



LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.

DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter *81-2*
No. *50* *May 22⁸ 1861*

COLLECTION OF PURITAN AND
ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE



LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

SCC
9155



THREE SERMONS

Concerning the
Sacred Trinity.

By JOHN WALLIS, D. D.

Professsor of Geometry, in the University of *Oxford*.



L O N D O N :

Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst*, at the Bible and Three
Crowns, in *Cheapside*, 1691.

THREE

SERMONS

OF

SERMONS

BY JOHN WILKES, D.D.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD



Printed by J. DODD, at the Theatre-François, in the Strand.
MDCCLXXII.

TO THE
READER.

THE first of the three Sermons here following, is Printed according as it was Preached in Oxford, in the Year 1664. (accommodated to that time and place;) but it was, for the Substance of it, Preached in London Twenty Years before that time. Which I mention to shew, that the Construction which I give of the Words, is not a new forced Notion, just now taken up to serve a turn; or (as somebody is pleased to call it) Equally New and Cautious: But, what I did, so long ago, take to be a then received Truth. And, I since find, it is at least as old as St. Austin's Epist. 174. The other Two are lately added, in pursuance of some other

A 2 Discourses

To the Reader.

Discourses lately made publick, concerning the Sacred Trinity. Wherein much of what was said before, scatteringly, (as those who wrote against it gave occasion;) is now enlarged and put into a little better Order. If what I have done may be serviceable to the Truth, and to the Church of God: I have what I did desire, and shall not think the Labour ill bestowed.

A
S E R M O N

Preached to the
UNIVERSITY of Oxford.

Decemb. 27. 1664.

JOH. xvij. 3.

Αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος Ζωή, ἵνα γινώ-
σκῶσί σε, (ὃν) μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, καί,
ὃν ἀπέστειλας, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

*And this is life eternal, that they might
know thee the onely true God, and
Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.*

I Need not apologize for the seasonableness
of this Text; by telling you, that the
Subject-Matter of it, suites well with the great
Solemnity, which at this time we celebrate;

B

and

A Sermon Preached to the

and the Pen-man, with that of the day : Because a Discourse on such a Subject, can never be unseasonable to a Christian Auditory. Especially to such as, whose profession being to seek after Knowledge, should not decline that of God and Christ, the chief of all.

Nor will it be any Exception hereunto :

That it is no news, but well known already : Not only because That there be many who pretend to know what they do not, or do in effect deny ; and That there be many things, which, though we know well, we have need enough to be minded of : But even because I do not find that many persons are wont to be displeased with being often minded of those things wherein they think that either their Interest or Excellency lies ; more than a good Wit when commended, or a fair Lady with being told she is handsome ; even though sometimes (as we are wont to say) they know it but too well already. And therefore, since to know God and Christ is both our Interest and our Commendation ; it will not, I hope, seem grievous to any to hear it discoursed of ; to the end that those who know it not may be incited to learn it, and those who know it, may take content in it.

And

And I shall as little apologize for a plain Discourse on this Subject : Since it is both my Profession and Practice, to Demonstrate or make things as plain as I can ; not to perplex or make them intricate ; which may amuse the Auditors, or sometimes please or tickle them ; but is not wont either to Teach, or Perswade : like too much of Ornament, which doth but disguise the native Beauty ; or too much Trimming, which hides the Cloth.

The words read, are our Saviour's Words ; address'd to his Father in the behalf of his Disciples : And are a part of that Prayer with which he closeth his large Exhortation, or Farewel-Sermon to his Disciples, the night before he was to suffer ; of which we have a large rehearsal in the three foregoing Chapters, the 14th, 15th, and 16th : which this 17th. closeth with a Prayer.

He begins his Prayer, with a Petition concerning *Eternal Life*, which he was to bestow (according to the Power his Father had granted him) to as many as He had given him ; that is, to as many as should effectually believe in him. To which Petition he subjoins this Exegetical *Epiphonema*, *and this is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* B 2 We

A Sermon Preached to the

We may consider the words either according to a *Synthetic* or an *Analytic* method, as the Schools speak: The former of which they commonly follow in Sciences *Theoretical*; the latter in *Practical*.

If considered *Synthetically*; they present us with, *First*, The Cause, or Principle; The Knowledge of God and Christ: and, *Secondly*, The Effect, or Consequent resulting from it; *Eternal Life*.

If *Analytically*; we have in them, *First*, A glorious End proposed; *Eternal Life*: and, *Secondly*, The Means proportionate thereunto; The Knowledge of God and Christ.

In the former way, the Result of them is to this purpose; That the excellent Knowledge of God and Christ, is attended with this most glorious Consequent, *Eternal Life*.

In the latter way, it amounts to thus much: That the way or means to *Eternal Life*, is the Knowledge of God and Christ.

Nor is it much material, whether of the two ways we take them; *Synthetically*, or *Analytically*: whether we take them as a *Theorem*; affirming this Effect, of that Cause: or as a *Problem*; directing to these Means for such an End.

Yet

Yet I chuse rather to take them in the latter consideration, (though not exclusive of the former;) Because, this *Epiphonema* taking its rise from the mention made of *Eternal Life*, in the former verse; (not from a former mention of the *Knowledge of God and Christ*;) it seems to be rather intended as a *Direction* how to attain *Eternal Life*; than, an account of the *Effect* of such a *Knowledge*. But, in doing the one, it doth the other also.

I shall begin, *first*, with that which lies first in the order of the word; The *End* proposed; or the *Effect*, or Consequent of this *Knowledge*; the *Happiness* which doth attend it: which, for its Excellency, is called *Life*, and, for its Duration, *Eternal*. *This is life eternal*.

The word *Life* I take to be here used in a figurative sense; and to import *Good* or *Happiness*: like as, its contrary, *Death*, especially *Death Eternal*, to import *Misery*.

There is indeed, at least, a threefold *Life* commonly mentioned; and, in proportion thereunto, a threefold *Death*: *Natural*, *Spiritual*, and *Eternal*.

Life Natural, (which is indeed the proper acceptation of the word *Life*, or the first signification of it,) is more easily apprehended,
than

than expressed. It imports that active state or condition which ariseth from the *Union of the Soul and Body*, as well in *Man*, as in other *Animals*; (not to mention that of *Plants* :) the destruction or want of which, upon the Soul's departure, we call *Death*. 'Tis that, according to which, in common speech, a *Man* or *Beast* is said to be alive or dead.

Now this *Life*, is, of all *natural Goods*, looked upon as the chiefest; and consequently *Death* the greatest of *natural Evils*: Because *Life* is that foundation or first good, which makes us capable of what else is so: and with our *Life*, we lose all the rest. Hence that in *Job 2. 4. Skin for skin, and all that a man hath, will he give for his life.* And that of *Solomon*; *A living Dog is better than a dead Lion, Eccles. 9. 4.* For, when *Life* is gone, there succeeds an incapacity, not only of *Doing*, but also of *Enjoying Good*.

From this consideration it is, that the other significations of the word have their Original. For *Life* being looked upon as the greatest natural Good, and *Death* as the greatest natural Evil; The one (by a *Synechdoche speciei*) is frequently used (both in sacred and profane Authors) to signify *Good* indefinitely, especially the

the greatest Good; and the other, in like manner, to signify Evil, especially the greatest Evil. The one is put for *Happiness*, and the other for *Misery*.

And then, again, (by a *Synechdoche generis*) this general notion of Good or Evil, Happiness or Misery, implied in the words Life and Death, becomes applicable to this or that particular Good and Evil, as occasion serves. Suppose the Spiritual Life of *Grace*, or Death in *Sin*: And the Eternal Life of *Glory* in Heaven, or the Eternal Death of *Torment* in Hell. Thus, *Deut. 30. 19.* I have set before you (saith Moses to Israel) life and death, blessing and cursing: (where Life and Death, are made equivalent to Blessing and Cursing;) therefore choose life (saith he) that thou and thy seed may Live; that is, that you may be Happy. So at *ver. 15.* of the same Chapter; I have set before you (saith he) life and good, death and evil. Where Life and Good are put exegetical each of other, and so Death and Evil. And in the same sense it is the Poet tells us, *Non est Vivere, sed Valere, vita.* Thus God to Adam in Paradise (for 'tis no new Trope, nor of yesterday) In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die the death; that is, thou shalt become miserable: For we know that Adam did not the same day die.

A Sermon Preached to the

die a natural Death; but some hundreds of years after : but he did that day begin to be in a state of Misery, whereof his natural Death was but a part. So, *Rom. 6. 23. The wages of sin is death ;* where the comprehension of all the Evils or Misery which sin deserves, or God inflicteth for it, is called *Death* : like as on the contrary, all the Happiness, which the Saints enjoy, is, on the same account, called *Life* ; *The gift of God is eternal Life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.* So here : By *Life* we understand *Happiness* ; contrary to which is the *Death* of *Misery* : and then (by a *Metalepsis*, or double Trope,) that *Happiness* in special, which the Saints enjoy in *Glory* (though not exclusive of what they have before ;) and that *Misery* which in *Hell* attends the wicked.

'Tis true indeed, that the condition of the Saints in *Glory*, after the Resurrection, may, even in a proper sense, be called *Life* ; because of that Union, which shall then be, of Soul and Body ; and the exercise of (at least the most noble) faculties of *Life*. Yet do not I take that to be the true import of the Word here. For though it be true, that the Saints in *Glory*, have not only an *Union of Soul and Body*, but likewise a *knowledge or sense* of that estate wherein

wherein they are, (which may import not only a Life, but even a Rational Life :) yet as true it is, that the Damned in Hell have so too ; (for their Souls and Bodies shall not be less *United* ; nor shall they be *Insensible* of their Woful condition :) yet is not that estate of theirs called a *Life* (though naturally it be so, and it is their misery that it is so,) but *Eternal Death* ; because a Life of Wo and Misery ; not of Bliss and Happiness : A *Living Misery*, being, in this sense, the truest *Death*.

Secondly, As it is called *Life* for its Excellency, so, for its Duration, it is called *Eternal*.

It is very usual in Scripture, in the use of Allegories, or Figurative expressions, to add some kind of *Epithet* to distinguish the word so used from the same in its native signification : And, when the word is used so as to express figuratively somewhat *more excellent* than it self, the *Epithet* hath somewhat of additional excellency in it. Thus Christ is said to be the *Spiritual rock*, 1 Cor. 10. 4. the *Living Bread*, or *Manna* that came down from Heaven, Joh. 6. 50. to distinguish the words, so metaphorically used, from the Rock and Manna literally spoken of, in the story of their travails in the Wilderness. And the Church of Christ, as *Living Stones*, be-

come a *Spiritual house*, and a *Holy priesthood*, to offer up *Spiritual sacrifices* to God, 1 Pet. 2. 5. Where the Epithets serve both for distinction from the material Stones and Temple, the Levitical Priesthood, and corporeal Sacrifices; and for the commendation or preheminance of those before these. So the *new heaven*, and the *new earth*, and the *new Jerusalem*, Rev. 21. 1, 2. *Jerusalem that is above*, Gal. 4. 26. And Matth. 26. 29. *I will drink no more* (saith Christ) *of the fruit of the vine, till I drink it New with you in my Father's kingdom*: Not that Christ did intend anew to drink of such wine in his Father's Kingdom; but of a *New wine*, another sort of wine than that commonly so called; to wit, those spiritual Joys in his Father's Kingdom, which should more refresh their Hearts and Souls, than this wine did their Bodies. So; *I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman*, Joh. 15. 1. *I am the good shepherd*, Joh. 10. 11. Not that Christ was more truly a *Vine*, in propriety of speech, than that which we so call; or indeed a *Shepherd*, who took the care of Sheep: But that there was in Christ somewhat of another kind much more eminent, than that of the *Vine*, which did yet in some measure resemble it; and, a much greater

ter Care, but of another nature, of those he calls his Flock, than a Shepherd hath of his Sheep. So here ; *This is life eternal* : Not a natural Life, (such as is commonly meant by the word *Life*,) a life of the Body, which after a short time is to be exchanged for Death ; but a Life, a Happiness, of another nature ; a far more excellent Good than what we call Life, which doth but very imperfectly express it ; An *Eternal Life*.

And this *Eternity*, as it serves, in general, to distinguish this word *Life* from the ordinary acceptation ; and doth import, for the kind of it, somewhat much more excellent : So it doth particularly point out that *Everlasting Duration* of this so great a Happiness. 'Tis that which, though indeed it have a Beginning, shall never have an End. And upon this account it is, that it is so often called *Eternal Life*, and *Life Everlasting* ; that it were endless to enumerate the places where it is so called.

An eternal inheritance ; A house eternal in the heavens ; An inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, which fadeth not away ; A kingdom which cannot be moved ; An eternal weight of glory ; When our mortal shall have put on immortality.

Heb. 9.15.
2 Cor. 5.1.
1 Pet. 1.4.
Heb. 12.28.
2 Cor. 4.17.
1 Cor. 15.
53.

And this consideration of *Eternity*, added to that of *Life*; this everlasting Duration, to that unspeakable, unimaginable Happiness; renders this *Eternal Life*, a perfect Felicity and every way compleat. For that Perfection of Degree, imported in the word *Life*, can admit of no addition, but that of Perfect Continuance, which the word *Eternal* assures us of. Like as, on the other hand, that perfection of *Misery*, which attends the wicked, is capable of no greater Aggravation, than that of *Perpetuity*: sealed up in that sad expression of a Living Misery, *Eternal Death*. You have them both paralleled in *Matth. 25. 46. These shall go into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.*

I have now done with the first part, the Happiness here proposed; *Eternal Life*.

Before I come to the second, *The knowledge of God and Christ*; it will be requisite to consider, a little, the connexion of these together, in the word *Is*; *This is Life Eternal*. Which is capable of a double acceptation. For it may be understood either as a *Formal*, or as a *Causal* predication. *This is life eternal*; that is, *Herein consisteth eternal life*. Or else thus; *This is life eternal,*

eternal, that is, *This is the way or means, to attain eternal Life.*

The former of these is very agreeable to the doctrine of the Schoolmen; who generally place the Happiness of Heaven in the *Beatifick Vision*; in the seeing or knowing of God. Grounded on such places as that of *Matth. 5. 8.* *Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.* *1 Cor. 13. 9, 10, 12.* *We know but in part, and we prophesie but in part; but when that which is perfect shall come, then that which is in part shall be done away: We now see through a glass darkely, but then face to face: Now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known.* *2 Cor. 3. 18.* *We all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory.* *1 Joh. 3. 2.* *Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know, that when he shall appear, (or, when it shall appear,) we shall be like him: for we shall see him as he is.* With others of the like import. And certainly that Perfection of Knowledge, shall be at least a great part of that Happiness, which we expect in Heaven; as from these and other the like places is well collected. So that it is not improperly said, that *Eternal Life* doth, at least in part, consist in such a knowledge.

Nor

Nor is it any sufficient Objection hereunto, to say, That, it is not by knowledge only, as an Act of the Understanding, that we enjoy God, wherein our Happiness consists; but by an Act of the Will also, chusing and closing with, and delighting in him.

For though this be true; yet neither is the Knowledge here spoken of, a bare *Speculative*, or Notional Knowledge, wherein the Understanding is alone concerned: But an *Active*, Operative Knowledge; such as brings the Will, Affections, and all the Faculties into a proportionate Conformity thereunto. And in such a Knowledge of God in the Understanding, attended with such a Conformity in the Will and other Faculties, it is not to be denied that our Happiness doth consist; even that of Eternal Life.

Yet (without excluding this sense) I take the words here to be rather a *Causal* Predication: assigning the way or Means whereby Eternal Life is attained. *This is life eternal*, that is, this is the Way to attain Eternal Life; *To know thee the only true God, &c.* The knowledge of God and Christ, being the direct way to attain Eternal Life. Parallel to which, is that of our Saviour, *Joh. 12. 50. His commandment is life everlasting.*

everlaſting. And very frequent elſewhere are ſuch *Metonymies* of the *Effect* for the *Cauſe*. *I am the reſurrection, and the life,* ſaith Chriſt, *Job.*

11. 25. that is, The Authour of it. So *Luk.*

12. 15. *Man's life conſiſteth not in the abundance of the things which he poſſeſſeth;* that is, it doth not depend upon it; it is not ſecured by it: or as Chriſt elſewhere, *Matth. 4. 4.* (out of *Deut. 8. 3.*) *Man liveth not by bread alone, &c.* And *Moses*, ſpeaking of their diligent obſerving the *Commands* of God, *Deut. 32. 47.* *This is your life,* (ſaith he) *and through this thing you ſhall prolong your days:* (where the latter Clause is enegetical of the former :) juſt in the ſame form with the words here, *This is life eternal;* that is, hereby they ſhall attain eternal Life.

This therefore being the moſt plain and ſimple Interpretation of the Words: We are now to enquire particularly, what that is that Chriſt here ſays to be Eternal Life, or rather the Way thereunto. *That they may know thee the only true God;* and, *whom thou haſt ſent, Jeſus Chriſt.*

Which contains in brief the Doctrine of the *Gospel*, or *Chriſtian Religion*: Distinguished into two parts, *The Knowledge of God*, and *The Knowledge*

Knowledge of Jesus Christ. Both which are necessary to bring us to Eternal Life.

I shall speak, *first*, to the former of these two; the Knowledge of God; that is, of God the Creatour and Lord of all; as distinguished to that of Christ the Redeemer. ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε, ὃ μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, That they might know thee the only true God.

By Thee, or the Person here spoken to, we are to understand God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; (For to him it is manifest, that Christ doth here direct his Prayer.) Yet not so much in his *Personal* as in his *Essential* consideration. For it is not the *Personality*, but the *Essence* of the Father, that determines him to be the only true God.

We have therefore, in the Object of this Knowledge, at least, these Three Propositions:

I. That there is a God. II. That there is but One (True) God. III. That God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is this God.

I. The First of these strikes at *Atheism*, or those that deny a God. And that we know thus much is necessary from that of *Heb. 11. 6. He that cometh unto God, must believe that God*

is,

is, and that he is a rewarder of those that diligently seek him. *Πιστεύει δὲ ὅτι ἔστι.* He must believe, That there is a God. Nay, he must believe also somewhat of *What he is*: Not fanſie to himself somewhat under the name of God, which indeed is not a God; or notions inconsistent with that of a Deity; as those, *Pſal. 50. 21. Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thy self:* or the like. For to believe such a false notion of God, is not to believe a God, but to believe an Idol.

We are next to know, as that there is a God; so, That there is but One God. I mean; But One True God. For *there are indeed*, as the Apostle tells us, *1 Cor. 8. 4, 5, 6. Gods many, and Lords many;* that is, there are *that are called Gods*, (for so he explains himself) *but to us there is but One God;* We know, (saith he) *that there is no other God but One.* And this indeed depends upon the former. For he that doth, according to a true notion of God, know That there is a God; must needs know also that there is *but One*. For the true notion of God, including Infinite, Absolute, Perfect, &c. must needs also include Unity; for it is inconsistent that there should be many such. So that, in a manner, Polytheism includes Atheism.

theism. He that believes many Gods, doth, in effect, not believe any: that is, not any such Being as of which it is impossible there should be more than One.

We are, *Thirdly*, to know, that *This* God, is that onely True God. I say, *This* God; whom we have variously designed in Scripture, by several Characters. *The God that made Heaven and Earth: The living God: The God of Israel: The God whose name is Jehovah: And* (as here, and elsewhere frequently in the New Testament) *the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* By which and other the like Characters, he is distinguished from all false Gods, from all pretended Deities. This God we are to know to be the onely True God.

But, when I say, That the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ* is this onely True God; I add, That this appertains not so much to his *Personality* as to his *Essence*. For though the three Persons in the Sacred Trinity, be distinguished each from other by their *Personalities*; (the Father is not the Son, nor the Son the Father, &c.) yet they all communicate in the common *Essence*; whereby the Son as well as the Father, and the Holy Ghost as either; is this *Onely True God*. The Person of the *Father* is indeed *True God*,

God, but not according to his Personality, but according to his Essence. And the Person of the Son is God also, and the True God; yet not another, but *the same* True God. And the Holy Ghost likewise. According to that of Job. 10. 30. *I and my Father are One*: That is, *One mod*, though not *One Person*. And 1 Job. 5. 7. *There are Three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these Three are One.* Three, and yet One. Three Persons, yet but One God. They are all this One, this Onely True God; beside whom there is no God.

I know there are some who would be glad to take advantage of this place, to the Derogation of the Divinity of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost. As if it were here affirmed, That *the Father onely were True God*: and therefore, not the Son, nor the Holy Ghost.

But the Cavil is obvious, and the Answer easie. It is not said that the *Father Onely* is True God; but that the Father is *the onely True God*; he is that God beside whom there is no other True God: which may well enough be said, though the Son also (as indeed he is) be *that same True God*; and the Holy Ghost likewise. Indeed should we say, That the

Son were also *True God*, and *another God*; the Father could not then be said to be the *Onely True God*, since that there would be another *True God* beside this. (And the like of the Holy Ghost.) But to say that the Son is *the Same True God*, is well consistent with it. For though another Person than the Father be *True God*, yet, because not *Another God*, this One God remains still the *Onely True God*. And the original words are to this purpose very clear; *ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε, ὃ μόνον ἀληθινόν Θεόν.* Where the Article *τὸν* coming before *μόνον*, (not after it) doth determine it to be a restriction of the Prædicate; not of the Subject. 'Tis not *σε μόνον, ὃ ἀληθινόν Θεόν*, but *σε, ὃ μόνον ἀληθινόν Θεόν*. Not *Thee onely* to be *the True God*; but (as we truly render it) *Thee to be the onely True God*. That is; *To know Thee to be that God*, beside which God there is no other *True God*; though another beside Thee be likewise this onely *True God*; viz. the same God with Thee, though not the same Person. It excludes only a Plurality of Gods, not a Plurality of Persons in the same God-head. 'Tis true indeed, That this Divinity, is not, in this place, so directly Affirmed, either of the Son, or the Holy Ghost: But, neither is it Denied:

And

And therefore it is to receive its decision from other places where it is affirmed clearly.

And thus much concerning the first branch of this Knowledge, the Knowledge of God. *To know Thee, the only True God.*

There is another piece of Knowledge necessary to the attainment of Eternal Life ; the Knowledge of Christ. For so it follows, *And Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*

'Tis true, that had we continued in that Estate wherein Man was at first Created, there had been no necessity of this second branch of Knowledge. For, had there been no Sin, there had been no need of a Saviour : and consequently, not of this knowledge of Jesus Christ. A knowledge of God, the onely True God, with an Obedience conformable thereunto, had then been enough to make us Happy. But Man, by his Fall, having contracted an Estate of Misery ; there is now no Restitution to our lost Happiness, but by a Redemption ; and there is no Redemption, but by Jesus Christ. For as *there is but One God ; so, but One Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus, 1 Tim. 2. 5.* Neither is there any other name given to men, whereby we must be saved, but that of Jesus Christ of Nazareth ; whom
they

A Sermon Preached to the

they Crucified, and God raised from the dead : (Act. 4. 10, 12.) There is no Salvation in any other. It is necessary therefore, to the attainment of Eternal Life, that we know Him, in this Capacity.

What we are to know concerning him, though we cannot expect, in so few words, to have clearly set down, without a Comment from other places to give light to them : Yet at least three things seem in these words to be pointed at ; His Divinity , His Incarnation, and His Mediatory Office.

1. His *Divinity* ; in that he is the *Son of God*. For he calls him *Father* , whom he says we must know to be the *only True God*. Indeed, were he onely the Son of God in such a sense as *Adam* is so called, *Luke 3. 38.* or the *Angels* thought to be , *Job 1. 6.* that is, by *Creation* ; for as *Saints* are so called (*Rom. 8.* and elsewhere,) that is, by *Adoption* ; it would not infer a *Divinity*. But to be (as *Christ* is) the *Son of God* by *Eternal Generation*, argues a *Communication* in the *same Nature*. As the Apostle infers, *Heb. 1. 5.* *For to which of the Angels said he at any time , Thou art my Son , this day have I begotten thee ? This onely begotten of the Father, must needs be also of the same nature with the Father ;*

Father; and therefore, God, as he is.

And this Argument, (however now perhaps there are who endeavour to elude it) the Jews, his Enemies, thought to be conclusive. For when they observed him to call *God his Father*, or pretend himself to be *the Son of God*; especially, *the Christ the Son of God*; they did not understand him to speak in such a sense as when themselves were commonly wont so to speak (as Joh. 8. 41. *We are not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God*;) but in such a sense as they judged Blasphemous, (and had been so indeed, had it not been true); who therefore sought the more to kill him, (Joh. 5. 18.) because he said, *That God was his Father; making himself Equal with God.* And the High Priest (Marth. 26. 65.) rent his Cloths, saying, *He speaketh Blasphemy*, when our Saviour affirmed before him, *That he was the Christ, the Son of God.* 'Twas manifest therefore, that he so spake, and they so understood him, of such a Son-ship as argued a Divinity, a being equal with God.

2. His *Humanity*, or *Incarnation*, is pointed at, in these words, *whom thou hast sent.* For by the Fathers sending him, or his coming into the World, is clearly meant his being *Incarnate*, or
made

A Sermon Preached to the

made Man. As Gal. 4. 4. God sent his Son made of a Woman. And Joh. 1. 14. The Word was made Flesh, and dwelt amongst us.

3. His Mediator Office, is implied as well in the Title *Christ*, added to his Name *Jesus*; as in that of his being sent by God. *Jesus the Christ*, or *Jesus the Messiah*, whom thou hast sent. For as his Name *Jesus* doth design the Person; so the Title *Christ*, that is *Messiah*, (that in Greek, answering to this in Hebrew, and both signifying the *Anointed*) doth import the Office, to which he was designed, and for which he was sent. For God did not send him, to no purpose; but sent him for this end, for

1 Tim. 2. 5.
Col. 10.

20, 21.
Rom. 5.

10, 11. &
alibi.

1 Joh. 2. 2.

Joh. 1. 29.

Heb. 9. 12,

15.

Eph. 1. 14.

Heb. 7. 25.

this Work, To be the Mediator between God and Man; To reconcile us to the Father; To make an Atonement or Propitiation for us. To take away the sins of the World; To obtain Eternal Redemption; To procure an Everlasting Inheritance; a purchased Possession; To make Intercession for us; To save to the uttermost those that come unto God by him. Or, as Job. 3. 16, 17. (where all the three Particulars are likewise intimated) God therefore sent his onely begotten Son into the World, that whosoever believes in him should not perish, but have Everlasting Life.

And

And now, having gone through the whole Text, we might, if time would suffer, look back upon it to take a new Survey thereof, and collect from thence some of those particular deductions which might concern our practice. For certainly, the Knowledge which Christ here declares *necessary to Eternal Life*, and the *means* conducing thereunto, is not a bare *Notional knowledge*, or a pure *speculative Belief*, (such as the Devils may have as well as we ;) Jam. 2. 19. but an *operative Knowledge*, a *practical Faith*, a *Faith fruitful in good Works*; without which those speculative notions will never bring us to Heaven. And therefore, without ingaging in the nice Disputes, of Justification by Faith alone, or Works concurring thereunto; this is on all hands agreed without dispute, That *Faith without good Works* will never justify us. Whatever their influence be, in Justification; their Presence at least is necessary. Without *Doing*, we cannot, in God's account, be reputed either to *Believe* or *Know*. Those that obey him not, are reckoned, in God's account, amongst those that *Know not God*: at least 2 Thef. 1. 8. amongst those *who profess they know God, but do* Tit. 1. 16. *in their works deny him*. Who shall be so far, by such a Knowledge, from obtaining *Eter-*

nal Life, that Christ shall come in flaming fire to take vengeance on them, and to punish them with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his Power.

In particular : If we know God, to be the onely True God ; Then must we Love him, Fear him, Worship him, and Obey him. Nor doth the knowledge of Christ, as Mediator, abate any thing of this Duty. For though he came to
 Gal. 3. 13. take away the Curse of the Law, by being made a Curse for us ; yet not our Obligation thereunto.
 Matth. 5. 17. He came not to destroy the Law, or make it less obligatory to duty, but to fulfill it. I may add ; That, those, who will not acknowledge themselves under the Obligation of it, have reason to fear, they be yet under the Curse of it.

Again, If we know Christ whom he hath sent ; It will be our duty then to Believe in him ; (For
 Joh. 17. 2. 'tis, to those onely, that Christ doth give eternal life.) And, so to Believe in him, as to Obey
 2Thes. 1. 8. him ; For, to those who obey not the Gospel of his Son, it is, that Christ shall render vengeance in flaming fire.

Furthermore : If in this Christ we hope to have *Eternal Life* ; how should this excite our *Rejoicing and Thankfulness* for so great *Salvation* ! Not by *Rioting and Drunkenness* ; by *Re-*
velling

velling, and Debauchery; (which is the Abuse, not the Celebration, of this Solemnity, in memory of Christ's Incarnation;) But by a *pious* Remembrance and Commemoration of that Redemption obtained for us: such as may be to the *Honour*, not the Reproach, of him that came to Redeem us from our vain ^{1 Pet. 1.} Conversation: That, denying ungodliness and worldly ^{18.} lusts, we should live Godly, Righteously, and Soberly ^{Tit. 2. 12, 13, 14.} in this present World: Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the Great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself, a peculiar People, zealous of good Works.

To whom with the Father and the Holy Ghost, be Glory for evermore.

The End of the First Sermon.

A Second
S E R M O N
 Concerning the
TRINITY:
 TO THE
UNIVERSITY of Oxford.

April 26. 1691.

JOH. xvij. 3.

Αὕτη δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ αἰώνιος Ζωή, ἵνα γινώ-
 σκωσί σε, (Ὁ) μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, καὶ
 ἐν ἀπέσειλας, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

*And this is life eternal, that they might
 know thee the onely true God, and
 Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.*

IT is now a great many years since, in this
 Place (if not to this Auditory) I did dis-
 course of these Words. I shall repeat very
 little of that Discourse: But think fit to add
 somewhat to what was then said. Our

A Second Sermon Preached

Our Saviour, in the three Chapters next foregoing (the 14th, 15th, and 16th. Chapters of S. John's Gospel) had made a large Discourse to his Disciples (after his Institution of the Lord's Supper) the night before he was to Die ; which (in this 17th. Chapter) he closeth with a Prayer, to his Father, in their behalf.

Wherein having made mention of *Eternal Life* (ver. 2.) which he was to give, to as many as the Father had given him, (that is, to as many as should effectually Believe in him ;) he subjoins this *Epiphonema*, *And This is Life Eternal, That they might know Thee, the only True God ; and, whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ.*

In which words, we have Two things proposed to us : The Christian's *Happiness* ; And, The *Means* whereby it is to be attained.

I. The *Christian's Happiness*, is called *Life*, as to its *Excellency* : and *Eternal*, as to its *Duration*. Which is *Begun* here, in the Kingdom of *Grace* : and is to be *Perfected*, and for ever *Continued*, in that of *Glory*.

II. The *Means* to attain it, is the *Knowledge* of *God* and *Christ*.

Where, by *Knowledge*, I do not understand a meer *Notional* or *Speculative Knowledge* ;
(For

(For such I presume the Devils may have in as large a proportion as any of us, and yet never attain *Eternal Life*;) But an *Active, Practical Knowledge*: Such a Knowledge as is attended with *Faith* and with *Practice* suitable thereunto. As in that of *Isa. 53. 11. By his Knowledge, (that is, by the Knowledge of Him) shall my righteous Servant justify many: That is, by Faith in him, attended with a suitable Practice to it.*

The *Object* of this Knowledge is declared to be twofold. 1. The Knowledge of *God*; and 2. The Knowledge of *Christ*. To know Thee the onely True God; that's one part. And (whom thou hast sent) *Jesus Christ*; that's the other.

And each of these contains several Particulars.

The former of them contains at least these Three. 1. That there is a *God*. 2. That there is but *One (True) God*. 3. That the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, is this *Onely True God*. He is that *God*, besides which *God*, there is no other *True God*. And, though *Jesus Christ* be *God* also; yet not another *God*, but the same *True God*. For *He and the Father are One*. *Joh. 10.*
30.

In the latter of them (the Knowledge of *Christ*) are Three things also. 1. His *Divinity*.

A Second Sermon Preached

nity. 2. His *Humanity*. And 3. His *Mediatory Office*. Which are here briefly insinuated; and are elsewhere more fully expressed.

1. His *Divinity*, in that he is the *Son of the Father*, who is the *Onely True God*: Not by *Creation*, as *Adam* and the *Angels* are called the *Sons of God*: nor by *Adoption*, as are the *Righteous*, who truly believe in *Christ*: But by *Generation*, as the *Onely Begotten of the Father*, (*Joh. 1. 14.*) and therefore of the *same Nature* with the *Father*.

2. His *Humanity*; implied in these words, *Whom Thou hast sent*. That is, *So sent* as to be *made of a Woman*: so sent as to be *made Flesh*. *Gal. 4. 4. Joh. 1. 14.*

3. His *Mediatory Office*: implied in the *Title Christ*, added to the Name *Jesus*, (*And, whom Thou hast sent, Jesus Christ.*) He was *so sent*, as to be *the Christ*, the *Messias*. So sent, as that *the World through him might be Saved*: So, as that *whosoever Believes in him should not Perish, but have Everlasting Life*. *Joh. 3. 16, 17.*

Of all which Points I did then Discourse more largely; and therefore do now but name them.

But I did then further observe, from the *Order of the Words*, (to obviate a *Cavil* of the

the

the Socinians,) that the Word *Onely* (μόνον) is here Restrictive, not of (the Subject) *Thee*; but of (the Predicate) the *True God*. Of which I intend (with God's Assistance, and your Patience) to speak further at this time.

Objection I.

The first and great *Objection* of the Socinians, from this place, against the *Divinity of Christ*, and the *Doctrine of the Trinity*, is this; If the *Father* be the *onely true God*; then the *Son*, or *Holy-Ghost*, is *not God*, or *not the True God*; but the *Father onely*.

To which I shall give Three things in Answer.

1. This Argument is a plain *Fallacy*; which they put upon us, by a willful perverting the Order of the Words. For it is not said *I thee Onely* to be the *True God*, (as if not the *Son* also, or the *Holy-Ghost*, were the *True God*, but the *Father onely*;) But, to *Know Thee* (not *Thee onely*, or *Onely Thee*;) to be the *Onely true God*. Nor is it so in our *English Translation* onely; but in the *Original Greek*: ἵνα γινώσκασί σε, τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν. It is not σε μόνον, τὸν, but σε, τὸν μόνον, ἀληθινόν, Θεόν. Where the Article τὸν coming after σε, and before μόνον, doth deter-

mine the Restrictive *μόνον*, not to be applied to the Subject *σε*, but to the Predicate, *ἀληθινόν θεόν*. Just as, in our English, the Article *The*, coming between *Thee* and *Onely*, doth confine the word *Onely*, not to *Thee* (that went before,) but to *True God*, which follows. *To know Thee* (not *onely Thee*,) *the onely true God*. That is, to know *Thee* to be *that God*, beside *which God*, there is *no other true God*. Which we readily Acknowledge, and Profess.

And then the Socinians Argument will appear just in this Form: The *God of Abraham* is the *Onely true God*; And therefore not the *God of Isaac*, nor the *God of Jacob*. Yes, say I; the *God of Isaac* is *the same God* with the *God of Abraham*; And therefore *the True God* as he is. And the *God of Jacob*, likewise.

And this one Answer doth fully satisfy the Objection, and there needs no more. Yet I shall add Two other things (though they might here be spared) because they may be of use elsewhere.

2. I say further: If it had been said (as it is not) *Thee Onely*; yet even this would not exclude any who is *the same with Him*. And therefore, not the *Son*, nor the *Holy-Ghost*; since they are *One and the same God with Him*. (I
and

and the Father are One, Joh. 10. 30. These Three are One, 1 Joh. 5. 7.)

To which purpose, consider we what we have Jer. 16. 14, 15. and again Jer. 23. 7, 8. Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be said, The Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel out of the land of Egypt ; But, The Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel from the land of the North, or out of the North Country. Now we are told by God himself, Exod. 20. 2, 3. I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, --- Thou shalt have no other God but ME. Shall we therefore argue thus ; The God who brought Israel out of Egypt, is the onely true God ; and we must have no other God but HIM. Therefore, not him who brought Israel out of the North-Country ? Yes, say I, Him also. For the God who brought them out of the North-Country, is the same God, with him who brought them out of Egypt, (not another God, though designed by another Character,) and therefore, in having Him, we have not another God. So here ; To Know thee onely (if it had been so said, as it is not ;) it had implied no more but thus, Not any who is not the same God with Thee. To Know Thee Onely (and not any other, who is not the same God with

F 2

Thee)

Thee) to be *the true God*. Which therefore would not exclude the *Son* nor *Holy Ghost*, who are the *same God* with the *Father*. But of this Answer, there is no need in this place, because it is not said *Thee Onely*, or *onely Thee*.

3. I say further ; If it had been said (as it is not) *Thee Onely*, (as the Socinians would have it to be understood ;) I would then say, This were an *Essential* Predication, rather than a *Personal*. That is, That the Predicate *True God*, is affirmed of him in regard of his *Essence*, rather than of his *Personality*. As belonging to the *Essence*, which is common to the *Three Persons*, not as peculiar to the *Person* of the *Father*. Like as if it were said, *David the King of Israel*, or *David the Father of Solomon*, is a *Reasonable Creature*, or *endued with Reason* ; this *being endued with Reason*, doth not belong to him as *King of Israel*, nor as *Father of Solomon* ; but, as he is a *Man* (though denominated by these Relations,) and is equivalent to this, *The Man* (who is *Father of Solomon*, and *King of Israel*) is *endued with Reason*. So if it be said, that *David King of Israel*, and *He onely*, was *Father of Solomon* : it is not intended, that he was so as *King of Israel* (much less, in that capacity *Onely*,) but rather, as the *Man* who
begot

begot him ; though designed by that Character. So here ; God the Creator is the *Onely True God* : and God the Redeemer likewise ; (Thus saith the Lord thy **Redeemer** the Holy One of Israel, the Lord of Hosts, I am the First and I am the Last, and beside ME there is no God, Isa. 41. 14. Isa. 44. 6. applied to Christ, Rev. 1. 8, 17. Rev. 22. 13, 16.) Shall we therefore argue, That God the **Redeemer** is the *Onely True God*, and beside Him there is no God, therefore not God the Creator ? No, we must not so argue. For it is not as Redeemer, or as Creator, that he is the *Onely True God*, but as God. (It may be *πᾶσι θεῶς*, but not *θεῶς ὁ μόνος*.) For he was the *Onely True God* from all Eternity ; but it was in Time that he made the World, and was the Redeemer of Mankind.

And this both the *Arian*, and the *Socinian*, must needs acknowledge as to the place before us. For when Christ saith, To know Thee (Father) the *Onely True God* ; it cannot (according to their Principles) be said of him as Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, but as God. For if Christ be onely a Titular God, or a Creature-God, (as they would have it,) there was a time, or moment, when he was not, (*ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*,) and therefore, when God was not his Father.

A Second Sermon Preached

ther. But he was the *Onely True God* from all *Eternity*; and therefore must be here so called, not as *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, but as *God*. Not according to his *Personality*, but according to his *Essence*; which, we say, is common to the *Three Persons*: Who are the *same God*, though under different *Denominations*.

But these two latter Answers, (though they be *True and Solid*;) are not necessary to this place; because it is not said *Thee Onely*. Yet I here name them, because they may be of use to answer some like Objection raised from some other place.

The full import of the words, is this, *That the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is that God, beside which God, there is no other True God. Or, There is no other True God, beside that God, which is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* And this we do fully agree with, when we say, *That the Son and the Holy-Ghost, are not another God, but the same True God with the Father.*

Objection II.

It may perhaps be next Objected, *That though this place do not Deny the Son and Holy-Ghost to be the True God, (meaning thereby, the same God with the Father:)* Yet neither doth it *Prove* them so to be. I an-

I answer. 'Tis true: This place alone, (without the concurrence of others) doth not Prove the Trinity. (And it is much if it should, where there are but *Two* mentioned.) Nor is it brought by us to that purpose. We only Answer the Objections brought against it by others, from this place: And leave the Proof of it to be fetched from other places in concurrence with this.

I have observed elsewhere (*Lett. 3.*) that if we should read it thus, *To know Thee to be the Onely True God; and him also whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ,* (as implying him also to be the same True God:) Or thus, *To know Thee, and (whom thou hast sent) Jesus Christ, the Only True God:* The words will well bear it, without any force put upon them.

Nor is this only a new Notion of my own. For I (since) find, that *S. Austin* had said the same long ago, in his *Epist. 174.* (speaking to *Pascentius*, an *Arian*, concerning this place) *De Patre tantummodo vos vultis intelligi, quod ait, Ut cognoscant Te unum verum Deum, & quem misisti, Jesum Christum; Ubi nos subaudimus, etiam Jesum Christum verum Deum: Ut hæc sit sententia, Te, & quem misisti, Jesum Christum, cognoscant unum verum Deum. Ne illa consequatur absurditas,*
ut,

A Second Sermon Preached.

ut, si propterea non est verus Deus Jesus Christus, quia dictum est Patri, Te unum verum Deum: propterea non sit Dominus Pater, quia dictum est de Christo, Unus Dominus. Where he takes the meaning to be this, To know Thee, and, whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ, the Only True God; which he backs with this Argument; Because if we should here on this account exclude the Son from being the True God; we might, for the same reason, exclude the Father from being the Lord, because it is said (1 Cor. 8. 6.) One Lord, Jesus Christ.

Yet even this, though it might prove it, as to the Son, it would not hence conclude it, as to the Holy-Ghost. But the concurrence of other places, will prove it more clearly as to both. I shall shew it of each.

As to the Son, we have it clearly affirmed, by the same S. John, (who best understood the import of his own words) that he is also the True God; (so that it was not intended here to exclude him.) 1 Joh. 5. 20. We are in him that is True, even in his Son Jesus Christ: This is the True God. (And therefore not only the Father.) And he had before told us (from Christ's own words) Joh. 10. 30. I and my Father are One.

Nor is it here meant of one in Testimony, as the

the Socinians would have it understood elsewhere, (there being in the Context here no mention of *Testimony* at all :) But it must be meant of *One God*. And this is manifest from the Inference which the *Jews* made from it. For they did thereupon take up stones to stone him, as for (what they call) *Blasphemy*: Because thou (say they) being a Man, makest thy self God, ver. 31, 32, 33. For which Inference there had been no Pretence, if by *One*, they had not understood *One God*.

And the High Priest in like manner, *Matth.* 26. 63, 64, 65. I adjure thee (saith he) by the Living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God; To which when Christ had answered, Thou hast said, (dicis quod res est,) He rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken Blasphemy, What further need have we of witnesses? For to say that he was the Christ, the Son of God; or (as it is in *Mark* 14. 61.) The Christ, the Son of the Blessed; was understood by them to be the same, as to call himself God. Which had been Blasphemy, had it not been True.

And what is said of Christ, *Joh.* 10. 30. I and the Father are One; is said of all Three, by the same St. John, (1 *Joh.* 5. 7.) The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; these Three are One.

Objection III.

It is Objected, that these words, last cited, are said to have been wanting in some Translations, or some ancient Copies.

Ans. Be it so. And so are some whole Epistles wanting in some Translations. And considerable parts of some other Chapters. But we are not therefore to cast them away as not Genuine. The II^d. and III^d. Epistles of St. *John*, and that of *Jude*, are said to have been wanting in the *Syriack* and *Arabick* Translations: And the Story of the *Woman taken in Adultery*, *Joh. 8*. wanting in the *Gothick* Gospels: And part of the last Chapter of St. *Mark's* Gospel, is said to be wanting in some Books: And the *Doxology* in the close of the Lord's Prayer: And the like in divers others. But we must not thence conclude them not to be Genuine, and put them out of our Bibles, because they have chanced to be omitted in some Books.

And it is so far from being strange, that such Omissions should sometimes happen; that it is very strange (if there were not a great Providence of God to preserve the Scriptures pure and entire) that there should be no more such mistakes than what are found. For
(before

(before the convenience of Printing was found out) when Copies were to be singly transcribed one from another, and even those but in a few hands : 'Twas very possible, (and hardly avoidable,) even for a diligent Transcriber, sometime to skip a line. Especially, (which is the case here) when some of the same words do again recur after a line or two ; Men are very subject, both in Writing and Printing, (as those well know who are versed in either,) to leap from one word, to the same recurring soon after. Nor is such Omission (when it happens) readily discerned, if (as here) the sense be not manifestly disturbed by it.

Now when such variety of Copies happens (that words be found in some, which are wanting in others,) this must either happen by a Casual mistake, (without any design of Fraud) or by a willful Falsification ; as to serve a particular turn ; (which I take to be the case of the Papists, *Indices Expurgatorii*.)

And, as to the words in question ; If the difference of Copies happened at first by a Casual mistake, (as I am apt to think,) 'tis very easy for a Transcriber (unawares) to leave out a Line which was in his Copy (especially where such omission doth not manifestly

nifestly disturb the sense ;) but not to *put in* a line which was not there. And, in such case, the Fuller Copy is likelyest to be True, and the Omission to be a Fault. Which happening (as it seems it did) some hundreds of years ago, in some one Copy ; it might easily pass (unobserved) into many others transcribed thence (and so to others derived from those Transcripts.) But an *Insertion* (of what was not in their Copy) must needs be willful, and not casual.

On the other side ; If this variety of Copies were at first from a *willful Falsification* ; It is much more likely to be a willful *Omission* of the *Arians*, in some of their Copies, (which might be done silently, and unobserved ;) than by a willful *Insertion* of the *Orthodox*.

For the Insertion of such a clause, if wholly New, and which had never before been Heard of ; would have been presently detected by the *Arians*, as soon as ever it should be urged against them.

Nor was any advantage to be made of it by the Orthodox, since the *Divinity of Christ* (which was the Point then in question) might be as strongly urged from that in St. *John's Gospel*, *I and the Father are One*, as from this
in

in his Epistle, *These Three are One.* And therefore it is not likely that the Orthodox should willfully make any such Falsification, from whence they could promise themselves no advantage. Nor do I find, it was ever charged upon them by the ancient *Arians* in those days: though *Athanasius* and others urged it against them. And in very ancient Copies, in which it had been left out, it is found supplied in the Margin, as having been faultily omitted.

And it is the more likely to be Genuine, because in this clause (*The Father, the Word, and the Holy-Ghost*) the second Person is called *simpliciter*, $\delta \lambda \acute{o} \gamma \omicron \varsigma$, *the Word*; which is St. John's Language, both here, and in his Gospel, *John*. 1. And is (I think) peculiar to him; and not so used by any other of the Holy Writers of the New Testament.

I do not deny but that this second Person may be called the *Word of God*, in *Heb.* 11. 3. By Faith we understand that the Worlds were framed by the Word of God. And 2 *Pet.* 3. 5, 7. By the Word of God were the Heavens of old. and the Earth, &c. and by the same Word they are kept in store. As he is by the same St. John, *Rev.* 19. 13. His name is called, the Word of God. But to call him the Word absolutely (without other addition) I think

think is peculiar to St. *John*. And therefore much more likely in this place, to have proceeded from the same Pen, and not to have been inserted by an Interpolator some hundreds of years after. And that clause *These Three are One*, in the Epistle, agreeing so well with *I and the Father are one* in the Gospel, is a further confirmation of their being both from the same Pen.

Add to this, That the *Antithesis* which we find in the 7th and 8th Verses, is so very Natural; that it is a great Presumption to be Genuine. There are Three that bear record in Heaven, The Father, the Word, and the Holy-Ghost, and these Three are One: And there are Three that bear witness in Earth, The Spirit, and the Water, and the Blood, and these Three agree in One. Which as it stands, is very Natural; but the latter clause would seem lame without the former; and the words *in Earth* wholly redundant in the latter, if not by *Antithesis* to answer to the words *in Heaven*, in the former Verse.

And that it was anciently so read, appears from St. Cyprian, by whom it is twice cited (in his Book *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, and in his *Epistle ad Iubaianum*) before the *Arian Controversy* was on foot.

In the former place, (arguing for the Church's Unity, not to be broken by *Schisms*) he speaks thus. *Dicit Dominus, Ego & Pater unum sumus. Et iterum de Patre & Filio & Spiritu Sancto, scriptum est, Et hi tres unum sunt. Et quisquam credit hanc Unitatem de divina firmitate venientem, sacramentis cœlestibus coherentem, scindi in Ecclesia posse?* That is, Our Lord saith, I and the Father are One: And again, of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, It is Written, These Three are One. And who can believe, that this Unity of the Church, proceeding from this Firm Union in God, and united by the Heavenly Sacraments, can be separated in the Church? Where he argues for the Unity of the Church (not to be divided by Schism) by two Arguments from this place. One from the firm Unity of God; noted in ver. 7. *The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are One; from whom this Church proceeds, (de divina firmitate venientem.)* The other, from their being United by the same Sacraments (*sacramentis cœlestibus coherentem*) which relates to ver. 8. *The Spirit, the Water, and the Bloud agree in One.* Which double Argument, from the two Verses, shew that, then, they were both read.

And, as to the former of them (which is that in question) He cites it again, in his

Epistola

Epistola ad Jubaianum ; where, disputing against Baptism by Hereticks, he thus argues ; Si baptizari quis apud Hereticos potuit ; utique & remissionem peccatorum consequi potuit. Si peccatorum remissionem consecutus est ; & sanctificatus est, & templum Dei factus est. Quæro, Cujus Dei ? Si Creatoris ; non potuit, qui in eum non credidit. Si Christi ; nec hujus potuit fieri templum, qui negat Deum Christum. Si Spiritus Sancti ; [cum tres Unum sint,] quomodo Spiritus Sanctus placatus esse ei potest, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus est ? That is ; If by Hereticks one could be baptized ; then he might obtain remission of sins : If he obtain remission of sins ; then is he sanctified, and become the Temple of God. I ask then, of What God ? Of the Creator ? that he cannot be, who did not in Him believe. Of Christ ? Neither can he be His Temple, who denies Christ to be God. Of the Holy Ghost ? No. For ; seeing these Three are One , How can the Holy Ghost be at Peace with him who is at Enmity with either the Father or the Son ?

'Tis manifest therefore that, These Three are One. was thus read in Cyprian's time ; as being by him twice cited , before the Arian Controversie was on foot.

And (before him) it is cited by Tertullian, in
his

his Book *adversus Praxeam*, cap. 25. *Connexus Patris in Filio, & Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit coherentes, alterum ex altero: qui Tres Unum sunt, (non Unus:) quomodo dictum est, Ego & Pater Unum sumus; ad substantiae Unitatem, non ad Numeri Singularitatem.* Where he doth not only cite the place, but doth likewise Parallel and Compare, *These Three are One*, (in this place) with *I and the Father are One*, (in the other place) as being of a like import. That is, The Connexion of the Father with the Son, and of the Son with the Paraclete or Holy Ghost, makes these coherent one with the other: *Which Three are ONE*, (*Unum* not *Unus*, *One Thing*, not *One Person*;) like as it is said, *I and the Father are One*, (*one Thing*) as to the *Unity of Substance*, though not as to *Singularity of Number*. They are *One Being*, *One Substance*, though otherwise they may be *Three*.

'Tis therefore no New Interpolation; but was anciently so read by *Cyprian* and *Tertullian* (the two most ancient of the Latin Fathers): long before the *Arian* Controversie was on foot. And hath been urged by others afterward, against the *Arians*.

Nor is there any prejudice (that I know of) against its being so read as now we read

H

it,

it, save that some of the *Fathers* (it is said) have omitted to Urge it against the *Arians*, when there hath been occasion of so doing.

But this (beside that it is only a Negative Argument, and I know not how well grounded) might very well happen, if it chanced to be wanting in that particular Copy which such Father used. (For we are not to suppose they had then such plenty of Bibles as are now in our hands; but some one Manuscript Copy was to serve many.) And because that in St. *John's* Gospel, *I and the Father are One*, did fit their purpose as well, or rather better, than this in his Epistle, *These Three are One*. For the Controversie, then on foot, was not so much that of the *Trinity*, as that of the *Divinity of Christ*.

To return, therefore, to the place which is before us; From what hath been said, it is manifest enough, that St. *John*, in calling the Father, *the Only True God*, did not intend to exclude *the Son*, from being *the same* True God; whom himself doth elsewhere call *the True God* also, 1 *Joh. 5. 20*.

No more (I say) than what is said, by name, of God *the Redeemer* (Isa. 44. 6, 8.) is to be thought exclusive of God *the Creator*, or God *the Father*; Thus saith the Lord, the REDEEM-
ER,

ER, the Lord of Hosts, I am the first, and I am the last, and beside *ME* there is no God. Which is applied to Christ in particular, *Rev.* 22. 13, 16. But is not exclusive of the Father; because God the Creator (or God the Father) is the same God with God the Redeemer, and therefore not another God beside him. And therefore both of them (or rather, the same God under both Considerations) indifferently called (especially in the Old Testament) God indefinitely, the Lord of Hosts, the Holy One of Israel.

Nor is that which is said of Christ, *1 Tim.* 6. 14, 15, 16. Our Lord Jesus Christ, who Onely hath Immortality, intended to exclude the Father; as if the Father were not also Immortal, or were not (what is there said of Christ) the blessed and onely Potentate, the King of kings, and the Lord of lords. But only, that our Lord Jesus Christ, is that God, which (God) is the blessed and onely Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, and who onely hath Immortality.

And (as was before noted by *S. Austin.*) The Father is not excluded from being Lord, notwithstanding that of *1 Cor.* 8. 6. To us there is but One God, the Father; and One Lord Jesus Christ: or that of *Eph.* 4. 5, 6. One Lord, one Faith, One Baptism, one God and Father of all. For

the Father, and the Son, are the same God, the same Lord. The same of whom it is said, *Isa. 45. 5. I am the Lord and there is none else, there is no God beside me.* And again, *ver. 6. I am the Lord and there is none else.* Where note, that the Word *Father*, in that phrase, *God and Father of All*, is different from the sense of it, in the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*: that relating to the common Nature; this to the Person.

And as in these places, what is said of the Son, (that *he onely hath Immortality*, that he is the *onely Potentate*, that he is the *One Lord*, that *beside him*, the Redeemer, *there is no God*,) are not to be understood *exclusive of the Father*; so what is here said of the Father, (that he is the *Onely True God*) is not to be understood *exclusive of the Son*; who is not *another*, but the *same True God*.

I thought here to have inserted (as in a proper place) a Discourse of some other Points relating to the Trinity; which I find it necessary here to omit (or to defer it to some other occasion) that I be not prevented by the time in what I have to say further.

That there is a God the *Creator*, a God the *Redeemer*, and a God the *Sanctifier*; and that these are the *same God*; I think cannot reasonably be Denied. I shall shew it of each. As

As to God the Creator, we are told, Gen. 1. 1. *In the beginning God Created the Heaven and the Earth.* (And, to the same purpose, in many other places.) And, I think, there is none doubts, but that this Creator, is the True God, the Supreme God. And in Jer. 10. 11. God doth by this Character distinguish himself from all other (pretended) Gods, *The Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth, they shall perish from the Earth, and from under these Heavens.*

As to God the Redeemer; I know that my Redeemer liveth, saith Job, Ch. 19. 25. By which Redeemer doubtless he meant the Living God, a God who did then Live; a God who was, then, in Being, and not (as the Socinians would have us think) who was not to Be, till Two Thousand years after. And Isa. 44. 6. Thus saith the Lord the Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts, *I am the first and I am the last, and beside Me there is no God.* Which Redeemer, must needs be the same God, with God the Creator, the Lord of Hosts.

As to God the Sanctifier; *Purge me with hyssop* (saith David) *and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow: Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me,* (Psal. 51. 7, 10.) Which certainly are works of Sanctification; and the God, to whom David
prayed,

prayed, is doubtless the *Living God*, a *God then a Being*. And when God promiseth to *Israel*, I will give them a heart to know me; and they shall return unto me with their whole heart; Jer. 24. 7. I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever; I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me, Jer. 32. 39, 40. I will give them one heart, and put a new spirit within them; I will take away the heart of stone and give them a heart of flesh, Ezek. 11. 19. and 36. 26. I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, Jer. 31. 33. The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayst live, Deut. 10. 6. All these are sanctifying works; and that God who doth them, is God the Sanctifier. And it is the same God, who doth thus Sanctifie, that is the Creator and the Redeemer.

Now this God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier, I take to be the same with what we otherwise call, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. And our Church doth so expound it in her Catechism; First, I learn to believe in God the Father, who hath Made me and all the World: Secondly, In God the Son, who hath Redeemed me and all Mankind:

kind: Thirdly, In God the Holy Ghost, who Sanctifieth me and all the Elect people of God. And it is no more absurd or inconsistent, to say, that God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy-Ghost, are the same God; than to say, that God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier, are the same God.

As they stand related to us, they are called God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier. As to the different Oeconomy, amongst themselves, one is called the Father, who is said to Beget; another the Son, who is said to be Begotten; a third, the Holy-Ghost, who is said to Proceed or Come forth; But are all the same God.

Objection IV.

But then here I meet with another Objection, on which the Socinians lay great weight. If God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier, or God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy-Ghost, be the same God, they cannot then be Three Persons: And if they be Three Persons, they must be Three Gods. For like as Three Persons, amongst Men, doth signifie Three Men; so Three Persons, who are God, must be Three Gods. Contrary to the First Commandment, which allows us to have but One God. To

To which I answer; *First*, This is only to cavil at a *Word*, when they have nothing of moment against the *Thing*. So that if instead of saying *These Three Persons are One God*, we say, *These Three are One God*, or give them another *Name* instead of *Persons*, or say *these Three Somewhats*, without giving them a *Name*, this Objection is at an end.

2. I say further; 'Tis very true, that, in our *English Tongue*, by another *Person*, we sometimes understand another *Man*, (because that other *Person* is, very often, another *Man* also.) But it is not always so; nor is that the proper Signification of the *Word*; but an Abusive sense put upon it.

And the reason of using the word *Person* in this abusive or improper sense; is, for want of an *English* word to answer the *Latin* word *Homo*, or the *Greek* ἀνθρωπος, which might indifferently relate to both *Sexes*.

For the word *Man* doth properly relate to the *Male*, and *Woman* to the *Female*. And if the word *Man* be sometimes so used as to imply the *Woman* also; it is (by a *Synecdoche*) putting the *Name* of One *Sex*, to signify Both. And 'tis for want of such a *Word* (which might indifferently relate to both *Sexes*) that we sometimes

time make use of *Person* in a borrowed sense, rather than to use a *Circumlocution* of *Man* and *Woman*, by naming both Sexes.

And if we should use such *Circumlocution* of *Man* and *Woman*; yet even this would not reach the whole *Species*. For we do not use to call them *Man* and *Woman*, till they be of a considerable *Age*; before which time they are called *Children*; and therefore to comprehend the whole *Species*, we say, *Man*, *Woman*, and *Child*.

We do indeed, sometimes, to that purpose, make use of the word *Mankind*, (adding the word *kind* to that of *Man*, to Ampliate the Signification of it.) But this relates only to *Genus Humanum* in a *Collective* sense; not to *Homines* taken *Distributively*. For we do not say a *Mankind*, two *Mankinds*, &c; as we say *Homo*, *Homines*.

We are fain, therefore, for want of a proper *English* word, to make use of *Person* in a borrowed sense to answer the Latin *Homo*.

But the Ancient *Fathers*, who first applied the word *Persona* to the Sacred *Trinity*, did not speak *English*. And therefore we cannot, from the present use of the word *Person* in our Language, conclude in what sense they used the word *Persona*.

I

3. Again;

A Second Sermon Preached

3. Again, the Schoolmen in later Ages, have yet put another sense on the word *Persona*, peculiar to themselves; extending it indifferently to *Men* and *Angels*; (for want of a proper word of that Extent;) so as to signifie (with them) what they call *Suppositum Rationale*, or what we call a *Reasonable Creature*. (And, in imitation of them, some others have since so used it.) But this is a New sense, of later Ages, since the time of those Fathers, (nor do the Schoolmen, in this sense, without a *Metaphor*, apply it to the Sacred Trinity.) We cannot therefore conclude from hence, What was the Fathers sense of it.

4. To find out therefore the true sense of the word *Person* as applied to the *Trinity*; we are not so much to consider, what now-a-days the word doth sometime signifie with us in *English*; nor what sense the Schoolmen have put upon it since the time of those Fathers: As, what was the true sense of the word *Persona*, at or before their times, in approved *Latin* Authours. Which is quite another thing from either of these senses.

For what in *English* we sometimes mean by *Three Persons* (taken indifferently for *Men*, *Women*, and *Children*,) the *Latins* would not have called

or Execute an Office ;) *Deponere personam* (to Resign the Office, or lay it down ;) so, *Agere personam* (to Act a Person,) and many the like.

So that there is nothing of *Contradiction*, nothing of *Inconsistence*, nothing *Absurd* or *Strange* in it, for the same Man to sustain divers Persons, (either successively, or at the same Time ;) or divers Persons to meet in the same Man ; according to the true and proper Notion of the word *Person*. A Man may, at the same time, sustain the Person of a King, and of a Father, if invested with *Regal* and *Paternal* Authority ; (and these Authorities may be *Subordinate* one to another ;) and he may accordingly Act sometime as a King, and sometime as a Father. Thus Tully, (who well understood the Propriety of Latin words) *Sustineo Unius tres Personas ; meam, Adversarii, Judicis*, (I being One and the same Man, sustain Three Persons ; That of my Own, that of my Adversary, and that of the Judge.) And David was, at the same time, Son of Jesse, Father of Solomon, and King of Israel.

And this takes away the very Foundation of their Objection ; Which proceeds upon this Mistake, as if *Three Persons* (in a proper sense) must needs imply *Three Men*. 6. Now

6. Now if *Three Persons* (in the proper sense of the word *Person*) may be *One Man*; what hinders but that *Three Divine Persons* (in a sense Metaphorical) may be *One God*? What hinders but that *the same God*, considered as the Maker and Sovereign of all the World, may be God the *Creator*, or God the *Father*; and the same God considered, as to his special Care of Mankind, as the Ruthour of our Redemption, be God the *Redeemer*, or God the *Son*; and the same God, as working effectually on the Hearts of his Elect, be God the *Sanctifier*, or God the *Holy Ghost*?

And what hinders but that the *same God*, distinguished according to these *three Considerations*, may fitly be said to be *Three Persons*? Or (if the word *Person* do not please) *Three Somewhats* that are but *One God*?

And this seems to me a Full and Clear Solution of that Objection, which they would have to be thought Insuperable.

Objection V.

It may perhaps be Objected further, Why must we needs make use of the word *Person*; and call them *Three Persons*, if *Three Somewhats* will serve as well?

I an-

I answer, *First*, We have no such need of the word *Person*, but that we can spare it. *Hypostasis* will serve our turn as well. And if they think the *Latin* word *Persona*, be not a good Translation of the *Greek Hypostasis*; Let them retain the *Greek* word. (We mean the same by both.) And then perhaps they will find themselves at a loss, to fasten some of their Objections upon the word *Hypostasis*, which they would fasten upon *Persona*.

2. But, *Secondly*; If the Thing be thus far agreed, That these *Three Somewhats* (thus considered) may be *One God*: I see not why they should contend with us about the *Name Person*. For this is only to quarrel about a *Word*, or *Name*, when the *Notion* is agreed.

3. If it were admitted (which I see no reason for) that the word *Person* doth not fitly express that *Notion* which it is intended to design; the most that can be inferred from it, is but, That we have not given it so fit a *Name*: And, to cavil at that, when the *Notion* intended by it is understood; were just as if one should argue, There never was such a *Man*, as whom they called *Pope Pius*; because the *Man*, who was so called, was not a *Pious Man*.

4. But

4. But I see not why the word *Person* should not be thought a very fit word for this purpose.

For Two of these Three are represented to us in Scripture under the Names of *Father* and *Son*; and this *Son* as *Begotten* of the *Father*; (and therefore these Names are not to be quarrelled with :) But all this in a *Metaphorical* sense; (For no Man can suppose, that this *Father* doth so *Beget* this *Son*, as these words do properly signify amongst Men).

Now the Relations of *Father* and *Son*, in a proper sense, are such as are properly denoted by the word *Persona*, in its proper Acceptation.

And consequently the *Father* and *Son*, in a *Metaphorical* sense, may (by a Continuation of the same Metaphor) be fitly called *Persons*, in that *Metaphorical* sense. And in what sense they be *Father* and *Son*, in a like sense they be *Persons*, according to the Propriety of the Latin word *Persona*. For such *Relatives* the *Latins* called *Personas*.

And if the *Father* and *Son* may fitly be so called; no doubt but the *Holy Ghost* may be so called also, as One *Proceeding* or *Coming forth* (ἐκπορευόμενος) from them. As in *Joh. 14. 26.*

The

The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name; he will teach you all things. And Job. 15. 26. The Comforter, whom I will send you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me. Where it is manifest, that, in what sense the Father and Son are to be reputed Persons; the Comforter or Holy Ghost, is, in the same sense, so to be reputed.

So that (I think) I have clearly Vindicated, not only the Notion, That these Three Somewhats may be One God; But the Name also; That these Somewhats, may fitly be called Persons.

Objection VI.

I shall name but one Objection more, which when I have satisfied, I shall conclude for this time.

That 6th. Objection (and 'tis but a weak one) is this. The Trinitarians do not all agree, but differ among themselves, in expressing their Notions in this Matter.

Very well. And do not the Antitrinitarians differ much more? Doth not the Arian and the Socinian differ as much from one another, as either of them do from us; (and declare that they so do?) And do not the Arians among themselves,

selves, and the Socinians amongst themselves, differ more than do the Trinitarians? Certainly they do.

It must be confessed, that different Men, as well in the same as in different Ages, have very differently expressed themselves, according to their different Sentiments of *Personality*; and of the particular *Distinctions* of the three Persons among themselves.

But so it is in all the most obvious things in the world. As, in *Time*, *Place*, *Space*, *Motion*, and the like. We are all apt to think, that we all know well enough, what we mean by those Words, till we be asked. But if we be put to it, to express our selves concerning any of them, *What it is*, whether a *Thing*, or *Nothing*, or not a *Thing*, or *somewhat of a Thing*, and *what that somewhat is*; it would be long enough before we should all agree to express our selves just in the same manner; and, *so clearly*, as that no man who hath a mind to cavil, could find occasion so to do. I might say the like of *Heat* and *Cold*; of *Light*, *Sight*, and *Colour*; of *Smells*, and *Tastes*, and the different *Sorts* of them.

Can we never be said to agree in this, That the Fire doth Burn and Consume the Wood; till we be all agreed what is the Figure of those Fiery Atoms (and what their Motion, and from what Impulse) which enter the Pores of the Wood, and separate its parts, and convert some of them to Smoak, some to Flame, and some to Ashes; and which to which; and in what manner all this is done?

What a folly then is it to require that, in the things of God, we should all so agree as to express our thoughts just in the same manner; as is not possible to do in the most obvious things we meet with?

And, in such a case as wherein to express our Notions, we have no Words but Figurative, it is not to be thought strange, that one man should make use of one Metaphor, and another of another, according as their several Fancies serve.

But thus far, I think, the Orthodox are all agreed; That between these Three, which the Scripture calls *The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, or *the Father, the Word, and the Spirit*, there is a Distinction, greater than that of (what we call) the *Divine Attributes*; but not so as to be *Three Gods*. And this Distinction,

inction, they have thought fit to denote by the Word *Hypostasis*, or *Person*.

They are also all agreed ; that one of these Persons (namely the Son or the Word) was *Incarnate*, or *Made Flesh*, and did take to himself our *Humane Nature*.

But as to the particular *Modes*, or *Manner How* ; either how these two *Natures* are *United*, or how these three *Persons* are *Distinguished* each from other : we may be content to be *Ignorant*, farther than God hath been pleased to *Reveal* to us.

We know that our *Immortal Soul* is joined with an *Humane Body*, so as to make *One Man* (without ceasing, that to be a *Spirit*, and this to be a *Body* :) But 'tis hard for us to say *How*. And accordingly we say, that the *Man Christ Jesus*, (without ceasing to be *Man*,) and *God manifested in the Flesh*, (without ceasing to be *God*,) are *One Christ* : But what kind of *Union* this is, which we call *Hypostatical*, we do not thoroughly understand. We know also that the *Father* is said to *Beget*, the *Son* to be *Begotten*, the *Holy Ghost* to *Proceed* : But neither do we fully understand the import of these Words ; nor is it needful that we should.

But, so far as was said before, we do all agree; and we may safely rest there.

Now to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; three Persons, but One God; be Honour, and Glory, and Praise, now and for ever.

The End of the Second Sermon.

A

A Third
S E R M O N
 Concerning the
TRINITY.

J O H. xvij. 3.

Αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ, ἵνα γινώσκω-
 σί σε, (ὃν) μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, καὶ, ὃν ἀ-
 πέστειλας, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

*And this is life eternal, that they might
 know thee the onely true God, and Jesus
 Christ, whom thou hast sent.*

I Have, in a former Discourse from this Verse, enter-
 ed upon the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; not so much,
 as being contained in it, as occasioned by it.

I have shewed that the word *Onely* is here restrictive,
 not of the Subject *Thee*, but of the Predicate *True God*.
 Affirming *the Father* to be *the Onely True God*, though
 not *the Father Onely*. Nor is it exclusive of *the Son*, who
 is also the same *True God*; and is so expressly called, by
 this same Writer, 1 *Joh. 5. 20.* where (speaking of Je-
 sus

A Third Sermon

sus Christ) he says, *This is the True God, and Eternal Life*; as if it were spoken with a direct aspect to the words before us.

Now that *Christ* is often called *God*, neither the *Arians* nor the *Socinians* do deny. And it is so frequent, and so evident, as not to be denied. Not only in the place last cited, but in many others. *Thy throne, O God endureth for ever*, Heb. 1. 8. *The Word was with God, and the Word was God*. Joh. 1. 1. *My Lord and my God*. Joh. 20. 28. *The Being over all, God blessed for ever, Amen*. (Or, *the Supreme Being, the ever blessed God*. Rom. 9. 5.) And elsewhere.

Objection VII.

But to this they Object, That though he be sometime called *God*; yet by *God* is not there meant the *Supreme God*: But either a mere *Titular God*, as the *Socinians* will have it; (as one of the *Λεγομένοι Θεοί*, 1 Cor. 8. 5. one who is called *God*, but indeed is not, but a mere *Man* however highly dignified.) Or (as the *Arians* will have it) that he is *God* indeed, but not the *Supreme God*, not the same *God* with the *Father*, but an *Inferiour God*, (*Deus factus*) a *made-God*, a *Creature-God*; who was indeed before the *World*, but not from *Eternity*, *ὅτι οὐκ ἦν*, there was (a *Time*, a *Moment*, a *Quando*) when he was not, when he had not a *Being*.

In Answer to both which; I shall endeavour to shew, (by the most signal *Characters*, whereby the *Supreme God*, the *Onely* true *God*, is set forth to us in *Scripture*; and by which he is therein Distinguished from all false *Gods*, or other pretended *Gods*;) that *Christ* is the *True God*, the *Supreme God*, the same *God* with the *Father*, and not another *God*.

CHARACTER I.

The first Character, which we meet with, of this God, is that of *Gen. 1. 1. In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth.* Which I think no man doubts but to be meant of the *True God, the Supreme God.* And by virtue of this, he claims the Sovereignty thereof; *The Earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof, Psal. 24. 1. Jehovah, the Lord of all the Earth, Josh. 3. 11, 13. The God of the Heaven, and the God of the Earth, Gen. 24. 3. The Heaven is my Throne, and the Earth is my Footstool, Isa. 66. 1. Behold the Heaven, and the Heaven of Heavens, is the Lord's, the Earth also, and all that is therein, Deut. 10. 14.*

The same Character is applied to God very often, *Isa. 42. 5, 8. Thus saith God the Lord (Jehovah) he that created the Heavens and stretched them out; he that spread forth the Earth and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein: I am the Lord (Jehovah) that is my name, and my Glory will I not give unto another.* And *Isa. 48. 13. Mine hand hath laid the foundation of the Earth, and my right hand hath spanned (or spread out) the Heavens. So Psal. 8. 3. When I consider the Heavens, the work of Thy fingers; the Moon and the Stars which thou hast ordained. Psal. 146. 6. Which made Heaven and Earth, the Sea, and all that therein is.* And many other places, not only in the Old Testament; but in the New Testament likewise; as *Acts 14. 15. That ye should turn from these vanities unto the Living God, who made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea and all things that are therein.* And *Acts 17. 24. God that made the World, and all things therein.* So *Revel. 4. 11. Thou hast created all things. Chap. 14. 7. Him that made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea, and the Fountains of Water.*

And it is the distinctive Character, whereby he doth distinguish,

distinguish himself from all other pretended Gods, *Jer. 10.* Where he who at *ver. 10.* is called *The Lord, the true God, the living God, an everlasting King*, at whose wrath the Earth shall tremble, and the Nations shall not abide his indignation; doth at *ver. 11.* give this defiance to all other Gods, *Thus shall ye say to them; The Gods which have not made the Heavens and the Earth, they shall perish from the Earth, and from under these Heavens.*

Now this Character we find ascribed to Christ. Not only, where it is spoken as of God indefinitely, but to be understood of Christ; (as are some of the places already mentioned :) But even where it is particularly applied to him.

I shall begin with that of *Joh. 1. 1, 2.* where we have a large Discourse of him, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* Where, by the *Word* is meant *Christ*, as is evident from the further descriptions of him in the following verses; 'Tis he of whom *John the Baptist* came to bear witness, *ver. 7, 8.* He who came into the World, but the World knew him not. *ver. 10.* Who came to his own, but his own received him not; but to as many as received him, he gave power to become the Sons of God. *ver. 11. 12.* Who was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us, and we beheld his glory; the glory as of the onely begotten of the Father. *ver. 14.* He of whom *John* bare witness and cried, saying, *This is he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me; (not as to his Humane Nature; for, so, John the Baptist was older than he, by six months, Luk. 1. 26.) and of his fulness (saith St. John) we have all received grace for grace; For the Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ, ver. 15, 16, 17.* 'Twas *Jesus Christ* therefore that is here called *the Word*.

Now of *this same Word*, it is said, *The same was in the beginning with God; All things were made by him, and with-*

out him was not any thing made which was made, ver. 2, 3. He was in the World, and the World was made by him, ver. 10. Consonant to that of Heb. 11. 3. The Worlds were formed by the Word of God: and 2 Pet. 2. 5. By the Word of God the Heavens were of old, and the Earth standing in the Water and out of the Water. And by the same Word, the heavens and earth are kept in store, or preserved, ver. 7.

And to the same purpose, Col. 1. 16, 17. By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And Heb. 1. 2. By whom also he made the Worlds.

In Psal. 102. we have a long Prayer (to the Supreme God doubtless) which bears this title, *A Prayer of the Afflicted, when he is overwhelmed, and poureth out his complaint before the Lord, (the Lord Jehovah.)* It begins thus, *Hear my Prayer, O Lord, (Jehovah) and let my cry come unto thee.* And at the same rate he proceeds, addressing himself to the same God all along. And at ver. 24, 25, 26, 27. he speaks thus, *O my God, thy years are throughout all Generations; Thou of old hast laid the Foundations of the Earth, and the Heavens are the work of thy hands; (who is the same God therefore of whom Moses had before said, In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth, Gen. 1. 1.) They shall perish (as the Psalmist proceeds) but thou shalt endure: Yea all of them shall wax old as a Garment, as a vesture shalt thou change them and they shall be changed: But thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end.* And doubtless the Psalmist, when he made this long Prayer, thought not of addressing himself to any other than the Supreme God. (Not to a God who had not, then, a Being, nor was to have till a Thousand Years after, as the Socinians would have us think of Christ.) He prays to God as his Redeemer; that is, to Christ.

And that Christ is that God to whom he did thus address, we are expressly told, Heb. 1. 8, 10, 11, 12.

A Third Sermon

But unto the Son he saith,---Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thine hands ; They shall perish, but thou remainest : and they all shall wax old as doth a Garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed ; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail. All which is plainly cited from that Psalm. Christ therefore is that God to whom that Prayer was made ; the same Supreme God, who created the Heaven and the Earth : even Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and to day and for ever, Heb. 13. 8.

And it is very frequent in Scripture, that what in one place is spoken of God *Indefinitely* (without specification of this or that Person-) is elsewhere applied to one or other of the Persons in particular, as that of the Creation is here to *Christ, the Redeemer* ; as being the *same God* who is the *Creator* also. And that of *Redemption*, to God the *Creator* (who is the *Redeemer* also) *Isai. 43. 1. Thus saith the LORD (Jehovah) that Created thee,--- Fear not, for I have Redeemed thee. So that God the Creator, and God the Redeemer, are the same God.*

C H A R A C T E R II.

The next Character I shall insist upon, is that where-by God denotes himself to *Moses*, *Exod. 3. 13, 14, 15. I Am that I AM ; and I AM hath sent me unto you.* When God was sending *Moses* to the *Children of Israel*, in order to their deliverance out of *Egypt*, *Moses* puts this Question, *When I come to the Children of Israel, and shall say to them, The God of your Fathers hath sent me unto you ; and they shall say, What is his Name ? What shall I say to them ?* 'Tis certainly, therefore the True God, that is here spoken of: Let us see what is the Character that this God gives of himself. And God said unto *Moses*, *I AM THAT I AM : And he said, Thus shalt thou say to the Children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.* This therefore is a proper Character of the True God.

God. *I am that I am*, (Ehjah asher Ehjah,) or *I am, who AM*; or *I am, He who AM*, so the vulgar Latin; (*Ego sum QV I SUM*;) and (*QUI EST*) *He that IS, hath sent me*: As if, what God says of himself (in the first Person) *I that AM*, were proper for *Moses* to say of him (in the third person) *He that IS*. And so the Septuagint, *Εγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢΝ*, *I am, He that AM*, or *He that IS*; and *ὁ ὢΝ* (*He that IS*) *hath sent me*. Where simply *TO BE*, is made a Distinctive Character of God, as he whose Essence is *To be*; and it is *Impossible* for him *Not to Be*. Who *IS* of *Himself* (or rather *Himself IS*) without deriving ought from any other; and from whom all other Beings, have their Being. *Who giveth to all, life and breath and all things*; *In whom we live and move and have our Being*, Act. 17. 27, 28. *Who hath first given to him?* that is, *None hath*: He receives nothing (*aliunde*) from ought else; but *of him, and through him, and to him are all things*, Rom. 11. 35, 36. who is therefore called *ὁ ὢν*.

The same notion the Heathens also had of the Supreme God. Hence *Aristotle* calls him *Ὀν* *Ὀντων*, the *Being of Beings*; and *Plato* αὐτὸ *Ὀν*, the *self Being*; who *himself IS*, and *gives Being* to all else.

And (being thus *self-existent*) he must be also a *Necessary Being* (*Ens Necessarium*) and *Eternal*, (for if ever he had *not been*, it were impossible he should ever *Be*; for how could *Nothing* make it *self to be*;) and likewise *Infinite* (as the *Source* of all Being.) All which the Heathen acknowledged (as consonant to Natural Light) as well as *We*.

Now this same Character *I Am*, or *ὁ ὢν* (which is the word whereby the Greek Septuagint doth here render the Hebrew word *Ehjah*, which we translate *I AM*) that is *I who AM*, or *He who IS*, we find signally applied to *Christ*, Rom. 9. 5. *He that IS*. For what there

werender, *Who IS*, in the Greek is not ὁς ἐστίν, but ὁ ὢν, *He that IS*, or *the Being*: With this addition, *over all*; (*the Being, over all, or the Supreme Being*;) with this further Character, *God Blessed for ever*; (*or the ever blessed God.*) *Amen.*

Where it is not amiss to note, that *the Blessed* (ὁ εὐλογητός) was an usual Title whereby they were wont to design the *True God*. And accordingly, that question which Caiaphas the High Priest, puts to our Saviour, *Mat. 26. 63. I adjure thee by the Living God, that thou tell us, whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God*; is in *Mark 19. 53. Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed*, ὡς τὸ εὐλογητόν. Where no man doubts but that by ὁ εὐλογητός, is meant, the *Supreme God*. And when *Christ* is here called, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητός εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας, (*the Supreme Being, the ever-Blessed God*;) with the Solemn note of Asseveration, *Amen*: It is certainly too August a Title for any less than the *Supreme God, the Only God*.

The same Character we have of him again, *Rev. 1. 8.* where we have not only the Title ὁ ὢν, importing his *Being*, but the additional intimation of his *Eternity*, through all the variety of continued Duration, *past, present, and to come.*

Where we are to observe, that at *ver. 4.* we have this Character of *God* Indefinitely, without restriction to this or that Person in the Deity, (as appears by its being contradistinct to *Christ* personally considered, *ver. 5.*) *Grace be unto you and peace*, (ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) *from him which Is, and which Was, and which is to come,--- and from Jesus Christ, &c.*

Where it is manifest from the unusual construction, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁ ὢν, &c. that the Title ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, (*who is, and was, and shall be*) is taken, τεχνικῶς, as the Grammarians speak, (as one *undeclined-Substantive*,

stantive joined with the Article $\tau\epsilon$) as being (all together) one joint title of God, *Indefinitely taken*, (because of that contradistinction which follows; *And from Jesus Christ*;) and with particular respect (as the Margin of our Bible directs) to that of *Exod.* 3. 14. $\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \epsilon\mu\iota\ \delta\ \epsilon\gamma\omega$, *I am $\delta\ \epsilon\gamma\omega$, or He who AM*; and can relate to none but the *Supreme God*.

Now what is thus said of *this God* indefinitely, at *ver.* 4. is again repeated of *Christ* in particular at *ver.* 8. (with a further addition of *Omnipotence*,) *I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending* (the First and the Last) *saith the Lord, which Is, and which Was, and which is to Come; the Almighty.* So that he is here design'd, not only by his *Absolute Being*; but by his *Eternity* also, through all variety of continued duration, (past, present, and future;) *who Is, and Was, and shall Be*; who was the *First* (before whom nothing was) and the *Last* (after whom nothing shall be;) and, by his *Omnipotence*, the *Almighty*.

The same title of *Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last*, is given him in divers other places; as at *ver.* 11, and 17. of the same Chapter, *I am Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last; I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, Amen.* And *Rev.* 2. 8. *The first and the last, which was dead and is alive.* And again, *Rev.* 21. 6. and *Rev.* 22. 13. All relating to *Isai.* 41. 4. *Isai.* 44. 6. *Isai.* 48. 12. where the like had before been said, as a Character (no doubt) of the True God. And *Isai.* 43. 10. *Before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me.*

And what can this be other than the *Infinite*, the *Eternal*, the *Almighty God*. The same yesterday, and to day, and for ever, as he is called, *Heb.* 13. 8. *The Blessed, and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, who only hath Immortality, &c.* as he is described,

1 Tim.

1 Tim. 6. 14, 15, 16. And again, *The King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*, Rev. 17. 14. and Rev. 19. 16. *The Great God, and our Saviour*, Tit. 2. 13. Where, *our Saviour*, is so contra-distinguished, not as another from the Great God, but as another Title of that same Person: He that is *our God and Saviour*, or *God our Saviour*, as it is Tit. 3. 4. (like as *God and the Father*, Ephes. 5. 2. and again, Col. 3. 17. *Giving thanks to God, and the Father.*) For 'tis manifest that here (Tit. 2. 13.) it is spoken of Christ's coming to judgment; which is here called, *the Glorious appearance of the Great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ*; that is, *the glorious appearance of Jesus Christ, who is the Great God and our Saviour*; The title that *Jeremy* gives to God, Jer. 32. 18. *The great and mighty God, the Lord of Hosts is his name.* Christ therefore, *our Saviour*, is ὁ μέγας Θεός, *the Great God.*

And the Doxology there added, Rev. 1. 6. *To him be glory and dominion for ever and ever, Amen.*; is equivalent to that of Θεὸς εὐλογητός, Rom. 9. 5. *God blessed for ever.* And the like, 1 Tim. 6. 16. *To whom be Honour and Power everlasting, Amen.* And much more, that of Rev. 5. 12, 13, 14. *Worthy is the Lamb, that was slain, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing*: (As High a Doxology as that in the close of the Lords-prayer;) To which we have the Acclamation of every Creature (which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the Sea, and all that are therein,) saying, *Blessing, Honour, Glory, and Power, be unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.* And the four Beasts said, *Amen*; And the four and twenty Elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever. Too great things to be said of a mere Creature, or a Titular God; but very agreeable to Christ, being (as he is) *the same God with the Father, the only True God.*

I might here add a like Remark, on that of *Isai.* 48. 12. *Hearken O Israel, I am HE; I am the First, I am also the Last.* And in like manner, *Isai.* 41. 4. *Isai.* 43. 10, 13, 25. *Deut.* 32. 39. *I, even I, am HE (Hu) and there is no other God with me, or beside me.* (And to the same purpose elsewhere.) *Ani Hu; I am HE;* so we render it.

I am HE; What HE? 'Tis $\delta \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \varsigma$, $\kappa \alpha \tau' \epsilon \xi \omicron \chi \eta \nu$, 'Tis the H E Absolutely taken, and Emphatically applied to God. Which I take to be of like import with, $\delta \Omega \nu$, I AM; *I that AM, or That which I S.* * The Greek * For I Septuagint (in the places cited) renders *Ani Hu* by take the $\epsilon \gamma \omega \epsilon \mu \iota$: And the vulgar Latin (indifferently) by *Ego* Hebrew Pronouns *Hu* and *Hi*, (which we commonly render by *He, She, or It*, according as the Gender varies) to be Derivatives from the Verb *Havah* or *Hajah* which signifies *To Be*. Not that I take *Hu* to be a proper Name of God (as are *Jah*, and *Jehovah*, from the same Verbs,) But an Appellative word, common to the Creatures also; but here Emphatically applied to God, (as are the words $\delta \Omega \nu$ and $\tau \delta \text{ } \omicron \nu$, which are common to the Creatures also; for they also are, in their kind, $\text{ } \omicron \nu \tau \alpha$.) And the Latin Pronouns *is, id*, (that is, *he or it*) when Relatively taken, are to be expounded of their Antecedent to which they Relate: But when put Absolutely without an Antecedent; they are of alike import with $\tau \delta$ *Quid* taken Substantively: ($\delta \tau \iota \varsigma$, or $\tau \delta \tau \iota$) according to which we use to say (even in our Metaphysics) *Ens & Aliquid convertuntur*, (*He or It*, so taken, are of the same import, with a Being, or What Is.) And the Learned Gataker (than whom I do not know that we have a better Critick; more Judicious or more Acute;) though (in his Book *De Stylo Novi Instrumenti, contra Pfochenium*,) he do not take *Hu* to be a Proper Name of God (but communicable to Creatures, however here Emphatically applied to him:) Yet doth allow, that in these places, and in many others (of which he gives divers instances) it is used for the Verb Substantive (*Sum*, or *Est*.) Which is the same with what I say, that it Imports a Being, or to Be, (and therefore, when signally applied to God, his Absolute, Infinite, Independent, Self-Being.) And so, it seems, the Septuagints did here understand it, who render *Ani Hu*, by $\epsilon \gamma \omega \epsilon \mu \iota$, I AM; (and the Vulgar Latin, by *Ego Sum*;) and in the New Testament (which commonly follows the Phrase of the Septuagints) Christ says it of himself, *Before Abraham Was* (not *I Was*, but) *I Am*, ($\epsilon \gamma \omega \epsilon \mu \iota$), importing thereby his Permanent and Insuccesive Being; co-existent to all the varieties of (Succesive) Duration; Past, Present, and Future: *the same Yesterday, and To-day, and for ever.* The difference between *is* or *id* Relatively taken (relating to what we call the Antecedent,) and the same taken Absolutely (without such reference to other than it self;) is much the same as between (what the Logicians call) *Est secundi adjecti* (which is but a Copula to join the Predicate with the Subject,) and *Est tertii adjecti*; where it self is (or doth include) the Predicate. As when *Socrates Est*, is resolved by *Socrates Est Ens*, or *Est Exstiens*; The word *Est*, so taken, including both the Copula and the Predicate: Like as *id* or *quid* Substantively taken, is not Relative, but Absolute, and the same with *Ens*.

A Third Sermon

Sum, Ego Ipse, Ego Sum Ipse, Ego Ipse Sum : That is, *I am He*, or *I AM*. And Christ, of himself, *Joh. 8. 58.* πρὶν Ἀβραάμ γενέσθαι, ἐγὼ εἰμι, *Before Abraham was, I AM*. And I the rather take it so to signify (in the places cited) because I there find it attended (exegetically) with an Intimation of his *Eternity*; He *Is*, He is the *First* and he is the *Last*; Before him *none Was*, and after him *none shall Be*: He *Is*, and ever *Was*, and ever *shall Be*.

CHARACTER III.

The next Character that I shall insist upon, is that of the two *Proper Names* of God, *Jah* and *Jehovah*; which I take to be Proper to God, and Incommunicable to any other. I put them both together, because they be both of the same import; and indeed, of the same with *Ehjeh*, (*I AM*) before-mentioned. The chief difference is, that *Ehjeh* (*I AM*) retains the form of the *Verb*; but *Jah* and *Jehovah* are *Nouns* verbal, from *Hajah* or *Havah* which signifie *to Be*: All denoting Gods absolute *Being*: And All peculiar to the Supreme God, and no where applied in Scripture (that I know of) to any other. I know the *Socinians* would perswade us that *Jehovah* is sometime given to an *Angel*, which we do not deny; but we say *that Angel* is not a *Created Angel*, but the *Angel of the Covenant*, who is God himself.

The name *Jah* comes often in the Old Testament, but not so often as *Jehovah*. Particularly in *Psal. 68. 5.* *Sing unto God, sing praises to his Name, extol him that rideth upon the heavens by his Name JAH.* So we find it in our Bibles, and it agrees with the Original. But in our Psalters, (by a continued mistake,) instead of *Jah* or *Ya*, is printed *Yea* *.

* In one Great Bible of this Translation, (amongst

Mr. Selden's Books in the Bodleyan Library) appointed to be read in Churches (as we are told in the Title page) printed (if I do not mis-remember the date) about the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, or the end of King Henry the Eighth, I find the Name J A. But in all other (whether Psalters or Bibles, Old or New) of that Translation (that I have con-

sulted) it is *Yea*. Of which (I suppose) the occasion at first was this: The Hebrew Letter, by different persons, is differently called *Jod* and *Yod*; and accordingly that Name to be written in English *Ja* or *Ya*. Which being (it seems) in some Books written or printed *Ya*; some after-Printer thinking it to be mis-printed for *yea*, did so (as he thought) Correct it; and the Error hath thence been propagated ever since. Yet this having (it seems) been discovered by some-body, some while since; I find in divers late Editions of the Psalter, or Psalms in our Book of Common-prayer, (which follows that Translation) it is thus printed *praise him in his name, yea, and rejoyce before him*, (with a *Comma* before and after *yea*,) leaving it indifferent, whether to refer *Yea* (or *Ya*) to the former Clause, as the Name of God; or, to the latter Clause as the Affirmative particle *yea*. But in the Original Hebrew, and in all other Translations (that I have observed) in any Language, I find the name *Jah*, or somewhat equivalent thereunto; as doubtless it ought to be.

But this name is no where (I think) retained in the Greek Septuagint, (the Septuagint renders it by *Κύριος* *ὁνομα αὐτοῦ*;) Nor in the New Testament (which frequently follows the Septuagints form of Speech,) unless in the Solemn Form of praise *Hallelu-Jah* (which the Greek puts into one word *Alleluia*) that is, *Praise Jah*, or (as it is usually rendred) *Praise ye the Lord*. Which is jointly applied to *him that sits upon the Throne* and to *the Lamb*, Rev. 19. 1, 3, 4, 6. whom I take to be there meant by *the Lord our God*, ver. 1. and *the Lord God Omnipotent*, ver. 6. and *the Great God*, ver. 17. For *the Supper of the Great God*, ver. 17. is the same with *the Supper of the Lamb*, ver. 7, 9.

The name *Jehovah* is, in the Old Testament, much more frequent; especially in the Original Hebrew. But in our Translation is frequently rendered by *the LORD*; as in all those places (if the Printers have been careful) where *LORD* is printed in Capital Letters.

The name *Jehovah*, is at Exod. 3. 14, 15. made equivalent to *Ehjah*, I AM. For what is said at ver. 14. *Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you*; is thus repeated at ver. 15. *Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of Israel, JEHOVAH (the God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob) hath sent me unto you*: with this Addition, *This is my name for ever, and this is my memorial*

memorial unto all generations. And Psal. 81. 18. *That men may know, that thou, whose Name alone is JEHOVAH, art the most High over all the earth.*

In which place, the restrictive word *Alone*, cannot be understood to affect the word *Name*, as if it were thus to be construed, (*cujus nomen est Jehovah solum*,) *Whose name is Only Jehovah*; (For God we know had other Names, whereby he is often called :) But to the word *Whose*, (*cujus solius nomen est Jehovah*,) *To whom Alone (or to whom Only) the name Jehovah doth belong.* So Isai. 45. 5. *I am JEHOVAH and none else; there is no God beside me.* And Deut. 5. 35, 39. *JEHOVAH he is God, and there is none else beside him: JEHOVAH he is God in heaven above, and upon earth beneath, there is none else.* And Isai. 42. 8. *I am JEHOVAH that is my name; and my Glory will I not give unto another.* And Deut. 6. 4. *Hear, O Israel, the LORD thy God is one LORD; or, JEHOVAH thy God is one JEHOVAH; there is no other Jehovah but he.* And Deut. 28. 58. *That thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD, or JEHOVAH thy God.* And to the same purpose, Deut. 32. 39. 1 Sam. 12. 2. and in many other places.

I will not dispute, whether this name *JEHOVAH*, were never made known, till God did thus declare it to *Moses*, at Exod. 3. 15. It might seem so to be by that of Exod. 6. 3. *I appeared unto Abraham, and to Isaac, and to Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH, was I not known to them.* 'Tis true, that God is often so called in the Book of *Genesis*: But that Book was written by *Moses*, after the time that *Moses* speaks of, in *Exodus*. And *Moses* might so call him, by a name known at the time when he wrote, though it had not been known at the time whereof he wrote.

wrote. As when *Abraham* is said to go forth from *Ur of the Chaldees*, or of *Chasdim*, *Gen. 11. 31.* though *Chefed* the Son of *Nahor* (from whom, in likelihood, the *Chaldees* were called *Chasdim*) was not born till afterwards, as appears *Gen. 22. 22.* So *Exod. 12. 40.* where the *Children of Israel* are said to have sojourned four hundred and thirty years; it must be reckoned backward as far as *Abraham's* coming forth from *Ur of the Chaldees*, at which time they could not be called, the *Children of Israel*, (for *Israel* was not then born,) but it was that people, who were afterwards called the *Children of Israel*. And many such *Prolepses*, or anticipations of Names, there are in all Historians.

But, whether it be upon this account, or some other, that he is said, by his Name *JEHOVAH* not to have been known to them, is not material to our present business. 'Tis enough, that *Jehovah* is now known to be the signal Name of the True God; and (I think) no where given to any other.

Now that our Saviour Christ is called *Jehovah*, is not to be denied. And it is for this reason, that the *Soci-nians* would have us think that this Name is not peculiar to God. In *Jer. 23. 5, 6.* he is called *Jehovah Tzidkenu*, the LORD our Righteousness. Behold the days come saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a Righteous Branch; and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice on the Earth; In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell in safety: (which is agreed, by Jews and Christians, to be understood of the *Messias*.) And this is the name whereby he shall be called (*JEHOVAH Tzidkenu*) the LORD our Righteousness, (*JEHOVAH* our Righteousness.) And to the same purpose, *Jer. 33. 15, 16.*

In *Psal. 102.* which is called, *A prayer of the afflicted, when he poureth out his complaint before the LORD* (*Jehovah*)

hovah.) It begins thus, *Hear my prayer O LORD (Jehovah) and let my cry come unto thee.* And he to whom this prayer is made, is eight or nine times called *the LORD (Jehovah.)* Now he to whom this prayer is made (we are told, *Hebr. 1. 8, 10, 11, 12.*) is our Lord Christ; *Unto the Son he saith,---Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands; They shall perish, but thou remainest; They all shall wax old as a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.* All which is cited out of that Prayer, made to the Lord Jehovah.

So *I the LORD (Jehovah) the first and the last, Isai. 41. 4. Thus saith the LORD (Jehovah) before me there was no God, neither shall there be after me, Isai. 43. 10. Thus saith the LORD (Jehovah,) the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, (Jehovah) the LORD of Hosts; I am the first and I am the last; and beside Me there is no God, Isai. 44. 6.* which are the Characters applied to Christ, *Rev. 1. 8, 9. & 2. 8. & 21. 6. & 22. 13.* as was shewed before.

'Tis true, that in the Greek Septuagint of the Old Testament, the name *Jehovah* is no where retained; but *ως* (I think) every where put for it. Whether because of a Jewish Superstition, no where to pronounce that Name; or because it could not conveniently be expressed in Greek Letters; I will not determine. And for that reason (because the Septuagints did not use it) it is not used in the New Testament (which doth mostly comply with the Language of the Septuagints; as being the Greek Translation then in use.) And therefore we are not to look for the Name *Jehovah* there applied to Christ. But divers places are in the New Testament applied to Christ, wherein the name *Jehovah* was used in the Old Testament. And the name *ὁ ως* (*the Lord*) by which both.

both the Septuagints and the New Testament do constantly render the Hebrew Name *Jehovah*, is so frequently applied to Christ in the New Testament, as that (throughout the New Testament) it is almost his constant Character, the Lord, the Lord Jesus Christ, &c. One Lord Jesus Christ, 1 Cor. 8. 6. Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, Jam. 2. 1. My Lord and my God, Joh. 20. 28. No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. 12. 3. And elsewhere so often, that none can be ignorant of it.

CHARACTER IV.

The last Character (which I shall insist upon) of the True God, the Only God; is that of the Lord God of Israel; Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c. Deut. 6. 4. And the Lord thy God, is almost the constant Language of Moses to the Children of Israel: And it is the Character which God directs him to use; Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of Israel, The Lord God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me; this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all Generations, Exod. 3. 15. and the Lord God of the Hebrews, ver. 18. And elsewhere very often throughout the Bible. And doubtless, he that was the Lord God of Israel, is the true God, the only God.

'Tis He who tells us, I am the Lord thy God--- Thou shalt have no other God but Me, Exod. 20. 3. And, Besides Me, there is no other God, Isai. 44. 6. and so often elsewhere; that it is needless to name the places.

And this Character, as well as the rest, is expressly given to Christ also, Luk. 1. 16, 17. where we are expressly told of John the Baptist, that many of the Children of Israel shall be turn to the Lord Their God (to the Lord God of Israel:) for he shall go before Him in the spirit and power.

power of Elias. Now we all know, whose *fore-runner* John Baptist was; and *before whom* he was to go, *in the Power and Spirit of Elias.* And he before whom he was thus to go, is *the Lord God of Israel*; and therefore not only a *Titular* God, or a *Creature* God, but the *True* God, the *Supreme* God, the same God with that God who is *the Lord God of Israel*; whom no man doubts to be the *True* God, the *Supreme* God, the *Only* God.

I might add many other Characters given to Christ, proving him to be the True God; as that *Rev. 2. 13. I am he which searcheth the Reins and Hearts, and I will give unto every one according to his Works,* (and to the same purpose, *Rev. 22. 12.* and elsewhere:) which God (the True God) claims as his peculiar Prerogative, *Jer. 17. 9, 10. The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, Who can know it? I the LORD search the Heart, I try the Reins; to give to every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings.* And to the same purpose, *Jer. 11. 20. Jer. 20. 12. 1 Chron. 28. 9. Psal. 7. 9. Psal. 139. 1.* and in many other places. And that likewise of *Isai. 9. 6. His Name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, &c.* with many other Characters of like nature, which can never agree to any but the True God.

But it is not my business, in this short Discourse, to say All that might be said; but what may be sufficient.

He therefore that is (as hath been shewed) God, the True God; the Mighty God; the Everlasting Father; the Eternal God; the First and the Last, (before whom nothing was, and after whom nothing shall be) that *Was, and Is, and shall Be*; the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever; the Almighty; by whom the World was made; by whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made that was made; who

who laid the foundations of the Earth, and the Heavens are the work of his hands; who, when the Heavens and the Earth shall fail, his years endure for ever; who searcheth the heart and the reins, to give to every one according to his works; who is *Jehovah*; the Lord God of Israel; the Supreme being; which is over all, God blessed for ever; who is the Blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who only hath immortality, to whom be Honour and Power Everlasting, Amen. That God (I say) of whom all these great things are said, is (certainly) not a mere Titular God, (who is called God but is not,) a Creature God, or only a dignified Man. For, if these be not Characters of the True God, by what Characters shall the True God be described?

I know, the Socinians have employed their Wits to find out sometricks to evade or elude some of these plain places, which I shall not trouble my self, or you to repeat; or to give an answer to them. For they are so weak, and so forced, that the plain words of Scripture, read together with the forced senses they would put upon them, are answer enough; nor do they need or deserve any further answer.

OBJECTION VIII.

The last Objection which I shall now take notice of, is this; That the Doctrine of the Trinity was not known to the Jewish Church before Christ.

To which I answer, 1. If it were not made known to them, it was not necessary for them to know. For matters of pure Revelation, are not necessary to be known, before they are revealed, (nor farther than they are revealed:) But may be so to us, to whom they are Revealed.

The whole Doctrine of our Redemption by Christ, was (doubtless) unknown to *Adam* before his Fall;
And,

And, had he not fallen, it would have been no fault in him not to have known it at all.

And when (after his fall) it was first made known to him, (in that first promise, that *the Seed of the Woman should break the Serpents head*, Gen. 3. 15.) it was yet so dark, that he could know very little (as to the particulars of it) of what is now known to us. And as God by *parcels* (*πολλομερῶς*) at *sundry times*, and in *divers manners*, declared more of it to *Abraham*, to *David*, and the *Prophets*, so were they obliged to know and believe more of it: and when *in the last days* he had declared the whole of it *by his Son*; Heb. 1. 1, 2. it is now necessary for us to believe much more; of which they might be safely ignorant. And, of the Trinity likewise, if it were not then revealed.

2. But Secondly, There were many things, which though not fully revealed, so as to be clearly understood by All; were yet so insinuated, as to be in good measure understood by some; and would more be so, when *the Veil should be taken off from Moses's face*, 2-Cor. 3. 13, 15, 16.

Thus the *Death and Resurrection* of Christ, were not understood, even by his own *Disciples*, till after his Resurrection. Yet we must not say that these things were not before intimated in the Scriptures (though covertly;) for when *their understandings were opened, to understand the Scriptures*, and what had been written of him in the *Law of Moses*, and in the *Prophets*, and in the *Psalms*; they then perceived that *it was so written*, and that *it behooved Christ to Suffer and to Rise from the dead the Third day*. Yet this was therein so covertly contained, that they seem no more to have understood it, than that of the *Trinity*.

And St. Paul in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, declares a great deal to have been covered under the *Jewish Rites*
and

and Ceremonies ; which, certainly, most of the Jewish Church did not understand ; though, in good measure, it might be understood by some.

I might say the like of the *Resurrection* ; which was but darkly discovered till *Immortality was brought to light through the Gospel*, 2 Tim. 1. 10. We must not yet say, it was wholly *unknown* to the Jewish Church, (of whom many, no doubt, did believe it :) Yet neither can we say, it was generally received ; For we know the *Pharisees* and the *Sadduces* were divided upon that point, *Act. 23. 6, 7, 8.* And so little is said of it in the Old Testament, that those who had a mind to be captious, might have found much more specious pretence of cavilling against it *then*, than our Adversaries *now* have against the Doctrine of the Trinity.

3. I say Thirdly, as of the *Resurrection*, there were then divers intimations, which are now better understood. (in a clearer light) than at that time they were : So I think there were also of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. I shall instance in some of them.

1. That there was, in the Unity of the God-head, a *Plurality* of Somewhat (which now we call Persons) seems fairly to be insinuated, even in that of *Elohim-bara*, Gen. 1. 1. (*In the beginning God created,*) where *Elohim* (God) a Nominative Case Plural, is joined with *Bara*, a Verb Singular ; (which is as if we should say in English, *We Am*, or *They Doth* ; which would to us sound oddly, if somewhat of Mystery be not intended in it.) Nor is it here only, but very frequently, that God is called *Elohim* in the Plural Number, (and much oftner than in the Singular Number *Eloah*,) as if, though *Jehovah* be but *One*, yet *Elohim* may be *Three* : Not *Three Gods*, but *Three Somewhats* in that *One God*. (For though it be *Elohim*, yet it is *Bara* : It is *So Three*, as yet to be *One*.) Nor is it *Elohajim* (in the Dual Number.) as spoken of

N

Two,

Two, or a Couple; but *Elohim* (in the Plural Number) as of more than Two.

This may perhaps be called a *Criticism*, (and it is so.) But I am loth to say, it is purely *Casual*, and not designed. For many times little Circumstances, and unheeded Expressions (as at first they may seem to be,) may (by the Divine Wisdom) be fore-designed to some considerable purpose. As, that of, *Not a bone of it shall be broken*, *Exod.* 12. 46. *Numb.* 9. 12. *Psal.* 34. 20. And that of, *they pierced my hands and my feet*, *Psal.* 22. 16. And, *they shall look upon him whom they have pierced*, *Zach.* 12. 10. And that, *they part my garment among them, and on my vesture they cast lots*, *Psal.* 22. 18. And, *they gave me gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink*, *Psal.* 69. 21. Which are most of them, but Poetical Expressions; and seemingly casual, and undesigned, as to their Literal Sense; but were providentially ordered, as being literally to be fulfilled; as we find in *Joh.* 19. 23, 24, 28, 29, 36, 37. and in the places parallel of the other Gospels.

I might instance in a great many such, which at first might seem Casual, but were Providentially designed. I shall content my self at present with one more; which is that of *St. Paul*, (which perhaps may be thought to look as like a *Criticism* as what I mention) *Gal.* 3. 16. Now to *Abraham* and his Seed were the promises made. He saith not, *And to Seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy Seed which is Christ.* Now the promises made to *Abraham*, to which he refers, are those *Gen.* 22. 16, 17, 18. (which, I think, is the only place, where, in promises made to *Abraham*, such mention is made of his Seed.) *By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord; For because, thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy Son, thine only Son; That in blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thy Seed, as the stars of the heaven,*

and as the sand which is upon the sea-shoar, and thy Seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy Seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.

By Abraham's Seed, here, is manifestly meant his Children whom God promisseth to multiply. And it might seem to be very indifferent whether to say, *thy Seed*, or *thy Children*. But St. Paul was so nice a Critick, as to take advantage of his saying *Seed* (in the Singular Number) and not *Seeds* or *Children* (in the Plural) as thereby signally denoting (as principally intended) that *One Seed*, which is *Christ*. Yet are not the rest of the *Seed* to be quite excluded (even in that last Clause of it, *In thy Seed shall all the Nations of the earth be blessed*), as appears by *Act. 3. 25*. And ye (men of Israel, ver. 12.) are the Children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant which God made with our Fathers, saying unto Abraham, *And in thy Seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed*. Whence 'tis evident, that seemingly unheeded Criticisms are sometimes Providentially designed. And such I take this of *Bara Elohim*, to be. And it is taken notice of to this purpose, both by Jewish and Christian writers.

The like *Plurality* seems plainly intimated in the same Chapter, *Gen. 1. 26*. Let *Us* make man in *OUR* image and after *OUR* likeness. Yet even this *Plurality* is no other than what in another consideration, is an *Unity*; for so it follows, ver. 27. So God created man in *HIS* own image. These *Plural Somewhats*, therefore, are but *One God*.

And 'tis but a childish excuse to say, It is the *Stile* of *Princes* to speak in the Plural, *We* and *Us* instead of *I* and *Me*. 'Tis indeed a piece of Courtship at this day, (and perhaps hath been for some Ages:) But how long hath it been so? 'Tis not so old as *Moses*; much less so old as the *Creation*. King *Pharoah*, and *Semacharib*, and

A Third Sermon

Ahasuerus, were wont to say *I, Me, Mine*, (not *We, Us, Ours.*) And *Nebuchadnezzar*, even in the Height of his Pride, Dan. 4. 30. *Is not this great Babylon that I have built, by the might of MY Power, and for the honour of MY Majesty.* Here's nothing of *We* and *Our*. This was not *Stilus Regius* in those days. And if we should here expound it by such an equivalence, *And God said, Let Me make man in My image*; it would scarce sound like good Sense. (For 'tis not usual to speak *Imperatively* in the *First person Singular.*) It seems therefore to imply a *Plurality*, though not a *Plurality of Gods*; and

The like we have Gen. 3. 22. *Behold, the man is become like One of Us.* Is this also *Stilo Regio*, instead of, *The man is become like one of Me?*

So, Gen. 11. 6, 7. *And the LORD (Jehovah) said, Let US go down, and confound their Language.*

2. And as these places intimate a *Plurality*, so I know not but that of Gen. 18. may intimate this *Plurality* to be a *Trinity*. That the appearance there of *three Men* to *Abraham*, was a *Divine Apparition* (though *Abraham* did not at first apprehend it so to be) is evident. For it is expressly said by *Moses*, ver 1. *The LORD (Jehovah) appeared unto him in the plains of Mamre; and he lift up his eyes, and lo Three Men stood by him.* So that this appearance of *Three Men*, was an appearance of the Lord *Jehovah*. And though we do not find that *Abraham* doth any where use the word *Jehovah* in that discourse, (but *Adonai* all along :) Yet *Moses* the Relater (where himself speaks) says every where *Jehovah*; though when he recites *Abraham's* words, it is *Adonai*: But even *Adonai* is a word *Plural* (as well as *Elohim*) that is, *my Lords*; (the Singular is *Adoni*, *my Lord*; but seldom said of God.)

Whether it were, that the name *J E H O V A H* were not then known to *Abraham* (according to that of
Exod.

Exod. 6. 3.) or that *Abraham* was not at first aware who it was with whom he was then discoursing; or for what other reason he did avoid using the name *Jehovah*; I shall not trouble my self curiously to enquire: But sure we are that *Moses* tells us, This Apparition of *Three Men* (as at first they seemed to be) was an Apparition of the Lord *Jehovah*.

We need not doubt therefore, but that *God* appeared there, in this Apparition of *Three Men*; which is therefore a fair intimation of a *Trinity of Persons*.

It might perhaps be cavill'd at, if this were all: And so might that of *Jonah's* being *three days and three nights in the Whale's belly*, when brought as an Argument to prove our Saviour ought so long to lie in the Grave. But *St. Paul* tells us, *1 Cor. 15. 3, 4.* that *Christ* died for our sins according to the *Scriptures*; and that he rose again the *Third day, according to the Scriptures*. (And *Christ* in like manner, *Luk. 24. 46.*) Yet I know not any thing more clear to that purpose in the *Scriptures* (of the Old Testament) than either this of *Jonah's* being so long in the *Whale's belly* (to which *Christ* himself alludes, *Mat. 12. 40.*) or that of *Hos. 6. 2.* *After two days he will revive us, and the third day he will raise us up.* Which seems not to be more express (for the Resurrection of *Christ* on the *Third day*) than this of *Jonah*. But such covert Intimations there are in the Old Testament; of things afterward more clearly discovered in the New.

Nor was this unknown to the ancient Jewish Doctors; as appears by what *Ainsworth* (in his Notes on *Gen. 1.*) cites from thence, (out of *R. Simeon, Ben Jochai* in *Zoar*;) *Come see the Mystery of the word Elohim: there are three Degrees, and every Degree by it self Distinct; and yet notwithstanding they are all one, and joined together in One, and are not divided one from another, (only, there he calls Degrees what we now call Persons.)* So that it was
not

not unknown to the Jews of old, whatever the present Jews think of it.

3. What these *Three* are, (the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Spirit*,) seems to be likewise intimated in the Story of the Creation, *Gen.* 1. where they seem to be distinctly named.

In the beginning (Elohim) *God created the Heaven and the Earth*, ver. 1. where no man doubts but *God the Father* is implied, though perhaps not *He only*.

And ver. 2. *The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the Waters*. Where *Ainsworth* tells us from the ancient *Rabbines* whom he cites, they call him, *The Spirit of Mercies from before the Lord*: *The Spirit of Wisdom*, called, *the Spirit of the Living God*: And, *The Spirit of the Messiah*. Of the same *Spirit*, we have elsewhere mention; *My Spirit shall not always strive with Man*, *Gen.* 6. 3. *Take not thine Holy Spirit from me*, *Psal.* 51. 11. *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me*, *Isai.* 61. 1. *They vexed his Holy Spirit*, *Isai.* 63. 10. and elsewhere. And if it be said, that by the *Spirit of God*, is meant *God himself*: we say so too, for we do acknowledge, that the *Holy Ghost*, is *God himself*.

And, of the *Word*, there is a like intimation, ver. 3. *God Said* (or spake the *Word*) *Let there be Light, and there was Light*. And in like manner, ver. 6, 9, 11. 14, 20. *God Said*, *Let there be a Firmament, &c.* So *Psal.* 33. 6, 7. *By the Word of the Lord were the Heavens made, &c.* *He Spake and it was done*, *He Commanded and it stood fast*. And *Psal.* 148. 5. *He Spake the Word and they were made*, *He commanded and they were created*. Consonant to that of *Heb.* 11. 3. *By faith we understand that the Worlds were made by the Word of God*. And *1 Pet.* 3. 5, 7. *By the Word of God the Heavens were of old, and the Earth, &c.* And by the same *Word* they are kept in store, or preserved. In which places, by the *Word*, so often mentioned,

tioned, and with such Emphasis put upon it; seemsto be meant, that *Word* mentioned, *Joh. 1. 1, 3, 10.* In the beginning was the *Word*, (ὁ λόγος,) All things were made by Him: The *World* was made by Him; just as in *Heb. 11. 3.* the *Worlds* were made by the *Word* of *God*.

Nor was this notion of the *Word* (Personally taken) unknown to the Jewish Doctors. For what we have *Psal. 110. 1.* The Lord said unto my Lord, (*Dixit Jehova Domino meo*) the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, renders by *Dixit Jehova*, (*Bemeimreh*) in *Verbo suo* meaning, by *His Word*, the *Messias*; and of whom our Saviour himself expounds it, *Mat. 22. 44.* And it is frequent, in that Paraphrase, by the *Word* to design the *Messias*; * as *S. Joh.* doth, * So in *Isa. 41. 10.*

Joh. 1. 1. In the beginning was the *Word*.
 Fear not, I am with thee; and ver. 13. Fear not, I will help thee; and ver. 14. Fear not, I will help thee, saith the Lord and thy Redeemer; and ver. 16. The Wind (or Spirit, Ruach) shall carry them away, and the Whirl-wind shall scatter them: Is in the *Chaldee* Paraphrase (rendred into Latin) Ne timeas, quia adiutorium tuum erit Verbum meum. Ne timeas, quia Verbum meum erit in adiutorium tuum. Ne timeatis, — Verbum meum est in auxilium vestrum, dicit dominus & Redemptor vester. Venus (seu Spiritus) abripiet eos, & Verbum eius disperget eos, quasi Turbo stipulas. (Where we have God, his Word, and Spirit.) So in *Isai. 48. 11.* For my own sake, for my own sake will I do it: and ver. 12. Hearken unto Me: and ver. 13. My hand hath laid the foundation of the Earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens: and ver. 15. I, even I have spoken, I have called him: and ver. 16. Come ye near unto me, hear ye this: Are in the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, Propter Nomen meum, propter Verbum meum faciam. Obedite Verbo meo. In Verbo meo fundavi terram, & in Potentia mea appendi celos. (Where again we have God, his Word, and Power, or Spirit.) In Verbo meo pepigi pactum cum Abraham patre vestro, & vocavi eum. Accedite ad Verbum meum, audite hæc. And, at the like rate, in many other places.

And I put the more weight upon this, because (as here, *Gen. 1. 2, 3.* so) we have in several other places, the *Word* and *Spirit* mentioned as concerned in the Creation, *Psal. 32. 6.* By the *Word* of the *L O R D* (*Jehovah*) were the *Heavens* made, and all the *Hosts* of them by the (*Spirit*, or) breath of his mouth, (*Beruach*.) Where we have *Jehovah*, his *Word*, and *Spirit*. *Job 26. 12, 13.* He divideth the *Sea* by his Power, and by his (*Wisdom*, or) Understanding he smiteth through the proud; By his *Spirit* he garnisheth the *Heavens*, his *Hand* hath formed the crooked *Serpent*.

Where

Where we have the *Power* of God, the *Wisdom* of God, and the *Spirit* of God. And Job 33. 4. *The Spirit of God hath made me, and the Breath of the Lord hath given me Life.* So, Psal. 104. 24, 30. O LORD (Jehovah) how wonderful are thy Works, in *Wisdom* thou hast made them all. Thou sendest forth thy *Spirit*, they are created, and thou renewest the face of the Earth.

And it is not amiss here to take notice, that as λόγος signifies as well *ratio* as *oratio*; so Christ (ὁ λόγος) is called the *Word* of God, and the *Wisdom* of God. And as in Joh. 1. 1, 3, 10. it is said of the *Word*, that in the beginning was the *Word*, all things were made by Him, and the *World* was made by him: And Heb. 1. 3. The *Worlds* were framed by the *Word* of God. So the same is said of *Wisdom*, Prov. 3. 19. The LORD by *Wisdom* hath formed the Earth, by *Understanding* hath he established the Heavens. And Prov. 8. 22. &c. The LORD possessed me (*Wisdom*) in the beginning of his way, before his works of old; I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, ere ever the Earth was;----When he prepared the Heavens I was there,---- When he established the Clouds above,---- When he strengthened the Fountains of the deep,--- When he appointed the Foundations of the Earth, then was I by him, &c.

And accordingly the *Holy Ghost* is called the *Power* of God, Luk. 1. 35. The *Holy Ghost* shall come upon thee, and the *Power* of the Highest shall over-shadow thee. And 1 Pet. 1. 5. Who are kept by the *Power* of God, through Faith unto Salvation; which doubtless is not without the operation of the *Holy Ghost*, working and preserving faith in us.

Suitably hereunto, God's *Power* and *Wisdom* are oft conjoined. He is *Wise in Heart*, and *Mighty in Strength*, Job 9. 4, &c. He is excellent in *Power*, and in *Judgment*, Job 37. 13.

But, (without laying too great a stress on every particular,) there seems a foundation clear enough to consider the *Word* of God, and the *Spirit* of God, as clearly distin-

distinguishable, even in the great Work of Creation ; and that the holy Writers, even in the Old Testament, have considered them as distinct ; and that even the Jewish Writers have owned them as such.

I know very well that those who have a mind to be cap-
tious, may cavil at these places, as the *Sadduces* of old did at those passages in the Old Testament tending to prove a *Resurrection*.

And not those only, but even some of our own ; who would have us think, that the Fathers before Christ had only *Promises* of *Temporal* blessings (not of *Heavenly* and *Eternal* :) Though *St. Paul* tells us, (when, of the hope and resurrection of the dead he was called in question ;) that he did so worship the God of his Fathers, believing all things which were written in the Law and the Prophets, and had hope towards God (which they also allowed) that there should be a *Resurrection* of the dead both of the *Just* and *Unjust* ; and that it was a promise made of God to their Fathers, to which their twelve Tribes instantly serving God day and night, hoped to come ; which were no other things than what *Moses* and the Prophets had said should come to pass ; and which to *King Agrippa* (who if not a Jew, was at least well acquainted with their Doctrines) should not seem strange, *Act. 23. 6. Act. 24. 14, 15. Act. 26. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 22. And Heb. 11. 13.* that all these died in faith, not having received the promises ; (that is, they died in the belief of better things than what they had yet received :) But saw them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed, they were but strangers and Pilgrims upon Earth. And our Saviour proves it out of the Old Testament, (*Mat. 22. 32.*) by such an Argument, as if one of us should have urged, it would perhaps have been ridiculed : *I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob ; Now God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.* And the Apostle pursues the same Argument, *Heb. 11. 9, 10, 14, 15, 16.*

A Third Sermon

They sojourned in the Land of promise, as in a strange Land, dwelling in Tabernacles (movable from place to place) for they looked for a City which hath foundations (a fixed City, not flitting as were those Tabernacles,) whose builder and maker is God: Declaring plainly that they did seek a Country: Not such as that from whence they came; but a better Country, that is, a Heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for he hath prepared for them a City; where he directly argues, that God's Promise, to be their God, was a Promise of Heaven.

And no doubt but the Prophets, and Men of God, had taught them all along, to put a *Spiritual Sense*, upon those (seemingly) *Temporal Promises*, (though the Sadduces would not believe it, but cavilled at it;) in so much that not only the *Pharisees* and *Doctors of the Law*; but even the *Women* embraced it (even before Christ's Resurrection;) *I know saith Martha (of her dead Brother Lazarus) that he shall Rise again in the Resurrection, at the last day, Joh. 11. 24.* And, of such *Spiritual Senses*, we have copious Instances, in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and elsewhere frequently.

And as they did without any reluctances, readily embrace the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*, when more clearly declared by the Apostles, (as a thing not wholly new to them;) so neither do we find in them any Reluctance to that of the *Trinity* (for which, in likelihood, they had in like manner been before prepared:) but readily closed with the Form of Baptism, *in the Name (not Names) of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Mat. 28. 19.* And that Solemn Benediction, *2 Cor. 13. 14. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all, Amen.* Where we have all the Three Persons reckoned together; as they are also in that celebrated place, *1 Joh. 5. 7. The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; these Three are One.* And as they had been before

before by Christ himself, *Joh. 14. 26. The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name, He shall teach you all things. And Joh. 15. 26. The Comforter whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which Proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me. And (to name no more places) Mat. 3. 16, 17. Jesus, when he was baptized, went strait-way out of the Water: And lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he (John the Baptist) saw the Spirit of God descending like a Dove, and lighting upon Him: And lo, a voice from heaven saying, This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*

4. There is yet another Consideration which doth confirm this opinion, that the Doctrine of the Trinity was not unknown to the Jewish Church before Christ: From the footsteps thereof yet extant in Heathen Writers.

'Tis well known (to those conversant in such Studies) that much of the Heathen Learning (their Philosophy, Theology, and Mythology) was borrowed from the Jews; though much Disguised, and sometimes Ridiculed by them. Which things though they be Fabulous, as disguised in a Romantick dress: yet they are good Evidence that there was a Truth in History, which gave occasion to those Fables.

None doubts but *Ovid's* Fable of the *Chaos* (of which all things were made) took its rise from *Moses's* History of the Creation: And *Deucalion's Flood*, from that of *Noah*: and the *Titan's* fighting against the Gods, from the Builders of *Babel's Tower*: And that of Two-faced *Janus*, from *Noah's* looking backward & forward to the World before and since the Flood. And many the like, of which we may see in *Natalis Comes*, in *Bochartus*, and others: And of which we have a large Collection in *Theophilus Gale's Court of the Gentiles*. And in *Dr. Dupont's Gnomologia Homerica*; wherein is a Collection of *Homer's Sayings*,

A Third Sermon

which look like Allusions to like Passages in Sacred Scripture ; and seem to be borrowed (most of them) from those Books of it, which were written before *Homer's* time ; who yet is one of the most Ancient and most Famous of Heathen Writers.

Plato hath borrowed so much of his Philosophy, History, and Theology, from the *Jewish* learning, as that he hath obtained the Title of (*Μωϋσῆς Ἀττικίζων*) *Moses disguised in a Greek dress*. And, may seem, because the name of *Jews* was odious, to cite them rather by the names of certain *Barbarians*, *Syrians*, *Phœnicians*, *Egyptians*, &c. From that Title of God in *Exodus*, I AM, ὁ ὢν, (or from the Equivalent names of *Jah* and *Jehovah*) he borrows his (τὸ ὄν, αὐτὸ ὄν, ὅτις ὄν,) *the Being*, (or *that which is*,) *the very Being*, *the true Being* ; which are the Titles he gives to the Supreme God. For his *Immortality of the Soul*, he reckons the best Argument to be (*θεῶν λόγος*) *a Divine Revelation*, which he had by *Tradition* from certain *Ancients*, who lived (as he speaks) *nearer to the Gods*, (as if he had borrowed even this Phrase from *Deut. 4. 7. What nation is so great, who hath God so Nigh unto them?*) And much more, as hath been noted by others.

And I am so far from thinking (as the *Socinians* would have us) that *St. John* did but *Platonize*, and borrowed his ὁ λόγος from *Plato's Trinity* ; that I rather think, that *Plato* borrowed his *Trinity* (as he did many other things) from the *Jewish Doctrine*, though by him disguised : And take it for a good Evidence, that the *Doctrine of the Trinity*, was then not unknown to them.

Aristotle, in the last Chapter of his Book, *De Mundo* ; which is *de Dei Nominibus* : He tells us that *God*, though he be but *One*, hath many Names : And amongst those many, he reckons that of the *Tres Parcæ* (*τρεῖς αἱ Μοῖραι*) or as we call them, *the Three Destinies* (*Atropas, Clotho, and Lachesis* ; (whom he doth accommodate to the three diver-

sities

verities of *Time*; *past, present, and future,*) to be *One* of these Names. Which, though numbered as *Three*, are but this *One God*. Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἐστὶν ἐν ἑνὶ πλὴν ὁ Θεός. (And cites *Plato* to the same purpose) καὶ ὁ γυναιὸς Πλάτων φησὶν. So that it seems both *Plato* and *Aristotle* were of opinion, that *Three Somewhats* may be *One God*. And this, in likelihood, they derived from the Jewish Learning.

I might say the like of their *three Judges* in another World, *Minos, Radamanthus* and *Æacus*. which thing though it be Fabulous, yet it implies thus much, That they had *then* a Notion, not only of the *Soul's Immortality*, but also of a *Trinity* of *Persons* in another World, who should take Account of mens Actions in this World. And both these Notions they had, no doubt, from the Jewish Learning; from whence their most sublime Notions were derived.

To these I might add that of their three-shap'd *Chimæra*; which their Poets feign to have been. Περσίδι λέων, ὀπίσσει δὲ δράκων, μέσση δὲ χαίρεα, as is to be seen in *Homer* one of their most Ancient Poets. And that of *Cerberus*, their three-headed Porter of the other World.

Which Poetical Fictions, though invented perhaps to *ridicule* the Trinity; do yet at last argue that they had *then* some notices of a Trinity, (of *Three Somewhats* which were yet but *One*.) For, if they had no notice of it, they could not have ridiculed it.

Our Adversaries, perhaps, may please themselves with the *Fan- sy*, that *Chimæra* and *Cerberus* are brought in to prove the Trinity.

But they mistake the point: We are not now *Proving* the Trinity, (which is already settled on a firmer Foundation;) but inquiring, whether *this* Doctrine were *then* known. And as we think it a good argument to prove the *Christian Religion*, to have been known in *Lucian's* time, (and known to *him*,) because *Lucian* doth *Scoff* at it; which he could not have done, if he had known nothing of it: So is it a good Argument to prove the Doctrine of the Trinity to have been *then* known, when it was ridiculed.

And it proves also, that there might be *then* prophane Wits to ridicule it, as there are *now* to *Blaspheme the Trinity*, as a *three-headed*

headed Monster; and, that this little Wit of theirs, is not their own, but stolen from wittier Heathens.

But, whether it were, or were not, known to the Jewish Church before Christ, (of which there be great Presumptions that it, was so known, as well as that of the *Resurrection*;) it is enough to us, that we are taught it *now*. And, if any will yet be so obstinate as not to believe, either the *Resurrection*, or the *Trinity*; upon pretence that neither of them was known to the *Jewish Church*, (or at least, not so clearly, but that they may be able to cavil at places from the Old Testament alledged to prove either;) we must leave them to the Wisdom and Judgment of God, till he shall think fit to instruct them better.

Now to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; Three Persons, but One Eternal and Ever blessed God; be Praise, Honour and Glory, Now and for Evermore, Amen.

FINIS.

Advertisement.

BY reason of the Authors absence from the Press at so great a distance, some mistakes have happened, both in the Letters and Sermons; and some things omitted, which should have been inserted in their proper places, but that they came so late to the Printers hands, that it could not well be done without discomposing his Affairs. Of both which it is thought fit thus to direct.

E R R A T A.

Let. I. p. 12. l. 6. for Divisions read Dimensions. p. 13. l. 6. dele Threc. p. 18. l. 7. for Meaning read Memory.

Let. II. p. 7. l. 21. for that read shall.

Let. III. p. 30. l. 11. as a separate Existence. p. 32 l. 7. as to be. p. 37. l. ult. for Those read These. p. 41. l. 18. known. p. 57. l. 7. for sure read save.

Let. IV. p. 7. l. 20. for toil read talk. p. 11. l. 2. as well as.

Let. V. p. 6. l. 22. dele of. p. 7. l. 19. for any read my. p. 11. l. 10. read 1 Joh. 5. 20. p. 12. l. 18. for Israel read Jacob. p. 18. l. 13. doth not well. p. 21. l. 14. said so much.

Let. VI. p. 4. l. 1. for Nor read Now. p. 9. l. 28. for then read there. p. 10. l. 28. for London read Leyden. p. 11. l. 19. at least. p. 13. l. 30. for This read Thus. p. 14. l. 33. for as read in. l. 34. thee only, the. p. 17. l. 6. for Railing read Ranting. p. 18. l. 2. was not then. l. 13. beside that in.

Let. VII. p. 6. l. 28. Possibility. p. 7. l. 27. for fourth read fault. p. 10. l. pen. All-comprehensive. p. 12. l. 20. Father. p. 13. l. 5. after Notions, add further than they are revealed. l. pen. Words. p. 14. l. 13. Hands. p. 17. l. 13. to Answer. l. 23. for one read me.

Serm. p. 15. l. 14. exegerical. p. 19 l. 7. God. p. 22. l. 19. for for read or. l. 21. for er read fer. P. 61. l. 9. read Author. P. 73. l. 3. read were framed.

A D D I T I O N S.

L E T. I. p. 2. l. 1. *after* united, *add* or intimately One. p. 12. l. 21. *after* Cube, *add*, (there being no limits in nature, greater than which a Cube cannot be).

Let. III. p. 16. l. 18. *Add this Marginal Note*, The Saxon word *Hel* or *Helle*, (whence comes the English word *Hell*,) doth not properly or necessarily import *the place of the Damned*; But may be indifferently taken for *Hell*, *hole*, or *hollow place*: Which are all words of the same original. *Helan* (to hide, or cover,) *Hole* (cavitas,) *Hol* (cavus) hollow. And when it is used in a restrained sense; it is Metonymical, or Synecdochical; as when *Hole* or *Pit*, is put for the *Grave*, and the like. p. 19. l. 2. *Add*, So that I take the plain sense of the words to be this: *He was* (for some time) *in that Hell*, or *Hades* (what ever by that word be meant); *wherein* (it is expressly said) *he was not left*; but was *Raised from it*. p. 44. l. 16. *Add*, Beside this Letter of thanks from his Partner in the Disputation; there was another from *Sandius* himself, (not Printed, but in Manuscript,) acknowledging a like conviction. Of which *Wittichius* recites an Extract; in his *Causa Spiritus Sancti Vindex demonstrata*, à *Christophoro Wittichio*: *Lugduni Batavorum, apud Cornelium Boutestein*, 1682.

Let. IV. p. 36. l. 26. *after* *Athanasius*, *Add*, ('Tis the same thing with me, whether it were written by Him or some Other, as long as I find it agreeable to Scripture. *At the end of the same line*, *Add* (Wherein yet I would not be thought to encourage dangerous Errors: For the Errors are equally Dangerous, and equally Fundamental; whether I do, or do not Anathematize them.) p. 38. *at the End*; *Add* Jan. 13. 169ⁱ. Yours, *John Wallis*.

Let. VI. p. 9. l. 25. *Add this Marginal Note*. *Socinus's* Words are these: *Velim autem scias, me duplici de causa (præter eam quam ipse commemoras) ab ista questione, De Animæ Immortalitate, abstinuisse. Nam & mihi res erat cum homine qui me calumniandi, inq; omnium invidiam vocandi, omnem occasionem quærebat. Necdum mihi, quid de questione ista statuendum sit, plane exploratum erat; quemadmodum nec hodie quidem est. Tantum id mihi videtur statui posse; Post hanc vitam, animam seu animum hominis non ita per se subsistere ut præmia ulla pœnasve sentiat, vel etiam ista sentiendi sit capax. Quæ mea Firma Opinio facile potest ex Disputatione ista colligi: Cum ex multis quæ identidem à me ibi dicuntur; Tum ex ea ipsa, de qua præcipuè agitur, sententia mea. Nam quamvis, cum ipso Puccio disputans, (qui, ut immortalitatem primi hominis ante peccatum probaret, animi ipsius Immortalitatem mihi obijciebat,) ostendi, non propterea dici posse hominem immortalem quia anima ipsius non moriatur: Tamen satis apparet me sentire, non ita vivere, post*
hominis.

Additions.

hominis ipsius mortem, animam ejus, ut per se premiorum poenarumve capax existat: Cum in ipso primo homine, totius Immortalitatis rationem uni gratia Divina tribuo; nec in ipsa Creatione quidquam Immortalis Vite agnosco. Socini Epist. 5. ad Volkeliu; die 16. Novembris, Anno, 1596.

Let. VI. p. 12. l. 3. *Add this Marginal Note: Sandius's Words are these, (cited by Wittichius in his Causa Spiritus Sancti Vindex, pag. 4.) Jam finitis illis quæ ad Librum tuum regerenda duxi (præter ea quæ satis à Socio meo responsum puto,) Oro te ne graveris ulterius hoc argumentum prosequi; quò tandem Veritas, si fieri possit, pateat; & velut scintilla ex silice ad Chalybem alliso profiliat. Nam ingenuè fateor, mihi conjecturam meam longe verisimiliorem visam, antequam Librum tuum, quo me docere aggressus es, legissem. Non parùm & contulit ad eam debilitandam, consideratio mea, Joh. 1. 32, 33. & Mat. 4. 11. Nam postquam in Baptismo Spiritus Sanctus super Christum descendit, & super eum mansit, eumque in desertum duxit, nec ab eo recessit; (cum non verisimile sit Christum temptationem Satanæ sine Spiritus Sancti auxilio superasse;) finita demum tentatione dicuntur Angeli accessisse & ministrasse ei. Quod si itaque conjectura mea consistere non possit, ut vix possit, perpendendum erit, an non Spiritus Sanctus possint esse septem Spiritus Principales; vel, multitudo Spirituum longè subtiliorum cæteris Angelorum ordinibus, fortean naturâ ipsâ: Et an per hanc hypothesein salvari possint omnes difficultates contra conjecturam meam hæcenus productæ. Novi quendam qui sentit, Spiritum Sanctum quidem esse unam Personam, eamque creatam, sed totum Universum Essentia sua pervadentem. Valdè autem dubito an hæc sententia subsistere queat. Illa de una Persona Spiritus Sancti comprehensis sub eo Angelis tanquam ejus ministris & satellitibus; mihi non admodum arridet. Si autem horum nihil verum comperiat; tum demum mihi verisimillimum videbitur, Spiritum Sanctum cum Deo Patre ejusque Verbo, unum Deum, unam Substantiam, unum Individuum esse.*



