. But can we think this the Duty of a reaſonable Being? Or, ſhall we not indignantly reject ſuch unjuſt Reflections upon thoſe Powers which God has given us?—Every *wiſe* Man muſt needs reject them, in that they are not only falſe and ſcandalous

lous, but cannot be admitted without Danger of Impoſition in Matters of the greateſt Concernment to us, reſpecting both our Comfort here, and our Salvation hereafter.

Is there no Danger then, it may be aſked, on the other Hand?—Are we quite ſafe, under the Conduct of our limited Reaſon, on a Subject that knows no Bounds?---May we truſt ourſelves on this vaſt Ocean, in the ſmall Bark of human Underſtanding, with perfect Security from Danger?---Is there no fear of making Shipwrack of our Faith? Of being driven by the rough Storms of Paſſion, on the Shoals and Quickſands of Error, or, caſt away under the Steerage of vain Conceit, on the waſte and comfortleſs Coaſt of Scepticiſm and Infidelity?—Yes truly—It muſt be owned, there is great Danger. But this is no good Reaſon for dropping our *Enquiries*, though

it

it certainly ought to check our *Preſumption.* It ſhould not damp our Zeal for the Truth, but only make us cautious in the Purſuit of it. Far from ſuppreſſing the Voice of Reaſon, we ſhould encourage and promote its Influence, by clearing away thoſe Paſſions and Prepoſſeſſions, which obſtruct its Progreſs, darken the Underſtanding, and ſo often, by engaging the Mind on the Side of Vice, pervert its Faculties to the Purpoſe of Error.

The Danger ariſes not from the Uſe of our reaſonable Faculties, but from the Diſuſe of them, or, from exerciſing them under the allowed Predominancy of Paſſion and Prejudice. And let me add, that they may be as freely and ſecurely exerciſed on the Subject before us, as they may on the plaineſt Doctrines of Chriſtianity. Nay, the more intricate and myſterious the Doctrine of the ſacred

cred TRINITY is ſuppoſed to be, the greater Care ſhould be taken to ſecure the Mind from Impoſition. And the Way to do this is, not ſurely to take every thing for granted, that is told us about it, and to believe it in *any* Senſe that *any* One may pleaſe to put upon it, (ſo indeed we muſt believe Contradiction itſelf;) but, to uſe our own beſt Judgment, and abide by that which appears moſt reaſonable.

NOR will it matter to ſay, "That the "Doctrine itſelf is abſolutely *Incomprehen-* "*ſible*, and, therefore, that *Reaſon* has nothing "to do with it." For, let us ſee whither ſuch an Argument would carry us?--If we are not to uſe our beſt Judgment, or, in other Words, (for the Thing is the ſame) to exerciſe the Faculty of *Reaſon* in Doctrines which are eſteemed myſterious, but muſt embrace them with a moſt cordial and implicit Faith, it fol-

lows, that the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* has good Right to our Faith. And thus we land on Popery, truſting to thoſe very Arguments for our Guides, which are ſent us by the Church of *Rome* to pilot us, left without our true Compaſs, through the dark Roads of Superſtition, into the Haven of all Manner of *Myſtery* and *Iniquity*.

I AM well aware, that there may be Doctrines which we are bound to believe on the Foot of Revelation, and which *unaſſiſted* Reaſon could never have diſcovered. And ſuch is the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. I am far from pleading the Cauſe of thoſe raſh and preſumptuous Speculatiſts, who reject every Thing which Reaſon without Revelation would not have ſuggeſted, or, is not able to account for, *why* it ſhould be, or, *how* it can be. This is *Raſhneſs*, and not *Reaſon*. And it is the overweening

weening Preſumption of theſe Magnifiers of their own Abilities, with the ſad Effect of it, (Infidelity and the Contempt of every thing eſteemed ſacred) which has brought the Uſe of our Reaſon in Matters of Religion ſo much into Diſcredit. Men of ſound Senſe and Judgment can deſpiſe ſuch a Conduct, and pity them for the dangerous Conſequences of their Vanity. But no wonder, really, that weaker Minds, taking Offence at their inſolent Manner of treating Revelation, ſhould become diſguſted with that Reaſon, which theſe vain Pretenders to it, make them ſuſpect to be at Enmity with all Religion. They may not eaſily diſtinguiſh between *Reaſon* and *Reaſoning*. The former always accords with Truth; the latter may be employed for or *againſt* it. So that we can ſay of a Man's *Reaſoning*, that he reaſons *right*, or, that he

rea-

reaſons *wrong*, and is miſtaken. But we can never ſay of him, who has *Reaſon* on his ſide, that he is in the *wrong*. This is conſtituted Judge as it were of the other. A Man, in reaſoning, may be miſled by going upon falſe Premiſes; or he may make a wrong Inference from true Premiſes. In both Caſes, his *Reaſoning* will be erroneous; And if he rely upon his Concluſions, as ſolid, merely, becauſe they have been made by his *reaſoning* Talent, he acts quite contrary to *Reaſon*.

Oftentimes, therefore, they are miſtaken for extolling *Reaſon*, who mean only to extol their own Talent at *Reaſoning*. And we may be aſſured of it, that thoſe People always mean this, who reject a Doctrine, as falſe or abſurd, becauſe they are not able to prove

prove it by natural Arguments without the Authority of ſacred Scripture. For, if a Revelation be given to Men, it were abſurd to ſuppoſe, that it contains nothing but what might eaſily have been known by the Light of Nature. And, therefore, to reject a Doctrine as unworthy to be received, merely, becauſe it reſts on *ſupernatural* Authority, is highly *unreaſonable*. And, whatever Encomiums they may pleaſe to paſs on *Reaſon*, they follow not its Dictate in this Inſtance, but the Vanity of their own Minds; and the Compliment muſt only be meant for their ſuperior Underſtanding.

The Sum of what has been ſaid then is this, That it is our Duty to inform ourſelves of the Nature and Evidence of the Doctrines which we profeſs to believe: But, at the ſame

ſame time, that our *Abilities* in reaſoning of them ſhould not be made the *Teſt* of their Truth or Falſhood, excluſive of Scripture Authority.

To apply this to that great Doctrine of our Church, which we have endeavoured to evince in the foregoing Lectures; Let us ſee, *how far* it may be the Subject of our Conſideration, and may demand the Exertion of our reaſonable Faculties. And alſo *on what Principles* the Objections to it are generally grounded.

1. First then, it can never be deemed unreaſonable to conſider, on *what Authority* our Faith in the Doctrine of the *Trinity* ſhould reſt. Now, as it is confeſſed on all hands to be of ſuch a Nature, that Reaſon unaſſiſted by Revelation could not have diſcovered it,

we

we muſt have Recourſe to the ſacred Scriptures for the Proof of it. In *them* we muſt ſearch, if we now doubt, whether there be *any*, and *what* Foundation there is for it. We are not to reſt ſatisfied with what *any one* Man, any *Body* of Men, nay, any *one Church* aſſerts, but what the *Scripture*, the Dictate of the *Holy Spirit*, and the Foundation of all the Churches, which name the Name of *Chriſt*, has aſſerted.

2. But ſince, in ſearching even the Scripture, we may be drawn aſide from the Truth by *Prejudice*, or unable, thro' *want of Learning* and a critical Knowledge of the *Original*, to ſee it clearly, and as it may hereafter be more fully known, it becomes us to diveſt ourſelves of the *firſt*, and to ſuffer the Conſideration of the *latter* to keep us modeſt, and make us content to receive peaceably and thank-

thankfully ſo much Light, as it hath pleaſed Providence to give us, without arrogantly diſputing againſt the Faith of others. And,

3. BECAUSE the Terms uſed by the Church in expreſſing this Doctrine have been underſtood differently, by very eminent Defenders of it themſelves, it becomes us, inſtead of haſtily rejecting it as unſcriptural, to examine carefully into the true Senſe and Meaning of the Church, and be very ſure, before we find fault with, that we *underſtand* her Aſſertions concerning it. This is not vainly to pry into a *Myſtery*, and to try our Strength of Underſtanding in ſomething that doth not belong to us to know. For, however deep and unfathomable the *Subject* itſelf of the Doctrine is, *viz.* the *Divine Being*, yet *ſo much*, as is propoſed to our Belief, may be underſtood, or, we believe, we know not

not what. We cannot know, whether it be agreeable, either, to *Reaſon* or *Scripture*, if we have no Meaning, nor affix any determinate Ideas to what we profeſs to believe. This therefore is our Duty, to enquire into the Senſe of the Church, when She calls upon us to hold the Catholick Faith of a *Trinity* in *Unity*, and *Unity* in *Trinity*. And, indeed, to make this Enquiry, and to do it with great Care, is but doing Juſtice to the Church. Becauſe we may repreſent Her as maintaining, and requiring to be believed, a Doctrine different from, perhaps, the Reverſe of what She requires us to believe, by publiſhing and proclaiming abroad only our own crude and miſtaken Notions of this Doctrine.

2. By what Rule, then, it may be ſaid, ſhall we come at the true Senſe of our

Church on this Head, if her Expreſſions be liable to be miſunderſtood?--I anſwer; By the ſame Rule that we ſhould come at the Meaning of any diſputed Paſſage of Scripture; that is, by interpreting her Words in conſiſtence with the general Tenor and univerſal Strain of her Liturgy as well as Articles. For, whatever Acceptation of her Expreſſions makes Her inconſiſtent with, and contradictory to Herſelf, that muſt be wrong, and will imply what She means not to affirm.

And, here, I cannot proceed without expreſſing the Regret I feel on reviewing the ſeveral Defences of the Trinity, even by the moſt eminent Divines of our Church. They appear to me to have expended their ingenious Labours on the Defence

fence of the *Terms* and * *Expreſſions* in which this Doctrine has been cloathed by the Com-

 piler

* And I may add, that moſt of them, in attempting to defend the Expreſſions of that Creed, have expreſſed themſelves much more obſcurely than the Compiler of it himſelf. The following Paſſage from Dr. *Sherlock's Vindication*, &c. is not the moſt exceptionable of any that might be produced from this Writer and his Defenders.

" This ſhews alſo, how theſe Three diſtinct Perſons " are each of them God, and yet are all but One God. " Each Perſon is God, for each Perſon has the whole " and entire Perfections of the Godhead, having by this " mutual Conſciouſneſs, the other Perſons in himſelf, " that each Perſon is in ſome Senſe the whole Trinity: " The Son is in the Father, and the Father in the Son, " and the Holy Spirit in Father and Son, and Father " and Son in the Holy Spirit; and therefore if the whole " Trinity be God, the Father is God, the Son is God, " and the Holy Ghoſt God, they being all mutually in " each other; and yet this is a plain Demonſtration, " that they are not Three Gods, but One God; be- " cauſe neither of them are the One Supreme God, but " as thus intimately united to all the Reſt; and then " they

piler of the Creed, commonly called the Creed of St. *Athanaſius*, too much to the Neglect of defending the *Doctrine* itſelf on the *plain* and *undoubted* Principles of the Liturgy in *general*. Hence has ariſen that mutual Contradiction and Diſputation among themſelves, ſo much to the Diſgrace, I will

" they can be all Three, but One Supreme God: This " gives an intelligible Account of one of the moſt diffi- " cult Problems in all School-Divinity, which the Ma- " ſter of the Sentences borrowed from St. *Auſtin* as he " has done moſt of his other Diſtinctions; That the " whole Trinity is not greater, than any One Perſon in " the Trinity. This ſounds very harſhly at firſt hearing, " and yet if we conſider it, we muſt confeſs it to be " true, unleſs we will ſay, that there is a greater and " leſs in God, or that the Three Perſons in the Trinity " make One God, as Three Parts make a Whole, each " of which Parts muſt be leſs than the Whole; and yet " I cannot ſee any poſſible way to underſtand this " Matter, but only this: That the whole Trinity by a " mutual Conſciouſneſs is in each Perſon, and therefore " no Perſon is leſs than the whole Trinity." *Sherlock's Vindication*, Page 82.

not

not ſay, of the Doctrine of the Trinity; but, however, to the Advantage of their common Opponents, who are not only ready to take the Advantage of them, but to uſe it alſo againſt the Doctrine itſelf and triumph in it, as if they had gained ſome over the Church. But they have gained none here. The Doctrine itſelf remains entire, and tho' the Fences raiſed about it by weak and fallible Men, jealous of the leaſt Innovation, may be broken through, it is for all that perfectly ſafe, being fenced about by the Strength of the Almighty in Proofs of Holy Writ: For, defended on the general Principles of the Church of England, it will be found to be perfectly conſiſtent with Scripture Principles.

HAVING thus ſhewn how far it is our Duty to enquire, and in what Manner we ſhould conduct our Enquiry into this great Doctrine,

I ſhall

I ſhall conclude with a View of the Ground on which the Objections to it are raiſed, giving a brief Anſwer to them.

Some then found their Objection on this Principle, That whatever is not an Object of Reaſon, and cannot be proved thereby, is not to be admitted for Truth. To which I anſwer; That, if they mean by Reaſon, the natural Faculties of the human Mind, unaſſiſted by Revelation, then no revealed Doctrine whatſoever is to be believed; and the Doctrine of a Reſurrection to Life ſtands liable to the ſame Objection. If they mean that no revealed Doctrine reſts on ſufficient Evidence, and ſuch as right Reaſon will admit, I deny the Aſſertion, right Reaſon always according with the Dictates of Revelation.

Another Principle on which the Objecters to the Doctrine of the Sacred Trinity pro-

proceed is, That a Myſtery can be no Object of Faith. In anſwer to which it will be proper to repeat an Obſervation before made, "That, however deep and unfathomable the "*Subject* itſelf of the Doctrine is, *viz.* The "Divine Nature and Eſſence (for who can "by ſearching find out God?) *Yet ſo much* "as is propoſed to our Belief may be under-"ſtood." Properly ſpeaking, therefore, the Doctrine is not myſterious, nor does the Church conſider it as ſuch, affirming that it may be proved by Scripture; which could not be done, if no determinate Idea could be affixed to the Doctrine to be proved. The Myſtery of the TRINITY conſiſts not in the Nature of the Thing aſſerted, but in the Incomprehenſibility of the Divinity concerning whom the Aſſertion is made. So that this Objection founded on the TRINITY being a Myſtery, is of no Weight againſt the Truth

of

of the *Doctrine*, or Propoſition aſſerted, reſpecting the *Divine Being*.

But the laſt and grand Charge brought againſt this Doctrine is, That it aſſerts more Gods than One; a Charge, which whether it proceed upon a Miſtake, or a wilful Perverſion of the Church's Meaning, is not eaſy to determine. On One I am ſure it muſt proceed; and as Nothing I ſhould ſay, however juſt, in Refutation of the Charge can be expected to be well received by thoſe that ground it on the latter; ſo, with ſuch Objecters as are under a Miſtake, it may be hoped it will be ſufficient for their Conviction to appeal to themſelves; Whether that Church holds a Plurality of Gods, whoſe Devotions are throughout the Liturgy addreſſed to One and the ſame Almighty Being, in the Name and through the Mediation of

Jeſus

Jeſus Chriſt; Which maketh Profeſſion in *One* of her Creeds of believing in "God "the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven "and Earth; And in Jeſus Chriſt his only "Son our Lord, who was conceived, &c." In *another*, of "believing in *One* God, the "Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and "Earth, and of all Things viſible and invi-"ſible; And in One Lord Jeſus Chriſt the "only begotten Son of God, &c." Which, after invoking ſeverally the ſacred Perſons in the TRINITY (as if foreſeeing the Offence that might elſe be taken, and willing to cut off all Occaſion of Offence) addreſſeth the holy, bleſſed and glorious TRINITY, as "Three "Perſons, and *One* God;" Which, in the very Creed generally eſteemed to be more exceptionably worded than the others, maketh Comment, as it were, of her Expreſſions concerning the *Three* Sacred Perſons, declaring

plainly, " That there are not *Three* Incom-
" prehenſibles, nor *Three* Uncreated, but
" *One*; That they are not *Three* Almighties,
" but *One*;" In ſhort, " That they are *not*
" *Three* Gods, but *One* God." Whatever In-
tricacy, therefore, there may be in the Terms
of this Doctrine expreſſed by TRINITY in
Unity, and *Unity* in *Trinity*; Nay, ſuppoſing
ſomething of an Impropriety in the Uſe of
them, yet we cannot be at a Loſs to know
this, that it is not the Intention of the Church
that we ſhould hold any ſuch Doctrine as the
Objecters repreſent it, or any other Doctrine
concerning the Divinity, than what is laid
down in Terms plain enough in the firſt Ar-
ticle, *viz.* " There is but One living and
" true God, everlaſting, without Body,
" Parts, or Paſſions; of infinite Power,
" Wiſdom and Goodneſs; The Maker and
" Preſerver of all Things both viſible and
" inviſible;

" invisible; And in Unity of this Godhead
" there be Three Persons of One Substance,
" Power and Eternity; the Father, the Son,
" and the Holy Ghost."

To which One *God, our* Creator, Redeemer, *and* Sanctifier, *be ascribed everlasting Praise.* Amen.

TWO

TRACTS,

Relating to the DOCTRINE

OF AN

INTERMEDIATE STATE,

BEING

REMARKS

ON

Mr. STEFFE's LETTER

CONCERNING THE

State of the Soul after Death.

AND

His BRIEF DEFENCE of the Same.

B. Dawson.

TO THE

REVEREND DR. LAW,

Master of St. PETER's COLLEGE in CAMBRIDGE,

THE following SHEETS,

In Testimony of the Author's Esteem

FOR HIS

CHARACTER and LEARNING,

ARE

With the greatest Deference

INSCRIBED, by

The AUTHOR.

ADVERTISEMENT.

UNDER the preſent briſk Agitation of the Queſtion, concerning the State of the Soul after Death, *the Republication of the following Tracts, with the Addition of an Anſwer to ſome Brief Notes made on the firſt of them, will not be thought unſeaſonable. The Objecter ſhould have received an Anſwer ſooner, if it had not been extremely inconvenient for the Author to have given one in a ſeparate Publication.*

REMARKS

ON

Mr. STEFFE's LETTER*

CONCERNING THE

State of the SOUL after Death.

MR. *Steffe* mentions four Texts in support of his Opinion, that after Death the Soul exists separately from the Body. Two of these are quoted from *Ecclesiastes*, the other two from St. *Paul's* Epistles.

I THINK with the Author, that the sacred Writings can alone decide the Point in Question, it being " a Doctrine not so much of " Reason

* Originally Published in the form of a Letter to the Monthly Reviewers, for *May* 1757.

" Reaſon as Revelation." Notwithſtanding, whatever is quoted from the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament can, I think, prove nothing in relation to this Queſtion; as there is not the leaſt Reaſon to believe, from the whole Tenour of them, that they contain any Revelation * at all concerning a State of Exiſtence after

* It may be obſerved upon this Aſſertion, that, " As " the *Jews* are expreſsly charged in *Leviticus* with con- " ſulting, aſking of, or enquiring of, or from the Dead " it is apparent, they did, in the Days of *Moſes*, believe " the Spirit of Man exiſted after its Departure from the " Body."

The Annotator muſt certainly have miſunderſtood my Meaning, and ſuppoſed that I denied the *Jews believed*, or had any *Notion* of a State of Exiſtence after the preſent. But this I denied not, nor was it at all to my Purpoſe to do it. What the *Jews* might *believe*, in the Time of *Moſes*, concerning a future State of Exiſtence, or what Notions they might entertain about the Circumſtances of ſuch a State, as whether the Soul will exiſt *embodied* or *unembodied*, was nothing to the Queſtion; but whether they had Authority from their *own* Scriptures, to warrant their Belief of a State of Exiſtence *at all* after Death; and if they

after the preſent. This was not the Intention of them. All the Revelations contained therein,

they had, then, Whether it was further revealed to them, that this future Life ſhould commence immediately on the Diſſolution of the Body, the Soul exiſting ſeparately till a general Reſurrection, *when* only it is ſuppoſed it will be *re-embodied*. If they had no Authority to believe the firſt; I mean, if their Scriptures contained no expreſs Revelation of a future State, in general, much leſs had they Authority for believing the Spirit of Man exiſted after its Departure from the Body in an Intermediate State between Death and the ſuppoſed general Reſurrection. I denied even the firſt, *viz.* That they had a future State of Exiſtence, *at all*, revealed to them. I think ſo ſtill, and that for this Doctrine we are indebted to the Goſpel of *Chriſt* alone. I may be miſtaken after all; but what the Annotator hath produced to the contrary, doth not convince me of an Error. The *Jews*, he obſerves, "did, in the Days of "*Moſes*, believe the Spirit of Man exiſted after its De-"parture from the Body." And what then?--Does this prove that they had this Notion from *Revelation*?--If *ſo*, it would follow, that the ſame was revealed alſo to the Antient *Greeks* and *Trojans*. For it is apparent that they did, in the Days of *Priam* and *Agamemnon*, believe the *ſame*. And as for "The *Jews* being expreſsly charged, "in *Leviticus*, with conſulting, aſking of, or enquiring "of,

therein, relate to the State of Men here, to the Diſpenſations of God towards Men in *this* World; the moſt diſtant of which was the Kingdom of the Meſſiah. This was the future State to which the *Jews* looked, *viz.* That under the Meſſiah their Kingdom ſhould become an univerſal and glorious Kingdom. But there is no Promiſe made to them of a Life after the preſent. This was to be revealed by *Chriſt*, who brought Life and Immortality to Light.

So that allowing the Author's Senſe and Conſtruction of the Texts he produces from the Old Teſtament to be juſt, yet they do not appear to contain a *revealed* Doctrine; but to be expreſſive only of the Preacher's private *Opinion*,

" of, or from the Dead;" Whatever Notions it may prove they had of the Dead, doth not the very Charge imply that *all* they *believed* concerning them was far from being ſolidly grounded?

Opinion, of what appeared to him reaſonable to ſuppoſe, or what was the Reſult of his own Thoughts and deep Penetration into the Nature of the human Soul. And, therefore, to reſt the Queſtion upon ſuch Texts, is to reſt it ſtill upon Reaſon; which he grants to be inſufficient here: or rather, indeed, to reſt it upon the bare Authority of a Philoſopher.

But if the Author ſhould inſiſt upon it, that the Preacher was an inſpired Writer, whoſe Sentiments are to be looked upon as divine, and every Thing he delivers as the infallible Dictate of the Spirit of God, let us examine the Conſtruction he puts upon the Texts, the firſt of which is, Eccl. iii. 21. *Who knoweth the Spirit of a Man that goeth upwards, and the Spirit of a Beaſt that goeth downward to the Earth?*

Instead of this Tranſlation, he offers another, as both more exact, and more literal,

'Who knoweth the Spirit of the Children 'of Men aſcending upward, and the Spirit 'of a Beaſt deſcending under the Earth?' This Tranſlation (if we could admit it) would juſt ſuit the Author's Opinion. But it is evidently leſs exact, as well as leſs literal, than the other. He tranſlates, indeed, the Word בני *(Children)* which is wholly omited by our Tranſlators. As this, however, affects not the Senſe of the Place, it is no way material. But he renders האדם *(Men)* which literally is *Man* *. *Aſcending upwards* is

* "בני האדם (ſays the Annotator) is rightly rendered, "*the Sons or Children of Men.*" But might it not be *as* rightly, at leaſt, rendered, the *Sons or Children of Man?*—If it may, (and I think the Annotator himſelf will not deny it) then to what purpoſe was the Obſervation made? — The point was not, whether Mr. *Steffe*, was right in rendering it *Sons of Men*, which, in meaning, is much the ſame with, *Sons of Man*; but whether האדם was, in point of Conſtruction, more *literally* rendered, of *Men*, than of *Man*. The Spirit of *a Man*, the Spirit of *the Sons of Men*, or the Spirit of the Sons of *Man*, are all equally well rendered, as to the Senſe; but

is not more literal, or more exact, than *that goeth upward*. *Deſcending under the Earth* is moſt of all unexact and illiteral. For למטה comes from the Verb נטה which ſignifies not, *to go, or be under,* but only *to incline towards any thing*; ſo that, the proper rendering of its Derivative למטה is *downwards*; beſides, ל prefixed to the Word ארץ determines the Senſe to be ſo. For what Nonſenſe would it make to render למטה, *under*, while לארץ ſignifies, *to the Earth*, i. e. deſcendeth *under to* the Earth!

but Mr. *Steffe* had propoſed the ſecond of theſe as *more literal* than the firſt, which is the Tranſlation in the Bible. Now it was in regard to the Word האדם *only* that I remarked he had not given a more exact and *literal* Verſion. And how much depends upon the rendering this Word in the *ſingular* or *plural* Number muſt be obvious to every one that underſtands the State of the Queſtion, and, conſequently, how material it was I ſhould remark upon his rendering it in the *plural* Number.

BUT, if this be the proper Conſtruction of the original Words, it may be aſked, Where is the Senſe * of the Aſſertion, That a Man's Spirit goeth upwards, and that of a Beaſt downward towards the Earth?—The Truth is, there is no Senſe in ſuch an Aſſertion; and our Author therefore ſtretches the Words to a quite different one; namely, that the Spirit of a Beaſt deſcends not *towards*, but *into*, or *under* the Earth, i. e. with the Body which moulders into Duſt. Againſt which Senſe

* "The Senſe is, (according to the Annotator) that "the Spirit of Man aſcendeth to God who gave it, but "the Spirit of the Brute, deſcendeth to the Earth with "his Body, and they periſh together." But, if this be meant, by the Spirit of a Beaſt going downward towards the Earth, *viz.* That it deſcendeth to the Earth with his Body, and they periſh together, What occaſion was there for Mr. *Steffe* to alter the Tranſlation in our Bibles and to render לְמַטָּה לָאָרֶץ not, *downwards*, *towards* or *to*, but, *under* the Earth?—It is plain that he thought the former could hardly expreſs ſuch a Senſe as he and the Annotator would put upon this Paſſage.

Senſe of the Words I ſhall but offer one Thing more in regard to the Signification of the Original, before I lay down what I conceive to be the true Meaning of the Text. And this is, that if it was the Intention of the Preacher to repreſent the Spirit of a Beaſt deſcending along with the Body into the Earth, he would not have uſed the Word ארץ, but אדמה, which is more ſynonymous with עפר than ארץ, ſignifying primarily *Earth*, in Oppoſition to other Subſtances; whereas ארץ properly ſignifies either the whole Earth, as diſtinguiſhed from the Heavens and the Sea, or a Tract of Land.

I would offer this, then, as the moſt literal Conſtruction of the Text, viz. *Who knoweth the Spirit of the Sons of Man, who goeth upwards* (walketh upright, or who is of an erect Poſture) *and the Spirit of a Beaſt that goeth*

goeth downward towards the Earth? (moveth or inclineth towards the Earth)*. The only

* THE Annotator has obſerved upon this Conſtruction, that "I cannot produce a ſingle Paſſage where הוּא is "put in Conſtruction with *the Sons of Man*;" And adds very bluntly, "There can be no doubt of its belonging "to the Word *Spirit*." Now, for the firſt, What can the Annotator mean by ſaying, that I "cannot produce "a ſingle Paſſage where הוּא is put in Conſtruction with "the *Sons of Man*"?—Have I put it in Conſtruction with *the Sons of Man?*—If I have not, what need to challenge me to juſtify aConſtruction which was never made?—It is very obvious that I put הוּא in Conſtruction with the Word *Man*, and not with the Words, *the Sons of Man*. Nay, I mention in the very next Sentence the Objection that might be made to conſtructing it with, *Man*, and endeavour to obviate it; and yet the Annotator ſeems to underſtand me as putting it in Conſtruction with, *the Sons of Man*. Or, if he mean, that "I cannot produce "a ſingle Paſſage where הוּא is put in Conſtruction with, *Man*," it is nothing to the Purpoſe, ſo long as many Inſtances may be produced of its being put in Conſtruction with a Word of the maſculine Gender. As the Grammarians themſelves allow that הִיא and הוּא are uſed promiſcuouſly one for another, or ſince (the Difference be-

only Objection to this Conſtruction is, that I make the Word *goeth* refer to Man, whereas the Pronoun הוא ſeems to determine it to relate to רוח (Spirit) ſince this Pronoun is reckoned by the Grammarians to be of the feminine Gender. But this, which hath led our Author to underſtand the Text, as he does, appears to be an Objection of little or no Moment, when we conſider the Grammarians themſelves, though they call הוא of the Maſculine, and היא of the feminine Gender, yet own, that they are uſed promiſcuouſly one for the other; many Inſtances of which might be produced. This I take to be the literal Conſtruction of the Words.

But

between ו and ז being ſo ſmall) they may have been by Accident eaſily changed one for the other, the Annotator was ſomething too poſitive in ſaying, "There can be "no Doubt of its belonging to the Word, *Spirit*."

BUT, with regard to their Meaning as they ſtand in Connection with what precedes and follows them, I apprehend they ſhould be rendered thus: *Who knoweth the Spirit of a Man* FROM *the Spirit of a Beaſt?*

AT the 18th Verſe it is ſaid, concerning the Eſtate of the Sons of Men, that they themſelves are Beaſts, or as the Beaſts. At the 19th Verſe the Reaſon is given, *For that which befalleth the Sons of Man befalleth Beaſts, even one thing befalleth them*; what is that?— Why, that they die alike, and are no more, having all one and the ſame Spirit; *as the one dieth, ſo dieth the other*; *yea, they have all one Breath*, (or rather *Spirit*, the ſame Word which occurs in our Text, and is tranſlated Spirit) *ſo that a Man hath no Pre-eminence above a Beaſt*; *for all is Vanity*. The Preacher continues, in the 20th Verſe, *All go unto one Place*

Place, all are of the Duſt, and all turn to Duſt again. Then follows the Text we are conſidering, as a Concluſion from the above Reflections: *Who knoweth* (who can diſtinguiſh, or what is the Difference, then, betwixt) *the Spirit of Man, who is formed upright, and the Spirit of a Beaſt, which inclineth its Body to the Earth? Wherefore I perceive, that there is nothing better than that a Man ſhould rejoice in his own Works, for that is his Portion*; an odd Kind of an Inference * for the Preacher to draw from ſo grave a Doctrine, as our Author ſuppoſes the preceding Verſe to contain.

* "True, (ſays the Annotator) if this were the Senſe "of the Original; which may be thus tranſlated, "*viz.* I ſaw therefore, That there was nothing good "from which a Man may rejoice in his own Works; be"cauſe ſuch is his Part or Condition; for who ſhall bring "him that he may ſee that which ſhall be after him." Which of theſe Tranſlations is to be preferred, or how much the Annotator has marred the Preacher's Inference from Mr. *Steffe*'s Doctrine, let the intelligent and learned Reader decide.

BUT, as I am not ſo ſolicitous to fix the preciſe Meaning of the Preacher, as to ſhew how little this Text is to be depended upon, in ſupport of the Doctrine of a ſeparate State of Exiſtence of the Soul after Death, I ſhall not ſtay to vindicate the Paraphraſe I have given, and ſhew its Conſiſtency with the general Tenour of this Book of *Eccleſiaſtes*, but proceed to demonſtrate by a yet different View of the Matter, the great Uncertainty, at leaſt, our Author goes upon in vindicating his Doctrine from this Text. For this Purpoſe let us even ſuppoſe, that the Author's Tranſlation is according to the literal Senſe of the Text, that עלה relates to רוח, that למטה ſignifies *under*, and that לארץ ſignifies *into the Earth*, and is as properly uſed as ארמה; in ſhort, that his Tranſlation may be admitted according to all the Rules of Grammar and Syntax, yet, it is ſtill dubious whether

ther he has hit upon the Senſe of the Words. For they are capable of being interpreted in a quite different Senſe, viz. *Who knoweth that the Spirit of Man aſcendeth upwards, and that the Spirit of a Beaſt deſcendeth under the Earth?* This Tranſlation is no leſs conſiſtent with Grammar and Syntax than the Author's; ſo that, ſuppoſing the Senſe he puts upon the Words *may* be the true Senſe, yet their being equally capable of another and quite contrary Senſe, deſtroys the Validity of the Argument he has founded upon them.

Let us now ſee how the Author ſupports his Doctrine from the other Text, Eccl. xii. 7. *Then ſhall the Duſt return to the Earth, as it was; and the Spirit ſhall return to God who gave it.*

OUR Author very juſtly maintains, that the Preacher can never intend here two different Times, the one when the Body turns to Duſt, and the other when the Reſurrection of the Dead ſhall be. The Time for the Return of the Body to the Duſt, and the Spirit to God who gave it, is the ſame; and any Objections to the Soul's ſeparate Exiſtence from the Body, founded only upon interpreting this Text, as referring to the Time of the Reſurrection, as well as to the Diſſolution of the Body, are altogether weak and frivolous.

BUT the Refutation of ſuch like Objections is not ſufficient to eſtabliſh the Truth of his Doctrine. Notwithſtanding his obviating that Difficulty, which ſeems to be the only one with him, the Text appears ſtill wholly againſt him.

IF

IF we conſider what is alluded to in the Expreſſion the Preacher makes uſe of, we ſhall be led to conſtrue the Words in a very different Senſe from that of the Author; who ſuppoſeth, that the Return of the Spirit to God means, that it ſhall exiſt a ſeparate conſcious Being, in the Preſence of God. Now when it is ſaid, *the Duſt ſhall return to the Earth as it was*, this plainly alludes to the Formation of the Body; and when it is ſaid, *And the Spirit ſhall return to God that gave it*, the Preacher as plainly alludes to God's forming Man a living Soul, by breathing into him the Breath of Life. What is it then that God gave Man?--Why, this Breath, רוח, the ſame Word which is tranſlated in our Text, *Spirit*. As at Death the Earth receives her Duſt again, ſo is God repreſented as taking again that Breath of *Life* which

which he breathed into Man. This is the obvious Senſe of the Words, and it is forced and unnatural to ſuppoſe the other; not to inſiſt upon another Conſideration, which oppoſes the Author's Senſe of the Words, *viz.* The Preacher is ſpeaking here of Mankind in general, of the wicked as well as the righteous; and can we imagine, that he would aſſert this of the former, that their Spirits return after Death to God?

I SHALL cloſe this Remark with obſerving, That the Author ſeems to be led into the Senſe he gives of this Text by a greater Attention to the Tranſlation of it in the Bible, than to the Original itſelf. Thus he inſiſts much upon the Word *then*, in order to get clear of the above-mentioned Objection, concerning the Time referred to; which Objection is, indeed, frivolous in itſelf, and eaſily

eaſily obviated; but not merely, if at all, by the Conſideration of the Word *then*, which is only one among many others that would have been, at leaſt, equally agreeable to the original Word ו.

AGAIN, we have tranſlated the Word ישוב, *then* SHALL *return*; as if the Preacher intended to inform us of ſome important Truth, or Event; it looks like a poſitive and peremptory Declaration, that the Soul *ſhall* certainly, after the Diſſolution of the Body, return to God; which manner of Speaking has occaſioned the Author to lay more Streſs upon this Text in Confirmation of his Doctrine, than he would have done, had he attended more to the Original. For ו does not neceſſarily ſignify *then*, no more than יש does, *ſhall return*. The moſt natural rendering

rendering of theſe Words, and which beſt Suits the Context, is, *or the Duſt return, &c.*

THUS have we conſidered what the Author has produced from the Old Teſtament in favour of his Opinion, and upon the moſt candid Review of his Arguments, I cannot but judge them very inſufficient; the Texts themſelves which he inſiſts upon having no relation to a State of Exiſtence after Death, whether ſeparate from the Body, or otherwiſe.

THE Texts he produces from the New Teſtament are much more to the Purpoſe, as we can have no Doubt of their referring to a future Exiſtence. The Author, however, ſeems not to lay greater Streſs upon them, nor does he conſider them more particularly than the others.

WITH

With regard to the firſt of theſe (*Phil.* i. 23.) he does but juſt argue from the literal rendering of the Word αναλυσαι, which we have tranſlated, *to depart.* He obſerves it ſignifies, *to be unlooſed from the Body, diſjoined, diſconnected,* which is an improper way of ſpeaking, upon the Suppoſition that the Soul ſleeps with the Body in the Grave. It is ſufficient to object to this (what the Author conjectures would be objected) that the Word is too general to determine the Matter. He therefore waves any farther Conſideration of this Text, and produces another, *viz.* 2 *Cor.* v. 8. the Language of which he thinks is more expreſs and determinate; *We are confident, I ſay, willing rather to be abſent from the Body,* εκδημησαι εκ τ σωματος, *and to be preſent with the Lord.*

AND here I will freely own, that the Expreſſion (conſidered apart, and independent of the Context and general Doctrine of the Apoſtle elſewhere) is very much in favour of the Author's Opinion. Εκδημησαι εκ τε σωματος can ſignify nothing elſe, without forcing the Conſtruction, than to be abſent from, or to quit the Body, and not merely to quit the troubles of Life; And, *to be preſent with the Lord*, immediately following ſuch an Expreſſion, would lead one (without attending to any thing farther than the Text itſelf) to imagine, that the Apoſtle deſired his Soul might quit his Body, and remove immediately to Chriſt, and be with him, while his Body remained in the Duſt.

BUT

BUT let us conſider the Context, and we ſhall find a very different Senſe reſult from the whole.

AT the firſt Verſe of this Chapter the Apoſtle ſays, *That if our earthly Houſe of this Tabernacle were diſſolved, we have a Building of God, an Houſe not made with Hands, eternal in the Heavens.* And, at the ſecond Verſe, *For in this we groan earneſtly, deſiring to be cloathed upon with our Houſe which is from Heaven.* Now this is undoubtedly that heavenly Body for which we are to exchange this earthly; the ſame glorified, incorruptible Body which he ſpeaks of in another Place, relating to the Reſurrection of the Dead. And, that this is the Houſe into which the Apoſtle deſires to remove, or the glorified Body which, after

Death, he desires to be cloathed with, and not to exist a mere separate Spirit, is plain from the fourth Verse, *For we that are in this Tabernacle do groan, being burdened, not*, says he, *for that we would be uncloathed, but cloathed upon*, &c. He goes on,

VERSE 5. *Now he that has wrought us for the self-same thing, is God, who also hath given unto us the Earnest of the Spirit.* What was this the Earnest of?—Why, that as God had raised Christ from the Dead, he would also raise them (the Apostles) from the Dead. And now observe the Reason he gives for his being bold, undaunted, or confident, *viz.*

VERSE 6. Therefore *we* (the Apostles) *are always confident*; namely, through Hope of

of the Building of God, the glorified Body he mentioned above.

VERSE 8. *We are confident, I ſay, and willing rather to be abſent from the Body,* (from this groſs and burthenſome Body) *and to be preſent with the Lord* (in our glorified Body at his Appearance): That he refers to his being preſent with Chriſt, not before, but after the Reſurrection, the two following Verſes, as well as the preceding ones already mentioned, evidently ſhew.

VERSE 9. *Wherefore we labour, that whether preſent or abſent, we may be accepted of him.*

VERSE 10. *For we muſt all appear before the Judgment Seat of Chriſt, that every one may receive the Things done in the Body, &c.* For *this* it is he labours, *viz.* That he may be accepted

cepted of Chriſt at the laſt Day; And for *this* it is he had rather be abſent from the Body, *viz.* That he may receive the Things he has done in the Body, and be for ever with the Lord.

THESE Texts then are far from proving our Author's Doctrine, how ſtrong ſoever they may appear to the firſt Sight, and conſidered without reference to the Context.

IN fine, the Author conſiders his Subject ſomewhat too ſuperficially, and concludes too haſtily from the Texts he produces. However, he deſerves the Attention of the Public, on account of his Method and Perſpicuity. If he is not every where demonſtrative, he is, at leaſt, always intelligible; and appears to be a ſincere Enquirer after Truth.

REMARKS

UPON

MR. STEFFE'S BRIEF DEFENCE

OF THE

First of the Five LETTERS

ON THE

INTERMEDIATE STATE.

REMARKS*

UPON

Mr. STEFFE's Brief Defence

OF THE

First of the Five Letters

ON THE

INTERMEDIATE STATE.

ONE great Cauſe of the ſlow Progreſs of religious Truth, next to the Want of a ſincere Love for it, ſeems to be a certain *Impatience* in conducting our Enquiries concerning it. The Defenders of Chriſtianity in the firſt Centuries are remarkably deficient

* Originally publiſhed in the Grand Magazine for *April* 1758.

in this reſpect; and though our modern Divines are not equally blameable, they are nevertheleſs greatly ſo. 'Tis this which has led them to frame many uncertain Hypotheſes, and indulge many wild Conjectures of Things which are diſcoverable by *Revelation alone*, and not to be well underſtood without a diligent and cloſe Attention to the Scriptures.

THE ſame *Impatience*, as it impedes their own Knowledge, ſo it frequently renders them leſs accurate and leſs perſpicuous in communicating Knowledge to others. They are apt to crowd in their Arguments too thick, and produce Paſſages of Scripture in ſuch Profuſion as tends rather to confuſe than convince the Reader. Thoſe Enquiries which proceed upon the ſimpleſt Plan are likely to be moſt effectual for the Advance-

ment

ment of Truth; ſince, though Error may happen to be the Reſult, yet the Error being by this means conſpicuous, becomes itſelf a Guide to Truth.

THERE was this Simplicity of Deſign, I muſt own, in the firſt of Mr. *Steffe*'s Five Letters; which to me was no ſmall Recommendation of it, and an Inducement to make thoſe Remarks, which I ſhould have been diſcouraged from attempting, had his Performance been more extenſive in its Plan, or more wanting in Perſpicuity.

HE there propoſed to prove the Doctrine of the Soul's ſeparate State of Exiſtence after Death, from four Texts of Scripture. In the Monthly Review for *May* 1757, I undertook to ſhew the Inſufficiency of the Texts themſelves, and of what was advanced from

from them to prove such a Doctrine. I now propose to consider what he has lately advanced in a Letter to *Lucilius*, entitled, *A Brief Defence of the First of the Five Letters on the Intermediate State*, &c. that is, so far as it respects my Remarks. *One* only of the four Texts will come under our Consideration; since, notwithstanding Mr. *Steffe*'s Acknowledgment of my 'Remarks 'deserving Notice, being, for the most Part, 'written with Fairness and Candour, as well 'as with the Appearance of Learning and 'Argument,' he has hardly made a Reply to, so far from attempting to refute, what has been said upon the *other Three*.

THE Passage in Dispute is, *Eccl.* iii. 21. *Who knoweth the Spirit of Man that goeth upward, and the Spirit of a Beast that goeth downward to the Earth?* Mr. *Steffe* had

had propoſed another Tranſlation, both as more exact, and more literal, *viz.* 'Who 'knoweth the Spirit of *the Children of Men* '*aſcending* upward, and the Spirit of a 'Beaſt *deſcending under* the Earth?' Which, it was aſſerted, is leſs exact, and leſs literal than the other; האדם, which he renders, *Men*, being literally, *Man*; and, *aſcending upward*, not more exact, or more literal than, *that goeth upward.* He now, however, chuſes *thus* to wave any Defence of theſe two Alterations, 'Whether בני האדם 'ſhould be rendered *Children* of *Men*, or— 'of *Man*; and העלה למעלה *going* upwards, 'or *aſcending* upwards, as it is a Matter of 'no Conſequence, I ſhall not trouble my-'ſelf to enquire.'

UPON which I ſhall only obſerve, that Mr. *Steffe* ſhould not have dropt this, as a Matter

Matter of *no Conſequence,* becauſe he himſelf propoſed theſe Alterations, as ſuch; and, indeed, could he have ſhewn that his rendering the Word האדם *of Men,* was more exact and literal than rendering it, *of Man,* in the ſingular Number, he had effectually removed this main Objection to his Senſe of the Text; *viz.* That the erect Poſture of the Body might only be ſignified by the Expreſſion, *that goeth upwards.* But to come to thoſe Alterations which Mr. *Steffe* undertakes to defend.

למטה לארץ *under the Earth:* This, I aſſerted, was moſt of all unexact and unliteral, and the Reaſon I gave, was the primary Signification of נטה *to incline towards,* and the Prepoſition ל's being prefixed to ארץ the literal Conſtruction of which is *to the Earth.* To this Mr. *Steffe* anſwers, 'That 'the

'the first of these Words can be rendered by 'nothing else than *beneath*, or *under*, in the fol-'lowing Passage, *Deut.* xxviii. 13. *And the Lord thy God shall make thee the* Head, *and not the* Tail, *and thou shalt---not be* beneath, לְמַטָּה, ὑποκάτω,' lxx.

BUT now, supposing the Instance good, and that לְמַטָּה does in *this* Passage signify *under*, does it follow that it is more literally, or more properly rendered so, than by its primary Meaning in *every* Passage of Scripture? --Because in *Deut.* xxviii. 13. it may be rendered *under*, which is not its primary Sense, must it therefore in *Eccl.* iii. 21. be rendered so, and not *towards*, which is its primary Sense?--Mr. *Steffe* had proposed *his* Translation of it, as more literal and more exact than *that* in the Bible. It was denied to be so. To have made, therefore, a valid De-

fence of his Tranſlation, he ſhould have ſhewn, that it was more *literal* and more *exact*; inſtead of which his whole Defence is, that למטה *ſometimes*, viz. in *Deut.* ſignifies, *under*.

BUT Mr. *Steffe* has been extremely unhappy in his Inſtance; למטה in this Paſſage no more ſignifying *under*, than in that of *Eccleſiaſtes*. *Downwards* is its proper rendering. There is no neceſſity of varying from its primary Acceptation. *And the Lord ſhall make thee the* Head, *and not the* Tail; *and thou ſhalt be*, למעלה, above *or* upwards, (as the Head is;) *and thou ſhalt not be* למטה. How is that?——Why, *below* or *downwards*, (as the Tail is). I know not of another Inſtance in all the Bible, which is leſs to his Purpoſe than this; at the ſame time that the quoting ſuch a Text plainly ſhews,

ſhews, that he was guided entirely by the Engliſh and not the Original, the Word *beneath*, ſounding ſo ſynonimous with his, *under*.

AND now let us examine Mr. *Steffe*'s Defence, in relation to לארץ. Here ל is prefixed to the Word ארץ. Its literal Conſtruction therefore, it was ſaid, is, *to the Earth*, which connects properly enough with למטה, *downwards*, but very improperly, or rather, not at all with it rendered, *under*; *under to* the Earth, making Nonſenſe.

To this Mr. *Steffe* anſwers much in the ſame Manner as above, *viz.* That ל is ſometimes uſed for the *Emphatic* ה or as a mere *Expletive*, and produceth a Text to ſhew it, *Ex.* xx. 4. Here, therefore, let it be obſerved as above, that ſuppoſing his *Inſtance*

good, yet it would not be ſufficient to make his *Defence good*. But to try the Inſtance itſelf. ‘ *Thou ſhalt not make to thee any* ‘ *Likeneſs of any Thing—that is in the Water* ‘ under *the Earth*, מתחת לארץ --- I confeſs ‘ I know not how theſe two laſt Words can ‘ be rendered properly, without conſidering ‘ the ל as a mere Expletive or Emphatic.’

Now, I confeſs, there appears to me not the leaſt Neceſſity for conſidering ל as a mere *Expletive* or *Emphatic*, though there may be no occaſion to render it, *to*. For by the Expreſſion במים מתחת לארץ, is not meant thoſe Waters which are ſubterraneous or *under* Ground, but the Waters which are *upon* the Earth; And, whereas they are ſaid to be מתחת, this does not ſignify, that they are actually *under* this Earth, (which would be Nonſenſe) but only that they are *below*,

or

or towards the Parts *below*, in Oppoſition to the *Heavens* which are ſaid to be *above*, or towards the Parts *above*. In the ſame Manner the *Earth* is ſaid to be *below*, in Oppoſition to the Heavens *above*; the very ſame Word is made Uſe of to expreſs this its Situation, and occurs in this ſame Verſe, one View of which will render any further Illuſtration of this Point unneceſſary. *Thou ſhalt not make unto thee any graven Image, or any Likeneſs of any Thing that is in Heaven* above ממעל, (literally, *from* above, or from the Parts above) *or that is in the Earth* beneath מתחת, (literally, *from* beneath, from the Parts below) *or that is in the Waters* מתחת *beneath*, (that is, which Waters are beneath or below the Heavens) לארץ *upon* the Earth.

THIS

THIS is the literal rendering of ל, and indeed makes the beſt Senſe. For is it not more proper and more intelligible to ſpeak of the Waters as being *upon* the Earth than *under* it?--Do we ſay, that the Ocean, and the Rivers, and the Pools are *under* the Earth?--We always ſpeak of them as being (which they really are) על־פני הארץ *on the Face of the Earth.* So that there is no need to conſider ל as an *Expletive*, or any other than a *Prepoſition.* Here again how obvious is it, that Mr. *Steffe* has been guided by the Authority of our *Engliſh* Tranſlators, inſtead of attending to the *Original!* For had they expreſſed themſelves thus, *viz.* 'That is in the Waters *below*, *on* the 'Earth,' he would not have thought of quoting this Text in his Defence.

I OBSERVED

I OBSERVED farther, that, if it was the Intention of the Preacher, in this Place, to repreſent the Spirit of a Beaſt deſcending along with the Body into the Earth, אדמה would have been more expreſſive of his Meaning than ארץ, as this latter is not ſo properly uſed to ſignify *Earth* or *Mould*, (that is, the Principle into which the Body is reſolved after Death) as *the* Earth itſelf, that is, the whole Globe, or a *Tract* of Land.

IN anſwer to this, Mr. *Steffe* would ſhow from one Paſſage of Scripture, that ארץ does *ſometimes* ſignify the *Soil* or *Mould* of the Earth; a Defence of the ſame kind with the two abovementioned. For admitting that it *may* be uſed in this Senſe, and that the Text he quotes, is a ſufficient Inſtance, yet what doth it prove?--Not, that ארץ is ſynonimous

with

with עפר or אדמה, or that it ſo properly ſignifies the *Principle* into which the Body is reſolved after Death, (which he ſhould have ſhewn, to make his Defence good) but only, that it is *ſometimes* uſed in a Senſe that is not its primary and proper One.

BUT here too, the Inſtance itſelf fails, 2 *Kings* ii. 19.—*the Situation of this City is pleaſant, but the Water is naught and the* Ground והארץ *barren.* ארץ in this Paſſage plainly ſignifies, the *whole Tract* of Land near the City, the *Country* itſelf, and not merely, the *Soil* or *Mould.* The Idea, that would here be conveyed by the Men of the City to *Eliſha*, is, not ſo much the *Nature* or *Quality* of the Soil, as the barren *Appearance* of the Country around, in which Caſe ארץ is more properly uſed than אדמה would have been; *And the Men of the City ſaid unto* Eliſha, *behold*,

behold, we pray thee; the Situation of this City is pleaſant, as my Lord ſeeth; but הארץ *the* Land, *(the* Country *around,) as thou ſeeſt, is barren.*

ONCE more then I muſt remark, (let not Mr. *Steffe* think it Want of Candour) that he has been guided here more by the Sound of the *Engliſh* Tranſlation, than by that 'true 'Taſte and Spirit of Criticiſm,' with which he would be criticiſed upon. No doubt, the Expreſſion, the *Ground* is *barren*, appears much in his favour, and as if it was the Intention of the Writer to denote by it the Quality of the Soil, *viz.* its *Barrenneſs*, in which Caſe ארץ would be uſed here for אדמה the *Ground* or *Soil.* But then, this is all that appears in his favour; for the Word tranſlated *barren* is משכלת, whoſe root is שכל, which does not properly ſignify, to be *barren*, but, to be *deprived* of, *Orbatus*

 fuit;

fuit; And, therefore, its Derivative משכלה is not ſo properly and literally rendered *barren*, or *unfruitful*, as, *bare* or *waſte*. Which latter Epithets apply well to ארץ taken in its primary Senſe, for a whole *Tract* of Land, but not at all, if taken in Mr. *Steffe*'s Senſe, for the *Soil* or *Mould* of the Earth. הארץ משכלת but the *Land* (or Country) is waſte. This is literal, and makes good Senſe. The *Ground* (meaning the *Soil* or *Mould*) is waſte. This is unliteral, and makes Nonſenſe.

Mr *Steffe*, therefore, were it only to ſhew that ארץ is *ever* taken in his Senſe, ſhould have produced a more plauſible Inſtance. And ſuch a one I will now point out to him. It is in *Eccl.* xii. 17. *Then ſhall the Duſt return to the Earth as it was*; one of the Texts themſelves which he had produced in ſupport of his Doctrine, and the Inſufficiency of which has

has been conſidered. In this Paſſage the Preacher is ſpeaking of the Return of the Body after Death to the Earth; and yet the Word ארץ is made uſe of, and not אדמה. I know not of another Text that appears, at firſt Sight, ſo much in favour of Mr. *Steffe*, and cannot but wonder at his Overſight, or at his Judgment in chuſing to produce another. So ſtrong and, at the ſame time, ſo very obvious an Objection to my Diſtinction betwixt ארץ and אדמה did this ſeem to a very acute Hebraiſt * and learned Divine in the Eſtabliſhment, (with whoſe Correſpondence on the Occaſion I have been honoured, and again beg Leave to expreſs my Senſibility to the Favour and my Deſire of its Continuance) that he thought it impoſſible to be conſidered in any other Light than as an

* Who has lately favoured the Public with a new and elaborate Tranſlation of the three firſt Chapters of *Geneſis*.

Exception. I ſhall not here, however, ſtay to obviate the Difficulty as it has not been urged by the Perſon, with whom alone I have to do at preſent.

To paſs then to the only Word remaining to be conſidered, relative to Mr. *Steffe*'s *Brief Defence*, *viz.* הוא. This Pronoun, in my Remarks on his former Performance, I had connected with האדם; and becauſe it is generally reckoned by Grammarians to be of the feminine Gender, and conſequently this might be objected to me, I offered ſomething to obviate any ſuch Objection. This, however, is not his Objection. What he urges is, ſomething more ſmart and witty. It might have ſavoured of Pedantry, to have attempted to confute a Perſon by grammatical Skill. Much genteeler, ſurely, this that follows; 'Others connect הוא with בני האדם

'בני האדם and therefore ſeem to place Man's
'Pre-eminence, neither in his *Life* nor his
'*Death*, but wholly in the *erect* Poſture of
'his Body. *Who knoweth the Spirit of Man,*
'*which* Man *goeth upward*, i. e. upright,
'while the Beaſt is *prone* to the Earth. But
'this, if it be really *Solomon*'s Definition of
'Man, ſeems neither better nor truer than
'the *implume bipes* of *Plato*, which there-
'fore *Diogenes* would equally have confuted
'with his Dunghill Cock; who with *Dry-*
'*den*'s *Chanticleer* might have ſaid,

"I with Pleaſure ſee
"Man ſtrutting on two Legs and apeing me." ‡

UPON

‡ Mr. *Steffe* is extremely welcome to this Piece of Wit, becauſe it is perfectly *innocent*, and may, though not very ſeaſonable on a Subject of this Nature, pleaſe ſome ſort of Readers. But will the R. R. Author of *the Divine Legation of Moſes* be thought to have exerciſed this ſame Talent of

UPON which I ſhall only remark, that *Solomon* or any Writer might mention the upright

of Wit, either, in a Manner worthy of himſelf, or, indeed, with *Innocence?* It can, ſurely, be deemed but a vulgar Pleaſure his Lordſhip ſeems to take, in calling the Controverters of the Doctrine of an intermediate State by the Name of *Dreamers*, *Sleepers*, *Middle-Men*, *&c.* Such Language is more worthy of that inferior and popular Claſs of Writers, (to which indeed it has hitherto been chiefly confined) than that Eminence, which the Biſhop of *Glouceſter* holds in the learned World. Theſe Gentlemen too, with whom his Lordſhip makes ſo *merry* and ſo *free*, have been too long dinn'd with ſuch ſort of Names to have their *Sleep* broken by a Repetition of the rude Noiſe. Nor can the R. R. Author be thought to have acquitted himſelf with more *Decency* and *Propriety of Character*, in making a very ſerious Expreſſion from a Sacred Writer ſerve the Purpoſe of a witty Sarcaſm. "St. *Jude's filthy Dreamers* only "*defiled the Fleſh.* Theſe *defile the Spirit.*" But, though we cannot ſuppoſe that St. *Jude* and the *Biſhop* are equally ſerious, yet it is not ſo clear, that his Lordſhip, in bringing this Charge of *Spiritual Defilement* againſt the Dreamers, is altogether *in Jeſt.* Certain it is, that, however unwilling his Lordſhip might be to ſuppreſs ſo jocular a Sentiment

right Poſture of Man, without intending it either as a Definition of Man or a Mark of his Pre-eminence.

HAVING

timent, he is willing we ſhould conſider the Doctrine in a ſerious Light, as of a dangerous and *defiling* Nature. For the Learned Author of, *Conſiderations on the Theory of Religion*, is repreſented as a Reviver of the *Sadducean* Opinion, of the *Extinction of the Soul* on Death, his valuable Quotations from Scripture *ſcornfully* termed, "A "Number of WONDERFUL Things." and this Scrap of Scripture, *there be gods many*, judged by the R. R. Author to be a ſtronger Text againſt the *Unity* of the Godhead, than any this learned Writer has produced for *his Opinion*. The late worthy Dr. *Taylor* of *Norwich* is called "Ano-"ther of theſe Sleepers," and a very ſenſible Quotation from him has the following *decent* Reflection paſſed upon it. "This is the old exploded *Traſh* of *Coward*, *Toland* "and *Collins*." And yet, I dare ſay, his Lordſhip will think this Writer as honourably claſs'd, in point of Authorſhip, with *Coward*, *Toland* and *Collins*, as the Biſhop of *Glouceſter* would be, ſhould ſome one, illnaturedly pleaſant, and availing himſelf of his Lordſhip's *decent* Expreſſion, claſs *his* Performance on this Subject, with the old, popular—*Traſh*—of *Goddard*, *Steffe* and *Fleming*.

HAVING thus conſidered all that Mr. *Steffe* has offered in Defence of the Senſe he had put upon this Text in *Eccl.* iii. 21. that is, ſo far as concerned the Remarks made upon the Firſt of his Five Letters on the *Intermediate State*; it will now be moſt proper to conclude the Whole, with obſerving how very defective this *Brief Defence* is, in the Plan itſelf, on which it proceeds, and comparing it with ſuch a one as *ought* to have been attempted.

THIS Text, then, was brought to prove the Doctrine of an *Intermediate State.* For this Purpoſe, the following was aſſerted to be the true Import of the Original, *viz. Who knoweth the Spirit of* the Children of Men, *which* (Spirit) aſcendeth *upwards? and the Spirit of*

of the Beaſt, which (Spirit) deſcendeth under *the Earth?*

Now, if this be the true Import of the Text in the Original, and *no other* Meaning can, conſiſtently with any juſt Rules of Interpretation, be affixed to the Words, then it is ſufficient to prove the Doctrine contended for. But, if either this be not the true Import of the Words in the Original, or another Meaning can, conſiſtently with juſt Rules of Interpretation, be affixed to them, then the Text is no certain Proof of the Doctrine. And that they are capable of *another* and very different Meaning, and conſequently inſufficient to found ſuch a Doctrine upon, is what was urged in Oppoſition to Mr. *Steffe*'s Argument in favour of it.

IN order therefore to make a good and valid Defence it behoved him to ſhew, that the Text was not capable of a *different* Senſe from that which he put upon it. Has this been done in the *Brief Defence* now conſidered? No. Nay, it has not been ſo much as attempted. Mr. *Steffe* has contented himſelf with endeavouring to ſhew (tho' he is far from having ſhewn even this) that his Senſe *may* be admitted; which was not the Point in queſtion. The Queſtion is, Whether his Senſe of the Words can be admitted as the moſt *literal* and moſt *exact* Senſe, and whether *no other* Meaning can be affixed to them, which doth not include in it the Doctrine of an *Intermediate State*.

I HAVE thought it neceſſary to preſent Mr. *Steffe* with this State of the Queſtion, that

that he may ſee with what Reaſon I may omit taking Notice of any future Defence on this Subject, if it ſhould proceed upon the *ſame Plan* with this, which I have been conſidering.

THE END.

THE INDEX.

A.

ARIANS, their Notion of Chriſt in a pre-exiſtent State conſidered and confuted *Page* 4--9, 94, &c.

—— their Theology compared with, and in what Reſpects differing from the Heathen 5

—— their Hypotheſis, on what grounded 6

—— their Objection to the *Trinitarian* Interpretation of the Three firſt Verſes of the firſt Chapter of St. *John*'s Goſpel, conſidered 17

Arians,

Arians, their Senſe of the *Word* or *Logos*, vide *Logos*.

Athanaſian (Creed), Unity of the Godhead aſſerted, and the Diviſion of it expreſly denied therein *Page* 232

B.

Begotten-Only Son, Meaning of that Expreſſion, applied to Chriſt 115

Boſom of the Father, the Meaning of that Expreſſion 75

C.

Chriſt pre-exiſted not a diſtinct Being from and inferior to *God* 12, 59, *et ſeq.*

—— not an Angel or Demi-god united to Humanity 14

—— *God* and not any inferior Being ſpake to the World by and dwelt in Him 28, 33, *et ſeq.*

Chriſt, Human Nature of *Page* 167--207
—— had no middle Nature between the Divine and Human 84, 186
—— Creation of all Things by, how to be interpreted 187--193
—— the Firſt-born of the new Creation 192--200
—— Texts relating to his Miſſion into the World 76--126
Church, Aſſertions of no one Church concerning the TRINITY, a ſufficient Ground of Faith, excluſive of Scripture Authority 223
—— of *England*, her Worſhip vindicated againſt the Objections of the *Socinians* 20
———— againſt the Objections of the *Arians* 22
———— the faireſt Way of interpreting her Aſſertions concerning the TRINITY 226

Church

Church of *England*, true Method of defending her Doctrines *Page* 49

——— to enquire carefully into the Meaning of her Expreſſions, but Juſtice to Her 225

——— vindicated from the Charge of *Polytheiſm* 133, 233--235

Council of *Nice* I. rejected the Word *(God)* in the 16th Verſe of the third Chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* 41

Creation, of the natural World aſcribed to *God* alone 187--189

——— when aſcribed to *Jeſus Chriſt* to be underſtood of the new, or ſpiritual 190--293

——— *Chriſt* the Firſt-born of the new 193--201

Creature, every, Πασης Κτισεως, what is meant by that Expreſſion, in the fifth Verſe of the firſt Chapter to the *Coloſſians* 198

Creeds,

Creeds, Unity of the Deity asserted in all of them *Page* 232, 235

Curcellæus, his Translation of *Rom.* ix. 5. 39

D.

Dawson Mr. his Sense of the *Logos*, and Translation of the first Verse of the first Chapter of St. *John*'s Gospel 58, 59

Defence of the Church, should be scriptural 49

Devotions of our Church addressed to One *God* 207, 232

Distinction, made in Scripture between the Person of the Father, and that of the Son, marks not a Division of the Godhead 28, 31

Divines, generally mistaken in their Sense of the *Logos* 16--18

——— many have more exceptionably expressed the Doctrine of the TRINITY than

the Compiler of the *Athanaſian* Creed *Page* 81, 86, 118--121, 227

Divinity true and perfect, wrought and was manifeſted in the Man *Chriſt Jeſus*, 1--128

——— proved from the Titles given to our *Redeemer* 2--9

——— from the Incarnation 9--12

——— from the Teſtimony of the Evangeliſts 12--19

——— from the Teſtimony of the Apoſtles 29--37

——— from the ſignal Preſervation of the Church of *Chriſt* 45--49

——— the Honour claimed by *Chriſt* on that Account 84--89

——— Miſtake of the *Jews* concerning it, as alſo of *Chriſt*'s own Diſciples and ſome later *Chriſtians* 89--100

——— Miracles of *Chriſt*, a Proof of it 102

Divinity,

Divinity, one and the ſame wrought in *Chriſt* and was manifeſted by the Spirit *Page* 122, 123, 157

Doctrine of the Church of *England*, concerning the Godhead, not myſterious 231

Doctrines revealed, Objects of a rational Enquiry 217, 222

——— of the Church of *England*, not to be blamed by thoſe that miſ-underſtand her Expreſſions 224.

——— of the Church of *England*, general Tenor of the Liturgy and Articles the only Interpreters of them 226

——— of the Church of *England*, how beſt defended 41, 42

E.

Eraſmus, his Tranſlation of a Paſſage in *Romans* relative to *Chriſt* 39

Enquiry rational into Religion, not dangerous *Page* 216

Eternal Power and Godhead, aſcribed to our *Saviour* 20

Evangeliſts, their Account of the Incarnation 9, 175

——— Proofs of the Divinity of our *Redeemer* from them 12--19

F.

Faith in revealed Doctrines, Scripture the only juſt Ground of 42, 223

——— implicit, Arguments for it lead to *Popery* 216

Father, Title of *Saviour* given in Scripture both to *God* the *Father*, and his *Son*, 36

——— Power of working Miracles aſcribed both to the *Father* and the *Son*, an Attribute of one and the ſame Being, or the perfectly Divine Nature 31

Firſt-born of every Creature, not applied to *Chriſt* with reſpect to his Pre-exiſtence *Page* 192--200

Fleming, Aſſerter of an Intermediate State 295

Fleſh, who manifeſted in the 4, 12, 18, 35, 99

—— σαρξ ſynonimous with, ανθρωπος a *Man* 72

G.

Glouceſter, Remark on the Biſhop of 293

Glory which *Chriſt* had with the *Father*, how to be interpreted 133

God, our *Saviour* proved to be true and perfect 9--20, 35, 74--126

—— ſtiled by St. *John*, the *Word* 59

—— Our, a Title given in Scripture to none but the One Supreme Being 4

Goddard,

Goddard, one of the Aſſerters of an Intermediate State 295

Godhead, undivided 28, &c. vide *Divinity*

——— the Fulneſs of it manifeſted in the Fleſh 33, vide *Chriſt*

Goſpel, in the Beginning with *God* the *Father* 58--64

——— afterwards with the Man *Chriſt Jeſus* 57 & *ſeq.*

Grace and Truth, the Goſpel contraſted with the Law ſtiled 73

Grotius, his Obſervation on *Rom.* ix. 5. 38

——— his Senſe of the *Logos*, and Perplexity occaſioned thereby 62

——— his Senſe of ως μονογενης παρα Πατρος 115

H.

Heaven from, the Meaning of that and ſuch like Expreſſions, applied to the coming of *Chriſt* into the World *Page* 76 *et ſeq.*

Holy Ghoſt, not a diſtinct Being from and inferior to *God* 150

——. The ſame in Subſtance with *God* 157

—— Blaſphemy againſt the *Holy Ghoſt* Blaſphemy againſt *God* 150

—— Divine Attributes aſcribed to the *Holy Ghoſt* 155, 156

——Ground of an Error concerning the 158

— A proper Diſtinction to be obſerved concerning the 160

— The ſame Operations aſcribed to the *Holy Ghoſt* as to *God* 148 *et ſeq.*

Human Nature of *Chriſt*, proved from the Account given of him from his Birth to the

the Time of his public Miniſtry
Page 176--178
—— proved from his Mediatorial Office
179--186

I.

I am, how underſtood of *Chriſt* 110, 111
Jehovah Aleim, imports not two diſtinct and ſeparate Beings 7
Jeſus. vide *Chriſt*
Jews, Their Miſconſtruction of our *Saviour*'s Words concerning his Dignity the ſame with that of the *Arians* 94
—— charged with an Intercourſe with the Dead, no Proof of an Intermediate State 246
Incarnation, 10--12, 175
———— *Arian* Notion of it ſtated and confuted 10

Incarnation, Dr. *South*'s Conception of it abſurd *Page* 81, 82, 121

Inferiority of *Chriſt* to *God* the *Father*, in what Reſpect aſſerted 84

Intermediate State 245

——— no Proof of it in the Old Teſtament 246

——— Objection from the *Jews* conſulting with the Dead, conſidered *Ibid*

K.

Kingdom of *Chriſt*, repreſented in Scripture as exiſting from the Foundation of the World 69

L.

Law Jewiſh, contraſted with *Grace* and *Truth*, or the *Logos* 73

——— the main Deſign of the 169

Logos, Diſſertation concerning the *Page* 55--140
—— *God* ſo ſtiled 59
—— *Chriſt* ſo ſtiled 71--74
—— different Senſe given of it by *Trinitarians*, *Arians*, *Socinians* and *Sabellians*, 55, 56
—— new Interpretation of the three firſt Verſes in St. *John*'s Goſpel concerning it 58--64
—— Objections to the new Interpretation anſwered 59--72
—— new Interpretation of the fourteenth Verſe of the ſame Chapter concerning it 71
—— Confirmation of the above new Interpretations, chiefly from our *Saviour*'s own Words 76--126
—— Mr. *Dawſon*'s Senſe of it 58
—— *Grotius*'s Senſe of it 62
Lord the, a Title given to *God* alone 3, 7

M.

Man, Dr. *Scot*'s Definition of, conſidered *Page* 173

Macedonius, accuſed of corrupting the Text relating to the Manifeſtation of our *Redeemer*, *viz.* 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. 40

Manhood of *Chriſt Jeſus*, what Texts relate to it 187--201

Miracles, Proof of the perfect Divinity which wrought in *Chriſt* 13--18

——— never aſcribed by believing Spectators to an *Angel* or *Demigod* operating in *Chriſt* 14--17

Moſes, the *Law* given by him, contraſted with *Grace* and *Truth*, *i. e.* the *Word* 73

N.

Nature human of *Chriſt*, not incompatible with the Divine Nature manifeſted in him *Page* 125

——metaphyſical of *Chriſt*, certain Expreſſions ſhewn to have no Relation to the 104--107

Nice, firſt Council of, rejected the Word Θεος in 1 *Tim.* iii. 16 41

Nicodemus, his Senſe of the *Jewiſh* phraſe of *coming from God* 76

——— his Teſtimony to the *perfect* Divinity of our *Redeemer* 19

O.

Only begotten Son of *God*. 115

P.

Perſons, Diſtinction made in Scripture of them doth not imply a *Diviſion* of the Godhead *Page* 28, 123

——— Dr. *Sherlock*'s Notion of them inconſiſtent with Scripture 86

——— Church of *England* holds the Diſtinction in Conſiſtence with the *Unity* of *God* 206

Polytheiſm, *Arians* more juſtly chargeable with it than the *Trinitarians* of the Church of *England* 22

——— unjuſtly charged upon the Church of *England* 132, 232--235

R.

Reaſon, conſiſtent with Revelation *Page* 216
——— Difference between Reaſon and Reaſoning 219
Redeemer. Vide *Divinity*
Redemption, aſcribed by the *Evangeliſts* and *Apoſtles* to *God* alone, and not to any inferior Being that operated in *Chriſt* 13--12, 29--40
——— *God* the original Author of our 128
Renovation of all Things, the Goſpel Conſtitution ſo called 197
Revealed Doctrines, Objects of a rational Enquiry 217--224
——— ——— ſome not diſcoverable by Reaſon no juſt Objection to the Belief of them 230

Revelation, Right Reaſon always accords with *Page* 230

S.

Sabellianiſm 56, 119
Saint Cyprian, *Hilary*, *Chryſoſtom*, Copies of 39
Salvation, *God* the Author of our 36, 43, 58
Sanctifier, *Creator* and *Redeemer* of the World, One and the ſame *God* 25, 51, 126, 129
Saviour, but One, *viz. God* in *Chriſt* 37
—— vide *Chriſt*, *Divinity*
Sent into the World, this Expreſſion the chief Ground of the *Arian* Notion of *Chriſt* 6
—— relates to the Office or Commiſſion of *Chriſt Jeſus* in this World 6, 100--112

Scot (Dr. *Joſeph Nicol*) his Notion of the Human Nature of *Chriſt* *Page* 173

Scripture, general Tenor and not particular Paſſages of it, the Teſt of revealed Doctrines 41

——— the only Rule of Faith concerning the TRINITY 223

Sherlock, (Dean) his Notion of the Divine Perſons *Tritheiſtical* 86

——— confuſed and obnoxious Expreſſions of 227

Socinians, their Notion of *Chriſt* 2

——— more conſiſtent than the *Arians* 4, 131

——— their Senſe of the *Logos* 56, 60

Son of *God*, to be honoured of all Men as the *Father* 85

——— *Chriſt* the *Son* of *God* by way of Eminence 127

Soul, its ſeparate Exiſtence on Death before the Reſurrection, not proved by the four following Texts, *viz. Eccl.* iii. 21. xii. 7. *Phil.* i. 23. 2 *Cor.* v. 8. *Page* 249, 259, 265

South, Dr. his Notion of the Incarnation 81

—— juſtly charges Dean *Sherlock* with *Tritheiſm* 87

—— his miſtaken Interpretation of, *The Boſom of the Father* 120

Steffe, Mr. Remarks on his *Letter* and *Brief Defence* 245--299

Superſtition Popiſh, Reformation from 48

—— Foundation of it laid in implicit Faith 217, 218

Syriac, Copies uſed by the Author of the, want the Word ἐστι in *Rom.* ix. 5. 38

T.

Trinity, as maintained by the Church of *England*, not *Tritheism* *Page* 22, 23, 132, 232--235

——— the Subject of it incomprehensible; but not the Doctrine or Proposition concerning it 231

——— Enquiry into the Sense of the Church concerning it is not prying into a Mystery 224

——— Rule laid down for coming at the Sense of the Church concerning it 225

———very exceptionably expressed by many Divines 227

——— Objections against the Doctrine, on what grounded, and answered 229--234

——— the supposed Mysteriousness of it, no Argument against a rational Enquiry into it 217

Trinity, Dr. *Sherlock*'s Explication of it unscriptural *Page* 129

Tritheism, not chargeable upon the Church of *England* 232--235

U.

Unity of the Deity expresly asserted by the Church of *England*. 133, 234

W.

Word The, a Title given both to *God* and *Christ* 58, 71 vide *Logos*

Worship of the Church of *England* defended 20, 22

A N

I N D E X,

OF THE

T E X T S

Explained, or referred to.

GENESIS.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
I.	3	188
II.	7	261
XV.	2	7
XXII.	2, 12, 16	115

EXODUS.

INDEX of TEXTS.

EXODUS.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
III.	14	111
XX.	4	145, 284

LEVITICUS.

XX.	27	246

DEUTERONOMY.

XXVIII.	13	281, 282

JUDGES.

XI.	34	115

II. KINGS.

II.	19	288

JOB.

JOB.

CHAPTER.	VERSE.	PAGE.
XI.	7	211
XII.	7, 8, 9, 10	212, 213

ECCLESIASTES.

III.	18, 19, 20	256
	21	249, 257, 259, 278, 281, 293, 296
	22	257
XII.	7	259, 290

ISAIAH.

VI.	8	155
XL.	3	1, 13

JEREMIAH.

VI.	26	115

AMOS.

INDEX of TEXTS.

AMOS.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
VIII.	10	115

ZECHARIAH.

XII.	10	115

MALACHI.

III.	1	3, 19

MATTHEW.

I.	18, 20	10
	23	11
XII.	28	150
XXV.	34	69

MARK.

I.	1, 2, 3	3
	2	4, 27, 28
II.	5, 7	14

JOHN.

LUKE.

CHAPTER.	VERSE.	PAGE.
I.	35	11, 149, 172
II.	12, 21, 22, 23, 24	176
	40, 42, 43, 46, 51, 52	177
IV.	2, 5	179
VII.	16	15
IX.	42, 43.	15
XI.	20	152
XVII.	15	16

JOHN.

I.	1	16, 55, 58, 59, 64, 67, 68, 70, 77, 126
	2	55, 62, 85
	3	55, 63, 64, 77, 84
	4	61, 135
	8	61
	14	71, 72, 74, 83, 100, 115

INDEX of TEXTS.

CHAPTER.	VERSE.	PAGE.
I.	17	74, 205
	18	75, 113, 121
III.	2	19, 76, 90, 204
	13	78, 90, 113
	34	83
V.	22	84, 87, 88
	23	85, 87, 88
VI.	32--35	89
	32--62	90
	33	97
	35	61
	35	39
	41	94
	48--55	61
	48	95
	50--53	95
	63	97, 138
	68	100
VII.	16	80, 100
	18	203

INDEX. of TEXTS.

CHAPTER.	VERSE.	PAGE.
VIII.	12	62
	24	111
	28	101, 111
	38	103
	40, &c.	107, &c.
	42	107
XI.	25	66, 67
XII.	49	112, 114
XIV.	6	62
	16	160
	22	116
	23	115
XV.	26	160
XVI.	13, &c.	122
XVII.	4	124
	5	123
XX.	21, 22	125

ACTS.

II.	22	30
III.	12, 13	30

INDEX of TEXTS.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
IV.	10	30
V.	3, 4	153
VII.	51	153
X.	38	31
XX.	28	154
XXVIII.	25	155

ROMANS.

IX.	5	38

1 CORINTHIANS.

I.	30	189
II.	4	155
	5	156
	7	69
	10	156, 159
	11	157
VIII.	6	187, 189
XII.	4, 5, 6	32, 143, 147
	6	148

CHAPTER.	VERSE.	PAGE.
XII.	6, 7	161
	8, 9, 10	147, 148, 161
	11	147, 148
	28	148, 154

2 CORINTHIANS.

I.	3	39
V.	1, 2	267
	4, 5, 6.	268
	8	265
	8, 9, 10	269
	17, 18	190
	19	32

EPHESIANS.

I.	3	39
	4	69
	17, 20, 21, 22, 23	34
III.	8, 9	191

INDEX of TEXTS.

CHAPTER.	VERSE.	PAGE.
III.	9	69
	11	192
IV.	14	163

PHILIPPIANS.

I.	23	265

COLOSSIANS.

I.	14	194, 197
	15	192, 198
	16, 17	192, 193
	17	198
	17, 18	194
	16, 17, 18	196
	19, 20	200
II.	9	35

1 TIMOTHY.

II.	5	35, 167, 172 201, 207

III.

CHAPTER.	VERSE.	PAGE.
III.	16	39

2 TIMOTHY.

I.	9	70

TITUS.

I.	3, 4	36
II.	10, 11, 13	36
III.	4, 5, 6	37

HEBREWS.

I.	1, 2, 3	201
II.	10, 17, 18	182

1 PETER.

I.	18, 19	135

1 JOHN.

I.	1, 2	69
	5	60, 67

INDEX of TEXTS.

CHAPTER.	VERSE.	PAGE.
IV.	8	60, 67
V.	1, 5	62

JUDE.

	8	294

REVELATIONS.

XIII.	8	70
XIX.	13	70, 71

ERRATA.

Page 60, line 20, *for* 6 *read* 5.
——122,—— 4, *for* 5 *read* 13.
——160,——17, *for* fame *read* fifteenth.
——187,—— 4, *after* Epiſtle, *add* to the *Corinthians*.
——191,—— 9, *for* we *read* I.
——202,——14, *for* ingenious *read* ingenuous.
——290,——16, *for* 17 *read* 7.

Publiſhed by the ſame Author.

I. Some Aſſiſtance offered to Parents in the Religious Education of their Children. Third Edition, Price 6*d.*

II. Reformation of Manners, the Ground of Confidence towards God; A Sermon preached on Occaſion of the General Faſt, *February* 13, 1761. Price 1*s.*

III. The Duty of Charity to the Poor, A Sermon preached at St. *Paul*'s, *Shadwell*, Price 1*s.*

IV. The Efficacy of Divine Aid, and the Vanity of confiding in Man; A Sermon from *Pſalm* 108, preached on Occaſion of the late General Faſt, *March* 12, 1762, *&c.*