



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### **Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### **About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>















THE  
WORKS  
OF  
THE REV. ISAAC WATTS, D.D.  
IN  
*NINE VOLUMES.*

---

VOL. VI.

---

CONTAINING  
*AN ESSAY ON CHARITY SCHOOLS,*  
THE ART OF READING AND WRITING ENGLISH,  
AND  
THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

---

LEEDS:

PRINTED BY EDWARD BAINES;

FOR WILLIAM BAYNES, PATERNOSTER-ROW; THOMAS WILLIAMS AND SON,  
STATIONERS' - COURT; THOMAS HAMILTON, PATERNOSTER - ROW; AND  
JOSIAH CONDER, BUCKLESBURY, LONDON.

1813.

17 000000 00 00000000

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

---

*AN ESSAY*  
TOWARDS THE ENCOURAGEMENT  
OF  
CHARITY SCHOOLS,  
PARTICULARLY AMONG  
• *PROTESTANT DISSENTERS.*

---





## CONTENTS OF VOLUME VI.

---

	PAGE.
<b>AN ESSAY TOWARDS THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF</b>	
<b>CHARITY SCHOOLS, ... ..</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>THE ART OF READING AND WRITING ENGLISH, ... ..</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY, ... ..</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>The Arian invited to the Orthodox Faith ... ..</b>	<b>207</b>
<b>Questions concerning Jesus the Son of God, ... ..</b>	<b>391</b>
<b>On the Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, ... ..</b>	<b>474</b>
<b>The Glory of Christ as God-man ... ..</b>	<b>484</b>
<b>Appendix (thereto) ... ..</b>	<b>649</b>







## PREFACE

To "AN ESSAY TOWARDS THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF CHARITY SCHOOLS, PARTICULARLY AMONG PROTESTANT DISSENTERS."

*To the generous Supporters of the Schools of Charity among the Protestant Dissenters, and particularly to the Managers of those Schools.*

GENTLEMEN,

**M**Y heart is with you in your pious and compassionate designs : Go on and prosper in your charitable cares and labours for the education of poor and unhappy children : Poor and unhappy children indeed, who have either lost their parents by death, or whose parents are not able to give them, or provide for them any tolerable instruction in the things of God or man. It is from occasional converse with some of you, that I have been better enabled to compose several parts of this defence of the schools of charity. It is also by some of your number that I have been informed what mistakes may be committed in the conduct of these affairs, and what methods may be most successful to attain your most desirable ends, that is, to keep the poor from being a nuisance, to render them some way useful to the world, and to put their feet into the paths that lead to their own happiness here and hereafter. Give me leave therefore to set before you in one view, several of those things which seem necessary to support this cause of liberality, and which I have learned in some measure from yourselves.

I. Let your great aims and designs in all your zeal and diligence in this matter, be very sincere for the public good. Set your intentions right for the glory of God, for the increase of true religion in the world, for the benefit of poor destitute children in soul and body, for the training them up to become blessings to the nation, for the support and honour of the present government, and for the security and defence of the protestant succession.

II. See to it that in every step you take, you keep as many of these things as possible constantly in your eye, whether you seek masters or mistresses for the instruction of children, whether you prescribe orders and rules for their behaviour, whether you appoint seasons for their examination, or whether you enquire after families in which they may be placed, when they go out of your schools ; and let no private ends or designs bias your thoughts and conduct in any of these affairs : Let it appear with bright evidence to the world, that the honour of God, and the good of the public, are your only motives in this work.

III. Take good care of the character of the masters and mistresses, whom you chuse for the instruction of the children. See that they be sufficiently skilled in the things which they pretend to teach : Admit none but those who are sober and religious in their personal behaviour, diligent and careful in all the parts of their proper duty, tender and compassionate to the children of the poor, *prudent to deal with them according to their temper,*

age and capacity, solicitous for the welfare and improvement of their scholars, and faithful to the trust which you repose in them. Let them not be persons of a hasty spirit, nor of an angry and rash temper: There have been some masters, I will not say in your schools, so brutal and uncompassionate, that because the children are poor, they are used with excess of rigour and severity in the treatment of them: Nor should the teachers be so familiar and easy, as to let their scholars trifle with them, or neglect their duty, or be guilty of criminal practices without due reproof or correction. They should not be persons of sloth or indolence, that have no concern whether the children improve or no, so they do but receive their salary. Nor should they be persons that are guilty of any degrees of intemperance, or violence, nor ill language, nor unbecoming speech or carriage, but such as may give an example of piety and virtue, charity and goodness, at the same time as they teach the rules of it.

As I would presume that no persons of any of these culpable characters, are entrusted with the education of children among you, so I am persuaded I need give no caution against the admission of persons into this trust, who are disaffected to the present government: For the very name and profession of a protestant dissenter, is utterly inconsistent with all the principles of those who have their eye to a popish pretender. These things are not only to be considered at first, when you admit masters or mistresses into your schools, but you must carefully enquire whether they continue this prudent and pious behaviour, and act agreeably to their station and business, and are conformable to your appointment and direction. Remember that if teachers and governors behave ill, there is huge injury done to children thereby. It is a waste of their time of life which is proper for learning, it is a deceiving of their parents, and a great disappointment to them, it is a cheat upon yourselves, and a loss both of your money and your care.

IV. Be not contented merely to have them read the bible, and be taught the catechism at proper seasons, but let the truths and duties of it be explained to them in a familiar and easy way, by taking the answers to pieces, and instructing the children till they understand the sense of them. It would also be a very useful thing for the children to have a particular collection of scriptures which might impress upon their tender minds, not only the duties of piety towards God, but also the duties of sobriety and temperance, of justice and truth, of humility and submission to superiors, of diligence and industry in their business, of kindness and love to all men, and especially to persons of piety and virtue, whatsoever sects or parties of christians they belong to. I am informed such a manual is partly composed, and will be published in a little time.

They should be put in mind frequently, of the excellency of the christian religion in distinction from that of Turks and Jews, and heathens; and of the excellency of the protestant religion, in opposition to the papists, with all their idolatry and superstition, their cruel and wicked principles, their mischievous and bloody practices. They should be informed also, on every occasion, of the great and invaluable privileges of being born in Great-Britain, and of living under so excellent a government as ours is, wherein there is liberty of conscience to serve God according to our own understandings, and wherein people are not punished and persecuted merely for their principles of religion. And on this account they should be taught to honour our most excellent King George, our most gracious Queen Caroline, and all the royal family, and be

ready to defend the protestant succession in this illustrious house, with their tongues, and their hands, and with all their powers. It may be useful also to put other little books into their hands, to assist the devotion of their younger years, and to encourage and confirm them in the principles and practices of all moral and divine virtues. Some of these may be written in verse as well as in prose, which will allure children to read them and assist their memories in getting them by heart: They should all have lessons appointed in their books, and they should be required to repeat them to their teachers, at stated hours or seasons, once or twice in a week

V. As the children are not constantly under their master's eye and care, but spend much of their time with their parents, so there should be some care taken to charge their parents to make them read at home, at least once or twice a day, and to keep them by due discipline to a regular behaviour, that they may not be guilty of profaneness or immorality, obstinacy, disobedience to superiors or any wickedness at home or abroad.

VI. Let not the Lord's-day be spent by them at random, nor let them wander after their own wills where they please: But let them be obliged to attend at some place of public worship, either with their masters or mistresses, that they may be under the eye and observation; or with their parents, who should be charged and engaged to take particular care of their religious observation of the Lord's-day. And wheresoever children go to worship on the Lord's-day, whether it be with their parents or with their teachers, let it be a constant part of the business on the Monday mornings, for their teachers to enquire what they remember of the sermons they have heard, at least, so far as to make them repeat the text by heart, on which the minister preached.

VII. Let there be certain seasons of examination appointed, two or three times a year, not only to enquire into the state of the school in general, or fill up vacancies as the children are dismissed, but to make a particular enquiry how the children improve in their learning; and if there be any defect, to find out whether it be the fault of the scholars, or of the teachers: If the child's incapacity or low natural parts be the occasion of it, let him be excited and encouraged to double diligence: If the child has been negligent, reproofs and threatenings should be added: But if it be found that the non-improvement of children be owing to the neglect, or the mismanagement of the teachers, let there be due cognizance taken of it in a proper way, and new teachers be chosen, if two or three admonitions obtain no success.

VIII. It would be a great and unspeakable advantage to these schools of charity, if you could contrive some methods whereby all the children of the poor, might be employed in some useful labours one part of the day; that those who are to earn their bread by the labour of their hands, might be engaged in work for this purpose even from the younger years of life. This would fix them betimes in such a manner of life, as the providence of God has suited to their circumstances in the world. This would have a manifest tendency to secure them from pride and sloth, and would be the most effectual answer to a very common and powerful objection, in the lips of many persons against charity schools.

IX. For this reason I would propose, that if the parents can and will employ their children one part of the day in useful labours toward their subsistence, this should rather be encouraged than forbidden; always provided that there be such due care taken daily by the parents, that it may be no



PREFACE.\*

excuse for idle children to absent themselves from the school and play truant, to the disappointment both of their parents, their teachers, and their benefactors.

X. When children have continued a proper time under the instructions of the school, and you find they have so much knowledge, as may lay some foundation for religion and virtue, and as may render them useful in some of the lower stations of life, endeavour then that they may be placed out, and fixed either in country-labours, in domestic services, in some inferior post in a shop, or in mechanic trades, that so they may not run loose and wild in the world, and forget all that you have taught them, and lie exposed to temptation and misery. If this cannot be done immediately, take some care that their parents or friends employ them in proper business at home, and keep them to reading, and writing, to knitting, sewing, or domestic work, that all your labours, and expences may not be lost.

XI. Whenev'er these children are to be placed out in families, see to it that these families have a due character for sobriety and diligence: Engage their masters or mistresses to take some care that these servants read their bible daily, and that they make use of any other part of their learning, as their post of service or employment will admit, that if possible, the benefits which you have bestowed on them may be lasting.

XII. For this purpose, enquire now and then into their behaviour in those places where you have fixed them: And if it appear they have behaved well, give them some token of your favour; ten or twenty or thirty shillings the first year or two, after they are gone from the school. This will greatly encourage them to pursue the practise of piety and virtue. I know some of you do more than this. I wish it were the universal custom of all the schools.

In the last place, as I hope you pray for divine success in every good work in which you are engaged, so let your prayers accompany this your labour of love, for the temporal and eternal welfare of the poor children, who taste of your bounty. May the God of light and grace succeed all your designs to train up those young destitute creatures to be a blessing to the world, and that your schools may be nurseries for the church of Christ: And may your liberality and your pious cares meet with a rich reward from heaven, in the abundant blessings of this life, and that which is to come. Amen.

AN  
ESSAY TOWARDS THE ENCOURAGEMENT  
OF  
CHARITY SCHOOLS,  
*Particularly among Protestant Dissenters.*

---

**T**HE good education of children is an important duty of parents, and a very valuable blessing to the rising age ; yet there are great multitudes of parents, in the lower ranks of life, who are so ignorant, that they are incapable of instructing their own children well in the knowledge of things, that belong to this world or another : Or, if they have knowledge, yet some are so exceeding poor, that they can hardly withhold time enough from earning their bread, to spend in the careful education of their sons and their daughters : And among these poorer parts of mankind, there are others, who are too careless in this important concern, though the welfare of their children, here and hereafter, seems to depend upon it : And there are great numbers also who die in poverty, and leave their young offspring behind them untaught, and grievously exposed.

What must be done in this case ? must all those children, who are so unhappy as to be born of poor or ignorant parents, grow up like the brutes of the earth, without education ? Must they be abandoned to the wilderness of their own nature, and be let run loose and savage in the streets ? Shall no care be taken to inform their minds, to curb their sinful passions, and to make them speak and act like reasonable creatures, and live useful to the world ? When we see or hear of such unhappy objects as these, methinks our compassion and charity for these young creatures of our own species, should work powerfully within us, to reach out the hand of bounty, to train them up to some degrees of knowledge, and to the practice of virtue, and put them in a way to support themselves by honest labour : Or, at least our zeal for the honour of God, for the good of our country, and for the welfare of the succeeding age, should inspire us with some sentiments of liberality, in order to redress this grievance, and prevent the growing mischief.

Those that are blessed with a good competence of the things of this life, and have no children of their own, seem to be invited by Providence to take these opportunities of doing good to the miserable and distressed orphans, who have lost their parents, and the children of the poor and needy, who cannot maintain and instruct their own offspring. Those also who feel the tender sen-

AN ESSAY ON CHARITY-SCHOOLS.

sations of parental love to their sons and their daughters, and, with zeal and delight, train them up in useful knowledge, should sympathize a little with those poor unhappy parents, who would fain have their children trained up in piety and virtue, in diligence, and duty to God and man; but their mere poverty withholds them from giving their children the benefit of a school. Thus different persons should be led by various motives to promote so pious and charitable a work.

These were the springs, which at first moved the hearts of some pious and generous persons to erect schools of charity for this purpose, and particularly in the city of London. There was one set up in Gravel Lane, in Southwark, by the protestant dissenters, a little before the revolution, and our deliverance by King William of glorious memory. Many others were formed by persons of the established church, to which several dissenters subscribed largely. But at last they found by sufficient experience, that the children were brought up in too many of these schools, in principles of disaffection to the present government, in a bigotted zeal for the word church, and with a violent enmity, and malicious spirit of persecution, against all whom they were taught to call presbyterians, though from many of their hands, they received their bread and clothing.

It was time then, for the dissenters to withdraw that charity which was so abused: And since the favour of our rulers gives us leave to educate children according to our sentiments, and the dictates of our consciences, some generous spirits among us, have made attempts of this kind, and employ their bounty in the support of a few such schools. And as we hope this charity will be acceptable to God, and useful to mankind, so we are well assured, it will be a sensible service to the present government, which has no friends in the world more sincere, and more zealous than the protestant dissenters. Several excellent sermons have been preached among us, wherein persons have been warmly excited to contribute their helping-hand, to this charitable and beneficial design. That which was published in the year 1723, by my worthy friend and brother, Mr. Daniel Neal, gives the most large and particular narrative of the management of these schools, and their methods of education, with an account of the advantages arising to the public thereby: And to this useful discourse, I refer my readers who would be particularly informed in this matter. When I was desired to preach on the like occasion last November, after a short account of the benefit of good education, I undertook to vindicate these schools from many common and popular objections which are raised against them: And I have here published this vindication a little enlarged, and descended into some more particular circumstances, at the earnest request of several gentlemen, who are concerned in the support.

and management of one of them, viz. that which is kept in Crutched-Friars near Aldgate.\*

I designed, indeed, to have prefaced this discourse with a short Treatise on Education; but that work growing larger daily under my hands, and being much importuned to let this appear sooner in the world, I have at last consented to it. Before I apply myself directly to answer the objections, I ask leave to lay down several propositions by way of concession: And when those who raise complaints against our schools of charity, have seen how much I grant to them, this may perhaps have some good influence, to mollify their spirits, and abate their opposition to these schools, and may prepare them to give a more favourable attention to the answers which shall follow:

**Proposition I.** The great God has wisely ordained in the course of his providence in all ages, that among mankind there should be some rich, and some poor: And the same providence hath allotted to the poor the meaner services, and hath given to the rich the superior and more honourable businesses of life: Nor is it possible, according to the present course of nature and human affairs, to alter this constitution of things, nor is it our design to attempt any thing so unreasonable.

II. As the children of the rich in general, ought to enjoy such an education, as may fit them for the better businesses of life, so the children of the poor, especially such as need the charity of their neighbours, should not be generally educated in such a manner, as may raise them above the services of a lower station.

III. Yet surely there may be some exception made for the children of those poor parents, who have enjoyed plentiful circumstances in life, and have behaved well in them, and performed the duties of justice and charity; but by the wise providence of God have been reduced to great degrees of poverty, and are hardly able to provide food and clothing for their own offspring, and much less to bestow a good education upon them. Some of these children are yet sunk deeper into distress, and are become orphans. Such misery has somewhat of a sacred tenderness belonging to it, and seems to claim the regards of sympathy and compassion from those who now enjoy plentiful circumstances, while they meditate on the uncertainty of human affairs, and remember that they are liable to the like calamity.

\* Since that time, the Reverend Mr. Samuel Chandler has published his sermon, which was preached January 1, 1728, wherein he defends these schools of charity against the cavils which have been raised, and the censures cast upon them, by the author of the "Fable of the Bees." Upon the perusal of it, I find very solid and effectual answers given to the objections of that author. His discourse has touched upon several points which I had omitted, and has given considerable assistance toward the support of this cause of charity and beneficence.

And it is my opinion, that amongst all the poor, these children ought to have the chief advantage of the schools of charity.

IV. It seems also not unreasonable, that some distinction may be made between the children of the poor in great towns or cities, and those who are born and bred in far distant villages. The poor who are born and bred in towns and cities, see and know more of the advantages of mankind, and the brighter side of the world; and come into more acquaintance with the better parts and offices of life, and by this means are, as it were, naturally something nearer to them, and are sometimes occasionally called to assist in them: Whereas those who are born and bred afar off in country-villages, see and know little or nothing of this, and therefore, as they have less aptitude for these things, and have less need of them, so they have no tendency or reach of soul after them; for providence seldom throws these objects or opportunities in their way.

V. If therefore the poor who are bred in towns and cities, should enjoy some small advantages in their education, beyond those who are born in far distant fields and villages, if they should be taught to add and subtract a few figures, as well as to write a plain hand, it is but agreeable to, and correspondent with that providence which has determined the place of their birth, and "fixed the bounds of their habitation;" Acts xvii. 26. But for the poorest of mankind in distant parts of the country, perhaps the art of reading, may be sufficient to answer most of their necessities: And if they are taught to read well, I will not urge the charity of my friends to bestow any higher degrees of learning upon them, on supposition that they are to be engaged in the business of husbandry and day-labour.

VI. And if it were possible, I would have every charity-school so constituted, that the children of the poor both in city and country, might be employed in some work and labour, generally one half of the day; that it might have partly the nature of a work-house, as well as of a school, for all those who are to live by their hard labour, rather than by their learning. I mention several of these things but very briefly here, because I shall have occasion to resume these subjects in the following parts of my discourse. I proceed now to give some answers to the common objections, against all our charity-schools for the instruction of the poor.

Objection I. There is no need of any learning at all for the meanest ranks of mankind: Their business is to labour, not to think: Their duty is to do what they are commanded, to fill up the most servile posts, and to perform the lowest offices and drudgeries of life, for the conveniency of their superiors, and common nature gives them knowledge enough for this purpose. They are born in the lowest station, and they ought always to

be kept in ignorance, that so knowing nothing but what they are bid, they may do their work without reasoning about it.

Answer 1. Shall I argue a little against this objection, upon the mere principle of compassion and pity? If we consider how many thousands of the poor, both men and women in this nation, are stupidly ignorant of every thing that belongs to religion and morality, and know nothing of the true life of a reasonable creature, who are almost perfect heathens in a christian country, surely it must raise some compassion in our hearts toward them; have we any tenderness about our souls, and yet refuse to do any thing to prevent the young rising generation from being immersed in the same stupid ignorance and gross errors about the things of God and man? Or, can we be content to see multitudes of mankind growing up wild and thoughtless of their best interests, and, perishing by thousands, from one generation to another, for want of light and knowledge?

2. Give me leave yet farther, to talk with such objectors upon the foot of that golden rule, which our Saviour gave to all his disciples; Mat. vii. 12. Is this dealing with others, as you would have others deal with you? Is this advice concerning the poor, such as your yourselves would think reasonable and agreeable to the rules of christian charity and goodness, if you had been born in the midst of extreme poverty and ignorance, and had several wealthy neighbours near you, who could relieve your misery at so easy a rate? Turn the tables a little, and set yourselves for a moment in the place of the poorest creature, and then enquire, whether you would think it a kind and equitable conduct in your wealthy neighbours, who call themselves christians, to bind you for ever down to a state of darkness, and discourage the charity of others, who would give you a lift from the deeps of ignorance? And must every soul of mankind who is born in poverty, be confined to live without knowledge? Suppose one in twenty should give some very promising prospect of an uncommon ingenuity and sense, must he be confined with his fellows to the same darkness and drudgery for ever? Let it be considered, that the God of nature has distributed genius, capacity, and sprightliness of mind with a promiscuous hand among the rich and the poor. The same God is *the Maker of them both*; Prov. xxii. 2. and he has not always made the richest to be the brightest of men. There may be here and there a fine and sparkling genius born in cottages; there may be some bright souls amongst the poorest of mortals: These may, perhaps, by good cultivation, grow up into honourable and useful members in the church or state: We have had surprising instances of this kind in our day. And why should not such sprightly children, if I may so express it, have their chance to rise in the world? And be put into a capacity of exerting their powers for the service of

God and man? Why should the world be deprived of all the benefit that might be drawn from such ingenious minds, under the care of a happy education? Let them at least be taught to know their letters, and have a way made for their brighter talents to discover themselves. Diamonds of a noble lustre are taken from common earth, and every diamond is rough or cloudy, till it is cut and polished. If there should happen to be a vein of silver mixed with the leaden ore, why should it be denied the favour of the refining-pot, since nature seems to have made it on purpose to shine and glitter?

3. A confinement of all the poor to such shameful degrees of profound ignorance, is the ready way to bring in confusion and slavery upon a whole nation. When the common people have no knowledge of any thing, they are the fittest tools for ambition and tyranny, for treason and public mischief. Men of crafty and aspiring minds, know how to make use of persons bred up in such gross ignorance, to carry on their seditious purposes, and raise dangerous tumults in a peaceful state. Or if subtle and imperious men should ever obtain power among us, these poor, thoughtless creatures are soon turned into fatal instruments to enslave a rich and free people. Or finally, if a rude and untaught multitude set up for themselves, and rise into tumult, or rebellion against our present sovereign King George, contrary to all right and justice, it would be found very hard to suppress them: They would never be convinced of their present folly, or of their true interest, because they were never taught to practise reasoning, nor to understand common sense. A silly noisy word or a foolish rhyme lost about through such a brutal multitude, has raised and fired a whole country into sedition and treason: Our British annals are the frequent witnesses of this madness, in those ancient days, when our forefathers could neither read nor write. Let it be remembered, that knowledge is the truest spring of liberty among mankind. Had many of the foreign nations in Europe, Asia, or Africa, ever enjoyed such means of knowledge as Great Britain enjoys, they had never been immersed in such deeps of bondage and slavery. It is knowledge that preserves and secures a sense of true freedom in the minds of men. Sampson was not put to grind in the mill, till he had lost his eyes. And if we are agreed to prevent light from striking into the souls of the multitude, it is possible that, in some few generations, it may come to our turn to grind in the mill too.

4. Such stupid ignorance will fit and prepare the minds of the poor for all the superstitions and iniquities of the popish church. Ignorance is the true and fruitful mother of such devotion. When persons are not taught the better principles of religion they will become ready believers of all the lying tales and miracles of the Romish clergy: they will quickly be induced to

practise all their gay and senseless superstitions, though they are never so contrary to reason and scripture, when they are not capable of saying any thing against them. They will be led blindly by the priests into any absurdities of faith, or any criminal practices which they please to consecrate by the name of religion. Besides, if there be no care of the instruction of the minds of the poor among us, whatsoever forms of worship, or of political service they happen to fall into, it is, as it were, by chance and without knowledge: It is all a mere matter of stupid mechanism: Whether they are in the church, or the street, in a fleet or an army; it is like a croud of bodies without souls. And can such a set of creatures when they are grown up to the age of men, and know nothing, can they be either acceptable to God in their pretences to religion, or can they be useful to Great Britain in its best interests? But this thought leads me to the next particular.

5. If young persons have no manner of education, they will not so much as know the God that made them, nor what is their duty towards their maker. What lamentable profaneness, what irreligion, what horrid blasphemy, what swearing and cursing, and all manner of impiety would abound amongst us, if the poorer part of mankind were never taught to read, nor instructed in the things of God? And indeed the instruction which this sort of objectors would allow them, is so very small, by permitting them to go to church once a week, that they would gain very little knowledge of God and Christ, and our holy religion thereby, if they were deprived of all other advantages of knowledge. I have sometimes conversed with some of those miserable creatures, and I have found them ignorant to a most amazing degree of the first principles of religion and the gospel.

Has Great Britain been blessed of God with many rich conveniences, for the improvement of the mind, by writing or printing books of every useful kind, and shall these blessings be made useless to so great a part of our nation? This would be to practise much as the papists do, who rob the common people of the bible, the book of life, and permit none to enjoy it, but in the Latin tongue. It is a fountain of heavenly grace, but it is a sealed one to the poor, that are educated in popish countries. And is it not a shame in this protestant nation, that the scripture should be a fountain sealed to any of her children? When the bible is translated into our mother tongue, is it not a lamentable thought and almost a scandal, that there should be any amongst us to whom it should be a useless book, because they have never learned to read? And those that are unwilling that their fellow-creatures should attain the knowledge of reading, it is as if they sealed up the book of life. If I am not learned enough to read, it is all one to me, as though the book were for ever shut; Is



xxix. 11. What an envious creature is he who would obstruct the free entrance of the common light of the heavens to mortals who are born in darkness, or would forbid sight to be given to the blind? What a provoking crime is this against the God of nature? And is it not a heinous and provoking sin against the God of grace, that when he has opened the book of life amongst us, there should be any persons, who should forbid us to be taught to read it, because we happen to be poor? Would it not be a most flagrant and complicated instance of ill-nature, pride and scorn, if we should hear a rich man say concerning his poor neighbours, *Because they are born in extreme poverty, let them live and die in darkness?*

6. If we lay the case of religion aside, and those important duties which all men owe to God, yet how ignorant will the poor be of the various duties which they owe to their fellow-creatures, if they have no manner of learning bestowed upon them? How little sense will they have of justice, of truth, of honesty and faithfulness? How little sense will servants have of the honour and obedience that is due to their own masters? How little will they know of that equity and righteous dealing which should be practised between man and man? What happy seeds of equity and truth, of labour, diligence and temperance are sown in the hearts of children by a wise and careful education in their younger years? But how many young creatures have been easily allured to theft and robbery, to lying and deceit, and all manner of iniquity and mischief, for want of a virtuous education? Their honest neighbours have been deprived of their just property by pilfering and plunder, and the criminals themselves have run headlong to the destruction of body and soul. Tell me, you that forbid children the knowledge of letters and would not suffer them to learn the art of reading, tell me, whether you can suppose they can ever become the worse labourers, worse servants, worse ploughmen or soldiers by reading in the word of God what duties they owe to men? Are not all the principles and rules of virtue and goodness, of diligence and sobriety, of obedience to superiors, of justice to their neighbours, of truth, faithfulness and love to all men contained in his holy book? And when the poor young creatures shall find all these things commanded and required by the great God that made them, when they shall read many happy examples of these duties, and the vengeance of God against transgressors, will all this have no influence upon their hearts, to lead them to practise these virtues? Are there not many other little books drawn out of the holy scriptures, wherein these virtues of the civil life are reduced to a shorter form, and set in a plain and easy view for those who have but little time to read? And if children have these manuals put into their hands, is it not the most likely way to train them up

in all the good qualities of the social life, and to guard against those vile and pernicious practices, against that sloth, that falsehood and lying, that thievery and drunkenness, rage and malice, which abound among the ignorant rabble of mankind, who never enjoyed the blessing of education, nor the benefit of a school, where their manners might be formed to virtue and goodness?

7. Let it be considered in the last place, how wretchedly the poor will spend all their leisure time, when they are released at certain seasons from the drudgery of life, if they are never taught to read. How do they stand prepared for every temptation, and for all manner of mischief, when they know not how to improve a few leisure moments? Human nature rude and untaught is the more prone to wickedness. At best we can only suppose them to sit, whole families together, in the long winter evenings, and talk scandal of their neighbours, because their minds were never furnished with better subjects of conversation. They are tempted to fill up their empty hours of life with trifles or follies, or with wicked stories, because they were never taught to know letters. How much happier would it be for the poor, if their seasons of leisure, could be employed in reading the holy scriptures, for their improvement in acquaintance with God, or in conversing with any useful books, that might furnish their minds with solid and profitable knowledge? This would refine their souls, and render them every way more useful in their stations as fathers, mothers, sons, daughters or servants. I have known such a poor family, where neither the grandmother, mother, father, nor any child could read: And I have often pitied them in my heart, to think how impertinently or sinfully their long evening hours must be spent after the work of the day is done: And they have gladly embraced the privilege of having their children taught to read in one of our schools of charity, under a sense of their own great unhappiness for want of this benefit in their younger years.

Objection II. But some will say, if the poor have any manner of learning bestowed upon them, they grow proud and haughty; they think they are immediately fit for better business, and they will not be content to do servile work, and especially the lowest offices, and the most laborious drudgery either of the house or the field: There is great want of ploughmen and labourers in the country, and poor boys will never submit to this, if they once get acquaintance with books and knowledge.

Answer 1. I would ask leave here, if it were lawful to enquire, whether some of these very masters, who make this objection, would not keep the poor in profound ignorance, that they might turn their servants into perfect slaves? But when some of the poorer sort of people have gained a little knowledge, perhaps, it has been found that, here and there, a morose rich

man, or a covetous and surly farmer, cannot make such mere slaves of them, as if they were asses or oxen? Permit me only to propose a query, whether this may not be some ground of the complaint: Are there not some persons, that would subdue their fellow-creatures, of their own species, into a perfect brutal servitude and make them as much their tools and instruments of labour as their cattle are, and treat them as though they had no souls, as though they had no share in human nature, as though they were not formed of the same flesh and blood, and had not the same sort of immortal spirits as themselves. Now if the poor know nothing at all; but are bred up in gross ignorance, and constant stupidity, it is supposed they are fitter to become beasts of burden all their lives, without ever thinking that they are men. If this be the case, I pity the slaves indeed; but woe to their lords and masters, who keep them all their lives in such profound ignorance, upon such wretched and inhuman motives. There is a day coming when the rich and the poor shall appear without distinction before that God, who is no *acceptor of persons*; Acts x. 34.

2. Do some persons complain, that the plough stands still or drags heavily for want of hands? But does the plough stand still no where but where there is a school of charity? Alas, it is not such a slender education, as we can give to a few poor children in the city or the country, that hinders this work. We would not pretend to breed them too high for that station in life, for which their birth has designed them, nor to raise them above the labours in the country-villages, where any of our schools are kept. And these villages also are exceeding few where we have schools. If there are any public schools of charity in such villages, which breed up the children of the poor, to such degrees and refinements in learning, whereby the tillage of the fields is prevented for want of hands, we disclaim all such sort of charity, and leave those who support these schools to defend them against so just an objection.

But if it may not be an offence, I would make a humble enquiry, whether there be not a far more powerful allurements that calls hands from the plough, and that is, that such a great number of persons, who had blessed their paternal seats in the country with their own residence, utterly remove their habitations and households to the city, and fix themselves near the court: May not this be a much greater occasion of draining the fields and villages of a multitude of the poor, who scarce ever return to a country life again: They are tempted and allured to follow their masters, and, as they call it, to *seek their fortunes in the town*: And some of these tempt their poor neighbours hither too: This fills the city with many hundreds, if not thousands, of the lower rank, more than the city itself produces:

Then several of these shift their places of service, or leave them in hopes to find better ; and by this means it comes to pass, that the very servants that are out of place in London, perhaps would sometimes be sufficient to plough up half a country or a diocese.

Far be it from me to blame all these gentlemen, who change the country-seat of their ancestors, for a habitation in the city : Many of them may have a just call of providence for this change. It is not my province nor pretence to direct others in the choice of their dwellings : Yet I cannot but think if this practice should increase and become universal among the more sober and religious part of the gentry, perhaps it may have an unhappy tendency to weaken their good influence on the adjacent country, to diminish the true strength of the nation, and endanger our civil liberties. But I recal myself from this hint. My present business is only to shew, that it is not our charity-schools, but this conduct of many rich men in the country, whether it be right or wrong, that calls off such a multitude of hands from husbandry.

3. Suppose it should be granted for once, which is not always true, that none but the ignorant will be brought to perform the meanest services ; yet after all the education that is provided for children in our charity-schools, there will be stupid and ignorant creatures enough for those lower offices of life : There will be many in every country, who live not within the reach of these schools ; and there will be some whose parts, and study, and improvement in these schools, or in better, will never arrive above a fitness for the meanest services. I confess I am not of the opinion of these gentlemen, that none but blockheads will follow the plough : But if I were of that mind, yet I might venture to say, the plough will never want hands, if it does not stand still till there be no blockheads. I add further, with regard to the charity-schools of this great city ; that those children of the poor who are born in London, are not born in a place to make ploughmen of them, even if they were left in the highest degrees of their native ignorance. They would not leave the city, nor be tempted to go down to country parishes to be employed in the business of the husbandman, though they should never have opportunity to learn their letters.

4. But you say, " They grow haughty and proud, by means of the little knowledge they attain in those schools." I would ask are there not as many as haughty and as proud, who have no learning at all ? I have seen some servants who have been blessed with a happy education, and have attained far greater degrees of knowledge both of the things of God and men, than any of the rest of the family, and yet they have been more humble, more diligent, more ready to put their hands to mean servile

offices than others who have not had a tenth part of their capacity or their improvement. I know at this time two servants in one large family, who were instructed in one of the charity-schools of the protestant dissenters, and yet according to their stations, they are as diligent, as humble, and as willing servants as any in the house. It is chiefly their temper, or their want of due instruction, rather than their learning, that renders servants either haughty or humble.

Here perhaps, the great apostle shall be cited to countenance this objection; 1 Cor. viii. 1. *Knowledge puffeth up.* But why should not the next sentence also be added, viz. that *charity edifieth?* Let the charity of these gentlemen who make this objection, encourage these schools, where the pride of the poor may be abated, where the souls of these young sinners may be edified, in humility and every virtue, where they may be taught their proper duty and behaviour both to God and man.

5. But I add in the last place, that if all the nation were as happy as I could wish, in the enjoyment of some degrees of good education, and if all the children of the poor were taught to read, then the art of reading would be as common as that of speaking, and no one would look on himself as superior to another, because he knows his letters, and could join syllables together. Then it would follow that no person would refuse to do the meanest services, if there were none beneath himself. For my part, I wish that there was not the meanest figure of mankind in Great Britain, whether employed in the drudgeries of a family, or holding the plough, but knew how to read his bible, that he might be better acquainted with his duty in this world, and the way to attain happiness in the next.

Objection III. But is there not a general complaint of bad servants in our day? Are they not high and haughty and wasteful? Do they not claim larger wages, and at the same time refuse to do the servile works that belong to their place? And what can this be imputed to more than to their education in these charity-schools, wherein they are bred up to more learning and knowledge than the poor had in the days of our fathers.

Answer 1. Give me leave in the first place to make a humble enquiry, whether masters or mistresses are in our day so pious, so virtuous, so frugal, so regular in their conduct, and so humble as in the days of our fathers? Whether families are regulated with so much care, and whether family religion is maintained with such a holy constancy? Whether there be such wise government and order, as in the days of those who went *before us?* Whether children are educated in the practice of *that modesty, that humility, that diligence* as in the time of our

masters? And if there be such a sad degeneracy found amongst the higher part of mankind, it is no wonder, if the lower ranks of human nature are corrupt, and grow degenerate too: So that you see this corruption among servants, may be accounted for, without laying all the load on our schools of demerit.

2. Some persons who have made their observations on human affairs, are ready to think that the luxury and finery of this age is very much increased, and that in one particular instance, which has no good influence on the temper and deportment of servants. "Do we not desire, say they, that our servants now-a-days should make a better appearance and shine brighter than is necessary for persons of their rank? Are there no masters who love to be waited on by servants in such apparel, as may make them think too well of themselves? Have mistresses one nothing to support that pride, haughtiness and vanity of mind in servants, which they afterwards complain of? And it may be enquired, whether some servants have not been encouraged to think themselves too good for the lowest and meanest class of life, when at other seasons, they appear as gay, and pluming and as well dressed as their superiors, and can hardly be distinguished from them." I would only hint this way of reasoning here, not to undertake the vindication of it, but merely to be made the matter of further enquiry and consideration: For I would not have those crimes of servants charged on our charity-schools, which perhaps may have their foundation in the imprudence of their superiors.

3. If it can be laid at all to the charge of any charity-schools that they have been the unhappy instruments of increasing pride among some servants, yet I am well assured, that these schools amongst protestant dissenters have done very little or none of this mischief. For amongst the vast multitudes of servants that are in Great Britain, I am persuaded that there is scarce one menial servant in two hundred, which has been bred up in the dissenting charity-schools. And it is a very hard case, if these schools must bear the accusation and the guilt of those crimes in general, whereof not one in two hundred can possibly belong to them.

For my part, I could wish where there is one servant of either sex bred up in our charity-schools, there were twenty educated there: I should then hope for fewer complaints of this kind in the world. And if we do not take care to train up more children of the lower rank in our schools, in order to fit them for servants I have good reason to say that we shall scarce find servants who will comply with the religious customs of our families, and we shall see cause to repent it on more accounts than one.

same manner, as the sons and daughters of gentlemen, or even of the middle order of men, who can bestow upon their children something more considerable towards their support in life. I acknowledge also, that charity-schools will never be set upon the best foot, and managed in the most unexceptionable manner, until some way be found to employ the children both in the city and country, that they may work as well as learn. I have been many years of this mind, and therefore I laid it down among my first propositions.

But let the persons, who would destroy our schools on account of this defect, find out some ways and means of employing the children of the poor. I am persuaded the supporters of our schools of charity, will cheerfully fall in with such proposals, and those who refuse it, should never be vindicated by me.

I know there are several managers of some of these schools, who have been earnestly desirous of engaging the children in work and labour one half of the day; they have consulted with their friends about various manufactures, or any useful labour of life; they have set their thoughts at work in good earnest and would have been glad to have been directed to any expedient of this kind, that the children might not have spent their whole days in a school, but might have employed half the day in the labour of their hands: But in some places, both of the country and city, this project could not be brought to bear: What then? Must the poor ignorant wretches be turned out of the school and never learn to read, because their friends could not find work for them? Must they be sent to saunter in the streets and lanes all the day long, and grow wild in idleness, and be exposed to every temptation, without either work or learning? May they not be civilized and taught their letters one part of the day, even though there be no manual labour appointed for them the other?

But here is a great difficulty and hardship of our case: we are reproached for educating the children of poor, without their confinement to labour, and the rich objectors know not how to propose any sufficient methods to effect what they desire: Even the wisdom of the nation in parliament, hath been often and in many sessions engaged in some contrivances for so valuable an end as the employment of the poor, both old and young, and something has been done towards it; but they have not yet been able to determine any thing of universal use in all places, and which is practicable throughout the nation.

In some of our schools of charity, this has been practised, and that not only in the country, but in the city too. The boys in our dissenting charity-schools, have been sometimes employed in digging, in weeding, in gathering stones out of the ploughed

pend; and where the weaving manufacture hath been cultivated, all the children have done something towards it, for some hours in the day. As for the girls that are educated in these schools, they are always taught to work with their needles of both kinds, both knitting and sewing; and in some places they are obliged, as I have been told, to make the beds, to use the hammer the snop, and when grown up, to do harder work, perhaps to stand at the wash-bowl, and to perform the servile offices which belong to a family. I wish these things were more universally taught and practised, as far as possible. And wherever any methods of employing these children who are bred by charity in labour, are contrived, proposed, and rendered useful and practicable in the city or the country, the managers of these schools will never refuse to promote it, nor should the donors ever refuse to comply under the penalty of being utterly shut out from the benefit of this liberality.

**Objection V.** But if we allow them to learn to read, what will there be that they should learn to write also? This puffing them up with a huge conceit of themselves and their learning, does make them think themselves immediately fit for clerks, or some superior business: And this knowledge surely can never be pretended to be necessary in the lower ranks of life.

**Answer.** I will by no means contend for writing as a matter of equal necessity or advantage with that of reading. There may be some places where the bounty of the contributors to such charitable work, may not be able to maintain a writing master, nor to keep children long enough at school: Yet even there they should be taught to read well. And there may also be some of the poor who dwell in very obscure villages, and are confined to menial labours, and others in towns or cities, and especially girls, whose business is most within doors at home, who may have but very little occasion, and as little inclination to use a pen. I would not therefore by any means have it made a necessary part of a charity-school, that the children should be taught to write. Yet I beg leave to give my opinion, that there are several conveniences, that even the poorest of the people, and especially servants, may attain by learning to write, which can be no disadvantage to the public, and some of which may be for the sensible benefit of their masters and mistresses, as well as of servants themselves.

#### I. For the servants themselves.

1. Why may not a poor servant have the privilege of conveying his thoughts to a dear relation, to a father, a mother, a brother or a sister, and letting them know their welfare or their troubles by writing? Why should all the lower part of mankind be universally, and for ever cut off from all those mutual tendernesses which nature inspires, and which may be communi-



cated by a paper-messenger? Perhaps some of their souls may have as much humanity and softness in them as those of the rich, and they may have as sweet a relish of the endearments of kindred or friendship: They may long as much to know how it stands with their father's house, from which they are as it were banished by the necessities of life and their servile stations; and it is a hard case if none of these must ever be permitted to partake of this privilege, because they happen to be poor: Hard case indeed, that they must never taste of these refreshments, these sweet solaces of the heart, to relieve the drudgery and fatigues of life.

2. There are many of the poorer parts of mankind, who have not their minds so crowded and encumbered with other things, that fill their letters with serious religion, and communicate to each other the lively sense which they have of divine things on their own hearts, and encourage each other in their progress in virtue and piety. There are several of these pious poor, who have given their friends many a supporting word in their conflict with temptations, and mutually send this sort of assistance to each other, and are encouraged hereby to go through their daily labours with cheerfulness. And why should this be utterly forbidden them? I wish all those who enjoy better circumstances improved their pens for so pious a purpose.

3. When the poorer part of the world who are truly serious attend upon the ministry of the gospel, they labour as well as the rich to treasure up in their minds as much of it as they are able, and take as much pains to retain it: But alas! Their memories are as feeble and treacherous; may they not be permitted then to take the first moments of leisure, and commit to writing those things which have affected their own hearts? May they not, in this manner, by a frequent review of what they have heard and written, maintain upon their souls a long and lively relish of divine truths, and preserve the sermon from being utterly lost? I know this is the practice of several who can use a pen, and I wish it were more universally practised. Perhaps we should not preach so many sermons, with so little profit to our hearers in this manner; and why should the poor in an auditory be forever cut off from this religious advantage, and forbid to use a pen for so sacred a service?

4. May not the poor have some little concerns of their own that relate to their souls, or their bodies, or their friends, or their engagements, and their circumstances in life? And must we suppose all their memories to be so extensive and capacious, so happy and faithful as to preserve all these concerns, and recollect them whensoever they have occasion? Are not the memories of the rich perpetually unburdened, relieved and assisted by the pen? Why may not the poor in their little affairs, be indulged

something of this benefit? Useful sentences, counsels, advices, moral and divine must be forgotten, if they cannot write. Their little agreements, promises, duties, debts, transactions of life, and memorable providences, afflictions, blessings, all that belongs to their sphere of action for time and eternity, must be in danger of being lost out of their thoughts, if they cannot use a pen. Writing, what a blessed and divine invention! And must all the poor be for ever secluded from all the privileges of it, where they may be obtained with so much ease?

Here I might make a pathetic address to all those who by mutual intercourse of letters, have maintained their love to their dear relations at a distance, and have felt the inward pleasure of receiving tidings of their welfare; I might address myself to those who have written or have received letters of piety to or from their friends; to those who have found the sweetness of recollecting past providences, by the help of their paper-memoirs, and of preserving some useful sermon long on their memories by the aids of writing; have not these things been a matter of special refreshment and delight to you? Have you not counted it a very valuable advantage to yourselves? And why should you for ever deny your fellow-creatures, that are made of the same clay, and cast in the same mould as yourselves, why should you for ever deny all of them such benefits as these, when they may be attained at so easy a rate? And if you do not think proper by your own liberality to bestow this benefit on the poor, yet by all the sacred pleasure and profit you have derived from the use of the pen, I entreat you not to discourage and forbid the liberality of others who would confer this privilege on them.

II. But in the second place, Consider whether a servant incapable of writing, can be so useful to his master? Or whether it will not be some considerable advantage to superiors, to have their servants, and their poor labourers able to make use of a pen.

1. May I have leave to ask whether it be not far better they should be able to write their own names, when you employ them, if it were but to give a receipt for their weekly, or their monthly, or their yearly wages? Is not their name better than merely their scrawling marks, which are such poor doubtful and uncertain tokens of their own giving a receipt?

2. It is a frequent case that occurs in common life, that servants are sent out perhaps to a considerable distance, with messages to several persons at once, and at the same time are ordered to buy several little necessaries for different persons in the family: Their zeal and diligence, it may be, is great and unexceptionable, but their memory fails them, and they drop two or three of their orders by the way: They are chid at home, if the master be choleric, perhaps with some severity, the family is in great and present want of the necessaries they should have

brought with them, and sensible inconveniences are hereby sustained : But all these inconveniences find an easy remedy, if the servant can use a pen : He puts down on a scrap of paper, some memoirs of his several orders, and he punctually fulfils them all. This is a known and common case, and among other things may plead for servants learning to write.

3. When masters are at a distance from their households and leave their servants in trust with their affairs, is it not a most unhappy thing if a household servant cannot communicate to his master by writing any sudden accident that may attend his concerns, his goods or his dwelling ? If he cannot give notice of any new occurrence that relates to his master's interest ? Is it not a most lamentable circumstance if a servant be left in the city or in a country-house for a few days together, and any terrible sudden calamity should attend his habitation or the family, and no servant could give notice of it to his distant master ? Are not masters willing to know what messages have been left for them during their absence ? And must every such be trusted merely to the untaught and unfaithful memory of a servant, for many days together till they shall see their master ?

I know there are such cases wherein persons of good figure in the world, who keep two dwellings at some distance from each other, are unwilling to hire those servants, whom they must leave behind them at one of their habitations, if they are not able to write ; because they expect frequent notice from their servants by letter, whereby they may be informed of the affairs of one part of their family or another ; and this makes their minds easy wheresoever they are, by the pleasurable tidings of the welfare of their absent children, and the regular conduct and peace of the distant part of their household.

4. I might add in the last place, if servants have never learned to write themselves, it is very seldom they are capable of reading what is written : And would it not be a great and frequent inconvenience to a master, when he is absent from his home, if he could not send a command to a servant in writing, about some necessary affair of his household, but this servant must go to some learned neighbour to read it for him, and thus communicate the concerns of his master to any one who could assist him to read his master's letter ? Let things of this kind, which are transacted between master and servant, be never so important and momentous, let it be never so much for the welfare of the family, the young children, the goods, or the estate, it is all one in this case where the servant cannot write : The loss must be sustained, the damage must be incurred, all inconveniences must be borne ; and these masters at least, may thank themselves for it, who discourage the support of these schools of

charity, and will not suffer those of the lower rank of people, to learn to use the pen of the writer.

**Objection VI.** But if we grant that the art of writing may be a convenience both to masters and servants, what necessity is there, that the poor should learn arithmetic, or be acquainted with accounts? Their poor fathers managed their little affairs without figures, and why may not their children do so too?

**Answer 1.** All that is pleaded for of this kind, is, that they may be taught to add and subtract little parcels of money, such as may come within their possession, or may be entrusted with them. Let it be considered, that it is the custom of the nation in our day, to run much deeper in debt, and deal more generally upon trust and credit, than was done in the days of our fathers; and even poor labourers are seldom paid every night, nor perhaps every week now-a-days: And is it not a hard case, if they may not have leave to learn to help their memories by short accounts of the money that is due to them, that in their demands they may neither do injury to their masters nor themselves? I am well assured that for want of this many mistakes have arisen, sometimes to the prejudice of the poor, and sometimes to the damage of those that employed them.

2. Or, suppose one of these poor unlearned children become a servant in a family, and the master entrust him with a small matter of money, to lay out for the common little necessaries of a week, how unable is he to account even for this little, without a pen and figures to help his memory? What lame and broken accounts must the master receive? Or, he must take it upon content that his servant is honest, and accept of the general story, that so much is expended, without any notice of the particular detail of the things which are bought or paid for: Or else he must be troubled often in a day, for every little necessary expence of life, and perhaps sometimes have his servant interrupt him, in his great affairs, with the narrative how he hath disposed of pence and farthings; and all this, because his servant was never taught to add or subtract a few shillings.

**Objection VII.** But if it should be allowed that charity-schools may teach the poor to write a little, and instruct them to make a few figures, and to add and subtract little sums of money, a few months would be sufficient for this. There is no need of three or four years schooling; no need of their learning to handle the pen in a nice and artful manner, to write a fine hand and to excel in curious penmanship; no need of their entering into the learned languages, or the deeps of arithmetic, which are proper for divines and physicians, for merchants and their clerks, for accountants and mathematicians, and the children of gentlemen.

**Answer.** I perfectly agree to all this objection, and acknow-

ledge the justice of it, except in this one particular, viz. That a few months is time enough for this learning. I am sure so scanty a space of time is not sufficient, to teach a youth of a common or low capacity, the art of writing and accounts enough to serve all the purposes even of the lower ranks of life. If children are not pretty thoroughly instructed in it by their masters and acquainted with it by much repetition and practice, it has been often found that they forget these things before they come to make any use of them for any valuable purpose. Surely a year or more may be allowed for this part of their instruction, without any inconvenience: The generality of children are not blessed with so swift a genius. This one thing being allowed; I would prosecute and urge the rest of this objection myself; for I do not think it reasonable that schools of charity should breed up children to all that politeness in any science, which should belong only to young persons of higher rank, and in better circumstances, and whose parents can furnish out a better education for them.

And here it may be confessed, that it is possible these niceties of learning, these refinements beyond the true design of charity-schools, may perhaps have raised some aspiring conceits in the minds of those children, who are generally born for the lower offices of life. I cannot but take the liberty here to transcribe, and recommend part of the right reverend, the bishop of London's\* directions for this purpose: "If charity-schools should grow by degrees into a more polite art of education, if the boys should be taught fine writing, &c. the girls fine working, and both of them fine singing, he grants, they would be too ready to value themselves upon their attainments, and this would have a natural tendency to set them above the meaner and more laborious stations and offices of life: All these things therefore, says he, should be carefully kept out of our charity-schools: Which doubtless will stand more clear of objections, and best answer the end of their institution, when they pretend to no more than to prepare children to be good christians, and good servants."

This wise and sagacious prelate, who well knows the conduct and state of many of the charity-schools in the church of England, saw sufficient reason for these cautions: He found that there were too many of these schools of ancient, if not of later foundation, wherein children are taught Latin, Greek, mathematics, and many parts of learning, which are by no means necessary for the poorer sort of mankind: And therefore he gives prudent advice against it. But the schools among the protestant dissenters have no such supports and endowments: They are poor in the contributions that support them; and as their poverty confines them to teach only a few plain and necessary

\* Dr. Edmund Gibson.

things, so the very notion of charity-schools should forbid these refinements, lest too much of the younger life of children should be spent therein, and be withheld from more necessary business and labour for their own maintenance.

Three years of diligence and application under prudent teachers will furnish most of the children of the poor with reading, writing and arithmetic enough for their future stations of life, provided they are not taken into these schools too young: And indeed, it is my opinion, they ought seldom to be admitted under eight or nine years old; and that when they have spent two or three years in learning, they may go forth to some of the harder labours, and lower businesses of life, that are suited to their rank. I confess if it could be contrived so that half the day should be spent in labour, and half in learning, then they might be indulged in a larger space of time, and this mixture of labour and learning, would render the charity-schools much more useful, and free from all exceptions: But of this I have spoken before.

And yet after all, I cannot but beg leave to put in one word of apology for here and there a lad of a bright genius, that may happen to be found in these schools of charity. If any one blessed with more sprightly talents of nature, should make a swifter progress in learning than his fellows, and discover uncommon seeds of ingenuity and science, let him not be thrust out of the schools sooner than his neighbours, out of a mere caution lest he should learn too much. I would become an intercessor, that he might not be turned abroad into the wide world, before the common term of years in that school is fulfilled, merely because he happens to have better parts than his school-fellows, and hath improved his time better than they. This would be a most unreasonable and grievous discouragement of industry, and a hard penalty laid upon wit and virtue.

Objection VIII. But if these children of the poor, who are supported by the charity of others, be trained up in reading, writing and arithmetic, will not this render them qualified for clerkship, or book-keeping, or any better sort of place or employment, where learning is necessary? And then they become "competitors for such places with others of equal talents, who have yet far better pretensions to them." The sons of tradesmen and mechanics, who have paid public taxes and parish dues, and even have given bread and clothes to the poor, their sons have a right to be employed in all these stations, as clerks or servants to merchants and others, wherein there is a prospect of advancement in life: And there are a thousand such in England; but if the charity-bred youth are preferred before them, it is taking the bread from those, whose fathers have fed, and clothed, and fostered them, to the prejudice of their own children.

**Answer.** The foregoing account of the slender and low degrees of learning, which are bestowed on the children in our charity-schools, seems to anticipate and exclude this complaint. There are none of these poor who are, or ought to be bred up to such an accomplished skill in writing and accounts, as to be qualified for any of these posts; except here and there a single lad, whose bright genius, and whose constant application and industry have out-run all his fellows: And for such an one I have pleaded before, that he might not be thrust out of school the sooner, and be punished merely for his ingenuity and diligence. As for the children or orphans of those who have fed and clothed the poor, and have lived in good fashion in the world, but have fallen into decay and poverty, I presume it would not displease the persons who make this objection, to see here and there one of them qualified for a little better business: For this is perfectly agreeable to their own sentiments, viz. That the children of persons who have lived well, and paid taxes, should have the first and chief benefits and advantages of lower life offered them, since they have the best pretensions to them.

**Objection IX.** Suppose it be allowed, that the children of the poor, be indulged the favour of learning to read and write, to add and subtract a few figures, since you have shewn that these things are so useful to servants and labourers: But why then are they not all made servants either to gentlemen, to farmers or to house-keepers? Why are they not bred up all to the plough in the country, or to be mere labourers in the city, or confined to household services or menial offices of life? "Why must any of them be placed out in a way of apprenticeship, to trades and manufactures?" Even this is a discouragement to the children of those persons of a little higher rank who have paid taxes, and helped to maintain the poor in their parishes. And unless all these children of a little better rank were supplied with such trades, none of the poor bred up by charity should have the advantage of such apprenticeships.

**Answer.** In most of the schools of the country, and in some of those in London, both the boys and the girls, are bred up with a design for service and hard labour abroad, or for such mean works or businesses, as their own parents can employ them in at home. The girls, as I have hinted before, are taught to read, spin, sew and knit, and to perform domestic labours, and been made fit for service in families, they are placed out in such services. The boys are called home perhaps, to assist their fathers in their poor labours of life, wherein they get their bread. But in some of the schools in and near London, and in some considerable towns, if there be a small provision made for their being put apprentices to the poorer trades, such as shoe-makers, tailors,

watermen, gardeners, workmen in timber, iron, &c. there are several considerations, which I have learned by converse about these matters, which may be offered in favour of it.

**Consideration I.** If all the children of the poor both in city and country, were entirely cut off from trades and manufactures, there would not be families enough in England, to receive them all as menial servants, or as retainers to the plough. And besides, one may ask the question, why should menial servants be multiplied beyond all necessity, since too many of them in great families, are bred up rather in idleness than labour? The business of common handicrafts, is much more laborious than the common domestic service in most families.

**II.** It is not menial servants, but mechanics and manufacturers that increase the commodities, and thereby the riches of the nation. And if the wealth of the nation be more increased by the number of manufactures which the nation produces, why should the apprenticeships of some of the poor, to those low mechanical trades in great towns and cities, be a forbidden exercise of bounty and charity? At least this argument will hold as to those mechanical businesses of life, which are not already overstocked: And I have been assured, that the managers of charity-schools have a just regard to this, in placing out the children of the poor."

**III.** The same assurances have also been given me, that there is great want of apprentices to several of these meaner trades: The master-workmen address themselves frequently to the managers of these schools, to help them to lads fit to be trained up in their trades and occupations. As the nation continually multiplies, so more of the necessaries of life are wanted, and increase the want of these mechanic arts. Let it be observed also, that the children of every common tradesman, are aspiring to better business: The working shops and stalls of these meanest mechanic artificers want more hands, and seek for apprentices; so that there is no detriment done to the children of these tradesmen, by supplying them with servants out of our charity-schools.

**IV.** Many of the children of these lower tradesmen are taught to read and write in our schools, and have instructions in the things of religion given them there. Such tradesmen, I mean, who are honest and industrious, but by reason of a numerous family, by losses or sickness, or other events of providence, are kept still under poverty: Their children are not only taught in our charity-schools, but also they enjoy the benefit of being placed out in apprenticeships proper to their character. And these very persons have thankfully accepted of the instruction of their children in these schools.

**V.** There is another reason that may encourage the mana-



gers of these schools to place out some children apprentices to manufacturers. Many of them are orphans, without father or mother, and they have no friends to provide business for them: Others have parents who cannot provide any employment for them: Now some children in the country, and multitudes who are born and bred up in London, would not know whither to go, or how to employ themselves, nor where to offer themselves for servants at eleven, or twelve, or thirteen years old: What family will take them in when they are capable of doing so little of the business of a footman? But at that age they may be employed in several of the manufactures of the land, if they are carefully and prudently placed in such a station.

VI. If these children are turned out of these schools to shift in the wide world too early, or to spend their time at random, many of them will forget their learning, and lose the benefits they had obtained by being taught in schools. Some of them would not only forget the good lessons of religion and morality, but even the knowledge of letters and syllables, till they cannot read their bibles, and run wild again in the world: But when they are placed by the managers of these schools in sober families, they engage their masters to see that they keep their learning in some good measure and make use of it.

VII. I add in the last place, that if neither parents nor friends of any kind take care to fix children in some particular business, nor place them in sober families, where they may be under due government, they will be in danger of growing idle and slothful, they will wander about the streets and lanes, and lie exposed to all manner of iniquity. Sometimes the wicked propensities of nature, and sometimes the necessities of nature will tempt them to cheating, stealing, robbing, &c. And they will be in danger of falling into shameless intemperance of every kind. The remains of their younger education, may be some check upon them indeed and lay their consciences under some restraint; yet at best in this great city, even children who are well instructed in their younger years; are too much exposed to wicked company and mischief, if there be no care taken to provide any fixed employment for them. But on the other hand, as it is well expressed in Mr. Neal's charity sermon, page 19. "If you give them learning, and put them to a trade, you give them a lasting inheritance; for understanding even in this sense, is a well-spring of life to him that hath it: It is a treasure that can never be taken from them; and therefore this must be the best way of shewing compassion to the children of the poor."

Objection X. But why must these children of the poor be clothed as well as taught? Why must they have a suit of new apparel given them yearly? This clothing makes the young creatures value themselves too highly, especially while their

raiment is new : They are ready to think better of themselves than becomes them ; and while they have it given them once a year, they are tempted to rank themselves with children of better shion ; their little souls are puffed up with pride, and their spirits are raised above their circumstances.

To this, I answer in general. There are very few schools of charity among dissenters, where the contributions arise high enough to provide clothing for the scholars : Nor is it necessary or proper, that it should be done where the money may be better expended in their instruction, or in training them up to such employments whereby they may support themselves, or where the inconveniences arising from it are greater than the good done by it. Yet where the liberality of benefactors will reach so far, as great towns, and especially in the chief city, there may be several things offered in the defence of it.

I. The covering of the poor and naked, in general, is a work of liberality approved in scripture recommended to christians, and joined with that of feeding the hungry, and giving drink to those that are athirst ? and it has a blessing pronounced upon it : Why then may not these poor children be sometimes the objects of such liberality, who have scarce any garments to cover them ? Indeed, many of them are so miserable in their rags and nastiness and their tatters, that they are hardly fit to come to a society that is well ordered, and to meet together in a school in order to their education, without some more convenient apparel than what their parents can provide them. This is an act of charity and bounty to the poor parents themselves, who are not capable to provide the necessaries of life for their offspring. Besides,

II. Let it be considered, that the clothes which are bestowed upon them once in a year or two, are of the coarsest kind, and in the plainest form, and thus they are sufficiently distinguished from children of better rank, and they ought always to be so distinguished. I grant if their clothing were the same with that of other children of higher circumstances, the temptation might be strong, and the objection might have some force. But there is no ground for these charity children to grow vain and proud of their raiment, when it is but a sort of livery, that publicly denotes those who wear it, to be educated by charity.

Let me add also, in the third place, that there are so great numbers of these charity-schools erected by the members of the established church, not only in London, but in many other places, where the children of the poor are taught and clothed, and set out apprentices to useful trades, that many of the poor among us, would be laid under great temptations to send their children to these schools to be educated in those forms of worship,

which they disapprove, and in religious sentiments different from their parents.

Objection XI. I know it will be smartly replied here, "And where is the hurt of all this?" What if they are educated in all the forms of the church of England? Surely, the difference between the dissenters and the church, is not so great and formidable, but that the poor should be willing to accept of such an education for their children, since they are not able to bring them up without the charity of others.

To this, I answer, first, That it is readily granted, that religion itself, in substance of it, is the same, which is professed and practised by both parties. God forbid, that I should suppose that a good education of youth in the established church, should prevent their usefulness here on earth, or their arrival at heaven. I hope, and believe, there are thousands of holy souls in the church of England, which are beloved of God, and shall be for ever happy in his presence. I love them heartily, and rejoice in the success of their ministers, and beg of God their labours may be more abundantly blessed to the honour of God, and the eternal happiness of a great multitude of souls.

Yet I beg leave humbly to mention, what every body knows, that there are some forms and ceremonies, which were invented by men, and which Christ never appointed, that are yet imposed on the ministers and the people in that church; not to mention some other disadvantages which the protestant dissenters have many times complained of. Now the poor have consciences as well as the rich; and the poor are concerned as well as the rich to have their children trained up in that way of worship which they think most agreeable to the will of God: And why should they be put under such temptations to resign up their children to a different education, if there may be another provision made for them, by a very small exercise of liberality among their own richer friends, who have the same religious sentiments with themselves.

Since our governors have been so just and kind to us, as to abolish those cruel, and unrighteous laws which forbid us to worship God according to our consciences, or to train up children in our own schools, why should not the poor among us be partakers of this privilege, as well as the rich? And why should not the rich among us be a little solicitous, that through their bounty and charity, their poor brethren might enjoy the advantage of bringing up their offspring in their own way of worship, which the law of the land indulges, and which they themselves rejoice in? Besides, it should be added here, that in all our dissenting schools, they are only taught the Assembly's Catechism, and in some, they are brought once a day to attend the public worship in our congregations, without any private influences to set them

against the church of England, or to make them bigots to any sect or party. As we refuse no children of the members of the established church, so we teach them nothing that I know of inconsistent with their continuance in that church.

In the second place, I answer, that though some few of these charity-schools in the established church, may perhaps indulge moderate principles, and have some favourable opinion of the protestant dissenters; yet it has been sufficiently evident, that too great a part of them have trained up children in a furious and blind opposition to all who separate from the church of England.

And if parents, who know not these things, should be tempted for the sake of clothes and apprenticeship, to permit their children to learn a different way of worship, which they do not so well approve of, yet it is hard, to think that they should be almost constrained to send them to such schools, as may not only fill their heads with party notions\*, but also tincture their hearts with a bitter party zeal; such schools as may not only give them a set of different principles, but might indulge them to mock and deride the religious sentiments of their parents. And yet this might be the case in many places, where the protestant dissenters are very poor; they would fain have their children taught to read and write, yet perhaps there is no other charity-school near them, but such as hates the name of a dissenter.

And after all, I must intreat leave to observe, that this is not the worst of the case. The children in many of these public schools, would not be only brought up with an aversion to the religious sentiments and practices of their parents, but would be also in great danger of learning to hate the present government under his most excellent majesty King George, and to rail at the establishment in the protestant succession, which is the glory of Great Britain, the defence of the reformed religion, and the securest guard of the liberties of Europe. This is not spoken at random, for I shall produce a most unquestionable authority for it, who declares it to have been lately so notorious, as that it is not possible to be denied. Now the education of youth in such schools, would not only prove the highest inconvenience and mischief to the children themselves, but a very great injury to the whole nation, and to mankind; and this would be the evident and unhappy effect, unless these schools are vastly reformed from these hateful practices, and freed from the dishonourable character, which most of them bore, and which many of them merited in years past.

The right reverend the lord bishop of London, whose words

\* See Mr. Chandler's sermon for the benefit of a charity-school, Jan. 1. 1727-8. page 34, 35.

I cited a little before, is a very great friend to these schools of charity; but he does not deny but that there has been too just ground for complaint some years ago, that in many of them the children have been trained up to a disaffection to our present government. His words are these: "This is a very heavy objection indeed, viz. that in many of the charity-schools, the children are trained up to disaffection to the government, and it is a point that the government is nearly concerned to look after since it is of little purpose to subdue and conquer the present ill humours, if a succession of disaffected persons is to be perpetually nursing up in our schools. And it is as little to be expected that any persons who are well-affected to the government, should contribute to the maintenance of such schools, as long as the opinion of this disaffection continues."

After that, his lordship hopes and believes, "that there is not at present the like ground to complain of disaffection in our charity-schools, as there was some years ago;" yet he acknowledges, that "while the protestant succession remained doubtful and no stone was left unturned to defeat it, some persons who had their views a different way, that is, jacobites, endeavoured to get the management of these schools into their hands, and to make them instrumental in nourishing and spreading an aversion to the protestant settlement. Which says he, was so notorious, as well as from some particular recommendations of masters and mistresses, as from the behaviour of too many of the children themselves, that the fact as to that time, cannot possibly be denied." His lordship indeed concludes, "that there is great reason to believe that much of this leaven is worked out;" and he is willing to hope, that since things are better, true and loyal subjects will begin to think more favourably of them.

It must be confessed his lordship, who is a most sincere and hearty friend to the protestant succession in the house of Hanover, hath employed his zeal and influence to recover the charity-schools of the established church from this bad character: But things are not changed all of a sudden; and his lordship gives us but very low and doubtful indications of an universal change for the better when he only tells us, "there is not the like ground to complain of disaffection, as there was some years ago, and there is great reason to believe much of this leaven is worked out." Though perhaps there may be too much of it still remaining. And what a dismal thing would it be, if a great part of the poor among the protestant dissenters, whose zeal for the present government, is their known and constant glory, if these very persons by the temptation of clothing and trades to be provided for their children, should be allured to place them under such sorts of masters and mistresses as the

bishop describes? What if their children should abhor, mock and ridicule the particular modes of religion which their parents practise; if they should ridicule and curse their parents for fanatic and presbyterians? And at the same time, if these young creatures, should be in danger also of growing up to practise sedition and rebellion against our excellent king and his posterity in years to come. I heartily join with his lordship to hope better things, and wish his zeal for a reformation may have great success.

Yet I think I ought to add a word in this place also, in favour of the poor of the church of England, who love and value the present government, and the protestant succession: What a grief would it be to them, if they should find their own children when grown up, to become enemies to the illustrious house of Hanover, and to be deeply tinctured with such principles as are contrary to the interest of Great Britain, and to the civil and religious liberty of men and christians?

On this occasion therefore, I think it may not be amiss to request every subscriber for the support of any charity-school, to make due and strict enquiry, Whether the teachers and governors of it, are hearty and zealous friends of the present government? That they may not lay out their money to propagate sedition instead of virtue, and to nourish the seeds of rebellion in the rising age, and lay a foundation for our future slavery and ruin.

Wheresoever therefore there is the least danger of this kind, surely every true Briton must consent to say, "Let charity-schools among protestant dissenters go on to clothe the naked, and to furnish the poor with trades, and to breed them up in all the forms of useful knowledge and industry, lest their needy parents should be tempted to venture them into dangerous nurseries, and lest their children should grow up to become the factious disturbers of our protestant government, as well as the persecutors and tormentors of their parents." If some persons are still of opinion, that the clothing of poor children may be attended with some inconvenience; I think it is but a small one, and it ought to be endured rather than the danger of a far greater evil should be incurred.

Upon the whole, I conclude, That those who are dissatisfied with the clothing of children in these schools of charity among the dissenters, are desired to contribute something towards their being taught to read, and write, and cast accounts; that they may be disposed of to some of the lowest businesses of life: Those that are displeased with their using the pen, or their learning to make figures, let them contribute something towards their learning to read the bible: Or if there are any persons that can suppose that this is too much knowledge for them; yet

even then they may give something towards the forming their rude and ignorant minds, and correcting their brutal manners, towards their being taught in a school something of religion and a catechism that they may learn to worship God, and know their duties to men.

If you have any desire that the poor of the nation should not be left to grow up in all manner of vice and iniquity, and become a burden and nuisance to the kingdom, if you have any value for the preservation of property, for the propagation of virtue or religion and the transmission of them to the next age, if you have any tenderness for the immortal souls of mankind, and any zeal for the honour of God in the growing generation, bestow a mite toward the support of this most useful and generous charity: Give something towards the instruction and education of a company of wretched young creatures, that they may be taken from the street, that they may be rescued from the vile company of those that curse and swear, rob and steal, that they may be kept from fatal temptations to drunkenness, lewdness and vile intemperance, and be preserved from sin and ruin.

If by the good effects of this slender education which you bestow upon them they should ever hereafter grow up to become useful members of civil society, and a blessing to the world, the following age shall thankfully acknowledge your hand in it, and the children themselves shall call you blessed: And above all, if they are by this means trained up to the fear of God, to the faith of Christ, and the practice of sincere piety, there will be so many precious souls rescued from the gates of hell, and so many blessed inhabitants added to the heavenly regions. What a grateful and surprising pleasure will it be to you to see such a glorious harvest sprung up there from your grains of charity scattered here on earth? What an unspeakable joy to reflect that you have been made the happy instruments of this salvation: And your labour of love shall not be forgotten in the great and solemn day of recompence.

## AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

*A short Account of the signal and surprising Appearances of God in his Providence for the erecting and support of a Charity-School, among the Pietists, or Puritans, in Germany.*

---

IT is now about thirty years ago, that some masters of art, the university at Leipsick, in Saxony, set up a private conference among themselves for the better understanding of scripture, and for the regulating their studies and their conversation accordingly: The first part of that exercise was critical, to find out the literal meaning of the text, and the other part consisted in the deducing of propositions and practical uses from it. This was kept up with good success for some time in a private chamber after evening service was over on Sundays. One of the persons concerned in this affair was Mr. Augustus Hermannus Frank. Many of the young students were powerfully wrought upon by this plain and practical way of reading the bible, and excited to an ardent love for the study of the holy scriptures, their minding now the hearty reformation of their souls and conversion from darkness to light than unnecessary strifes and disputes. They always begun and ended with prayer.

When this thing began to have a wider spread and influence, other students who had no mind to enter upon a new course of life, in derision called them Pietists, as our fathers in England were called Puritans, and much on the same account. The clamours against them grew fierce and violent, the pulpits rung with this new name of reproach, ecclesiastical courts bestirred themselves, and the first instruments of pietism were banished from Leipsick: Mr. Frank was persecuted from place to place, till at last, by the providence of God, he was chosen professor of the oriental languages at the university of Hall, and removed to Glaucha, in the suburbs of that city.

This good man when he was settled at Glaucha, being grieved at the gross ignorance of the poor and at their wickedness, appointed them to come every Thursday, to his house in order to make some charitable distributions amongst them, and instruct them in the things of God. This was about the year 1704. The next year he fixed an alms-box in his parlour, and a little time a certain person put into it at once about the value eighteen shillings and sixpence. He took this in his hands and said in full assurance of faith, "This is now a considerable



fund, worthy to be laid out in some important undertaking; wherefore, I will even take this for the foundation of a charity-school." The same day he bought as many books as cost eight shillings, and then got a student to teach the poor children two hours in a day. He fitted up a place before his study for a charity-school, and fixed a box on one of the walls. At the top thereof, he set down these words: "For defraying the charges of putting to school poor children and providing books and other necessaries;" Anno MDCXCV. And at the bottom? Prov. xix. 17. *He that hath pity upon the poor, lendeth unto the Lord, and, that which he hath given, will he pay him again.*

"We had, saith he, many poor children brought together before we had built a house to receive them: In the mean time the Lord inclined the heart of a person of quality to lay out the sum of a thousand crowns for the use of the poor: And two other persons supplied us with four hundred crowns to encourage the design on foot.

Much of this money was spent in feeding and clothing and instructing the orphans before they began to build a hospital: and, as the author expresses it; "The Lord knows we had not so much as would answer the cost of a small cottage, much less a building as might hold two hundred people: But the Lord strengthened my faith, and on July 13, 1698, the foundation of a hospital was laid in the name of God, and as for the building itself I was to wait upon God, and from week to week receive at his hand what he would be graciously pleased to furnish me with for carrying on the same."

The pious author goes on and informs us how successfully the building proceeded in opposition to all the froward censures of ill-meaning people, by the most unforeseen and amazing instances of the liberality of persons known and unknown, which brought in daily, weekly, and sometimes hourly supplies both for the support of the orphans and the building of the house; till it has at last arisen to such a fair extent and to the support and instruction of so many hundreds of the poor as to become the glory of the German churches, the wonder of the nations, and the most miraculous instance of the effect of faith and prayer that was ever known of this kind, not only since the days of the apostles, but perhaps since the creation.

It is hardly possible to read the account without a sacred astonishment. There we find to what an extreme necessity they were at several times reduced in the building, and yet before night their supplies were as suitable, sufficient and surprizing, as if an angel had been appointed to oversee the work, and to take care that the workmen were paid.

God has not only manifested his divine approbation of

charity-schools by such a perpetual series of testimonies, as it were, from heaven promoting this building and supplying their wants, but the success of this work in the conversion of a multitude of souls here, and in spreading vital religion through many adjacent countries gives a further demonstration how pleasing it has been to God.

Out of these schools under the care of this great and pious man hath proceeded a great number of pious and learned tutors, for gentlemen's children, school-masters and divines who have done much towards the spreading a new and lively savour of christianity through many of the provinces of Germany; and besides this, they have educated multitudes of honest and pious christians who were taken in here as orphans, and who have been placed out to various trades, artifices and labours in life, whereby there is a considerable reformation in those parts of the world and a glorious change from a cold formal lifeless profession of religion to the practice of solid piety and goodness.

The late reverend and pious doctor Josiah Woodward, the present right reverend doctor Kennet bishop of Peterborough, and other divines of the church of England have given their public encomiums of this strange and surprizing work of liberality several years ago. It was a most heavy and painful stroke which this glorious scene of piety and charity sustained last year by the death of the most excellent founder professor Frank, but the work is still carried on by his worthy successors, and may the same happy success still attend it through a rich supply of the Spirit of Christ among them.

The larger account of these things is contained in several narratives written by professor Frank himself, and by the late pious Mr. William Anthony Boehm, chaplain to the late prince George of Denmark, these are all put together and prefaced by doctor Woodward; printed by Mr. Downing in Bartholomew-Close: And are well worth the perusal of the present age, to let them see there is a divine providence in the world, and a divine approbation of sincere works of charity.



---

**THE ART OF**  
**READING**  
**AND**  
**WRITING ENGLISH,**  
**&c.**

---

TO

**MRS. SARAH, MRS. MARY, AND MRS. ELIZABETH ABNEY,**

*Daughters of Sir Thomas Abney, Knight and Alderman of London.*

---

MY HONOURED YOUNG FRIENDS,

**W**HEN it pleased God to afford me the first degrees of release from a long and tiresome weakness, I thought myself bound to make my best acknowledgment of that uncommon generosity and kindness of your honoured parents, by which I was first invited into your family, and my health began to be restored. Nor could I do any thing more grateful to them, nor more pleasing to myself, than offer my assistance in some part of your education, while I was incapable of more public work.

I began therefore at the first principles of learning, that I might have opportunity to correct any lesser mistakes of your youngest years, and to perfect your knowledge of our mother-tongue: For this purpose, when I found no spelling-book sufficient to answer my designs, I wrote many of these directions; but my health was so imperfect, that I was not able, at that time, to transcribe and finish this little book, which was designed for you.

Thus it lay by neglected some years, till a charity-school arose at Cheshunt in Hertfordshire, raised and supported by the diffusive goodness of your family, in concert with the pious neighbourhood. Then was I requested, and even provoked to put the last hand to this work, for the better instruction of the children that were taught there; though I must confess, it has grown up, under my reviews of it, to a much larger size than I ever intended.

But, Ladies, I take the freedom to make you my sole patronesses in this affair; for I scarce know any thing else that can effectually defend me, for laying out so many hours in these rudiments of learning, but a desire to be made useful in lesser services, while I am cut off from greater; and the duty of gratitude to an excellent household, where so many years of my affliction have been attended with so rich a variety of conveniences and benefits: And now I ask your leave to offer it to the public.

May the valuable lives of Sir Thomas Abney, and his honoured Lady, be prolonged as blessings to the world; while the kindness they have shown me, is signally and plentifully rewarded from heaven with blessings on all your heads: And may the little share I have had in assisting your education, be improved by divine providence and grace, to your temporal and everlasting welfare. So prays

Your affectionate Instructor,

And obliged humble Servant,

I. WATTS.

Theobalds in Hertfordshire, }  
July 31, 1720. }

## PREFACE

### TO "THE ART OF READING AND WRITING ENGLISH."

**T**HE reader is briefly informed, in the Title Page, what is the general design of this little book, and who are the persons that may hope to profit by it. The Dedication sufficiently acquaints him with the occasion of this composition: And since custom has taught the world to expect a word or two of address in the first leaves of a book, it shall be the business of the Preface to offer a few things which relate to the methods of teaching to read and write English, and to declare a little more particularly what may be expected from this attempt.

My learned friends will easily forgive me, that I did not write for them, who are fitter to be my instructors, in a science which has never been my professed business: I expect rather they will reprove me, for descending from nobler studies, to employ my thoughts on so mean a subject. Now, if I had a mind to flatter my ambition, I would call in several great names to answer for me. Shall those renowned divines and mathematicians, Bishop Wilkins, and Dr. Wallis? Shall Milton, that noblest of poets, and Ray, that pious philosopher, busy themselves in grammars and dictionaries, and nomenclatures, and employ their meditations on words and syllables, and that without sinking their character? Then surely I may tread in their steps and imitate such patterns without disgrace.

But I will content myself with a much plainer apology, and confess to the world that I think nothing of this nature too mean for me to lay out a few weeks of my life upon, for the service of a family, to whom, under God, I owe that I live: For when I had surveyed grammars, and spelling-books, for this service, I found none of them perfectly answer my design, that is, to lead English readers into an easy acquaintance with their mother-tongue, without constraining them to acquire the knowledge of other languages. And though I did not set myself at first to write these directions for the public, yet, since they are written, surely I may offer them to the world without offence. It is not my ambition, by this composure, to supplant the primer or the spelling-book. This book was not written to stand in their stead; yet since it lies naturally in my way, I will venture to speak my sentiments concerning the best way of composing them. It is the custom of common spelling-books, in the first part of them, after the letters, to join consonants and vowels together in various forms, then to make tables of common words, of one, two, three, and more syllables: After these, they place catalogues of proper names, dividing them all into their distinct syllables; and I think this method is happily and judiciously contrived for the ease of the teacher, and the profit of the learner. In this part, all the words should be ranged in distinct tables, according to their accents on the first, second, or following syllables; and the consonants which are pronounced double, should have a double accent upon them, as Mr. Dyche has contrived, and Mr. Munday has since improved. At the end of this first part of the book, three or four pages would be sufficient just to tell the young scholars, briefly, which are vowels, which are consonants, which are diphthongs; and to teach them the common

stops of comma, colon, and period, with the marks of the ten figures, &c. till they grow up to be fit for a fuller acquaintance with all these things.

But, I think, the second part of a spelling-book would be much better composed of lessons for children of various kinds: Wherein there should be not only such praxes on the words of different syllables, as Mr. Dyché has framed, but several easy portions of scripture collected out of the Psalms, and Proverbs, and the New Testament, as well as other little compositions, that might teach them duty and behaviour towards God and man, abroad and at home: Then I would place some pages of short sentences, to discourage the vices to which children are most addicted: Then a catalogue of common English proverbs: After this, some of the more difficult parts of the scripture, with proper names in it, choosing out such verses, as may, at the same time, entertain the child with some agreeable notices of sacred history. Next to this might be added some well-chosen, short, and useful stories, that may entice the young learner to the pleasure of reading; something of the history of mankind, a short account of England, or the common affairs of our nation: And the world will forgive me, if I should say, let a few pieces of poesy be added; and let the verse be of various kinds, to acquaint the learner with all sorts of subjects and manners of writing, that he may know how to read them when they are put into his hand. And if the author would add proper short prayers and graces for children, he has my hearty approbation. After all, it would not be amiss if a leaf or two were employed in shewing the child how to read written letters, by a plate of writing in the secretary and the round-hand graven on purpose; as well as the Lord's-prayer, or creed, or some such short specimen, repeated in the Roman, the Italian, the Old English, and the written letters. I should rejoice to see a good spelling-book framed according to this model.

Then, if I might be thought worthy to give advice to the teachers, I would persuade them to follow this method, namely, Let the children learn to know the letters, and a great part of the single syllables, as they are ranked in spelling-books, before they read any thing else; and be sure that they are well taught to give the full force and sound of the vowels and consonants, as they are variously joined. Then let them have two sorts of tasks appointed every day, one in the tables, or catalogues of words in the first part, and one in the lessons of the second part. Thus they would learn at the same time something valuable and useful in life, as well as the art of reading. And by this means also the child would have some variety in his learning, to render it more pleasant.

The book that I have written is supposed at least to follow the first reading of such a spelling-book; or, which is all one, to be written for those who are a little acquainted with reading: For the art of reading is best begun like the art of speaking, and that is, by rote; though it is best improved and perfected by rules.

The manner in which I would advise the perusal of this little book, as far as is necessary for children, should be this: When they give their spelling-books a second reading, or, for want of that, when they begin their bible, let them also begin such parts as their master shall choose out of this book: And thus they should have two sorts of lessons every day again; and by the one they would learn rules which they should carefully put in practice in the other. But my chief hope is to improve the knowledge of persons advanced

ignorance; though I have frequently, in the book, addressed my *distinctions* to masters and their scholars.

I demand myself that there are thousands of young persons, and many *illiterate* persons, who for want of happier advantages, may profit considerably in this universal piece of knowledge, by the directions that are here proposed. They may learn to read more usefully to those who hear, as well as to write more intelligibly to those who must read, if they will but enter into acquaintance with the principles of their native tongue, and follow the rules here prescribed.

It is not so easy a matter to read well as most people imagine: There are multitudes who can read common words true, can speak every hard name clearly, and pronounce the single or the united syllables perfectly well; who yet are not capable of reading six lines together with a proper sound, and a graceful turn of voice either to inform or please the hearers: and if they ever attempt to read verse, even of the noblest composition, they perpetually affect *phrases* their own ears, as well as the company, with ill tones and cadences, without accent, and a false harmony, to the utter ruin of the sense, and the disgrace of the poet.

As for spelling, how wretchedly is it practised by a great part of the *learned* world? For having never attained a good knowledge of the general form and sound of the English letters, nor the customary and various use of *orthography*; and being utter strangers to the derivation of words from foreign languages, they neither spell according to custom, nor to the sound, nor the derivation. When they have learned the use of a pen, they make such a hideous jumble of letters to stand for words, that neither the vulgar nor the learned can guess what they mean.

Yet here I am sensible I must beg pardon of the critics, that I have allowed my readers to spell several English words rather according to custom, and the present pronunciation, than in the etymological and learned way; and that I have advised them sometimes to spell words of the same sound, and the same derivation, two different ways, if they have a different meaning; as practise, when it is a verb, with an *s*; and when it is a noun, with a *c*: For it is the happiness of any language to distinguish the writing, and, if it were possible, the sound also of every word which has two distinct senses, as we do in the words Advise and Advice; that neither speech nor writing might have any thing ambiguous.

I hope they will forgive too, if I have allowed the unlearned to spell many of the same words two ways, even when their sense is the same; as Pretious may be written with a *t*, or a *c*. Perhaps they may tell me, that both these can never be right. But in several of these instances, the critics themselves are at great variance, though the matter is of too trifling importance to be the subject of learned quarrels; and custom, which is, and will be sovereign over all the forms of writing and speaking, gives me licence to indulge my unlearned readers in this easy practice. I will never contest the business of spelling with any man; for after all the most laborious searches into antiquity, and the combats of the grammarians, there are a hundred words that all the learned will not spell the same way.

I have by no means aimed at perfection, and shall not at all be disappointed when the world tells me, I have not attained an impossibility. The English tongue being composed out of many languages, enjoys indeed a variety of their beauties; but by this means it becomes also so exceeding irregular,



that no perfect account of it can be given in certain rules, without such long catalogues of perpetual exceptions as would much exceed the rules themselves. And after all, too curious and exquisite a nicety in these minute affairs, is not worth the tedious attendance of a reasonable mind, nor the labours of a short life. If what was composed for private use, may be made a public advantage, and may assist my countrymen to a little more decency and propriety in reading and spelling than heretofore they practised, they will enjoy the benefit, and I shall rejoice to find that the service is more extensive than my first design.

Those who have a mind to inform themselves more perfectly of the genius and composition of our language, either in the original derivation of it, or in the present use and practice, must consult such treatises as are written on purpose; amongst which, I knew none equal to that *Essay towards a Practical English Grammar*, composed by Mr. James Greenwood; wherein he has shown the deep knowledge, without the haughty airs of a critic; and he is preparing a new edition, with great improvements, by the friendly communications of the learned world. When that ingenious author has finished the work he designs, if he would deny himself so far as to publish a short abstract of the three first parts of it, in two or three sheets, merely for the instruction of common English readers, I am well assured it would give them an easier and better acquaintance with the nature of grammar, and the genius of their native tongue, than any treatise that has ever yet come within my notice.

THE  
ART OF READING AND WRITING ENGLISH,  
&c.

---

CHAPTER I.—Of Letters and Syllables.

I. QUESTION.

**WHAT** is reading?

**Answer.** To read, is to express written or printed words by their proper sound.

2 Q. What are words made of?

A. Words are made of letters and syllables, either one or more; as *I, by, fire, water.*

3 Q. What is a letter?

A. A letter is the mark of a single sound; and it is the least part of a word, as *a, m, s.*

4 Q. What is a syllable?

A. A syllable is one distinct sound, made by one letter alone; as *a, e, i*; or by more letters joined together; as *ka, dan, den, pint, sport.*

5 Q. How many letters are there?

A. There are usually counted twenty-four letters in English, *a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v x y z.*

6. Q. Are all these letters of one sort?

A. Five of them are vowels, as *a, e, i, o, u*; and all the rest are consonants.

**Note.** I have here followed the old and usual custom of making twenty-four letters, and distinguishing the *u* and *i* into vowels and consonants afterwards; though it had been much more proper and natural, if our fathers had made the *u* and *j* consonants two distinct letters, and called them *ju* and *vee*, and thus made it six and twenty.

7 Q. What is a vowel?

A. A vowel is a letter which can make a perfect and distinct sound of itself, and often makes a syllable alone, as *o, a.*

8 Q. What is a consonant?

A. A consonant is a letter which can never make a syllable alone, nor give a clear and perfect sound without a vowel pronounced with it.

9 Q. How does it appear that a consonant can make no perfect sound by itself alone?

A. The very names of the consonants cannot be spoken,

nor mentioned, without the sound of a vowel; as *f* is called *cf*; *b* is called *bee*; *k* is called *ka*.

10 Q. Are the consonants all of one kind?

A. Five of the consonants are called liquids, or half vowels, because they have a kind of imperfect sound of themselves, as *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *s*; the rest are mutes, or quite silent.

## CHAP. II.—Of Letters changing their Nature, double Consonants, and Diphthongs.

### I. QUESTION.

DO the vowels never become consonants?

Answer. *i* and *u* are sometimes made consonants, and have a different shape and sound, as *ja*, *va*.

2 Q. How does the *j* consonant sound?

A. *j* when it is a consonant sounds like a soft *g*, as in the words *jest* and *judge*.

3 Q. How does *v* sound when it is a consonant?

A. The *v* consonant sounds almost like *f*, as in the words *value*, *visit*, *live*, *starve*.

4 Q. Do any of the consonants ever become vowels?

A. *y* and *w* sometimes are used for vowels.

5 Q. When is *y* a vowel?

A. *y* is a vowel whensoever it sounds like *i*, as *type*, *rhyme*; and it is often written instead of *i*, at the end of a word, as in *fly*, *city*, *mystery*.

6 Q. When is *w* a vowel?

A. *w* is a vowel when it sounds like *u*, and comes after another vowel to make a diphthong; as in these words, *law*, *few*, *town*.

7 Q. What is a diphthong?

A. A diphthong is when two vowels are joined together in one syllable, to make one sound, as *a i* in *raise*, *e e* in *feed*, *i e* in *grief*, *o a* in *goat*, *o w* in *grow*, and *u y* in *buy*.

8 Q. Are two consonants never joined together in one syllable?

A. Yes; sometimes double consonants begin words or syllables, and sometimes end them; as *f l* in *fly*, *s t* in *star*, and *n g* in *king*, with many others?

9 Q. Are three vowels or consonants never joined together?

A. Sometimes three vowels are joined in one sound, and make a triphthong, as *u a i*, in *acquaint*, *e a u*, in *beauty*, *i e u*, in *lieu*, *i e w*, in *view*; and sometimes three consonants, as *s t r*, in *strong*, *t h r* in *throw*, or four, as *n g t h*, in *length*, *r c h t*, in *parcht*, *p h t h*, in *phthisic*.

*Note.* By this means there are a few words in the English tongue that are of one syllable, and have seven consonants to one vowel; as *strength*, *stretch*.

10 Q. Do the letters never alter or lose their sound?

A. Vowels, consonants, and diphthongs alter their sound very much in different words, and sometimes entirely lose it.

11 Q. How may you know when any letter loses or changes its sound?

A. Though many of these things in the following chapters are reduced to rules; yet these rules are so large, and the exceptions so many, that we may almost as well learn this by practice.

*Note.* The following chapters, as far as the tenth, may be read by children two or three times over; but they should not be put to the task of learning them by heart. Yet if the master thinks proper to mark out a few of the most useful questions in them for his scholars to learn, he must use his own discretion in choosing them; and thus proceed to the tenth chapter.

### CHAP. III.—Of Consonants changing their Sound.

#### I. QUESTION.

WHICH are the consonants that alter their sound in different words?

Answer. Chiefly these six, *c*, *g*, *h*, *k*, *s* and *t*.

2 Q. When doth *c* change its proper sound?

A. *c* properly sounds like *k*, as *can*, *cry*, but before *e*, *i* or *y*, it is pronounced like *s*, as *cease*, *city*, *cypress*, *mercy*.

3 Q. How doth *g* change its pronunciation?

A. Three ways; when it comes before *e*, *i*, or *y*: when it comes before *h*, and when it comes before *n*.

4 Q. How doth *g* change its sound before *e*, *i*, or *y*?

A. *g* before *e*, *i*, or *y*, at the end of a syllable, always sounds soft like *j* consonant, as *huge*, *barge*, *clergy*; and sometimes before *e*, *i*, or *y*, in the beginning of a syllable, as *gentle*, *ginger*, *gipsy*; but not always, as *get*, *give*; for which there are no certain rules.

5 Q. Are *g* and *c* always sounded hard before a consonant?

A. Let it be noted, That wheresoever the letters *c* or *g* come before an apostrophe, where the vowel *e* is cut off, or left out, the *c* and *g* must still be sounded soft, as though *e* were written; as *placed*, *plac'd*; *danced*, *danc'd*; *raged*, *rag'd*; *changed*, *chang'd*.

6 Q. How doth *g* alter its sound before *h*?

A. *gh*, at the end of a syllable, only lengthens the sound of it, as *high*, *bright*, *dough*, *sigh*; which some pronounce *sithe*; except in these few words, where it is pronounced like *f*, as *cough*, *trough*, *chough*, *laugh*, *laughter*, *rough*, *tough*, *hough* and *enough*.

7 Q. How does *g* sound before *n* ?

When *g* comes before *n*, in the beginning of a word, it sounds like *h*, as *gnaw*, *gnash*, *gnat*.

8 Q. Does *h* show any alteration in its sound ?

A. *ch*, *sh*, and *th*, have a peculiar sound like new and distinct letters, as *chalk*, *cheese*, *shall*, *shew*, *that*, *there* ; and *ph*, which sounds like *f*, as *physic*, *dolphin*.

9 Q. Doth *th* always sound alike ?

A. *th* sometimes has a hard sound, as *this*, *they*, *bathe*, *brother* ; and sometimes 'tis sounded softer, as *hath*, *bath*, *thin*, *thick*.

10 Q. Wherein doth *k* alter its sound ?

A. *k* before *n*, in the beginning of a word, is pronounced like *h*, as *knock*, *knife*, *knowledge*.

11 Q. Wherein doth *s* change its pronunciation ?

A. *s* sounds sometimes softer, as *this*, *best*, *lesson* ; sometimes hard, like *z*, as *these*, *his*, *reason*.

12 Q. How doth *t* change its sound ?

A. *ti*, *ct*, and *si*, in the middle of a word, sound like *sh* ; when another vowel follows them, as *social*, *vision*, *action*, *relation* ; except when *s* goes just before the *t*, as *christian*, *question* ; also except such derivative words, as *emptied*, *mightier*, *twentieth*, which are but few.

13 Q. Doth *t* sound like *s* any where else.

A. *st* sounds like double *s* in such words as *these*, *castle*, *thistle*, *whistle*.

#### CHAP. IV.—Of Consonants that lose their Sound.

##### I QUESTION.

ARE all the consonants always pronounced ?

A. Nine consonants lose their sounds entirely in some words, as *b*, *c*, *g*, *h*, *l*, *n*, *p*, *s*, and *w*.

2 Q. When doth *b* lose its sound ?

A. *b* is not sounded at the end of a word just after *m*, as *lamb*, *comb*, nor before *t*, as *debt*, *doubt*.

3 Q. When is *c* quite silent ?

A. *c* is not sounded in these words, *verdict*, *victuals*, *indict*, *muscle*.

4 Q. Where has *g* no sound ?

A. *g* has no sound before *n*, in the end of a word, as *sign* *sovereign* ; except *condign*.

5 Q. When is *h* without sound.

A. *h* is hardly sounded in these words, *honour*, *honest*, *hair*, *herb*, &c.

6 Q. When is *l* not pronounced ?

A. The sound of *l* is almost worn out towards the end of

a syllable in many words; as *pastm*, *half*, *fault*, *talk*, *salmon*, *faulcon*.

7 Q. Where is *n* silent?

A. *n* is never pronounced at the end of a word after *m*, as *damn*, *condemn*, *column*, *contemn*, *limn*, *solemn*, *hymn*, *autumn*, nor in the words *malt-kiln*, and *brick-kiln*.

8 Q. Where does *p* lose its sound?

A. *p* can hardly be sounded in such words as these, *receipt*, *psalm*, *tempt*, *empty*, *redemption*.

9 Q. In what words doth *s* lose its sound?

A. *s* is not sounded in *isle*, *island*, *demesne*, *viscount*.

10 Q. When is *w* not pronounced?

A. The sound of *w* before *r* is almost worn out, as *wrath*, *wrile*, *bewray*; nor is it sounded after *s* in these words, *sworn*, *answer*.

Note, I have not mentioned here such consonants, as *c* in *scissors*, *science*, *ack*, *sick*, &c. and *t* in *pitch*, *catch*; *h* in *ghast*, *ghost*, *rhyme*, *myrrh*; because they have all the sound they can have, in the place where they stand.

## CHAP. V.—Of the several Sounds of single Vowels,

### I QUESTION.

DO the vowels always keep the same sound?

Answer. Every vowel has a long and a short sound, but the letter *a* is pronounced long, and short, and broad.

2 Q. How are these three several sounds of *a* distinguished?

A. *a* is sounded in short in *mat*, *cart*; 'tis long in *mate*, *care*; and broad in *malt*, *call*.

3 Q. What are the different sounds of *e*?

A. *e* is pronounced short in *hell*, *then*, *ever*; and long in *he*, *here*, *these*, *even*; and besides these, the short sound is sometimes prolonged, as *there*, *were*, *equal*, &c.

4 Q. How is *i* sounded?

A. We pronounce *i* short in *fish*, *mill*, *thin*; long in *fire*, *mile*, *thine*; and it sounds like short *u* in *first*, *third*, *bird*, *dirt*, &c.

5 Q. How is *o* pronounced?

A. 'Tis a short *o* in *not*, *rod*; 'tis a long *o* in *post*, *gold*; it is sounded double in *to*, *do*, *more*, *prove*; it sounds like *i* in *women*, and it is pronounced like short *u* in *love*, *dost*, *doth*, *some*, *comfort*, *conduit*, *money*, and some others.

6 Q. Has *u* several sounds also?

A. *u* is pronounced short in *dull*, *cut*; long in *dure*, *cure*; and it sounds like a short *i* in *bury*, *busy*; and words derived from them.

7 Q. How shall you know when these vowels are to be pronounced long or short?

A. This can hardly be determined by any general rules, but must be learned by practice ; yet there is this one rule that scarce ever fails, namely, All single vowels are short, where only a single consonant comes after them in the same syllable, as *flag, then, pin, not, cur* ; and they have a long sound if *e* be added at the end of a word, after a single consonant, as *stage, these, pine, note, cure*.

The chief exception to this rule are the letters *i* and *o* in some few common words, which custom pronounces short, though they have an *e* at the end ; as *give, live, one, some, come, gone, love, done, dove*.

8 Q. When must *a* have its broad sound ?

A. Chiefly in two cases :

First, *a* hath generally its broad sound when *l* follows it in the same syllable, as *call, false, bald, halter* ; except in some words that have a double *l* in the middle, as *tallow, sallad*, or where *f* or *v* consonant follows it, as *calf, half, salve*.

Secondly, *a* is often pronounced broad, when it comes after a *w* in the same syllable ; as *war, was, water, swan, swallow*, and some few other words.

9 Q. What general exception is there to these two rules concerning the letter *a* ?

A. *a* must be sounded long like other vowels in short words that end in *e*, though an *l* come after it, or *w* before it ; as *pale, whale, wade, ware, waste*.

## CHAP. VI.—Of single Vowels losing their Sound,

### I QUESTION.

DO the vowels ever quite lose their sound ?

Answer. One of the vowels in a diphthong often loses its sound, and sometimes single vowels too.

2 Q. When doth *a* lose its sound ?

A. A single *a* seldom or never loses its sound, except in *diamond*.

3 Q. When doth *e* lose its sound ?

A. *e* loses its sound in words of two syllables that end in *en*, as *garden, token* ; or *le* as *candle, castle* ; or *re* as *metre, lucre*.

Note, In these sorts of words the sound of the vowel may be dropt without loss ; because *n, l, r*, are liquids, or half vowels, and have some imperfect sound of their own.

4 Q. Is a single *e* ever pronounced at the end of a word ?

A. A single *e* is never pronounced at the end of a word, but where there is no other vowel in the word, as *the, he, she, me, we, be*.

5 Q. Why then doth *e* stand at the end of so many words, if it must be silent and not pronounced ?

**A.** The silent *e* at the end of a word serves two purposes :  
**First,** It makes that word a syllable long, which otherwise would be short, as *can, cane, not, note, hast, hate, bath, bathe.*  
**Secondly,** It softens the sound of *c* and *g*, as *lac, lace, rag, rage, sing, singe.*

In other words it does nothing but shew the genius and custom of the English tongue, which seldom ends a word with any other of the four vowels ; as *lie, die, toe, foe, sloe, true, virtue, plague.*

**6 Q.** Are there any words wherein *i* is not pronounced ?

**A.** *i* is not pronounced in *evil, devil, venison, marriage, carriage, business, cushion, fashion, parliament.*

**7 Q.** Doth *o* ever lose its sound ?

**A.** The sound of *o* is lost in many words ending in *on*, as *mutton, crimson, bacon.*

**8 Q.** Doth *u* ever lose its sound ?

**A.** A single *u* is always pronounced, but it is often lost when another vowel follows it after *g*, as *guard, guilty, tongue, plague* ; yet not always, as *anguish, languish.*

**9 Q.** Doth not *u* lose its sound after *q* ?

**A.** *q* is never written without *u* ; and there are some words wherein the *u* is quite silent ; as *conquer, musquet, liquor, masquerade* ; and all words borrowed from other languages that end in *que*, as *barque, risque, burlesque, oblique.*

### CHAP. VII.—Of the Sound of Diphthongs.

#### I QUESTION.

**ARE** both the vowels in a diphthong plainly pronounced ?

**Answer.** In some words they seem to be both pronounced, in some they are not, and in other words they have a peculiar sound by themselves.

**2 Q.** Give some instances of words where both vowels seem to be pronounced.

**A.** *a i* are both pronounced in the word *pain*, *o u* in *house*, *e i* in *point*, *o w* in *cow.*

**3 Q.** Give some instances of diphthongs, where but one of the vowels is pronounced ?

**A.** *a* only is pronounced in *heart*, *e* in *bread*, *i* in *guide*, *o* in *cough*, and *u* in *rough.*

**4 Q.** Give some instances where the vowels, joined in a diphthong, have a peculiar sound of their own.

**A.** *ee* in *need*, *oo* in *moon.*

**5 Q.** What is the use of writing two vowels, where but one is pronounced.

**A.** Custom has made it necessary, and it serves also gene-



rally to lengthen the syllable, or to alter the sound of the other vowel ; as *a u* in *cause*, *e v* in *people*, *o a* in *groan*.

6 Q. Do not diphthongs much alter their sound in different words ;

A, Yes ; so much, as scarce to be reduced to any certain rules, and it is better learned by custom and practice.

Note, It has been usual, with writers on these subjects, to distinguish the diphthongs into two sorts, namely, *proper* and *improper* : They call those *proper* where both vowels are pronounced ; and *improper*, where one only is sounded. But there are so many instances wherein one of the vowels is not sounded, even in those which they call proper diphthongs ; as in *aunt*, *grow*, *flow*, *cough*, *rough*, *newter*, &c. that I choose rather to make no such distinction between them ; for it is nothing but practice can teach us how and when one or both vowels are to be sounded.

We should proceed in the next place to show what difference there is in the pronunciation of proper names, or words of any foreign language.

Let it be observed in general, that most words borrowed or derived from the learned languages, namely, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, are pronounced in English, as Englishmen pronounce them in those languages ; except where the termination is altered, and those words are made English, then that determination is pronounced according to the English custom.

These words that we have borrowed from our neighbour nations, such as the French, &c. should be pronounced nearly as a Frenchman pronounces them in his own tongue.

But to help the English reader, these few following rules may be of some advantage.

## CHAP. VIII.—Of the Sound of Consonants in Foreign Words.

### I QUESTION.

WHICH of the consonants differ from their English sound in words borrowed or derived from other languages ?

Answer. *c*, *g*, *h*, and *t*, in proper names and foreign words differ a little from the usual English pronunciation ; also the double consonant *ch*.

2 Q. Wherein doth *c* differ ?

A. *c* sounds like *k* in *sceptic*, *scepticism*, *scepton*, *ascetic* ; and some proper names ; as *Cis*, *Cenchrea*, *Aceldama*.

3 Q. Where doth *ch* differ from the English sound ?

A. *ch* sounds like *k* in words derived from the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew ; as *chaos*, *character*, *christian*, *stomach*, *anchor*, *scheme*, &c. and proper names ; as *Melchizedek*, *Archelaus*, *Archippus*, and *Antioch*. But there are two exceptions.

First, except *schism*, *schismatic*, *drachm*, &c. where the *ch* is lost.

Secondly, except *Rachael*, *Tychicus*, *cherubim* ; and the words that are made English beginning with *arch*, as *arch-bishop*, *arch-angel*, *architect*, where *ch* has the proper English sound ; though if a vowel follow *arch*, the *ch*, may be also sometimes sounded like *k* ; as *archetype*, *architect*, &c. may be read *arke-type*, *arki-lect*.

4 Q. How is *ch* sounded in French words?

A. *ch* in French words sounds like *sh*, as *chevalier*, *machine*, *espuchin*, *chagrin*.

5 Q. How is *g* sounded in proper names, and foreign words?

A. *g* keeps its hard sound in most proper names and foreign words before *e* and *i*, as *Geba*, *Gilboa*, *Gilbert*, *Gelderland*, *Rhegium*; except some few, as *Geoffry*, *George*, *Gyles*, *Egypt*, and all French words, where 'tis sounded soft.

6 Q. Is *h* sounded in foreign words?

A. It is usually sounded as in English; but the sound of it quite lost in these following proper names, *Dorothy*, *Esther*, *Anthony*, *Thomas*, *Arthur*, *John*, *Humphry*, or *Humphrey*, and at the end of words after a vowel, as *Messiah*, *Jeremiah*, *Shiloh*.

7 Q. Wherein doth *t* change its English sound?

A. *t* in Greek and Hebrew proper names keeps its own natural sound, *Pelatiuh*, *Phaltiel*, *Adramittium*, &c. In Latin words 'tis sounded like *sh*, as *Gratian*, *Portius*, as it is in the English.

#### CHAP. IX.—Of the Sound of Vowels in Foreign Words.

##### I QUESTION.

IS *a* sounded in all foreign words?

Answer. The sound of *a* is almost lost in *Bilboa*, *Guinea*, *Pharaoh*, *Israel*, and some others.

2 Q. Is *e* at the end of a foreign word pronounced?

A. Yes; always in Hebrew words, as *Jesse*, *Mamre*; in Greek, as an epitome, a *catastrophe*, *Canduce*, *Phebe*; and in Latin as a *simile*, *præmunire*: except where the termination or end of the word is made English, as *Eve*, *Tyre*, *Crete*, *Kenite*, *Israélite*, *ode*, *scheme*, *dialogue*, &c. which the English learner can know only by custom.

3 Q. How are the diphthongs sounded in foreign words?

A. The learned languages, as Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, have but few diphthongs in comparison of English; therefore in words that are borrowed thence, two distinct vowels generally make two distinct syllables; as the Latin, *de-ist*, *po-et*, *cre-ate*, *co-operate*, *Je-su-it*: the Greek, *Ide-a*, *oce-an*, *Archela-us*, *Zacche-us*, *Co-os*; the Hebrew, *Kadesh-barne-a*, *Ephra-im*, *Abi-ezer*, *Zo-ar*, and *Gibe-on*.

4 Q. How is double *a*, or double *e* sounded in foreign words?

A. We meet with these chiefly in Hebrew names, and they are sounded for the most part like single *a*, or single *e*; as *Isaac*, *Canaan*, *Balaam*, *Baal*, *Beershebah*, and *Beel-zebub*.

5 Q. What are the chief diphthongs in Latin that are brought into the English tongue?

A. *a e* and *o e*, in which the two vowels are joined together often in writing, as *æ* and *œ*, and always sound like a English *e*; as *Æneas*, *Ætna*, *Cæsar*, *œconomy*; and oftentimes are so written; as *Encas*, *Cesar*, &c.

“ Here let the scholar learn the following rules, and perfectly understand and remember the two next chapters, at least the sense of them,

### CHAP. X.—Of Dividing the Syllables in Spelling.

HAVING finished all that is necessary concerning the sound of letters, I proceed to consider them as joined in syllables and words in spelling.

1 Q. What is spelling?

A. Spelling is the art of composing words out of letters and syllables, either in reading or writing.

2 Q. How are the letters to be divided in spelling words of several syllables?

A. All the letters that make up the first syllable are to be put together, and pronounced; then put the letters that make up the second syllable together, and having pronounced them, join them to the first, and thus proceed till the word is finished: As for example, in the word *Philosopher*.

*P, h, i,* ————— *Phi*  
*l, o,* ————— *lo* ————— *Phi—lo*  
*s, o,* ————— *so* ————— *Phi—lo—so*  
*p h, e, r,* ————— *pher* ————— *Phi-lo-so pher.*

3 Q. How shall I know how many syllables are in a word?

A. Consider how many distinct sounds are in it, or how many pauses or stops may be made in the pronouncing of it, for there are just so many syllables in that word, as in *butter*, *any*, *candle*, are two syllables, because they are two distinct sounds; in *tes-ti-fy*, are three syllables, because three sounds; and in *tes-ti-mo-ny* there are four.

Note here, That a word of one syllable is called a *monosyllable*, a word of two is a *dissyllable*; and three make a *trissyllable*: Words of more syllables are called *polysyllables*.

4 Q. What is the great general rule for true spelling?

A. In dividing syllables aright, you must put as many letters to one syllable as make one distinct sound in pronouncing that word; as *tri-al*, *con-straint*, *i-vy*, *but-ter*, *mag-ni-fy*, *temp-ta-tion*.

5 Q. What are the four particular rules for true spelling?

**A.** The first rule is this : A consonant betwixt two vowels must be joined to the latter of them, as *a-bide*, *pa-per*, *na-ked* ; except the letter *x*, which is always joined to the vowel that goes before, as '*ox-en*, *ex-er-cise*.

Observe here, that *ch*, *ph*, *th*, and *sh*, are to be counted single consonants, and belong to this rule, as *fa-ther*, *cy-pher*, except where they are sounded apart, as *up-hold*, *pat-boat*, *grass-hopper*.

**6 Q.** Are there not some words wherein a single consonant, between two vowels, is pronounced in the former syllable ; as *image*, *body*, *mother* ; and some others ?

**A.** In all such words the sound of the consonant is truly double, and belongs to both syllables ; but custom has determined that the consonant shall be rather joined to the latter in writing and spelling, as *i-mage*, *bo-dy*, *mo-ther*.

**7 Q.** What is the second rule for true spelling ?

**A.** When two consonants of the same kind come together in the middle of a word, they must be parted, that is, one to the former syllable, and the other to the latter, as *bor-row*, *com-mon*, *lit-tle*.

**8 Q.** What is the third rule ?

**A.** When several consonants come together in the middle of a word, they must be placed in the syllables according to the distinct sounds ; as in the words *re-store*, *be-speak*, *a-skew*, *a-squint*, *fa-ble*, all the middle consonants belong to the last syllable : but the very same consonants in *mas-ter*, *whis-per*, *bas-ket*, *mus-quet*, *pub-lish*, must be divided, one to the first syllable, and the other to the latter, because they are so pronounced.

**9 Q.** What is the fourth rule ?

**A.** When two vowels come together in the middle of a word, and both are fully pronounced in distinct sounds, they must be divided in distinct sounds, as *cre-ate*, *ru-in*, *No-ah* ; though the very same vowels are diphthongs in the words *fear*, *guilt*, *goat*, and *make* but one syllable.

## CHAP. XI.—Of Compound and Derivative Words.

### I. QUESTION.

**WHAT** sort of words are excepted from these particular rules ?

**Answer.** Compound words and derivatives.

**2 Q.** What is a compound word ?

**A.** A compound word is either made up of two distinct words, as *where-in*, *thank-ful*, *sap-less*, *cart-horse*, *up-hold* ; or it is made of one word, which is called the primitive, and a syllable going before it which is called a preposition ; such as *ad*, *en*, *un*, *sub*, *per*, *de*, *dis*, *pre*, *trans*, *re*, &c. whence arise

such words as these, *en-able*, *un-equal*, *dis-ease*, *re-strain*, *trans-act*, and such like.

3 Q. What is a derivative word ?

A. A derivative word is made of one word and a syllable coming after it, which is called a termination ; such as *ed* in *painted*, *en* in *gold-en*, *ess* in *count-ess*, *est* in *read-est*, *eth* in *speak-eth*, *er* in *hear-er*, *ing* in *talking*, *ish* in *fool-ish*, *ist* in *art-ist*, *ous* in *covet-ous*, *ly* in *kind-ly* ; and several others.

4 Q. How must compound and derivative words be divided in spelling ?

A. The single words must keep their own proper letters and syllables distinct, and the little prepositions or terminations must be spelt distinct by themselves.

5 Q. Are any compound words excepted from this rule ?

A. In such as are derived from the Latin, Greek, or Hebrew, as *adorn*, *proselyte*, *transient*, *iniquity*, *Bethel*, and several others, the primitive word can never be distinguished without the knowledge of other tongues ; and therefore the English scholar may spell them according to the common rules, without just blame ; as *pro-selyte*, *tran-sient*, *a-dorn*, *ini-quity*, *Be-thel*.

6 Q. Are any derivative words reduced also to the common rules ?

A. Yes, there are two sorts :

*First*, Such as end in a single consonant, and double it before the termination, as *cut*, *cut-teth*, *glad*, *glad-der*, *commit*, *commit-ting*.

*Secondly*, Such as end in *e*, and lose it before the termination, as from *write* come *writ-est*, *writ-eth*, *writ-er*, *writ-ing* ; all which must be spelled by the common rules.

*Notes*, The following chapter is not necessary for children.

## CHAP. XII.—Of Quantity and Accent.

### I. QUESTION.

ARE all words and syllables to be pronounced with the same sort of voice or sound.

Answer. Every syllable must be sounded according to its proper quantity, and every word of two or more syllables must have its proper accent.

2 Q. What is quantity ?

A. Quantity is the distinction of syllables into long or short.

3 Q. How are long and short syllables distinguished ?

A. All long syllables have a diphthong in them, as *gain*, *heap*, or else the vowel has a long or a broad sound, as *gall*,

*mate, hope*; all other syllables are short; as *mat, hop, bank, string, punch*.

4 Q. What do you mean by accent?

A. The accent is a particular stress or force of sound that the voice lays upon any syllable, whether the syllable be long or short, as *ó* in *ó-pen*, *pé* in *pé-ny*.

5 Q. Doth not the accent then always belong to the long syllable?

A. Though the accent is laid much more frequently on a long syllable, than a short one, yet not always; for in these words, *móney, bórrów*, the last syllable is long, and the first short, yet the accent belongs to the first.

Yet here let it be noted, *That though in reading Verse, the accent must be on the same syllables as it is in Prose, and the words must have the same pronunciation; yet a syllable in Verse is called Long or Short, not according to the long or short vowel, but according to the accent.*

6 Q. Is the accent always the same in the same words?

A. It is for the most part the same; yet there are two cases wherein, sometimes the accent differs.

First, The same word when it signifies an action, is accented upon the last syllable, as to *contráct, to rébel*: when it signifies a thing, the accent is sometimes transferred to the first, as a *sóntract & rébel*.

Secondly, Though compound words and derivatives are most times accented like their primitives, yet not always; as *máker* has a strong accent on the first syllable, which is lost in *shoe-maker*; *prefér* has the accent on the last syllable; but *préference* and *préferable* on the first: *Fínite* has its accent on the *fi*, but *ínfinite* on the syllable *in*; and *ínfínity*, has it restored to the syllable *fi*, again.

7 Q. Doth the accent change the sound of letters?

A. Wheresoever the accent is laid on a short vowel before a single consonant, it makes the consonant be pronounced double, as *malíce, séven, bódy*, must be sounded like *mal-lice, seven, bod-dy*.

8 Q. Have any words more accents than one?

A. Yes, Some long words have two accents, as *únivérstal, ómniprésént*, both which are accented on the first and third syllables: *Tránsubstántiátion* has three; but generally one of those accents is much stronger than the other.

9 Q. Are there any certain directions where to place the accent in words of several syllables?

A. Though there can no certain rules be given where to place the accent, but custom must entirely determine: yet there is this general observation, which may be of some use, namely, *That it is the custom of the English, in most words, to remove the accent far from the last syllable; whence these particular remarks follow:*

1. That in words of two syllables, where both are short, or both long, the accent is laid generally on the first, as *mánte*, *prívate*. 2. If the first syllable only be long, the accent is very seldom laid on the last. 3. That where the accent lies on the last syllable, the word is almost always a kind of a compound, and the first syllable is a preposition, as *complète*, *dissólve*, *prérent*, *retúrñ*. 4. That in words of three, four, or five syllables, the accent is seldom laid on the two last syllables, but often on one of the first, as *cèremony*, *abómínable*, *quèstionable*, *vísionary*. 5. In words of six syllables there are frequently two accents, one on the first, and the other on the fourth, as *jústificátiôn*, *únphilosóphical*, *fámiliáritý*.

But after all the rules than can be given, I know not any thing that will lead a child so easily to put the right accent upon words, as tables or catalogues of words disposed according to their accents on the first, second, or third syllables, &c.

It must be acknowledged that our language is compounded and mingled with so many languages, that renders the sounds of letters and syllables so very irregular, that it is hardly to be learned by any rules, without long and particular catalogues of words, or by constant observation and practice.

Thus far have I followed the common method, and written these chapters in the way of *Question and Answer*: It is easy for any master to teach children the following chapters in the same manner: But it would have taken up too much room to have written the whole book in this method.

### CHAP. XIII.—Of the Notes or Points used in Writing or Printing.

AFTER such an account of *letters* and *syllables* as I thought necessary, in order to pronounce *single words* aright, we come now to consider how they are to be pronounced when they are *joined together* to make up *sentences*; and this is what we call *reading* in the most proper sense.

But before I lay down particular *directions how to read*, we must take notice of several sorts of *points* and *marks*, that are used in writing or printing, to distinguish the several parts of a sentence, and the several kinds of sentences and ways of writing which are used, that the learner may know how to manage his voice, according to the sense.

The *points* or *marks*, used in writing or printing, may be distinguished into three sorts, and called *stops of the voice*, *notes of affection*, and *marks in reading*.

The *stops of the voice* shew us where to make a pause, or rest, and take breath: and are these four:

1. Comma,
2. Semicolon;
3. Colon;
4. Period.

1. A *comma* divides betwixt all the lesser parts of the same sentence, and directs us to rest while we can tell two; as *Neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, shall separate me from thy love.* 2. A *semicolon* separates betwixt the bigger parts or branches of the same sentence, and directs us to rest while we can tell three; as, *Woe to them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter.* And especially where there is a sort of opposition between the one and the other; as, *And such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are justified,* &c. 3. A *colon* divides between two or more sentences that belong to the same sense, and have any proper connection with one another; and it requires a pause a little longer than a *semicolon*; as *My soul followeth hard after thee: thy right-hand upholdeth me.* But let it be noted, that a *colon* and a *semicolon* are often used one for the other, especially in our bibles. 4. A *period*, or full stop, shows either the sense, or that particular sentence to be fully finished, and requires us to rest while we can tell five or six, if the sentence be long: or while we can tell four, if it be short: as, *Rejoice evermore. Pray without ceasing. In every thing give thanks. Quench not the Spirit.*

The notes of affection are these two:

1. Interrogation ?
2. Exclamation !

1. A note of *interrogation* requires as long a stop as a *period*, and is always used when a question is asked; as, *What advantage hath a Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision?*

2. A note of *exclamation*, or as some call it, *admiration*, requires also a stop as long as a *period*, and betokens some sudden passion of the mind, as admiring, wishing, or crying out; as, *O that I might have my request! Alas! Alas! How is the city fallen!*

The other marks used in reading are these twelve:

- |                                      |                |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Apostrophe ' 5. Paragraph ¶       | 9. Index ¶     |
| 2. Hyphen - or = 6. Quotation "      | 10. Asterisk * |
| 3. Parenthesis () 7. Section §       | 11. Obelisk †  |
| 4. Brackets [ ] 8. Ellipsis - - or — | 12. Caret ^    |

1. *Apostrophe*, or, as it may be written in *English*, *apostrophy*, is set over a word where some letter is left out; as, 'tis, thro', lov'd, fear'd, for it is, through, loved, feared.

2. An *hyphen* joins two words together, which make a compound, as *coach-man*, *apple-pye*; or if a line end in the middle of a word, it is used to shew that those divided syllables should be joined together in reading, and make but one word.

3. A *parenthesis* is used to include something that is not



necessary to the sense, but brought in by the by, to explain or illustrate it; as, *To their power (I bear record) they were willing of themselves. I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing.*

Note, That before and after a parenthesis you must stop as long as a comma; and the words inclosed in the parenthesis, must be pronounced with a little different sound of voice sometimes.

4. *Brackets or crotchets*, are used to include a word or two which is mentioned in the sentence, as the very matter of discourse; as, *The little word [man] makes a great noise in the world.* These brackets are also used sometimes to include a part of a sentence that is cited from another author, sometimes to inclose a word or sentence that is to be explained, and sometime the explication itself; as, *When David said, [Thou wilt shew me the path of life] he foretold the resurrection of Christ; Psal. xvi. 11.*

Note, That brackets and parenthesis [ ] and ( ) are often used for one another without distinction.

5. A *paragraph* is thus marked ¶, and is used chiefly in the bible, to distinguish a new paragraph, or where another sense or subject begins, or some new matter.

6. A *quotation* is marked with reversed commas, thus “ ”; and is used when something is repeated or quoted out of another author, both at the beginning of the quotation, and at the beginning of every line of it; as, *An old philosopher said, “ I carry all my goods about me.”*

7. A *section* § is used for the same purpose, in other books, as a *paragraph* ¶ is in the bible. *Sections* are made for dividing chapters of any book into several parts.

Note, At the end of a *paragraph*, or the end of a *section*, the reader should make a little longer stop, or pause, than he does at a common *period*.

8. *Ellipsis*, or, as some call it, a *blank line*, is used when part of the word is left out and concealed, as *D— of B—* for *Duke of Buckingham*: or when part of a sentence or verse, &c. is omitted or wanting, either in the beginning or at the end, as *— that I may recover strength before I go hence—* Psal. xxxix. 13. When part of a book or chapter is lost, it is often marked thus \* \* \*.

9. *Index or hand*, ☞ points to something very remarkable, that should particularly be taken notice of.


10. *Asterism or asterisk* \*, a *star*, and

11. *Obelisk or daggert* †, and other marks, such as *parallels* || and |||, &c. refer the reader to something in the margin.

12. A *caret* is made thus ^, and is set under the line, where some word or syllable is left out, which is commonly written above the line, and should be read where this note stands,

and  
in fear God, honour the king.

But this is used only in writing, not in printing; and it is called *interlining*.

It may not be amiss to add here, that crooked line which is usually called *braces*,  whose design is to couple two or more words or lines together, that have relation to one thing; thus,

The letter A has  $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{a long} \\ \text{a short} \\ \text{or} \\ \text{a broad} \end{array} \right\} \text{sound.}$

And it saves the writer the trouble of repeating the same word, or words.

It is used also sometimes in poetry, when three lines have the same rhyme or ending; as,

“ Not all the skill that mortals have,  
“ Can stop the hand of death, or save  
“ Their flow-mortals from the grave.” }

There are also some other *marks* that belong to single words, and not to sentences; but these are seldom used except in particular books, especially such as treat of grammar, spelling, poetry, &c. namely,

*Dialysis* .. over two vowels, to shew they must be pronounced in distinct syllables, as *Raphäel*.

*Circumflex* ^ over a long syllable, as *Euphrâtes*, *Thessolonica*, *Aristobûlus*.

*Accent* ' to shew where the stress or force of the sound must be placed, as *côntant*, *côntempt*.

A *double accent* " shews the following consonant is pronounced double, as *bû-nish*.

#### CHAP. XIV.—Directions for Reading.

BEFORE I give any directions to *scholars*, I would take the freedom here to propose one to the *teacher*; and that is, That what lessons soever he appoints the child to spell or read, he should sometimes spell or read that very lesson over before the child; whether it be the tables of syllables, or words, or names, or verses in the bible or testament; or whether it be a news-paper, an oration, a dialogue, poetry, &c. And let him observe the stops, read slow, give the proper accents distinctly to every word, and every part of the sentence. Children that have a tolerable ear, will take in the sounds well, and imitate their master's voice, and be secured against an ill turn of voice,

or unhappy tone, by this method ; and they will better learn to pronounce well whatsoever they read by this method, than by a mere correction of their faults, without any example.

If the master keeps several scholars to the same lesson, this may be done with ease ; for all may attend in their own books while the master spells or reads.

The chief *directions* which should be given to learners, in order to read and pronounce well, are such as these :

1. Be sure you take due pains in learning to pronounce common single words well, by attaining a perfect knowledge of the nature and sound of the vowels and consonants, and especially the double consonants, and the diphthongs : then it will be a very easy matter to join the syllables together in reading harder and longer words, and to join words together in reading sentences.

2. If you do not certainly know any word at first sight, do not guess at it, lest thereby you get a habit of miscalling words, and reading falsely ; and be sure to spell every word and syllable before you pronounce it, if you are not acquainted with it.

I confess it does not appear so well, when you are reading in company to spell letter by letter ; therefore spell any strange long word you meet with in your mind, syllable by syllable, and pronounce it slowly, step by step ; and thus you may read the longest word in the world easily, as *ma-her-sha-lal-hash-baz* ; Is. viii. 1. But this is merely an indulgence to those who are not able to read better.

3. Have a care of putting *hem's* and *o's* and *ha's*, between your words ; but pronounce every syllable distinct and clear, without a long drawling tone.

Let the tone and sound of your voice in *reading* be the same as it is in *speaking* ; and do not affect to change that natural and easy sound wherewith you *speak*, for a strange, new, awkward tone, as some do when they begin to *read* ; which would almost persuade our ears that the *speaker* and the *reader* were two different persons, if our eyes did not tell us the contrary.

4. Take heed of hurrying your words or syllables over in *haste*, lest thereby you are led to *flutter* or *stammer*, in speaking or reading ; it is better to read slow at first : but most children, when they come to read well, are in danger of too much *hurry* and *speed* in their pronunciation, whereby many of your lesser syllables are ready to be cut off or lost, and the language becomes a kind of *gibberish*, and is scarce to be understood.

5. Children may be taught to let their voice in reading be *so loud*, as that every one in the same room may hear and understand ; but *not loud enough* to reach the next room, if the doors be shut. The reader's voice should be such as may give a clear and distinct sound of every syllable to those who must hear, let the subject matter be of any kind whatsoever ; but if it be any thing passionate or affecting, the voice may be raised a little higher.

6. Make proper stops and pauses, according as the points direct; as the *comma*, *semicolon*, *colon*, and *period*; by which the hearers will better understand all that you read, and you will have time to take breath to continue in reading.

But be sure to make no stops where the sense admits of none; and take care to avoid that faulty custom of reading all the short little words quick, and the solid and longer words of a sentence very slow: for such a reader, by the *jerks* and *starts* of his voice, destroys the sense, and suffers no hearer to understand it.

7. As the accent, or stress of the voice, must be placed on the proper syllable in pronouncing each word, so a proper accent must be given to such words in a sentence, whereby the force and meaning of that sentence may best appear. This is called the *emphasis*.

The notes of *interrogation*, *admiration*, &c. are often useful to direct where the *emphasis* must be placed; which shall be farther explained in the next chapter.

8. Consider what the subject is which you read, and let your voice humour the sense a little.

Where the subject is merely *historical*, as a *news-paper* or a *story*, or any relation of what was done, there you should not vary the accents very much, nor affect so strong and passionate a pronunciation, as you ought to do where the subject is *affecting* or *persuasive*; as in an *oration*, an *exhortation*, or the more practical parts of a *sermon*.

Where the sense is *grave* and *solemn*, especially if it be in the way of *instruction*, or *explaining* any point of difficulty, let your voice be more slow, and pronounce every word very distinctly; but where the subject is some *familiar*, *easy*, and *pleasant* matter, let your pronunciation be a little more speedy: But still remember, that to read too fast, is a greater fault, at all times, than to read too slow, supposing that the *accents* and *emphasis* be well observed.

9. Attend with diligence when you hear persons who read well: observe the manner how they pronounce; take notice where they give a different turn to their voice; mark in what sort of sentences, and in what parts of any sentence, they alter the sound; and then endeavour to imitate them. Thus you will learn a graceful cadence of voice in *reading*; as you may learn the change of the notes in *singing*, by rote as well as by rule and by the ear, attending to the teacher, together with the eye fixed upon the book of tunes.

10. Let those who desire to read gracefully, practise it often in the presence of such as have an harmonious ear, and understand good reading; and let them be willing and desirous to be corrected.

Let the master once or twice a week appoint his best scho-

lars to read some oration, some affectionate sermon, some poetry, some news-paper, some familiar dialogues, to shew them how to pronounce different sorts of writing, by correcting their mistakes.

Though I would advise young persons to read aloud even sometimes in private, in order to obtain a graceful pronunciation; yet I would not have them trust only to their *private reading*, for this purpose, lest they fall into some foolish and self-pleasing tones, of which their own ears are not sufficient judges, and thereby settle themselves in an ill habit, which they may carry with them even to old age, and beyond all possibility of cure.

CHAP XV.—*Of the Emphasis, or Accent which belongs to some special Word or Words in a Sentence.*

IT has been said already, that as that force of the voice which is placed on the proper syllable in each word, is called the *accent*: so that stress or force of sound that is laid on a particular word in a sentence, is called the *emphasis*.

The word on which the stress is laid, is called the *emphatical word*, because it gives force, and spirit, or beauty, to the whole sentence; as in Nehem. vi. 11. *Should such a man as I flee?* The little word *I* is the most *emphatical*, and requires the accent.

To place an *emphasis* upon any word, is only to pronounce that word with a peculiar strength of voice above the rest. But if the word be of two syllables, then the accented syllable of the *emphatical* word must be pronounced stronger than otherwise it would be, and not any new or different *accent* placed upon that word. As in this question, *Did you travel to London, or to York, last week?* The first syllable in *London*, and the word *York*, must both be pronounced with a strong sound, because the *emphasis* lies on those two words.

And upon this consideration it is, that we use the words *accent* or *emphasis* indifferently, to signify the stress that must be laid on any word in a sentence, because both are usually placed on the same syllable.

Yet if it happen that there be a plain opposition between two words in a sentence, whereof one differs from the other but in part, as *righteous* and *unrighteous*; *form* and *reform*, or *conform*; *proper* and *improper*; *just* and *unjust*; then the accent is often removed from its common place, and fixed on that first syllable in which those words differ; as, *If I would form my manners well, I must not conform to the world, but rather reform it. The just must die as well as the unjust.* Whereas if these words *unjust* or *conform* stood by themselves in a sentence,

without such an opposition, the accent would lie on the last syllable ; as, *I would never conform to their unjust practices.*

As there may be two accents upon one word, so there may be two or three emphasis in one sentence ; as, *James is neither a fool, nor a wit, a blockhead, nor a poet.* Now in this sentence, *fool, wit, blockhead, poet,* are all emphatical words

The great and general rule to find out which is the emphatical word in a sentence, is this ; Consider what is the chief design of the speaker or writer ; and that word which shows the chief design of the sentence, is the emphatical word : for it is for the sake of that word, or words, the whole sentence seems to be made.

There might be some particular rules given to find the emphatical word, such as these :

1st. When a question is asked, the emphasis often lies on the questioning word, such as, *who, what, when, whither* ; as *Who is there ? What is the matter ? Whither did you go ?* But 'tis not always so ; as, *Who was the strongest, or the wisest man ?* In which sentence, *wisest and strongest* are the emphatical words.

2dly. When two words are set in opposition one to other, and one of them is pronounced with an emphasis, the other should have an emphasis also ; as, *If they run, we will run, for our feet are as good as theirs.* In this sentence *they* and *we, ours* and *theirs,* are the emphatical words.

In reading a discourse which we know not before, sometimes we happen to place the emphasis very improperly ; then we must read the sentence over again, in order to pronounce it with a proper sound : But when a person speaks his own mind, or reads a discourse which he is acquainted with, he scarce ever gives the emphasis to the wrong word.

To make it appear of how great importance it is to place the emphasis aright, let us consider, that the very sense and meaning of a sentence is oftentimes very different, according as the accent or emphasis is laid upon different words ; and the particular design of the speaker is distinguished hereby, as in this short question, *May a man walk in at the door now ?* If the emphasis be laid upon the word *man,* the proper negative answer to it is, *No, but a boy may.* If the emphasis be laid upon the word *walk,* the answer is, *No, but he may creep in.* If the emphasis be put on the word *door,* the answer will be, *No, but he may at the great gate.* And if the emphasis be placed on the word *now,* the negative answer is plainly this, *No, but he might yesterday.* And let us but consider how impertinent either of these answers will be, if the enquirer did not lay the emphasis on the proper word, that should give the true meaning of his question.

Take the utmost care therefore, in reading, to distinguish the

*emphatical word*; for the beauty and propriety of reading depends much upon it; and that every reader may fully understand me, I would lay down these *four particular rules* concerning the *emphasis*.

1st. *Carefully avoid uniformity of voice, or reading without any emphasis at all*; like a mere ignorant boy, who knows not what he reads, expressing every word with the same tone, and laying a peculiar force of sound no where: for such an one pronounces the most pathetic oration, as though he were conning over a mere catalogue of single words.

2dly. *Do not multiply the accents, nor change the tone of your voice so often as to imitate singing or chanting*; for this is another extreme, and as faulty as the former. The reader should not make new *emphasis* beyond the design of the writer: and therefore,

3dly. *Take heed of laying a stress or accent on words where there ought to be none*. Some persons have got a very unhappy custom of placing a strong sound on words, not so much according to their sense, as according to the length of the sentence, and the capacity of their breath to hold out in pronouncing it: therefore you shall find them strengthen their tone perhaps at the end of every *line*, or *comma*; and others shall do it perhaps only at a *colon*, or *period*. Now, tho' towards the end of the sentence the voice should usually suffer an agreeable turn, yet not always grow louder; for the *emphatical word* may stand perhaps in the middle of the sentence, where there is no stop at all. But this leads me to the *fourth rule*.

4thly. *Have a care of omitting the accent, or emphasis, where it ought to be placed*; for this will make the sentence lose all its force, and oftentimes conceal the meaning of it from the hearer.

Perhaps I have been too tedious here; but if these rules are not observed in *reading*, the speech of the finest orator, with all the noblest ornaments of eloquence, will become flat, and dull, and feeble, and have no power to charm or persuade.

#### CHAP. XVI.—*Observations concerning the Letters in printed Books, and in Writing.*

1. THE twenty four letters are called the alphabet, because *alpha, beta*, are the names of the two first *Greek* letters *A* and *B*. Note, that the great letters are called *capitals*, and the others *small*.

2. The round, full, and upright print, is called the *Roman*, as *Father*. The long, narrow and leaning letters, are called *Italic*, or *Italian*, as *Father*. The old black letter is called the *English*, as *father*.

3. In most books both the *Roman* and *Italian* are used, but in the old *English* letter few things are printed now-a-days, besides acts of parliament, proclamations, &c.

4. Books that are printed in the *Roman* letter, allow such parts as these to be printed in the *Italic*, namely,

(1.) The preface, and sometimes the *index*, or *table* of the matters contained in the book.—(2.) The titles or arguments of the several chapters, sections, or pages.—(3.) Examples to any rules that are laid down.—(4.) Words of any foreign language that are cited or mentioned.—(5.) Such sentences as are cited from other authors, or the speeches or sayings of any person.—(6.) Those words that have the chief place or force in a sentence, and are most significant and remarkable; where the *emphasis* is placed.—(7.) Where any word or words are made the very matter of the discourse, or are explained, those words are printed often in the *Italic*; or else the explication of them is so; as, the name of *cannon* is given to a *great-gun*.

*Note.* That if a book, or chapter, or preface, &c. be printed in the *Italic* letter, ~~then~~ all these things before-mentioned are printed in the *Roman*.

*Note also,* That most of those things which ought to be put in a different letter in *print*, ought to have a stroke drawn under them in *writing*, or be written in a different hand, or, at least, they should be included in *crotchets* for distinction sake.

#### CHAP. XVII.—Of Great Letters.

THE last observation concerning letters, is this, That *capital*, or great letters, are never used among the small, in the middle or end of words, but only at the beginning of a word; and that in the cases following.

1. At the beginning of any writing, book, chapter, paragraph, &c.

2. After a period, or any full stop, when a new sentence begins.

3. At the beginning of every line in poetry, and every verse in the bible.

4. At the beginning of proper names of all sorts, whether of persons, as *Thomas*; places, as *London*; ships, as *The Hope-well*; titles and distinctions of men and women, as *King, Queen, Bishop, Knight, Lady, Esquire, Gentleman, Sir, Madam*.

5. All the names of God must begin with a great letter, as *God, Lord, the Eternal, the Almighty*; and also the *Son of God, the holy Spirit*.

6. A citation of any author, or saying of any person, which is quoted in his own words, begins with a capital; as, *The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God*.

7. Where whole words or sentences are written in capitals, something is expressed extraordinary remarkable; as, *I AM*



*THAT I AM*, is the name of God: Whole words also are written in capitals, in the titles of books, for ornament sake.

8. When *I* or *O* are single words, they must always be writ in capitals, as *I read, O brave!*

9. It has also been the growing custom of this age in printing of every thing, but especially poetry or verse, to begin every name of a thing, which is called a *noun substantive*, with a great letter; though I cannot approve it so universally as it is practised.

CHAP. XVIII.—Observations concerning the Size, Pages, Titles, &c. in printed Books.

1. BOOKS are said to be printed in *folio*, in *quarto*, in *octavo*, or in *twelves*, or sometimes in *twenty-fours*.

Books in *folio*, are those wherein a whole sheet makes but two leaves; in *quarto*, a sheet makes four leaves; in *octavo*, eight leaves; and in *duodecimo*, or *twelves*, twelve leaves, &c.

2. A *page* in a book, is all that is written, or printed on one side of a leaf.

3. A *line* signifies all the words that stand in one rank, from the left-hand of the page to the right.

4. But when the page is divided into several parts from the top to the bottom, one of those parts is called a *column*: as in bibles, testaments, news-papers, dictionaries, all tables of catalogues of words.

5. The spaces on the side, or bottom of the page, are called the *margin*, whether they be empty, or have notes in them, which are called *marginal notes*.

6. The first page of every book, which gives an account what that book treats of, is called the *title page*; and the first part of it is usually written or printed in capitals.

7. The word or sentence that stands over the head of every page is called the *running title*.

8. The word that is written at the bottom of the page, at the right-hand, is called the *catch-word*, and is repeated again at the beginning of the next page, to show that the pages are printed in true order, and follow one another aright.

9. The great or small letters and figures that stand under many of the pages, are *marks* of the *printer*, chiefly for the use of the *book-binder* to number the sheets; as, A, B, C, note the 1st, 2d, and 3d sheet, &c.

10. Where a line begins shorter than the rest, with a great letter, it is called a *new paragraph*.

11. As *chapters* are parts of a *book*, so *sections* are sometimes made parts of a chapter, and *paragraphs* are parts of a *section*.

12. The words or sentences written just before the beginning of a chapter or section, are called the *contents* of it, or sometimes the *argument*.

CHAP. XIX.—*Observations in reading the Bible.*

1. THE Bible is divided into the *Old Testament*, and the *New*, and each of these divided again into several books, as the book of *Genesis*, the book of *Exodus*, &c. The books into chapters, namely, I, II, III, &c. and the chapters into verses, 1, 2, 3, &c.

2. There is generally a *period* at the end of every verse, though the sense sometimes is not complete; and oftentimes a *colon* in the middle of a verse, instead of a *semicolon* or *comma*; especially in the *Old Testament*.

3. This mark, ¶, is usually put at the beginning of every *paragraph*, as we took notice before.

4. In the bible those words only are printed in a different or *italic* letter, which are not found in the original *Hebrew* or *Greek*; but the translators have added them, to complete the sense, or to explain it, and therefore proper names are not distinguished by a different print, but by a great letter at the beginning.

5. In the *Old Testament*, where LORD is written all in capitals, the word in the *Hebrew* is *Jehovah*: Where it is written in small letters, Lord, it is some other word in the *Hebrew*, as *Adbn*, or *Adonai*, &c.

6. In bibles with marginal notes, let these three things be observed:—

(1.) The little letters a, b, c, d, placed between the words, refer to other texts of scripture in the margin that have a like sense? and these are called *references*.—(2.) An *obelisk* or *dagger* †, is used to shew what are the words, or literal expressions of the *Hebrew* or *Greek*, which the translators have a little altered, to render them proper *English*.—(3.) A *double stroke*, or *parallel* ||, is used to shew how the words may be differently translated. *Lastly*, It is an useful thing also to remark, that the very same names are spelled different ways in the *Old Testament*, and in the *New*; because the words in the *Old Testament* are much according to the *Hebrew*, from whence they are translated, and the *New* are spelled according to the *Greek*. See the seventh table.

## CHAPTER XX.—Of Reading Verse.

THERE are two ways of writing on any subject, and these are *prose and verse*; or, in other words, *plain language and poetry*.

*Prose* is the common manner of writing where there is no necessary confinement to a certain number of syllables, or placing the words in any peculiar form.

English *verse* generally includes both *metre* and *rhyme*.

When every line is confined to a certain number of syllables and the words so placed, that the accents may naturally fall on such peculiar syllables as make a sort of harmony to the ear; this is called the *metre*.

When two or more verses, near to each other, end with the same, or a like sound, the verse is said to have *rhyme* :

## TAKE THESE EXAMPLES :

“ I’ve tasted all the pleasures here,  
 “ They are not lasting, nor sincere,  
 “ To eat and drink, discourse and play,  
 “ To-morrow as we do to-day :  
 “ This beaten track of life I’ve trod  
 “ So long, it grows a tedious road.”

SIR R. BLACKMORE.

## OR THUS :

“ Patience a little longer hold,  
 “ A while this mortal burden bear ;  
 “ When a few moments more are told,  
 “ All this vain scene will disappear :  
 “ Immortal life will follow this,  
 “ And guilt and grief be chang’d for endless joy and bliss.”

Sir R. B.

Sometimes a *double rhyme* is used, and the two last syllables chime together ; but this is seldom admitted, except in comical, pleasant, or familiar verse : as,

“ What made thee, Tom, last night so merry ?  
 “ Was it good ale, or good canary ?”

Sometimes *English* verse is written *without rhyme*, and is called *blank verse*. For instance of this, take the description of hell in Milton’s admirable poem, called *Paradise lost*.

“ Regions of sorrow, doleful shades, where peace  
 “ And rest can never dwell: Hope never comes,  
 “ That comes to all ; but torture without end  
 “ Still urges ; and a fiery deluge fed  
 “ With ever-burning sulphur unconsum’d.”

But in this sort of verse the *metre* is observed, as much as if it had *rhyme* also.

In *English* metre the words are generally so disposed, that the accent may fall on every second, fourth, and sixth syllable ; and on the eighth, and tenth, and twelfth also, if the lines are *so long*. The first six lines of Sir Richard Blackmore’s excel-

lent poem, called *Prince Arthur*, happen to give us an instance of this without one variation.

“ I sing the Briton and his gen’rous arms,  
 “ Who vérs’d in súfferings, and the rude alarms  
 “ Of wár, relúctant lést his nátive sóil,  
 “ And úndismáy’d sustáin’d incéssant toil,  
 “ Till led by heav’n propitious hé retúrn’d,  
 “ To blés the isle which long his ábsence móurn’d.”

Now, because *English* verse generally takes this turn, ignorant persons are ready to imagine that it must be so universally, and that it is absolutely necessary to give this sort of sound to every line in poesy, and to lay a stress upon every second syllable; whereas there is a great deal of just liberty and variation, which poesy allows in this case, without destroying the harmony of the verse, and indeed it adds a beauty and grace to the poetry, sometimes to indulge such a variety, and especially in the first and second syllables of the line.

But for want of this knowledge, most people affect to read verse in a very different manner from prose; and they think it not sufficient to place a common accent, but lay a very hard and unnatural stress on every other syllable; and they seem to stop and rest on it, whether the natural pronunciation of the words will allow it or no. By this means they give a false and wretched accent to many words, and spoil good *English*, to make it sound like verse in their opinion. In short, they would not only read the song, but give it a tune too,

Let the following instance be given, wherein one of these mistaken readers will be guilty of this fault in a shameful degree:

Note, I have placed the accents in this example, not where they ought to lie, but where such a common reader would place them.

“ Anglés invisíblé to sénése,  
 “ Spreading their pinions for a shiéld.  
 “ Are thé brave souldiers bést defénce,  
 “ When cánnons in long órder sháll dispénse  
 “ Terrible sláughtér round the fiéld.”

What an hideous harmony doth this stanza make on the lips of such a pronouncer?

The great and general rule therefore of reading *English* verse is, to pronounce every word, and every sentence, just as if it were prose, observing the stops with great exactness, and giving each word and syllable its due and natural accent; but with these two small allowances, or alterations.

I. At the end of every line, where is no stop, make a stop about half so long as a comma, just to give notice that the line is ended.

II. If any words in the line happen to have two sounds, chooe to give that sound to it which most favours the metre and the *rhyme*.

To favour the metre, is to read two syllables distinct, or to contract them into one, according as the metre requires ; as the word *glittering* must make three syllables in this line ;

“ All glittering in arms he stood.”

But in the following line it makes but two ; as,

“ All glitt'ring in his arms he stood.”

The metre also is favoured sometimes by placing the accent on different syllables in some few words that will admit of it ; as the word *avenue* must have the accent on the first syllable in this line,

“ Wide avenues for cruel death.”

But in the next line it must be accented on the second syllable ; as,

“ A Wide avenue to the grave.”

To favour the rhyme, is to pronounce the last word of the line so as to make it chime with the line foregoing, where the word admits of two prononciations ; as,

“ Were I but once from bondage free,

“ I'd never sell my liberty.”

Here I must pronounce the word *liberty*, as if it were written with a double *ee*, *libertee*, to rhyme to the word *free*.

But if the Verse ran thus ;

“ My soul ascends above the sky,

“ And triumphs in her liberty.”

The word *liberty* must be sounded as ending in *i*, that *sky* may have a juster rhyme to it.

But whether you pronounce *liberty* as though it were written with *ee* or *i*, you must still pronounce that last syllable but feebly, and not so strong as to misplace the accent, and fix it on the last syllable.

So in this Verse ;

“ Unbind my feet, and break my chain,

“ For I shall ne'er rebel again.”

Here you must give the diphthong *ai* its full sound, in the word *again* ; but it must be pronounced *agen* in the following verse ; as,

“ Put Daniel in the lions' den,

“ When he's released, he'll pray again.”

Now having made these two small allowances, if the verse does not sound well and harmonious to the ear when it is read like prose, the fault must be charged on the poet, and not on the reader ; for it is certain that those verses are not well composed, which will not be read gracefully according to the common rules of prononciation.

Make an experiment now in the lines before mentioned, and if you read them like prose, you will find the justness of the natural accent is maintained in every word, and yet the harmony or *musc* of the verse sufficiently secured.

“ Angels invisible to sense,  
 “ Spreading their pinions for a shield,  
 “ Are the brave souldiers’ best defence,  
 “ When cannons in long order shall dispense  
 “ Terrible slaughter round the field.”

I might take notice here, that there are two other kinds of metre in English, besides this common sort, where the accent is supposed to lodge on every second syllable.

One sort of uncommon verse, is when the line contains but seven syllables, and a pretty strong accent lies on the first syllable in the line, and on the third, fifth, and seventh ; as,

“ Glitt’ring stones, and golden things,  
 “ Wealth and honours that have wings,  
 “ Ever flutt’ring to be gone,  
 “ I could never call my own :  
 “ Riches that the world bestows,  
 “ She can take, and I can lose ;  
 “ But the treasures that are mine,  
 “ Lie afar beyond her line.

The other sort of uncommon verse has a quick and hasty sound, and must have the accent placed on every third syllable. Matters of mirth and pleasantry are the subject of this sort of song ; and but seldom is it used where the sense is very solemn and serious. Take this instance of it :

“ ’Tis the voice of the sluggard : I hear him complain,  
 “ You have wak’d me too soon, I must slumber again.  
 “ As the door on its hinges, so he on his bed  
 “ Turns his sides, and his shoulders, and his heavy head.”

In this last line the natural and proper accent lies not on the word *his*, where the word seems to require it ; but on the word *heavy* : Yet it happens to have a sort of beauty in it here, to keep the natural accent, and thereby you shew the heaviness of the sluggard more emphatically, while he suffers not the verse to run swift, and smooth, and harmonious.

Thus let the poetry always answer for itself, but the reader should keep true to the natural accent. And, in general, it must be still maintained that the common rules of reading prose, hold good in reading all these kinds of poetry : Nor is the reader obliged to know before-hand what particular kind of verse he is going to read, if he will but follow the common pronunciation of the English tongue ; let him but humour the sense a little, as he ought to do in prose, by reading swift or slow, according as the subject is grave or merry, and if he has acquainted himself a little with verse, and practised the reading of it, where the poet has performed his part well, the lines will yield their proper harmony.

Thus it appears to be a much easier matter to read verse well, than most people imagine, if they would but content themselves to pronounce it as they do common language, without affecting to add new music to the lines, by an unnatural turn and tone of the voice.

CHAP. XXI.—*General Directions for Spelling and Writing true English.*

ALL the rules that can possibly be given, for spelling *English* words aright, can never make the scholar perfect in this work, without diligent observation of every word in the books which he reads; and by this means alone thousands have attained a good degree of skill in it: Yet considerable assistance towards this art, may be given to children, and those that are unlearned, by some general methods, and some particular rules.

The general directions for true spelling, are these:

1st. Pronounce the word plain, clear, distinct, syllable by syllable; give the full sound to every part of it, and write it according to the longest, the hardest, and harshest sound in which the word is ever pronounced; as *apron*, not *a-purn*; *cole-wort*, not *collut*, &c.

The reason of this rule is this: Most words were originally pronounced as they are written; but the pronunciation being something long and rough, difficult and uneasy, they came to be pronounced in a more short and easy way for conversation, by the leaving out some letters, and softening the sound of others: So for instance, *join* is pronounced *jine*; *purse* is pronounced *pus*; *half* is pronounced *haf*; *marriage*, *marrage*; *nation*, *nashun*; *vic-tu-als*, *vittles*: But the way of writing these words remain still the same.

2d. When scholars begin to read pretty well, let the master take their books out of their hands, after they have read their lessons, and then ask them to spell the easier or the harder words of it, such as he judges suitable to their capacities or their improvement.

Two scholars, when they have read their own lessons, may ask each other to spell the words of them, and thus improve themselves; or any two persons of advanced years, who are sensible of their own defects.

3d. Let there be a spelling exercise appointed twice a week, at least, for the whole school; and by degrees, let the master ask them to spell every word in some well-collected catalogues, and the tables in this book; and let them be encouraged by gaining superior places in their rank, as Captain, Lieutenant, &c. according as they spell most words right.

Two or three scholars may use these tables of words in a sort of sport or play, and when they ask each other to spell them, he that misses not one in ten or twenty, shall gain a pin, or two pins, or a marble, or what other toy they think proper, never exceeding the value of a farthing.

4th. When scholars begin to write well let several of them be appointed to write a page, or a column out of these, or any other tables of words, and sometimes out of the bible, or any

other book, and well observe how every word is spelt: Then let the master take all their books and papers away, and himself, or one of the best scholars, read and pronounce all the words distinctly, and let all the rest write them down, and be encouraged, or reprov'd, according to the number of faults.

Any two persons may do this for their own improvement; and the reason why I give this direction is, because once writing a line, impresseth it more upon the memory than three or four readings.

5th. Read over the chapters of this book, from the third to the tenth, with diligence, and remark how the vowels and consonants are sounded in different sort of words, English or foreign; and learn to write them accordingly: Observe where they keep their proper sound, and where they change it.

Take particular notice also what letters are silent, and not pronounced at all; and remember to put in those letters in writing, though you leave them out in reading.

6th. In your younger years especially, take all proper opportunities for writing, and be careful to spell every word true: This may be done by the help of some small English dictionary, where the words are put down in the order of the alphabet; and if you doubt of the spelling of any word, write it not without first consulting the dictionary.

The best dictionary that I know for this purpose, is entitled, *A New English Dictionary, &c.* by J. K. The second edition, 1713, in a small octavo.

---

CHAP. XXII.—*Particular Rules for spelling and writing true English.*

A great part of the English tongue is so irregular in the letters and composition of it, that it would require almost as many rules to spell by, as there are words to be spelled: But there are several other words that may be reduced into some ranks and order, and the scholar may be assisted toward the spelling them aright, by the observations, and the rules following:

The certain rules are these:

1. *ch* at the end of a word, after a short vowel, always takes *t* before it, as *catch, fetch, pitch, botch, dutch*; except some very few common words, as *much, such, rich, which*.
2. A vowel sounding long before a single consonant, requires an *e* at the end, as *fate, where, mine, bone, tune*: But very seldom after a double consonant or a diphthong, except after the letters *c* soft, *g* soft, *s*, *x*, *z*, and *v* consonant, as in *voice, fence, range, house, rouse, carve, twelve*.



3. Where *g* has a soft sound after a short vowel, & generally must go before it; as *badger, hedge, ridge, lodge, sudge*.

4. Wheresoever *g* is sounded hard after a long vowel in the end of a word, we must follow it, as *plague, intrigue, prorogue*; and in all foreign words, as *catalogue, synagogue, &c.*

5. *gh* is written instead of *g* in *ghess, ghillar, aghast, ghastly, ghost*; and *gu* in the words following, *guard, guest, guide, guile, guilt, guinea, guise*, and their compounds and derivatives, as *beguile, disguise, guilty, &c.*

6. *k* at the end of a word after a short vowel, always takes *c* before it, as *crack, knock, neck, sick, duck*.

7. Double *l* is always used at the end of words of one syllable after a single vowel, as *call, fall, fill, smell, roll, poll*.

8. Double *s* most usually ends a word after a vowel that sounds short, as *pass, goodness, miss, toss*: except a few common words of one syllable; as, *as, was, yes, is, his, this, us, thus*: except also when *s* or *es* is added to a word, as *horse, horses; kiss, kisses; despise, despises; die, dies*.

9. A long *s* is never used at the end of a word, nor just after a short *s*, in writing or printing.

The sound of *us*, at the end of a word of more than one syllable, is written *ous*, in words purely English, as *righteous, pitious, cautious, &c.*

The observations which cannot be reduced to any certain rules, are these:

1. Observe when a single vowel is sounded, whether the word be written with a diphthong or no, as *bread, heart, have* a diphthong; but *fed, part, have* not.

2. Observe the words where *ch* has the proper English sound, as *child, patch, such*; and where it is sounded hard, and written instead of *k*, as *school, stomach, character, &c.* or where it is sounded like *sh*, as in French words *chaise, machine, chagrine, &c.*

3. Observe where *sc* is written instead of *c* soft, or *s*; as *science, disciple, scent, ascent, conscience, &c.*

4. Observe where *ph* is written instead of *f*, as *physic, philosophy, triumph, camphire, &c.*

5. Observe where *que* is written instead of *k*, as *oblique, antique, musque, &c.*

6. Observe where *rh* is written for *r*, as *rheum, rhetoric, myrrh, catarrh, &c.*

7. Observe how the sound of *shi*, before a vowel, is written; whether with *ci*, as *vicious*; or *sci*, as *omniscient*; or *shi*, as *fashion*; or *si*, as *vision*; or *sii*, as *passion*; or *ti*, as *condition*. But remember where that *sh* sounds hard like *zh*, it is always written with a single *s*, as *vision, decision, occasion, confusion*.

8. Observe where *y* is written for *i*, as *presbyter*, *synagogue*, *hyme*, *type*, *myrtle*, *physic*, and many others.

9. Observe where *x* is sounded before *ion*, most times *ct* must be written, as *affliction*, *destruction*; but not always, as *crucifixion*, *complexion*, *defluxion*, and *reflexion*, which is sometimes spelled *reflection*.

10. Observe in the last place, that compound and derivative words are generally spelled as their primitives are, as *guile*, *beguiles*; *knock*, *knocked*; *catch*, *catcher*; *rich*, *richer*; *call*, *calling*.

The chief exception is in the final *e*, namely, If the first, or the primitive word, in a compound or derivative end in *e*, that *e* is often left out; as *take*, *taking*; *write*, *writing*; *house*, *household*; *horse*, *horsman*; but sometimes it must be written, as *where*, *whereof*; *here*, *herein*; *peace*, *peaceable*; which no rules can so well determine, as a general acquaintance with the English tongue.

Note also, that if the primitive word end in *y*, it may be most times changed into *i*, as in *marry*, *marriage*; *married*, or *married*; but not in *marrying*, where *i* follows it.

To provoke all my readers to observe these directions, let them know, that it is for want of skill in this art of spelling, that so many women in our age are ashamed to write, and thus forget the art of writing itself for want of practice: and if several men, whose business constrain them to write frequently, could but know the ridiculous faults of their own spelling, they would be ashamed to be so exposed. Diligent attendance to these directions, and due care in younger years, would prevent these inconveniences.

#### CHAP. XXIII.—Observations concerning the various Ways of Spelling the same Word.

THOUGH far the greatest part of English words are spelled but one way, yet there are some that seem to admit of two manners of spelling; for which these following rules may be given for our observation:

1. *e e* is sometimes written for *i e*, in the middle of a word, as *niece* *neece*; *piece*, *pcece*; *belief*, *beleef*; *thievs*, *theeves*.

2. *i n* is changed for *e n*, at the beginning of a word, as *ingage*, *engage*; *inquire*, *euquire*; *indunger*, *endunger*; *indure*, *endure*; *intangle*, *entangle*.

3. *i m* is also changed for *e m*, as *imploy*, *employ*; *imbattle*, *embattle*; *imbezzle*, *embezzle*; *imbarque*, *embarque*.

4. *k* may be left out after *c*, in words borrowed from the

Latin, as *publick*, public; *musick*, music; *logick*, logic; *pedantick*, pedantic.

5. *e l* is sometimes written for *l e*, at the end of some words, as *cattle*, *cattel*, *battle*, *battel*.

6. *o a* is turned sometimes into long *o*, and *e* final, as *coal*, *cole*; *cloak*, *cloke*; *smoak*, *smoke*; *groan*, *grone*; *shoar*, *shore*.

7. *o r* is written where *our* was wont to be written, as *labour*, *labor*; *honour*, *honor*; *favour*, *favor*; *conqueror*, *obqueror*.

8. Among other letters which are now-a-days omitted by some writers, *p* between *m* and *t* is often left out; as *presumption*, *presumtion*; *attempt*, *atteint*; so in *assumption*, *contempt*, *contemptuous*, *temptation*, &c.

9. *ph* is changed into *f* many times, as *phansy*, *phanatic*, *phantastic*, *phantom*, *phrensy*, *phlegm*, *sulphur*, *prophane*; for which are written, *fancy*, *fanatic*, &c.

10. *que* is changed into *k*, or *ke*; as *barque*, *traffique*, *masque*, *flasque*, *relique*, *chequer*, *casquet*, *musquet*, are often written, *bark*, *traffick*, &c.

11. *re* or *er* are written indifferently in these words; *theatre*, or *theater*; so *metre*, *meter*; *centre*, *center*; *sepulchre*, *sepulcher*.

12. *s* is sometimes turned into *z*, in such words as *razor*, *scissars*, *brasier*, *losenge*, *exercise*, *chastise*, *devise*, *enterprise*; which may be written *razor*, *scizzars*, *exercize*, *enterprize*, &c.

There are also many other words where *c* is made frequently to supply the place of *s*, but it is by no means proper, though it is very common; as in *dispence*, *suspence*, *scence*, *pretence*, &c. all which words ought to end in *se*, as *dispense*, *suspense*, *sense*, &c.

13. *ti*, or *ci*, are written in these words, *antient*, *vicious*, *gratious*, *pretious*, *spatious*, &c. as *ancient*, *vicious*, &c.

14. *ugh* may be left out in *though*, *tho'*, *through*, *thro'*, and in *thought*, *brought*, &c. with an apostrophe in the room of them, as *tho't*, *bro't*, &c.

15. *ugh* is sometimes changed for *w*, as in *yew*; *plow*, *bow*, *thorow*, *enow*; for *yough*, *plough*, *bough*, *thorough*, *enough*.

Upon the word *enough* there is this observation made, that, when it signifies a *sufficient quantity*, it is written always with *ugh*, and pronounced *enuff*, as *there is wine enough*. But when it signifies a *sufficient number*, it is oftentimes both pronounced and written *enow*; as, *There are bottles enow*.

16. *ul*, or *wl*, is turned into *ll* in these words, *rowl*, *roll*, *powl*, *poll*, *scrowl*, *scroll*, *controul*, *controll*.

17. Many words are written with *u* after a vowel, which

used to be written with *w* heretofore, as *noun*, *nown*; *ground*, *grownd*; *sour*, *sowr*; *caul*, *cawl*; *lowr*, *lowr*.

18. Words whose sounds end in *i*, were once written with *i*, now with *y*, as *flie*, *fly*; *bloodie*, *bloody*; *victorie*, *victory*: some are written either with *i e*, or *y e*, as *die*, *dye*; *lie*, *lye*; *tie*, *tye*: others only with *y*, as *my*, *thy*; *by*; others chiefly with *y e*, as *rye*, *pye*: as custom pleases.

19. It may be observed in general, that *i* and *y* are written for one another indifferently in many words, as *lion*, *lyon*; *tiger*; *tyger*; *praise*, *prayse*; *toil*, *toyl*; *said*, *sayd*; *paid*, *payd*.

20. Some words are written either with a double or single consonant in the middle, as well as in the end; as *aray*, *array*; *orange*, *orrange*; *forage*, *forage*; *later*, *latter*; *mat*, *matt*; *rot*, *rott*; *scof*, *scoff*; *sum*, *summ*: and words of several syllables ending in *l* as *hopefull*, *hopeful*; *speciall*, *special*: *naturall*, *natural*.

I dare not pretend to maintain that both these ways of spelling the same words in this chapter, are learnedly right and critically true. Nor do I write now for scholars and critics; but many of the learned have been wisely negligent in these lesser matters, and not wasted their time in long and deep researches after an *e*, or an *s*, or a *z*, and they have taken the liberty to spell these words different ways; and many times, in imitation of the French, have left out useless letters by way of refinement: I confess the derivation of these words is hereby lost. But after all, custom, which will be the standard of language, has rendered both these methods of spelling tolerable, at least to the unlearned.

For the words which are not reduced to any of these rules, see the sixth table.

There are also several English proper names which men spell different ways; as *Elisabeth*, or *Elizabeth*; *Esther*, or *Hester*; *Nathanael*, or *Nathaniel*; *Humfry* or *Humphrey*; *Anthony*, or *Antony*; *Gaspar*, or *Jaspar*, *Hierom*, or *Jerem*; *Giles*, or *Gyles*; *Katherine*, or *Catharine*; *Britain*, or *Brittain*. But I shall not make a distinct table of them here observation will sufficiently teach them.

I shall conclude this chapter with one remark, namely, That in old writings, and in books printed long ago, you find many needless letters used in spelling several words, which are left out in modern books and writings; as for instance, the words which we write, *son*, *gun*, *sap*, *press*, *goodness*, *tho'*, *body*, *doth*, *doest*, &c. were once written, *sonne*, *gunne*, *sappe*, *presse*, *goodnesse*, *though*, *boddy* or *boddie*, *doeth*, *doest*; and a thousand other instances there are of the like kind wherein modern writers have shortened the manner of spelling by leaving out such letters as are not pronounced.

CHAP. XXIV.—*Catalogues of Words pronounced or written in such a Way as cannot be reduced to Rules, &c.*

IN learning to read and write English, we shall find several words whose accent, pronunciation, and spelling, are not easy to be brought under any certain rules; and these can only be learnt by long observation, or by tables or catalogues drawn up for this end.

There are several other things also that relate to reading and writing, which cannot well be taught otherwise than by tables; such are abbreviations and contractions in writing and in speaking, whereby two or three letters are to signify one or two words or more, as A. M. or M. A. *Master of arts*. So numbers as one, two, three, &c. which are marked with letters, as I, II, III, &c. or with particular characters, as 1, 2, 3, &c. Various other *letters* and *marks* also are used to signify whole words, as *l.* for *pounds*; *oz.* for *ounces*; &, or &, for *and*, which may be learnt by the following table.

TABLE I.

*A Table of Words accented on different Syllables, according to the Custom of the Speaker, even when they are used to signify the same Thing.*

A'cademy	Acádemý
A'cceptable	Acce'ptable
A'dmirable	Admi'rablé
A'dvertisement	Adverti'sement
A'ttribute	Attri'bute
A'venue	Avé'nué
C'onfessor	Confé'ssor
C'ontemptible	Conté'mptible
C'ontrary	Contrá'y
C'ontribute	Contribú'te
C'overse	Convér'se
C'onservant	Convér'sant
C'orollary	Coró'llary
C'orrosive	Corró'sive
C'orruptible	Corrú'ptible
C'oncupiscence	Concupi'scence
D'electable	Delé'ctable
D'istribute	Distribú'te
G'azette	Gazé'tte
O'economy	Oecó'nomý
R'efractory	Refrá'ctory
S'uccessor	Succé'ssor
T'oward	Towá'rd
U'tensil	Uté'nzil

With some others.

Note, I do not suppose both these ways of pronunciation to be equally proper; but both are used, and that among persons of education and learning in different parts of the nation; and custom is the great rule of pronouncing, as well as of spelling, so that every one should usually speak according to custom.

TABLE II.

*A Table of Words which are accented on the first Syllable when they signify the Name of a Thing; but on the latter Syllable, when they signify an Action. The first is a Noun, the second a Verb.*

Nouns.	Verbs.
To be A'bsent	To absé'nt
An A'ccent	To accé'nt
An A'ttribute	To attri'bute
A C'ément	To cemé'nt
A C'ollect	To collé'ct
A C'omound	To compó'und
A C'onduct	To condu'ct
The C'onfines	To confi'ne
A C'onflict	To confli'ct
A C'óncert	To concé'rt
A C'onsort	To consó'rt
A C'ontest	To conté'st
A C'ontract	To contrá'ct
A C'onvert	To convé'rt
A D'ésert	To desé'rt
A F'érment	To fermé'nt
F'réquent	To fréque'nt
I'ncense	To incé'nsé
An O'bject	To objé'ct
An O'verthrow.	To overthré'w
A P'rémise	To premi'se
A P'résent	To présé'nt
A P'roject	To projé'ct
A R'ébel	To rebé'l
A R'écord	To recó'rd
R'éfuse	To refú'se
A S'ubject	To subjé'ct
A T'orment	To tormé'nt
An U'nite	To uní'te.

Note here, That names derived from these verbs, are accented as the verbs are; as, to *fermént*, *ferménting*; to *colléct*, a *colléctor*: to *objéct*, an *objéction*, &c.

TABLE III.—*A Table of other Words pronounced different Ways, when they are used in different Senses.*

AN Abuse, or injury;  
Borne, or carried;  
A Bow to shoot;  
Can't for cannot;  
Close, or near;

To abuse, or do injury.  
Born, or brought forth.  
To bow, or bend.  
Cant, unintelligible talk.  
To Close, or shut, or end.

Hie, <i>make haste</i>	Lain, or Layn, <i>did lie</i>	Mite, <i>small money</i>
High, <i>lusty</i>	Lane, <i>a narrow passage</i>	Might, <i>strength</i>
Hoy, <i>a sort of ship</i>	Latin, <i>old roman</i>	Moat, <i>a ditch</i>
Him, <i>that mus</i>	Latten, <i>tin</i>	Mote, <i>in the eye</i>
Hymn, <i>a song</i>	Lattice, <i>of a window</i>	More, <i>in quantity</i>
Hire, <i>wages</i>	Lettice, <i>a woman's name</i>	Mower, <i>that mows</i>
Higher, <i>more high</i>	Lettuce, <i>an herb</i>	Moor, <i>or marsh</i>
His, <i>of him</i>	Lease, <i>of a house</i>	Naught, <i>bad</i>
Hiss, <i>like a snake</i>	Leash, <i>three</i>	Noughtit, <i>nothing</i>
Hoar, <i>frost</i>	Lees, <i>dregs of wine</i>	Nay, <i>not</i>
Whore, <i>a lewd woman</i>	Leopard, <i>a beast</i>	Neigh, <i>as a horse</i>
Hole, <i>hollowness</i>	Leper, <i>one leprous</i>	Near, or Neet, <i>nigh</i>
Whole, <i>perfect</i>	Leaper, <i>that leapeth</i>	Ne'er, <i>never</i>
Holloo, <i>or ho! ho! to call</i>	Lessen, <i>to make less</i>	Neither, <i>none of the two</i>
Hallow, <i>to make holy</i>	Lesson, <i>a reading</i>	Neather, <i>lower</i>
Hollow, <i>not solid</i>	Lest, <i>for fear</i>	No, <i>denying</i>
Holy, <i>pious</i>	Least, <i>smallest</i>	Know, <i>understand</i>
Wholly, <i>entirely</i>	Liquorish, <i>dainty</i>	New, <i>not old</i>
Home, <i>house</i>	Liquorice, <i>a sweet root</i>	Nnew, <i>understood</i>
Whom? <i>what man?</i>	Lier, <i>in wait</i>	None, <i>not one</i>
Holw, <i>holty</i>	Lyer, <i>a teller of lies</i>	Known, <i>understood</i>
Hoop, <i>for a barrel</i>	Limb, <i>a member</i>	Neal, <i>burden grass</i>
Whoop, <i>to cry out</i>	Linn, <i>to paint</i>	Kneel, <i>bend the knee</i>
Hue, <i>colour</i>	Ioath, <i>abhor</i>	Nap, <i>sleep</i>
Hew, <i>to cut</i>	Loth, <i>unwilling</i>	Knap, <i>of cloth</i>
Hugh, <i>a man's name</i>	Line, <i>length</i>	Nit, <i>young louse</i>
I, <i>myself</i>	Loyu, <i>of veal</i>	Knit, <i>make hose</i>
Eve, <i>to see with</i>	Lo, <i>behold</i>	Nag, <i>a horse</i>
Idie, <i>lazy</i>	Low, <i>humble</i>	Knag, <i>a knot</i>
Idol, <i>an image</i>	Lose, <i>to suffer loss</i>	Nell, <i>Elenor</i>
I'll, <i>I will</i>	Loose, <i>slack</i>	Knell, <i>for funeral</i>
Isle, <i>in the church</i>	Lower, <i>to let down</i>	Not, <i>denying</i>
Isle, <i>an island</i>	Lowr, <i>to frown</i>	Knot, <i>to unite</i>
Oil, <i>of olives</i>	Made, <i>finish'd</i>	Ore, <i>of gold</i>
Imploy, <i>work</i>	Maid, <i>a young woman</i>	Oar, <i>of a boat</i>
Imply, <i>to signify</i>	Main, <i>the chief</i>	O'er, <i>over</i>
In, <i>within</i>	Maue, <i>of a beast</i>	Of, <i>belonging to</i>
Inn, <i>for travellers</i>	Male, <i>not female</i>	Off, <i>at a distance</i>
Incite, <i>to stir up</i>	Mail, <i>armour</i>	O, <i>as O brave</i>
Insight, <i>knowledge</i>	Manner, <i>custom</i>	Oh! <i>alas</i>
Ingenious, <i>of sharp parts</i>	Manor, <i>a lordship</i>	Owe, <i>to be indebted</i>
Ingenuous, <i>candid</i>	Marsh, <i>watry ground</i>	One, <i>in number</i>
Joyst, <i>a beam</i>	Mesh, <i>the hole in a net</i>	Won, <i>at play</i>
Joyce, <i>a man's name</i>	Mayor, <i>of a town</i>	Own, <i>to acknowledge</i>
Ketch, <i>a ship</i>	Mare, <i>female horse</i>	Order, <i>Rank</i>
Catch, <i>to lay hold</i>	Mead, <i>a meadow</i>	Ordure, <i>dung</i>
Kill, <i>to murder</i>	Mede, <i>one of Media</i>	Our, <i>of us</i>
Kiln, <i>for bricks</i>	Mean, <i>of little value</i>	Hour, <i>sixty minutes</i>
Kind, <i>good-natured</i>	Mein, or Mien, <i>aspect</i>	Palate, <i>in the mouth</i>
Coin'd, <i>as money</i>	Meat, <i>to eat</i>	Pallet, <i>a little bed</i>
Kiss, <i>to salute</i>	Meet, <i>fit</i>	Pale, <i>a colour</i>
Cis, <i>Saul's father</i>	Meet, <i>come together</i>	Pail, <i>a vessel</i>
Knave, <i>dishonest</i>	Mete, <i>to measure</i>	Pall, <i>a funeral cloth</i>
Nave, <i>of a cart wheel</i>	Message, <i>business</i>	Paul, <i>a man's name</i>
Knight, <i>by honour</i>	Messuage, <i>a house</i>	Pain, <i>or grief</i>
Night, <i>the evening</i>	Mews, <i>for hawks</i>	Pane, <i>of glass</i>
Lade, <i>the water</i>	Muse, <i>to meditate</i>	Parson, <i>of a parish</i>
Laid, or Layd, <i>pluced</i>	Mile, <i>by measure</i>	Person, <i>some body</i>
	Meil, <i>to labour</i>	Peal, <i>upon the bells</i>

money	Cygnets, a young swan	Fellon, a whitlow
to breweth	Signet, a seal	Felon, a criminal
to break	Baign, to touch or se	File, a smith's tool
blain's son,	Dane of Denmark	Foil, to overcome
shrub	Dam, to stop	Fillip, or Fillop, with the finger
name	Damn, to condemn	Phillip, a man's name
Caul, over the	Dear, of great value	Fir, wood
's	Deer, in a park	Furr, of a skin
, a great gun	Decent, becoming	Floor, ground
a rule	Descent, going down	Flour, for bread
chief	Deep, low in the earth	Flower, of the field
, a tower in Rome	Diepe, a town in France	Forth, abroad
full speed	Defer, to put off	Fourth, in number
, that carrieth	Differ, to disagree	Foul, nasty
under ground	Desert, merit	Fowl, a bird
that selieth	Desart, or Desert, a wil- derness	Fourm, to sit on
, for incense	Dew, from heaven	Form, shape
, a reformer	Due, a debt	Francis, a man's name
e, judgment	Do, to make	Frances, a woman
ry, an herb	Doe, a female deer	Frays, quarrels
y, 100 years	Dough, paste or leaven	Froise, fr'd meat
, a guard	Done, acted	Gall, bitter substance
to sit in	Dun, a colour	Gaul, a Frenchman
a job of work	Devices, invention	Genteel, graceful
, rage	Devizes, in Wiltshire	Gentile, heathen
for the neck	Doer, that doth	Gentle, quiet
ll, in London	Door, of an house	Gesture, carriage
all, a county	Dragon, a beast	Jesture, a merry fellow
, of a room	Dragoon, a soldier	Gilt, with gold
, setting a seal	Draught, a drink	Guilt, of sin
, an instrument	Drought, dryness	Glutinous, sticking
, a fruit	Ear, for hearing	Gluttonous, greedy
, of a sentence	Ear, ever	Grate, of iron
, of a bird or beast	Year, twelve months	Great, large
, not fine	Early, betimes	Grater, for the nutmeg
, race or way	Yearly, every year	Greater, larger
or garment	Earth, the ground	Grave, a boat
a cottage	Hearth, of a chimney	Grave, solemn
, a blazing star	Easter, a frust	Grown, increased
it, to do	Esther, the queen	Grot, a cave
ion, public	Eaten, devour'd	Groat, four pence
tune, to converse	Eton, a town's name	Hail, to salute
il, an assembly	Eminent, famous	Hale, to araw along
el, advice	Imminent, over head	Hare, a beast
, was able	Enter, go in	Hair, of the head
of cattle	Inter, to bury	Heir, eldest son
nt, a messenger	Envy, hatred	Harsh, cruel
nt, passab'e	Envoy, a messenger	Hash, to mince meat
as, Corinth, fruit	Exercise, labour	Hart, a beast
, of the sea	Exorcise, to conjure	Heart, the seat of life
, in the neck	Fain, desirous	Haven, a harbour
in, near relation	Feign, to dissemble	Heaven, on high
a, to cheat	Faint, weary	Heard, of cattle
bal, an instrument	Feint, a pretence	Heard, d'd hear
ol, a mark	Fair, comely	Hard, difficult
ess, a tree	Fare, a customary price	Here, in this place
us, an island	Feed, to eat	Hear, to hear ken
e, a little vessel	Fee'd, rewarded	
ie, sail near the shore		



Hie, <i>make haste</i>	Lain, or Layn, <i>did lie</i>	Mite, <i>small money</i>
High, <i>lifted</i>	Lane, <i>a narrow passage</i>	Might, <i>strength</i>
Hoy, <i>a sort of ship</i>	Latin, <i>old roman</i>	Moat, <i>a ditch</i>
Him, <i>thus was</i>	Latten, <i>tin</i>	Mote, <i>in the eye</i>
Hymn, <i>a song</i>	Lattice, <i>of a window</i>	More, <i>in quantity</i>
Hire, <i>wages</i>	Letice, <i>a woman's name</i>	Mower, <i>that mows</i>
Higher, <i>more high</i>	Lettuce, <i>an herb</i>	Moor, <i>or marsh</i>
His, <i>of him</i>	Lease, <i>of a house</i>	Naught, <i>bad</i>
Hiss, <i>like a snake</i>	Leash, <i>three</i>	Nought, <i>nothing</i>
Hoar, <i>frost</i>	Lees, <i>dregs of wine</i>	Nay, <i>not</i>
Whore, <i>a lewd woman</i>	Leopard, <i>a beast</i>	Neigh, <i>as a horse</i>
Hole, <i>hollowness</i>	Leper, <i>one leprous</i>	Near, or Neet, <i>nigh</i>
Whole, <i>perfect</i>	Leaper, <i>that leapeth</i>	Ne'er, <i>never</i>
Holloo, or ho! ho! to call	Lessen, <i>to make less</i>	Neither, <i>none of the two</i>
Hallow, <i>to make holy</i>	Lesson, <i>a reading</i>	Neather, <i>lower</i>
Hollow, <i>not solid</i>	Lest, <i>for fear</i>	No, <i>denying</i>
Holy, <i>pious</i>	Least, <i>smallest</i>	Know, <i>understand</i>
Wholly, <i>entirely</i>	Liquorish, <i>drinky</i>	Now, <i>not old</i>
Home, <i>house</i>	Liquorice, <i>a sweet root</i>	Nnew, <i>understood</i>
Whom? <i>what man?</i>	Lier, <i>in wait</i>	Nope, <i>not one</i>
Holm, <i>holly</i>	Lyer, <i>a teller of lies</i>	Known, <i>understood</i>
Hoop, <i>for a barrel</i>	Limb, <i>a member</i>	Neal, <i>harden grass</i>
Whoop, <i>to cry out</i>	Linn, <i>to paint</i>	Kneel, <i>bend the knee</i>
Hue, <i>colour</i>	Loath, <i>abhor</i>	Nap, <i>sleep</i>
Hew, <i>to cut</i>	Loth, <i>unwilling</i>	Knap, <i>of cloth</i>
Hugh, <i>a man's name</i>	Linc, <i>length</i>	Nit, <i>young louse</i>
I, <i>myself</i>	Loyu, <i>of real</i>	Knit, <i>make hose</i>
Eve, <i>to see with</i>	Lo, <i>behold</i>	Nag, <i>a horse</i>
Idle, <i>lazy</i>	Low, <i>humble</i>	Knag, <i>a knot</i>
Idol, <i>an image</i>	Lose, <i>to suffer loss</i>	Nell, <i>Eleanor</i>
I'll, <i>I will</i>	Loose, <i>slack</i>	Knell, <i>for funeral</i>
Isle, <i>in the church</i>	Lower, <i>to let down</i>	Not, <i>denying</i>
Isle, <i>an island</i>	Lowr, <i>to frown</i>	Knot, <i>to unite</i>
Oil, <i>of olives</i>	Made, <i>finish'd</i>	Ore, <i>of gold</i>
Employ, <i>work</i>	Maid, <i>a young woman</i>	Oar, <i>of a boat</i>
Imply, <i>to signify</i>	Main, <i>the chief</i>	O'er, <i>over</i>
In, <i>within</i>	Maue, <i>of a beast</i>	Of, <i>belonging to</i>
Inn, <i>for travellers</i>	Male, <i>not female</i>	Off, <i>at a distance</i>
Incite, <i>to stir up</i>	Mail, <i>armour</i>	O, <i>as O brave</i>
Insight, <i>knowledge</i>	Manner, <i>custom</i>	Oh! <i>alas</i>
Ingenious, <i>of sharp parts</i>	Manor, <i>a lordship</i>	Owe, <i>to be indebted</i>
Ingenuous, <i>candid</i>	Marsh, <i>watry ground</i>	One, <i>in number</i>
Joyst, <i>a beam</i>	Mesh, <i>the hole in a net</i>	Won, <i>at play</i>
Joyce, <i>a man's name</i>	Blayor, <i>of a town</i>	Own, <i>to acknowledge</i>
Ketch, <i>a ship</i>	Mare, <i>female horse</i>	Order, <i>Rank</i>
Catch, <i>to lay hold</i>	Mead, <i>a meadow</i>	Ordure, <i>dung</i>
Kill, <i>to murder</i>	Mede, <i>one of Media</i>	Our, <i>of us</i>
Kiln, <i>for bricks</i>	Mean, <i>of little value</i>	Hour, <i>sixty minutes</i>
Kind, <i>good-natured</i>	Mein, or Mied, <i>aspect</i>	Palate, <i>in the mouth</i>
Coin'd, <i>as money</i>	Meat, <i>to eat</i>	Pallet, <i>a little bed</i>
Kiss, <i>to salute</i>	Meet, <i>fit</i>	Pale, <i>a colour</i>
Cis, <i>Saul's father</i>	Meet, <i>come together</i>	Pail, <i>a vessel</i>
Knave, <i>dishonest</i>	Mete, <i>to measure</i>	Pall, <i>a funeral cloth</i>
Nave, <i>of a cart wheel</i>	Message, <i>business</i>	Paul, <i>a man's name</i>
Knight, <i>by honour</i>	Message, <i>a house</i>	Pain, <i>or grief</i>
Night, <i>the evening</i>	Mews, <i>for hawks</i>	Pane, <i>of glass</i>
Lule, <i>the water</i>	Muse, <i>to meditate</i>	Parson, <i>of a parish</i>
Laid, or Layd, <i>placed</i>	Mile, <i>by measure</i>	Person, <i>some body</i>
	Moil, <i>to labour</i>	Peal, <i>upon the bells</i>

the outside	Read, in a book	Spred, from Spread, &c.
a fruit	Relic, a remainder	Sign, a token
a couple	Relict, a widow	Sine, in geometry
to cut	Rere, the back-part	Site, situation
a man's name	Rear, to erect	Cite, to summon
salt	Rest, quiet	Sight, seeing
to choose	Wreat, to turn or twist	Sink, to go down
a quarrel	Rhyme or Rhythm in verse	Cinque, five
half a quart	Rime, a freezing mist	Slight, to despise
a stop	Rice, a sort of corn	Sleight, dexterity
of abode	Rise, advancement	Sloe, a sour fruit
e, a fish	Rie, sort of corn	Slow, not quick
the hair	Rye, in Sussex	Slough, a miry place
of metal	Wry, crooked	Slough, of a shoe
the fruit	Ring, the bells	Soul, of a man
ib, a leaden weight	Wring, the hands	Sole, a fish
a long stick	Rite, a ceremony	Some, a part
neck	Right, just and true	Sum, the whole
elain, or Porcelane,	Wright, a workman	Son, a nun child
ort of china ware	Write, with a pen	Sun, the heavenly light
lain, an herb	Roole, did ride	Noon, quickly
as water	Road, the highway	Swoon, to faint
er, might	Row'd did row	Sword, a weapon
lice, exercise	Roe, a kind of deer	Soar'd, did soar
tise, to exercise	Row, a rank	Sore, an ulcer
to beseech	Rome, a city	Soar, to mount upwards
a booty	Rheum, humour	Stare to look earnestly
ence, being here	Room, part of a house	Stair, a step
ents, gifts	Roote, by custom	Near, a young bullock
es, the king's sons	Wrote, did write	Steer, to guide a ship
ess, the king's daugh-	Wrought, worked	Stead, place
	Rough, not smooth	Steed, a horse
incipal, chief	Ruff, a bond	Stile, for passage
iple, the first rule	Roof, top of a house	Style, of writing
t, advantage	Sail, of a ship	Stood, did stand
bet, a foreteller	Sale, bargaining	Stud, an ambusement
becy, foretelling	Saviour, that saveth	Success, help
besy, to foretel	Savour, a smell	Sucker, a young twig
e, of paper	Sea, water	Sue, to make suit
r, of singers	Say, speak	Sew, with a needle
re, of glass	Seem, appear	Sound, noise
rry, of marble	Seam, that is sown	Tail, end
k, to torment	Scene, of the stage	Tale, a story
ck, of a ship	Seen, beheld	Tare, weight allow'd
l, water	Seas, great waters	Tear, to rend in pieces
gn, rule as king	Seize, to lay hold of	Tare, did tear
l, of a bridle	Cease, to leave off	Than, in comparing
in, dry'd grape	Sent, did send	Then, at that time
son, argument	Scent, a smell	There, in that place
e, to set up	Shew, to make appear	Their, of them
sun beams	Shoe, for the foot	Through, thorow
e, to run	Ship, for sailing	Throw, to cast
e, to blot out	Sheep, a beast	Throne, a seat of state
e, to demolish	Shoar, a prop	Thrown, cast
l, a colour	Shore, the sea coast	Tide, flux of the sea
d, did read	Shown, did shew	Ty'd, made fast
dish, somewhat red	Shone, did shine	Tile, for covering
ish, a root	Shrend, to mince	Toil, to take pains
d. a shurb	Shred, minced	Time, as day or hour

Carret, Carrot, Carot	Gaol, Jayl	Reflexion, Reflection
Camelot, Camlet	Gaoler, Jaylor	Rhyme, Rhythm
Chace, Chase	Gill, Jill	Riband, Ribbon
Chaldron, Chauldron	Gninee, Guinea	Ruin, Ruine
Cakiron, Cauldron	Guess, Ghess	Receipt, Recait
Chear, Cheer	Grandure, Grandeur	Sattin, Satten
Checker, Chequer	Hainous, Heinous	Sense, Sence
Choir, Quire	Head-ake, Head-ache	Sceleton, Skeleton
Clark, Clerk	Halser, Hawser	Shew, Show
Conatrey, Country	Hiccough, Hiccup or cup	Snipe, Snite
Cyon, Scion	Hanch, Haunch	Scritore, Scritoir
Clyster, Glistre	Houshold, Household	Surgeon, Chirurgeon
Cyder, Sider	Hearse, Herse	Sextan, Sacristan
Chamois, Shammy gloves	Hatchment, Achieve-	Scutcheon, Escutcheon
Cloth, Clothe	ment	Sparagrass, Asparagus
Choose, Chuse	Julep, Julap	Squire, Esquire
Connection, Connexion	Imposthume, Apostem	Scimiter, Cymiter
Clod, Clot	Jessamine, Jessemin	Shoos, Shoo
Crowd, Crowd	Indite, Indict	Sphere, Sphear
Collidge, College	Ideot, Idiot	Santer, Saunter
Compleat, Complete	Launch, Lanch	Steddy, Steady
Cosen, Cosen, <i>to cheat</i>	Lacquay, Lackey	Sive, Sieve
Cosen, Cousin	Landress, Laudress	Sithe, Sythe, Sciths
Curds, Cruds	Least, lest, <i>or smallest</i>	Strait, Straight
Cruise, Cruize	Lemmon, Limon	Solder, Sodder
Counsellour, Councillour	Leasure, Leisure	Scroe, Screw, <i>or Skrew</i>
Damsall, Damosel	Loath, Lothe	Soldier, Souldier
Damsin, Damson, <i>or Da-</i>	Leaver, Lever	Skreen, Screen
<i>mascene</i>	Lantern, Lant-horn	Suddain, Sudden
Demeans, Demesnes	Landscape, Landskip	Skain, Skean <i>of thread</i>
Desert, Desart	Licorice, Liquorice	Sovereign, Sovereain, <i>or</i>
Daign, Deign	Metal, Mettle	<i>reign, or raign</i>
Dram, Drachm	Murder, Murther	Stirrup, Stirrup
Eilet, Oilet-holes	Manteau, Mantua-gown	Subtil, Subtle
Ensign, Ancient, <i>ship's</i>	Meer, Mere	Serjeant, Sergeant
<i>flag</i>	Neer, Near	Supream, Supreme
Examina, Examine	Orchard, Hotyard	Sprain, Strain
Extasy, Ectasy	Peny, Penny	Survey, Surveigh
Emerods, Hemorrhoids	Perswade, Persuade	Syrup, Syrrup
Extreme, Extream	Primerose, Primrose	Spittal, <i>or Spittle, con-</i>
Felon, Fellon	Pigeon, Pidgeon	<i>tracted from Hospital</i>
Fancy, Phansy, <i>or Phan-</i>	Pretense, Pretence	Tabacco, Tabaco, To-
<i>tase</i>	Porrenger, Porringer	bacco
Faulcon, Falcon	Priviledge, Privilege	Tach, Tack
Fore-head, Forhead	Persue, Pursue	Taffety, Taffata
Fane, Vane	Periwig, Peruque	Teize, Tease
Fan, Van	Profane, Prophane	Terras, Terrace
Farther, Further	Porrige, Pottage	Thirsday, Thursday
Flix, Flux	Portmanteau, Portmantle	Troop, Troup
Flood, Flood	Plat, Plot <i>of ground</i>	Tonn, Tunn, <i>or Tun</i>
Flea, Flay, <i>or skin</i>	Plaister, Plaster	Treacle, Triacle
Fraight, Freight	Poppet, Puppet	Vellom, Vellam, Vallam
Foreign, Forreign, <i>For-</i>	Phrensy, Frenzy	Vicarage, Vicaridge
<i>rein</i>	Public, Publick	Veil, Vail
Gray, Grey	Quit, Coit	Viall, Phial
Gage, Gauge	Quoif, Coif	Waint, Waste, <i>or middk</i>
Gulf, Gulph	Quoil, Coyll <i>of ropes</i>	Whay, Whey
Gantlet, Gauntlet	Quinsie, Squinancy	Wraek, Wreck
Graff, Graft		

TABLE VIII.

99

Note, Let it be observed here (as in the twenty-third chapter) that both these ways of spelling all these words, are not the original and proper composition of them; but through the negligence of the learned, and through the prevalence of custom, both these ways become common and tolerable.

TABLE VII.—A Table of proper Names spelled different Ways in the Old Testament and in the New.

Old Test.	New Test.	Old Test.	New Test.
AHAZ,	Achaz	Judah	Judas, Jude
Ashdod,	Azotus	Kish,	Cis
Baalzebub,	Beelzebub	Molech,	Moloch,
Elijah,	Elias	Melchizedek,	Melchisedec
Elisha,	Eliseus	Naphtali,	Naphtalim
Hagar,	Agar	Nashon,	Naasson
Hannor,	Emmor	Rachab,	Rahab
Hannah,	Anna	Rebekah,	Rebecca
Hezekiah,	Ezechias	Rehoboam,	Roboam
Hexron,	Esrom	Shechem,	Sychem
Harah,	Charran	Sampson,	Samson
Hoseah,	Osee	Tyrus,	Tyre
Jacob,	James	Tarshish,	Tarsus
Jephtha,	Jephthae	Uzziah,	Ozias
Joshua,	Jesus	Zebulon,	Zabulon
Isaiah,	Esaias	Zidon,	Sidoa
Immanuel,	Emmanuel	Zion,	Sion

And some others.

Note, Here in general, That names ending in *ah* in the Old Testament are turned into *as*, if they are men, as *Uriah*, *Urias*; *Josiah*, *Josias*, &c. and into *a* if they are women, as *Sarah*, *Sara*.

TABLE VIII.—A Table of Words written very different from their Pronunciation.

Written	Pronounced	Written	Pronounced	Written	Pronounced
ADIEU,	<i>Adu</i>	Asthma,	<i>asma</i>	Bury,	<i>berry</i>
Ancient,	<i>Ainchunt</i>	Aukward,	<i>awkurd</i> , or <i>un-kuard</i>	Buy,	<i>by</i>
Almond,	<i>Annun</i>	Auricula,	<i>riggolas</i>	Buyer,	<i>byar</i>
Anise-seed,	<i>Anniseed</i>	Autumn,	<i>autun</i>	Carduus,	<i>cardress</i>
Apparitor,	<i>paritur</i>	Awry,	<i>ari</i>	Carrion,	<i>carren</i>
Apprentice,	<i>prentis</i>	Balast,	<i>ballas</i>	Centaury,	<i>centry</i>
Artichoke,	<i>hartichoke</i>	Balcony,	<i>belcony</i>	Chaise,	<i>shaze</i>
Apothecary,	<i>potiticary</i>	Balluster,	<i>bannister</i>	Chariot,	<i>charrut</i>
Answer,	<i>ansur</i>	Ballad,	<i>ballet</i>	Chorister,	<i>Querister</i>
Alchemy,	<i>occamy</i>	Beau,	<i>bo</i>	Circle,	<i>surcle</i>
Anemone,	<i>emmiery</i>	Beauty,	<i>buty</i>	Circuit,	<i>surket</i>
Apothegm,	<i>apothegm</i>	Boatswain,	<i>bote-son</i>	Cochineal,	<i>cutchineel</i>
Apron,	<i>apurn</i>	Bosom,	<i>boozum</i>	Chronicles,	<i>crunnik'ls</i>
Arustein,	<i>imposthume</i>	Bureau,	<i>buo</i>	Cockwain,	<i>cox'u</i>
At-hievement,	<i>hatchment</i>	Busy,	<i>bizy</i>	Colewort,	<i>collut</i>
Atheist,	<i>athist</i>	Business,	<i>bizness</i>	Condeit,	<i>cundet</i>
Athwart,	<i>athurt</i>			Conscience,	<i>conslunch</i>

<i>Written</i>	<i>Pronounced</i>	<i>Written</i>	<i>Pronounced</i>	<i>Written</i>	<i>Pronounced</i>
Colonel, <i>curnel</i>		Hymn, <i>Him</i>		Phthisick, <i>tizzeck</i>	
Conscientious, <i>conshen-</i>		Jaundice, <i>Janders</i>		Purse, <i>pus</i>	
shus		Jeopardy, <i>Jepurdee</i>		Pique, <i>peck</i>	
Construe, <i>constur</i>		Jessamine, <i>jassamy</i>		Pottage, <i>parrage</i>	
Coroner, <i>crowner</i>		Jointure, <i>jinture</i>		Protonotary, <i>prothoneter</i>	
Courage, <i>currence</i>		Joyst, <i>jue</i>		Psalm, <i>saam</i>	
Courtesy, <i>curchee</i>		Jonquill, <i>junkill</i>		Physician, <i>fizzishan</i>	
Cough, <i>coff</i>		Iron, <i>ivn</i>		Quotient, <i>coshent</i>	
Coyne, <i>quine</i>		Island, <i>ian</i>		Rendezvous, <i>randecoo</i>	
Cuckow, <i>coocoo</i>		Isle, <i>ile</i>		Rational, <i>rushumal</i>	
Cucumber, <i>coocumber</i>		Isthmus, <i>ismus</i>		Righteous, <i>richus</i>	
Cupboard, <i>cubbard</i>		Juice, <i>juce</i>		Rbeum, <i>rume</i>	
Cushon, <i>cooshon</i>		Knowledge, <i>hnollege</i>		Rbouleau, <i>rokelo</i>	
Cypher, <i>sifer</i>		Knob, <i>hnob</i>		Rough, <i>ruff</i>	
Cuirassier, <i>kairsser</i>		Knuckle, <i>hnukkt</i>		Saffron, <i>suffurn</i>	
Czar, <i>zar</i>		Knight, <i>hnite</i>		Sarsenet, <i>sasnet</i>	
Daughter, <i>dawter</i>		Lacquay, <i>luckee</i>		Scholar, <i>scollur</i>	
Debauchee, <i>deboshoe</i>		Laughter, <i>luster</i>		Sentinel, <i>sentry</i>	
Diamond, <i>dimun</i>		League, <i>leeg</i>		Sergeant, <i>sargant</i>	
Dictionary, <i>dianery</i>		Leopard, <i>lepurd</i>		Seven night, <i>Sennet</i>	
Dough, <i>do</i>		Lieu, <i>lu</i>		Seigniory, <i>Sennorg</i>	
Dungeon, <i>dunjun</i>		Lieutenant, <i>lestennant</i>		Scent, <i>sent</i>	
Eight, <i>ait</i>		Lychuus, <i>likeness</i>		Schedule, <i>Sedule</i>	
Entendre, <i>antowndre</i>		Liquor, <i>likker</i>		Schism, <i>Siam</i>	
Enough, <i>anyff</i>		Luscious, <i>lushus</i>		Schismatic, <i>Sismutic</i>	
Ensign, <i>Insign</i>		Machine, <i>mashcen</i>		Scummer, <i>Skmuner</i>	
Errand, <i>arrant</i>		Melancholy, <i>multancho-</i>		Sheriff, <i>Sereere</i>	
Eschew, <i>esku, or eschu</i>		lee		Shipwright, <i>Shiprite</i>	
Ewe, <i>U</i>		Mastiff, <i>mastee</i>		Sigh, <i>Si, or Sithe</i>	
Exchange, <i>change</i>		Myrrh, <i>mir,</i>		Synptom, <i>Sintum</i>	
Exchequer, <i>checker</i>		Medicine, <i>mes'n</i>		Slaughter, <i>Slawter</i>	
Emuch, <i>unuke</i>		Monkey, <i>munkee</i>		Slough, <i>Slou</i>	
Exhort, <i>exort</i>		Mithridate, <i>mettredate</i>		Sallad, <i>sallet</i>	
Eye, <i>I</i>		Monsieur, <i>mounseer</i>		Spaniel, <i>spannel</i>	
Fardling, <i>farden</i>		Mortgage, <i>morgage</i>		Stomach, <i>stumuk</i>	
Fashion, <i>fashun</i>		Money, <i>munnee</i>		Subtily, <i>sutitety</i>	
Feign, <i>fuin</i>		Nephew, <i>neva</i>		Suit, <i>sute</i>	
Fooffee, <i>foeffe</i>		Neigh, <i>nay</i>		Sword, <i>scard</i>	
First, <i>just</i>		Nauseous, <i>naushus</i>		Swoon, <i>sound</i>	
Fruменты, <i>furmittee</i>		Neighbour, <i>nebur</i>		Synagogue, <i>sinnagog</i>	
Friendship, <i>friendship</i>		Northwest, <i>norwest</i>		Through, <i>throu, or throo</i>	
Guinea, <i>Ginne</i>		Nuisance, <i>nusance</i>		Thirsty, <i>thustee</i>	
Ghess, <i>gess</i>		Nurse, <i>nus</i>		Toilet, <i>twalet or twilight</i>	
Ghost, <i>goast</i>		Ocean, <i>oshun</i>		Tongue, <i>tung</i>	
Groundsill, <i>grunsell</i>		Onion, <i>unnyan</i>		Tough, <i>tuff</i>	
Gorgeous, <i>gorjus</i>		Owe, <i>O,</i>		Truncheon, <i>trunchun</i>	
Haut-bois, <i>hoboy</i>		Ought, <i>art</i>		Tuesday, <i>teuzday</i>	
Haut-goust, <i>hogo</i>		Oatmeal, <i>otmell</i>		Vault, <i>raut</i>	
Handkerchief, <i>hankechur</i>		Pamphlet, <i>pamflet</i>		Venison, <i>ven'n</i>	
Handsom, <i>Hansum</i>		Poursuivant, <i>persevant</i>		Verdict, <i>vardit</i>	
Harangue, <i>Harange</i>		Parliament, <i>parliament</i>		Verjudice, <i>vargess</i>	
Pieough, <i>Hiccup</i>		Postscript, <i>poscript</i>		Victuals, <i>vutties</i>	
Hieroglyphic, <i>Hieroglyffe</i>		Pentateuch, <i>pentatuke</i>		View, <i>vu</i>	
Hieroglyby, <i>Hirmky</i>		People, <i>peuple</i>		Vouchsafe, <i>rootsafe</i>	
Bright, <i>Huit, or Hite</i>		Perfect, <i>perfet</i>		Voyage, <i>voige</i>	
Housewife, <i>Hizzif</i>		Phlegm, <i>flcum</i>		Upholder, or Upholster,	
Honey, <i>Huzzes</i>		Physic, <i>jizzic</i>		upholsterer	

<i>Written</i>	<i>Pronounced</i>	<i>Written</i>	<i>Pronounced</i>	<i>Written</i>	<i>Pronounced</i>
Urals, <i>ecelo</i>		Whortle-berry, <i>hurt</i> or		Wrought, <i>raut</i>	
Usquebaugh, <i>Uskeba</i>		hurtle-berry		Wry-neck, <i>ryneck</i>	
Wednesday, <i>Wensday</i>		Women, <i>wimmen</i>		You, <i>U</i>	
Weight, <i>wait</i>		Whose, <i>hoose</i>		Yotcht, <i>got</i>	
Whoredom, <i>Hoordum</i>		Wrestle, <i>ressle</i>		Yeoman, <i>yemias</i>	
Wholesom, <i>hole:sun</i>		Waist-coat, <i>wescote</i>		Youth, <i>Uth</i>	
		Wrist-band, <i>ristban</i>			

There are many other words that are pronounced in a very different manner from what they are written according to the dialect or corrupt speech that obtains in several cities of England: it would be endless to remark all these: I have therefore chosen out chiefly those words which are written different from their common and frequent pronunciation in the city of London, especially among the vulgar.

Note also, That there are some other corruptions in the pronouncing of several words by many of the citizens themselves, that were at first perhaps owing to a silly affectation, because it makes the words longer than really they are: such as *yourn* for *yours*; *ourn* for *ours*; *theirn* for *theirs*; *gould* for *gold*; *ould* for *old*; *hooskup* for *bishop*; *squench* for *quench*; *squeedge* for *squeeze*; *scroudge* for *scoundrel*; *verb* for *verb*; which I have not thought worthy of a place in this catalogue, as well as others that must be ascribed to mere ignorance, many of which I have here described, for the instruction of those who know not how to spell them.

TABLE IX.—A Table of proper Names written very different from their Pronunciation.

<i>Written</i>	<i>Pronounced</i>	<i>Written</i>	<i>Pronounced</i>	<i>Written</i>	<i>Pronounced</i>
AGMONDĒSHAM,		Dorothy, <i>Doroty</i>		Leonard, <i>Lennard</i>	
<i>Amesham</i>		Ellinor, <i>Ellenor</i> , Eleanor,		Lincoln, <i>Lincō</i>	
Augustin, <i>Austin</i>		<i>E.lcnur</i>		London, <i>Lunūn</i>	
Alresford, <i>Alyford</i>		Egypt, <i>Egip</i>		Loughborough, <i>Lufburro</i>	
St. Albans, <i>St. A:ubans</i>		England, <i>Inglan</i>		Margaret, <i>Margate</i>	
Abraham, <i>Abrum</i>		Esther, or Hester, <i>Eestur</i>		Mariborough, <i>Malburro</i>	
Aix-la - chapelle, <i>E la</i>		February, <i>Feburre:y</i>		Michaelmas, <i>Micklemas</i>	
<i>shappel</i>		Geoffry, <i>Jeffry</i>		Mary, <i>Maere</i>	
Bartholomew, <i>Baritlemy</i>		George, <i>Jorge</i>		St. Neots, <i>St. Needs</i>	
Birmingham, <i>Brummi-</i>		Ghent, <i>Gent</i>		Nicholas, <i>Nickless</i>	
<i>jum.</i>		Glasgow, or Glasgow,		Okehampton, <i>Ollkinton</i>	
Bergantot, <i>Burgany</i>		<i>Glasko</i>		Paul's church, <i>Pole's</i>	
Berwick, <i>Barrick</i>		Guernsey, <i>Gurnzee</i>		Philip, <i>Filup</i>	
Bleinheim, <i>Blenheme</i>		Gloucester, <i>Gloster</i>		Portsmouth, <i>Portmuth</i>	
Bourdeaux, <i>Boordo</i>		Guild-hall, <i>Eeld' hall</i>		Prague, <i>Praag</i>	
Brentford, <i>Bransford</i>		Hague, <i>Hu-ag</i>		Ralph, <i>Rafe</i>	
Bristol, <i>Bristo</i>		Hertford, <i>Harsford</i>		Ranelagh, <i>Ranela</i>	
Cecily, <i>Sisly</i>		Hierom, or Jerome, <i>Jer-</i>		Rhenish, <i>Remish</i>	
Champaign; <i>Shampaine</i>		<i>rum</i>		Rhine, <i>Rine</i>	
Chess-hunt or Chest-		Holborn, <i>Hoburn</i>		Rhone, <i>Roms</i>	
hunt, <i>Chess'n</i>		Hugh, <i>Hu</i>		Rotherhitb, <i>Redriff</i>	
Christ, <i>Crist</i>		Humfry, <i>Umfry</i>		Salisbury, <i>Salsberry</i>	
Christmas, <i>Crismas</i>		John, <i>Jon</i>		Sevenoak, <i>Sevmuck</i>	
Christopher, <i>Christofur</i>		Joseph, <i>Josef</i>		Sibyl, <i>Sibbil</i>	
Cireucester, <i>Sisseter</i>		Isaac, <i>Izac</i>		Sarah, <i>Sarey</i>	
Cologne, <i>Cullen</i>		Katharine, or Catharine,		Southwark, <i>Suthrick</i>	
Cenchrea, <i>Kencread</i>		<i>Cattur</i>		Stephen, <i>Stee'n</i>	
Deptford, <i>DeДФur</i>		Leicester, <i>Lester</i>		Thames, <i>Tems</i>	

Written	Pronounced	Written	Pronounced	Written	Pronounced
Thanet, <i>Tannet</i> or <i>Tennet</i>		Versailles, <i>Versails</i>		Worcester, <i>Wuster</i>	
Theobalds, <i>Tibbals</i>		Ursula, <i>Ustly</i>		Waltham, <i>Waltum</i>	
Thomas, <i>Tommus</i>		Walter, <i>Watur</i>		Westminster <i>Westminster</i>	
Toucester, <i>Tosseter</i>		Warwick, <i>Warrick</i>		Zachary, <i>Zacry</i>	
Toulon, <i>Tooloon</i>					

Note, That I have here set down only such names of persons and places as are common, and frequently occur in conversation, at least in the city of London, and in writing in our age. It would have been an endless task to mention all the little villages or towns in England, and other uations, that are corruptly pronounced, or whose spelling differs from the customary sound.

Names of places whose common pronunciation ends in *ick*, are written *ick*, as *Norwich*, *Sandwich*, *Ipswich*, *Harwich*, *Greenwich*. If it ends in *um*, they are written *um*, as *Tottenham*, *Durham*, *Shoreham*: *Berry* is written *bury*, as *Shrewsbury*, *Tewksbury*: *Horo*, is written *borough*, or *burgh*; as *Scarborough*, *Edinburgh*, *Edinburgh*, *Hamburgh*: *Ust* is written *kurst*, as *Penshurst*, *Brokenhurst*; *Ood* is written *wood*, as *Burnt-wood*, *Heywood*.

As for the letters that compose proper names of places which are very uncommon, as well as the sur-names of men, 'tis impossible to tell exactly what they are, or how to place them in spelling, without particular information; sometimes because their original derivation or true composition is far from the present sound of them, and sometimes because every person takes a liberty to spell his own name as he pleases: So *Reynolds* is a frequent surname; but it is also spelt *Reignolds*, or *Rainolds*, or *Raynolds*. So *Thomson* is spelt also *Thomson*, or *Thompson*, or *Tompson*, according to the skill or humour of the writer, or some superstitious or affected reverence to the custom of their ancestors, whether true or false.

**TABLE X.—A Table of Words joined together in common Discourse, and pronounced very different from their true Spelling.**

*IT* is contracted by leaving out the *i*, as *'tis* for *it is*; *'twas* for *it was*.

*Not* is contracted in these words; *can't* for *can not*; *mayn't* for *may not*; *sha'nt* for *shall not*; *coodn't* for *could not*; *shood'nt* for *should not*; *woodn't* for *would not*; *won't* for *will not*; *'tisn't* for *it is not*.

*Have* is often contracted into *ha*, as *ha' done* for *have done*; *hu'n't* for *have not*.

*Give* is contracted thus, *gi'mmee* for *give me*; *gee't'er* for *give it her*; *ge'n ye* for *given you*.

*Good* is contracted thus; *gaffer* for *good-father*; *grammer* for *good-mother*; *goodee* for *good-wife*.

*With* is contracted thus; *wi'mmee* for *with me*; *wee'ye* for *with you*; *goodbw'y* for *God be with you*.

*You* is thus contracted; *ben't ye* for *be not you*; *won't ye* for *will not you*; *cum'tee* for *come to you*; *how'dee* for *how do you*; *de'e no* for *do you know*; *y'a' been* for *you have been*.

*Him* is thus contracted; *tuk'n* for *take him*; *gee't'n* for *give it him*; *gee'nsum* for *give him some*.

*Them* is thus contracted; *Call'um* for *call them*; *a'tr'um* for *after them*; *gee't'um* for *give it them*.

*Penny* or *pence*, and words joined with it, are thus contracted; *Pen'uth* for *penny-worth*; *tup-pence* for *two-pence*; *trip-pence* for *three-pence*; *sip-pence* for *five-pence*; *ha'penny* or *halfpenny*; *ha'p'uth* for *halfpennyworth*.

Some of these words are now and then spelled partly as they are pronounced; but 'tis only or chiefly in pleasant and familiar writing, as *take e'm, han't, won't*.

There are many other contractions in speech used in the English tongue, which would be too tedious to describe: I have given these few only as a pattern, that the child may learn how to spell others of the like nature, by pronouncing each word distinct and apart.

There are also some other corrupt pronunciations of Latin words, or terms of art in use among the vulgar, as *iciprizys* for *si prius*; *sessarero* for *certiorari*; *suppiney* for *sub pena*; *hippo* or *hypochondriacal*; and other words that are shorten'd in speech, as *poz* for *positively*; *plenipo* for *plenipotentiary*, &c. which I cannot much approve, tho' some polite persons have used them, and thereby confirm the ignorance and ill custom of the unlearned part of mankind, without any necessity.

Here I would have it observed also, that all the three foregoing tables, namely, the *eighth*, *ninth*, and *tenth*, were not written so much with a design to teach how to *read*, as how to *write*: not to tell how such words ought to be *pronounced*, because some of those pronunciations are corrupt and too vulgar; but the design is rather to show how those words ought to be *spell'd*, which have obtained by custom so different a pronunciation.

TABLE XI.—A Table of Abbreviations and Contractions, wherein one, or two, or three Letters, stand for one or more Words.

A. or An. Answer	D. Duke
A. B. or B. A. Bachelor of arts	Dr. Doctor
Abp. Archbishop	D. D. Doctor in Divinity
A. D. <i>Anno Domini</i> or in the year of our Lord	Do. Ditto, the same
A. M. or M. A. Master of arts	E. Earl
B. Book	E. g. or ex. gr. <i>exempli gratia</i> , or for example
B. A. Bachelor of arts	F. R. S. Fellow of the royal society
Bp. Bishop	Hnble. Honourable
B. V. M. Blessed Virgin Mary	Id. <i>idem</i> , the same
B. Brother	Ibid. <i>ibidem</i> , in the same place
C. C. C. Corpus Christi college	I. H. S. <i>Jesus hominum saluator</i> , or Jesus the Saviour of men.
Cent. <i>Centum</i> an hundred	
C. S. <i>Custos sigilli</i> , keeper of the seal	



I. N. R. I. <i>Jesus of Nazareth</i>	P. S. Postscript
King (or <i>Rex</i> ) of the <i>Jews</i>	q. d. <i>quasi dicat</i> , as if he should say
J. D. <i>Juris Doctor</i> , doctor of the law	Q. Queen, or question
K. King	R. <i>Rex</i> , king, or <i>Regina</i> , queen; as W. R. king <i>William</i> . A. R. queen <i>Anne</i> . C. R. II. king <i>Charles</i> the second
Km. Kingdom	Revd. Reverend
Kt. or Knt. Knight	Rt. Right, as Rt. Wpful. right worshipful, or Rt. Honble. right honourable
L. or Ld. Lord	S. or St. Saint
L. C. J. Lord chief justice	S. S. T. <i>Sacrosancta Theologia</i> , holy divinity
Ldp. or Lp. Lordship	S. T. P. Professor, or doctor in divinity
Lap. Ladyship	S. Sc. Holy or sacred scripture
L. L. D. <i>Legum Doctor</i> , doctor of the laws	Sc. <i>Scilicet</i> , to wit, or, that is
M. Marquis	Sh. Shire
M. A. Master of arts	Sr. Sir
Math. Mathematics	Ult. <i>ultimus</i> , last
M. D. <i>Medicinae doctor</i> , doctor in physic	v. <i>vide</i> , see
Mr. Master	(viz.) <i>videlicet</i> ; or that is
Mrs. Mistress	v. g. <i>verbi gratia</i> , for example
MS. Manuscript	Wp. Worship
MSS. Manuscripts	Wpful. Worshipful
M. S. <i>Memoriae sacrum</i> , or sacred to the memory.	&, &, <i>et</i> , and
N. B. <i>Nota bene</i> , mark well	&c. &c. <i>et cætera</i> , and so forth
N. S. New stile	
O. S. Old Stile	
Pen, or <i>penult</i> . Last save one	
<i>Per cent</i> . By the hundred	
P. G. Professor in <i>Gresham</i> college; as M. of music, A. of astronomy, &c.	

There are many other contractions that are used both in print and writing, which may be reduced to these general heads:

1. Titles and characters of men; as *Adml.* admiral; *Bart.* baronet; *Capt.* captain; *Col.* colonel; *Esq.* esquire; *Gen.* general; *Gent.* gentleman; *Philomath.* philomathematicus, or a lover of mathematics; *Prof.* professor.

2. Proper names of persons and places; as *Abr.* Abraham; *Geo.* George; *Wm.* William; *Lond.* London; *Southton*, Southampton, &c.

3. Books of the bible, as *Gen.* Genesis, *Ex.* Exodus, &c.

4. Months; as *Jan.* January, *Feb.* February, *Sept.* September, &c.

5. Winds; *N.* north, *S.* south, *E.* east, *W.* west; *N. N. E.* north north-east, *W. b. S.* west and by south.

arts of books; as *Ch.* or *Chap.* chapter; *S.* or *Sect.* p. or *pa.* page; *l.* line; *v.* verse; *Qu.* question; *wer.*; *Obj.* objection; *Sal.* solution, or answer; *Ep.* *Doct.* doctrine; *Obs.* observation; *Expl.* explication,

Inscriptions on coin or money, and on medals; as *HVS D. G. M. BR. FR. ET. HIB. REX. F. D.* *Georgius, Dei Gratia Magnæ Britannæ, Franciæ & Rex Fidei Defensor.* George, by the grace of God, Great Britain, France, and Ireland, defender of the

*And on the Reverse.*

*VN. ET L. DVX. S. R. I. A. TH. ET EL. 1720.* *Brunswigæ & Lunenburgæ Dux, sacri Romani imperii sarrarius & elector, 1720.* Duke of Brunswick and rg, high-treasurer and elector of the sacred Roman 1720.

**III.—A Table of Contractions used only in Writing, but scarce ever in print in our Age.**

ccount	L. J. C. Lord Jesus	wch. which
ist	Christ	wt. what
ministrator	Mam. Madam	ye. the
tor	Mty. Majesty	yt. that
missioner	Pd. Paid	ys. this
red	qt. containing	yr. your
r	Rcd. received	Xt. Christ
ecutor	Servt. Servant	Xtian. Christian
noured	Sd. said	Xtmas. Christmas
	wth. with	
	wn. when	

is written often for *ment*, at the end of a word, as *in-commandmt.* and *t* set a little above the last letter, with a *t* under it, stands for *ant* or *ent*, in many other words *covent.* *covenant*; *obedt.* *obedient*, &c.

with a line or dash over it, goes for *tion*, at the end of a *s condicon,* condition.

dash or line over any vowel, stands for *n* or *m*; thus, *com<sup>o</sup>n* *non,* *wat* for *want*, *com<sup>e</sup>t* for *comment*.

Some of these contractions are used in books that are printed on subjects, as *Execrs. Admr. &c.* in law books; *Dr. Cr. Acct.* in books indize but seldom in other authors.

See more in the fourteenth table.

TABLE XIII.—*A Table of Numbers and Figures.*

NUMBERS are usually expressed either by these seven Roman capital letters, I. V. X. L. C. D. M. which are called *numerals*, or by these ten characters, namely, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, which are called *figures*, and 0, which is called a *cypher*.

*Their Signification.*

	1. One
	2. Two
I. One	3. Three
V. Five	4. Four
X. Ten	5. Five
L. Fifty	6. Six
C. One Hundred	7. Seven
D. Five Hundred	8. Eight
M. A Thousand	9. Nine
	0. Nothing

Observe concerning the *numeral letters*, that if a less *numeral letter* be placed before a greater, it takes away from the greater so much as the lesser stands for; but being placed after a greater, it adds so much to it as the lesser stands for: as the letter V. stands for *five*; but having I placed before it, it takes one from it, and makes both stand but for *four*: thus, IV. But I being set after V. it adds one to it, and make it *six*, VI. Take notice of these examples.

IV. Four	V. Five	VI. Six
IX. Nine	X. Ten	XI. Eleven
XL. Forty	L. Fifty	LX. Sixty
XC. Ninety	C. Hundred	CX. Hundred & ten

Observe concerning the *characters or figures*, that *cyphers* at the right-hand of *figures* increase their value ten times, as 1 one, 10 ten, 100 hundred, 7 seven, 7000, seven thousand: but at the left-hand they signify nothing at all, as 01, 001, make but one, 0002 is but two.

A figure at every remove from from the right-hand increases its value ten times, as 9 nine, 98 ninety-eight, 987 nine hundred and eighty-seven.

1. One	I.
2. Two	II.
3. Three	III.
4. Four	IV.
5. Five	V.
6. Six	VI.

7. Seven	VII.
8. Eight	VIII.
9. Nine	IX.
10. Ten	X.
11. Eleven	XI.
12. Twelve	XII.
13. Thirteen	XIII.
14. Fourteen	XIV.
15. Fifteen	XV.
16. Sixteen	XVI.
17. Seventeen	XVII.
18. Eighteen	XVIII.
19. Nineteen	XIX.
20. Twenty	XX.
21. Twenty-one	XXI.
22. Twenty-two	XXII.
23. Twenty-three.	XXIII.
24. Twenty-four	XXIV.
25. Twenty-five	XXV.
26. Twenty-six	XXVI.
27. Twenty-seven	XXVII.
28. Twenty-eight	XXVIII.
29. Twenty-nine	XXIX.
30. Thirty	XXX.
40. Forty	XL.
50. Fifty	L.
60. Sixty	LX.
70. Seventy	LXX.
80. Eighty	LXXX.
90. Ninety	XC.
100. One hundred	C.
200. Two-hundred	CC.
300. Three hundred	CCC.
400. Four hundred	CCCC.
500. Five hundred.	D. or IↃ.
600. Six hundred	DC. or IↃC.
700. Seven hundred	DCC. or IↃCC.
800. Eight hundred	DCCC. or IↃCCC.
900. Nine hundred	DCCCC. or IↃCCCC.
1000. One thousand	M. or CIↃ.
1720. One thousand seven hundred and twenty	MDCC. XX.

Note here, that the numbers are sometimes expressed by small Roman letters, as i. one, ii. two, xvi. sixteen, lxxviii. seventy-eight, &c.

That where books, chapters, sections, and verses are cited, the numeral letters are generally used to signify the book and chapter, and the figures to signify the sections, verses, or smaller parts; as Exod. xii. 17. Exodus the twelfth chap-

ter, and the seventeenth verse. So B. IX. Sect. 24. signifies book the ninth, the twenty-fourth section.

Figures are also used to express the things following, namely,

1. The order or succession of things, as 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 10th, 39th; & second, third, &c.
2. The fractions or parts of a thing, as  $\frac{1}{2}$  one half,  $\frac{1}{3}$  one third part,  $\frac{1}{4}$  fourth, or quarter,  $\frac{2}{3}$  two thirds,  $\frac{1}{2}$  quarters,  $\frac{5}{8}$  five eighths, &c.
3. The numbers of action, as 2ce twice, 3ce thrice.
4. The size of books, 4to quarto, 8vo octava, 12mo duodecimo or twelve 24mo twenty-four.
5. The months, as 7br September, 8br October, 9br November, 10br December.

TABLE XIV.—A Table of Letters and other Marks used in whole Words in Money, Weights, Measures, &c.

<p><i>In Money.</i></p> <p>l. a pound, or 20 shillings  s. or f. a shilling or 12 pence  d. a penny, or 4 farthings  q. a farthing; <i>or thus,</i>  <math>\frac{1}{4}</math> One farthing  <math>\frac{1}{2}</math> An halfpenny.  <math>\frac{3}{4}</math> Three farthings  8s. 16s. 7d. <math>\frac{1}{4}</math>, Eight pound, sixteen shillings, and seven-pence farthing.</p> <p><i>Common Weights &amp; Measures.</i></p> <p>C. an hundred weight  q. a quarter of an hundred  lb a pound  oz. an ounce  pwt. Pennyweight  hhd. Hogshead  gal. Gallon  yd. Yard  nl. Nail  mo. Month  d. Day  h. Hour</p>	<p>m. Minute.</p> <p><i>Apothecaries Weights and Measures.</i></p> <p>lb Pound, or pint  <math>\frac{3}{4}</math> Ounce  <math>\frac{3}{4}</math> Dram or drachm  <math>\frac{1}{2}</math> Scruple  gr. Grain  ls. half  <math>\frac{3}{4}</math>ii. Two ounces  <math>\frac{1}{2}</math>iv. Scruples  <math>\frac{3}{4}</math>iss. One dram and a half  gt. Drop  m. Handful  ana. Equal quantity.</p> <p><i>Numbers.</i></p> <p>6 + 2 six more two, or six increased by two.  6 - 2 six less two, or six less ed by two.  6 × 2 six multiplied by two.  <math>\frac{6}{2}</math> six divided by two.  6 = 3 + 3 six is equal to three more three.</p>
---	---

*The Seven wandering Stars, called, The Seven Planets.*

- ☉ The Sun.
- ☾ The Moon.
- ♄ Saturn.
- ♃ Jupiter, or Jove.
- ♂ Mars.
- ♀ Venus.
- ☿ Mercury.

But by the best philosophers in our age, the Sun is supposed to rest in the centre, and that the Earth is a planet, and then is sometimes marked thus ☉.

*According to the vulgar Philosophy, the Planets may be thus described in their Order.*

The Earth, the centre of the world  
 Sees all the planets round her hurl'd:  
 The Moon keeps always near:  
 Then *Merc'ry, Venus, and the Sun,*  
 And *Mars and Jove* their circuits run,  
 And *Saturn's* highest sphere.

*Or thus, according to the New Philosophy.*

First *Saturn, Jupiter and Mars,*  
 Then rolls the *Earth* among the stars,  
 And round the *Earth* the *Moon* :  
*Venus and Mercury* are next,  
 The *Sun* is in the centre fixt,  
 And makes a glorious noon.

*The Twelve Heavenly Signs or Constellations, or Companies of fixed Stars, through which the Sun passes in a Year.*

- ♈ *Aries, or the Ram.*
- ♉ *Taurus, the Bull.*
- ♊ *Gemini, the Twins.*
- ♋ *Cancer, the Crab.*
- ♌ *Leo, the Lion.*
- ♍ *Virgo, the Virgin.*
- ♎ *Libra, the Scales.*
- ♏ *Scorpio, the Scorpion.*
- ♐ *Sagittarius, the Archer.*
- ♑ *Capricornus, the Sea-goat.*
- ♒ *Aquarius, the Water-pot.*
- ♓ *Pisces, the Fishes.*

*The Twelve signs may be thus described.*

The *Ram, the Bull, the heavenly Twins,*  
 And near the *Crab the Lion* shines,  
 The *Virgin and the Scales,*  
 The *Scorpion, Archer and Sea-goat,*  
 The man that holds the *Water-pot,*  
 And *Fish* with glittering tails.

---

**THE LAST TABLE.**

I persuade myself that I shall gratify many of my readers by inserting here several copies composed for the use of children at the writing school.

**I. Copies containing Moral Instructions, beginning with every Letter of the Alphabet.**

Attend the advice Of the old and the wise.  
 Be not angry, nor fret, But forgive and forget.  
 Can you think it no ill, To pilfer and steal ?  
 Do the thing you are bid, Nor be sullen when bid.  
 Envy none for their wealth, Or their honour or health.  
 Fear, worship, and love, The great God above.  
 Grow quiet and easy, When fools try to teize ye.  
 Honour father and mother, Love sister and brother.  
 It is dangerous folly, To jest with things holy.  
 Keep your books without blot, And your clothes without spot.  
 Let your hands do no wrong, Nor backbite with your tongue.  
 Make haste to obey, Nor dispute or delay.  
 Never stay within hearing Of cursing and swearing.  
 Offer God all the prime Of your strength and your time.  
 Provoke not the poor, Tho' he lie at your door.  
 Quash all evil thoughts, And mourn for your faults.  
 Remember the liar Has his part in hell-fire.  
 Shun the wicked and rude, But converse with the good.  
 Transgress not the rule, Or at home, or at school.  
 Vie still with the best, And excel all the rest.  
 When you are at your play, Take heed what you say.  
 X Excuse, but with truth, The follies of youth.  
 Yield a little for peace, And let quarrelling cease.  
 Zeal and charity join'd. Make you pious and kind.

Note, The letter X begins no English word, so that we must begin that line with *Ex* ; unless the reader will choose this instead of it, namely,

X is such a cross letter, Balks my morals and metre.

**II. Copies containing the whole Alphabet, or the twenty-four Letters.**

Knowledge shall be promoted by frequent exercise.  
 Happy hours are quickly follow'd by amazing vexations.  
 Quick-sighted men by exercise will gain perfection.  
 A dazzling triumph quickly flown, is but a gay vexation.

**III. Copies composed of short Letters to teach to Write even with Ease.**

Virtue in an eminent station raises our esteem.  
 Art comes in to imitate or assist nature.  
 Our most virtuous actions are not meritorious.  
 Conversation is a sweet entertainment to wise men.  
 Some inconveniences await our easiest moments.  
 A covetous, or an curious man, is never at rest.

---

*In Verse.*

Astronomers can trace A comet's various race.  
 Nor snow, nor ice, nor rain, Were ever sent in vain.  
 No meaner creatures can Converse or act as man.  
 Here no man is secure To sin or mourn no more.

---

 THE CONCLUSION.

IT may not be amiss to conclude this little book with a short view of the unspeakable advantages of Reading and Writing.

The knowledge of letters is one of the greatest blessings that ever God bestowed on the children of men. By this means we preserve for our own use, through all our lives, what our memory would have lost in a few days, and lay up a rich treasure of knowledge for those that shall come after us.

But the Arts of Reading and Writing we can sit at home and acquaint ourselves what is done in all the distant parts of the world, and find what our fathers did long ago in the first ages of mankind. By this means a Briton holds correspondence with his friends in America or Japan, and manages all his traffic. We learn by this means how the old Romans lived, how the Jews worshipped: We learn what Moses wrote, what Enoch prophesied, where Adam dwelt, and what he did soon after the creation; and those who shall live when the day of judgment comes, may learn by the same means what we now speak, and what we do in great Britain, or in the land of China.

In short, the Art of Letters does, as it were, revive all the past ages of men, and set them at once upon the stage; and brings all the nations from afar, and gives them, as it were, a general interview: so that the most distant nations, and distant ages of mankind, may converse together, and grow into acquaintance.

But the greatest blessing of all, is the knowledge of the Holy Scripture, wherein God has appointed his servants in ancient times to write down the discoveries which he has made of his power and justice, his providence and his grace, that we who live near the end of time may learn the way to heaven and everlasting happiness.

Thus Letters give us a sort of immortality in this world, and they are given us in the word of God to support our immortal hopes in the next.

Those therefore who wilfully neglect this sort of knowledge, and despise the Art of Letters, need no heavier curse or pu-



nishment than what they chuse for themselves, namely, "To live and die in ignorance, both of the things of God and man."

If the terror of such a thought will not awaken the slothful to seek so much acquaintance with their Mother Tongue, as may render them capable of some of the advantages here described, I know not where to find a persuasive that shall work upon souls that are sunk down so far into brutal stupidity, and so unworthy of a reasonable nature.

---

THE  
**CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE**  
OF THE  
**TRINITY.**

---



100

11

**PREFACE**  
TO "THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY."

THE late controversies about the important Doctrine of the Trinity, have engaged multitudes of christians in a fresh study of that subject; and amongst the rest I thought it my duty to review my opinions and my faith.

In my younger years, when I endeavoured to form my judgment on that article, the Socinians were the chief or only popular opponents. Upon a honest search of the scripture, and a comparison of their notions with it, I wondered how it was possible for any person to believe the bible to be the word of God, and yet to believe that Jesus Christ was a mere man. So perverse and preposterous did their sense of the scripture appear, that I was amazed how men, who pretended to reason above their neighbours, could wrench and strain their understandings, and subdue their assent to such interpretations. And I am of the same mind still.

But while I was then establishing my sentiments of the Deity of the Son and Spirit by the plain expressions of scripture, and the assistance of learned writers. I was led easily into the scholastic forms of explication; this being the current language of several centuries. And thus unawares I mingled those opinions of the schools, with the more plain and scriptural doctrine, and thought them all necessary to my faith, as thousands had done before me.

When I lately resumed this study, I found that the refiners of the Arian heresy had introduced a much more plausible scheme than that of Socinus. While I read some of these writers, I was so much divested of prejudice, and so sincerely willing to find any new light, which might render this sublime doctrine more intelligible, that some persons would have charged me with lukewarmness and indifference. But I think my heart was upright in these enquiries. And as the result of my search, I must say, that I am a steadfast and sincere believer of the godhead of Christ still. For though these authors give a rational and successful turn to some places of scripture, which I thought once did contain a substantial argument for that truth, yet there was never any thing that I could find in these new writings, that gave me a satisfying answer to that old, that general and extensive argument for the Deity of the Son and Spirit, which I have proposed in its clearest light in the eighth proposition. The expressions of scripture on that head were so numerous, so evident, so firm and strong, that I could not with any justice and reason enter into the sentiments of this new scheme. But after a due survey of it, I was fully convinced, that the professors of it, who denied the Son and Spirit to have true and eternal godhead belonging to them, were so far departed from the christian faith.

I render hearty thanks to God, who hath so guarded the freedom of my thoughts, as to keep them religiously submissive to plain revelation; and has made these later enquiries a means to establish my faith in this blessed article: The Father, Son and Spirit, are three persons and one God, and to confirm it by juster and brighter evidences, than I was possessed of before.

\* Let it be ever remembered, that both in the title, the preface, and throughout the whole treatise, I take the word "person" to signify no more than a sufficient distinction between the sacred Three, to sustain the distinct characters and offices assigned to them in scripture.

But while I was engaged in this study, I found that the scholastic explication of this sacred doctrine was not in all the parts of it so evidently revealed, and so firmly grounded upon scripture as the plain doctrine itself. Thus while my faith grew bolder in this sacred article, my assurance as the modes of explication sensibly abated. Though none of the Arian arguments could prevail against my belief of the true and eternal godhead subsisting in three persons, yet my thoughts were often embarrassed about the co-eternal and co-equal sonship of Christ, and possession of the holy Spirit, about the communication of the same infinite individual essence, or the conveyance of the same unoriginated and self-existent nature to two other distinct persons in the godhead. I began to think that we had been too bold in our determinations of the "modus" of this mystery; we had entered too far, and been too positive in describing the eternal and consubstantial generation of the Son, and inspiration of the Holy Ghost in the same numerical essence; and what we had made particular detail of these incomprehensibles too necessary a part of our creed.

And especially when I came to reflect, that there had been some other modes of explaining this sacred article proposed to the world, and some of them patronized by men of distinguished learning and unblemished piety, I found that these learned scholastic forms and terms of explication were by no means necessary to support the scriptural doctrine: I took notice also how much occasion the unskilful management of these artificial hypotheses had given to the cavils of heretical wits to blaspheme the doctrine itself.

I then considered with myself, how useful it might be to private christians to have the plain naked doctrine of scripture concerning the Trinity fairly drawn out, and set before their eyes with all its divine vouchers: How much more easily they would embrace this article when they see the whole of it so expressly revealed: And though they might confess they knew not the way to explain it, yet perhaps they might be more firmly established in the truth, and better guarded against temptations to heresy, than if it were surrounded and incorporated with hard words and learned explications, which could not be proved with such express evidence from the word of God, which are confessed to be as inconceivable as the doctrine itself, and which had often ministered to strife and controversy.

I imagined also, that it would be an acceptable service to the church of Christ, if this sublime and important doctrine were brought down to a practical use, and our particular duties to the sacred Three were distinctly declared and vindicated out of the holy scriptures; which is of far greater moment to our piety and salvation than any nice adjustment of all the mysterious circumstances that relate to this article in the theory of it.

I know of no treatise on this subject written in this manner, and therefore I attempted it. Now the reader will find these four things following designed and kept in view throughout this discourse, viz.

I. To declare and confirm this blessed doctrine of the Trinity, by plain and express testimonies of scripture. As far as I was capable, I would make this truth appear to the world with as much evidence as it has appeared to me, that the same true godhead belongs to Father, Son and Spirit, and yet that they are three such distinct agents or principles of action, as may reasonably be called persons.

II. To describe, according to the revelation of scripture, what are the same divine honours and duties that may be paid to the sacred tree, considered as one in godhead; and what are the distinct personal duties and honours that we are required to pay to each divine person, considered in their distinct characters and offices.

III. To shew that all the necessary truths that relate to this doctrine may be believed, and all the necessary duties that flow from it may be performed, without enquiring into any particular schemes to explain this great mystery of godliness, or to determine the manner, how one God subsists in three persons." To this end I have taken care to avoid every argument, and every expression that would confine our thoughts to any one scheme of explication, or necessarily lead us into any one hypothesis. For since the Doctrine of the Trinity is so important in itself, and so necessary to true christianity, I could not willingly bring in any thing as a necessary part of this doctrine, but what might be acknowledged and professed by all who believe that the Son and Spirit are the true God, though they may fall to very various and different sentiments about the way of explaining it.

And in the last place, I have attempted to do all this in such plain and easy language, that every private christian who reads this doctrine may understand it, so far as is necessary, may be established the scriptural proofs of it, and may have his faith secured in this way of temptation. Upon this account I have been watchful against admitting those latin and greek words and terms of art, which have so often tended to flatter the vanity of men, and make them learned mere words and syllables, and which have often proved an incumbrance and burthen to their faith, rather than a support of it.

Having these views and designs always in my eye, the judicious reader will not wonder that I have omitted some forms of argument, and some texts of scripture which have been often called into this service. Some of these perhaps would have led me to speak of some particular scheme of explication which was contrary to my great design. Others did not strike me with the same satisfactory evidence, as some of my fathers or brethren have found from them: And though I will not rob them of their arguments, yet I beg leave to produce none at my own. And yet I may be bold to profess, that I believe this sacred doctrine as firmly as those who think they can prove it by a multitude of scriptures which I have omitted: And I hope this may be a sufficient apology, for any such omissions.

It is a most uncharitable and unrighteous thing, while a man is professing and proving any article of faith in most express language, and by convincing demonstrations, that he should be suspected of hesitancy, merely because he chuses to leave out some public phrases, or happens to drop some popular argument in that controversy, or excuses some doubtful text of scripture from that service: And yet this hath been too often the shameful practice and the just reproach of many christians, in whom the fury of an ignorant zeal has prevailed above the heavenly graces of light and love.

At the same time I will take the freedom to declare, that when a man excepts against one argument for any sacred truth as feeble, and sets another with jest and raillery; when he tells you this is not

authentic, and the other has quite a different sense ; when he cavils at this term because it is not precisely and expressly written in scripture, and will express the same truth in no terms at all, nor mention any one argument that is sufficient to prove it, I think that man gives too just a suspicion that he is no great friend to that doctrine ; and if he should tell me I have no reason to deny his orthodoxy, yet I am sure at best, there is reason enough to doubt of his prudence. But to proceed to my design :

The method which I have chosen is what the learned called "analytic." Beginning with the first and plainest principle of natural religion, and then, supposing the revelation of scripture, I have attempted to lead my reader onward to the most easy and yet most satisfying evidence of this glorious mystery of the gospel. Nor did I think it necessary to stand still often to observe and answer every objection. For these many times break in upon the order of a discourse, and divert the mind from the train of argument ; and as Doctor Knight well observes in the preface to his late sermons on this subject. "Objecting is endless ; the pursuit of which wears the mind, draws it too far from the main argument, and is apt to leave it in confusion and obscurity. Honest hearts and common understanding, whose concern is greater to discern truth, than to know the multiform windings of error, being once convinced of the goodness of the proofs that infer a doctrine, will be satisfied therewith, though they be not qualified to return an answer to every objector : For they well know that objections must fall, where the proofs of a doctrine are clear and conclusive."

I confess my thoughts sometimes ran out too far in a defence of some occasional positions, or incidental truths ; but upon a review I have cut them all off from the body of this discourse, lest the thread of it should be too much interrupted, and have reserved them to be published in distinct essays or dissertations, if it be found needful.

After all our labours and studies, it is the good Spirit of God alone, who can lead us into all truth. If he please he can bless this little treatise which is the fruit of retirement, labour and prayer, and make it useful to instruct the ignorant, to settle the wavering, to guard those that are tempted, and to recover those that have gone astray. To this end I entreat my readers, that since it is but a little book, they would begin and read it through, that they may see all the parts of it in their proper connexion. Then I presume they will not take offence at any single sentence, which if separated from the rest of the work, might perhaps have given surprize or disgust to the weaker christians.

I conclude with an ardent address to heaven, that the sacred mysteries of our religion, and particularly this doctrine, which contains in it, and carries with it the substance and glory of the gospel, may prevail over all the clouds and powers of error. O may it never more be profaned by angry disputes and fruitless janglings ! But be humbly received and piously improved, in order to pay all necessary honours and duties to the sacred Three, which is the great design for which this doctrine was revealed : And thereby we shall effectually secure and evidence our own interest in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of the Father, and the communion of the holy Spirit. Amen.

## THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

---

### INTRODUCTION.

**T**HERE are many thousands of souls brought to the saving knowledge of God, and trained up for heaven by the various revelations which God gave to mankind before our Lord Jesus Christ came into the world. His own counsels and contrivances wrought powerfully for the salvation both of the patriarchs and the Jews under those darker dispensations, without their particular and explicit knowledge of those divine methods whereby that very salvation was to be effected. These were reserved as a mystery hidden from ages and generations to be revealed by the gospel in these later times. Therefore the gospel is called the "revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest by a clear interpretation of the scriptures of the prophets, and made known to all nations for the obedience of faith;" Rom. xvi. 25, 26. that is, that the nations might shew their obedience to a revealing God, by believing this doctrine now it is clearly revealed, and the prophets are explained.

It is the gospel that teaches us how God the Father sent his own Son to assume human nature, and therein to fulfil all righteousness, and to make full satisfaction for our sins by his sufferings and death, in order to restore us to the favour of God. It is the gospel that tells us how our Lord Jesus Christ ascended to heaven, and receiving from the Father the promise of the Spirit, sends him down to renew our natures to holiness, and to restore us to the image of God. And it is the gospel that calls us to believe or trust in this Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, in order to be restored to the favour of God by his death and righteousness, and to be renewed after the divine image, by the operations of his holy Spirit.

Thus we are taught by the gospel, what hand the Son and Spirit have in our salvation as well as the Father. The Father appears here as our sovereign and offended governor, condescending to be reconciled, and appointing this method for our recovery: The Son of God appears as a Redeemer or Reconciler; and the Spirit of God as a Sanctifier; and we are taught to get an actual interest in these blessings by faith.

Upon this account, when we are admitted into the profession of the christian faith, the names of the Father, the Son, and the holy Spirit, are joined together in the very ceremony of



admission. We are baptized with this form of words, according to the institution of Christ; Mat. xxviii. 19. "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost."

Thus though the ancient Jews and patriarchs might be saved without an explicit knowledge of the special methods of this salvation, and the divine persons concerned in it, because they were not clearly revealed; yet since these are clearly revealed to us by Christ and his apostles in the New Testament, and appointed to be a part both of our faith and our profession, it is evident that some knowledge of these divine persons, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, and their several sacred offices, or an acquaintance with the doctrine of the blessed Trinity, is now become a necessary part of our religion: So that I know not how any man can properly be called a christian without it.

It is certain, indeed, and must be confessed, that this sacred doctrine of the Trinity has some great and unsearchable difficulties which attend the full explication of it, such as the wisest men in all ages have found too hard and too high for their comprehension; and yet it is as certain, that so much of this doctrine as is necessary to salvation, is plainly revealed in scripture, and easy to be understood; that the unlearned, and persons of the meanest capacity, may attain the knowledge of it: For *the high way to heaven*, which was to be revealed under the gospel, must be marked out with such plainness and evidence, "that the way-faring men, though fools, shall not err therein;" Is. xxxv. 8.

It shall be my business therefore, at present, to lead the unlearned christian, by soft and easy steps, into this mystery, so far as may furnish him with a sufficient knowledge of it for his own salvation, and shew him how to confirm and maintain his belief of it by the plain evidence of scripture, and to secure him from making shipwreck of his faith in the day of temptation. And I shall attempt to do all this without perplexing and embarrassing his mind with any of those various mazes of scheme and hypothesis, which men of learning have invented to explain and defend this sacred article of the christian faith.

The way wherein I shall pursue this design is, by laying down the following propositions:

I. There is a God.

II. This God is the Creator of all things, the first and the eternal Being, the greatest, the wisest, and the best of beings, the sovereign Lord and Disposer of all his works, the righteous Governor of his intellectual creatures, and the proper object of their worship.

III. There is, and there can be, but one true God, but one such God as agrees with the foregoing description.

IV. Since there can be but one God, the peculiar, divine and distinguishing characters of godhead cannot belong to any other being.

V. And God himself is so jealous of his own honour, and so concerned to maintain the dignity of his godhead, as never to suffer these peculiar distinguishing characters to be ascribed to any other besides himself.

VI. He is also so kind and faithful to his creatures, as to tell them what are these peculiar and distinguishing characters of godhead, that they may not run into this mistake and guilt of ascribing them to any other.

VII. The peculiar and distinguishing characters of godhead, are those names, titles, attributes, works and worship which God has assumed to himself in his word, exclusive of any other being; and has either asserted them expressly to belong only to himself, or left it sufficiently evident in his word, that they belong to him alone.

VIII. Yet these very names, titles, attributes, works and worship, which are peculiar to God, and incommunicable to another, are ascribed to three, by God himself, in his word; which three are distinguished by the names of Father, Son, and Spirit.

IX. There are also some other circumstantial but convincing evidences, that the Son and the Spirit have the true and proper godhead ascribed to them as well as the Father.

X. Thence it necessarily follows, that these three, viz. the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, have such an intimate and real communion in that one godhead, as is sufficient to justify the ascription of those peculiar and distinguishing divine characters to them.

XI. Since there is, and can be, but one true God, these three, who have such a communion in godhead, may properly be called the one God, or, the only true God.

XII. Though the Father, Son, and Spirit are but one true God, yet there are such distinct properties, actions, characters and circumstances ascribed to these three, as are usually ascribed to three distinct persons among men.

XIII. Therefore it has been the custom of the christian church, in almost all ages, to use the word person, in order to describe these three distinctions of Father, Son and Spirit, and to call them three distinct persons.

XIV. Though the sacred three are evidently and plainly discovered in scripture to be one and the same God, and three distinct personal agents or persons; yet the scripture hath not in plain and evident language explained, and precisely

determined, the particular way and manner, *how these three persons are one God, or how this one godhead is in three persons.*

XV. Thence I infer, that it can never be necessary to salvation to know the precise way and manner, how one godhead subsists in these three personal agents, or, *how these three persons are one God.*

XVI. Yet we ought to believe the general Doctrine of the Trinity, viz. That these three personal agents, Father, Son and Spirit, have some real continuation in one godhead, though we cannot find out the precise way and manner of explaining it.

XVII. And wheresoever we meet with any thing in scripture that is incommunicably divine, ascribed to either of these three persons, we may venture to take it in the plain and obvious sense of the words, since we believe the true and eternal godhead to belong to them all.

XVIII. Where any thing inferior to the dignity of godhead is really and properly attributed in scripture to the person of the Son, or the holy Spirit, it may be easily imputed to some inferior nature united to the godhead in that person, or to some inferior character or office sustained by that person.

XIX. Nor do these inferior nature or natures, characters or agencies, at all hinder our firm belief of the godhead of these three persons, which is so plainly expressed in scripture; nor should it abate or diminish our sacred regards to them.

XX. We are bound, therefore, to pay divine honours to each of the sacred three, viz. the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, according to their distinct characters and offices assigned them in scripture.

XXI. In so doing, we shall effectually secure our own salvation: For the scripture has made our salvation to depend on those offices which these divine persons sustain, and the honours due to them according to those offices, rather than upon any deep philosophical notions of their essence and personalities, any nice and exact acquaintance with their mysterious union and distinction.

XXII. The man, therefore, who professes each of the sacred Three, to have sufficient divine power and capacity to sustain the characters, and fulfil the offices attributed to them in scripture, and pays due honour to them according to those offices, may justly be owned by me, and received as a christian brother; though we may differ much in our notions and opinions about the explication of the blessed Trinity, or though we may both be ignorant or doubtful of the true way of explaining it.

Now if these propositions are found agreeable to the mind and will of God in his word, then may his blessed Spirit furnish

me with clearness of thought, with force of argument, and happiness of expression to explain and prove them, so far as to enlighten the understanding, and satisfy the conscience of humble and sincere christians in this great and glorious doctrine of the Trinity; that they may pay their distinct honours to the sacred Three, in this world of darkness and imperfection, and walk on rejoicing in their way to the world of perfect life and happiness. Amen.

PROPOSITION I.—*There is a God.*

It must be known by the light of nature, that there is a God, before we can reasonably have any thing to do with scripture, or believe his word. Now the shortest and plainest way to come at the knowledge of God by the light of nature, is by considering the whole frame of this visible world, and the various parts of it. Hereby we shall not only find that there is a God, but we shall learn in a great measure what is his nature also. A man cannot open his eyes but he sees many objects round about him which did not make themselves: The birds, the beasts, and the fishes, the herbs, and the trees, the fire, and the water, all seem to confess that they were not their own creators, for they cannot preserve themselves. Nor did we give being to ourselves or to them, because we can neither preserve ourselves nor them in being.

Besides there is an infinite variety of instances in the constant regular motions of the planets, the influences of the sun and moon, in the wondrous composition of plants and animals, and in their several properties and operations, as well as in the very structure of our own bodies, and the faculties of our minds; which sufficiently discover there must be some superior and divine power and wisdom, which both contrived and created their natures and ours, and gave being both to them and us.

Thus it appears that the first notion we have of God, by the light of nature is, the Creator of all things. Thence it follows, that he must be before all those things which he has made; therefore he must be the first of beings.

And it is plain, that he could have no beginning, and that there was no time when God was not; for then he could never have begun to be; since there was nothing that could create him, nor can there be any reason why he should of himself start out of nothing into being at any moment, if he had not been before: So that since we have proved that there is a God, we may be sure that he ever was, or that he was from all eternity.

Now the same argument which proves that he had no beginning, will infer also, that he can have no end: For as nothing could give him being, nothing can take it way. He depends

not on any thing for leave to exist, since nothing in nature could possibly concur or contribute any thing toward his existence. Nor does his being depend on any arbitrary act of his own will, for he did not create himself. Nor can he himself wish, or will, or desire not to be, because he is perfectly wise, and knows it is best for him for ever to exist; and, therefore, he must exist, or be for ever.

And this is what the learned call a necessary being; that is, one who ever was, and ever must be; without beginning and without end. And this, in many of their writings, is justly made to be the great and eminent distinction betwixt God and the creature; viz. that the creatures might be, or not be, as God pleases; but God always was, and always will be: He must necessarily have a being from everlasting to everlasting.

As his works discover his existence, or his being; so the greatness of his works shews the greatness of his power. He that made all things out of mere nothing, must be Almighty: He that has contrived all things with such exquisite art, must be All-wise and All-knowing; and he that has furnished this lower world with such innumerable rich varieties of light and food, of colours, sounds, smells, and tastes, and materials for all the conveniences of life to support and to entertain our natures, he must be a Being of unspeakable goodness. It appears yet with fuller evidence, that God is the chiefest, the greatest, the wisest, and the best of Beings, when we consider more particularly, that all the power, knowledge, wisdom, and goodness, all the virtues, and excellencies, and the very natures of all other beings are derived from God, and given to the creatures by God their Creator; and therefore he must, in some glorious and eminent manner, possess all perfections and excellencies himself, for nothing can give to another that which itself has not. Thus *the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handy-work*, as the holy Psalmist assures us; Psal. xix. 1. And thus, *The invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead*; Rom. i. 20.

The light of reason, or nature, further teaches us, that such an Almighty Being, who by his own power and wisdom has created all things out of nothing, must needs be the sovereign Lord, the absolute possessor and proprietor of all his creatures, they must be all at his disposal, and under his government. And as for the intelligent parts of his creation, such as men and angels, it is the very law of their natures, that they ought to love, worship and obey him that made them, to pray to him for what they want, and to praise him for what they receive, and thence he becomes the proper object of worship. Reason itself

assures us, that he who hath shewn such exquisite wisdom, even in the formation of his inanimate creatures, and in his disposal and management of them agreeably to those purposes for which they are fitted, will manifest also the same wisdom in governing his intelligent creatures, and bestow those rewards or punishments on them for which they are fitted, agreeable to their tempers, characters and actions. And this is properly called the righteousness or equity of God, or his governing justice.

I have been much the longer in this proof of the being of God, in order to introduce the next proposition which expresses his nature, and contains the common and general sense of the word of God.

*PROP. II.—God is the Creator of all things, the first and the eternal Being, the greatest, the wisest, and the best of Beings, the sovereign Lord and Disposer of all his Works, the righteous Governor of his intellectual Creatures, and the proper Object of their Worship.*

This description of God is drawn with apparent evidence from the very proof of his being. The same light of nature or reason which tells us that there is a God, does at the same time tell us what God is: and this being the plainest and the most obvious and easy way of coming to the knowledge of his existence, these must be the first, the plainest, and the easiest notions of godhead or divine nature, that mankind naturally obtains and receives. But since the knowledge of God, by the light of reason, is so low, and feeble, and obscure in the greatest part of mankind, he has condescended to reveal both his being and his nature in his written word. This hath been attested with so many divine signs and miracles, as prove it beyond all controversy to be the word of the living God: And in this word of his he hath described his nature in the same manner as the light of reason would describe it; though in greater perfection, and with fuller assurance. When, therefore, we use the word God properly, absolutely, and without any special limitation; some of these ideas will naturally come into the mind, and especially those of Almighty, All-wise, the Creator, and the Eternal. Therefore this has been the common sense of the word in heathen nations, even from all antiquity, and amongst all the thinking part of mankind, who have acknowledged one God only; and this is the general sense of the word God in the scripture, as might be made to appear by many quotations, if it were needful.

Hence it will follow, that those persons who make the word God to signify mere authority, dominion, or government, do much diminish the idea of it; they contract and narrow the sense

of it in opposition to the common usage of the word in all languages, ages and nations, wherein the unity of God has been professed; they divert it from the common meaning of it in the lips of Jews, heathens, and christians. And they would do well to consider, whether this is not done merely to serve some particular schemes of their own, and to support some hypothesis or opinion of theirs, which otherwise could never be obtained. I confess, the word God is used sometimes in the bible both in a figurative, and in a limited or imperfect sense.

1. It is used in a figurative or improper sense, to signify some character among creatures that hath a likeness or resemblance to any part of this description of God. So Moses the prophet is called a *god to Pharaoh*; Exod. vii. 1. Because he carried divine authority with him in his message to Pharaoh, and wrought divine works before him, which were representations of God's government and his power. So angels are called gods; Ps. xcvi. 7. and in many other places, for the same reason. So prophets, judges and magistrates are called gods; Ps. lxxxii. 1. *He judgeth among the gods.* Verse 6. *I said ye are gods.* John x. 35. *He called them gods to whom the word of God came*; because they spoke and acted under divine influence, or in the name and authority of God.

2. This word God is used also in many scriptures in a limited or imperfect sense, to signify the object of worship, which is one part of the description of the true God. So Isa. xlv. 15. —*yea, he maketh a god, and worshippeth it.* Isa. xxxvi. 18. *Hath any of the gods of the nations delivered his land.* Verse 19. *Where are the gods of Hamath and Arphad?* that is, their idols whom they worshipped. Micah. iv. 5. *The people will walk every one in the name of his god,* that is, that being, either real or imaginary, whom they worshipped. And probably, in this sense, the devil is called *the god of this world*; 2 Cor. iv. 4. because he was worshipped by the heathens under various names, as well as because he seems to have great power in this sinful world, by the permission of God.

But after all, there is, and there must be, such a distinction between the word God, when it is applied peculiarly to the true God, the Creator, and when it is applied to creatures, or to idols, as that the creature may not be mistaken for the Creator; nor an idol for the living and the true God. Wheresoever, therefore, the word God is used in scripture, and it does not evidently appear to be used in any of these figurative, diminutive, and imperfect senses, we are naturally and reasonably led to understand it concerning the All-wise and Almighty Creator and Governor of all things, the greatest, the wisest, and the best of Beings.

**PROP. III.**—*There is, and there can be, but one true God, but one such God as agrees with the foregoing Description.*

The unity or oneness of the Godhead, is a great truth derived from the light of nature, as well as from scripture. The light of nature tells us, that there can be but one, who is the first, the wisest, and the best of Beings; there can but be one Almighty: And many of the ancient sages, in the heathen world, have found out this truth by their own reason, and maintained it with force of argument. If I were to talk like a philosopher upon this head, I would prove that there could be but one God, because the very nature of God implies in it full perfection and complete all-sufficiency; so that he can stand in need of nothing, because he has a sufficiency in himself for all conceivable purposes and ends. If there were therefore any other God, that other God would be a needless one, or an unnecessary being, which would destroy the very nature and notion of godhead; for God is a necessary being, or a being of absolute necessity, as we have proved before, and he cannot but exist.

But as my design is to assist the understanding of the meanest christians, I will rather have recourse to the plain words of scripture: And there are many places in the word of God where he asserts his own unity; Deut. vi. 4. *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.* Exod. xx. 3. *Thou shalt have no other gods before me.* Isa. xliii. 10. *Before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me.* Isa. xlv. 8. *Is there a God besides me? Yea, there is no God, I know not any.* Isai. xlv. 5. *I am the Lord, and there is none else; there is no God besides me.*

The Jews of old were so ready to be led away to the idolatry of their neighbour nations, and to worship more gods than one, that the blessed God thought it proper in his word to give them frequent repetitions of this great truth, to guard them against the danger of acknowledging any gods besides himself: And it being a great part of the design of the gospel, to reform the heathen world from polytheism, or the worship of many gods, Christ and his apostles have taken care in the New Testament to inculcate this divine truth again in express language. Mark xii. 29. The words of Moses are cited by our Lord Jesus, as the foundation of all religion. The first of all the commandments is, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.* Mark x. 18. There is none good but one, that is God. By which he means, there is none has such original and eternal and all-sufficient goodness as he. Gal. iii. 20. *God is one.* Eph. iv. 6. *One God and Father of all, who is above all.* 1 Cor. viii. 4, 5, 6. *An idol is nothing in the world, and there is none other God but one; for though there be that are called*



*gods, whether in heaven or in earth, as there be gods many and lords many; but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things. We must, therefore, take care in searching out and expressing the Doctrine of the Trinity, that we do not make two or three distinct gods, lest we break in upon the foundation of all religion, whether natural, Jewish, or christian.*

**PROP. IV.**—*Since there can be but one God, the peculiar, and divine distinguishing Characters of Godhead cannot belong to any other Being.*

This proposition is so evident, that I have to spend no time in proving, that the essential and distinguishing marks and qualities of any one being can never belong to another: For otherwise there could be no certain distinction betwixt any two different beings in nature; and we should run into perpetual mistakes hourly, and take one for the other. If the distinguishing characters of fire could belong to earth or water, or the peculiar marks of human nature could be found in plants or brute animals, this would bring everlasting confusion into the affairs of life, and common language. Much more necessary is it that there should be the most evident marks of distinction between God and a creature, lest we should bring the same confusion into all our religion and worship, by mistaking the creature for God, and God for the creature.

**PROP. V.**—*God himself, is so jealous of his own Honour, and so concerned to maintain the Dignity of his Godhead, as never to suffer these peculiar distinguishing Characters of Godhead to be ascribed to any other besides himself.*

It is fit that godhead should support its own dignity, and bear its character high above all creatures; otherwise God could not be just and true to himself. It is necessary that the almighty Maker and sovereign Governor of all, should maintain his state and majesty, and suffer nothing, which is not God, to approach too near the grandeur of godhead; nor will he bear it without high resentment and divine indignation.

This is what is properly called his jealousy in scripture. He is often described as *a jealous God*, and will not suffer creatures to share with him in his incommunicable glories. Ex. xx. 3, 4, 5. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me; Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them, for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God." Deut. iv. 23, 24. "Take heed to yourselves

lest you make you a graven image, or the likeness of any thing which the Lord thy God hath forbidden thee; for the Lord thy God is a consuming fire, even a jealous God." Deut. vi. 13, 14, 15. "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name: Ye shall not go after other gods, the gods of the people which are round about you, for the Lord thy God is a jealous God among you, lest the anger of the Lord thy God be kindled against thee, and destroy thee from off the face of the earth." To the same purpose speaks Joshua, chapter xxiv. verse 19. Deut. xxxii. 16, 17. "They provoked him to jealousy with strange gods, with abominations provoked they him to anger; they sacrificed to devils, not to God; to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came newly up, whom your father feared not." Verses 19, 20, 21. "When the Lord saw it he abhorred them, because of the provoking of his sons and his daughters: And he said, I will hide my face from them; they have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God; they have provoked me to anger with their vanities." Such are the awful manifestations of God, in a way of jealousy, for his own name and the dignity of his godhead.

The heart of God is so much set upon it to exclude all rivals or competitors from any share in the prerogatives of godhead, that he borrows one of his names from his jealousy in this matter; Ex. xxxiv. 14. *Thou shalt worship no other God; for the Lord whose name is jealous, is a jealous God.* He declares solemnly, that his honour should not be given to another; nor will he bear that any thing should come near him, or to be likened to him in the glory of his nature; Isa. xlii. 8. *I am the Lord; that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another.* Isa. xli. 9. *I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me.* Isa. xl. 18. *To whom will ye liken God, or what likeness will ye compare unto him? Verse 25. To whom will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One.* And when he threatens his vengeance against the worship of that which is not God, he speaks in the fire and fury of his jealousy, as it is often expressed in the language of the prophets.

**PROP. VI.**—*God is also so kind and faithful to his Creatures, as to tell them what are these peculiar and distinguishing Characters of Godhead, that they may not run into this Mistake and Guilt of ascribing them to any other.*

Though men of learning and retirement among the heathens, who have devoted themselves to the study of philosophy, have found out several of these peculiar characters of godhead; and the light of reason, if well improved, is sufficient to teach all men so much of God, as to leave them without excuse; Rom. i. 19, 20. Yet in our fallen and degenerate state we are

so thoughtless and foolish, and our understanding is so feeble, so rash and giddy, that we are ready to commit mistakes in this solemn and important point. Therefore the blessed God in great condescension has told us in his word, what are the peculiar glories that belong to his nature, and the characters by which he will be known and distinguished from all that is not God. And since he has separated a people to himself, and promised to give them the knowledge of himself, in order to his glory and their own happiness, he has been so kind to them, and so faithful to his covenant, as to mark out those distinguishing characters of godhead, by which he will be known, in a very evident manner; and that not in a single text or two, but in many places of holy scripture, that they may not thoughtlessly run into the heinous mistake, of ascribing godhead to any inferior natures, and incur the dreadful penalties which his jealousy has threatened.

**PROP. VII.**—*The peculiar and distinguishing Characters of Godhead are those Names, Titles, Attributes, Works and Worship, which God has assumed to himself in his Word, exclusive of any other being; and has either asserted them expressly to belong only to himself, or left it sufficiently evident in his Word that they belong to him alone.*

Here I shall not insist on all the peculiar characters of godhead that may be found in scripture, but mention only a few, viz. such as in my opinion seem to carry the clearest evidence with them. The peculiar divine names are chiefly these two; viz. the name Jehovah, and the name GOD, with some additional word of honour, as the *true God*, the *great God*, the *mighty God*, the *only wise God*, *God and none else*, and *God blessed for ever*. The peculiar divine titles are, *the God of Abraham*, *the Lord of hosts*, *King of kings*, and *Lord of lords*, *the first and the last*. The peculiar divine attributes are, omniscience, omnipotence, eternity and immutability. The peculiar divine works are, the creation and conservation of all things, the changing of the heart, and raising the dead. The last peculiar character of godhead, is divine worship. And, I think, the words of scripture where these characters of godhead are mentioned, will be most easily compared together, and set in the fairest light, if I refer them all to be cited under this next proposition.

**PROP. VIII.**—*Yet these very Names, Titles, Attributes, Works and Worship, which are peculiar to God, and incommunicable to another, are ascribed to Three by God himself in his Word; which Three are distinguished by the Names Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.*

One can hardly read a leaf of scripture, especially of the New Testament, but we find some mention made of these three glorious agents, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost: And

though these words are not to be understood precisely in the same sense as when applied to men; yet the meaning of these words must answer the common use of them in some main respect; else surely such words would not have been used. And if we consult the general sense of them in scripture, we shall find that this word *Father* signifies some superior character, from whom the *Son* derives, at least, his character of *Sonship*, and upon whom he depends so far as he is a *Son*, by whom he is sent on glorious errands.

The *Son*, who is also sometimes called the *only begotten of the Father*, must have some very extraordinary relation to the *Father* more than any other being, and is often employed by the *Father*.

The *holy Spirit* has this title eminently given him as a being of a spiritual nature, as a prime agent in the affairs of the *Father* and *Son*: even as the spirit of a man knows and manages the affairs of a man; and he is called *holy*, because his great work is to sanctify and to make *holy* the children of men.

But of these things I shall speak more hereafter. My work is here to prove, that all three have the peculiar characters of *godhead*.

That the incommunicable divine names, &c. are ascribed to *God the Father*, the first in the sacred *Trinity*, is universally agreed by all christians of all parties, there is therefore no need to spend time in proving it. My present business, therefore, shall be to shew under each of these five heads, viz. names, titles, attributes, works and worship, what are the peculiar characters of *godhead*, and prove, first, that they are ascribed to *Christ*, the *Son of God*; and then, that several of them are ascribed also to the *holy Spirit*.

Before we enter on this argument, it may be proper to observe, that all parties allow that the second person in the *Trinity*, or our *Lord Jesus Christ*, is sometimes called *the angel or messenger of his Father*; sometimes *his servant*, *his wisdom*, *the brightness of his glory*, *the express image of his person*, *the life*, *the light*, &c. But the chief names he is called by, are υἱος "huios," the *Son*, or λογος "logos," the *reason or word of God*. I mention this only to shew, that where we meet with him in scripture under these various names, we may know it is the same person. Nor need I take pains to prove this here, since I design to mention and make use of no place of scripture where any of these appellations can be controverted, without a particular vindication of them in this sense.

I proceed now to the argument proposed :

I. "The names of *God* ascribed to *Christ*."

1. *Jehovah* is a name peculiar to *God*; which we may infer

from the very composition of the word, according to the opinion of the best Hebrew critics: For it signifies being itself, he who was, and who is, and who shall be; and therein seems to denote the eternity and the unchangeableness of God, whose name is "I am that I am;" Ex. iii. 14. And answers to the description of God; Rev. iv. 8. "The Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come." But there are most express scriptures which prove the name Jehovah to be incommunicable; Ps. lxxxiii. 18. "Thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth." Is. xlv. 5. "I am Jehovah, and there is none else, there is no God besides me." Is. xlii. 8. "I am Jehovah, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another."

Here let it be noted, for the benefit of the unlearned christians, that where the word Lord is written in great letters in the Old Testament [LORD] the word in the Hebrew is Jehovah; where it is written in small letters [Lord] it is some other word in the Hebrew, as Adon or Adonai, &c. except perhaps one or two places where the printer hath made a mistake.

Now this name Jehovah is ascribed to our Lord Jesus Christ, or the Son of God; Jer. xxiii. 6. The righteous branch that was to be raised unto David, was the promised Messiah or Christ. And "this is the name whereby he shall be called the Lord our righteousness." It is evident that this name is not ascribed to Christ as the name *Jehovah-Nissi*, [the Lord is my banner] is given to an altar; Ex. xvii. 15. Or *Jehovah-shalom*; Judges vi. 24. [the Lord is peace.] Or as the name *Jehovah-shammah* [the Lord is there] is given to a city; Ezek. xlvi. 35. Because it is possible in all those places that God the Father may be signified. But Christ must be the person meant in these words, whether they be translated Jehovah our righteousness, or, Jehovah is our righteousness, for it is a promise concerning the times of the New Testament, where Christ is often described as our righteousness, but God the Father is never described so; 1 Cor. i. 30. Christ Jesus is made unto us wisdom and righteousness.

There are other places in the Old Testament where the name Jehovah is given to Christ upon this very account; Is. xlv. 24, 25. "Surely shall one say, In Jehovah have I righteousness and strength: In Jehovah shall all the seed of Israel be justified:" Which in the New Testament are thus interpreted; Rom. v. 18. "By the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life." 2 Cor. v. 21. "Christ who knew no sin, was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

Christ is called Jehovah, Is. vi. 1, 9, 10. "I saw the Lord Jehovah sitting upon a throne, and he said, go and tell this peo-

ple, hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not; make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and convert and be healed." Compared with John xii. 40, 41. "He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their hearts, that they should not see with their eyes, and understand with their hearts, and be converted, and I should heal them." These things said Isaiah, when he saw his glory, and spake of him. It is manifest enough to any whose pre-conceived opinions do not turn them aside from the obvious sense of scripture, that our Lord Jesus Christ is the person here meant.

So Zech. xi. 12, 13. "They weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver: And the Lord [*Jehovah*] said unto me, Cast it unto the potter, a goodly price that I was prized at of them!" Compared with Mat. xxvii. 9. "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken, They took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued." The prophet here tells us, it was the Lord Jehovah that was thus valued, and that was Christ, as St. Matthew applies it.

That the name Jehovah is applied also to Christ in other places, I shall take frequent notice.

2. The name God, with some additional honour, is another name whereby God is distinguished from creatures, as, *The true God, the great and mighty God, the only wise God, the only God, or God and none else, and God blessed for ever.* For though upon some special account the word God is sometimes applied to a creature, yet it is without any honourable addition or epithet joined to it.

1. *The true God*, is a distinguishing name. John xvii. 3. "This is life eternal to know thee the only true God." Now Christ is so called 1 John v. 20, 21. "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life. Little children, keep yourselves from idols, *Amen.*"—It is very unlikely that the apostle John should conclude his epistle with such a solemn charge against idolatry, or the worshipping that which is not God, and yet in the foregoing verse leave his expression concerning the true God so easily and so naturally to be interpreted concerning Christ Jesus, if he were not the true God.

It is farther evident, that he who is called the eternal life in this verse, is the true God, and it is as evident, that Christ is called the life, and the eternal life, in the same epistle; 1 John i. 2. "For the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and shew unto you that eternal life, [that is, the Son of God] which was with the Father and was manifested unto us."

2. "The great and mighty God," is a distinguishing name; Deut. x. 17. "The Lord God, your God, is a great God, a mighty, and a terrible;" Jer. xxxii. 18, 19. "The great, the mighty God, the Lord of hosts is his name. Great in counsel, and mighty in works." Which appellations are given to Christ. Titus ii. 13. "Looking for the blessed hope, and the glorious appearance of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, or as it may be properly translated, our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ;" Is. ix. 6. "To us a child is born, to us a Son is given, his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God."

3. "The only wise God," is a distinguishing name. 1 Tim. i. 17. "To the king, eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever, *Amen*." Rom. xvi. 27. "To God only wise be glory through Jesus Christ for ever, *Amen*." Which character is applied to Christ himself; Jude 24, 25. "Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy; to the only wise God our Saviour be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever, *Amen*." Now that this doxology is ascribed to Christ, it appears not only from this that he is called our Saviour, which is Christ's special title; but it is he who shall present the church without fault to himself, or before the presence of his own glory. See Eph. v. 25, 27. "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it,—that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle,—and without blemish.

4. "The only God," or "God and none else," is another distinguishing name; Deut. iv. 35, 39. "The Lord he is God, and there is none else besides him;" Is. xlv. 5. "I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me." Now whosoever will read the latter end of the xlv. chapter of Isaiah, from verse 15, to verse 25, will find several expressions of the same kind. "I am the Lord, there is no God else beside me; I am God, and there is none else;" and yet they are applied to this, who is eminently called the Saviour, verses 15, 21. "In whom Israel shall be saved with an everlasting salvation." Verse 17. To whom "all the ends of the earth are to look that they may be saved." Verse 22. In whom we "have righteousness and strength." Verse 24. In whom the "seed of Israel shall be justified and shall glory." Verse 25. And to whom "every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear;" Verse 23. All which characters belong to our Lord Jesus Christ in the common language of the New Testament, and this 23d verse is particularly cited and applied to him; Rom. xiv. 10, 11. "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ: For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every

tongue shall confess to God." And whosoever will read that chapter from the 6th to the 12th verse, will find the words Lord, God, and Christ, used very promiscuously for one another.

5. "God blessed for ever," is also a distinguishing name; 2 Cor. xi. 31. "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore." Rom. i. 25. They "worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever, *Amen.*" Yet this name is given to Christ; Rom. ix. 5. "Christ who is over all, God blessed for ever, *Amen.*"

Here it is proper to be noted, that when the word God is applied to creatures in scripture, there is generally some degrading circumstances, or some diminishing expression added in the same place, to exclude them from any interest or share in the true godhead. But when it is ascribed to Jesus Christ, there are characters of additional honour often joined to it, to shew that he is the true God. So if Satan be called God, it is but the God of this world; 2 Cor. iv. 4. "If Moses be called god, it is a god that was made a god only to Pharaoh, and a god whose brother was a man." Exod. vii. 1. "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet."—If magistrates are called gods, they are mortal gods; Ps. lxxxii. 6. "I have said ye are gods, but ye shall die like men." If angels are called gods, they are such gods as worship a superior God; Ps. xcvi. 7. "Worship him, all ye gods." But our Lord Jesus is called the "true God, the great and the mighty God, the only wise God, God, and there is none besides him, God blessed for evermore," as we shall shew hereafter.

## II. The titles of God ascribed to Christ.

1. "The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." This was the glorious name whereby God described himself when he sent Moses to fetch Israel out of the land of bondage; Exod. iii. 6, 15. "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, &c.—And God said to Moses, thus shalt thou say to 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 to you. This is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations."

And yet the person who speaks this, is called "the angel of the Lord." Verse 2. "And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire, out of the midst of a bush;" and it is plain, that he who sat or dwelt in the bush was God himself; Exod. iii. 16. and 4, 5. This is "the Lord God of the fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, who appeared to Moses in the bush;" all this is confirmed in the New Testament; Acts vii. 30. where this history is repeated. And when Moses would bless the tribe of Joseph with a divine blessing and the favour of God, he calls it the "good will of



him that dwelt in the bush ;" Deut. xxxiii. 16. Here I shall take occasion to enlarge a little on these appearances of Christ to the patriarchs. Christ Jesus is that God who called to Abraham and bid him offer up his son ; Gen. xxii. 1, &c. for he is called the angel of the Lord, verse 11. when he " called to him out of heaven, and said—Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy Son, thy only Son from me," that is from that God who commanded him to be offered up. This was the angel of the covenant, and yet the God of Abraham. " The angel which redeemed Jacob from all evil, is the God before whom his fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, and the God which fed him all his life long ;" Gen. xlviii. 15, 16.

And it is universally agreed by the ancient and modern writers, that this angel was the same who appeared to Abraham when " the word of the Lord came to him in a vision : " Gen. xv. 1, 2. This was the Lord who appeared to him ; Gen. xvi. 1. " And said, I am the Almighty God." This is one of those " three men who appeared to Abraham ; Gen. xviii. 1, 2. who is called Jehovah," verse 13, 14, &c. " This was the man who wrestled with Jacob ;" Gen. xxxii. 24. who is called God ; verses 28, 30. who is styled the angel of God, the angel of the Lord, and the Lord, or Jehovah, promiscuously, in his appearance to Gideon ; Judg. vi. 12, 14, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23. The Captain of the Lord's host, appearing to Joshua, who is called the Lord, or Jehovah ; Josh. v. 14, 15. compared with vi. 1 who is also the angel of God's presence ; Isai. lxiii. 9. " The angel or messenger of the covenant ;" Mal. iii. 1. and " the angel in whom is the name of God ;" Exod. xxiii. 20, 21. or in whom godhead dwells ; that is, the Messiah, or our Lord Jesus Christ, who appeared often to the patriarchs in a visible shape as a prelude or token of his future incarnation.

Nor did he favour the patriarchs only with such a visit, but the prophets were blessed with it too. Isai. vi. is a plain instance of it, as we have shewn before, where Isaiah saw Christ in great magnificence and glory. Ezekiel had the same favour also, and that frequently ; Ezek. i. 26. " And above the firmament that was over the heads of the living creatures was the likeness of a throne—and the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it." Verse 28. " This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord, or Jehovah ; and when I saw it, I fell on my face, and I heard a voice of one that spake." Chap. ii. 23. He enjoyed the same vision. And chap. viii. 1, 2, 3, &c. He was favoured with it again, and " the glory of the God of Israel was there." Chap. x. 15, 19, 20. The same again And xl. 22. Amos also saw God in the form of a man or angel Amos vii. 7. for " he stood upon a wall with a plumb-line in his hand," and talked with him. And chap. ix. 1. He stood on the

altar and spake to him. Zechariah, in the first six chapters of his prophecy, conversed with the angel of the Lord in the form of a man; as chap. i. 9. and ii. 1, 3. and iii. 1, &c. Yet this angel sometimes seems to be the same with the Lord or Jehovah; as i. 19, 20. and ii. i. 3, 5. and iii. 1, 2.

Now that most or all of these appearances was Jesus Christ, is generally owned by christians of all ages, and all parties; there are scarce any that have denied it.

And it is evident, that in these and other places this angel assumes the peculiar and distinguishing titles of the great God to himself: In his appearance to the more ancient fathers he called himself God Almighty; as in Exod. vi. 4. But when he appeared to Moses, he made himself known by his name Jehovah; verses 2, 3. "And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am the Lord, or Jehovah: And I appeared to Abraham, and to Isaac, and to Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them." Now it was not possible for those to whom he appeared to distinguish him from the true and eternal God, when he used those express words, "I am God almighty, or all-sufficient, I am Jehovah, the Lord; I am that I am; I am the God of Abraham, &c." and consequently they were necessarily exposed to the danger of idolatry, and in a manner, I may say, they were unavoidably led into it, if the person speaking to them were not really the true and eternal God, the proper object of divine worship.

It seems to me but a poor and feeble evasion to say, that all these magnificent and distinguishing names and titles of the great and blessed God might be assumed by the angel, or Christ, though he were but a creature, because he came in the name, and with the authority of the true God. 1. It is by no means agreeable to the majesty and high jealousy of God to give his name and glory thus to another, without any sufficient and most evident token of distinction. 2. It was too assuming and presumptuous in a creature thus to personate God, his Maker, without some present and apparent distinguishing marks of his own inferiority. And, 3. It was too hard and invincible a temptation to Abraham, and Jacob, and Moses themselves, to practise idol-worship, and give divine honours to that which was not God.

It is therefore made clear to me with abundant evidence, that in all these appearances the true and eternal God himself was present; and, as it is expressed concerning Christ; Col. ii. 9. so in those figures and appearances, whether of light or fire, of a man or an angel, there dwelt all the fulness of the godhead bodily.

2. "The Lord of hosts" is another glorious and distinguishing title of God: He that is supreme over all the hosts or armies of heaven and earth. 2 Sam. vi. 2. "God, whose name

say merely, "I can search the heart and try the reins;" "but, I am he which searcheth the hearts, &c. using the very words of Jeremiah the prophet, as though he would have said, that very character of godhead belongs to me, I am that omniscient Being.

2. *Omnipresence* is a distinguishing perfection of God, which implies the immediate presence of God in all places; taking cognizance of, and managing all the affairs of his universal kingdom; Ps. cxxxix. 7. "Whither shall I fly from thy presence? If I ascend up to heaven thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there." And this is the common consolation that God gives to his people wheresoever they are; "Fear not, for I am with thee;" Is. xli. 10. and xliii. 5, &c. And he gives this encouragement to his people, and this terror to his enemies; Jer. xxiii. 24. "Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the Lord: Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord."

And so does our Lord Jesus Christ fill heaven, and earth, and all things; for the church is called "the body of Christ; and the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Eph. i. 23. He promises his presence with his people in the same divine language; Mat. xviii. 20. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Mat. xxviii. 20. "Lo I am with you always to the end of the world." The presence of the Lord Jehovah, both in heaven and on earth at the same time, seems to be intimated; Gen. xix. 24. *Then the Lord (Jehovah) rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord (Jehovah) out of heaven.* What has been said before concerning the appearances of Christ, as the angel of the covenant to the patriarchs, makes it evident that the Jehovah on earth, who had been a little before talking with Abraham about the destruction of Sodom, was our Lord Jesus Christ: And since there is but one Jehovah, he must be the same with Jehovah in heaven; and this is further confirmed by a parallel text; John iii. 13. "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven."

3. *Omnipotence*, or almighty power, is another divine attribute that I shall name in this place. *Almighty*, is so peculiar a character of godhead, that God takes it for his very title in above fifty places of the Old Testament. It is expressed in the hebrew by the word *שׁדדאי* Shaddai, and in several places of the book of the Revelation by *παντοκράτωρ* Pantocrator in the greek. Now our Lord Jesus Christ is this almighty wheresoever he appeared to the patriarchs in a visible form under this name; as to Abraham; Gen. xvii. 1. to Jacob; Gen. xxv. 11. Gen. xlviii. 3. and perhaps it is he who speaks; Rev. i. 8. and the apostle Paul tells us; Phil. iii. 21. that "he has power to subdue all things to himself."

4. The attribute of *eternity*, or without beginning or end, is also a peculiar distinguishing perfection of God; Ps. xc. 2. "From everlasting to everlasting thou art God." The eternity of God is also denoted by that title of his, "I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God;" Is. xlv. 6. Now our Lord Jesus Christ has this same eternity, for he is that God, "whose throne is for ever and ever;" Heb. i. 8. He is "the alpha and omega, the first and the last; Rev. i. 11. and ii. 8. And the historical eternity of Melchisedeck, whose beginning of days and end of life are not mentioned in history, renders him a proper type of Christ, "the Son of God, who has no beginning of days, or end of life," and who must have real and true eternity to answer this type; Heb. vii. 3.

5. The last attribute I shall mention is, *Immutability*, or unchangeableness. This God assumes to himself as a peculiar glory. See Mal. iii. 6. "I am the Lord, I change not." So is Christ unchangeable. Heb. i. 12. The heavens and earth "shall be changed, but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." Heb. xiii. 8. "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, today, and for ever.

#### IV. Divine works, or operations ascribed to Christ.

*The creation of the world*, is a work of almighty power, and belongs only to God; Gen. i. 1. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." It is ascribed to him in scripture as a distinguishing character of godhead; Heb. iii. 4. "He that built all things is God." The Lord himself maintains this as his own prerogative; Is. xlv. 24. "I am the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself;" yet this almighty work is attributed to Christ; John i. 1, 3. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made that was made;" and verse 10. "The world was made by him." Ps. cii. 25, 26, 27. "Of old hast thou laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands: They shall perish, but thou shalt endure, &c." All which three verses are spoken concerning Christ, as appears in Heb. i. 10, &c. "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands, &c." And here it is proper to take notice of four things:

1. That the way whereby God creates all things, is by his word, to shew with what ease almighty power performs so divine a work; Gen. i. 3. "And God said, let there be light, and there was light." Ps. xxxiii. 9. "He spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast." And, Heb. xi. 3. "The worlds were framed by the word of God." And it is in the same manner that our Lord Jesus Christ is said to *uphold all things*,

viz. by the word of his power ;" Heb. i. 3. which signifies his mighty, or rather almighty word\*.

2. It may further be observed, that as God is the first cause of all created beings, so he is the last end of all. All things were made for him, as well as by him ; Rev. iv. 11. "Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." Heb. ii. 10. "It became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things," which is a description of God. Even so all things were created for Christ, as well as by him. See Col. i. 16, 17. "By him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible ; whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers ; all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist," or are conserved in their being and appointed station and order.

3. I remark yet further under this head, that creation is such a peculiar work of God, that his existence or being, his very nature, power, and godhead are certainly and infallibly inferred from it, as the apostle Paul assures us ; Rom. i. 20. "The invisible things of God from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead ; so that they are without excuse ;" even they who do not glorify that being as God, whom they may easily know by the work of creation. Thence it follows, that our Lord Jesus Christ must be the true God, must have eternal power and godhead, and must be glorified as God, since he created all things : For if any being that had not eternal power and godhead could create a world, then St. Paul's argument is feeble, and falls to the ground ; then the invisible things of the world do not prove the existence of an invisible, eternal and almighty God. Human reason can find out no higher being than him, by whom all things were created, even that eternal power and godhead, which made all things, and was before all things, even from eternity. Now if Jesus Christ be the Creator, then he is the highest being that reason can find out, and demands all the honours of true godhead.

4. It may be observed, in the last place, that if our Lord Jesus Christ were but a mere man, and not the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and yet had the honour and worship of a God given to him, he seems to fall under the sentence of destruction which is pronounced by the true and living God ; Jer. x. 11. "The gods that have not made the heavens and the

\* Here it may be noted, that it is not the word *Αγορ* logos, that is either used in Heb. i. 3. or in Heb. xi. 3. which is generally chosen when the Father is represented as acting by his Son or the personal word : But the word *Ρημα* *rema*, is used in both these places, to show that the Son of God upholds the creation by a mere word of command, acting in the same easy, and almighty, and divine manner as the Father.

earth, even they shall perish from the earth, and from under the heavens." But this leads me to the last distinguishing character of godhead.

#### V. Divine worship ascribed to Christ.

Religious worship is so peculiar a prerogative of God that he will by no means suffer any meaner being to share in it. He assumes this character to himself with a divine jealousy, lest any being beneath God should partake of it; Deut. vi. 13, 14, 15.

"Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt worship by his name. Ye shall not go after other gods, for the Lord thy God is a jealous God among you, lest the anger of the Lord thy God be kindled against thee, and destroy thee from off the face of the earth." This charge is repeated again; Deut. x. 20. and it is cited by our Lord Jesus Christ in these words; Mat. iv. 10. "It is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." The first command doubtless includes this meaning, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," that is, no other objects of worship; and Ex. xxxiv. 14. repeats it, "Thou shalt worship no other God; for the Lord whose name is jealous, is a jealous God."

Yet it is abundantly evident, that our Lord Jesus Christ is the proper object of worship, both for angels and men; Heb. i. 6. "And again, when he bringeth the first begotten into the world, he saith, let all the angels of God worship him." Which is cited from Ps. xcvi. 7. "Worship him all ye gods:" Upon which account our Lord Jesus Christ may be called the God of gods, as well as the Father; Deut. x. 17. Ps. cxxxvi. 2. since angels, which are called gods, must worship him. And let it be noted, that if our translation be right, this is not that worship or honour which is given him as Mediator by the Father's appointment, upon the account of his sufferings and death, as it is elsewhere expressed, but upon the account of his original divine nature, and as God now taking flesh: Though it must be confessed the Greek words rather bear this sense: *When he bringeth again his first-begotten into the world, which may refer to his resurrection; yet still it is evident, that angels must worship him.* Our Lord Jesus Christ was worshipped as the true God, the Lord Jehovah, by the patriarchs, when he appeared unto them in a visible shape under the Old Testament.

He was worshipped also when he dwelt on earth very often: but I will not cite nor insist on particular instances of this, because some may doubt whether this were not sometimes a mere high degree of reverence and obeisance paid to him under the surprising influence of his miracles, which does scarce amount to religious worship, since his godhead was not then so fully

discovered to his disciples, as to carry them above all doubt of his Messiahship or his Deity. But we have plain testimonies of divine worship paid to him after his resurrection; for Thomas honoured him as his Lord and his God; John xx. 28. He was worshipped by Stephen with his dying breath; Acts vii. 59. and with him that first martyr entrusted his departing soul. Nor do we ever find the least hint of his dislike or prohibition of worship. Nay, he commends the faith of Thomas calling him Lord and God. Whereas good men and angels have ever forbid worship to be paid to them, as being due to God alone. So when Cornelius worshipped Peter; Acts x. 26. "Peter forbid him and said, stand up; I myself also am a man." So when John worshipped the angel; Rev. xix. 10. and xxii. 8, 9, he refused the worship twice, "and said, see thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant; worship God," that is, God only is the proper object of thy worship.

It may be very properly observed concerning these two texts in the book of Revelation, where the angel refuses worship, and directs it to be paid only to God, that this was done after the full glorification of Christ, when God had appointed every knee to bow to him, and exalted him in our nature to his full majesty and dominion, and when he was known and adored by the church as the proper object of worship. Now if God only was to be worshipped in that day, it is a plain consequence, that Christ is God. That this worship is due to Christ, is further confirmed by the express orders which are given by God himself, both in the Old and New Testament, for the worship of his Son Jesus Christ; Ps. xlv. 11. "He is thy Lord, and worship thou him." John v. 23. *That all men should honour the Son, as they honour the Father.* And the great and blessed God, who is so jealous of his own prerogative and worship, would never have suffered those practices, much less would he have commanded them, if Christ had not been really the true God, and in some way and manner one with himself, and fit to receive the same divine honours.

Objection. Some may be ready to say, this is a sort of lower adoration, a subordinate sort of divine worship, that is paid to Jesus Christ, who is called God in scripture; whereas God the Father must have supreme divine worship, and reserves to himself still this supreme and distinguishing prerogative of true godhead.

Answer I. This seems to be but a vain evasion, because the scripture knows no such distinctions of supreme and subordinate divine or religious worship. It must be granted, as I have hinted before, that the scripture sometimes uses the word worship for other honours than what are divine and religious, as, 1 Chron. xix. 20. "They bowed their heads, and worshipped

the Lord and the king;" Mat. xviii. 26. "The servant fell down and worshipped his Lord." Rev. iii. 9. where Christ himself says to the church of Sardis, "I will make them come and worship before thy feet." And perhaps some who knew not that Christ was God, might pay this sort of worship to him on earth. Worship, in this sense, signifies only an extraordinary degree of honour paid to any superior person or character, even as we use the word in English, when we call several characters, or societies of men, worshipful. But this is not divine or religious worship, such as was appointed to be paid to Christ in his exalted state, and was never forbid even in his state of humiliation.

Now in religious and divine worship there is no mention made of two sorts or degrees of it. But if such distinctions were necessary to be observed in our worshipping the Father and the Son, it seems necessary that the scripture should have plainly and expressly told us of it somewhere, lest we run into the danger and heinous guilt of idolatry, by paying the some divine worship to both. There are so many plain expressions that encourage proper divine worship to be paid to Christ, and no plain expressions that give us any notion of a meaner or inferior divine worship, that either the scripture seems defective in a most material point of religion, or Jesus must be worshipped with proper divine honours as the Father.

II. "If Christ were to be worshipped merely with inferior worship, this would be to set up an inferior god; and thus the christian religion, whose professed design was to abolish polytheism among the nations, and to root out the worship of many gods, some of higher and some of lower rank, even this very christian religion would but more effectually establish it hereby; and the apostles would evidently build up again the things they destroyed. The very applying the name of God so frequently to our Lord Jesus Christ, and ascribing any thing of divine characters or worship to him, if he be not the true and living God, would seem to be an unpardonable fault and gross absurdity in those men, I mean the evangelists and the apostles: For they professed to be sent from God to destroy the heathen superstition, which consisted much in the worship of superior and inferior deities, and to turn the Gentiles from these vanities to the knowledge and worship of the one true and living God; See Acts xiv. 15. Acts xvii. 23, 24. Gal. iv. 8.

III. It is evident, that when Christ appeared to the patriarchs as the Lord Jehovah, and assumed the glorious names and titles of God in his converse with them, he was worshipped with supreme honour as the supreme God; for they thought him to be so, according to his own assertions, I am the Lord. They could have no notion of supreme and subordinate worship. Now



it is very strange to suppose, what some would persuade us, that after all his services and sufferings he should be rewarded only with subordinate and inferior worship, who had so long before enjoyed the supreme.

The objectors will enquire then, what is that advancement of honour which Christ received as the reward of his sufferings? I answer, he was worshipped before as God, now as god-man and mediator: Before he might be worshipped as Θεὸς λόγος, God the word, now as God the word in flesh, as God incarnate; that the whole human nature might see and know itself united to the object of divine worship. How far the blessed soul of our Lord Jesus may know and receive its distinct share of the thanks and praises which ascend from the saints on earth, is a secret not so clearly discovered in scripture: Surely such sacred and inimitable zeal for his Father's glory, such astonishing compassion to lost mankind, such a life and such a death, such a conflict and such a victory, deserve the highest honours and glories that we can pay to a creature. And doubtless his exalted human nature receives them from all the blessed spirits above. *Glory, and honour, and immortality*, were the rewards promised to every son of Adam who fulfilled the law of God; Rom. ii. 7. and much more are they become due to the second Adam, the man Christ Jesus, who fulfilled the law in every point, and, by his most illustrious obedience, magnified it and made it honourable beyond expression.

We may add further also, that since the man Jesus hath received so glorious an advancement at the right-hand of God, we may reasonably suppose, that his human powers have a vast and extensive cognizance of his churches on earth; and that he partakes of all those circumstances of the honour done to his whole sacred person, which are not purely divine and incommunicable: though we have no warrant to separate and divide the human nature from the divine, in the honours which we pay him.

Still it is the godhead of Christ that is the standing and eternal ground of all that divine and religious worship, which we are bound to give him, though we borrow many motives from his life, his love and his death. And since the great God has so often in his word assumed this sort of worship to himself, as his own prerogative and his distinguishing character, I am persuaded he would never have enjoined nor indulged worship to be paid to Jesus Christ in such a manner as is done in scripture, how great soever his services had been to God or man, if he had not the fulness of the godhead dwelling in him bodily. This shall suffice to answer the objection arising from this distinction of higher and lower worship.

I might now run through the several particular acts of divine worship, which the scripture makes the peculiar rights of

God, and yet ascribes them to Christ : Such as, " Believing or trusting in him ;" John xiv. 1. " Let not your heart be troubled, saith Christ ; ye believe in God, believe also in me ;" Rom. xv. 12. " In him shall the Gentiles trust." " Calling upon him, and praying to him ;" Rom. x. 13. " For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, that is, Christ, shall be saved." Paul prayed to him, to take away his thorn in the flesh ; 2 Cor. xii. 8. " For this I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me." " Adoring and praising him ;" Rev. v. 13. " And every creature which is in heaven, and on earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." " Swearing by his name ;" Rom. ix. 1. " I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost." Now all these divine honours done to our Lord Jesus, are foretold in the Old Testament, and required or practised in the New Testament, and would be so many affronts to the supreme majesty and dignity of the blessed God the Father, if Jesus Christ were not one and the same God with him, as we shall shew in the following propositions. A variety of other texts might be cited to make good these seventh and eighth propositions ; but I chuse rather, in this place, to content myself with citing those which are most unexceptionable, and have no just ground of controversy belonging to them.

To sum up all, let me make this one remark. That the places of scripture which I have brought to shew what are the peculiar and distinguishing characters of godhead, are so plain and easy to be understood, and those scriptures which apply these very same characters to our Lord Jesus Christ are so obvious, so evident, so naturally applicable to him, even in the divinest sense of them, that it needs a good deal of skill, and wit, and criticism to divert them to another sense : If it needed but half so much art and critical subtilty to apply those scriptures to Jesus Christ, as it does to turn them away from him, one might be tempted indeed to doubt his godhead, or to deny it.

It is plain that the Arian and Socinian doctrines which deny our Lord Jesus Christ to be the true and eternal God, cannot be supported in opposition to such obvious evidences of scripture, without more skill and learning, more subtilty and nice arts of distinction to evade the sense of plain words, than the bulk of common christians can ever be furnished with. Day-labourers and tradesmen, children and servants, of the meanest rank, reading their bibles, would naturally be led into the belief of Christ's divinity ; for they could never find out how to explain away such manifest expressions concerning the godhead of Christ, and make them signify a mere creature. Thence I would take

leave to infer, that Arian and Socinian doctrines are not the doctrines of the bible, which in matters of such moment and consequence are and must be so easy, open and clear, that the ignorant and the unlearned may read and understand; "for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

Now the plain christian, who reads his bible honestly, and follows the natural meaning of the words, will be led into the most dangerous mistake, and to the practice of downright idolatry by the very bible itself, if these divine characters which I have mentioned are not really applicable to Christ. If Christ were not a partaker of true godhead, I can never imagine that the great God, who is so jealous of his own honour, and so kind and faithful to his people; and who knows how ready mankind is to take every occasion to run into idol-worship, would ever lay such stumbling-blocks or temptations in their way, and leave them in his word for the use of all ages. I cannot persuade myself that this God would have let those passages stand in the holy scriptures as our rule of faith and practice, which have such a natural tendency to diminish his own dignity, to give away his divine prerogatives to another, and to deceive the humble and the simple into such pernicious suares, and that in a point of so high and awful importance.

I proceed now to consider which of the peculiar divine characters are ascribed in scripture to the Holy Ghost, and in this part of my discourse I shall be much briefer; not only because the scripture has not occasion to give half so many proofs of the godhead of the Holy Spirit, but because if the true and proper godhead of Christ be fully proved, that of the Holy Spirit will be easily admitted.

"Divine characters ascribed to the Holy Spirit."

I. The peculiar name of God, which is ascribed to the Holy Spirit in scripture, is Jehovah. The Spirit of God is the same with Jehovah; Is. vi. 3. "One of the seraphims cried to another, saying, holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts, in the original, it is Jehovah, the whole earth is full of his glory." And the voice of this Jehovah said, verse 9, 10. "Go and tell this people, hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not," &c. Now that these words were spoken by the Holy Ghost, is evident from Acts xxviii. 25, 26. "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Isaias the prophet, unto our fathers, saying, go unto this people, and say, hearing ye shall hear, and not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive," &c. Nor is it any sufficient objection that these words are applied to Christ; John xii. 41. "These things, said Isaias, when he saw his, that is, Christ's glory, and spake of him." For Christ and the Holy Ghost are one in godhead, as we shall shew hereafter.

**Deut. xxxii. 12.** "The Lord, or Jehovah alone did lead him," that is, Israel, in the wilderness. The prophet Isaiah speaking of this matter ascribes it to the holy Spirit; **Is. lxiii. 14.** "As a beast goeth down into the valley, the Spirit of the Lord caused him, that is, Israel, to rest; so didst thou lead thy people to make thy name glorious." Now either the Spirit is Jehovah, or Jehovah alone did not lead them.

**Pa. xcv. 3.** "The Lord, or Jehovah, is a great God, and a great king above all gods." Verse 7, &c. "To-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, as in the day of temptation in the wilderness: When your fathers tempted me, and proved me, and saw my works. Forty years long was I grieved with this generation;" which words are cited by St. Paul, as spoken by the Holy Ghost; **Heb. iii. 7, 8, 9, &c.** "Wherefore, as the Holy Ghost saith, to-day, if ye will hear his voice, &c. When your fathers tempted me, and I was grieved with that generation." And this is further confirmed; **Is. lxiii. 10.** "They rebelled and vexed his holy Spirit." And Stephen reproving the Jews; **Acts vii. 51.** said, "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: As your fathers did, so do ye." Nor is it any just objection, against this, that they were said to tempt Christ in the wilderness; **1 Cor. x. 9.** For in point of godhead Christ and the Holy Spirit are one.

**II.** The peculiar titles of God, which seem to be used promiscuously for God the Father, or for the Holy Spirit, are these, viz. the God of Israel and the Lord of hosts. The holy Spirit is represented as one with the "God of Israel;" **2 Sam. xxxiii. 2, 3.** "The Spirit of the Lord, or of Jehovah, spake by me, and his word was in my tongue. The God of Israel said, the rock of Israel spake to me, he that ruleth over men must be just:" Thus the Spirit of the Lord is the same with the God and the Rock of Israel. He is also called the "Lord of Hosts" in the text before cited; **Is. vi.** on which I shall not enlarge.

**III.** The peculiar attributes of God ascribed to the Holy Spirit are, omnipresence and omniscience.

**I.** "Omnipresence" is attributed to the holy Spirit; **Ps. cxxxix. 7.** "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? And whither shall I flee from thy presence?" It is vain to flee from one who is every where. **John xiv. 16, 17.** "The Spirit of truth" is promised to abide with the saints for ever, to be in them, to dwell in them; "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever: He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you;" **Rom. viii. 11.** He dwells in believers according to his promise, and makes them his holy temple; **1 Cor. vi. 19.** And is in all times, and in all places, where-soever his saints and servants are, distributing his several gifts and graces. **1 Cor. xii. 11.** "All these worketh the self-same

Spirit, dividing to every severally as he will :” Which expression carries as it were a divine sovereignty in it.

2. “Omniscience” belongs also to the holy Spirit: 1 Cor. ii. 10. “The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.” It is “the Spirit of Christ that was in the prophets which testified a thousand years before-hand the sufferings of Christ.” 1 Pet. i. 11. And this is one peculiar property of godhead; Is. xli. 23. where God challenges all other pretenders to godhead to vie with him. “Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods.” Many minute circumstances of the birth, life and death of Christ, as well as his resurrection and the propagation of the gospel, how exactly were they foretold by ancient prophets, and all through the inspiration of this Spirit of prophecy! 2 Pet. i. 21. “Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

3. “Eternity” is another attribute of God: And since some properties of God are ascribed to the holy Spirit, eternity must in the same sense belong to him also. Perhaps it is he who is called the eternal Spirit: Heb. ix. 14. “The blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself;” &c. Though some persons rather understand this of the eternal Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ himself.

But whether it be the one or the other that is there designed, yet I would not build an argument upon the mere doubtful criticism of a Greek word, and pretend it to be fully convincing, since that learned writer, Dr. Waterland himself when he is pleading for the eternity of Christ, from Micah v. 2. “his goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting,” confesses the argument, “is but probable, since there is not ground sufficient for calling it certain and indisputable:” only this he adds by way of remark, “That whosoever should undertake to prove the eternity of God the Father from any express words, either of the Old or New Testament, would find his proof liable to the same difficulty, and uncertainty, from the ambiguity of the Hebrew, or Greek phrases used to denote eternity.

IV. “Divine works are attributed to the blessed Spirit, as creation of the world, the change of the heart or regeneration, and the raising the dead.”

1. “The work of creation,” which has been proved before to be a divine work, is attributed to him; Job xxvi. 13. “By his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens:” Job xxxiii. 4. “The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty has given me life.” Ps. xxxiii. 6. “By the word of the Lord were the heavens made: and all the host of them by the breath, or Spirit, of his mouth;” for it is the same word רוח “ruach,” which is translated “Spirit” in the two foregoing texts, is rendered breath in this.

Acts iv. 24, 25. "Lord, thou art God, who hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is : Who by his mouth of thy servant David said, why did the heathens rage?" &c. He who spake by the mouth of David, is here declared to be that God who is the Creator of all things ; but the Holy Ghost is he who spake by the mouth of David, as appears from his own witness in 2 Sam. xxiii. 2, 3. "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me," &c. Not only does David the prophet thus witness concerning himself, but the apostle Peter does the same ; Acts i. 16. "The Holy Ghost, by the mouth of David, spake concerning Judas," &c. Therefore the Holy Ghost, is the Creator of all things.

2. The work of "changing the heart," and of new creation belongs to the great God ; Prov. xxi. 1. "The heart even of kings is in the hand of the Lord ; it is he that turneth them whithersoever he will." And when the heart is turned from sin to God, it is said to be his workmanship ; Eph. ii. 10. By him we "are created unto good works." And Jude verse 1. "we are said to be sanctified by God the Father. God assumes this prerogative to himself ; Lev. xx. 8. "I am the Lord which sanctifieth you." Yet this very work of new creation or sanctification is frequently in scripture ascribed to the holy Spirit ; Rom. xv. 16. "The Gentiles are sanctified by the Holy Ghost." And we are "chosen to salvation through the sanctification of the Spirit ;" 2 Thess. ii. 13. 1 Pet. i. 2. Upon this account it is, that the saints who are described as "born of God ;" John i. 13. and 1 John v. 1, 3, are said to be born of the Spirit ; John iii. 5, 6, 8.

3. The work of "raising the dead" is a divine work, which is also ascribed to the holy Spirit. That it is a work which seems to be appropriated to godhead, St. Paul intimates ; Rom. iv. 17. "He who quickens the dead, and calls the things which are not as though they were." is a description of God. And God is described in the same manner ; Rom. viii. 11. "He that raised up Christ from the dead." And that this was a glorious instance of his divine power ; see Eph. i. 19, 20. Now this work, both of raising Christ and all the saints from the dead, is ascribed to the Holy Spirit ; 1 Pet. iii. 18. "Christ—being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." Rom. viii. 11. "He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

I am come now to the last distinguishing character of godhead, and that is, to be the object of religious worship.

V. "Divine worship is paid to the Holy Spirit."

"Baptism is a sacred ceremony, whereby we are devoted and given up to God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ. But the holy Spirit is not omitted in this piece of worship ; Mat-

xxviii. 19. "Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." So that we are dedicated to the Holy Ghost in this solemnity, even as we are to God the Father. Here we may make this just remark, viz. That it can hardly be supposed, that Christ should appoint this solemn entrance into christianity, by baptizing men in the name of the one God and two mere creatures; but since they are joined, we may much rather conclude, that Christ himself, together with the Holy Ghost, are partakers of true deity, as well as the Father; otherwise, as a late writer says, the office of baptism would be an invincible stumbling-block both to Jews and Gentiles.

The Jews could not bear the least appearance of idolatry after they had smarted so severely for it under the Babylonish captivity, and would never afterward suffer any to be joined with the true God in their worship. Thus St. Paul testifies concerning them, that "they abhorred idols;" Rom. ii. 22. And as for the Gentiles, it was the main design of christianity to root out idolatry from among them, "to turn them from idols to the living God;" 1 Thess. i. 9. Now if the Son and Holy Ghost were inferior to the Father, and not the same God, the joining them with the Father in this initiating ordinance, would seem to have a very broad appearance of idolatry: And thus the Jews would have been effectually prejudiced against the gospel; and the Gentiles would have been rather confirmed in the worship of idols, or that which is not God.

Another thing wherein religious worship seems to be paid to the holy Spirit, is this, viz. that the apostle prays for the blessing to descend from the holy Spirit on the Corinthians, in the same way and manner in which the blessing of the Father and Son are prayed for; 2 Cor. xiii. 14. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." If this be a petition or prayer, it is a prayer to the sacred three. And the Holy Ghost is the object of this worship as well as the Father or Son. It seems evident also, that the holy Spirit was worshipped in some of those texts which were cited from the Old Testament, to prove the divine names, titles and attributes to belong to him; as Is. vi. Ps. xvi. &c. which I shall not repeat. And since it is he who enlightens, who comforts, who regenerates, and sanctifies men, who bestows on the saints so many gifts and graces, distributing them severally as he will, since he knows the hearts of men, and changes and renews their hearts unto holiness, the very reason of things leads us to adore him, and gives sufficient foundation to pray to him for what gifts or graces we want, and to praise and give him thanks for what we have received, as shall be shewn hereafter. I might take notice here, that several of these same divine characters are ascribed also to Jesus Christ, as the sanctification of

ianers, the raising of the dead, &c. but the proofs of the divinity of Christ are sufficient and abundant without these helps.

Thus I have finished the eighth proposition, and shewn that these very names, titles, attributes, works and worship, which are peculiar to God, and incommunicable to another, are ascribed to three by God himself, in his word, which three are distinguished by the names of Father, Son and Spirit.

After all, suppose a man should object thus, You have pretended to prove the deity of the Son and Spirit, by the ascription of such properties, works and worship to them, as belong only to the true God : But how do you know that all these can never belong to any creature ? As for instance, cannot God communicate to any inferior being a sort of omnipotency, and vest him with almighty power ? Or omniscience, and give him universal knowledge ? Or immutability, and make him unchangeable ? Is it an impossible thing that any being inferior to the great God, should be capable of forming several parts of the creation : Of changing the hearts of men ? Of raising the dead ? And is there no sort of religious worship, thanksgiving and praise, which can be given to any creature, upon the account of some extraordinary and spiritual benefits, received, or to be received from him ? And if so, then the ascription of these things to the Son and Spirit, are not sufficient and certain proofs, that true and proper godhead is ascribed to them. I answer :

It is not within our present reach, nor does it necessarily concern us, to know how far the powers of a creature can go, how glorious, and powerful, and perfect a creature God can make, or how sublime worship or honours, he might have fitted a creature to receive : It is not for us to say, that in the nature of things, it is utterly impossible for any being beneath a God, to have any one of these powers or characters communicated to him : Yet we dare affirm this, that since God has assumed these properties, these works, this worship, and peculiarised them to himself in his word, and since he describes himself by these characters, to distinguish himself from all inferior beings, he would never suffer any mere creature to stand upon record in his word, with these powers, properties, and characters belonging to him ; for this would be to give away his own distinguishing titles and properties. This would be to run counter to that holy jealousy, which he professes for his own name, and to bring perpetual confusion into all parts of religion, as I have shewn in the foregoing propositions.



**PROP. IX.**—*There are also some other circumstantial but convincing Evidences, that the Son and the Spirit have the true and proper Godhead ascribed to them, as well as the Father.*

There are many things spoken concerning God, the true and the living God, in some parts of his word, which in other parts of it are ascribed to our Lord Jesus Christ, or to the blessed Spirit.

First, To our Lord Jesus Christ.—1. The final judgment of the world is ascribed to God. Ps. l. 6. "For God is Judge himself." Rom. iii. 6. "Then how shall God judge the world?" And it is ascribed also to our Lord Jesus Christ. "Rom. xiv. 10. "We must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." 2 Tim. iv. 1. "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing." And indeed how can we suppose a being, who has not divine perfections, capable of such a work? It seems to require an omniscient mind, and an almighty arm, to manifest the secrets of all hearts, and to discover and punish the infinite variety of secret wickednesses in the hearts of men, as well as proclaim and reward the secret workings of piety, in those that have loved God.

2. There is a glorious description of the triumph of God; Ps. lxxviii. 4, 8, 17, 18. "He rides upon the heavens by his name, Jah: The earth shook, the heavens dropped, at the presence of God, the God of Israel. The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: The Lord is among them as in Sinai, in the holy place: Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: Thou hast received gifts for men;" which is applied to the ascension of Christ into heaven. Eph. iv. 8, 10. "Wherefore he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. He that descended, is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things." Christ is therefore this Lord, this God, this Jehovah or Jah, whose triumph is there described.

3. The children of Israel, as it is related in Ps. lxxviii. 56. "tempted and provoked the most high God:" which is asserted concerning Christ; 1 Cor. x. 9. "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed," &c. Therefore the tempting of Christ is a tempting of the most high God.

4. The kingdom of God is an everlasting kingdom; Ps. cxlv. 13. "and his dominion endures through all generations." which honour is ascribed to Christ in a citation of the xlv. Psalm, by St. Paul, Heb. i. 8. "But unto the Son he saith, thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." And in many other places.

5. Isaiah prophesies chapter vii. 14. "A virgin shall bear a Son, and shall call his name Immanuel." ~~Witnessed~~ by Mat.



10. The blessed God excludes every thing from comparison or competition with himself; Is. xlvi. 4. "To whom will ye liken me, and make me equal, and compare me, that we may be like?" Yet our Lord Jesus Christ says concerning himself; John xiv. 9. "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father;" and the apostle Paul adds; Heb. i. 3. He is the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person;" and Phil. ii. 6.—"He thought it no robbery to be equal with God;" though it must be confessed, that the criticisms which attend this last named text, take off something from its force and evidence, and render the sense of it a little dubious.

11. Christ is that glorious person, "in whom dwells the fulness of the godhead bodily;" Col. ii. 9. which is too exalted an expression to be given to a mere creature, if the godhead or divine nature were not so united to the man Christ Jesus, as to render him one complex person, God and man. It is true that the apostle prays for the Ephesians, that they "may be filled with all the fulness of God;" Eph. iii. 19. But this can mean no more than a fulness of those gifts, graces, and manifestations of God, which the primitive christians enjoyed and hoped for. But the word godhead is never used to signify gifts and graces, but only the divine nature, which in its perfection and fulness, dwelt in this peculiar and transcendent manner in Christ alone, and not in his saints. And the addition of the word, bodily, seems to shew a peculiar union of the godhead to the human nature or body, of our Lord Jesus Christ.

12. Our faith and trust in Christ, is the same with faith and trust in God, as appears; Jer. xvii. 5, 7. "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man; blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is." Compared with Ps. ii. 12.—"Blessed are all they that put their trust in him," that is, Christ.

13. Christ is the Lord our God, by whom we are saved; Hos. i. 7. "The Lord said, "I will have mercy on the house of Judah, and will save them by the Lord, [Jehovah;] their God," compared with Luke ii. 11. "Unto you is born in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ, the Lord." God the Father who is Jehovah, saves his church by his Son, who is also Jehovah and their God.

14. That glorious person who is called "the Spirit of God," Rom. viii. 9. and in many other places of scripture, is also called "the Spirit of Christ," in that very same verse, as well as 1 Pet. i. 11. "and the Spirit of his Son;" Gal. iv. 6. and as he is promised to be poured "out on all flesh," by the Lord our God; Joel ii. 27, 28. this was accomplished; Acts ii. 16. when Christ "shed forth this Spirit; verse 33. and baptized the disciples "with the Holy Ghost, and with fire," as Mat. iii. 11.

Thence it appears, that Christ is that God to whom the Spirit belongs, and he sends it.

15. Christ's own resurrection is attributed to God the Father; Rom. vi. 4. and to the holy Spirit; 1 Pet. iii. 18. and yet Christ ascribed it to himself; John ii. 19, 21. "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up, which he spake of the temple of his body;" this shews that the same divine power and godhead of the Father, which raised up Christ, dwelt also in the Son and Spirit.

16. That it was our Lord Jesus Christ who died for us, is abundantly manifest from all the New Testament; and yet Acts xx. 28. it is said, "Feed the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood." And 1 John iii. 16. "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us." So that he who shed his blood, and laid down his life for sinners, was the true God: He came into the world, and was born of a virgin, and took upon him the name of Emmanuel, or God with us, God in our nature, that he might have flesh and blood, which he gave for the redemption of his people. See more under the last particular.

17. After the resurrection of Christ, the apostle Thomas, in a rapture of faith, calls him, "my Lord, and my God;" John xx. 28. And our Saviour is so far from reproving him, that he commends him, and pronounces those blessed, who should believe the same doctrine, which he professed, without having the same sensible advantages. Now where the words Lord God are thus joined, it looks so like the incommunicable title of God, by which he is often described in the Old Testament, that Christ would never have suffered these words of Thomas to pass without a reproof, if he himself had not a real oneness with the great God, and a right to this incommunicable title. By a comparison of this with what has been said before concerning the visible appearances of God of old, we may grow bold and say, "Surely this was the Lord God, whose voice Adam heard in the garden;" Gen. iii. 8. This was the "Lord God of Abraham; Gen. xxviii. 18. "The Lord God of your fathers in the burning bush;" Ex. iii. 15, &c.

18. Whereas it is said, Rev. xxii. 6. "The Lord God of the holy prophets, sent his angel to shew unto his servants the things which must shortly be done." It is added, verse 16. "I Jesus have sent my angel, to testify to you these things in the churches." Whence we may reasonably suppose, that our Lord Jesus, and the Lord God of the prophets, have such an intimate relation to, and union with one another, that these two names may be used without danger, the one for the other. For Christ is the Lord God of the prophets, as well as the Lord God of Abraham.

10. There are many other titles and characters, attributed to our Lord Jesus Christ, and that so often, and in such a manner, as seem to raise him high above the character of creatures, so that I can hardly think these titles would have been thus attributed to him in scripture, if he had not godhead in him, even though he had been never so glorious, and exalted a creature.

He is called the "truth;" John xiv. 6. The "Amen, the faithful and the true witness;" Rev. iii. 14. which seems to be the name given to God himself; by Is. lxv. 16. where prophesying of the times of the gospel, he says, that men shall "bless themselves in the God," "Amen," and shall swear by the God, "Amen," which we translate the "God of truth." It is in this "Amen," in whom the nations of the earth should be blessed, and by whose name they should swear, in the days of christianity, when "the new heavens and earth are created;" verse 17. Christ is called the "light," absolutely, and without limitation; John i. 4. Now light in such an absolute way of expression, is one of the titles of God; 1 John i. 5. "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." He is called the "life;" 1 John i. 2. "Truth and life;" John xiv. 6. "The resurrection and the life;" John xi. 25. and the "word of life;" 1 John i. 1. "Eternal life," verse 2. and chapter v. 20. Now the living God that has life in himself, and gives life to all things; is a glorious title and character of God, in many places of scripture: But this seems so to be too nearly imitated in these titles given to Christ, if he were not God.

Christ is called the "word," "who was with God, and who was God;" John i. 1. He was in so close a union with the true God the Father, and so much one with him, that he may be justly called the true God; and especially when there is one of the characters of true godhead immediately subjoined, viz. that *all things were made by him*; Verse 3. The "word" is a frequent name of Christ in the New Testament, especially in the writings of the apostle John: And some critics well skilled in Jewish and Hebrew language, have given us a number of instances, where Christ is called the word of God, and word of the Lord, in the Old Testament also. He is called the "living word;" Heb. iv. 12, 13. as it should be rendered. "The word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart; neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and open unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do." Which text carries something too sublime in it for any mere creature; and yet christian writers have generally explained this text, concerning our

Lord Jesus Christ, who is the living word of God, speaking to men, in, and by the word of his gospel.

Now I will easily grant, that any one of these terms, truth, light, life, the word, &c. if upon some particular occasion only, it had been applied to Christ, would not have been sufficient to prove him to be true God: Yet when all these are applied to Christ, and that in such a manner, or sometimes with such epithets and adjuncts, and in several places of scripture, it seems to raise our thoughts of Christ necessarily above all created beings, and leads us to ascribe true godhead to him: And especially when these scriptures are considered, under the light and influence of many other texts, which have been cited before, where true and eternal godhead is without all doubt attributed to him.

20. I close all these circumstantial evidences, with that common argument, which is found in the lips of almost all christians, to prove the divinity of Christ, viz. that nothing less than the blood of him that was true God, could make satisfaction to divine justice, equal to the offences that were given it by our sins. The argument seems thus far, at least, to have a convincing force in it. It is said, that, "without blood there is no remission;" Heb. ix. 22. and it is said also, that "it was not possible for the blood of bulls and of goats to take away sin;" Heb. viii. 3. Now I cannot see any certain reason, why God might not have appointed the blood of bulls and goats, to be a sufficient atonement for our sins; or why it was impossible that it should be sufficient; but upon this account only, because it was not an equivalent. For if the justice of God would have been satisfied with any thing less than an equivalent, how can it be said, that it was not possible for the blood of animals to have been appointed for that end, by the sovereign will of God?

But if the governing justice of God insisted upon an equivalent sacrifice, or a satisfaction equal to all the infinite offences of the millions of mankind that are redeemed, then they who deny the godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, are obliged to shew where this equivalent is to be found. I must declare my opinion, that it is the dignity of the man Christ Jesus, as he is united to God, and one with God, that entered into the merit of all his sufferings, and made the price of our redemption an abundant satisfaction for sin, and a glorious equivalent for all the sinners that were redeemed, because they were the sufferings of him who was God.

These are some circumstantial evidences, which shew, that true and proper godhead is ascribed to our Lord Jesus in scripture. I proceed therefore, Secondly, To produce the same sort of evidences, concerning the divinity of the Holy Ghost.

1. The inspiration of the prophets, and other holy writers,

is attributed to God; Heb. i. 1. "God who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the fathers, by the prophets," &c. And 2 Tim. iii. 16. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." But this very work of inspiration is frequently ascribed to the holy Spirit; 2 Sam. xxiii. 2. "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me." Ezek. xi. 5. "The Spirit of the Lord fell upon me, and said unto me, speak," &c. 2. Pet. i. 21. Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Therefore the Holy Ghost is God.

2. The body of Christ is said to be conceived in the virgin Mary, by the operation "of the Holy Ghost;" Mat. i. 20. and by the over-shadowing power of the Highest;" Luke i. 35. that is, the holy Spirit by whom divine power is exerted; and yet for this very reason Christ is called the Son of God, because he was conceived by the influence of the Holy Ghost: which would hardly have been expressed in that manner, if the Holy Ghost had not been God.

3. Lying to the Holy Ghost, is lying to God; Acts v. 3, 4. "Why hath Satan filled thy heart, to lie to the Holy Ghost? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." The holy Spirit seems to be called God in this text.

4. That God who dwells in us as his temple, is the holy Spirit; 2 Cor. vi. 16. "Ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them." Compared with 1 Cor. vi. 19. "Know you not, that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you." Now for what reason can any thing be called the temple of God, in God's own word, but because God himself dwells in it?

5. To which I might subjoin in the last place, that blasphemy against the Holy Ghost has a greater penalty annexed to it under the gospel, than blaspheming against God or Christ. See Mat. xii. 31, 32. "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: But whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in that which is to come." Now it is not to be supposed, that if the Holy Ghost were but a mere creature, the sin of blasphemy committed against him, should have a more express and dreadful threatening of utter destruction pronounced against it, than blasphemy against God the Father, or against his Son, who is his express image. I grant, that the most obvious and direct sense of that threatening, is to denounce damnation, without hope, upon those who shall wilfully and utterly reject the last and fullest demonstrations of the Messiah, and the brightest evidence of the gospel, by resisting the convictions of the Holy Ghost, in all his miraculous

operations. Yet I think it may be worth our enquiry, whether this solemn and awful denunciation of judgment, against those obstinate resisters of the gospel, and blasphemers of the Holy Ghost, might not be written in such express and dreadful language to stand as a sacred fence and guard, against any attempts to diminish his divine dignity.

Thus I have fulfilled the proposal in the ninth proposition, and shown a variety of other evidences of the deity of the Son, and of the holy Spirit. I will not pretend, that every text which I have here cited, is so plainly or necessarily determined, to the sense in which I have cited it, as to be free from all objections: Though the greatest part of them cannot reasonably be construed to any other sense, without an unnatural strain and force put upon them, to make them serve some Arian or Socinian scheme. And there is just reason to believe, that the all-wise God would never have expressed himself in these scriptures, in such a manner, and used the names of God,\* Lord, Jehovah, so promiscuously in speaking of Christ, and of the holy Spirit, and that without any guard, any exception or limitation, if there had been any error or danger in believing Christ or the Spirit, to have proper godhead in them.

I do not pretend to instruct the learned world; my design here was to write for private and unlearned christians, and to lead them by the fairest and most obvious sense of scripture, into some acquaintance with the great doctrine of the Trinity. And it is my settled opinion, that a christian can never safely build his faith, in any important article of religion, upon such scriptures as want a great deal of art, and labour, and critical skill, to make them speak that article plainly. Yet because the adversaries of our faith, have endeavoured to pervert the natural sense of many a text, those who have a mind to see how the sense of several of these scriptures is confirmed, by just criticism and reasoning, in opposition to the cavils and objections of men, may consult such authors, as have written largely on this subject, as Bishop Pearson, Dr. Barrow, Bishop Bull, Dr. Owen, &c. in the last age, and more lately Mr. Boyse, and Dr. Waterland, in their treatises of the Divinity of Christ, Dr. Waterland's sermons on that subject, Mr. Samuel Mather in his two Discourses on the Trinity, and the godhead of the Holy Ghost, Mr. Guyse's two volumes of sermons on the Deity of Christ, and the holy Spirit, and Dr. Knight's sermons on that subject, with several others.

I would remark yet further, that though several of these scriptures taken singly and alone, will not certainly prove that the peculiar divine characters are ascribed to the Son and the Spirit, because some of them may be otherwise construed; yet

\* See the two last paragraphs, under Proposition II.



when they stand in such a light as I have set them in, and run parallel to, and are connected with so great a number of other scriptures, that certainly ascribe godhead to the Son and Spirit; I think, the most, if not all, of these may serve to brighten the evidence, and enforce the conviction.

**PROP. X.**—*Thence it necessarily follows that these three, viz: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, have such an intimate and real Communion in that one Godhead, as is sufficient to justify the Ascription of those peculiar and distinguishing divine Characters to them.*

It was the great design of God to discover his nature and his will, and to make himself known to the children of men, by all his revelations to mankind: And when he employed holy men to write his word, it was to preserve these divine discoveries of himself uncorrupted, and to deliver them down to all ages, that he might be known and worshipped according to those revelations of himself, which he hath made. It is only by these divine and distinguishing characters which he has assumed, and peculiarized to himself in his word, that we know what and who God is: Now we can never imagine, that a God who is so jealous of his own honour, and so kind and faithful to his creatures, should ever suffer such peculiar and distinguishing characters of godhead, to be ascribed in such a multitude of places of his own word to any thing that is not God, lest he thereby give away all that honour and glory, which it is the very design of his word to appropriate and reserve to himself, and lest he should lead his own people into a dangerous error. Though I have mentioned this once or twice before, yet my reader will forgive me that I repeat it again, because I would have him always keep it in his eye, and have it deeply impressed upon his mind, as an argument, in my esteem, of resistless evidence, and uncontrollable force.

The Son and the Spirit, who have these peculiar divine characters ascribed to them, must therefore have some real and proper communion in the divine nature, some participation or share in the true and eternal godhead: Otherwise the word of God, which was written for our instruction, would be more ready to deceive us than to lead us into truth, and would thereby impeach both the goodness and faithfulness of God. Let me make in this place two remarks.

**Remark I.** If any of my readers should think they can refute above twenty of the arguments that I have used to prove the godhead of Christ, and the Holy Spirit, by giving those scriptures another turn of sense; yet let them remember that they cannot go fairly into a denial of their godhead, till they have

refuted them all, which I am fully persuaded they will never be able to do.

II. I think I ought here to mention again that which was hinted before, viz. That though the ascriptions of deity to the blessed Spirit are not written in scripture with half so much frequency or evidence, as those ascriptions of deity to the Son of God: Yet if the deity of the Son be well confirmed, that of the Holy Spirit will be readily granted by all. Every proof therefore of the godhead of Christ may be counted a consequential scripture proof of the godhead of the Holy Ghost.

A MORAL ARGUMENT.

Before I dismiss this proposition, I would ask leave to add one moral argument, to prove that the Son and Holy Spirit have real communion in the divine nature, as well as the Father.

The greatest number of christians since the days of the apostles, the most religious, the most holy of men, and multitudes of glorious confessors and martyrs, have believed this doctrine of the divinity of the Son and Spirit, and under the influence of this belief have paid divine honours to them both: And this many of them have done with such concurring circumstances, that carry in them a good force of argument, viz. they have worshipped them as God, 1. After they have sought the knowledge of the truth with utmost diligence and prayer. 2. When they have been in the holiest and most heavenly frames of spirit, and in their devoutest hours. 3. When they have been under the most sensible impressions of the love of the Father, and the Son, and under the most quickening influences of the blessed Spirit himself. 4. In the devotions of a death bed, and in the songs and doxologies of martyrdom.

Now can we suppose that, in such devout and glorious seasons as these are, God the Father should ever thus manifest his own love to souls that are degrading him by worshipping another god? That Christ Jesus should reveal himself in his dying love to souls that are practising idolatry, and worshipping himself, instead of the true God? Or can we believe that the blessed Spirit should give his influences; and his consolations, to encourage and assist such false worship, and himself assume these divine honours, if he had no title to godhead? Or can we imagine that the true and gracious God, should suffer such multitudes of holy souls to be deluded and given up, to believe a lie in such an awful and important point, in their most devout moments, and in their dying hour?

**PROP. XI.**—*Since there is and can be but one true God, these Three, who have such a Communion in Godhead, may properly be called the one God, or the only true God.*

The reason of it is this : Because, if God *will not give his glory, and his name to any other*, as we have before proved, Is. xlii. 8. then those to whom he has given his name and his glory, are not another, but they are one and the same with himself. There is a sameness of godhead, therefore, that belongs to these three, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit : So that the Son and the Spirit cannot be called another god, or gods ; for if they could, this would support, and not destroy, the polytheism, or multiplicity of gods, which was acknowledged and believed by the heathen nations. And perhaps it is better to express this by a sameness of godhead, than by calling it an equality ; for equality is more properly found between several distinct beings : Now wherein soever these three are distinct, it may admit of some doubt and argument whether they are equal or no.

Therefore we cannot fall into any mistake of doctrine, when we read in scripture, that the Father, the Son, and Spirit are one, if we suppose it to signify, or at least to include, they are one in divine nature, or godhead ; they are properly one and the same God ; as when Christ expresses himself thus ; John x. 30. “ I and my Father are one ;” and when the apostle John, speaking of the holy Trinity, saith ; 1 John v. 7. “ For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost : And these three are one.”

Whatsoever other sense may possibly be put on the first of these texts, *I and my Father are one*, since Christ had not in that day so fully revealed his own godhead ; yet it is evident, that this last expression of the three that bear record in heaven, cannot signify these three are one in their testimony ; or, one in design and agreement, as some would have it : Because when the apostle, in the following verse, speaks of the agreement of the three witnesses on earth, the Spirit, the water, and the bloods ; he asserts expressly these three, *as they agree in one thing*. But in this verse he says concerning the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, they are one, *as they are* which must mean that the three witnesses in heaven have some superior, and more intimate union or oneness, than the three witnesses on earth pretended to : And what can this more justly be applied to, than a oneness in the divine nature ? This last text hath been the subject of many cavils and disputes, whether it were written originally by the apostle, or whether it were not foisted into the scripture in some later ages ; but upon the best examination we can make, I think there are good reasons to approve it apostolical.

Now since there is but only true and living God, these three, *or each of them*, may be called the only true and living God :

and wheresoever any such expression is found in scripture, attributing the only true godhead to one of these, it is not to be supposed that it excludes the other two from communion in the only true godhead; but rather to shew that there is no other true godhead, but what belongs to these. In this sense we must understand the following texts, where the one God is mentioned, if we would interpret them in a consistency with those numerous scriptures before cited, where the one true godhead is attributed to the Son and holy Spirit. Mat. xix. 17. "Whyallest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God." Mark xii. 32. "There is one God, and there is none other but he;" and many other places.

There are some texts wherein the Father is represented as the only true God. John xvii. 3. "That they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John. xvi. 7. "To God only wise, or, to the only wise God be glory, through Jesus Christ for ever." 1 Cor. viii. 6. "To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we are in him." Eph. iv. 4, 5, 6. "There is one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father of all, who is above all."

There are also some texts, wherein our Lord Jesus Christ may seem to be represented as the only true God. Is. xlv. 21, 22. "There is no God else besides me, a just God, and a Saviour, there is none beside me. Look unto me, and be ye saved all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else." Jude ver. 25. "To the only wise God our Saviour be glory and majesty." And some learned writers suppose, that whole title in the fourth verse of his epistle belongs to Christ, where men are said to *know the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ*; and they translate it thus agreeably enough to the greek, "and our Master, God Lord and Jesus Christ." *Τοι μόνου Δεσποτῆ, Θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.* Especially when St. Peter's second epistle, of which St. Jude's epistle is but a sort of epitome, applies the same word *Δεσποτῆ* to Christ; 2 Pet. ii. 1. Now in any of these scriptures, we are not to imagine that either the Father or the Son are excluded, or shut out from true godhead; but that in some of them the only true godhead is represented in the person of the Father; in the others, the same godhead is represented in the person of the Son, for this only true godhead subsists and acts in three different persons; as we shall see in the following propositions.\*

\* Here it may not be amiss to mention that which some divines have laid a great stress upon, to prove the doctrine of the Trinity, viz. That God the Father, when he was about to create man, speaks thus; Gen. i. 26. "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; consulting, as it were, with the Son and Spirit, This seems very probable; And perhaps it may be upon this account, that the Hebrew word is used in the plural number in the following texts: Ec. xii. 1. "Remember thy Creators in the days of thy youth." Ps. cxlix. 2. "Let Israel rejoice in his Makers." Job xxxv. 10. "None saith, where is God my Makers?" Is. liv. 5. "Thy Makers is thy husbands." Though other critics conceive

**PROP. XII.**—*Though the Father, Son and Spirit are but one God, yet there are such different Properties, Actions, Characters, and Circumstances ascribed to these Three, as are usually ascribed to Three distinct Persons amongst Men.*

To make this proposition evident I shall do two things. First, I will attempt to prove that they have personal actions and characters ascribed to them in scripture : And then secondly, shew that these actions require distinct persons. First, "The sacred three have personal actions and characters ascribed to them." That God the Father is a person all parties easily allow. The actions of creating, and governing all things, purposing ends and using means, and disposing the creatures according to the rules of his wisdom, justice and grace, are abundant evidences of his personality, and the scripture is full of them. The Son of God, even before he came into this world, did converse with the ancient patriarchs, was sent of God as the angel of his presence, to lead the Israelites in the wilderness, to encourage Joshua as captain of Jehovah's host, and then to take flesh upon him of the virgin Mary ; all which are personal actions. The holy Spirit did lead Israel through the desert, did inspire the prophets, and speak by them. did guide and influence our Lord Jesus Christ, did work miracles by the apostles, &c. And all these are personal actions.

Now lest any opposer should say, "All these several actions are performed by one single person, even the great God himself, under mere different names or appearances, and not by three distinct personal agents," I shall therefore prove.

In the second place. That "actions which require distinct persons, are ascribed to the sacred three in scripture." Now those are certainly such distinct personal actions and characters, as require three distinct personal agents, which cannot be ascribed or attributed to each other. And there are such different and distinct personal characters and actions ascribed to each of these

these plural words to be mere expressions of eminence concerning God in the hebrew language, as Abraham is called "masters," and Pharoah, Lords ; Gen. xxiv. and ix. 1. And as the hebrew word for God is  $\text{אלהים}$  Elohim, which signifies Gods, and is used for a false god or an angel, as well for the true God.

There are also some other expressions in scripture, where the Father, Son and Spirit seem as plainly to be denoted ; Gen. iii. 22. "The Lord God said, behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil." And Is. vi. 8. When the Father, Son, and Spirit are represented in vision, the prophet "heard the voice of the Lord saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for us ?" That is, & as one God, and us as three persons.

Since this was in the press, there has appeared a small discourse called "The Trinity of the Bible," wherein the argument arising from these hebrew plurals, and from the name Elohim is shewn in its fullest force, and pushed to the utmost ; and that with great probability, if the author had but answered the objections, he himself has raised in the margin, page 9 and 10. to the fuller satisfaction of his readers.

ree in the word of God, as cannot possibly be ascribed to either the other two. There are such things attributed to the Father, which cannot be attributed to the Son, or the holy Spirit : And again, there are such things attributed to the Son, as cannot be ascribed to the Father, nor the Spirit : And such things are attributed to the Spirit, which cannot be ascribed either to the Father, or the Son : Of which I shall produce a few instances.

The Father is said to generate, or beget the Son. Ps. ii. 7. "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." Which is applied to Christ ; Heb. i. 5. and chapter v. 5. Now this paternal act whatsoever it mean, yet it cannot be attributed either to the Son or the Spirit. The Son is called the "only begotten of the Father ;" John i. 14, 18. Which filial character cannot be ascribed to the Spirit, or the Father. The Spirit is said to be given by the Father to the Son ; John iii. 34. "God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him." And Is. lxi. 1. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me ;" which is applied to Christ ; Luke iv. 18. But what is said here of the Spirit, cannot be attributed to the Father, nor the Son.

The Father sent the Son into the world to take flesh upon him, and to be born, or made of a woman ;" John vi. 38, 39, 40, 57. John iv. 4. "But neither the Father nor the Spirit, are ever said to be sent to take upon them our nature, or the likeness of sinful flesh, as is expressed concerning the Son ; Rom. viii. 3. The Holy Spirit is said to be sent from the Father, by our Lord Jesus Christ unto the disciples ; John xv. 26. "When the Comforter come, whom I will send to you from the Father." And Acts 13. "The Son having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed him forth in his various gifts upon the apostles." The diversity of characters and offices which are retained, and fulfilled by the Father, Son and Spirit, in order to the salvation of sinners, are so many distinct personal titles and properties, and actions attributed to them, whereby they are fully distinguished from one another, as three personal agents.

The Father sustains the character of the supreme Lord, and Governor of all things, in the economy of our salvation. He is presented in scripture as maintaining the rights of godhead and demanding satisfaction for the affronts that are done thereto, in our behalf : He purposes and appoints the scheme of our salvation in himself ; Eph. i. 9. He sends his own Son *in the likeness of sinful flesh*, to make satisfaction to his injured authority, and to the offended dignity of godhead.

The Son took flesh and blood, to do the will of the Father. Heb. x. 5, 7. "A body hast thou prepared me : And lo, I come, in the volume of the book it is written of me, to do thy will, O God." It is the Son who dies to make atonement for us, who rises again, and ascends to heaven as our high-priest,

there to intercede for us ; and is exalted by the Father to the kingdom, in order to govern the world and the church.

The holy Spirit, in the sacred economy of our salvation, is sent from the Father by the Son, to lead sinners into the knowledge of the truth, to change their natures, to sanctify or make them holy, to comfort and conduct them to glory, as well as to work miracles in the world, for the confirmation of this gospel.

Now all these are so many several offices, characters and actions, which cannot be promiscuously applied to one another, in the same manner as they are attributed distinctly to each of the sacred Three in scripture ; and therefore they must be accounted distinct personal actions, &c. I know not how it is possible for any one to read these following texts of scripture, wherein all the blessed Three are mentioned together, without supposing them to be three distinct personal agents.

Is. xlii. 1. Where God the Father says, "Behold my servant whom I uphold, I will put my Spirit upon him." Is. lxi. 1. Where the Son of God in prophecy says, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me." Luke iii. 22. "And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape, like a dove upon him, that is Christ, and a voice came from heaven, which said, thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased." Here are the three persons of the blessed Trinity, manifesting themselves in a sensible manner at the baptism of Christ. The Son like a man, the holy Spirit as a dove, and the Father speaking from heaven. Mat. xxviii. 19. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." John xiv. 16, 17. "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, even the Spirit of truth." John xiv. 26. "The Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, and he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." The little word he in the greek is *ειπεν* which is always used for a person. John xv. 26. "I will send unto you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me." Where this personal word *ειπεν* is again used.

Rom. viii. 11. "The Spirit of him, that is, the Father, who raised up Jesus from the dead." Rom. xv. 30. "I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me, in your prayers to God for me." 2 Cor. xiii. 14. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all, amen." Eph. ii. 18. "Through him, that is, Christ, we both have an access by one Spirit unto the Father." Eph. iv. 4, 5, 6. "There is one Spirit, one Lord,

one God and Father of all." 1 Pet. 1. 2. "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. Jude verses 20, 21. "Praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life."

I think the plain and express scripture contained in these citations, sufficiently distinguishes three personal agents, without any further comment upon them. A Turk, or an Indian, that reads them without any prepossession, would certainly understand most of them so.

**PROP. XIII.**—*Therefore it has been the Custom of the Christian Church in almost all Ages, to use the Word Person, in Order to describe these Three Distinctions of Father, Son, and Spirit; and to call them Three distinct Persons.*

The word person signifies, in the common language of mankind, one single intelligent voluntary agent, or a principle of action that has understanding and will. So three men, or three angels, are properly called three distinct persons; and the Father, the Son and Spirit, who are all one God, yet having three such distinct sort of actions and characters attributed to them, as may properly be ascribed to three distinct intelligent agents, we make no scruple to call them three persons. For it is sufficiently evident, that three mere names, three attributes, three modes or manners of being, three relations, or three sorts of conception of one and the same single or individual being, are not sufficient to sustain the three different offices, or to perform the three different sorts of actions, which are attributed to Father, Son, and Spirit: Nor can we account for them, without supposing three distinct intelligent agents.

It might be also mentioned to confirm this proposition, that the scripture itself used the word person, in one or more places, to distinguish the Father from the Son. Heb. i. 3. Christ is called *the express image of his Father's person*. And though the Greek word "hypostasis," which we well render person, sometimes signifies substance, as it is translated Heb. xi. 1. yet in that very place the word seems to intimate a distinction from the Father, strong enough to answer the word person in our language. Again in 2 Cor. iv. 6. "The knowledge of the glory of God shines forth in the person of Jesus Christ;" which perhaps is a better translation of the Greek word *προσωπον* "prosonon," then when we render it the face of Christ.

Though the word person be fitly used and applied in this case, yet we generally suppose it is not to be taken exactly in the same sense, as when we apply the word to three men, or to three angels, and call them three distinct persons; for they



have not such real communion in one nature, as these three sacred persons have in one godhead. But since these things are so difficult to determine, I will never contend with my brother, or fellow-christian, who scruples to use the word person in this doctrine; provided he will but allow such a distinction between the sacred three, as is sufficient to support their distinct characters and offices assigned to them in scripture: And this is all that I mean by using this word. Yet since the word person is the best word that we know, and comes nearest to the ideas or conceptions, which the scripture seems to give us of the distinction between Father, Son, and Spirit; I use it still with great freedom and satisfaction, in a sense near a-kin to the common sense of the word.

A MORAL ARGUMENT.

As I have used one moral argument at the end of the tenth proposition, to prove the true and proper Deity of Father, Son, and Spirit: so I shall propose another of the same kind under this proposition, to confirm both the doctrine of their Deity and distinct personality together: And it is this,

This great article of belief, that "Father, Son, and Spirit are three persons, and yet one God," is so sublime in its nature, so impossible to be found out by human reason if it had not been revealed; it carries in it such an appearance of contradiction at first, it is so exceeding hard to explain and reconcile, even when it is well considered by us; and it is so shocking and offensive in the most usual explications of it to the great pretenders to reason, that it can hardly be supposed how it should enter into the minds of men at first; and how it should have been so generally believed in the christian church in almost all ages of christianity, if it had not been very plainly revealed, and strongly confirmed in scripture so that those honest and conscientious men could not wink against the light and strength of evidence, nor turn the scripture to any other sense.

It is not to be imagined that such a doctrine of the Trinity, which has no countenance from the light of nature nor any manner of allurements in it to gratify the lusts or fancies of men, nor flatter the pride of human reason, should ever have come, without most forcible evidence, into the heads of such multitudes of great and wise men, who thought and searched with freedom for themselves, and who read the bible with a honest enquiry after truth; I say it is not to be imagined that such a strange article should ever have been believed by these men, and brought into the church, or subsisted there so many hundred years, and especially since the reformation, were it not for the plain, strong, over-bearing light, and resistless proofs of it that are found in

the word of God\*. Several remarks with which the reverend ministers of London have prefaced their late "Harmony of confessions" on this article, are well worth notice here, see pages 41—47.

*Psor. XIV.—Though the Sacred Three are evidently and plainly discovered in Scripture, to be one and the same God, and three distinct personal Agents or Persons, yet the Scripture hath not in plain and evident Language explained and precisely determined the particular Way and Manner, how these Three Persons are one God, or how this one Godhead is in Three Persons.*

The truth of this doctrine, that "there are three divine persons and one God, is abundantly more evident in the scripture, than any particular explication of this sacred doctrine: And though learned men have endeavoured to explain the Trinity by reason, to determine the "modus" or manner how three are one, and one three, to defend their schemes by human arguments, and to illustrate them by several similitudes, yet these illustrations, these explainings and reasonings, with the human terms that belong to them, are not to be esteemed, as they have too often been, the matter of divine revelation, any farther than they are by evident and irresistible consequence drawn from the word of God.

Among these explications, some of them seem to me to be evidently false and insufficient.

Such is the Arian scheme, which supposes the Father only to be the true God, and that the two other persons have not true, proper and eternal godhead belonging to them: And such is the Sabellian scheme, which supposes the Father, Son, and Spirit, not to be distinct persons, but mere different names, modes, and appearances of the one God. One of these denies the true godhead, the other the personality.

Other schemes have been multiplied in the christian world, which do indeed secure and maintain the substance of the scriptural doctrine of the Trinity, as the Athanasian, the scholastic scheme, &c. Yet they have such various difficulties attending them, that I do not think it necessary to trouble the private christian with a long detail of them here.

And indeed to speak my own sentiments freely, I must say,

\* How the particular explications of this doctrine came to be so various, both in the writings of the primitive and modern christians, will be easily accounted for in the following proposition, viz. "because scripture has not clearly explained it." And if the bulk of the christian world, has at any time for some ages together followed one and the same scheme of explication, it is because they found undeniably the plain doctrine of three persons, and one God revealed in scripture, and they knew no other way to give a tolerable explication of it all that time.

that upon a fresh and unbiassed search of matters a mature and deliberate view of the scriptural doctrine of the Trinity, as I find it in the bible, and a new survey of the several schemes found out to explain it, I am more firmly established than ever in this doctrine, that Father, Son, and Spirit, are the one true God, yet subsisting in three persons : But as to the various schemes of explication, there is not any of them can prevail upon me any farther now, than to receive them as possible or probable. explications of a very deep and difficult doctrine of scripture.

But suppose the professors of any of the best of these schemes should find sufficient arguments from the word of God, to demonstrate the truth of their own scheme, and could prove it beyond all contradiction, that their particular explication of the Trinity, is the very doctrine that is revealed in the Holy Scripture, yet I am sure they can never prove that it is clearly and plainly revealed there. But it still requires much skill and labour of reasoning to draw it out from scripture, and set it in an evident light.

**PROP. XV.**—*Thence I infer, that it can never be necessary to Salvation, to know the precise Way and Manner how one God subsists in three Personal Agents, or how these Three Persons are one God.*

The reasons of this proposition are very evident :

1. Though the doctrine of the Trinity seems to be a fundamental article of christianity, yet the particular explication of this sacred doctrine, as we have hinted before, cannot be a fundamental, because “ it is not any where revealed to us in scripture, in so plain and manifest language, as the fundamental articles of our religion are and must be :” For the scriptures were written to make the meanest of men wise to salvation ; even the babes in Christ, and the weak, and the unlearned, the “ base and the foolish things of this world, whom God hath chosen and called ;” 1 Cor. i. 27. Now that it is not so plainly revealed, appears, because learned and pious men, who have made a honest search after truth, derive their several explications of this doctrine by long and difficult trains of reasoning, and are often ready to commit mistakes, and to run counter to the most established principles of natural reason, and sometimes contradict themselves too in this work.

I will not deny but there may be several truths both of natural and revealed religion that are merely drawn by reasoning and consequence, which may yet be necessary to salvation. But then these are such as are open and obvious to the first view of reason, and such as lie very near the surface of scripture, if I may so express it, and may be inferred with the greatest ease by men of the lowest rank of understanding. Such easy and obvious consequences may contain fundamental doctrines. But

whatsoever lies hidden deep in the sacred mines of the word of God, and must be digged thence with much learning and study, much toil and labour of reasoning, and can be drawn out only by long chains of laborious argument, these things can never be designed of God for the fundamental articles of our religion, nor ought they to be esteemed or imposed as such by weak and fallible men.

2. A second reason I have to persuade me, that no particular explication of the Trinity, and the "modus" of it is necessary and fundamental, is this; that there have been many, and very different explications of this doctrine embraced by some persons of most exemplary piety: Such persons as have most firmly believed the general doctrine itself, and such, concerning whom I could even venture to say, *May my soul be where theirs is in the other world!* Some have asserted one substance, one conscious mind, inconceivably and necessarily distinguished into three personal agents. Others have supposed, three distinct substances or minds, and yet all intimately, and essentially, and necessarily united in one godhead. Some have maintained the son-ship of Christ, and procession of the Spirit, to be essentially and eternal necessary to the divine nature. Others would account for the generation, and procession, and every thing that looks like derivation, some other way, rather than let it belong to godhead. And yet the writings and conversation of all of them, have been famous for a savour of piety; they have all paid divine honours to Father, Son and Spirit, and lived and died to the glory of God their Saviour: Some of them were certainly mistaken on earth, in their particular explication of this mystery, because they differed so widely; and they were taken to heaven before they could agree in this point of controversy; thence it plainly follows, that an agreement and certainty in this point is not necessary in our way to heaven.

3. Another argument I would use to prove, that the particular explications of this doctrine of the Trinity, cannot be necessary to salvation, is this, that the *duties which we are obliged to pay to the Father, Son and Spirit, in order to our own salvation, do not depend upon any particular modes of explication, in what manner they are one, and in what manner they are three; but upon their divine all-sufficiency to fulfil and sustain their several offices and characters, that are attributed to them in the word of God.* But this I shall enlarge upon more in some following propositions. I shall conclude this head, with calling in the testimony of some authors to support this proposition, whose zeal for the sacred doctrine of the Trinity, can never be called in question.

The first, is the reverend, learned and pious Doctor Owen, to whose name and memory I pay as great a veneration as to most of the writers of the last age. In his little Treatise of the

“ Doctrine of the Trinity,” third edition, 8vo. p. 18. he hath these words. “ The sum of this revelation in this matter is, that God is one ; that this one God is Father, Son and Holy Ghost ; that the Father is the Father of the Son ; and the Son the Son of the Father ; and the Holy Ghost the Spirit of the Father, and the Son ; and that in respect of this their mutual relation, they are distinct from each other. This is the substance of the doctrine of the Trinity, as to the first direct concernment of faith therein.” And a little after, “ This is the whole of faith’s concernment in this matter, as it respects the direct revelation of God made by himself in the scripture, and the first proper general end thereof. Let this be clearly confirmed by direct and positive divine testimonies containing the declaration and revelation of God, concerning himself, and faith is secured as to all its concerns. For it hath both its proper formal object, and is sufficiently enabled to be directive of divine worship and obedience. The explication of this doctrine unto edification, suitable unto the revelation mentioned, is of another consideration.”

And page 75. when he has finished his proofs of the god-head and personality of the sacred Three, he sums up all in these words, viz. “ Our conclusion from the whole is ; that there is nothing more expressed in the scripture, than this sacred truth is ; that there is one God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost which are divine, distinct, intelligent, voluntary, omnipotent principles of operation and working, which whosoever thinks himself obliged to believe the scripture, must believe ; and concerning others in this discourse, we are not solicitous. This is that which was first proposed ; namely, to manifest what is expressly revealed in the scripture, concerning God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; so as that we may duly believe in him, yield obedience unto him, enjoy communion with him, walk in his love and fear, and so come at length to be blessed with him for evermore. Nor doth faith for its security, establishment and direction, absolutely stand in need of any farther exposition or explanation of these things.” And after the author has given a brief explication of essence, substance, unity, distinction, personality, &c. in a few pages he adds page 79, “ Nor are those brief explications themselves before-mentioned, so proposed as to be placed immediately in the same rank and order with the original revelations before insisted on, but only are pressed as proper expressions of what is revealed, to increase our light, and further our edification.”

The next authors I shall cite on this subject, are the “ four London ministers, who stated and defended the doctrine of the blessed Trinity,” in a book lately published by their concurrent labours, and who are persons of undoubted piety and zeal for the christian faith.

In page 18, their words are these : " Section 6. We do not ourselves pretend to say, how these three are distinguished from each other : That we leave to those, who are bold enough to speak, even upon such a point as this, without, if not against what the scriptures themselves any where have said : We only say, that there they are distinguished."

" Section 7. We farther add, that though these three are in the scriptures distinguished from, and therefore not to be confounded with each other ; yet we have learned nothing there, either of their being compounded, or divided : Nor do we therefore undertake to shew explicitly, and in particulars, how they are three ; nor how, though three, yet they are one. What we assert again is only, that they are three, some way or other ; and though in some respect three, yet but one God.

Section 8. " Nay, though these three are in the holy scriptures spoken of under the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; and as begetting, begotten, and proceeding : Yet still we leave it to those who are wiser, or at least more daring and bold than we, to say that this does, and to shew afterward how it does relate to the divine essence.\* For we have no notion of a greater or lesser in the godhead, do think, that wherever that does belong, it must equally belong : And consequently, that it is not any one of the three, that is, exclusive of the others ; but that these three are the one supreme God.

" Section 9. Let it be added, before we produce our proofs, that these three are not merely three names : And that these names do not every where in scripture, if they do any where, bear one and the same meaning.

" Section 10. We shall now only venture to say once more, that whatever the distinction is between these sacred Three, or wherein soever it does consist ; as on one part it does not destroy the unity of the divine nature, so on the other, it is such, so real and so great, as is just and sufficient ground to support whatever is distinctly said of the one or the other of them in the holy scriptures. So as that the person of the Father is not the Son ; nor

\* Though these authors agree entirely with Dr. Owen, in not making the knowledge of any particular explication of the doctrine of the Trinity necessary to salvation, yet they differ in this ; that Dr. Owen in several parts of his Treatise, supposes the vulgar explication of Father, Son and Spirit as three eternal, necessary, personal differences in the very essence of God, to be a certain and unavoidable consequence of the doctrine itself : But the writer of these sections is not certain, that these differences of Father, Son, Spirit, generation, procession, &c. do relate to the divine essence itself ; and in this point I ask leave to differ from that great man Doctor Owen, and join with these later writers ; for, in maturer years, I am not ashamed to profess my ignorance in a subject so sublime, and to abate some degrees of my younger confidence as to the modes of explaining this mystery.

the Son, the Father; nor either of these the Holy Ghost. Thus far the serious plain christian, may venture into this awful mystery of the blessed Trinity." But as these reverend authors, in the following words, do not by any means advise the unlearned and private christian to search farther, so I cannot see any great necessity that he should.

**PROP. XVI.**—*Yet it is our Duty to believe the general Doctrine of the Trinity, viz. that these Three personal Agents, Father, Son, and Spirit, have real Communion in one God head, although we cannot find out the precise way and manner of explaining it.*

I would have it observed here, that I do not absolutely determine the sacred doctrine of the Trinity to be incapable of all explications: For though many past attempts may have been weak and insufficient, yet it does not follow that all future attempts shall be so too. Who can assure us that God will never give to any favourite christian, the happy turn of thought, that may lead him, as by an easy clue, into the knowledge of this mystery? Daniel foretels, that towards the latter end of the world *many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased* Dan. xii. 4. By a mutual commerce of the sentiments of men (learning and piety, and by the assistance of the divine Spirit there may be some glorious spark of light cast upon this obscure article of faith, which former ages despaired of: Even the great Sir Isaac Newton in our age has traced the nature, bulk, and motions of the heavenly bodies, beyond what former ages knew, or what men on earth could ever have hoped for.

But suppose this sacred doctrine, as to the manner of it could never be explained by us, or to us in this present mortal state, yet all the cavils of our adversaries hitherto have never been able to prove, that this doctrine itself, free from all human additions and incumbrances, is really impossible; and therefore we are bound to believe this article, so far as God has plainly and evidently revealed it, though it should be to us inexplicable.

There is, I confess, a certain pride in the mind of man that is ready to resist divine truth, if it does not lie level to our understanding, submit to our reasonings, and come within the compass of our clear and comprehensive ideas. It was this criminal pride, that has tempted some of the Socinian writers to say that if the doctrines of the divinity and satisfaction of Christ were never so plainly expressed in scripture, yet they would not assent to them in the literal sense, because they could not understand them, or because, according to the judgment of their reason, it could not be approved. Therefore they are wont to twi-

and turn the plain expressions of scripture by the arts of criticism and metaphor, to signify something else. Socinus himself says, that in such cases, "any the greatest force is to be used with words rather than take them in the obvious sense." "*Epistola secunda ad Balcerium.*"

But surely it must be acknowledged that in the nature, works and ways of God, there are many things which are above the reach of our present understandings; many things which are true, and yet we know not how to reconcile them to one another. And whatsoever doctrines of this kind God shall plainly reveal to us in his word, we are bound under the penalty of his high displeasure, to receive and believe, though we cannot reconcile them.

But some will object and say, "Must we believe things that are inconsistent and assent to contradictions?"

Answer. There is a great deal of difference between a seeming and a real contradiction. If we can suppose, that it could ever have been said in scripture, that three Gods are one God, or three persons are one person, there had been reason indeed to disbelieve it in the literal sense, and to have found out some more consistent interpretation of it, according to the rules of speech: For neither reason or religion can require us to believe plain inconsistencies.

But when we assert that Father, Son and holy Spirit, are three distinct agents in our salvation, such as we usually call persons; and when we again assert that the Father is God, the Son is God, the Spirit is God, and yet that there are not three Gods, but one God; there is no real contradiction in all these, though we could not find the plain, and certain way to reconcile them: And since these propositions are of such importance in our religion, since the sense of them is evidently contained in scripture, though not the express words; since they seem to lie plain and open to the view of any common reader, that has never been prepossessed with other notions, I think we may venture to say, God requires the belief of them where the bible is known and read.

Here some persons will be ready to say, "We cannot find these doctrines in the bible, we cannot see them written there with sufficient evidence, and therefore we believe them not, nor can we be required to believe what we cannot see revealed."

But these objectors would do well to ask themselves solemnly, as in the sight of God, "Whether or no they should not think them plainly and sufficiently revealed, if they could but reconcile them by reason to their own satisfaction?" If so, then it is plain, that the impediment of belief does not lie in the want of evidence, but in faulty prejudices and reluctance of the mind,



because of the inability of our reason, to comprehend what is revealed. We are not willing to see these truths, because difficulty and mystery attend them; and it is exceeding natural and easy to wink a little, when we are not willing to see.

Now if these secret prejudices are indulged, if we will not submit to receive these sacred truths, morely because we cannot comprehend and reconcile them, we have some ground to suspect ourselves guilty of that inward pride, and obstinacy of mind, which is highly criminal in the sight of God. And whether the great God will not terribly resent in the other world, these faulty prejudices, this haughtiness of the mind, this unbelief of truths so plainly revealed, is a thought that should make us tremble, and render us exceeding cautious, and meek and humble in all our conduct about these important doctrines of religion.

I must confess for myself with honest freedom, that in my diligent search after truth in the bible, I would have been glad to have taken up with some ideas of the Trinity, that might have been less subject to the cavils of human reason, and more easily comprehended and reconciled, if the plain and obvious sense of scripture in a multitude of places, had not constrained my faith to submit to divine revelation, and to acquiesce in this great truth, that "Father, Son, and Spirit, are three persons, and yet but one God."

I might here add another reason also, why we ought to believe, that these three persons have some real and intimate communion in the godhead, viz. because the characters and offices they sustain in the matter of our salvation, and the duties which we owe them, do in my judgment require the perfections of a God, that they may be fit to fulfil those offices, and to receive the homage of those duties. There appears to be a necessity of omnipotence and omniscience, and of other divine attributes, to execute those glorious works, which are assigned to the Son, and the holy Spirit, in the word of God, as well as those which are ascribed to the Father. Nor do I know how we can justly pay them honours answerable to these characters, if we believe them to be mere creatures.

**PROP. XVII.**—*And wheresoever we meet with any Thing in Scripture, that is incommunicably divine, ascribed to either of these Three Persons, we may venture to take it in the plain and obvious Sense of the Words, since we believe the true and eternal Godhead to belong to them all.*

It has been hinted before, that there is a great deal of reason to suppose, that the Arians and the Socinians, and all others who deny the proper godhead of the Son and Spirit, are guilty of a gross mistake; because there are so many places of scrip-

ture which they are forced to handle with much art and criticism, and to twist, and to strain, and to pervert them from their plain and native sense, before they can make them consist with the Arian or Socinian doctrines. But the christian who believes, that the Son and Spirit have proper communion in the godhead, reads with pleasure all those expressions of scripture, which ascribe divine titles and dignity both to the Spirit, and the Son, as well as the Father, and understands, and believes them in the plain sense of the words, with much satisfaction and ease, and lets his faith rest upon the express revelation of God in his word.

All that is incommunicably divine, and that is attributed to the Son or Spirit in scripture, is naturally and easily applied or imputed to the same godhead or divine nature, which belongs both to the Father, to the Son, and to the holy Spirit, or in which the Son and Spirit have communion together with the Father.

*PROP. XVIII.—Where any Thing inferior to the dignity of Godhead is really and properly attributed in Scripture to the Person of the Son, or the Holy Spirit, it may be easily imputed to some inferior Nature, united to the Godhead in that Person, or to some inferior Character or Office sustained by that Person.*

Here let it be observed, that there are some inferior properties and actions in scripture ascribed to God in general, and to the person of the Father, as well as to the Son and Spirit, which are not to be taken properly, but merely in a figurative sense, such as to have eyes and ears, hands and feet, to rejoice, to grieve, to repent, &c. Which signify the pure actions of God as an infinite Spirit, expressed towards his creatures in a figurative and familiar way, and in likeness to man, that we may understand them the better. These are not the inferior expressions which I speak of. But when any thing inferior to the dignity of godhead, is in a real and proper manner attributed to the Son, or the Spirit; then it is to be explained in one of these two ways which this proposition describes.

The reason of this proposition is evident; because since the Son, and the holy Spirit, are truly and properly partakers of godhead, or the divine nature, therefore nothing that is inferior to the nature of God, can be asserted concerning them, considered absolutely and simply as partakers in the divine essence. Whatsoever therefore is properly ascribed to any of these sacred persons, that is beneath the dignity of godhead, must arise from something external to God, something that is not essential to the divine nature.

Now this something external to God, is either real or rela-

tive. If it be real, it must be some inferior nature united to the godhead. If it be relative, it must be some inferior character or office, sustained by one of the sacred persons: And upon either of these accounts, we may suppose something inferior to the supreme dignity of godhead, to be ascribed to one or more of the sacred three.

Let us enquire particularly concerning this.

There are many things inferior to the dignity of godhead, which are evidently attributed to the Son in scripture; such as these, that he was "made of a woman;" Gal. iv. 4. That he was in the "form of a servant;" Philip. ii. 7. That he "increased in wisdom and stature;" Luke ii. 52. That he "knew not the day of judgment;" Mark xiii. 32. That he was hungry and thirsty, and asleep; that he wept, that he groaned, that he was forsaken of his Father, that his soul was exceeding sorrowful, that he was crucified, and died, that he rose again, and ascended to heaven.

But all these things are easily accounted for, by the union of the godhead, to the inferior nature of man, in the person of Jesus Christ. For he who was born of the virgin was "Emmanuel, or God with us;" Luke i. 54. He who was true and real God, was also true and real man, and of the "seed of David according to the flesh;" Rom. i. 3. He who was God over all, blessed for ever, according to his divine nature, "came from the Jewish fathers according to the flesh, or his human nature;" Rom. ix. 5. He who was the true God was "manifested in the flesh;" 1 Tim. iii. 16. This is called the "incarnation of Christ," and the New Testament is full of it.

Hence it comes to pass, that the properties and actions of one nature are ascribed sometimes to the whole person, and sometimes to the other nature. So the Son of man is said to be in heaven; John iii. 13. and that while the man Jesus was here upon earth; because, as God, he was in heaven and earth, and every where present. So the Lord of glory is said to be crucified; 1 Cor. ii. 8. because the man Christ Jesus was crucified, who in his divine nature is the Lord of glory. So the church is said to be "purchased with God's own blood;" Acts xx. 28. because the blood of the man who was also God purchased the church. So "God laid down his life for us;" 1 John iii. 16. that is, he who was God laid down his human life. This is what divines usually call a communication of properties.

If there be any thing inferior to the dignity of godhead attributed to the Son or Spirit, which cannot be imputed to some real inferior nature, united to the godhead in that person, then it arises from something relative, and it must be attributed to some inferior character or office, sustained by that person in the economy of our salvation.

Now there are some things that seem inferior to the dignity of godhead, which are attributed to the Son, even before his coming in the flesh, and being born of a virgin; as, that God the Father sent his Son into the world, which seems to imply his being before. That he "came down from heaven, not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him;" John vi. 38, 39. Gal. iv. 4. That he left the "glory which he had with the Father before the beginning of the world;" John xvii. 5. That God the Father "prepared a body for him;" Heb. x. 5. The Son came and assumed that body "to do the will of God on earth;" verses 7, 9. compared with Ps. xl. 6, 7, 8. as he had been God's angel or messenger to the patriarchs.

Now if we can give ourselves leave to suppose, that the human soul of our Lord Jesus Christ had a being, and was personally united to the divine nature, long before his body was born of the virgin, even from the very foundation of the world, and that this was the angel who conversed with Abraham, Moses, Joshua, &c. then we may most easily account for these expressions of scripture, which signify something inferior to godhead before his incarnation; and we may attribute them to the human soul of Christ; which, though infinitely inferior to God, yet doubtless is a spirit of a very excellent and noble nature, as being formed on purpose to be united to God, and never existed but in a personal union with God.

There is nothing in the whole word of God, that I know of, which discountenances such a supposition as this; and there are a great many texts both of the Old and New Testament, which are with the greatest ease explained and reconciled this way, which it is very hard to account for, without admitting this opinion; nor has it the least ill aspect on any other article of our faith\*.

But if we dare not venture our thoughts so far out of the common track, as to suppose that the human soul of Christ had any being, before he took flesh, then we suppose, that he existed

\* If any of my readers imagine, that either here, or in the end of this chapter, I have forgot the words of my title page, and have used the aid of human schemes, I treat them to remember, that I have built nothing at all toward the proof of the Trinity, upon any such supposition or scheme whatsoever; but have only proposed an illustration, a simile, a thought or notion, whereby the divine doctrine may be more easily apprehended, or whereby many texts of scripture may be more naturally explained, and more happily reconciled. Those who disapprove these hints, may entirely neglect them, and the plain scriptural doctrine of the Trinity abides the same still.

I do not mention this pre-existence of the human soul of Christ as a point of faith, which I firmly believe, but merely as a matter of opinion not to be rashly rejected, and well worth our farther enquiry; for I have not met with any thing yet published against it, that is sufficient to forbid the proposal of it here; and perhaps I shall say much more for it, if I should live to publish some short "dissertations" that I have written relating to the "doctrine of the Trinity."

only in his divine nature before his incarnation ; and then these inferior expressions of being God's messenger or angel, of having a body prepared for him by the Father, of being sent, of coming to do the will of his Father, and of not doing his own will, &c. must be attributed to his character and office as Mediator, which carries something inferior in it, and which he assumed even from the beginning of the world : So that the Son who had all power and sovereignty as God, must be said, under the character of a mediator, to be the messenger, the servant of God the Father, and be sent by him to do his will.

And thus by considering our Lord Jesus Christ, either in his inferior nature, as having a human soul, and a human body united to godhead, or in his inferior office as being a mediator, we may explain all those texts which ascribe something to him below the majesty of godhead. And where we cannot apply it to his human nature, it must be applied to his office.

I might multiply examples out of many parts of the New Testament and the Old, to shew with how much ease and readiness, this doctrine will assist us to explain and reconcile many things that are said concerning Christ ; but I chuse rather to exemplify this, in explaining those difficult expressions of our Lord Jesus Christ concerning himself, which are recorded in John v. 19—30. “ Verily I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do : for what things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise. The Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doth.—As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.—The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son, to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.” And yet a little after, he saith again, “ I can of my own self do nothing.”

Here are some divine characters, which seem to be too great for any mere creature ; such as, “ Whatsoever things the Father doth, these also doth the Son likewise. The Father sheweth the Son all things that himself doth. The Son raiseth the dead by his word, and quickeneth whom he will ; all men must honour the Son, as they honour the Father. As the Father hath life in himself, so the Son hath life in himself.”

Here are also some characters, that seem much inferior to the dignity of godhead ; “ The Son can do nothing of himself. Judgment is committed to him by the Father. He has it

ven to him, to have life in himself; and authority to execute judgment is given him :” And it is repeated again, “ Of himself he can do nothing ;” verse 30.

Now may not these scriptures admit of this exposition, imputing the inferior characters and expressions, to his inferior or man nature, thus? Jesus is but a man, and can do nothing himself; but because the Man Jesus is the Son of man, or the appointed Messiah; as verse 27. therefore the Father has ordained, that he should be personally united to God, “ it hath pleased the Father, that in him the fulness of godhead should dwell bodily;” thus the Son of man hath union with godhead in him: And by this means, he has it given him to have life in himself; for where godhead is, there also are the properties of godhead, one of which is, to have life in himself. By this means also the person of the Son as god-man, is said to know all things that the Father does, and doth the same things which the Father doeth, or performs that which the Father hath imposed. So the Son raiseth the dead, quickeneth whom he will, and executeth judgment on all mankind, and receiveth divine honours, as well as the Father: And yet he is said to have all this power and honour given him by the Father, because by the appointment of the Father, the divine nature dwells in Jesus the Son of man, who of himself, and in himself is but a man, and could do nothing.

The Son, as he is a man, is represented here as able to do nothing of himself: The Father, though he be God, is represented as willing to do nothing of himself: Therefore the Father, whose divine nature dwells in the Son, doth all things by the Son, as his great agent and minister in the salvation of men.

Or if this interpretation does not please, we may then suppose that the inferior characters here mentioned, are only attributed to Christ as Mediator; and then the interpretation is this; viz. Though considered as God, he knows all things, he can do all things, and is the sovereign of life yet considered as Mediator, he is supposed to waive this sovereignty; and in this sense he may be said to receive these powers, instructions, and delegated authority from the Father, who sustains the sovereign or supreme character in the economy of grace.

This shall suffice concerning the inferior actions and characters, which are ascribed to Christ in the scripture.

I proceed now to consider the holy Spirit.

There are also some things in scripture, which seem inferior to the dignity of godhead, that are attributed to the blessed Spirit, as that he is “ sent by the Father at the Son’s request;” John xiv. 16. that “ he is sent by the Son;” John xv. 26. that

“he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak;” John xvi. 13. “That he shall receive the things of the Son, and shew them unto men;” verses 14, 15. That the “Holy Ghost was given to some men, by the laying on of the hands of other men;” Acts viii. 17, 18. “That the Spirit is poured out upon men;” Acts ii. 17, 18. That men are “baptized with the Holy Ghost;” Mat. iii. 11. “That he maketh intercession for the saints, with groanings that cannot be uttered;” Rom. viii. 26, 27.

Now if there be no inferior nature, which belongs to the Spirit of God, to which these things may properly be ascribed, then they must be imputed to the Spirit of God, considered in the inferior character, or office of a deputy, or vicegerent, a messenger, or advocate\*, both of the Father, and of the Son: And in this sense, he who considered as true God, is one with the Father, and hath absolute sovereignty; yet considered in the gospel, as a prime minister of the Father’s and Son’s kingdom, is pleased to represent himself as being sent by the Father and the Son, as their chief agent, to fulfil many kind offices for us, and in us, in the economy of salvation.

If I could make this proposition clearer, and give my reader an easier conception of it by any human illustrations, I would attempt it in this manner, and try to represent this divine mystery of three persons, with three distinct characters, yet but one God.

Suppose a king should send an ambassador extraordinary to a foreign country, and at his removal should appoint a resident to stay behind him in that country; and suppose the soul of the king himself could be so united also to the body, or person, both of the ambassador and the resident, as to animate, actuate and move them, and become, as it were, one person with each of them: Then the soul of the king himself might be said to sustain both his own character as king, and the inferior character both of the ambassador and the resident, and fulfil all those offices under a distinct sort of personality.

Thus we may apprehend, how God the Father, the King of heaven, sent down his Son, a distinct person, in whom the same godhead dwells, as an ambassador extraordinary to earth; and the Holy Spirit a distinct person also, who hath the same godhead, was left here as a resident. And thus this eternal God, being the same in the Father, Son and Spirit, sustains the su-

\* The word *παράκλητος*, “paracletos,” which we translate the “Comforter,” in the xiv. xv. and xvi. chapters of St. John, may be as properly rendered, the “advocate;” for that Greek word signifies both. Now to be an advocate is the proper office of the Holy Spirit, that is, to speak for God the Father, and for Christ in the world, since Christ is gone to heaven; and it is the very same word which we translate “advocate;” 1 John ii. 2. When it is applied to Christ as speaking for us in heaven.

perior character of a sovereign king, in the person of the Father, and may be said also to sustain these inferior characters of an ambassador, and a resident, and to fulfil these offices in the persons of the Son and Spirit.

I confess these "similes" borrowed from earthly things, are very imperfect, and insufficient to represent things divine and heavenly; but perhaps they may serve to strike some little light upon this sacred mystery.

*PROP. XIX.—Nor do these inferior Natures, Characters or Agencies, at all hinder our firm Belief of the Godhead of these Three Persons, which is so plainly expressed in Scripture, nor should it abate or diminish our Sacred Regards to them.*

Whatsoever inferior nature may be united to the godhead in any of the divine persons, or whatsoever inferior characters or offices they may sustain in the matters of our salvation, these do not at all take away, or diminish the nature or dignity of the godhead, subsisting in that person. The divine nature must still maintain its own honour and eternal dignity; for God must be God for ever, and cannot divest himself of his own real and essential glories, whatsoever condescending forms and offices he may assume, in order to fulfil his wondrous counsels, and designs of power or love, of creation or providence, or the greater work of redemption.

To make this very plain, I would express myself here thus in imitation of Doctor Owen speaking of Christ. Each nature united in the person of Christ, is entire, and preserves to itself its own natural properties. For he is no less true and perfect God, for being united to man; nor is he less a true, perfect man, consisting of soul and body, by being united to God. His divine nature still continues omniscient, omnipotent, infinite, &c. His human nature finite, or limited, in knowledge and power, and was, before its glorification, subject to all infirmities of life, and death, to which the same nature in others absolutely considered, is obnoxious.

In each of these natures, he acts suitably to the essential properties and principles of that nature. As God, he made all things, upholds all things by the word of his power, fills heaven and earth, &c. As man, he lived, hungered, suffered, died, rose, ascended into heaven. Yet by reason of the union of both these natures in the same person sometimes the person Christ may be said to do all these things; and sometimes the actions of one nature are attributed to the other; so God is said to lay down his life for us, &c. as I have shewn before.

So in the Holy Spirit, the dignity of divine nature is preserved entire; and thus it acts like itself, with sovereign autho-



ity and power in many places of scripture; though in other places the person of the Spirit is represented as acting in a way of deputation, and, as it were, by commission received from the Father or the Son.

Still we must remember, that under whatsoever inferior characters or offices the Son or Spirit are represented in scripture, yet their communion in and with the divine nature ceases not, true godhead belongs to them still. And wheresoever true godhead is, there are all the attributes, honours, and prerogatives of godhead, whatsoever other or lower characters that person may also assume and sustain.

**PROP. XX.**—*We are bound therefore to pay divine Honours to each of the Sacred Three, viz. the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, according to their distinct Characters and Offices assigned them in Scripture.*

Though each person of the blessed Trinity ought to have divine honours paid to him, yet these honours are generally distinguished, and expressed in such a manner, as is suited to their distinct personal characters, and operations, as they are revealed to us in the word of God, which is the only rule of our duty and worship.

Let it always be observed and kept in mind, that the only ground and foundation, and formal reason of the divine worship and honours that are paid to each of the sacred Three, is their godhead, or communion in the divine nature; yet the special forms of the worship and honour which is paid them, arise chiefly from those special offices and characters, which the scripture assigns to them.

Now in order to shew clearly, what are their distinct honours, together with the reasons of them, let us consider, in what manner the scripture represents their distinct characters and offices.

*First, Of the Father.*—God the Father, is represented in scripture generally as the first or supreme Agent, but as acting by his word or Son, and through his Spirit, and that sometimes in the works of creation and providence, as well as in the works of redemption and salvation.

In "creation," this is sufficiently evident; Ps. xxxiii. 6. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath, [or Spirit,] of his mouth."

Eph. iii. 9. "God who created all things by Jesus Christ."

Heb. i. 2. "By whom, [that is, his Son,] he made the worlds."

The Spirit also hath his share of agency herein. Thus, Job xxvi. 13. "By his Spirit he garnished the heavens; and his " Spirit moved on the face of the waters;" Gen. i. 2.

And it is very natural to suppose that, since God the Father created all things by his Son, and his Holy Spirit ; therefore he says ; Gen. i. 26. " Let us make man in our image, after our likeness," consulting, as it were, with his Son, or with his Son and Spirit about the creation of man.

This is evident also in the administrations of " providence."

Is. ix. 6. " To us a Son is born, that is, Christ, the government shall be upon his shoulder."

Ps. cx. 5. " The Lord at thy right-hand, shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath," that is, Christ exalted to the right-hand of God.

Mat. xxviii. 18. " Jesus spake to them, saying, all power is given unto me in heaven, and in earth."

John v. 22. " The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son."

It is also by the Spirit, that the Father manages his providential kingdom.

Ps. civ. 36. When his creatures faint and die, God " sendeth forth his Spirit, and they are created, and thus he renews the face of the earth," that is, he continues a succession of creatures, by the agency of his Spirit, in the course of his providence.

Is. xxxiv. 17. When God sends desolation, and wild beasts into Babylon, it is expressed, " his Spirit hath gathered them."

And that he acts thus by his Son, through his Spirit, in the work of our salvation, is much more frequently expressed in scripture. I shall mention but a few texts, and only such, where both the Son and Spirit are mentioned in the same place.

1 Pet. i. 2. " Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through the sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience ; and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

2 Cor. i. 21, 22. " He which establisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God ; who hath also sealed us, and given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts."

Rom. v. 1, 5. " We have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.—The Love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost which is given to us."

1 Cor. vi. 11. " Washed, justified, sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."

John xiv. 16, 17. Christ saith, " I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another comforter, even the Spirit of truth."

Acts ii. 33. " Jesus being by the right-hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear."

Gal. iv. 4, 5, 6. " God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law,

that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father.

2 Cor. v. 18. "All things are of God, that is, the Father, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ." Verse 5. "He that hath wrought us for the self-same thing, that is, fitted us for heaven, is God, who hath also given us the earnest of the Spirit."

And in this sense the evangelical benediction or blessing is thus expressed, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen." 2 Cor. xiii. 14. And in this sense it is, that we are "baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;" Mat. xxviii. 19. For though I believe there may be a good consequential argument drawn from both these scriptures, to prove that the Son and the Spirit have real communion in the godhead, as well as the Father; yet the first and direct design, is to shew, that each of these divine persons have a share, and concur in the work of our salvation; and that faith, and hope, and all the blessings of grace and glory, depend on the eternal love of God the Father, exerting itself in a way of mercy to sinners, in and by the gracious mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ, through the operations of the blessed Spirit.

From all these, and many other scriptures, it is evident, that in the economy of our salvation, God the Father appears as vested with the supreme majesty and dignity, and maintaining the rights of godhead, as sustaining the supreme character of a divine Creator and Governor, offended by the sins of men, contriving a way of reconciliation, sending his only Son into the world for this end, anointing him with his own Spirit, accepting him in his sacrifice and mediation, crowning him with honours upon the discharge of his atoning work, communicating the Spirit to him, to be sent down plentifully to mankind, proposing the gospel of reconciliation to sinful men, and ordaining and appointing all things which are done by the Son and Spirit, as distinct personal agents in this glorious affair; though in the godhead they are one with him.

Question. "What are those honours which the holy scripture therefore directs us to pay to God the Father?"

Answer. The honours which are led more directly and specially to address to God the Father, are these:

I. To adore him as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: 1 Pet. i. 3. Eph. iii. 14. as the first in order in the sacred Trinity. To worship him as sitting on the throne of government; Rev. iv. 9, 10. as maintaining the dignity and the rights of godhead, as creating all things; Rev. iv. 11. and giving laws and orders to all the creation: To humble and abase ourselves before him, as having broken his laws: To express repentance towards

God, and say, "Father, we have sinned against thy heavenly Majesty;" Acts xx. 21. Luke xv. 18. And to return and devote ourselves afresh to God the Father, and subject ourselves to his government, against whom we had rebelled; Hos. xiv. 1, 2. There are so many instances of this kind of worship paid to God the Father in scripture, that I need not dwell longer upon this head.

II. Another part of divine worship due to the Father, is to offer our thanks and praises to him for all those adorable instances of his wisdom, power and goodness, which appear in the works of creation, providence and redemption: We praise him, that he should make us at first after his own image, endue us with noble faculties, and furnish this world with rich conveniences for our use, and propose to our choice immortality and happiness. And when we had abused his goodness, and chosen sin and misery, that he should be pleased to look on fallen sinners with an eye of pity, that he appointed a way for their restoration to his favour and image, that he sent his own Son to become a Mediator, that he laid on him the iniquities of men, and made his soul an offering for sin: That he also appointed the blessed Spirit to renew our natures, that he sends him to restore his own image upon us, to work faith and repentance in our hearts, to bring us into this covenant of reconciliation, and to fit us for heaven. Of this sort of worship, which consists in gratitude, doxology, blessing and praise, to the Father, there are multiplied instances in scripture.

III. We are bound also to pray to God the Father, for whatsoever mercies we stand in need of, as well as give thanks and praises to him for what we receive, whether these mercies are to be bestowed upon us immediately by the hands of the Son, or of the blessed Spirit; because both in the economy of nature and grace, he is represented as the prime Agent, vesting his Son and his Holy Spirit with their peculiar characters and offices, and acting towards us, in and by them; though their eternal godhead be the same with that of the Father.

Thence it comes to pass, that God the Father is set forth in scripture as the most proper constant object of our addresses in worship, and that our worship is most generally to be paid to the Father in the name, or through the mediation of his Son, and by the assistance of his holy Spirit: For as it is by the mediation of his Son Jesus Christ, he approaches to us, and condescends to be reconciled to us, and by the operations of his blessed Spirit in us, he brings us near to himself, so he expects we should make a return of honour and worship to him in the same order and manner: And this we find appointed by our Lord Jesus Christ, and required and practised by his blessed apostles. This is manifest in a great number of texts in the New Tes-

John xvi. 23, 24. "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you: Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name;" verse 26. "At that day ye shall ask in my name."

John xiv. 16. Christ tells us, he "will pray the Father and he shall give us another comforter,—even the Spirit of truth, &c. And Luke xi. 13. Christ says, "Your heavenly Father will give the holy Spirit to them that ask him." So that the gift of the Holy Spirit, and his divine influences for illumination sanctification and comfort, is one of those blessings which we are to ask the Father for, as Christ himself did.

Rom. vii. 25. "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Rom. xvi. 27. "To God only wise be glory through Jesus Christ for ever, *Amen*."

I Cor. xv. 57. "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Eph. ii. 18. "Through him, that is Christ, we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father."

Eph. iii. 14, &c. "I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,—that he would grant you to be strengthened by his Spirit in the inner man. That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." Verse 21. "Unto him, that is the Father, be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages."—

Eph. v. 20. "Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Phil. ii. 11. "That every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

Col. iii. 17. "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him."

Heb. xiii. 15. "By him therefore, that is Christ, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually."

Eph. vi. 18. "Praying always, that is to God, with prayer and supplication in the Spirit."

Jude verse 20 "Praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God," that is the Father.

Rom. viii. 15. "Ye have received the spirit of adoption whereby we cry, *Abba* Father."

Now while the Son and the blessed Spirit are made the glorious mediums of our worship, which is addressed in this manner to the Father, they receive honours from us, such as, I think, no mere creature can have a right to, and which may be justly called divine.

But there are proper divine personal honours and worship which scripture gives us sufficient foundation to pay more directly to the Son, and the blessed Spirit themselves, according to the

several characters in the dispensation of the gospel : And in order to find out what these are, let us consider how the Son and the Spirit are represented in the holy scripture, and what characters they sustain, as we have done concerning the Father.

*Secondly, Of the Son.*—The Son is represented in scripture, as being sent down to earth by the Father to do his will ; as coming from heaven, and taking flesh upon him by the appointment of his Father, as undertaking and fulfilling the glorious offices of a prophet, priest, and king, and an example of holiness ; as performing all the services, and enduring all the pains and sorrows, and death itself, which were appointed for him as our great Reconciler, in order to make a full and proper satisfaction for our sins, and bring us into the favour of God ; as rising again from the dead, and conquering death and hell ; as interceding for us in heaven, and reigning there in glory ; as sending his Spirit to convince and convert sinners, to sanctify and comfort the saints ; as managing all the affairs of nature and grace, for his Father's honour, and the good of his people, according as the Father has intrusted him with the government of the world and of the church ; and as being ready to come with thousands of angels to judge the world, to condemn the wicked to eternal punishment, and to reward the saints with an everlasting heaven.

Therefore both the prophecies, precepts, and examples of scripture give us abundant encouragement to pay several acts of worship to the Son of God.

Question. “ What are those acts of worship, and those honours which the scriptures lead us to pay to the Son ? ”

Answer I. We are bound to offer our humble adorations and acknowledgments, our thanks and praises to our Lord Jesus Christ; for all those gracious offices which he has, does, and will sustain and execute for our welfare and everlasting happiness. We adore him for his condescending mercy, and that infinite love that appeared in taking our nature upon him, and dwelling with men in such circumstances of poverty, meanness and disgrace. We adore his unspeakable pity in taking our sins upon him, and atoning for our guilt by his agonies in the garden, and his agonies on the cross. We adore and bless the Prince of life who died for us, and rose again, and shews us the way to heaven. We bless him for sending his holy Spirit, for all the glorious purposes of our conviction, sanctification and salvation.

Now that direct addresses of praise and adoration may be paid to Christ, is very evident.

That it was our Lord Jesus Christ, or God the word, who was worshipped by the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and Moses, whensoever God appeared in a bodily shape, and conversed with them, is plain ; for the Father never appeared thus. It was he also whom Joshua, Gideon, &c. worshipped. He is the appointed object of worship. Ps. ii. 11, 12. “ Serve the Lord

with fear ; kiss the Son lest he be angry ;—blessed are all they that put their trust in him." Ps. xlv. 11. "He is thy Lord, and worship thou him. And daily shall he be praised ; Ps. lxxii. 15. And if we turn to the New Testament, we shall find both commands and examples of adoration and thanksgiving paid to Christ.

John v. 22, 23. "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men might honour the Son, as they honour the Father."

Phil. ii. 10, 11. "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, both of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth ; and that every thing should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord." And thus we are bound to adore him as Lord of all things, as universal sovereign of men and angels, of all the upper and the lower worlds.

1 Tim. i. 12. "I thank Jesus Christ our Lord, who hath enabled me, and put me into the ministry."

2 Tim. iv. 18. "The Lord, that is Christ, shall deliver me from every evil, and will preserve me to his heavenly kingdom : To whom be glory for ever and ever, *Amen*."

So in 1 Pet. iv. 11. There is a doxology or ascription of glory to our Lord Jesus Christ. "To whom be praise and dominion for ever, *Amen*."

2 Pet. iii. 18. "Our Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory both now and for ever, *Amen*."

And I think that doxology in Jude belongs to Christ, as I have shewn before, verse 25. "To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power both now and ever, *Amen*."

So Rev. i. 5, 6. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father ; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever, *Amen*."

Rev. v. 8, 9, 10. "They fell down before the Lamb, and sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy, for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood ;" verses 12, 13. "Saying with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

Rev. vii. 10. "Salvation to our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb."

11. And as we are bound to offer thanksgiving and praise to him, and to ascribe to him, that glory and dominion which is his due, so it is our duty to pray to him, call upon him, and trust

in him for those blessings, which he is exalted to bestow as our Saviour.

In short, there is no benefit which he is exalted to bestow upon us, but we may directly address him by faith and prayer for it. The following scriptures will make this evident :

John xiv. 1. "Ye believe in God, believe also in me," in which place, as well as many others, perhaps the word *πιστω* is better rendered "trust."

Acts xxii. 16. "Be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

Stephen just expiring prayed to Christ; Acts vii. 59. "Lord Jesus receive my Spirit."

2 Cor xii. 8. When St. Paul was buffeted by Satan, he prayed to Christ for relief. "For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me."

Phil. ii. 19. "I trust in the Lord Jesus to send Timotheus."

1 Thess. iii. 11. "Our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way unto you."

2 Thess. ii. 16, 17. "Our Lord Jesus Christ himself, comfort your hearts, and establish you in every good word and work."

The apostle Paul frequently concludes his letters, both to persons and to churches, praying for "grace and peace to descend upon them from our Lord Jesus Christ." The apostle John also does the same; 2 John verse 3. and Rev. i. 4, 5. Though whether these are so explicit, and distinct addresses to Christ, has been matter of doubt and dispute.

And as he is expressly said to be "exalted as a Prince, and a Saviour to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins;" Acts iv. 31. So we may properly pray to him, and trust in him to bestow on us repentance and forgiveness.

III. Self-dedication and subjection of the soul to Christ, as a Lord and governor, is also a part of that honour and worship which is due to him; besides fear and love, &c.

2 Cor. v. 15. "He died for all, that they who live should not henceforth live to themselves, but to him who died for them, and rose again."

2 Cor. viii. 5. "They first gave their own selves to the Lord."

John xiii. 13. "Ye call me master and Lord—and so I am."

John xiv. 15. "If ye love me, keep my commandments."

Here let it be observed also, that in several of these scriptures we are taught to pray to, or to praise, or to trust in our Lord Jesus Christ, not only for those blessings which he immediately bestows on us, but for those also which are bestowed more immediately by the Holy Spirit, such as illumination, sanctification and com-



fort ; because in the economy of the gospel the Son of God acts toward us in many instances in and by the Spirit, and receives worship on that account ; even as the Father acts in and by both the Son and the Spirit, and is accordingly worshipped, and praised for the blessings conferred on us by the Spirit or the Son.

Now because the performance of several of these offices, which our Lord Jesus fulfils, seems to require such a degree of knowledge, wisdom, power, glory and dignity, as belong only to the true God, and for which no person can be sufficient, which has not such an intimate union and communion in and with the divine nature ; therefore when we pay these honours to Christ as Mediator, we may be properly said to worship him with divine honours. We worship the godhead as dwelling in the man Christ Jesus ; we worship the glorious person, " in whom dwells the fulness of the godhead bodily ;" Col. ii. 9.

And let it be noted also, that since he is the true God, or hath real communion in the divine nature, I see no plain reason why we may not worship the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the true God, even without any immediate regard to his mediatorial offices. Surely, I think, we may adore the " logos," or word, who " was with God," and who " was God," before the creation of the world, though we have now more express commands and more engaging motives to worship him as dwelling in our flesh ; and as having fulfilled his mediatorial offices, and ascended to the highest heavens.

*Thirdly, Of the Holy Spirit.*—I proceed now to consider the character and offices, sustained by the Holy Spirit in scripture, and consequently what worship is due to him.

The Holy Spirit is represented in scripture as a personal agent, through whom God created the world, and manages the affairs of providence and grace ; it is the blessed Spirit who instructed his people, published the revelations of his mind and will, inspired his prophets, wrought miracles, conducted our Lord Jesus Christ during his humiliation, raised up Christ from the dead ; and then as sent by Christ when he was exalted in heaven, he influenced and directed his apostles, gave them a variety of miraculous gifts, sends out ministers, calls sinners, convinces and converts them to faith and holiness, sanctifies, comforts, and establishes believers, prepares and seals them for heaven and glory.

I shall not repeat here the scriptures that mention the agency of the blessed Spirit in creation and providence, but only cite some few of those, which respect his influence on, and operations by the Lord Jesus Christ on earth, his agency on the prophets, the apostles, and the saints and churches.

I. *On the Prophets.*—Acts i. 16. " The Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before."

2 Pet. i. 21. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

1 Pet. i. 11. "The Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets; testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow."

II. *On Christ on Earth.*—Mat. xii. 28. "I cast out devils by the Spirit of God."

1 Tim. iii. 16. "God manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit," that is, proved to be the Messiah by the working of the Holy Spirit.

1 Pet. iii. 18. "Christ—put to death in the flesh, quickened in, or by the Spirit," that is, from the dead.

Acts i. 2. "After he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments to the apostles whom he had chosen."

III. *On the Apostles and Ministers.*—John xiv. 26. "The Holy Ghost shall teach you all things," and xvi. 13. "He shall guide you into all truth, and shew you things to come."

Acts ii. 4. "They were filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."

Rom. xv. 19. "Through mighty signs and wonders, which St. Paul wrought by the power of the Spirit of God."

1 Cor. xii. 4, 8, 11. "Diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; but all these worketh that one and the same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." Which manner of expression denotes a sovereign, a divine and personal agency of the Holy Ghost.

The Holy Spirit directed the apostles where to exercise their ministry. Acts viii. 29. "The Spirit said to Philip, go near, and join thyself to the chariot of the Ethiopian." Acts x. 29. "The Spirit said to Peter, go with the servants of Cornelius, doubting nothing, for I have sent them:" And we read that he bid, and forbid Paul to go and preach in this, or the other place as he pleased; Acts xvi. 6, 7.

It is the Spirit who appoints the ministers of the gospel. Acts xiii. 2. "The Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them." And Acts xx. 28. "The elders of the church of Ephesus were made overseers by the Holy Ghost."

IV. *On the world, but especially on the church.*—John xvi. 8. "He will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." John xv. 26. "The Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, shall testify of me."

John iii. 5. "Except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

Rom. v. 5. "The love of God is shed abroad in your hearts by the Holy Ghost."

Rom. viii. 13. "If through the Spirit ye do mortify the deeds of the body." Verse 16. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God."

Rom. xv. 16. "Being sanctified by the Holy Ghost."

1 Cor. vi. 11. "Sanctified by the Spirit of our God."

Titus iii. 5. "We are saved by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost."

Eph. i. 12. "Sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise."

1 Cor. iii. 16. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." Chap. vi. ver. 19. "Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you." Thus the Spirit of God dwells in the saints, as in his own temple.

And it is he also who directs and governs the churches of Christ. Rev. ii. 7. "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches."

Now as the New Testament is full of expressions of this kind, so there are several hints of this nature in the Old Testament also. David prays for the teaching and the leading of the Spirit of God; Psal. cxliiii. 10. He prays that the Holy Spirit may not be taken from him, and that God would uphold him by his free Spirit; Psal. li. 11, 12. And it is the great promise frequently repeated concerning the times of the New Testament, that the Spirit of God shall be given to men, shall be poured out upon them, and not depart from them, but abide with them, as a principle of knowledge and holiness; Isai. xlv. 3. and lix. 21. Joel ii. 28.

Thus it is abundantly manifest, that the Spirit of God does almost every thing that is to be done in, or by the saints, the ministers, or the churches, in order to build and support the kingdom of Christ in the world, and to apply the redemption of our Lord Jesus Christ, and render it effectual to the salvation of every single christian.

Now here arise three questions.

Question I. "What honours or what worship does the scripture encourage or warrant us to pay to the blessed Spirit, according to these glorious offices, which he sustains for our sakes, and the benefits which we receive from him?"

Answer. It has been already proved under the eighth proposition, "that divine worship is paid in scripture to the Holy Spirit, for we are baptized into his name;" Mat. xxviii. 19. That is, we are devoted to his service. The sacred benediction or blessing is desired to descend upon the saints from the Holy Spirit, as well as from the Father and the Son, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. And the same is repeated by the apostle John; Rev. i. 4, 5. "Grace unto you, and peace, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which

are before the throne ; and from Jesus Christ." Where it is generally supposed, that the blessed Spirit of God is described by seven Spirits, because of his variety of gifts and graces.

We are required also not to quench the Spirit ; 1 Thess. v. 19. not to grieve the Holy Spirit of God ; Eph. iv. 30. that is, not to resist his convictions and pious motions, as the Jews did in elder and in later days, for which they are severely reprov'd. Acts vii. 51, but to obey and comply with all his holy influences, and have a most sacred regard to them.

And since there are none of us but have in some instances, more or less, resisted and quenched the good motions of the blessed Spirit, I think we may justly be allowed to mourn before him, and confess to him how much we have injured his love, and take shame to ourselves before him, for all these indignities and provocations.

As we are said also in scripture to be led by the Spirit, to be taught by the Spirit, to be strengthened and comforted by the Spirit, to be assisted in prayer, and in every good work by the same Spirit, so it is our duty to wait and depend on him for instruction, consolation and assistance in all the affairs of the christian life.

Question II. " Is it proper for us to address ourselves in a way of prayer or praise, directly to the blessed Spirit, since we can neither find it plainly commanded or practised in the word of God ?"

Answer. I confess we cannot find in scripture any such positive and express precepts or examples of petition and praise, so directly addressed to the person of the Holy Spirit, as there are to the Father and to the Son.

One reason may be this, because in the economy of the gospel he is not seated on a throne of Majesty, nor sustains a royal character ; but he is rather represented as acting in subordination to the Father and the Son, and sent by the Father and the Son, as a prime minister in their kingdom. And therefore since our worship of the blessed Trinity is generally regulated by the economy of the gospel, our direct addresses are generally made to the Father or to the Son, who are seated on a throne, and sustain a royal character in this economy.

I would add also, that though the Son himself is represented as Lord and King in this economy, yet he is often described as acting in subordination to the Father. And it is for this reason, it may be, that there are but few addresses made directly and distinctly to the Son of God himself in the scripture, in comparison of those which are made in general to God, or distinctly to the Father.

Another reason why the Holy Spirit has not such direct and

express addresses made to him as the Father and the Son in scripture may be this, that the agency and seat of the Father and Son are described as in heaven, where they dwell, to receive our homage and worship, and to send down blessings; but the agency and seat of the Holy Spirit is within us, where he dwells to assist us in paying that homage and worship to the Son and the Father. Now there may seem to be some reason, why our direct adorations and addresses of prayer and praise should chiefly be offered to those persons of the sacred Trinity, which are represented as sitting upon a throne in heaven, rather than to that person who is represented as dwelling within ourselves, and exerting his divine powers there.

Yet since we have proved before, that the Spirit hath real, true and proper communion in the godhead, and that he is one God with the Father and the Son, it is certain that he knows all our wants, our desires and our petitions, for he is omniscient: He is able to supply them all, for he is almighty: And he is particularly ordained in this glorious economy to enlighten, convince, convert, sanctify, comfort, and save us, to bestow gifts, graces and divine blessings upon us; and to fit us for the inheritance of heaven; and upon these accounts there is sufficient ground, in my judgment, to address ourselves to him by way of prayer, for the spiritual mercies we want; and by way of praise, for the blessings we receive; and especially upon some particular occasions, wherein the agency of the Spirit is most eminently concerned.

There is this plain reason for it:

If there be any mere creature, to whom I can certainly communicate the knowledge of my wants, who has also power to supply them, and has a particular office or appointment for this end, surely all the light of reason and scripture lead me to address him by petition for a supply, and to give him thanks for what I have received; much more then may I pay the same sort of honours in a divine manner, to the blessed Spirit, who is the true God, and knows all my wants, and all my prayers and praises.

Finally, since learned men have found in the primitive ages, some few hints or examples of a doxology, or ascription of praise to the Holy Spirit together with the Father and the Son, though there be no such example in scripture, and since this has been the frequent custom of the church in all these latter ages, I cannot see any sufficient reason to renounce or forsake it, since it is built on such plain and natural reasonings and consequences drawn from scripture.

It may be expedient to practise it frequently in some churches where it has been long used, lest great offence be given; it may be proper also sometimes to use it on purpose to hold forth the

doctrine of the Trinity in times of error, and to take away all suspicion of heresy from the public worship.

Yet I cannot but give my opinion, that since the apostles continually vary their doxologies, it is a piece of christian prudence not to confine one's self everlastingly to any one certain form of doxology lest the people think that very form to be of sacred necessity: And I am not willing to be the man who should venture to say, there is an absolute necessity of using any doxology, which has no pattern or precept in scripture.

We must have a care lest we make any thing necessary by mere human custom or constitution, which the holy scripture hath not made so by a divine appointment. For though I have shewn that there is in scripture a sufficient foundation to allow and support the common doxology, yet there is no plain and positive command for it there, nor any account of the practice of it.\*

**Question III.** "Is it lawful in our doxologies or ascriptions of praise, to pay the same worship to the Holy Spirit, or to the Son, as we do to the Father?"

**Answer I.** It is the divine nature or godhead in each person, that is the only foundation of divine worship; and since it is one and the same godhead, that subsists in the Spirit and the Son, as in the Father, therefore when we use such acts and forms of devotion in blessing and praising God, as agree to the godhead

\* The doxologies used in the New Testament are these, viz. Rom. xi. 36. "Of him, and through him, and to him are all things. To whom be glory for ever, Amen." Rom. xvi. 27. "To God only wise be glory through Jesus Christ, for ever, Amen." Gal. i. 4, 5, "According to the will of God and our Father. To him be glory for ever and ever, Amen." Ephes. iii. 21. "To him be glory in the church, by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end, Amen." Phil. iv. 20. "Now to God and our Father be glory for ever and ever, Amen." 1 Tim. i. 17. "Now to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever, Amen." 1 Tim. vi. 16. "Whom no man hath seen, or can see. To whom be honour and power everlasting, Amen." 2 Tim. iv. 8. "The Lord shall deliver me, &c. to whom be glory for ever and ever, Amen." Heb. xiii. 24. "The God of peace,—(through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever, Amen." 1 Pet. iv. 11. "That God in all things may be glorified, through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever, Amen." 1 Pet. i. 3. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. iii. 18. "Our Saviour Jesus Christ, to him be glory both now, and for ever, Amen." Jude verse 25. "To the only wise God, our Saviour, be glory, and majesty, dominion, and power, both now and ever, Amen." Rev. i. 5, 6. "To him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, &c. be glory, and dominion, for ever and ever, Amen." Rev. iv. 11. "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." Rev. v. 12. "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory and blessing." Verse 13. "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be to him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever, Amen." Rev. vii. 10. "Salvation unto our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb." Verse 12. "Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour, and power, and might be unto our God, for ever and ever, Amen." Rev. xix. 1. "Hallelujah, salvation, and glory, and honour, and power, unto the Lord our God."

considered absolutely in itself, we may pay the same worship to Father, Son and Spirit, or to the godhead subsisting in three persons. But secondly,

II. If we consider the three persons of the Trinity in their distinct personal properties and characters, it is utterly inconsistent with the whole current of scripture to pay the same form of address and adoration to each of the sacred three. As for instance,

We adore the Father as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the first person in the sacred order of the Trinity : we bless him for sending his own Son into our nature, and for appointing him to be our high-priest, our sacrifice, and our great Reconciler ; we give him thanks for the gift of his Holy Spirit, given first to Jesus Christ our Lord, and by him to us. But we cannot offer the same forms of expression, nor indeed the same acts of inward worship to the persons of the Son or the Holy Spirit.

In like manner we give praise and thanks to the Son ; that he condescended to be made " partaker of our flesh and blood ;" that he " bore our sins in his body on the tree ;" that he was " slain, and washed us in his blood, and redeemed us to God and made us kings and priests to God and his Father ;" we bless him, because he intercedes for us at the throne in heaven : and that he, by his Father's appointment and deputation, governs and disposes of all things for the good of his church here on earth. Now these doxologies or thanksgivings cannot be addressed to the person of the Spirit, nor to God the Father.

And I think it is in this sense, we may best understand those words in John v. 22, 23. " The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all men might honour the Son, as they honour the Father." That is, since the Father, who is represented as the original Governor and Judge of mankind, hath vested the Son as Mediator with this authority of government and judgment, therefore those divine honours that belong to the Father, considered as Governor and Judge may be properly paid to the Son ; and this without the least infringement of the rights of godhead, since the Son is also true God, or hath communion in the divine nature. For though we do not think it is the direct design of that place to express the divinity of the Son, yet I think that such a command would not have been given if the Son had not been true God.

Yet let it be noted here, that we cannot address Jesus Christ the Son, considered personally, in all respects with the same honours as we address the Father ; because we cannot say to Christ, " Lord, thou art the God and Father of Christ ; thou art the original Judge of all, and thou hast given all judgment into the hands of thy Son." These sort of addresses belong

peculiarly and only to the Father, and if paid to Christ personally considered are ridiculous and absurd.

But to proceed. We may pay also divine honours and praise to the Holy Spirit for his miraculous gifts of old, for inspiring the prophets and apostles, for all his distributions of gifts, graces, and sacred influences to his churches, his saints, and his ministers in our days. But if we mention expressly his deputation to this sacred office by the Father and the Son, then we give thanks to the Holy Spirit, who has accepted this office in our salvation, to enlighten, comfort and sanctify us; and in executing this blessed office by commission from the Father and Son, distributes his gifts and his graces among us. Now this form of words could not properly be used in an address to the Father, nor to the Son. Yet in the third place,

III. I would make this remark here, viz. That when we mention merely the benefits that we receive from the Son or Spirit, we may give thanks to God the Father for them all, because in the order of the gospel, he sent both the Spirit and the Son to provide and bestow those blessings on us. Thus we may bless God the Father for the atonement of Christ, and his glorious righteousness; for the providential government of Christ over the nations, and his spiritual government over his church, as well as for the enlightening, sanctifying and comforting influences of the Holy Ghost, &c.

We may give thanks also to the Son, for all the benefits that we receive from the Holy Spirit, for it is the Son who by the appointment and gift of the Father sends the Holy Spirit to us.

But we cannot properly give thanks to the Son or the Spirit, considered in their distinct personal characters, for all the benefits and blessings which are particularly attributed to the Father in scripture; such as contriving our salvation, sending the Son to purchase it, and by the hands of the Son sending the Spirit to apply it; for this would bring confusion into that admirable divine order, which God hath established in our salvation.

All these things flow with so clear and natural an evidence from the scriptures, which have been before cited, that it is needless to cite and repeat them here.

Thus it is abundantly evident, that distinct personal honours, must be addressed to the three sacred persons, on the account of their different properties, characters and offices, though the same absolute and essential honours of the deity or godhead may be addressed to all three together, or to God subsisting in three persons. Now in the fourth place,

IV. To give a short and direct answer to the third question, When the common doxologies are used, wherein glory is given to the Father, Son and Spirit, in the same form of words, we



may either understand the absolute essential honours of godhead, which we give to the divine nature, subsisting in Father, Son and Spirit; or we may in our thoughts give adoration and thanks to each of the sacred three for the various and distinct offices they sustain, and distinct benefits we receive from them.

If we may dare to make use of the similitude before mentioned, and conceive of a king, whose soul doth also animate and actuate an ambassador extraordinary and a resident in a foreign country, and by their means bestow blessings on his subjects in that foreign country, we may in some measure apprehend how far each of these persons may have communion in the same royal honours, and how far their particular personal honours are distinct from each other: But no human simile can perfectly express things divine.

To conclude, I have here shewn what are the general honours of the godhead subsisting in three persons; and what are the particular divine honours that belong to each person, as sustaining particular characters and offices in the economy of creation, providence and redemption. And though the Son and the Spirit may be properly addressed with divine honours, as having communion in true godhead, yet since the scripture is given us to direct our worship, is it not better in our most common and usual addresses to God to follow the express directions and examples of scripture, and imitate the inspired apostles, those first and most glorious christians?

And since we find so great a silence in scripture of any express precepts or patterns, of prayer or praise, directed distinctly to the person of the blessed Spirit, let us not bind it upon our own consciences, nor upon others, as a piece of necessary worship; but rather practise it occasionally as prudence and expedience may require.

Since we find both precepts and patterns for prayer and praise to be often addressed to our Lord Jesus Christ, let us also often call upon the name of the Lord Jesus, and direct frequent doxologies to the Lamb that was slain.

But since the most frequent patterns and precepts in scripture lead us to direct our addresses to God the Father, who transacts all his affairs with us, in and through his Son by his Holy Spirit, I think we should also make it the most frequent and usual practice in our devotions, "to have our access through Jesus Christ, by one Spirit unto the Father;" Eph. ii 18. that is, to address the Father, by the meditation of the Son, through the assistance of the Holy Spirit; that this divine economy, which is the substance and glory of the christian religion, and runs through the whole of it, might be visible also in our common devotions, and appear manifestly to run through the several parts of christian worship in which we are engaged.

**PROP. XXI.**—*In so doing we shall effectually secure our own Salvation ; For the Scripture has made our Salvation to depend on those Relations and Offices which these divine Persons sustain, and on the Honours due to them according to these Offices, rather than upon any deep Philosophical Notions of their Essence and Personalities, any nice and exact Acquaintance with their mysterious Union and Distinction.*

I have said before, that I know not how we can pay such honours and worship to Christ or the blessed Spirit, as are expressed and described in the New Testament, unless we suppose them to have some real communion in the divine nature, and to have true godhead belonging to them : Yet if we turn over all the books of the New Testament, we shall find that the stress of our salvation is laid upon our humble sense of our sins, our return to God the Father by sincere repentance, and change of heart and life, and our unfeigned faith in the Lord Jesus. These were the great and glorious things that St. Paul mentions as the sum of his preaching in order to the salvation of men. Acts xx. 21. “ Testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.”

And when the things absolutely necessary to salvation are mentioned, which relate particularly to our Lord Jesus Christ, these are generally comprehended in a belief of the characters and offices of Christ, as the great promised Messiah, as a Saviour, a Prophet, a Mediator, a Priest, and proper sacrifice of atonement, as a Lord and King, as an example, as a head of vital influence, as our final Judge, &c. together with our sense of his all-sufficiency for those offices, and our sacred practical regards to him in the discharge of them. These are the chief things required in order to salvation ; and not a distinct knowledge or belief how or in what manner he is the same with the Father, and in what manner he differs from the Father.

The language in which the requisites of salvation are generally expressed, as they relate to Christ or the Holy Spirit, is as follows :—

Acts xvi. 31. “ Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved.”

Mark i. 15. “ Repent ye, and believe the gospel,” that is, the glad tidings of peace with God by Jesus Christ the Messiah.

Mark xvi. 16. “ He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.”

John viii. 24. “ If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins,” that is, if ye believe not that I am the Messiah, the promised Saviour of mankind.

Acts ii. 38. “ Repent and be baptized every one of you in

the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

John iii. 3. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God;" verse 5. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God:" that is, except he be inwardly regenerated, sanctified and cleansed from sin by the influence of the Holy Spirit, as we are outwardly baptized and cleansed with water, he cannot be saved.

Rom. viii. 9. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Verse 13. "If ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."

Rom. x. 9. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth, the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe with thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Verse 13. "He that calleth on the name of the Lord shall be saved."

Acts x. 43. "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins."

John i. 12. "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the children of God, even to them that believe on his name."

John vi. 37. "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out."

Mat. xi. 28. "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

Heb. vii. 25. "He is able to save to the uttermost, all that come to God by him."

Rom. iii. 25. "Him hath God set forth for a propitiation through faith in his blood."

2 Tim. i. 12. "I know whom I have believed, that is Christ, and I am persuaded he is able to keep what I have committed to him against that day."

Heb. v. 9. "He became the author of eternal salvation to all that obey him."

John vi. 40. "This is the will of him that hath sent me, that every one who seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: And I will raise him up at the last day."

Now faith or believing in our Lord Jesus, is most frequently mentioned here: And this, so far as we can find it explained in scripture, and made necessary to salvation, signifies chiefly, a believing him to be the Messiah, the Christ, who was foretold by all the ancient prophets as the Saviour of mankind, and it includes in it, or necessarily draws after it, such addresses of the soul, and sacred regards to him, as are suited to his character as the Lord and Saviour of mankind, and the only and all-sufficient Mediator between God and man.

The only difficulty lies in this, that several places of the New Testament seem to make a belief of Christ to be the Son of God necessary to salvation ; as John xx. 31. " These things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." 1 John v. 13. " These things have I written unto you, that believe on the name of the Son of God ; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God." 1 John iv. 15. " Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him." 1 John ii. 23. " Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father."

Now the objection runs thus : If we are required to believe that Christ is the Son of God, then we must know and believe what is this relation of sonship to God the Father in order to salvation, and this seems to be more than a mere knowledge and belief of his offices, and his all-sufficient capacity to fulfil them.

In answer to this objection, I have shewn in a particular discourse, which I had once designed to publish at the end of this book, what appears to me the true meaning of this name, " Son of God ;" and upon the best judgment I can make, by a comparison of scriptures together, I am inclined to believe that this name Son of God signifies, " That glorious person who has in general some peculiar and sublime relation to God the Father, and is appointed to be the Messiah or Saviour ;" and the chief things included herein, are his office and his divine fitness and capacity to fulfil it ; and it is under this notion Christ was preached to the Jews, and believed on by the disciples. It is this that renders him directly suitable to the necessities of perishing sinners, and a most proper object for the exercise of a saving faith. This therefore is the most natural and probable sense of this title, " the Son of God," in the general use of it in the New Testament ; and especially in those places where our salvation is made to depend on the belief of it.

This imperfect idea or conception of some glorious and peculiar but unknown relation to God, seems to be the utmost which at that time the disciples could well arrive at concerning his Sonship.

How far they could be apprized of his true godhead, I make not the matter of my present enquiry : Their faith of that sometimes at least seemed to be fluttering and dubious. But as to their notion of his sonship, they seem to have no certain idea whether it related to his body, or his soul, to his divine nature, or his office, or to several of these together.

It is hard to suppose, that the eternal generation of the Son of God, as a distinct person, yet co-equal, and consubstantial, or of

the same essence with the Father, should be made a fundamental article of faith, in that dawn of the gospel, that hour of Jewish twilight between declining Judaism and rising Christianity. It is very hard to imagine, that God should propose so sublime a doctrine of so obscure and doubtful evidence in that day, as a test to the faith of poor ignorant fishermen, and pronounce damnation on the disbelief of it.

I am persuaded therefore, that faith in him as the divine Messiah, or all-sufficient and appointed Saviour, is the thing required in those very texts where he is called the Son of God, and proposed as such for the object of our belief: And that a belief of the natural and eternal and consubstantial sonship of Christ to God as a Father, was not made the necessary term or requisite of salvation, neither in those texts before mentioned, nor in any others. Nor indeed can I find it asserted or revealed with so much evidence in any part of the word of God, as is necessary to make it a fundamental article of my faith.

This doctrine of the co-eternal generation and consubstantial and co-equal sonship, is but one of the learned schemes found out to explain the "modus" or manner of one godhead subsisting in distinct persons. Now I would fain have my readers learn that our faith in the scripture doctrine of the true and eternal godhead of Christ, which is plainly revealed, does not necessarily depend on any of those learned schemes and explanations, which, if they are not merely humane, yet are of mere doubtful revelation, and a matter of difficulty and dispute even among the learned and pious Trinitarians.

I grant it indeed a very possible thing, that the great God may propose any sublime truth to our belief, as a test of the obedience of our understanding to his word, and a trial of the submission of our reason to faith and divine revelation. But then such a truth must be revealed with bright evidence, and great plainness in the word of God. And we ought to keep our consciences under so awful a sense of this sovereignty of God, as to make us willing to submit our belief to every such truth plainly revealed in scripture, even though it may surmount our present comprehension. And since God hath revealed it, I think, with sufficient evidence in scripture that the Son and Holy Spirit have real communion with the Father, in the divine nature or godhead, and are the one true God, we should be much afraid to allow ourselves in any degrading sentiments concerning those glorious persons, and maintain a holy jealousy, lest we defraud them of that due honour and divine veneration which belongs to those sacred Three who are in one godhead.

Yet if I may give up my thoughts and judgment entirely to the conduct of scripture, I am there led to believe that the practical concern we have with these three persons of the blessed

**Trinity, is of far greater importance in the matter of salvation, than any of the nice and speculative notions and terms of art concerning the essence, union, and distinction of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit ; though we must always take heed to maintain such notions concerning their nature, powers and properties, as are sufficient to support and justify all the practical honours and duties we pay to them.**

**PROP. XXII.—***The Man therefore who professes each of the Sacred Three to have sufficient divine Power, and Capacity to sustain the Characters, and fulfil the Offices attributed to them in Scripture, and pays due Honour to them according to those Offices, may justly be owned by me, and received as a Christian Brother, though we may differ much in our Notions and Opinions about the Explication of the Blessed Trinity, or though we may both be ignorant or doubtful of the True Way of explaining it.*

No man can pay the honours due to our Lord Jesus, unless he believe him to have the dignity and perfections of godhead belonging to him, so far as to answer the purposes of an all-sufficient sacrifice, and atonement for sin, so far as to give him universal acquaintance with the infinite affairs of his kingdom in the world and the church, together with equal power to manage and controul all things in the regions of heaven, earth and hell: But these powers and capacities do not depend on any particular mode of explaining the Trinity.

No man can pay the honours due to the blessed Spirit, unless he believe him to have such communion in godhead, as to render him fit for the universal Agent or Minister in this most extensive kingdom of Christ, that he may both know and influence all the infinite affairs of creation and providence and grace; but these powers and capacities do not depend on any particular mode of explaining the Trinity.

No man therefore in my judgment, can pay due honours to the Son or Spirit, unless he believe them to be the true God; though he may pay all necessary honours to them without knowing how to explain the "modus" or manner how they are one God and yet distinct persons.

He therefore that appears to me to be a hearty lover of God and Jesus Christ, a humble enquirer and searcher after truth, that believes and professes our Lord Jesus and the blessed Spirit to have such a real communion in the divine nature, or such an one-ness with God, as is sufficient to sustain all the glorious offices which are assigned to him in scripture, particularly the satisfaction for our sins, the sanctification of our natures, and the government and influence over the visible and invisible worlds, and such as is sufficient to render them the proper objects of

divine worship according to those various offices, he shall not be excluded by me from the number of the faithful, for any defect in this article of the catholic faith.

And if he make this confession honestly in any words of his own choosing, and make it evident to me, that his sense and meaning amounts to what I have here expressed, I shall venture to call him my fellow-christian and my brother; nor shall I dare to condemn him, though he refuse to make use of the expressions I have here written, or any other words that I should chuse for him. If a man has "faith and knowledge," though I may fancy him to be rude in knowledge and weak in the faith, yet I am commanded to receive him, and "not to doubtful disputations:" Rom. xiv. 1.

But while I am professing christian charity, I would set a due honour and defence upon the christian faith; and amidst all my love to men, I would remember what honours are due to Christ, "my Lord and my God." "Whosoever abideth not in the necessary doctrine of Christ, hath not God, nor is he to be received into the church," nor the house, as a christian brother, or as a friend; 2 John verse 9. If I read and believe the word of God I must believe there are some such gross errors in doctrine, that will as effectually exclude from the church of Christ and from the kingdom of heaven, as gross immoralities in practice: There are such things as damnable heresies which will bring upon the professors of them swift destruction; and the apostle assures us that one of these heresies is a "denial of the Lord that bought them;" 2 Pet. ii. 1.

#### CONCLUSION.

Before I put a full end to this little treatise, I would ask leave of my readers, and especially those of younger years, to propose to them these two heads of advice relating to the doctrine of the Trinity. The first refers to our enquiry into the doctrine itself. The second to our establishment in the faith of it.

The directions I would give concerning our enquiries into this great doctrine are these:

I. "Seek for it chiefly in the word of God;" build your faith entirely upon this word, and not upon the books of men. There you will be sure to find no human additions to it, but the pure divine doctrine itself. And whensoever you consult the writings of men on this subject, dare to admit nothing but what you see evidently proved by the word of God. Judicious collections out of the Holy Scripture relating to this article, are of great use, when they are not chosen and culled out, and put together merely to serve and support some particular scheme

of explication. Though the writings of men may be of great service, yet you must use them only as helps not as determiners of your faith.

II. "Read the word with holy reverence and humility of soul," resolving to believe whatsoever you find there plainly revealed, whether you can reconcile it or no to your own fancies or former opinions. Read with an awful submission of your understandings to the authority of God speaking in his word. See Proposition XVI.

III. "Read and pursue your enquiries with a solemn concern about the importance of this doctrine:" Let not a vain, light, airy spirit tempt you ever to think or speak of it as a trivial matter, nor to mix it with common careless talk, nor profane it by noisy janglings, and a vain affectation of disputes about so divine a mystery. I fear this is a most provoking sin in our day.

IV. "Read with an abasing sense of your your own weakness and darkness of mind," and with importunate prayer to God for the teachings of his Spirit, who searches the deep things of God, and is promised to be given to those that ask it, and to lead them into all necessary truth.

V. "Set yourself to this work with great solemnity," and let your judgment determine itself in this important article, as in the presence of God your Supreme and final Judge. Dare not to indulge any old prejudices, or a vain affectation of novelty. Do not consult with flesh and blood, or suffer any carnal interests to have influence upon your judgment, or to bias your assent to any principle or opinion. Let nothing but the convincing evidence of scripture decide the question, and settle your faith. Take heed lest you build your belief upon any reasons or motives which you cannot justify to your conscience under the sharpest and severest enquiry: nor take up merely with such a shew of argument, either to confirm or renounce any important article as you dare not produce at the bar of God, and speak it boldly as a proof of your faith in the face of men and angels.

VI. And while you read and meditate on this subject and pursue your enquiries about this important point of religion, "watch and preserve a pure and holy frame of soul." Take heed lest you indulge a haughty, or a sensual, sinful temper; examine your hearts and your ways, and remove every iniquity; lest the great and dreadful God, who is jealous for the honour of his name, should be provoked to leave you to your own darkness, or abandon you to the foolish fires of fancy; lest he should give you up in judgment to the vain dictates of a proud and conceited mind, and thereby you may



be entangled in the most pernicious errors, or lost in everlasting wanderings.

The directions which relate to our establishment in the faith of the Trinity are these :

I. "Furnish your memory with those portions of holy scripture, wherein this sacred doctrine is most clearly expressed," and by which it is most effectually supported: "That you may be ready to give to every one that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear;" 1 Pet. iii. 15. that you may have an answer ready at hand to repel the assaults of error and temptation. The sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, and the shield of faith in that word, are admirable pieces of christian armour and artillery in an evil day.

II. "Maintain a firm and resolute assent to what the word of God plainly reveals concerning this divine doctrine," and be not ever wavering and tossed in your mind, with a kind of doubtful uncertainty, merely because you cannot explain the matter, and adjust every difficulty.

Keep on your spirit such a holy awe of the majesty and authority of God speaking in his word, that you may never stagger in the faith, which you can find so clearly dictated from heaven. Nor be ashamed to profess it at all proper occasions.

Having settled the substance of this doctrine in your minds, and founded it on the plain and solid evidence of scripture, you ought not to doubt and waver, much less to desert your faith merely because you cannot answer every objection against it: For even in the affairs of nature and the civil life, as Dr. Owen well expresses it, "If the objections wherewith we may be entangled be not of the same weight and importance with the reason for which we embraced any opinion, it is a madness to forego it on the account thereof. And much more must this hold amongst the common sort of christians, in things spiritual and divine. If they will let go, and part with their faith in any truth, because they are not able to answer distinctly some objections that may be made against it, they may quickly find themselves disputed into atheism."

In every sacred truth that is revealed to us, a plain evidence and full assurance that God hath said it, should be a sufficient answer to a thousand objections.

III. Since a particular knowledge of the "modus" or manner, how three persons are one God, is not clearly revealed in scripture, and therefore not necessary to salvation, "Be not too fond of any learned explications of this sacred mystery." Do not give into them too soon, nor yield your full assent to them too easily, nor be furiously zealous in the defence of them. Do not fix and root your judgment too fast in any of these

schemes of explaining the Trinity, till you see most abundant and convincing evidence ; and take care that you do not mingle any of these explications with the plain scriptural doctrine, so as to make them necessary articles of your faith. Hereby you will obtain great advantage in a day of temptation, as will appear thus :

You may observe it has been the usual and subtle practice of our adversaries to cavil at our faith of the Trinity by perplexing some part of our learned explications and schemes with knotty objections and arguments : And many times they have found themselves so successful herein, that they have sorely shaken the faith of many a christian, merely because he had mingled his opinions and his faith together, and joined the scriptural doctrine of the Trinity together with some learned hypothesis to explain it, in the same article of his faith. Whereas a man that well distinguishes between the plain scriptural doctrine itself, and the particular explications of it, holds his faith in the divine doctrine firm and unmoved, while several human forms of explication are attacked, and perhaps destroyed. Such a christian may triumph in a day of temptation, and may defend his creed, by keeping close to what the scripture has most evidently revealed, while he sees others that have built a high superstructure of notions about this doctrine, make shipwreck of their opinions, and their faith together.

IV. I would add this also, that one effectual method to establish the heart in this divine and important truth is, "to take a due survey what a sacred influence it has into all the parts of our holy religion : " And when we feel the daily want of the blessed Trinity, we shall not easily part with the doctrine. Let us keep a humble sense of the deplorable state of sin and ruin, into which the fall of man has brought us, and then we may see what need there is of the presence of a God in all the parts of our recovery and salvation. We may then see what need we have of so divine and all-sufficient a Reconciler as Jesus the Son of God, to bring us into his favour ; and what need of the almighty operations of the blessed Spirit to create us anew, and to restore us to his image. And since true and proper divinity or godhead is ascribed to those two glorious persons who are employed in this work, our hopes hereby have a surer refuge, and our faith a more immediate and divine foundation. It is quite contrary to our duty and our interest, to change such a Saviour, and such a Sanctifier, for any meaner beings which men may be tempted to put into these sacred offices, since the great and blessed God, subsisting in three persons, is pleased to undertake them, in various forms of condescension.

To conclude, let us with humble faith read and believe this glorious doctrine of the christian Trinity, so far as it is declared

in the holy scripture : Let us adore God the Father, as the author of all our mercies and our hopes. Let us trust in Jesus Christ his Son with a divine faith, as our all-sufficient Saviour, and obey him as our sovereign Lord. Let us wait for and seek the almighty and divine influences of the blessed Spirit to enlighten, to sanctify and to comfort us, and to carry us onward in our way to heaven. Let us be constant and zealous in paying these divine honours to the sacred three, which the word of God hath appointed, and upon which scripture hath taught us to expect eternal life : And then if God be faithful, and his gospel true, eternal life shall be our portion in the other world, though we know not how to explain all divine mysteries in this.

Now to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, three persons and one God, be all honour and glory, and everlasting praise, *Amen.*

## PREFACE

### “ THE ARIAN INVITED TO THE ORTHODOX FAITH.”

**W**HILE I was writing the little treatise of the “ Christian Doctrine of a Trinity,” the subject carried my thoughts away into several occasional sentiments, and incidental truths. These would have interrupted the thread my designed discourse too much, if they had been mingled with the several propositions to which they belong. I thought it proper therefore to throw them into distinct dissertations, several of which I had concluded before that treatise was made public.

It was my design to have finished them all at that time ; but some accidental occurrences broke off those studies, and I have been farther prevented by other requests of my friends, and my own promised engagements of various kinds, from resuming that subject again, till a few months ago this last winter. A man who through long weakness of body is rendered incapable of applying himself above six or seven hours in a week to any peculiar study, distinct from his necessary work, may be well excused if he is slow in the publication of any thing upon such a controverted doctrine.

I confess when I wrote that little book, I had no purpose of engaging myself in controversy. My intention was only to exhibit the plain naked doctrine of the Trinity, viz. “ That the Father, Son, and Spirit, are represented in scripture under three personal characters, and yet as having communion in one godhead,” without entering into any particular modes of explication, and without pretending to say new things on that article, either by way of position or argument. My chief view and design was to establish plain, unlearned christians in the faith of that doctrine, by those scriptural evidences, which seemed to me strong and convincing ; and to lay a foundation for extensive charity, by making it appear that no particular mode of explication was plainly and evidently determined in the word of God : And that the scripture has made our salvation to depend on those offices which these divine persons sustain, and on the honours due to them according to those offices, rather than upon any deep philosophical notions of their essence and personalities, any nice and exact acquaintance with their mysterious union and distinction.

I presumed therefore that if any persons who disbelieved the proper deity of the Son and Spirit, had a mind to signalize themselves by an opposition to the common faith, they would have chosen some author of superior rank, who had entered more largely into the merits of the cause, and by a full and particular explication of the scriptural proofs thereof, had vindicated that doctrine in a more complete and controversial manner. But I found myself mistaken ; for some months after my treatise appeared in the world, there was published a professed answer to it, bearing this title, “ A sober Appeal to a Turk or an Indian concerning the plain Sense of Scripture relating to the Trinity, being an Answer to Mr. I. Watts's late Book, intitled, The Christian Doctrine, &c.” I have a very great disinclination to handle the saw of controversy, especially in matters so divine and sacred ; and my imperfect health does by no means permit me to lay out many hours in such work. My life itself, that is, all the useful moments of it, are so shortened and diminished hereby, that I find them all much too few for the more agreeable parts of that service to which Christ has called me ; and upon this account I shall not think

myself obliged to enter the lists with any antagonist whatsoever, upon matters of dispute and intricacy, either now or hereafter.

Yet since I had promised some occasional dissertations on this subject, I found it was much expected by the world, that I should then take some notice of this author and his work, which I have now done in several of the discourses which I have written, and endeavoured to lay a foundation for the support of the common doctrine of the Trinity, by obviating some of his most plausible objections.

And since I never designed to give a large and particular answer to the "Sober Appeal," for the reasons already mentioned, I think it proper here to make a few general remarks on the style and manner of that writing.

And first I acknowledge my obligations to the author, for the terms of decency and respect, and the language of friendship with which he treats me both in the preface and in the greatest part of his book. I receive them as the unmerited civilities of a courteous stranger: And had I the happiness of knowing his name, perhaps I should find just occasion to make an equal return.— But while I am permitted to learn his character no otherwise but from his writing, I can only treat my unknown friend with all that esteem which his writing deserves. For I must confess, how superior soever others may appear in learning and argument, yet I am not willing any writer should exceed me in the practices of a christian temper.

But I hope my respondent will not take it ill, if I mention a few instances, wherein he seems to have been awakened by his zeal to forget his usual style: As when he takes occasion to pity me and all my friends, for the shifts we are put to in the defence of our doctrine. When he tells me he will not triumph over the weakness of my arguments, and yet affects a triumph in several places; with some other such superior airs, which he assumes in the course of the debate. This language carries a sort of sovereignty and contempt in it, but adds neither force nor ornament to the paragraph of the cause.

Again, He seems to indulge the same insulting strain, when he repeats so often the words resistless and over-bearing, which I think I had never used but once or twice at most. This represents me as though I had supposed every single argument of mine to be over-bearing and resistless; whereas in those places where I use either of these words, they refer chiefly to the whole strength of all the arguments put together, and which, I confess, still I cannot resist; and multitudes of christians have confessed the same. If I any where use such language on slighter occasions I receive the reproof.

He seems again to forget his usual candour, when he construes my words in his preface, and his appendix, as casting damnation on all those who disbelieve the eternal deity of Christ, by my citing the words of the apostle; 2 Pet. ii. 1. "Damnable heresies, denying the Lord that bought them," page 489. I must confess, I do not think that scripture particularly refers to those that deny the godhead of Christ; but rather to those that deny him as a Holy Governor of his people: Or else it reproves in general all those that deny Christ in any of those powers, properties, offices, or characters, the belief of which is made necessary to salvation. Now when the first part of my book is spent in proving the deity of Christ and the Spirit, the second part of it in declaring their personality, and the third or last part in surveying their several offices and relations in which they stand to us. and upon a recapitulation I make this conclusion, "That there are such things as damnable heresies, when persons deny the Lord that bought them;" this should, with much more justice, be referred, as I designed it, to the denial of all or any of these preceding properties, characters, or offices of Christ, the belief of which the scripture makes necessary to salvation, and not merely be confined to the single doctrine of his deity.

Another thing I am constrained to take notice of is, that my unknown friend the appellaut had written with a greater degree of open fairness and evidence, if he had attacked my propositions in the method in which I have placed them, wherein they give mutual light and force to each other: But he has chosen rather to single out for his first attacks some special paragraphs out of distant places of my book, whereby he seems to insinuate to the reader the weakness of my whole argument; and he spends above sixty pages upon these, till at last he himself confesses, that he "thinks it high time to enter upon the arguments I have used," page 62. And even then he "intreats patience once more" for three pages, here he enters upon a regular form of objections, page 65. But however it be, I have this advantage by it, that as other circumstances permit me not to engage in any regular or continued controversy, so I am the better justified to all the world in taking notice of what this author hath objected, in several unconnected dissertations.

I have not much reason to complain of misrepresentations of my sense by the appellaut, in the matters of argument. One of the most remarkable instances of this kind is, when he supposes me to believe a "greater distinction between the sacred three in the godhead itself" than my words amount to, as page 10. and other places. For though I confess the scriptural representation of personal distinctions in some places is pretty strong, yet I have no where asserted three literal and proper distinct personalities to be internal and essential to the godhead itself. In general I must own he has written with a degree of impartiality and fairness in this respect beyond what is usual in such controversies; and if ever he has mistaken my sense, I persuade myself that it was not done with design, because, except the places mentioned, there is a general appearance of justice and candour running through his arguments. Yet I cannot but take notice of one passage, wherein he has not done the Rev. Dr. Waterland the same justice, in a citation, pages 12 and 153, where he twice represents him as declaring, that "the Doctrine of the Trinity is thoroughly understood but by few in comparison," whereas that learned author had only asserted, that "the controversy of the Trinity is thoroughly understood but by few in comparison," which makes a great difference in the sense: for multitudes of the vulgar rank of mankind may understand the doctrine of the Trinity, sufficient for their own salvation, while the learned controversies that relate to it are much unknown by them.

I own the light I have received from this author in the different turn he hath given to some few of those scriptures which I had brought as proofs of my doctrine, which I must acknowledge carries such a degree of probability, as to weaken the force of my arguments derived from thence; such are John iii. 13. Zech. xi. 12, 13. and perhaps, one or two more; for I would not willingly pervert one text of scripture from its native and sacred sense, to support any article of my faith.

I take this opportunity here also, together with my thanks to this author, to acknowledge the goodness of some other friends, who by their obliging letters have made other occasional exceptions to any uncautious sentences which I had used in some part of my treatise; which being written chiefly for private christians, had not all that strict accuracy in it that controversy required. But these expressions I shall endeavour to correct in the next edition, which my booksellers tell me will be quickly wanted.

With regard to the business of charity, which I mentioned before, as well as the matters of argument for the defence of the deity of our blessed Saviour. I have other dissertations lying by me, which give some general solutions to the chief scriptural difficulties in this controversy, and make it appear that the common doctrine of the Trinity stands firm upon the greatest part of those scriptural proofs by which I have endeavoured to support it. And I hope it shall also be sufficiently proved, that the zealous contenders for this

doctrine are not always so deficient in their charity as they are too often represented.

I know there are some things will be objected to these dissertations, viz.

Objection I. Since I have several more discourses by me already finished, it will be naturally demanded, "Why I have not published them at once? Why I have given the world at present only these three?" To this I answer, That these three essays enter not so far into the particular distinctions between the sacred persons, but chiefly maintain their communion in the same godhead: I thought therefore it was much more proper to send these abroad first; hoping that if my labours of this kind find acceptance among my friends, I might then be better encouraged to publish the rest in a few months time; in some of which I found myself constrained to speak more largely, and particularly of the "distinction of persons in the sacred Trinity."

But on the other hand, if the general doctrine of the communion of Christ in the deity; or the union of two natures in one person, or divine worship paid to Christ the Mediator, cannot be supported, our particular modes of explaining the distinction of the divine persons are all destroyed and rendered useless.

II. It will be censured as a fault by many, "that I repeat the same things." Truly the reason is, because these essays were written at distant times: And besides, in such a controversy it is necessary sometimes to set the same things before the view of the reader, which would have but little force, or perhaps be forgotten, if they were only intermingled with other parts of the controversy, and by that means were out of sight.

III. Some will make it a matter of offence and scandal, that "I do not write with that full assurance of every thing as others would do in the like case." To this I answer, That since the studies of these last years I think I am established afresh in the belief of the deity of Christ, and the blessed Spirit, and assured of it upon sufficient grounds, that they are one with the Father in godhead, though they are represented in scripture as distinct persons. But as to the various particular explications of this doctrine, and incidental arguments that attend it, I desire to believe and to write with a humble consciousness of my own ignorance, and to give my assent but in proportion to the degrees of light and evidence. I am persuaded, if every man would proportion his assent by the same rule, much of our modern assurance would be abated; we should have but few dogmatists amongst us, even in some important doctrines; and by this method perhaps the most positive and confident assertors of their own opinions would become the most doubtful and modest of all men.

Besides, when I consult the scripture, or human writers, on so sublime a subject, I do not come with all my opinions fixed and determined, but I read in order to receive further light, and therefore I would write as one who may be mistaken, and who is honestly seeking truth. I know the weakness of human understanding, and how easily we are led into error. I have often seen occasion to retract my former sentiments, and correct them by further discoveries; and I esteem a modest and cautious manner of speech, in most of the controverted points, to be one excellence of a fallible writer, and retraction of an error to be yet a superior attainment: And though this is made sometimes a matter of scoff among vulgar souls, it is always a honour among the wise.

IV. "Some think, that I do not write with indignation and zeal enough, and that I treat the adversaries of the divinity of Christ with too much gentleness for any man who professes to be a friend to that sacred article, and a lover of the blessed Saviour."

I might make several replies to such an objection. As,

Answer J. If my blessed Saviour has loved his own enemies so as to die

is them, and to intreat them in the gentlest manner to be reconciled to God the Father by him, I persuade myself he will never be angry with me, if I show as much love to those who dishonour him, as to intreat them in a gentle manner, after his example, to be reconciled to God their Saviour, to confess his sublime character, and to pay him divine honours.

II. I would not willingly call every man an enemy to Christ, who lies under some doubts of his supreme godhead. My charity inclines me to believe that some of them, both read their bibles carefully, and pray daily for divine instruction to lead them into all truth: That they honour and adore that glorious person whom they believe to be the brightness of his Father's glory, and by whom he created the worlds, who condescended to take a human body, and to die for sinners; and that they trust in him, and love him above all things, beside God the Father, though perhaps some culpable prejudices may cleave to their minds, whereby they are prevented from receiving that light and evidence of his divine nature, which, in my opinion, shines clearly in the word of God: And I cannot but hope, that such humble and sincere enquirers will not miss any of the necessary articles of faith.

III. I am well assured that the wisdom which comes from above is first pure, and then peaceable; that we are required in the gospel not to call for signs from heaven, even upon such Samaritans who will not receive Christ at all, but with all meekness to instruct those that oppose themselves, that they may be recovered out of any dangerous snares. The methods in which dispute controversy has generally been written, have proved fatal to religion, and utterly improper to promote the truth. When we rail we set our opponents a railing too; and in such a frame of spirit, we are neither fit to instruct others, nor are they fit to receive instruction. The wrath of man works not the righteousness of God, nor the knowledge of Christ. These angry fits of zeal do but awaken the disorderly passions of men, and tempt them to resist every argument that comes armed with such assumed sovereignty and fire. It is God only who has a right and a power to convince the obstinate by a spirit of burning: He may clothe an angel in flame, or inspire a prophet to be the minister of his shining vengeance, but I had rather be made a humble messenger of his light and love. The great God can send conviction in the language of death and ruin, but he does not exert this power till gentler methods have been tried in vain.

Besides, in contests and debates among men much darkness is consistent with vehement heat. These qualities are found in greatest perfection in the nether world; and sometimes on earth the fiercest heat has the deepest darkness attending it. Light itself, when joined with noise and fire, has not the most happy influence to improve and refine the mind. A flash of lightning rather affrights than guides us: The voice of thunder carries more terror than instruction in it: The soul bars up all the avenues of its understanding against truth itself, when it demands entrance by such human methods of violence. It is only the gentle approaches of truth, like the morning light, which open the windows of the soul, and make it willing to receive all further discoveries. I add in the last place,

IV. That if by such methods as these I shall be so far honoured of God, as to recover any who have departed from their former principles, or establish those who doubt, I am well assured that my blessed Lord will esteem it as a better service done for himself, than if I had guarded his sacred doctrines by scattering all the terrors of hell round about them, than if I had thundered out damnation against disbelievers, and awakened the rage of every gainsayer without the least hope of conviction. There was once a "great and strong wind that rent the mountains, and brake the rocks in pieces, after the wind an earthquake, and after the earthquake a fire, but the Lord was not in the fire, in the earthquake, or in the wind; then a still small voice was heard; God was in that voice, and visited his prophet who was jealous for the Lord of hosts:" † Kings xix 11—13.



I conclude the preface with one request to my readers of every kind, whether Arian or Athanasian; and that is, that they would not make all their former, nor their present opinions an everlasting standard of truth, and a test whereby to judge of every thing they read: And that they would not suddenly pronounce nonsense or heresy upon every sentence that differs from their former belief.

I entreat them on one side, that they would search and examine honestly, whether it be not possible that such a sublime and mysterious doctrine as the deity of Christ, may be true, when some of the more indefensible appendages of it are lopped off; which doctrine, when mingled with these appendages, was very hard to be believed or defended: And on the other hand, I desire that my readers would consider impartially, whether so difficult a doctrine as this of the Sacred Trinity may not be better defended in itself, and more effectually let into the mind of disbelievers, by granting those things which seem to be the obvious sense of some scriptures, and removing other things which scripture does not assert, and which were some of the chief bars against their belief of it.

In the mean time, while we all employ a diligent and impartial search after these sacred truths, and are seeking to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord, let us with daily and importunate requests implore the assistances of the blessed Spirit, since our Saviour has promised to send him as a guide into those very truths which relate to himself. John xvi. 14. "He shall glorify me: For he shall receive of mine and shew it unto you."

THE  
ARIAN INVITED TO THE ORTHODOX FAITH:

OR,

*A plain and easy Method to lead such as deny the proper Deity of Christ, into the Belief of that great Article.*

---

DISSERTATION I.

SECTION I.

**W**HEN christians are divided in their sentiments, and break out into party quarrels, the names of their opinions will be tossed to and fro, as terms of reproach and scandal. Arian is made a word of infamy, and orthodox on the other hand is turned into a jest, a matter of mere ridicule. But I have no inclination either to rail or laugh; nor would I use one of these words in a reproachful sense, nor the other in a ridiculous one; and therefore it is proper that I should here explain my meaning, that where-soever these words occur in the following papers, the reader may have just ideas of them.

I do not love to affix such names to any party of men as they themselves utterly disown: This has a tendency to irritate the spirits of those whom we design to enlighten, and reduce to the faith and profession of our own sentiments, and therefore it should be avoided as much as we can. Yet it often so happens in the affairs of mankind, that it is hardly possible to describe the followers of any particular sect or opinion, when it is necessary to speak of them, without using the same names which the world generally gives them: And the world generally gives them the name of those who have been the most famous assertors or professors of such kind of doctrines.

As it is therefore my design in the present essay to address those who may have entertained scruples or doubts about this great doctrine of the "Deity of Christ," or have departed from their former principles, I would treat them with all gentleness: And I freely declare, that I believe the name of Arian hath been often of late given to such as have by no means deserved it, and are no abettors of the old principles of Arius.

An ancient Arian is one who believes the Son and Holy Spirit to be mere creatures: He believes our Lord Jesus Christ to be a glorious person, but still as much inferior to the true and

eternal God, as a creature differs from the Creator; for he believes his human soul, or that spirit which supplies the place of it, to be his highest or divinest nature, and that it was produced by the power and arbitrary will of God the Father, some time before the world was made, and thus he believes it to be properly a creature, utterly denying the true and proper godhead of Christ; yet he owns him to be sometimes called God in scripture, on the account of his great likeness to God, his acting in the name of God, and his government of the world. And thus by changing and diminishing the idea of the word God, and reducing it to an inferior sense, he allows an inferior godhead to belong to Christ. He believes also this glorious spirit did take upon him a human body, was born of the Virgin Mary, and thus became a complete man, in the fulness of time appointed by the Father. This is usually represented as the general sense of the ancient followers of Arius.

Now it is evident that the modern disbelievers of the divinity of Christ, or most of them at least, have refined the ancient doctrines of Arius, and thereby, perhaps, rendered their sentiments more defensible, at least in their own opinion: But if through divine assistance I shall become so happy as to lead any that believe even these ancient Arian principles, into the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, by natural and easy steps, I would fain persuade myself that some of the moderns will not shut their eyes against the evidence of light, nor resist the force of such attraction, but yield to it with greater ease.

But if this expectation be too presuming, and no disbeliever be recovered to the common faith of the deity of Christ, yet I must indulge my hope thus far at least, that some wavering, doubtful, and unsettled christians may be established in their faith by some of these attempts.

Before I proceed, it is necessary also that I should tell what I mean by the word "orthodoxy." For several centuries past, this word has been applied to that explication of the doctrine of the Trinity, which supposes the divine nature to be but one numerical or individual essence or being; and that this essence is the same in the Father, the Word, and the Spirit. That these three are so far distinct as to lay a foundation for the scripture to speak of them in a personal manner, as I, Thou, and He; and upon this account they are called three persons: But that they are not so distinct as to have three distinct consciousnesses, for they are only supposed to be three incomprehensible differences in one and the same numerical essence of God, or in one and the same individual spirit. That in the person of Christ two distinct natures are united, God and man; whence it comes to pass that some proper divine characters, and some human, are attributed to the same person.

Now I ask leave to try whether it is not possible to lead one who has favoured the Arian sentiments toward a belief of the chief parts of this doctrine, which for some ages past has obtained the name of orthodoxy, though I confess there are some other parts of it which are not so defensible.

SECT. II.—The method which I shall pursue in my present attempt, is to propose these following queries :

Query I. Is it not a principle of natural religion, and universally confirmed by reason and scripture, that there is but one God, one true and living God, one eternal and Almighty Creator and supreme Governor of all things, one infinite being, who is the first cause and last end of all ?

II. Have you not always believed this God to be one Spirit, one single Spirit, one conscious mind, and not made up of two or three conscious minds or spirits ? Nor am I going to lead you into any other idea of the great and blessed God, or to give you any occasion to imagine that we believe two or three Gods.

III. Has not this great and blessed God assumed to himself in his word some peculiar names, titles, characters and prerogatives, whereby he will distinguish himself from every thing which is beside and beneath him, that he might give his people a distinct knowledge of himself, and secure them from the danger of paying divine honours to any thing that is not God ? See "Christian Doctrine of the Trinity," Propositions iv. v. vi.

IV. Are not Jehovah the true God, the great God, the mighty God, and God blessed for ever, the God of Abraham, the Lord of Hosts, the King of kings, the Lord of lords, the first and the last, some of these distinguishing names and titles of God ?

Are not the searching of the heart of man, omnipresence, omnipotence, and the works of creation, and the conservation of all things, some of these divine characters or prerogatives ? See "Christian Doctrine," Propositions vii. viii. which propositions, with the greatest part of their explication, may be vindicated against all reasonable objections.

Let it be observed, that the enquiry here is not, how far, or in what degree some of these titles, characters, powers, and operations may possibly belong to an exalted creature, in the abstracted nature of things, or by the favour of God ? But whether God in his word has not made these titles, operations, and characters, his own appropriate prerogatives, to distinguish himself from inferior beings ? And has he not expressed himself with a divine solicitude and sacred jealousy in this matter, that Jehovah is his name, and he will not give his glory to another ?

V. Are not these names, titles, and prerogatives ascribed to our Lord Jesus Christ, in several places of scripture, in such a manner as would naturally lead the unlearned and common christian into a belief that they are the very same characters whereby the great and blessed God has distinguished himself; are they not often attributed to our Lord Jesus Christ, without any such evident limitations or restrictions as to distinguish them from the prerogatives of the one true God?

Nay, let me add further, are they not expressed in such a manner, and so applied to Christ, that would lead even the wise, the learned, and the cautious reader, into the same sentiments, if he had not imbibed some other opinion, and upon that account endeavoured to evade this sense? See "Christian Doctrine of the Trinity," Propositions viii. and ix. The multitudes of pious christians, learned and unlearned, that in all ages of the church have honestly read their bibles, and have fallen into this sentiment of things, after the strictest search to find the truth, are a sufficient answer to this query, and a proof of the affirmative.

VI. Is here not then the appearance of a very considerable difficulty, how to reconcile these ascriptions of divine titles and prerogatives both to God the Father and to Jesus Christ, without breaking in upon the sacred doctrine of the unity of God, which is established both by reason and scripture? And how shall this difficulty be removed, but by a consultation of those sacred writings wherein we find the same divine characters ascribed both to Christ and to the Father.

VII. Does not the scripture give us a very natural and evident solution of this difficulty, when it assures us that there is a most peculiar and intimate union, or oneness, between the great God and his Son Jesus Christ? Col. ii. 9. *In him dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily.* John x. 30. *I and my Father are one.* John xiv. 10. *I am in the Father, and the Father is in me.* John xiv. 9. *He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.* John xiv. 10. *I speak not of myself,—the Father that dwelleth in me doeth the works.* 1 John v. 7: *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one.* Exod. xxiii. 20. *I will send an angel before thee, beware of him, provoke him not, &c. for my name is in him.*

VIII. Are there not other scriptures that express evidently both a divine and a human nature in our Lord Jesus; as Rom. ix. 5. *Christ of the seed of David after the flesh, and yet he his over all God blessed for ever?* 1 Tim. iii. 16. *God manifest in the flesh, who was seen of angels, and received up into glory.* Rev. xxii. 13, 16. *The beginning and the end, the first and the last, the root and the offspring of David.*

John i. 1, 14. "The Word, who was with God; and who was God, was made flesh, and dwelt among us."

IX. May there not be such a close and intimate union or oneness between God and a creature, as that the actions and characters of either of them may be attributed to the whole compound being? And may not this lay a foundation for such divine expressions concerning Christ, viz. That he is Jehovah, the great God over all, God blessed for ever; Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; and let all the angels of God worship him, which are characters belonging to the true God; And yet concerning this same person Jesus Christ, is it not said also, he eat, drank, slept, walked, groaned and died, which are characters belonging to man?

X. May not this intimate union or oneness between God and a creature, give occasion for the actions and properties of the man to be attributed to God? And may we not this way account for such expressions as these, Acts xx. 28. "God hath purchased the church with his own blood." 1 John iii. 16. "God laid down his life for us. God manifest in the flesh, was received up into glory; 1 Tim. iii. 16?"

Note, This figure of speech, whereby the peculiar attributes of one nature are ascribed to another, is called a communication of properties: And it is usual in all languages, and in all nations, when two distinct beings are united into one common principle of action. So we say of a wise woman, she is a prudent body; so of a drunkard, that he is a thirsty soul. We often call a witty or skilful man, an ingenious headpiece, and we give the name of a sleepy soul to a sluggard; because soul and body being united compose a man, therefore some property of body is oftentimes attributed to the soul, and some property of soul attributed to the body.

XI. Is not this a more natural, more easy, and more scriptural method of accounting for the attribution of divine names and properties to our Lord Jesus Christ, than for us to take the peculiar and distinguishing names, titles, characters and properties of godhead which are applied to Christ, and sink them to a diminutive and inferior sense, and thus apply them to the man Christ Jesus? Would not every reader, even a Turk or an Indian\*, readily believe these names and characters to be incommunicably divine, and appropriate only to the great God, if they did not read them applied also to Jesus Christ? And would they

\* I will allow the author of the "Sober Appeal to a Turk or an Indian," to have given as fair a gloss to his construction of those scriptures in another sense, as any writer has done: But in several places it is evident with how much difficulty and hardship those texts are strained to any other meaning than what the Trinitarian writers have generally given them. Where the gloss of that author is fairest, and most likely to prevail on readers, it shall be considered in some future papers, if the present essays are well received by the world.

not rather chuse to account for this application of them by the personal union of the man Jesus Christ to the divine nature, than by denying these characters to be appropriate to God? Is it not more rational and more scriptural to suppose the man Christ, by his union to God, capable of these names and characters in their sublime and exalted sense, than to run counter to so many places of scripture, which at least seem to appropriate these names and characters to God.

XII. Does it not tend to take away the distinction betwixt God and his creatures, which ought always to be sacred and inviolable, if we make such names and characters as Jelovahi, the great, the mighty, the blessed God, the Creator, the preserver of all things, and the object of worship, to be attributed and applied to any thing that is not God? Or if we sink them into a low and diminutive sense, in order to make such an application of them? Is a mere distant resemblance of God in some of his properties, or a being appointed under God a deputy governor of the world, a sufficient reason to have all these glorious and incommunicable divine titles, characters, and worship attributed to a mere creature?

XIII. Would not such an attribution of divine names, titles and characters, to a mere creature, have a plain and strong tendency to introduce a polytheism and idolatry, too near a kin to that which is often condemned among the heathens, viz. The bowing and worshipping heroes, departed souls, inferior and superior gods? Would it not have an apparent aspect of God's giving his name, and his glory to another, contrary to Isa. xlii. 8. And has it not a manifest and dangerous appearance of breaking the first commandment, which says, *Thou shalt have no other gods before me?* Is not Christ Jesus in the Arian scheme represented as another and an inferior god? Another and an inferior object of worship? Nor do I see how it is possible, upon that hypothesis, to answer what the learned Dr. Waterland has urged so often, and so successfully against his opponents, viz. That the Arian writers, by their hypothesis, introduce more Gods than one.

XIV. As the holy scripture leads us into this method of solving the proposed difficulty, of both divine and human properties ascribed to Christ, so does not reason itself dictate and confirm the same? Since we find two distinct and seeming inconsistent properties ascribed to the person of Christ, viz. divine and human, is it not far better to suppose the single subjects of these properties united into one compound subject, viz. God and man? And then each single subject may keep its own properties. Is not this easier than to join two inconsistent properties in the same single subject, which scripture doth neither necessitate, nor encourage, and philosophy and reason will not allow?

XV. Since the modern refiners of the Arian scheme have granted, that there is a peculiar, strict and perfect union and communion, between the Father and the Son, and cannot deny, but that several of the texts I have cited may have a secret reference to some mysterious, incomprehensible instances of union and communion between them, see Dr. Clarke's *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, part the first, number 594 and 600. Where is the inconvenience, or difficulty, of allowing this to be called a personal union, whereby what is proper to God may be attributed to Christ, and what is proper to the man Christ may be attributed to God, and what is proper to either part of the compound person may be applied to the whole? Thus *God manifest in the flesh was seen of angels*, and ascended to heaven, may signify the same, as that *Jesus Christ, or the man united to godhead, was seen of angels, and ascended to heaven*; 1 Tim. iii. 16.

SECT. III.—Suppose a person, who had before indulged the Arian error, and denied the proper divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, should by these steps of enquiry be led on thus far, to believe that Christ is called God, Jehovah, the great God, and the blessed God, in the true, proper, and exalted sense, he might yet be led farther onward into this doctrine, and quickly learn how to explain in clear ideas, several other propositions which are asserted and maintained in the orthodox scheme, that is, in the common explication of the Trinity: viz. how the Son of God may be also God of one substance, power, and eternity, or of the same substance with the Father, and in some sense equal with him in power and glory. And it may be explained also by this means, how Christ becomes the Son of God by an ineffable communication of the divine nature to him from the Father, and thus he may be the image of the invisible God, and the express image of his Father's person; thus also all the divine characters which are ascribed to Christ in the New Testament, may be properly said to be derived from the Father. Observe the following method:

1. If the essence of God which is in the Father, and in the Son Jesus Christ, be the same numerical essence\*, then it is evident that the Son hath the same substance with the Father.

\* It is generally granted by the greatest and best Trinitarian writers, that supposing we believe the Father, Son and Spirit, to be really, truly and properly, one God, the particular manner of explaining the internal distinctions in the divine essence is of much less importance. Upon this concession I take leave to say, that though the doctrine of the same numerical essence belonging to the sacred three, has been opposed by some learned and pious writers, yet this is the opinion which is certainly most consonant to the light of nature, which has been for many centuries past counted the orthodox doctrine, and which seems most agreeable to the dignity of God, where that is represented in scripture, and therefore I rather incline to believe it: And I think the personal representations of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, may be explained in a full consistency therewith, as I shall endeavour to shew hereafter.



2. If the perfections that belong to that divine essence are equal or the same in the Father and in the Son, then there is a sense wherein the Father and Son may be said to be equal in power and glory; though the Father may be properly said to have them originally, and the Son by communication.

3. The divine nature, or Deity, may be said to be communicated to Jesus Christ the Son, by the Father's uniting the human nature of Christ to his own godhead, or to some divine power or principle of agency represented personally or by God's actually assuming the man Christ Jesus, his Son, into a personal union with himself, or his own infinite wisdom, which act of uniting the godhead to the man Christ Jesus may be called a communication of the divine nature to the Son\*.

4. And perhaps, this is one way whereby Christ becomes the Son of God; nor is it utterly improper to apply the text here; Ps. ii. 7. *I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* Christ becomes the Son of God, and may said to be begotten of the Father by a divine decree or appointment. And thus as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; John v. 26. That is, he hath given the favour of union with the divine nature to the man Christ Jesus; and to have life in himself is one property of the divine nature†, which now exists in the complex person.

5. Thus Jesus Christ, the Son of God, becomes the most perfect image of the invisible God, *the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person.* The powers and perfections with which the man Jesus is invested, by the indwell-

Here let it be noted also, that the divine nature of Christ is sometimes taken inadequately for the eternal word or wisdom of God, sometimes, adequately for God, exerting or acting by his eternal word or wisdom, or godhead under the special idea of wisdom. Now it is chiefly in this latter sense that I speak of the godhead of Christ in these three dissertations.

\* Though it has been an opinion generally received, that the Sonship of Christ belongs to his divine nature, supposing it to be really derived from the Father by eternal generation, yet the scripture does no where assert this doctrine, but it is drawn only by supposed consequences: And there are many zealous Trinitarians, and learned writers in our day, who suppose no derivation of one person from another in pure godhead, lest it infer some inferiority in the person derived; and therefore they explain Christ's Sonship rather to signify the peculiar derivation of his soul and body from God the Father, or his being constituted the Messiah by the decree and appointment of God; and Doctor Thomas Goodwin also supposes, "that the union of the man Jesus to the divine nature is one reason why he is called the Son of God. It was by the personal union that God bestowed on the man Jesus the glory of being his Son," Volume II. Book 3. Page 146.

† This is not so bold a thought as Doctor Goodwin has on this text, when he says, "It is one attribute of Christ as he is God-man, yea, as he is man taken up into that union, to have life independently in himself, even as God the Father hath." Volume II. Book 3. Page 193.

ing and united godhead, would render him a most illustrious image of the Father, if there were no superior sense in which also he were the express image of God ; for there is no being through which the godhead shines in all its perfections with such brightness, such express likeness, and such glory as in the person of Jesus-Christ ; 2 Cor. iv. 6.

6. Yet farther, if we can receive the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ's human soul, which seems to be the most obvious and natural sense of many scriptures, if we can believe that it was formed the first of creatures before the foundation of the world, and was present with God in the beginning of all things, which is no hard matter for an Arian to grant, then we may also justly believe this union between God and man to have begun before the world was, in some unknown moment of God's own eternity : For when the human soul of Christ was first brought into existence, it might be united in that moment to the divine nature.

Thus Christ was, in this sense also, the first-born of every creature. For his complex person had a being before the creation was formed ; and perhaps, this may be the best way of expounding the doctrine of the most primitive fathers concerning the ante-mundane generation of Christ, that is, his becoming the Son of God in a new manner just before the world was made. See the fourth Dissertation on the Logos.

According to this view of things, it is easy to understand how he had some hand in the creation as God-man\* ; that is, as Jesus Christ, by whom God created all things ; Eph. iii. 9. How all things were created by him, and for him, and by him all things consist ; Col. i. 16. And he upholds all things by the word of his power ; Heb. i. 3. For he was God-man from the beginning of his existence as man. Thus divine perfections always belonged to him ; his godhead was co-essential and co-eternal with the godhead of the Father, for it was the same divine essence ; and his person as God-man existed before the foundation of the world.

These glorious attributions, by this means, appear to have a just foundation in the divine and human natures of Christ united, even without entering into any of the particular and internal distinctions and personalities which belong to the divine essence itself, and which are more abstruse and incomprehensible ; and therefore they are not the first and most necessary things to be taught or learned in the doctrine of the Deity of Christ.

Lastly, The human soul of Christ being thus anciently united to the divine nature, did about seventeen hundred years

\* Doctor Thomas Goodwin does at large maintain and prove, that Christ, as God-man, created all things, and under this character he was the instrument by which God created the world. " See his Discourse of the Knowledge of God and Christ." Book 3, Chapter 10, 11, 12. Page 173, 190.

ago, assume a body that was prepared for it by the Father through the peculiar operation of the Holy Spirit. Upon this account sometimes Christ, or the Son of God, is said to come in the flesh; at other times God himself is represented as manifest in the flesh; some expressions referring chiefly to the godhead, others to god-man, or the soul of Christ in ancient union with his divine nature.

SECT. IV.—Now, if by such methods of reasoning a disbeliever of the proper divinity of Christ shall be induced to believe his true godhead, by virtue of such a personal union between the man Christ Jesus and the divine nature, I cannot but think there is a just foundation laid for a ready belief of all the glorious consequent doctrines of the priesthood and kingdom of Christ; and of the proper and perfect satisfaction of Christ offered to the infinite Majesty of heaven for all the infinite offences of sinful men. Our blessed Saviour, by this doctrine, is furnished with all those divine powers and perfections that are requisite for his exaltation to the government over all things, since in his person there is the true and eternal godhead united to the man Jesus: And he becomes hereby the proper object of divine worship, considered in his person as God-man. And whosoever shall believe and confess this doctrine, has, in my opinion, a sufficient degree of orthodoxy in this point to be received into any christian church, although he may have some scruples or difficulties remaining upon his mind, about some opinions relating to other parts of the doctrine of the Trinity.

The most natural and pressing objection which here would arise in the mind is this, “If the divine nature or true God be but one single conscious mind or spirit, and this spirit be united to human nature, or the man Jesus, then does not God the Father seem to be incarnate? Is there not too great an approach made to that doctrine which was called the heresy of the Sabellians, or the Patripassians, viz. That God the Father took flesh, suffered, died, and rose again, and ascended to heaven?” To this I answer,

I. If the sonship of Christ be not referred to his divine nature, but rather to the extraordinary production of his human nature, or to its personal union with the godhead, or to his office as Messiah, then the name of Father will not import any internal real distinction in the divine nature or essence\*, but rather it

\* That the notions of paternity and sonship are not necessary internal distinction of the divine essence, but rather economical, external and relative, seems to be the sense of some learned trinitarians. “Though these three are in the holy scriptures spoken of under the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and as begetting, begotten and proceeding; yet still we leave it to those who are wiser, or at least more bold and daring than we, to say, that this does, and to show afterwards how it does relate to the divine essence: For we have no notion of a greater or lesser in the godhead.” See “*Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity by some London Ministers,*” page 21.

imports a honourable title or character which the great God assumes, upon the account of his being the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ as man, or his constituting him God-man and Mediator. The Father is also a proper name which belongs to God, considered as sustaining the character of prime agent in all the works of creation, providence, government, and salvation. But when this godhead is considered in its union to man, and as part of the complex person, then it does not assume to itself these supreme characters, nor the title of Father in the Trinity; and being joined to the man Christ Jesus, it may receive those characters of office and inferiority which belong to a Mediator, as well as it renders the person of Christ God-man fit to sustain these offices.

In this view, although Christ Jesus the Son be united to the same godhead, which is the very essence and nature of the Father, yet it cannot be said properly, that he is personally united to the Father because this union to human nature, though it does not diminish any thing of the divine perfections, yet it alters the relative titles and characters that belong to God, as he appears the Father of all things, the sovereign majesty, the prime almighty Creator, and Governor of heaven and earth.

The similitude which I have used in the *Christian Doctrine of the Trinity*, Proposition XVIII. would set this in a fair light, if I may repeat part of it again, viz. Suppose a king should send an ambassador extraordinary to a foreign country; and suppose the soul of the king himself, or one of his intellectual powers, could be so united also to the body, or person, of the ambassador, as to animate, actuate and move him, and become, as it were, one person with him; then the soul of the king himself might be said to sustain both his own character as king, and the inferior character of the ambassador, and fulfil both those offices under a distinct sort of personality, or in two distinct persons.

Thus we may apprehend, how God the Father, the King of heaven, sent down his Son, a distinct person, in whom the same godhead dwells, as an ambassador extraordinary, to earth. And thus this eternal godhead being the same in the Father and Son, sustains the superior character of a sovereign King, in the person of the Father, and may he said also to sustain the inferior character of an ambassador, and to fulfil that office in the person of the Son. We must not expect human similies should be entire and perfect images of things divine: If they give us some illustration of sacred mysteries it is sufficient. The holy scripture seems to favour this representation when it describes the godhead, or sometimes even the Father, as subsisting in the man

Christ, and executing all his three offices of a Prophet, Priest, and King, in and by the human nature.

1. A Prophet; John xiv. 10. *The words I speak to you I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works; that is, it is the same God, who is sometimes called Father, that speaks in me, and confirms the words by miraculous works.*—2. A Priest; 2 Cor. v. 19. *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself; that is, God in the person of Christ was the reconciler of the world to himself in the person of the Father.*—3. A King, or Lawgiver; 1 Thess. v. 18.—*In every thing give thanks, for this is the will, or command of God in Christ concerning you. God in Christ is our commander.*

Thus it is the same God, who at other times sustains the person of the Father, dwelling personally in the man Jesus his Son, who assists him in all the works of mediation, so far that it may be said God performs them; and thus *God laid down his life for us; 1 John iii. 16. and God redeemed the church with his own blood; Acts xx. 28. It is that God who was manifest in the flesh; 1 Tim. iii. 16.*

Thus you see, how far we may go toward the solution of this difficulty, before we come to distinguish three persons in the very essence of God. And I cannot avoid remarking, that all these thoughts put together do naturally lead one rather to incline to this opinion, that the godhead of the Father and of the Son, are numerically one and the same godhead, however internally and externally distinguished by personal subsistences and relative properties. And this is the constant idea that our protestant divines abroad and at home have given us of the deity of Christ, viz. as the same numerical godhead which is in the Father.

II. But, perhaps, this will not be thought sufficient entirely to answer and remove the difficulty: I add therefore, that if we suppose there may be some such, or greater distinctions in the divine nature itself, or in God the infinite Spirit, as are between the understanding and will in the soul of man, which is a finite spirit, I have shewn very particularly in another discourse, how one of these divine powers, or differences in the divine nature, may be united to man in such a sense as the other cannot so properly be said to be united to him; and for this I must desire the reader's patience, till I see whether the world will encourage further publications on this subject.

#### CONCLUSION.

Lest I should be exposed to the censure of my zealous friends, for not speaking so largely, fully and particularly, in this dissertation, concerning the three sacred persons in the

Trinity, Father, Son, and Spirit; as I have done elsewhere, I entreat them to consider the design of this discourse, which is not to explain this article at large, but merely to lead an Arian by soft and easy steps, into a belief of the divinity of Christ: And therefore it was necessary that I should not break in upon his understanding all at once, and attempt to assault and batter down all his old sentiments; but that I should explain the doctrine in as near a correspondency to his former sentiments as truth would permit, and represent the deity of Christ, and the union of the two natures in one person in such a manner as might give the least disgust and offence to one of Arian principles\*, provided always, that I assert nothing but what is agreeable to scripture, though I do not at once publish the whole of that doctrine in all its varieties. It would be a good beginning to proceed thus far; time and study of the scripture; with divine instructions, may lead him on to farther knowledge, and a more complete agreement with our best writers, so far as they agree with the word of God.

Our blessed Saviour bore with the prejudices of his own disciples for a season; he had many other things to say to them, even at the end of his life, *but they could not bear them yet*; John xvi. 12. And the blessed apostles bore with the prejudices of the Jews many years, and did not all at once beat down their whole scheme of Mosiac principles. When St. Paul taught the Corinthians, he *fed them with milk and not with meat, for they were not able to bear it*; 1 Cor. iii. 2. And when he found the Hebrews backward to hear, he reserved till afterwards, the many things which he had to say, and which were *hard to be uttered*; Heb. v. 11, 12. *The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle to all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves*; 2 Tim. ii. 24. as well knowing, that it is by short and gentle steps, and by slow degrees, that human nature is capable of dropping its former prejudices, parting with any of its old opinions, and receiving further light.—I am well persuaded, that disputes regulated by christian love, and under the conduct of sacred charity, are in their own nature most proper to rectify the unwilling mistakes of men; and if ever the Spirit of God condescend to bless any controversial writings for the conviction of those that are in error it is the soft and gentle method of argument that stands fairest to receive such divine influences.

\* That great defender of the Divinity of Christ, Dr. Waterland, will bear me out in this manner of writing, for he freely declares, "He does not find fault with the fathers for adapting their style sometimes to pagans, but commends them rather for doing it in some cases, as doing what was proper." See his *Further Vindication of Christ's Divinity*, &c. page 17. And St. Paul practises the same thing, and becomes all things to all men, even to Jews and heathens, that by all means he may save some; 1 Cor. ix. 22.

## DISSERTATION II.

*God and Man united in the Person of Christ.*

AS it is evident throughout all the scripture, so it is agreed on all hands, that our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ is a proper person, and is so described in the word of God. He has all the peculiar characters of personality belonging to him; he is a distinct intelligent agent; and the personal pronouns, I, thou, and he, are applied to him with great frequency in the holy writings. It is also as clear in itself, and agreed upon without controversy on all sides, that he has the true and proper characters, attributes, actions and passions of man attributed to him: The history of his life and death bear witness to this in all the evangelists. It is also very evident to me, and has appeared so to almost all the christian church, in the several ages of it, that the names, titles, peculiar properties, and incommunicable prerogatives of God, are given to this glorious person in the scripture both of the Old and New Testament. It is very hard, if not impossible, for us to give any tolerable account, how and why the peculiar and appropriate characters both of God and of man in so many places, and in such variety of expressions, should be given to the same person, Jesus Christ, unless we suppose the two distinct natures of God and of man, united to make up one complex, or compound principle of action and passion, that is to make up one person.

The holy scripture lays an evident foundation for this. Christ is plainly described in several of the sacred writings as God and man, united to make up one person, one complex principle of action and passion. He is often called God, and he is often called a man, both in the Old and New Testament; and sometimes both these natures are represented together; Col. i. 9. *In him dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily* Rom. ix. 5. *Christ of the seed of David after the flesh, and yet he is over all, God blessed for ever*; 1 Tim. iii. 16. *God manifest in the flesh, who was seen of angels, received up into glory*; Rev. xxii. 13, 16. *The beginning and the end, the first and the last, the root and the offspring of David*; Joh. i. 1, 14. *The word who was with God, and who was God, who made flesh and dwelt among us*. It is upon the account of this union that both human and divine properties and characters are attributed to him in the bible.

In opposition to this it has been objected, "That in the passages of scripture mentioned in my book of the "Christian Doctrine of the Trinity," there is not the least hint of two intelligent agents united in one person. "Sober Appeal."

Answer. I would let the reader judge, whether in the passages which are there mentioned, as well as in the texts I have now cited, there is not much more than a mere hint of two suc

intelligent agents united : It seems to me to be the very language of scripture. But if the two natures of Christ were not expressed so plainly as they are, and connected and united in the same texts, yet there are so many different characters applied to Christ, which necessarily require two such intelligent agents, one divine, and one human, that the inference appears very obvious and unavoidable, that God and man are united in the person of Christ. Let us look into ourselves a little, and enquire, Why we believe man to be a compound being, a creature or person made up of an animal body, and a rational Spirit? If we would speak as philosophers, the only reason why we believe it is, because we find some powers, properties and operations belong to us, which cannot belong to a mere animal, or a body of flesh and blood, such as thinking, reasoning, doubting, reflecting, designing, repenting, wishing, &c. And we find also other ideas, operations, powers and properties, which cannot belong to a spirit, such as corporeal qualities, dimensions, figure, local motion, tangible, impenetrable and solid substance, eating, drinking, walking : From these things put together, we infer, that since one single nature is not capable of all these properties and operations, therefore the person of man is made up of two distinct natures, viz. a body and a spirit. Now it is the same diversity of appearances, and the same reasoning, that persuade us to believe the person of Christ is made up of two natures, divine and human : And the scripture seems to account for these things the same way.

It is objected again, That "the author of the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity, &c. hath defined the word person, in the common language of men, to signify one single, intelligent, voluntary agent, or principle of action, therefore according to the common sense and language of mankind, here are two persons in Christ, as well as two natures ; and therefore the author will not say, that he uses the word PERSON here in a sense near akin to the common sense of the word." "Sober Appeal."

Answer, Yes, the author may venture to say, he used the word PERSON here in a sense near akin to its common sense: And I gave particular notice, that "though the word person may be fitly used and applied to the doctrine of the Trinity, yet we generally suppose it is not to be taken exactly in the same sense, as when we call three men, or three angels, three distinct persons." Now what is not exactly the same sense, may yet be a sense near akin. And if in explaining things divine we use the same word to include a little more, or a little less, than in things human, I think this may be done without blame, since we give notice of this special use of the word, since it is the best word we have, and it is that which comes nearest to the divine or sacred ideas which we would express.



The word person, in the common sense of it, signifies one single, intelligent, voluntary agent. But in this theological sense it is supposed to signify one complex, intelligent, voluntary agent; and thus the two natures of Christ, divine and human, may be called one person. In order to explain this in a very near approach to the common forms of human language, I would propose the few queries following:

Query I. May not two distinct substances, such as a body and a spirit, be so intimately united, as that the one may act in subordination to the other, and they may both be esteemed, by virtue of this union, as one common subject of action or passion, or one complex principle of doing and suffering? And is not the whole being properly called a person? The common affairs and language of mankind, who are composed of a spirit and a body, answer this query in the affirmative by daily and hourly experience.

II. In this instance, of a person composed of two distinct substances, is not that which is done, or sustained by the one or the other substance, attributed to the whole complex being? If the body sleeps or walks, if the soul meditates, loves or fears, do we not say, the man fears, loves, meditates, walks or sleeps?

III. In this complex being, or person, are not the actions, passions or characters, of either part of the composition, sometimes attributed to the other in common language? Do we not frequently say, and hear such sentences as these, viz. Poor soul, how pale it looks! That tall thing is very silly. No wise body would have done so. This deformed figure here is a learned man. Some body thought of me. A projecting brain. A thoughtful face. A witty head. A honest heart. A heavy soul. A warm spirit. In each of which expressions some property of body is attributed to the soul, or some property of the soul attributed to the body. This is what we call a communication of properties, and it is used in the sacred writings as well as human. Gen. vi. 12. *All flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth, when in truth it was the spirits of men had corrupted their way.* Prov. xxvii. 7. *The full soul loatheth the honey-comb, but to the hungry soul every bitter thing is sweet,* whereas hunger and fulness are really the properties of the body. 1 Thess. iv. 14. *Them that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.* It is in truth, the body that sleeps, and the soul is brought from heaven with Christ to judgment; yet you find, in the language of the apostle, this communication of properties.

IV. May not two intelligent agents, or two spirits, one of which is inferior to the other, be so intimately united, as that the one may generally act in entire subordination to the other, and under the influence of the other, so that they shall be esteemed

as one common principle of action and passion? And may not what is done or sustained by one spirit, be sometimes attributed to the whole complex being, or sometimes to the other spirit, by reason of their most close and intimate union. The union of the soul and body to make one complex being, that is, a man, which are two things so utterly distinct in their own natures, gives foundation enough for the union of two spirits into one complex principle of action, since kindred natures may better admit of closer union than natures so exceeding different.

V. May not the personal pronouns I, thou, and he, be applied to this whole complex being; especially in every instance wherein the inferior spirit acts in entire subordination to the superior? And as the word person, in common language, signifies one single, intelligent, voluntary agent, so may it not, in this instance, signify one complex, intelligent, voluntary agent? And thus the word person will appear to be used here in a sense near akin to the common ideas of it.

VI. Are there not many other words in human language which are used in this manner, that is, to signify either one single substance, or to signify one complex substance, made up of two, or more, single substances united? We may borrow instances from corporeal unions. When two contiguous houses have mutual communication made between them by proper doors, and are inhabited by one family, they are often called one house: They were two single houses before, now they are one complex house. So two trees may be planted close together, and if they are barked on one side, and bound to each other, by this union they will, as it were, grow into one, and we may with propriety call them one tree: Such instances are also common in twin-fruits, as apples, cherries\*, &c. We may borrow instances also from political unions. So the parliament of England, and the parliament of Scotland, are united and made one parliament: Or those two single nations, which contain thousands of intelligent agents, may be united and made one nation, that is, one complex nation. So a man and his wife, who are two single natural persons, may be called one political person, for they are one person in the eye of the law, because what the one sustains, receives, or acts, is in many cases attributed to the other. Now to apply these queries to the doctrine of two natures in the person of Christ.

VII. May not the great God, the infinite Spirit, think it proper to assume into union with himself a finite Spirit, in so close and intimate a manner as is possible for two such spirits to be united to each other? And may they not be

\* I would not have used similitudes of so low a rank to represent things sacred, if I could have found such proper resemblances among the higher ranks of beings: But, as others have observed before, an iron key that opens a lock, is better than a golden one which will not open it.

esteemed as one complex being, one complex principle of action and passion ?

VIII. Whether this complex agent, made up of the human and divine natures, so intimately united, may not have the personal pronouns, I, thou, and he, in the singular number, applied to it with a justness and propriety of speech, which pronouns are the distinguishing characters that human language has affixed to distinct persons ?

IX. May not this union be properly called a personal union ? Or, if we choose Greek words, a hypostatical union ? And may not this lay a foundation for that figure of speech which is so exceeding common in human language, viz. a communication of properties, when two different beings are thus united into one ?

X. Though it be impossible for us to tell precisely and fully wherein the personal union consists, yet is it not sufficient for us to know that it is a nearer, and more intimate union between the godhead and the man Jesus, than there is between God and any other creature within our notice ? And that it is sufficient to lay a foundation for the attribution of the distinguishing properties, operations and passions of the one to the other, or to the whole complex person ? Thus, though the saints are said to be united to God, or to be one with God, and to dwell in God, and to have God dwelling in them, yet we never find the peculiar properties, actions and passions of God and of the saints, mutually attributed to each other in that manner as the actions and passions, and peculiar properties of God and the man Jesus are ; nor are they ever described as making one complex being or person ; nor are the actions, passions, and peculiar properties of God and the saints, attributed to any such complex being, or compounded person, made up of both.

XI. Whether the person, the complete person of our Lord Jesus Christ, may not therefore be properly described, as the blessed God in personal union with a man, or as a man personally united to God ? And whether this is not the most plain, easy and natural way, of accounting for the human and divine titles and characters attributed to him ? Is not this done without straining any of the expressions of scripture from their most proper ideas, and always allowing the divine titles and characters to signify the idea of true deity, and the human characters to intend nothing superior to human nature ?

XII. Whether upon this principle it may not be said Christ is God, Christ is man. *He grew in wisdom and in stature.* He knows all things, &c. referring to his two different natures, or the two different parts of his complex person ? Upon this account, when we speak of God manifest in the flesh, may it not

properly said, *God was seen of angels, and he ascended into heaven; Christ was of the seed of David after the flesh, and he reigned over all God blessed for ever; God laid down his life for us; God purchased the church with his own blood? &c.* If it is true of one of his natures, be affirmed concerning his whole person, and sometimes concerning the other nature, this union of two natures in one person lays a plain foundation for it.

**Objection.** "Supposing this strange notion, of two intelligent agents making one person, we shall find some things so manifestly spoken of the entire person, as will effectually prevent this way of escape: As particularly, when our Lord says, *Mark xii. 32. that he knew not the day of judgment: For though he was allowed to affirm of the person, what belongs to either nature, yet I fear it will be accounted no better than equivocation, saying of the person what belongs to either, for certainly if it is true of either nature, it is true of the person which is supposed to be constituted of both natures. By the same liberty of speaking might one not deny that Christ is God, meaning it of his human nature; and again, on the other hand, deny that Christ is man, meaning it of his divine nature? The same may be said concerning those places, where Christ says, I can do nothing of myself, &c. "Sober Appeal."*

**Answer,** This objection is pushed home with its utmost force by a very acute writer, Mr. Emlyn, in his *Humble Enquiry, &c.* I would refer the reader to those answers which that excellent author, Mr. Boyse, has given it, in his "*Vindication of the true Deity of Christ,*" from page 94 to page 108, edition 3d, wherein the whole dispute on this subject is contained. There are also several other authors who have vindicated this text, *Mark xiii. 32.* from the inferences which the Arian writers would draw from it, by such considerations as these:

**I.** Our Saviour speaks this under the character of a mediator, or a prophet commissioned by the Father, to reveal his will to men; Now, since he had it not in his commission to reveal the day of judgment, he speaks as though he knew it not, because it was not within the reach or extent of that knowledge which his Father commissioned him to communicate to men at that time, though in his divine nature he had in himself the knowledge of it. By the same reason our Lord might say, he could do nothing of himself, which he had not commission to do as mediator.

**II.** That in this place Christ represents himself as the Son of man in the foregoing verses, *Mark xiii. 26.* and thereby he may be understood to distinguish his human nature from his divinity, and to deny that he knew the day of judgment as he was God or the Son of God. And it is certain, that our blessed Lord, in the days of his humiliation, often spoke of himself con-

sidered in his human nature abstracted from the divine, though the union was never dissolved : It was his proper work on earth to represent himself as man, rather than as God, for had the Jews known, *they would not have crucified the Lord of glory* ; 1 Cor. ii. 8.

III. To this I would add, in the last place, That if the sonship of Christ does not belong to his godhead, even when he is called the Son of God, but belongs rather to his office as Mediator, or to the derivation of his human nature, both soul and body from God the Father, in a peculiar and extraordinary way, then wheresoever he is represented as a Son, whether as Son of God or Son of man, still his sonship is an inferior part of his character ; and on this account we may expect many things asserted or denied concerning him, which cannot properly be asserted or denied concerning his supreme nature or godhead, which has nothing in itself so much derivative and dependent, as seems to be implied in the word Son.

Now, if we should allow the inference which the objector makes, viz. that if our Saviour in his whole complex person, should deny, concerning himself, those properties which he possesses in one of his natures, it would approach too near to an equivocation," yet when he speaks of himself expressly in his inferior character, or in his inferior nature, as a Son, or as Mediator, he may then expressly deny any divine and supreme property of himself, considered in his divine nature, without any shadow of such an imputation. Though he would not say Christ is not God, or Christ is not man, yet he might freely declare, that his divine nature is not man, or the Son of man is not God ; and in the same sense the Son can do nothing of himself, and the Son of man knows not the day of judgment.

I was willing to answer this objection particularly, because it is generally supposed by the Arian writers to be unanswerable, though it has diverted me too far from the subject of personality, which I was pursuing.

Perhaps it may be yet further objected here, against the unity of the person of Christ, that the human and the divine natures are still two persons, for they are two distinct intelligent agents, and the pronouns I, thou, and he, may be applied to either of them, considered apart.

Answer I. To this I answer, the same may be said concerning any of the foregoing instances that I gave of two substances united into one compound substance : So the complex house may be called two houses ; and the complex tree be called two trees ; and Great Britain may be called two nations ; and a man and wife may be called two persons still : There is a sense in which they are two, though there is another sense in which they are one. But I think it is sufficient to denominate each of these examples

one being, or to attribute unity to each of them, if one thing is frequently predicated or affirmed concerning each of these examples as a complex idea.

Nor can I see any thing so terrible or heretical in it, if we should suppose the human nature and divine nature of Christ, to be in some sense two distinct persons, as God and man, being each of them a single intelligent agent. I confess the frightful sound of Nestorianism may reasonably forbid a man to indulge this language, because it will not be counted orthodox: But I know of no manner of injury done to the scripture, to the sacred truths of the gospel, nor to the common schemes of explaining the trinity, by such an allowance as this is. The reverend Mr. Robert Fleming is positive in this point. See *Christology*, book III. chapter 3. page 279. And the scripture sometimes seems to speak of Christ as a distinct person in one of his natures, and as abstracted from the other, though it be not really separated.

II. But yet I may add, that the common way of speaking to which our divines have accustomed themselves, denies the human nature of Jesus Christ to be so properly called a distinct person by itself, because it was never ordained to exist one moment separate from the godhead: And therefore the complex idea of God-man, may with greater propriety be called a person, than the human nature alone. If I were engaged to support this notion, I might propose a parallel case to give some light to it, viz. an angel is called a person, because though it be but a single spirit, yet it was never ordained to exist in union with an animal body: And yet a human soul, which is one single spirit, is not so usually called a person in the separate state because it is ordained to dwell in a human body; and upon this account the addition of a human body is many times reckoned necessary to complete the personality, or to make a human soul, a complete person.

III. If this difficulty could be solved no other way, we might correct the account which I have given of the word person, and include in it all the ideas which the learned Doctor Waterland has expressed in his definition, viz. "a single person is an intelligent agent, having the distinctive characters of I, thou, and he; and not divided or distinguished into more intelligent agents capable of the same characters." See "Second Vindication of Christ's Divinity," query fifteenth, where he has set this definition of the word in a clear and easy light. Let it be noted here, that the Doctor accurately and judiciously uses the words divided and distinguished, not divisible and distinguishable; for the human and divine constituents of the person of Christ are really divisible into two such persons, but since their union they never were, or shall be really separated and divided.

If after all it should be found, that the scripture, on some

occasions, represents the divine nature of Christ as a person, and at another time speaks of the human soul as a person, either before or after its incarnation ; and if in other places it describes the divine and human natures united as one person, I cannot see any inconsistency, in all this ; supposing that person be distinguished into single and complex, and into complete and incomplete : In one or other of these senses, the word person may be variously applied, without any force or strain put on the words of scripture, and without any violation of the rules of human language.

I cannot but think the light in which I have here set this matter of the complex person of our Lord Jesus Christ, is sufficiently evident ; and though, perhaps, we may not always agree about terms and names, and the use of the word person, yet the ideas which I have represented seem to be clear and distinct, and, perhaps, may give satisfaction to those who are not inclined to dispute about words and names. If a further account of the use of the term person in this controversy be desired, See "Dissertation the Sixth."

And since it may bear a dispute, whether the word person be ever used in this sense in scripture, it shall never be a matter of zeal and contest with me, whether another man will express these ideas in my words or no ; provided he will but acknowledge such a peculiar union between the human and divine natures in Christ, as sufficiently qualifies him for all the honours and offices of his mediation, and lays a foundation for attributing to him the appropriate and peculiar titles, characters and operations, both of God and man. To him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. *Amen.*

### DISSERTATION III.

#### *The Worship of Christ, as Mediator, founded on his Godhead.*

It is an unhappiness to the christian church, that there should be any controversies raised about matters of so sacred importance, as the worship which is paid to our blessed Saviour. It is agreed now-a-days on all hands, that both God the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ, are the proper objects of religious worship ; but the chief dispute lies here, whether the worship that is paid to both of them be properly divine or no ? And, whether our Saviour be the object of our worship, merely as a glorious creature, whom the Father has thus dignified, or as he himself has proper communion with God the Father in the divine nature, and is one God with him ? That is, Whether true and proper godhead, or an inferior exalted character, be the proper foundation, and ground of the worship that is paid to him ?

I have read, with some diligence and care, what the author of the "Sober Appeal," and others, even the most ingenious of the modern Anti-trinitarians have written on the subject, where they endeavour to prove, that religious worship under the New Testament is not so peculiar a prerogative of the supreme God, but that it may be given to our Lord Jesus Christ, though he be, in their sense, but a mere exalted creature; and that the New Testament requires religious worship to be paid to him as such. After all, I cannot see sufficient reason to abandon my former argument on this head, which I have published in my "Christian Doctrine of the Trinity," though, perhaps, I may take an advantage from this study, to correct some of my sentiments, while I endeavour to guard and defend the most important of them. In the pursuit of this subject, I shall attempt to establish the common protestant doctrine of the worship of Jesus Christ, the Mediator, upon the foundation of his godhead, and answer the most considerable objections I have met with in any of those writers.

The method I shall take in this discourse, is to lay down several successive propositions, to support the argument for the divinity of Christ, drawn from the payment of religious worship to him, and then shew, that divine, or religious worship, may be paid to him as Mediator, even though the man Jesus is a part of the complex person of the Mediator who is religiously worshipped.

Proposition I. "Worship is some peculiar honour or respect paid to an intelligent being, either real or imaginary."

The word worship, in old English, was used for honour in general, whether this be paid by the body or the mind, or both: And inward esteem or respect for any being may be called worship, though this word frequently implies also some external forms of bodily reverence, such as bowing, kneeling, or prostration. It is also supposed to be paid to an intelligent being; for though the heathens worshipped stocks and stones, and the papists pay a sort of worship to the relics of the saints, and to their images, yet it is always built upon this supposition, that there is some God, or some inferior spirit, or power that dwells in these images, or attends and takes notice of the respect that is paid to themselves, by the means or medium of the image, relick, or other material beings; unless, in some cases, idolaters have been so stupid as to imagine, the wooden idol itself had acquired intellectual powers.

II. "Human or civil worship, is that human honour which is paid to any of our fellow-creatures on earth, upon the account of some excellency which a man may possess or some special relation or character which a human person may sustain."



This sort of worship is given to knights, baronets, and several societies of men in our nation. This kind of worship was paid to king David; 1 Chron. xxix. 20. "They worshipped the king." And it is the same which may be supposed to be paid by the debtor to his lord; Mat. xviii. 26. *The servant fell down and worshipped his lord.* So Christ tells the church of Sardis, he would make her adversaries *come and worship before her feet*; Rev. iii. 9. And, perhaps, some who knew not that Christ was God, might pay this sort of worship to him as a very extraordinary man in the days of his humiliation.

III. "Religious worship is generally described to be divine honour paid to some superior being, on the account of some supposed divine excellencies and powers belonging to it."

I cannot boldly affirm, that all religious worship implies the absolute supremacy, the complete omnipotence, and sovereign godhead of the object of it, in the common sense of mankind. The heathens paid religious worship to inferior deities, and to household gods, whose power they did not imagine to be absolutely supreme; nay, they believed their influence to have a narrow and limited extent, though it was superior to human: But still they imagined it to be a sort of divine power, so far as it reached; and consequently the worship which they paid these inferior deities was divine worship. But God, in his word, has forbidden all this sort of worship to be given to any being beneath, and beside himself, as we shall see immediately.

Indeed, the learned Dr. Waterland, in his "First Defence of his Sixteenth, and Following Queries," maintains, "that whatever has been, or may be, the sense of men, and their notions of worship, yet the great God has determined the meaning of religious worship in scripture to include the divinity, supremacy, eternity, &c. of the object:" See page 239, 240, &c. and has said several valuable things on this subject, worthy of a diligent perusal, and of great importance in this controversy. Our author the appellant, utterly refuses this account, "for, says he, if religious worship imply the supremacy and divinity of the object, who will dispute it, whether it can belong only to the supreme God? But is not this plainly begging the question, and going in a circle?" "Sober Appeal."

But I ask leave to differ from his sentiment: nor can I think this is arguing in a circle, nor begging the question; for if Dr. Waterland has proved, that the sense of religious worship, in scripture always includes the proper godhead, the supremacy and eternity of the object of it, then by the proof of this sense he cuts off all other inferior senses of religious worship, from the scriptural use of the word, and effectually maintains, that it must belong to God alone according to scripture. And when the appellant has again perused what this learned author

has written, both in his "first, and second defence of the queries," perhaps he may find, that he has well vindicated the sole right of the supreme God to all religious worship; therefore I shall refer to his writings, rather than rehearse them here: That learned author stands in no need of my assistance to defend his arguments.

The appellant gives us another idea of religious worship, for it seems to him, that "religious worship imports our expressing a dependence on, or making acknowledgment to some other being as superior to man. There might be the same outward signs of this worship, as of civil respect, such as bowing, kneeling, &c. And there might be the same immediate acts, as asking favours, returning thanks, &c. which, no doubt, are allowable between man and man; but all direct expressions of respect and homage to other beings, as of a superior nature, and having power over us, whether visible or invisible, I take to be properly religious worship. And this was forbidden absolutely under the Old Testament: This would have been accounted the worshipping another god, though they did not acknowledge the being they worshipped to be supreme, eternal, immutable, &c. which indeed, in most instances, could never be supposed." Appeal.

I cannot say I am fully satisfied with this account of religious worship; for if an angel should bring me a message, or command from heaven, would it be unlawful to ask him to explain it by his superior knowledge? Or, to desire him to return again, and give me some help toward the performance of it? Or to make a thankful acknowledgment to him for his angelical service and condescension to converse with me? I confess these things do not express a direct dependence on this angel in distinction from God, nor any acknowledgment of such dependence on him, any further than merely as a divine messenger, and therefore these, perhaps, may not arise to this author's idea of religious worship\*. But however let us now take this idea of worship which the appellant himself has proposed, and state it thus more at large, and I think according to his meaning.

Religious worship is "honour more than human, paid to some being on the account of some supposed excellencies, or

\* I acknowledge it is a more difficult, and a more important thing, than I heretofore imagined, to ascertain the precise idea of religious worship. And since it seems manifest in scripture, that it is appropriate to God, I take the liberty with my own writings, to retract that sentence in my book of the Trinity. "If there be any more creature to whom I can communicate the knowledge of my wants, &c. the light of reason and scripture lead me to address him." And that sentence also, "The very reason of things leads us to adore him." And I give thanks to the appellant, who has convinced me that these expressions are incautious and unguarded. Though according to the method of controversial writers, who seem to renounce all retractions, I might have pretence to colour them over: But I chuse to stand corrected.

powers, more than human, belonging to it, with an acknowledgment of our dependence on this being, and subjection to it." And now let us see, whether according to his own description, my argument for the divinity of Christ, drawn from religious worship, will not stand upon firm and unshaken ground.

IV. "God has assumed religious worship to himself in his word, as his own peculiar prerogative, and with the severest penalties has forbid it to be paid to any inferior being."

It is not my business here to enquire, whether in the abstracted nature of things a mere creature be, or be not, capable of religious worship, that is, of some honours superior to human, and yet inferior to divine: but it is evident, that God thought it the best way to secure his own divine honour, and to guard his people in all ages from idolatry, by forbidding all such religious honours to be paid to any mere creature whatsoever: And this he does in most general expressions, excluding all sorts, kinds, and forms of religious worship whatsoever, and that in the most awful and solemn language, as a matter of the greatest importance. Ex. xxxiv. 14. *Thou shalt worship no other God, for the Lord, whose name is jealous, is a jealous God.* Deut. vi. 4, 13, 14, 15. *The Lord our God is one Lord: Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and him shalt thou serve, and shalt swear by his Name. Ye shall not go after other gods; for the Lord thy God is a jealous God among you, lest the anger of the Lord thy God be kindled against thee and destroy thee.* Deut. x. 20. *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God; him shalt thou serve, and to him shalt thou cleave, and swear by his name: He is thy praise, he is thy God, that hath done for thee great and terrible things.* Deut. xiii. 1, 2. "If a prophet shall say, let us go after other gods and serve them," it is interpreted verse 5. "a turning them away from the Lord their God," and *that prophet shall be put to death.* And verse 6, &c. "If thy brother, thy son, thy daughter, thy wife or thy friend, &c. shall say let us go and serve other gods, thou shalt stone him with stones that he die," for it is interpreted a "thrusting thee away from the Lord God." And, verse 12, &c. "If a whole city shall agree to serve other gods, the inhabitants of that city shall be utterly destroyed with the edge of the sword, the city itself shall be burned with fire, and shall be a heap for ever." 1 Sam. vii. 3. *Prepare your hearts unto the Lord, and serve him only, and he will deliver you.* Hosea xiii. 4. *I am the Lord thy God from the land of Egypt, and thou shalt know no other God but me, for there is no other Saviour beside me.* Ps. lxxxi. 9, 10. *There shall no strange god be in thee, neither shalt thou worship any strange god. I am the Lord thy God, &c.* The first of the ten commandments delivered with such solemnity upon Mount Sinai;

Exod. xx. 2. is this, *Thou shalt have no other gods before me*; that is, no other objects of worship, upon which thou shalt have a religious dependence, or to which thou shalt pay religious honours.

V. "Religious worship is attributed to our Lord Jesus Christ both in prophecy, in precept, and in example in scripture."

Ps. xlv. 11. *He is thy Lord, and worship thou him.* Heb. i. 6. *When he bringeth the first begotten into the world, he saith, let all the angels of God worship him.* Rom. x. 13. *Who-soever shall call upon the name of the Lord, that is, Christ, shall be saved.* Rev. v. 13. *Every creature which is in heaven and earth, &c. heard I, saying, blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever.* Besides the account we have of the disciples, of Stephen the martyr, and of St. Paul, the last apostle, worshipping Christ, and praying to him: and the several doxologies that are paid to him, both in earth and in heaven, are sufficient proofs that religious worship is due to him; nor do any of the modern Anti-trinitarians deny it.

VI. "Thence we infer, that true godhead belongs to our Lord Jesus Christ;" or that he has such communion in the godhead of the Father, such a oneness with the Father in the divine nature, as renders him justly capable of religious, or divine worship: For if religious worship be a peculiar prerogative of the true God, and Jesus Christ has religious worship paid to him, he must also be the true God. Let us now consider what the objectors have to say in opposition to these three last propositions. The appellant and his brethren readily allow, that religious worship is, and ought to be paid to our Lord Jesus Christ; he allows also, that during the days of the Old Testament religious worship was absolutely forbidden to be given to any creature. He seems hereby to allow what I have proposed as the meaning of the first command, viz. "That there should be no other object of religious worship but the Lord Jehovah, the one God of Israel\*." But then he will not allow the inference, "That therefore Jesus Christ is the true God." For if God signifies an object of worship, he supposes the first command is so far

\* That this is the true meaning of the first command, is evident from many places of scripture; for whosoever men set up any other object of worship, it is called in scripture language, "the setting up idols, or other gods," even though these idols were only designed to be the objects of mediate or subordinate worship; nay, though they were only mediums of worshipping the true God; so Jeroboam's calves are called other gods; 1 Kings xiv. 9. & Chron. xiii. 8. Laban's images are called gods; Gen. xxxi. 30. which were probably the household gods of the family; Joshua xxiv. 2. Though by these Jeroboam, Nahor and Laban, might ultimately worship the true God; as Gen. xxxi. 49, 53. Whatever was honoured with religious worship, in scripture sense is called God, and therefore in scripture language every thing but Jehovah, or the true and supreme God, is excluded from such worship by the first commandment.

repealed under the gospel, as to admit another, even an inferior object of worship, viz. "Our Lord Jesus Christ, as the fourth command in the decalogue is repealed, so far as concerns that seventh day which the Jews were required to keep as their sabbath."

Here the appellant speaks his sentiments with freedom, in plain language, and confesses the necessity he is driven to, of supposing the first commandment to be in part repealed. He seems to be conscious that these words, "Thou shalt have no other gods, no other Elohim before me," exclude all other gods, both inferior and subordinate as well as supreme, beside the one Jehovah, the Lord God of the Jews. Nor can he account any other way for the worship of Christ, as an inferior god, but by repealing in part the first commandment. Now to prove that the first command is not repealed, neither in whole nor in part\*, I give these six reasons:

Reason I. The very grounds upon which this ancient command, of worshipping one God only, and the prohibition of other gods, is founded, abide the same under the gospel, and the reasons by which it was enforced under the Old Testament, seem to remain the same under the New, viz. his being the one God, the one Jehovah, the Eternal, the Almighty, the Creator of all things, his jealousy of his own honour, his deliverance of his people from bondage, his being the Author of the salvation of his people, and his sovereign authority over them, with his all-sufficiency for their help and happiness. Now, is not God the same only Lord God, and one Jehovah, the same Eternal, Almighty, and Creator of all things? Is not God as jealous of his own honour under the gospel, as he was under the law? Is he not that Being who has delivered his people from spiritual bondage, which was typified by the land of Egypt? Is he not the same one God under the New Testament which he was under the Old? Is he not that God upon whom his people as much depend for deliverance and salvation? And therefore to admit another God under the New Testament to be the proper object of worship, seems to be as inconsistent with the unity, the holy jealousy, and the all-sufficiency of God, under the gospel, as it was in the days of judaism.

There are also several other expressions of the prophet Isaiah, and the other prophets, wherein God asserts his own unity, his own peculiar prerogative and right to religious worship, in opposition to all other gods, or other objects of worship, not only because he alone is the Creator of all things, but he

\* I see not, indeed, how it is possible for this first command to be repealed in any part, unless it be wholly repealed; for the form of it is negative, and thus it excludes any other god or gods whatsoever. Now if any other god be admitted under the New Testament, I think the whole command is repealed.

alone is omnipresent, he alone knows all future things from the beginning; he alone is the Maker and Redeemer of Israel; he is the first and the last, &c. Now the one true God has the same reasons to maintain his divine prerogative and sole right to religious worship under the gospel; he alone is the omnipresent, the omniscient God, the Maker and Saviour of his people.

If it be objected here, that Christ is also represented as the Creator of all things, the Maker and Saviour of his people, &c. and therefore he may become an object of worship too, we readily allow it; because we suppose him to be one God with the Father, and therefore the ancient titles and characters of god-head belong to him, and render him justly capable of religious worship.

II. If Christ or his apostles taught the Jews the worship of any other god, or gods, beside Jehovah the God of Israel, I question whether all their miracles, and their professed commission from heaven, could ever have justly gained them any credit with the Jews; whether they ought not to have been rejected by the law of God, according to that solemn declaration of God to Israel, and that universal rule which he gave them by which to examine and try all their succeeding prophets; Deut. xiii. 1—5. *If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder cometh to pass, whercof he spake unto thee, saying, let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams; for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether you love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul: And that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams, shall be put to death, because he hath spoken to turn you away from the Lord your God.*

If it should be said here, that the reason why the offender is stoned, was not because he led them to other gods, but because he turned them away from the true God: I answer, that there is nothing of this kind mentioned in the description of the crime, viz. a turning them away from the true God. but it is only brought in at the end of the law, to shew the malignity of the crime itself, and to make it appear, that the teaching them to worship other gods, would be interpreted by the true God as a rejection of himself. And this is plain in several instances, when the Jews worshipped other gods and retained the worship of the true God still, yet they are charged with turning away from the Lord their God. Upon this supposition therefore, that Christ or his apostles taught the Jews to worship another god or gods, which they had not before known, I would speak it with holy fear and caution, does there not seem to be a divine command to put them to death, whatsoever signs or wonders they produced to vindi-

cate their commission? And thus, if they set up our Lord Jesus Christ, whom the appellant allows to be called God in an inferior sense, and proposed him as another god, another object of religious worship, did they not hereby sap the foundations of all their own pretences to a divine commission, and seem to give the Jews, their countrymen, a right to stone them to death, according to their own law? And I humbly question, whether all their miracles could have been a sufficient protection to them.

Let it be considered further, that when the Jews took up stones to stone our Saviour, they pronounced him worthy of death according to their law, for that *he being a man made himself god*; John x. 33. Whereas the words which our Saviour spake were these, *I and my Father are one*; verse 30. He doth not deny himself to be God, which seemed very necessary to be done at such an important juncture as this, if he had not been the true God, nor doth he declare himself to be a God different from the Father, which might have given the Jews a juster pretence to stone him; but his words are, *I and my Father are one*; which represent him to be the same God as the Father, or to be God by virtue of some personal oneness with the godhead of the Father. Nor can I conceive how any thing else but the supposition of this doctrine could have so honourably vindicated our Saviour's conduct at this juncture, and at the same time have taken away all just pretence from the Jews for attempting to stone him: Since he did not preach up another God, his miraculous works obliged them to believe all that he said, and to these mighty works he appeals; verse 32. Whereas, if he had preached up himself as another god, that Jewish law seems to stand in force against him notwithstanding his miracles.

I confess this thought has something in it very solemn and awful; it carries, in my esteem, very great weight with it, and confirms me in the belief, that Jesus Christ has communion in the godhead of the Father, and is in a proper sense the same God; otherwise I cannot see how he could be made an object of religious worship: For if he be God only in an inferior sense, then he is another god, and seems hereby to lie exposed to the condemnation of this sacred rule in Deuteronomy; this divine test of future prophets which Jehovah gave to Israel by the mouth of Moses. The learned Dr. Waterland is so positive on this head, that he asserts, *The worship of the same one God, exclusive of all others, is for ever made unchangeable by this text.* "First Defence of the Queries."

If it should be objected by an Arian here, That this, and all other prohibitions under the Old Testament, to worship any other god, must be construed with a particular relation to those false gods and idols of the heathen nations of which the Jews were in

danger ; but it must not be supposed, that God ever designed by such language to exclude from religious worship so glorious a being as his own Son, who can hardly be called a creature, though he be a distinct being, produced by the will and power of God, and of a nature inferior to the Father.

Answer I. The language of this prohibition is very general, it excludes all Elohim, God, or gods, which thou hast not known. Now it does not appear from scripture, that the Jews knew any true God besides the *God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, their only Jehovah : So that the word plainly excluding all gods that they had not known, seems for ever to exclude Christ from their worship, if he be not the same God with Jehovah, the God of Abraham, whom the Jews knew.

II. How could the Jews ever imagine that there was such a limitation intended and implied in the general prohibition, when there is not any intimation of it in the books of Moses, nor, indeed, in any of the prophets ? And since Jesus Christ, in the Arian sense, was an unknown god to them, how could they ever come to the knowledge of him, or be assured that he is so glorious a being as the Son of God, and that he is appointed by the Father to be called God, and to be worshipped, except by the divine tokens of prophecy and miracle ? How should they ever know that this supposed limitation of the general and solemn prohibition of worship did not reach to exclude this person but by some such divine testimonies ? Now the force of these very divine testimonies, miracles and prophecy, seem to be enervated and precluded in this single case, viz. the receiving any other God, or having any other object of worship. In all other cases, as Grotius well observes, *de veritate religionis christiana*, prophecy and miracle were constituted the criteria of an inspired person, and the Jews were bound to receive him ; but in this one case of worshipping another god, these criteria were excluded by this very law or statute : So that this law of having no other God seems to be confirmed to the Jews for ever.

If the objector should persist and say, that “ there are intimations given us in the Old Testament that the Messiah must be worshipped, when he comes, and that therefore the Jews would not be so much surprized at the proposal of another object of worship in the days of the Messiah.” To this I answer two ways :

Answer I. This seems to be a begging the question, and taking it for granted, that the Messiah is not the one true God in any sense which is the present matter of debate.

II. It should be observed, that in most of those places, wherein it is foretold that the Messiah should be worshipped with religious worship, his godhead is also intimated ; Ps. xvii. 1. *Jehovah reigneth let the earth rejoice ;* verse 6. *All the people*



see his glory; verse 7. *confounded be they that boast themselves of idols: Worship him all ye gods, or angels: Which verse applied to Christ; Heb. i. 6. So Ps. cii. 15. where the kingdom of the Messiah is foretold, the Gentiles shall fear the name of the Lord; verse 22. The people are gathered together, a the kingdoms to serve the Lord; verses 24, 25. Thou hast laid the foundations of the earth, &c. which is also applied to Christ Heb. i. 10. So Ps. xlv. 6. Thy throne, O God, is for ever a ever; verse 11. He is thy Lord, and worship thou him; which is also applied to Christ in the same place. So again; Is. v. 13, 14. Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself, and let him be ye fear and dread, and he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence; which compared with Is. xxviii. 16. 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7. Rom. ix. 33. Mat. xxi. 44, & shew that this is spoken of the Messiah: And several other scriptures might be cited to the same purpose. So that still seems to be the indwelling or united godhead, which is worshipped in the Messiah, and which gives the Messiah, in his complete person, a right to religious worship, as we shall see hereafter.*

III. Our blessed Saviour, in the beginning of his ministry was tempted by the devil, to fall down and worship him: upon which occasion our Lord confirms the first commandment, and repeats and cites the words of the Mosaic law. Mat. iv. 10. *is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve; Deut. vi. 13. and x. 20.* And it is worthy of observation, what Doctor Waterland remarks here, that "the reason which Christ gives for refusing to worship him, is not that he was a bad spirit, an enemy to God, or that God had commanded it, but because none are to be worshipped but God only.

It may be objected here, That our Saviour only means appropriate supreme worship to God the Father, but he does not exclude himself, nor any other inferior being, from an inferior and subordinate worship, proper for subordinate beings, and therefore subordinate worship may be paid to one who is not the true and eternal God.

I answer, that as all inferior and subordinate \* worship, any mere inferior or subordinate beings, is acknowledged to be excluded under the Old Testament, by the Mosaic law, so our Saviour's citation and repetition of it there, does most expressly and directly exclude mere creatures from subordinate worship.

\* When I speak of supreme and subordinate worship in this place, I would be understood with respect to the proper foundation of worship, and not with regard to the modes of worship, the motives, designs, or particular forms of address; for in the ninth proposition I have shewn, that these may possibly be of a subordinate or subordinate even when God is worshipped under some subordinate character, though the foundation of worship is always supreme or properly divine; and thither I refer the reader. See pages 447—452.

as well as supreme; For the devil does not tempt him to pay supreme worship to himself, since he acknowledges that he is not the maker, nor supreme possessor of the kingdoms of the world; but he says only that these were delivered into his hands, and therefore he was capable of bestowing them upon Christ. As he therefore was but a subordinate possessor, he could demand but subordinate worship, which our Lord forbids by a citation out of the Mosaic law; Luke iv. 5, 6, 7, 8.

Now in disputes on this subject, and this text the Unitarians seem to have found out but these two refuges, for which they have any colour or pretence:

1. That notwithstanding the devil's own expression, that he received his kingdoms and powers from another hand, and that they were not originally his own, by supreme right, yet that he was so impudent and unreasonable in the same breath as to desire divine worship. To which I answer, that as impudent and unreasonable as his requests may be at some times, yet in this place, the Unitarians have no manner of proof that he requested supreme worship: and there is a rational probability of the contrary. It is most likely, that he desired such worship as the heathens were wont to pay to any of their deities, besides the supreme, that is, those deities into whose hands their supreme God had delivered the government of particular parts of the creation.

2. It is pretended that Christ's prohibition of worshipping any thing besides the true God at this time of his temptation, was of no force after his own exaltation; and though God only was to be worshipped at that time, yet in three or four years afterwards Jesus Christ also being exalted, might have religious worship paid to him, though he were but an inferior being.

To this it is answered, that our blessed Lord not only now, but afterwards, preaches the same doctrine; he takes other occasions, in the course of his ministry, to confirm that solid foundation of all religion, that there is but one God, one object of worship." Now if he himself, or his apostles immediately after his resurrection, had been appointed to set up the worship of himself as a mere inferior being, and another God, it is not to be supposed that our Lord Jesus should have introduced his own ministry upon earth with so sacred a confirmation of the one only object of worship in his repelling the temptation of the devil: Nor can we think he would have taken frequent occasion to maintain that doctrine and practice inviolable, and that without the least hint of any repeal of it.

So very important and considerable a change of religion as this, which repeals the first commandment, and admits another God to be owned and worshipped, would certainly have required a very particular and express account of it to be given to the

Jews, and much labour to be spent in persuading them of the change of this great and fundamental article of their faith and practice, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God, is one Lord, thou shalt have no God besides him.*

Here if it be said, Christ gave some intimations of a repeal of it when he speaks of his own future worship, and told them, that *all men must honour the Son, as they honour the Father*; John v. 22. Let us remember also, that he gave frequent intimations of his own communion in the godhead; for he said, *I am in the Father, and the Father in me; I and my Father are one*; John xiv. 10, 11. x. 30. and thus the first command abides in its full force still.

IV. That religious worship is the peculiar prerogative of God alone under the New Testament, as well as under the Old, is further proved by the continuance of this precept in force after the resurrection and exaltation of Christ as well as before: For the apostle John was twice going to worship the angel; Rev. xix. 10. and xxii. 8, 9. the angel refused the worship both times, and said, *See thou do it not, I am thy fellow-servant; worship God*; which must necessarily signify worship God alone, or that God only is the proper object of thy worship, otherwise it could not exclude the worship of an angel. Now if God alone was to be worshipped after the full glorification of Christ, when God had appointed *every knee to bow to him*, and when he was known and adored by the church as a proper object of worship, I think it is a very plain consequence that Christ is God; that he has a glorious communion in the divine nature with the one true God, the God of Israel, who was the only proper object of worship under the Old Testament and is the same under the New.

Whether St. John mistook this angel for Christ himself, or whether he might incautiously, and on a sudden, attempt to pay too sublime a respect and honour to a mere angel, is much the same to my argument; for the angel forbids this honour to be done to himself, as being due to God alone; and this being the reason of his repeated prohibition, the same reason would also exclude Jesus Christ from worship, if he were not true God. And, perhaps, this redoubled occurrence and prohibition might be placed in the end of scripture, by divine providence, to let us see, that from the beginning of the bible to the end of it, God alone is entitled to religious worship.

V. The Jews had learned from the Old Testament, the worship of one true God and him only; and there is scarce any command more frequently renewed, or guarded with more awful sanctions, and more terrible examples of the wrath of God against the breakers of it: Now if Christ or his apostles had so much as pretended any repeal of this law, the Jews would have had a most public and glorious pretence against christianity.

The doctrine of the worship of Christ as a mere creature, would have raised in the heart of every Jew one of the most unconquerable prejudices against the gospel. Since the time that they smarted so severely in Babylon by a captivity of seventy years for their idolatries, they have been always observed to have the utmost aversion to every appearance of idolatry, or the worship of any thing beside the one true God : St. Paul testifies thus of his countrymen ; Rom. ii. 17, 22. *Thou art called a Jew, and abhorrest idols.* Now if the crucifixion of the Messiah was a stumbling-block to the Jews, which many of them could not get over, the worship of a man, an exalted creature, would, in all probability, have been a much greater stumbling-block and impediment of their belief of the gospel. Their aversion to a crucified Messiah arose only from their own foolish traditions and pre-conceived errors ; but their aversion to the worship of man is patronized by all their sacred writings, for they could hardly read any part of their bible but they found some precept, threatening, or divine judgment recorded, against worshipping any creature, or receiving any other god.

It is evident in the writings of the apostles, that Jesus Christ is several times called God, and that he is worshipped. Now if he has not the same godhead with the God of the Jews, then he is another god, another object of worship ; and when the Jews had smarted so terribly in all former ages for their worshipping any beside their own true God, and for their breach of the first commandment, it would appear like an immoveable and everlasting bar against their acceptance of the religion of Christ, if they had been told, that this first commandment was now in some measure repealed, and that they must now admit of another god, even the man Jesus, and pay him religious worship, though he were but a creature. Shall it be objected here, that there were several parts of their religion repealed, namely, all their ceremonial law, which they seemed to be as fond of as any thing in their religion ; and why might they not submit to a repeal of the first command also ?

But it may be answered, That there was sufficient evidence given of the repeal of the ceremonial law, by discovering to them, that all these were but shadows of the promised blessings of the Messiah ; and consequently when the substance and glory of their religion appears in the reign of their expected Messiah, it is necessary that the shadows should vanish and disappear. So St. Paul argues in his Epistle to the Jews or Hebrews. Even their sabbath itself in the Jewish forms of it, was a type of the blessed rest under the gospel, and of the final rest in heaven, as the apostle proves in the fourth chapter of that epistle, as well as in Col. ii. 16, 17. But there is not the least intimation that the first commandment had any thing in it cere-

monial or typical ; nor can any such reason be given why that should ever suffer a repeal. I add further, That the apostle not only gives a reason for it, but I think he declares in very plain language, that their laws of ceremonies are repealed in the epistles to the Galatians and Colossians, as well as the Hebrews ; at least so far as not to be necessary : And I am well assured, that if the first command were to have suffered such a repeal, and to have admitted another god, there would have been as much, or more need of plain and express declarations of it by inspired men, because there seems to be so much more of natural reason for the continuance of this command, than there is, or can be, for any part of the ceremonial law.

It will be further enquired, “ Then how came any of the Jews ever to be persuaded to receive christianity, and to worship Christ whom they knew to be a man, if they had such an utter aversion to every shadow of idolatry, and the worship of any thing beside the God of Abraham, their own true and only God ? ”

The answer is obvious here, for the apostles did not in their very first preaching require of them the religious worship of Christ, but by degrees led them into it. They first preached up the peculiar and extraordinary presence of God with the man Jesus, whereby he wrought miracles, as is evident ; Acts ii. 22. and Acts x. 38. *God was with him.* Then they taught by degrees, that the *fulness of the godhead dwelt in him bodily* ; as Col. ii. 9, That the union betwixt the true God and the man Jesus was so great, as that the actions and sufferings of Christ were attributed to God, that *God redeemed the church with his own blood* ; Acts xx. 28. That Christ was so far one with the true God, as that upon this account he is called *God manifest in the flesh, God over all blessed for ever* ; 1 Tim. iii. 16. and Rom ix. 5. Thus the Jews themselves might be led to the worship of Jesus Christ by the discovery of the same godhead dwelling in him, and united to him, whom they and their fathers were taught to worship by the law of Moses. Jesus Christ is the same God or Jehovah, but now dwelling in flesh ; and this they might prove out of many of their own prophets.

VI. As the doctrine of worshipping another, an inferior god, would have been a just stumbling-block to the Jews against receiving christianity, so it might have been fairly objected by the gentiles against the preaching of the apostles, when in their ministry they demolished the heathen gods and heroes. The blessed apostles made it their business, every where to inculcate the doctrine of the one true God, to call the heathens away from the worship of all their inferior deities, the souls of all their departed heroes, and all such as *are not God by nature* ; Acts x.v. 15 and xvii. 24. Gal. iv. 8. that they might no longer *serve those who by nature are no gods.* Now, how could they expect

success in their reasonings with the heathens on this subject, if they introduced Jesus Christ as another god, as an inferior god, as one who by nature was no god, and proposed him to be their god, or the object of their worship, merely by the appointment of the supreme God? Would not this look like *building again the things which they had destroyed*, if Jesus Christ had no such communion in the natural supreme and eternal godhead, as might render him a proper, capable object of their religious worship, according to the general dictate of scripture, that we must worship God alone? Would not this have a tendency to establish their old superstition and polytheism rather than destroy it?

Let us suppose St. Paul had been just preaching up the unity of the true God to the Athenians, or Corinthians, and forbidding them to worship any of these inferior gods, and the souls of departed heroes; let us suppose that he had fixed their faith upon the one true God, and appropriated their worship to him; and suppose in a little time after, he should teach them to call upon the name of the Lord Jesus, which doubtless he did to all his disciples, for the christians were generally known by this character, viz. *All that call upon the name of the Lord Jesus*; 1 Cor. i. 2. What would the heathens say? "Did you not lately teach us the worship of the one true God, and bid us renounce ~~our~~ several departed heroes and inferior deities, and all other gods whatsoever; And are you already bringing in your departed hero Christ for a new inferior god among us?" I know not how the apostle could readily and clearly give a plain and satisfactory answer to them upon the Arian principle. But if he should tell them Jesus Christ is not another god, for this man Jesus has the fulness of the true godhead dwelling in him, he is united to the one true God, and thereby becomes one with God and upon this account may justly be worshipped. Such an answer of the apostle would stop their accusation, would make his own doctrine consistent with itself, would maintain the unity of the true God, and justify his demolition of their inferior deities.

I freely confess, that there is a real difference between the Arian worship of Christ, and the heathen worship of their gods or heroes; because these are either fictitious, or at best have no such real power and authority as our Saviour is allowed to have even in the Arian scheme. But it would be hard to make this difference appear to the heathen multitudes where the apostle preached: for if Christ be supposed to have no superior nature to his human soul and body, the gentiles would plead hard for their inferior gods and heroes, both as having an extensive power in themselves suited to their particular charge, and as being appointed by Jupiter their chief god, to perform various services for mankind, to exercise their deputed powers, and to receive inferior

worship. Now it would be a tedious and difficult matter to convince the gentiles of the real difference between their own heroes and the christian hero ; and it would be hard to make it appear to them, that the christian's inferior god had a much juster title to worship than the heathen inferior gods, upon the supposition of having no God beside him who made all things. And while the apostles continually inculcated this doctrine of the unity of God ; and while the gentiles themselves as well as the apostles called every thing God which they worshipped, it would be very hard to prove to them, that Jesus Christ, if he were a mere creature, had so much better pretence and claim to their worship than their own heroes had without much labour of distinctions far above the reach of the multitudes ; whereas the adorableness of Christ, on the account of the supreme in-dwelling godhead, sets all things right with ease and plainness : He must be worshipped as supreme God, for he is one with God supreme.

Indeed the appellant exclaims against this sort of reasoning. " Would it not grieve one, says he, if it may not move one's indignation, to see christians representing the worship of Christ, the only true and proper worship which the gospel directs us to pay unto him, as little better than Heathenish idolatry ; and thus in effect making the blessed Jesus no better than an idol ?"— " Appeal." Surely the appellant must needs know, that I am not singular in this reasoning ; and that this is no new charge against his doctrine ; Dr. Cudworth, in his " Intellectual System," Dr. Waterland in his " Defence of the Queries," Dr. Smallbroke, in his " Two Sermons against Arianism," and others, concur with the fathers writing on this subject, to charge the Arians with a restoration of idolatry, and support of polytheism, like that of the Pagans, when they called Jesus Christ a mere creature, and yet pay him religious worship.

And truly, if this argument move grief and indignation, it will fall heavy on the Arian scheme, and not on my argument : For it is that scheme which represents the blessed Jesus as an inferior god, and thus brings him too near to the rank of those inferior gods or heroes in the sense of the heathens ; whereas the scripture places him in a vastly superior character, as *God over all blessed for ever*, and as one with God the Father ; and though I believe from my heart, that several of these writers have a sacred and profound reverence for the blessed Jesus, and adore, and love, and trust in him, yet this inferior or figurative godhead, which is all they usually allow him ; and upon which they build his worship, seems to bring him down down too near to those ideas and characters which the heathens attributed to their inferior gods. I am well persuaded, that these gentlemen abhor the thought of such indignity offered to our blessed Lord, but their opinion seems to draw such consequences

after it, and it is neither unfair nor unfriendly to give them a hint of it.

To conclude this part of the argument, to prove the everlasting obligation of this command, to worship God only, I beg leave to transcribe a few lines from Mr. Boyse, in his excellent "Vindication of the True Deity of our blessed Saviour," page 142. edition the third. Upon the whole, the opinion and practice of the Unitarians plainly re-advances that creature-worship, which is one great design of the christian religion to overturn and abolish. It undermines that grand article of the everlasting gospel that was to be preached to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people; fear God, and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come, and worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea and the fountains of waters; Rev. xiv. 6, 7. And this it does by setting up as an object of religious worship a creature, to whom neither the divine perfections nor works belong. Thus I have confirmed this argument for the divinity of Christ, which is drawn from religious worship paid to him, by answering the objection which supposes religious worship not forbidden to a creature under the New Testament, though it was under the Old: And I think it is made pretty evident, that the same prohibition stands still in force under the New Testament, and that the first command obliges christians as well as Jews, viz. *Thou shalt have no other gods before me*: And therefore if Christ is a God, or an object of religious worship, though he be another person, yet he is not another God, but one and the same God with the Father, or the God of Israel, for we must have no other God but the God of Israel, we must not have two Gods.

A second objection which is used by the refiners of the Arian scheme, against the appropriating all religious worship to God alone, is, that "this doctrine absolutely precludes God himself from all right of appointing any person to be adored with any religious worship at all, whatsoever exalted station he may be raised to in the divine economy, unless he has true and eternal godhead in him, that is, unless he has the same inherent and independent right to this worship as God the Father himself has."

Answer. Suppose it be granted, that this doctrine does preclude it; but then let it be considered, it is God himself has precluded it in his own own word, whence this our doctrine is derived. I will not say, this is absolutely precluded in the nature of things; but if God himself, in every part of his word, both in the Old and New Testament, has confined religious worship to himself as his own prerogative; and rather than let any mere creature be worshipped, if he condescends himself in the person of his Son, or in union with the man Christ Jesus, to



assume inferior characters, and transact inferior concerns in his own economical kingdom, surely there is nothing in this which is absurd or unscriptural. It rather makes a divine grandeur run through all the transactions of God with the children of men; and there is no dishonour done to the sovereignty of God, by precluding himself by his own counsels, and his own revelations, from exalting any mere creature to be the object of religious worship.

Now, that God has precluded all the mere created beings, even in the invisible world, from this honour, seems naturally to be inferred from the care and solicitude which God has shewn in the Old Testament as well as in the New, to prevent angels from receiving any religious worship from the children of men. And Doctor Waterland offers most ingenious and probable reasons for it. "Defence I." query XVI. pages 231, 232. Suppose some exalted creatures could know, hear, and relieve our wants at any distance, suppose they were appointed to bear some rule over us, and suppose we thought it proper to respect, worship, and adore them accordingly: "But God's thoughts are not our thoughts he has entered an express caveat and prohibition in the case. Possibly he may apprehend it to be more for his own glory, and more for our good, that our whole worship and service be paid to him than a part only. Possibly he may know, such is human infirmity, that if any part, or kind or degree of religious worship, was permitted to be given to creatures, it might insensibly alienate our minds from the Creator; or eat out all our reverence and respect for God. Or, it may be, that while our acknowledgments are ordered to be paid to him, and to him alone, we may thereby be induced to live more in dependence on him; become more immediately united to him; and have the greater love and esteem for him. He will not, perhaps, leave his favours in the hands, or in the disposal of his creatures, lest we should forget whom we are principally obliged to; or lest we should imagine, that he is not always every where present, to hear our petitions and to answer them, according to his own good pleasure. These, or a thousand better reasons, infinite wisdom may have, for appropriating all acts of religious worship to God. It is sufficient for us to know that he has done it: And of this, holy scripture has given abundant proof. Thus that learned author.

Wheresoever angels appear in scripture, both under the Jewish and christian economy, you find them solicitous to forbid the worship of themselves, unless where the angel of the covenant, or the angel of God's presence appeared, that is, the Messiah, in whom was the name of God, and who assumed the titles of Jehovah and the God of Israel, whom we generally believe to be the Lord Jesus Christ himself. Worshipping of angels

is a thing utterly forbidden, and yet if the angel of the covenant was worshipped, I cannot account for it any other way, but by supposing the angel who said I am Jehovah, was really Jehovah, the only true God, or had the fulness of the godhead dwelling in him; he was God manifest in the burning bush, God manifest in the Shechinah, before he was God manifest in the flesh.

There is a third objection which they bring against the doctrine of the worship of Christ, founded on his true and eternal godhead, and it is this, that the scripture never recommends the worship of Christ upon this account, nor is there any one instance where it appears, that he was worshipped as the supreme God: The scripture plainly puts it upon another foot, viz. because *the Father hath committed all judgment to him, therefore all men must honour him*; because *God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, &c.* upon the account of his humiliation, and his obedience to death; because God hath commanded, saying, *let all the angels of God worship him*; and that *the Lamb is worthy to receive power and glory, &c. because he was slain, and has redeemed us to God.* Now if his godhead were the true foundation of religious worship, it is strange, say they, that this only foundation, this standing, and eternal ground of all that religious worship, which we are bound to give to Christ, should be so entirely overlooked in all the instances of it, and that the worship of him should be always put upon another foot. "Appeal," page 128, 129.

Answer I. I think it is not strictly true that the godhead of Christ is never mentioned in scripture as the ground of his worship; Ps. xlv. 6. "Thy throne, O God is for ever and ever. And verse 11. The Psalmist addresses the church thus, "He is thy Lord, and worship thou him." His Godhead and his Lordship are both mentioned before the command of worship; See also Ps. xcvi. 1, &c. "Jehovah reigneth let the earth rejoice; the hills melted like wax at the presence of the Lord, at the presence of the Lord of the whole earth. The heavens declare his righteousness, and all the people see his glory. Confounded be all they that serve graven images, worship him all ye gods." Now both these passages of scripture are applied to Christ; Heb. i. 6, 8. "When he bringeth his first begotten into the world he saith, let all the angels of God worship him: And unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God is for ever and ever." See more in Ps. cii. 15, 22, 24. Is. viii. 13, 14. &c. as before. Thus you see Christ is called Jehovah and God in those very places where his worship is required. That text in Phil. ii. 9—11. where the human nature of Christ seems to be taken into the complex object of worship, as I shall shew afterward, that

very text is borrowed from Is. xlv. 23. where God, the only true God, the just God and Saviour, is represented as the object of religious worship, and that upon the account of his godhead, as well as of his salvation : And therefore it is the same godhead that may lay a just foundation for the worship of Christ in those very places of scripture in the New Testament, which require us to worship him as God-man, or Mediator.

See further, John v. 23. where all men are ordered to honour the Son even as they honour the Father. There are some characters which seem to imply godhead united to man in the context, viz. having life in himself, raising the dead, doing whatsoever the Father doth, &c. And if the last verses of Jude be a doxology given to Christ, he is there called the only wise God our Saviour, which is a sufficient ground for such a doxology. And I think the reasons which I have formerly given for the proof of this exposition, maintain a good degree of strength still, notwithstanding what has been said in opposition to it.

II. As there are some scriptures under the Old Testament which demand the worship of God the Father on the account of his being the one true God, omniscient, omnipotent, and the Creator of all things ; so there are other scriptures which demand the worship of him upon the account of the various benefits which he has bestowed upon Israel, viz. because he has brought them out of the land of Egypt and the house of bondage, because he has delivered and saved them, he is their Redeemer and their King\*. It is the divine nature that renders God the Father properly capable of religious worship according to the scripture, but his various benefits are strong reasons and obligations upon all mankind, and especially upon his own people to worship him. These benefits do not add a new foundation for his worship, but add new obligations upon creatures to pay him divine adoration. These benefits do also determine and model the special forms and expressions of worship, paid to God the Father : He is to be worshipped, because he is God, but he is to be worshipped in this or that form of address, that is, as a deliverer, or a Saviour, &c. because he rescued and saved his people.

In like manner, as there are some texts of scripture which

\* So it is said in the New Testament ; Rev. xix 1, 2. "Salvation, and glory, and honour, to the Lord our God, for true and righteous are his judgments." Rev. iv. 11. "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour, for thou hast created all things. Creation and judgment, truth and righteousness are the reasons or motives given for the worship of the Father : But his divinity stands as the foundation of worship, whatever particular operations may be assigned as the reasons and motives of it. So Christ may be said to be worshipped because he is Creator as well as Judge ; John i. 3. John v. 22, 23. yet his divinity lies at the bottom to support it.

represent our Lord Jesus Christ as God, and which in the same manner require or demand religious worship for him, so there are several places which shew us the obligations that lie upon us to worship Christ Jesus, and reveal to us the particular forms and language of worship in which we should address him, viz. "as the Lamb that was slain and has redeemed us : as he that was obedient to the death, and died for us, and redeemed us to God through his blood." Though it is his deity still that renders him capable of religious adoration, yet some of the reasons and motives why we worship him, are derived from what his humanity has done. It is a frequent thing with the scripture to represent our obligations to duty as derived from the benefits we receive ; and to represent the object of our worship rather in his relation to us, and our dependence upon him, than in his own metaphysical nature and incomprehensible essence : And since the scripture has dealt thus in relation to God the Father, and his worship, no wonder that it speaks the same sort of language with regard to Jesus Christ when he is revealed as the object of our worship. We praise God the Father, because he has created us, Psal. c. 3, 4. and the Son, because he redeemed us, ev. v. 9—13.

But that I may give the objection its full weight and force, may be replied here, that "not only our obligation to worship Christ, but even his right to receive our worship, seems to be given him by the Father, upon the account of his humiliation and obedience to death ;" especially in that famous scripture ; Phil. ii. 7, 8, 9. *He took upon him the form of a servant ; he is found in the likeness of men, he humbled himself and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross : Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, &c.*

To this I answer, that in this passage the scripture seems to have a peculiar reference to the exaltation of the human nature of Christ, to become part of the complex object of worship in union with the divine. Now this was a honour of which the man Jesus seems utterly incapable, according to scripture, had he not been united to God. I say therefore, this text speaks of the worship of Christ as man in union with Deity, and that not only because of the appropriation of all religious worship to God, but the very language in which this worship of Christ is expressed by the apostle, is taken from Is. xlv. 23. where the true God or Jehovah assumes this worship ; and the citation of it by St. Paul, both here and in Rom. xiv. 10—12. proves the godhead of Christ. But when this man who is united to God, had thus humbled himself, then the Father ordained him publicly to receive his proper share of that religious honour which is paid

to God-man, or God dwelling in human nature. Then he was exalted as God-man and Mediator, to be adored by all men: He might be worshipped before as God in his divine robes, if I may so express it, but now he must be worshipped in his mediatorial robes, in his garments of flesh and blood. The public right of the man Jesus to religious worship, as part of the \* complex person of the Mediator, is here manifested to the world, as a reward of his sufferings. This seems to be the precise meaning of the apostle in this place as far as I am capable of penetrating into it.

But the answer made to this present objection as well as to others drawn from Jolin v. 22, 23. will derive further force and evidence from the following propositions:

VII. "The godhead of Christ hath assumed the man Jesus into an unspeakable and most intimate union with itself, which is generally called a hypostatical or personal union."

The scripture seems to express this in several places, as when Christ is called "God manifest in the flesh." 1 Tim. iii. 16. when the *Word, who was God*, is said to be *made flesh*; John i. 1, 14. He who was "of the seed of David after the flesh, is over-all God blessed for ever." Rom. ix. 5. "In him dwells all the fulness of the godhead bodily;" Col. ii. 9. These scriptures have been sufficiently explained, and this proposition confirmed so far, that I shall not employ myself any further in it here.

VIII. "The complete person of our Lord Jesus Christ, or God-man, is a proper and appointed object of the christain-worship."

Though the divinity of Christ is the sole foundation of these honours, yet when this divinity has put on human nature, and received it into a personal union with itself, in order to become a proper mediator between God the Father and mankind, then the whole person God-man may receive the worship, and stant-

\* Some may complain that I speak without caution here in calling the man Jesus a part of the complex person of our Mediator, because the Godhead of Christ is usually described as a complete person, and the human nature of man is reckoned only an adjunct or appendix to the second person in the Trinity. I do not attempt here to refute this correction, nor will I insist upon the use of the word "part," if the word "adjunct" or "appendix" will better serve the various designs of this doctrine. Yet it may not be amiss to cite Mr. Baxter on this occasion, in his "Paraphrase on Col. i. 16, 17." "The orthodox hold that Christ hath only two natures in one person, the divine and human. And of these the subtle philosophers say, that his human nature is no part of his person, but an adjunct, because God cannot be a part. But others avoid this as dangerous." Thus you see in Mr. Baxter's opinion, some of the orthodox think it dangerous to deny the human nature of Christ, to be a part of his person. And Turretine confesses it to be a part of the person of the Mediator, though it is but an adjunct of the "Logos" or Word, or second Person of the Trinity. "Institutionis Theologiae loci xiii. questionis sexagæ, et septimæ." And after all, I think, this dispute would be a mere logomachy.

entitled to the religious honour. I am so far from being singular in this sentiment, that it might be easily shewn to be the opinion of a great part of our protestant writers. The name of Turretine is well known in the learned world : In his "Institutions of Theology," Place xiv. question 18. section 10. he determines "the human nature of Christ to be the inseparable adjunct of the divine nature in the matter of adoration, and that it is adored together with the Word. And in section 12. he allows the whole Mediator or God-man to be adored, though the human nature be not the formal and terminative object of worship. Section 14. Adoration does not more confound the two natures of Christ, and the honour due to them, than faith does ; for as it regards Christ, both God and man, distinctly in one person, so it attributes to him according to both natures that which belongs to him. Section 15. Though the human nature or flesh of Christ is not adored by itself, or for itself, yet it is truly said to be adored in the Word, with whom it is personally united. And in section 11. Though it is the Deity alone that makes the person of God-man adorable, yet Christ as Mediator must be adored, and various motives to worship him are drawn from his mediation."

Dr. Owen is of the same mind. See his "Treatise of the Person of Christ," page 152. "His divine nature is the proper formal object of our faith, but the entire person as God and man is the immediate object of it. We believe in him because he is God ; but we believe in him as he is God and man in one person. All of Christ is considered and glorified in this acting of faith on him, and the benefits of his mediation are the special motives thereunto. Page 322. The human nature of Christ in his divine person, and together with it, is the object of all divine adoration and worship. Rev. v. 13. All creatures whatever do for ever ascribe *blessing, honour, glory, and power unto the Lamb*, in the same manner as *unto him who sits upon the throne*. But no other creature either is, or ever can be exalted into such a condition of glory, as to be the object of any divine worship. I must confess there are some few writers that imagine it is the pure godhead of Christ alone is the single object of worship ; and they are afraid to allow the united human nature to be considered as a part of the complex person worshipped, lest worship should seem to be given to any thing that is not God. I must own, that in treating matters so sublime we ought to be well upon our guard, lest while we would pay just honour to the man Jesus, we should take away some of the just prerogatives of his godhead : But on the other hand, we must learn what worship we ought to pay to Christ from the scripture itself, since it is a matter of pure revelation ; and I should not readily allow the man Jesus to be taken into the complex object of wor-

ship, if the scripture itself did not seem to lead me to it, by the following considerations :

I. The worship of the complex person of our Lord Jesus Christ is represented as an appointed worship, and that\* partly as a honour bestowed upon him by the Father, by way of recompence for his sufferings ; Phil. ii. 9. *Therefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.* Now the pure godhead of Christ never did or could suffer ; that is and always was worthy of our religious worship, had it never assumed human nature, had Christ never been obedient to the death, and never redeemed us. But the human nature may become part of the complex object of worship, by the appointment and gift of the Father, partly upon the account of its sufferings. The man was first united to godhead with this very view and design that he should suffer and die ; and as his union to godhead renders him capable of religious honour, so his sufferings and death may be appointed in the counsels of God to lead the way to his actual enjoyment of it, or to some higher degrees of it.

II. It is the Mediator Christ Jesus who is worshipped under his character as Mediator. Now this office or character includes his human nature as well as his divine : Nay, it has a peculiar respect to his human nature, as St. Paul tells Timothy, *for there is one God and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus ;* 1 Tim. ii. 5. The honour is paid to the *Lamb that was slain in the midst of the throne* ; and the heavenly spirits worship him because he has fulfilled the office of a Mediator, and *redeemed them to God with his blood* ; Rev. v. 9. *The man Jesus is appointed the Judge of the world* ; Acts xvii. 31. and *all men are therefore obliged to honour him as they honour the Father, because he is the Son of man* ; that is, the Messiah, with a connotation of his manhood ; John v. 23, 27. It is as Mediator we are to believe or trust in him, and to call upon him : It is as God-man and Mediator, that dying Stephen committed his soul to him, for he saw him with his eyes. Christ requires us to believe on him as the means, or method of obtaining salvation : Now it is not his pure godhead, but the person God-man who has purchased salvation, and who is exalted to bestow it, and therefore we must trust in this person, and call upon him under this character as God-man.

III. The very actions and sufferings of his human nature

\* I use the word "partly" to shew, that the man Jesus in union with godhead, might be appointed to be adored at his incarnation or before, and yet he might have a further claim to it given him upon his death and resurrection, and thus it may be said, "Therefore God hath highly exalted him ;" Phil. ii. 9—11. even as Jesus was beloved of God always, and yet he himself says, "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life and take it again ;" John x. 17.

re chiefly mentioned in some of those places where honour and worship are not only appointed to him by the Father, but actually given him by the saints. When the apostle had described him as "man, the Son of man, or the second Adam;" Heb. ii. 9. adds, *We see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour;* and accordingly this honour and this glory which he obtained by death is paid in heaven, and ought to be paid him on earth. Heaven is full of this worship, and it is represented as given to the Lamb by the whole creation; Rev. v. 13. and particularly to the saints, and sometimes by angels, verses 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive honour and power;* Rev. v. 13. *To him that has loved us, and washed us—in his blood, be glory and dominion for ever;* Rev. i. 5,

*Because he was obedient to the death of the cross, therefore the Father has appointed that every knee shall bow to him;"* Rev. vii. 8, 9, 10. Now if these three considerations are put together, they seem to give a sufficient confirmation of the sentiments of those two great men, Doctor Owen and Professor Arretine in this point, viz. That the whole complex person Christ both God and man, is the true object of our worship.

Objection. "But how can it be that the divine nature or godhead can be the only foundation of worship, and yet Jesus Christ be worshipped as a complex person God and man? Is it an allowance of religious worship to be given to a creature as well as to God?"

Answer. It is the complete person who is the proper object of worship; the man could never be worshipped, if he were not also God. But when godhead assumes a creature into so near an union as to make one person with itself, the religious honour may be paid to the whole person, without allowing religious honour to be paid to any mere creature\*. This may be explained by an example or two, whereby we may learn that that belongs not to any single nature in itself, may come to belong to it in union with another nature. We may borrow one example from scripture; 1 John i. 1, 2, 3. "The word of God, the eternal life which was with the Father, is said to be seen, and heard and handled." Now if we take this "logos" or word in any sense whatsoever, it certainly signifies a most exalted spiritual being, and in itself it is not capable of being seen, being heard, being handled: so a mere creature, considered in itself, is not capable of religious worship. But when this "logos" is

\* When I speak in any of my writings of worshipping that which is not God, and call it idolatry, I desire to be understood in this sense, viz. worshipping that which has not true godhead belonging to it, at least as a part of the compounded thing or person. For though the human nature of Christ is not true God, yet it is worshipped, not in and by itself, but in and with the divine, and as a part of a complex nature of the Mediator.



united to flesh and blood, then it makes one complex person and thus it is seen, it is heard, it is handled : So the man Jesus being united to godhead makes one complex person, and thus receives its share of honour in the worship paid to the person of Christ. Yet still the foundation of religious worship lies only in the godhead, to which the man Jesus is united, even as the foundation of corporeal attributes, seeing, hearing, handling, lies only in flesh and blood ; to which the "logos" or divine Word is united.

But there is another example or similitude which perhaps comes nearer to the subject, and, I think, makes it evident beyond exception, how the divinity of Christ may be the foundation of religious worship, and yet the man Jesus may be assumed into a kind of partnership. Let us survey and compare it in these several successive views : 1. Suppose a human spirit in the world of separate spirits, had some intellectual excellencies above its fellow-spirits, it might receive human honours upon this account : So was the godhead of Jesus Christ supreme in the invisible world, and received religious honours. 2. Suppose this excellent human spirit assumed a beautiful and graceful body into union with itself, then this whole human person might not only receive human honours upon the account of its intellectual excellencies, but it might receive addresses of human honour because of its beauty and graceful figure or motion : So the godhead of Christ having assumed the man Jesus into union with itself, this whole person might not only receive religious honours upon the account of its divine perfections, but also on account of the characters, graces, obedience, and sufferings of the man Jesus. Such honours are frequently paid to Christ in scripture. And yet further, as some of the particular forms of address made to this supposed whole human person, may be derived from some special properties, or graceful motions of the body, so some of the particular forms of address made to the whole person of Christ, are derived from the actions and sufferings of his manhood. The scriptural examples of worship paid to Christ manifest this. 3. The gestures of human honour, such as bowing the head or the knee, together with the acclamations or songs of human praise which are paid to this supposed human person may be seen and heard with agreeable sensations by the human body as an animal, as well as noticed and accepted by the human spirit united to it : So the religious honours which are paid to Christ may be seen and heard, or known and observed by the man Jesus with special satisfaction, as well as they are noticed and accepted by the indwelling godhead united to him. 4. Yet the beautiful and graceful body considered apart from the human soul, is not capable of human honours, even as the man Jesus apart from the deity is not capable, according to scripture,

religious honours. 5. Therefore the whole foundation of human honours paid to this united soul and body, this complex human person, lies in the intelligent nature, or the soul : So the whole foundation of religious honours paid, or payable, to this united God and man, this complex person of Christ, lies in the divine nature or godhead, though some special reasons, motives, and forms of address may be borrowed from this human nature.

I know there may be a great deal of metaphysical controversy raised to perplex this, or any other representation of things : But if we will attend to this illustration, I think it sets the whole matter of the worship of Jesus Christ, God-man, in a fair and easy light ; and yet at the same time maintains the foundation of religious worship payable to Christ to be laid in his divine nature. Now, if we consider the worship of Christ as God-man and Mediator in this manner of representation, it gives a natural and easy solution to many difficulties that have been proposed. Particularly that objection derived from John v. 22, 23. *The Father has committed all judgment to the Son, that all men might honour the Son, as they honour the Father.* Here some have said, " It were a most absurd interpretation, that the Father has committed all judgment to my human nature, that men might honour my divine nature ; for the divine nature receives nothing hereby, and is adorable on a much higher reason, without it. Certainly the same subject is intended to be honoured, which is invested with authority from God, viz. the Son of man.

Answer. This is granted, that it is the same subject receives authority and receives honour ; and it is no absurd interpretation to say, the Father has committed all judgment to my human nature being united to the divine, which union makes me capable of this office, that men might honour my human nature in union with the divine, which union renders the whole complex person capable of this honour or adoration. Though this objection might also be answered another way, as Dr. Waterland, *Defence II. Query 16. page 381. Christ is not worshipped because God committed judgment to him, but God committed it to him for this purpose, that men might know the divinity of his person, and thereupon worship him.* But in this solution of the difficulty, both the office and the worship seem to be attributed alone to the divine nature of Christ, and therefore I rather chuse the former solution.

A further enquiry will arise here, " Whether the human nature of Christ shares in the divine honours that are paid to his person."

Answer. Divine honour or worship may signify, either honour paid to a divine person, or else an acknowledgment of divine perfections. In the first sense the human nature may share in divine worship, in the second it cannot so properly. But.

To answer this more particularly, let us remember that the religious honours which are paid to the person of Christ, may be considered either as the ascription of divine perfections and operations to him, or as the ascription of human graces, perfections, kindnesses, operations, or sufferings, or as the ascription of mediatorial offices, operations and benefits, which are the result of both divine and human natures.

Now I grant the human nature distinctly considered, cannot directly share in the ascriptions of divine perfections, though it may receive sensible pleasure in seeing divine honours paid to the godhead. But the human nature considered as a part of the complex person of Christ, may receive its share of the ascription both of human and mediatorial characters and operations to this complex person, and derive a sensible satisfaction thence. For as we cannot suppose, that the human nature of Christ in this exalted state can be utterly ignorant of the knees that bow to his person, and the tongues confessing that he is Lord; so the man Jesus cannot chuse but have a sacred relish and complacency in these honours as a reward of his sufferings, always referring them to the final glory of the divine nature. If Jesus Christ be worshipped as the Lamb that was slain, and his human nature takes cognizance of these addresses, it cannot but receive its own share of satisfaction from this knowledge.

If this proposition want further illustration, let us try if the following supposition will do it. Suppose God himself were clothed with a robe of light which had intelligence or consciousness in it; suppose in our addresses to God thus arrayed with light, we should be required to make honourable mention of that vesture of glory which surrounded him; might not this intellectual glory be said to receive honour or worship from us, as considered in union with the indwelling deity? And might it not take cognizance of this honour with delight and just approbation? Yet this intellectual glory, this conscious light, would by no means be a proper object of any such honours in itself, but merely by virtue of the indwelling God: And every degree of honour or satisfaction which it received would redound to the glory of God himself who dwelt in the midst of it. Thus God dwelling in the manhood of Christ, as in a vesture or tabernacle is worshipped by men; and some of the addresses he receives are paid to him expressly as incarnate, and thus the manhood is conscious of, and receives its own appointed share of the honour. But these thoughts lead me on to the next proposition.

IX. "Since the design of the union of God and man in one person, was to render Christ a fit Mediator, therefore the worship that is paid may be considered either as ultimate, or as mediatorial, and it may in some sense be called either supreme or subordinate."

Religious worship may be considered with relation to its foundation, which renders the object capable of it, and in this sense it may be always called supreme, for no person who has not true and proper godhead can demand religious worship. But when worship is considered with relation to its end or design, or has a peculiar respect to the character of Christ as Mediator, then it may sometimes be called mediatorial or subordinate, for when Christ is worshipped in his mediatorial capacity, the design is, that he may fulfil some mediatory office for us, in order to bring us to God and heaven, or it is to give him thanks that he has done it.

Again, if the worship of Christ be considered with regard to the forms or modes of address, it may, perhaps, be called either ultimate and supreme, or mediatorial and subordinate. It was supreme and ultimate when he was worshipped in his appearances to the patriarchs as God Almighty ; it is the same when we pay him the honour of divine perfections residing in him, even the same divine perfections which are in the Father, and say, *glory be to thy name, O Jesus, who art over all God blessed for ever.* But it may be called mediatorial and subordinate when we trust in him, or entreat him to bring us near to God, when we call upon his name to bestow on us the grace and gifts he has received of the Father for us, or when we ascribe *honour to him who has washed us in his blood,* and reconciled us to God.

Christ considered explicitly as the second person of the Trinity, or considered as God incarnate, perhaps has not always such honours paid to him in scripture as are supreme and ultimate in the highest and divinest sense. But this is not for want of dignity or deity in his complete person, but because Christ, the second person, or incarnate, is rather represented as a Mediator in the New Testament : And according to the economy of the gospel, the forms of worship paid to him under this character, are rather mediatorial and subordinate : Whereas the forms of ultimate and supreme worship are generally appropriated to God in the person of the Father, as sustaining in that economy the dignity and state of godhead.

I confess, that in my book *of the Trinity* I have followed some great writers, and allowed no different sorts or degrees of religious worship mentioned in scripture, nor any scriptural difference between supreme and subordinate religious worship. In so sublime and so difficult a subject we are too ready to follow the phrases and language of great writers without a due examination : I beg leave here to correct these expressions, and to explain myself according to the distinction which I have now proposed. I know of no subordinate worship in scripture with regard to the foundation of it, or that which renders the object capable of religious worship ; this is the sense in which I meant all worship is

supreme, that is, it admits no person to be the object of it who is not God ; but there may be mediate or subordinate forms of worship paid to him that is true God, when in union with an inferior nature he condescends to take upon him the form or character of a Mediator.

All the expressions of scripture which represent our *coming to the Father by Jesus Christ, or praying to the Father in his name, or giving thanks to God in the name of Jesus Christ, and offering the sacrifice of praise by him, that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ.* This language seems to signify mediate and subordinate worship, that is, religious honour paid to Jesus Christ as Mediator, in order to make us and our services acceptable to God the Father. And when the man Christ Jesus is said to be exalted, that *at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue confess, that Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father,* it seems to imply this mediate or subordinate worship, that is, as to the special purpose and design of it, though at the same time this very man Christ Jesus is united to the divine nature, and by that means rendered capable of being worshipped as part of the complex person God-man. There are two or three senses in which it may be said that Christ Jesus is worshipped to the glory of the Father.

I. As God the Father, or the godhead subsisting in the person and character of the Father, sustains the dignity of supreme God and sovereign Lord and Governor in the economical kingdom, as he maintains the rights and majesty of the divine nature, and transacts all its affairs through his Son Jesus Christ as a divine medium ; in this sense, though the divine nature to which the man Jesus Christ is united be the same with that in the Father, yet as it subsists in the person and character of the Father, it assumes supremacy, and all things are done to its glory ; and all that the man Jesus does, or enjoys, is to the glory of the Father, though the same united godhead capacitates him for these actions, honours, or enjoyments.

II. When Christ is worshipped, it is to the glory of the Father, because it is God the Father has appointed this union of the man Jesus to the divine nature, whereby as a part of the complex person of the Mediator he is made the object of religious worship. And,

III. As our addresses to Jesus Christ as Mediator, or God-man, are performed by us with this design, that we may glorify the person of God the Father, or the divine nature in the character of supreme majesty and godhead.

Now that all this may be done without injury to the sacred doctrine of God alone being the proper or fundamental object of worship, I shall attempt to explain by this similitude. Suppose

the usual and peculiar honour paid to Roman emperors were prostration ; suppose the emperor Constantine and his Son possessed a complete equal share in the empire, and suppose Caius a common soldier had offended Constantine the father ; then his son puts on the garments of a common soldier, makes a visit to Caius in the army, and promises him to become a Mediator with his Father to reconcile him to the offending soldier Caius. Upon this view Caius falls prostrate, and pays the son imperial honours, and intreats him to fulfil this work of mediation, or gives him thanks for what he has done in it : He also addresses Constantine the father with prostration, or imperial honours, but comes in the name of his son, and for his sake is admitted into favour. The son here receives imperial honour because he is still emperor, which is the foundation of it ; yet the honour is but mediatorial and subordinate, because the design of it is to draw near to the Father by the Son. Constantine the father always receives imperial honours from Caius, which are ultimate and supreme, for he sustains the dignity and majesty of empire. The Son, though equal in the empire, yet receives mediate honours, because he condescends to be a Mediator : And yet the manner in which Caius pays these mediate honours, viz. prostration, is supreme and imperial, or shews the son to be an emperor too.

Thus the divine nature, as subsisting in God the Father, receives only supreme and ultimate honour from us sinners : But God, as vested with human nature, or the man Jesus united to godhead, receives mediatory honours, because the design of our address to him is to reconcile us to God the Father : Yet these mediatory honours are divine, and paid to him in a religious manner, so as at the same time to acknowledge his communion in the divine nature, and his oneness with God the Father. The person of Christ is partaker of religious and divine honours, supreme, if you consider the foundation of them, but mediate or subordinate, if you consider the design of them.

I am very unwilling, in writing on this sacred subject of divine worship, to oppose so great and excellent a defender of the divinity of Christ as Doctor Waterland. He utterly denies, indeed, all mediate or subordinate worship, yet let it be noted that he allows Christ to be worshipped under the character and office of Mediator ; but since as Mediator he is God as well as man, he maintains it is divine worship is paid him under all his offices. *He is a divine Mediator, a divine Priest, a divine Prophet, a divine King ; and so our worship of him never wants its proper object, never moves from its proper foundation, but remains constantly the same. Our worship of Christ as a Mediator does not hinder us from considering him as God at the same time, any more than our considering the Father as King, Judge,*

*Preserver, or Rewarder, hinders us from considering him also as divine.* I perfectly agree to these sentiments. All the worship that is paid to Christ may be called divine, because the complex object of it has a divine nature, yet I think it cannot always so properly be called supreme and ultimate; because some of the addresses which are made to him who is God, particularly refer to what he has done, and to what he does, as man and Mediator, which is a subordinate and not a supreme character. Nor can I see any inconvenience in calling this worship mediatorial or subordinate, especially since the New Testament seems to give the most frequent precepts and patterns of that worship which is due to Christ in his mediatorial character rather than in his pure godhead.

I think we may maintain the deity of Christ, and the necessity of his deity to render him adorable, without denying that mediatorial worship which seems to be the most natural and obvious meaning of several scriptures. And even in the esteem of our opponents, it adds honour and justice to an argument against themselves, when we allow what may fairly be allowed, and do not strain the scripture from its most obvious meaning, in order to disallow and deny every thing which our opponents have some colour to assert.

Objection. There is no worship of God the supreme being, according to the gospel, but what must be offered through Christ as a Mediator. *No man comes to the Father but by me; John xiv. 6.* Now if Christ be worshipped with divine worship as God supreme, who can be the mediator? So that when I worship him with divine worship as God, I must worship him without a mediator, which is not according to the gospel. This objection may be answered two ways, viz. By considering Christ the Mediator in his human nature, or in his divine.

Answer I. If we consider Christ in his human nature, he is an all-sufficient Mediator to bring sinners into the favour of God, because he has done and suffered every thing that is necessary to procure peace; and he is united to the divine nature, whence all his mediatorial actions and capacities receive their efficacy.—The man Jesus Christ is a *Mediator between God and man*; as the scripture expresses it; 1 Tim. ii. 5. and he may be addressed with religious worship, because he is united to God, or he is one with God: And yet he may be thus addressed without another mediator, for nothing in the gospel forbids a sinner to worship God-man, or a man united to God, without any medium. Or,

II. If we consider Christ the Mediator in his divine nature, we may address him with divine and mediatorial worship without any other medium; for in the character of mediator, and as he is united to man, he is not that supreme offended majesty of

heaven, which refuses access to sinners without a mediator. It is God in the person of the Father who sustains the supreme dignity and majesty of godhead, or the character of supreme governor ; and it is in his person that the Deity is dishonoured by the sins of men ; therefore he is not to be approached under the gospel by offending sinners without a mediator : And the word Father is put with great propriety and emphasis into that text ; John xiv. 6. *No man comes to the Father but by me.* But the same God in the person of the Son or Mediator, dwelling in the human nature of his Son Jesus, may be worshipped without a mediator ; for in this view the godhead does as it were put off the character of supreme governor, by assuming human nature, by condescending to accept the work of reconciliation, and to sustain the office of a mediator.

The foregoing similitude will serve to illustrate this. The son of Constantine is emperor as well as the father, and is offended as well as the father, because the soldier Caius had broken the laws of the empire ; and therefore the son will not admit Caius the offender to approach him, or come into his presence, when he is sitting on the imperial throne, assuming the character of emperor : But when he has put on the garments of a common soldier, that he may become a mediator, he gives Caius the offender leave to address him as a mediator, and thus reconciles him to the offended emperor, to Constantine his father.

Lest there should be any exception taken against this similitude, because Constantine and his son are two distinct beings, whereas the godhead of the Father, and the godhead of the Son is the same, I might represent the matter thus : Suppose there were but one single emperor of Rome, and call him Augustus Cæsar, he may refuse to admit an offender into his presence, without a mediator, while he sits on the imperial throne, dressed in robes imperial ; and yet Augustus Cæsar himself may put on meaner raiment, may visit the offender in his own dwelling, and permit him to converse with himself though he be emperor, under the inferior character of a friend, that would willingly reconcile the offender to himself as emperor : Thus God in Christ is reconciling the world to himself. God in Christ may visit us offending sinners in our own dwelling on earth ; he may permit us to address and worship him without any other mediator, though God in the person of the Father, and as supreme governor, would not suffer it.

There does not seem any thing in all this, either unscriptural, or contrary to common reason ; nor has it any thing in it so disagreeable to human ideas and customs, but it might lead us into a clear and intelligible conception of these divine mysteries, if we could but suffer ourselves to receive such an explication of difficulties in divine matters, as may be borrowed from human



affairs. And surely it is in such sort of human language that God in his word reveals to us the mysteries of salvation ; and our blessed Saviour in this manner, by parables drawn from earthly things, represents to us things heavenly.

#### CONCLUSION.

I shall conclude this discourse with a short recapitulation of it under the following queries, and a remark or two on the common sense of the Arians and the Trinitarians about the worship of Christ.

Query I. Is it not the constant custom, both of scriptural and heathen writers, to give the name of God to every thing that is made the object of religious worship, whether it be superior or inferior, whether it be one or many?—II. Is it not expressly forbidden in the first command to have any other god or gods, besides Jehovah the God of Israel, that is, to receive or admit any other object of religious worship?—III. Does not this command seem to be of everlasting continuance, by the repetition and establishment of it under the New Testament, as well as by the peculiar and repeated solemnities of its sanction under the Old?—IV. Is not our blessed Saviour called God several times in the New Testament, and is he not also represented as a proper object of worship, both in precept and example?—V. Does it not therefore appear a most natural consequence, that he is the true God? Or that Jesus Christ has such an union and communion with Jehovah the God of Israel, as to be called by the same names in their sublime sense, and to receive religious worship accordingly?—VI. Are there not some expressions in the New Testament, where Christ seems to be exalted and advanced to receive religious worship, as a gift from God the Father, and sometimes as a reward of the sufferings of his human nature?—VII. Does not his human nature itself, according to the language of scripture, seem to be the more immediate object of this exaltation and reward, and to be admitted so far into a share of these honours as it is capable of receiving them?—VIII. May not this difficulty be solved, by supposing the man Jesus, by his most intimate union to, or oneness with Jehovah, or the God of Israel, to become one person with him, and thereby become a part of the object of religious worship, from which all other creatures are for ever excluded, because they have not this privilege of personal union with the divine nature?

#### THE REMARKS ARE THESE.

The doctrine of religious worship paid to the man Jesus, is acknowledged by the Arians, and accounted for by the appellant, by supposing him to be exalted by the appointment of God the Father to this honour, though in truth he be only a creature or a

being inferior to the true God ; and by supposing the first commandment to be so far repealed under the New Testament, as to admit of another object of worship, that is, another god besides the supreme God, the God of Israel. But this seems to be cutting the knot instead of untying it, and breaking through the great doctrines of the deity of Christ, and the perpetuity of the first command. On the other hand, the man Jesus is excluded from all share whatsoever in religious honour or worship by some few Trinitarian writers and they determine those texts, wherein Christ is represented as exalted by the Father to this honour, to belong only to his divine nature considered as clothed with flesh and blood, and they explain them these two ways :

I. By supposing the divine nature in the person of Christ to be economically, though not really, inferior to the divine nature in the person of the Father, for he sustained the character of God's servant, angel, messenger, &c. and that God the Father has given the divine nature of Christ an economical exaltation, or right to religious worship, both as dwelling in flesh, and as now publicly vested with regal authority, though it had really this right to divine worship before.

II. Since the deity of the Messiah was not distinctly known to former ages, they suppose that after the sufferings and death of Christ, the Father has more clearly published his deity to the world, and has declared him to be one God with himself, and the proper object of worship. Thus God the Father's publication of the deity of Christ, as adorable, and of its peculiar additional claim to our worship, since the sufferings of his human nature, is called, the exaltation of him to this worship on the account of those sufferings ; as there are other things also said to be done in scripture language when they are only manifested.

These are the justest and fairest representations which I know of the common solution of this difficulty ; and so far as the exaltation of Christ in those texts can relate to his divine nature, I concur with these sentiments. And indeed I should have acquiesced herein entirely, and sought no farther, if I had not found some expressions of scripture which seem to carry with them in their plain literal sense, an exaltation of the man Jesus to some peculiar religious honours. This inclined me to attempt a solution of this difficulty in a little different manner. Nor am I alone herein, for there are several great divines in this same sentiment, viz. That the *human nature of Christ is a proper part of the person of the Mediator, and as such is joined with the divine nature in the religious worship and honours which are paid to Christ as god-man* ; So Dr. Owen, Turretine, &c. as I have cited them under Proposition VIII. But if it be found plainly inconsistent either with the deity of Christ, or with the first commandment, I still think it better to relinquish this at-

tempt, and betake myself to the common explication of these difficult texts, rather than renounce the deity of Christ, or the perpetuity of the first command, which seem to be established upon so numerous and so evident proofs of scripture.

Yet after all, if these two different propositions are plainly revealed in scripture, viz. That religious worship belongs to God alone; and that the man Jesus as personally united to the godhead, is exalted to some kind of partnership in this honour, I would chuse to believe them both, since I do not see any evident contradiction in them, though perhaps I may not have hit upon the best way of reconciling them. It is a general and excellent rule, that where two propositions are evidently true, we are not to reject either of them, because we cannot at present find the modus or manner how they are reconciled: I would be ever mindful of the weakness and narrowness of our understandings, and confess that there are some mysterious and sublime doctrines in the word of God, for whose farther explication we must wait till the *pouring down of the blessed Spirit from on high, when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea; when the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun as the light of seven days.*

In the mean time, if we yield our assent to what God has plainly revealed, and fulfil the practical parts of religion which God has plainly enjoined, we have no reason to doubt of our acceptance unto eternal life, and our safe removal and advancement to the upper blessed world. There we shall see the Redeemer face to face, and have the mysterious glories of his sacred person revealed to us, that we may pay him such celestial honours as are required of all the worshippers in those holy and happy regions. And when we shall join together in that joyful song, *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive glory and blessing, for he has washed us from our sins in his own blood, and redeemed us unto God,* we shall then be fully apprized of the nature of that worship which we pay to our Redeemer; and we shall no more dispute how far the man Jesus is admitted to a participation of these honours, who in union with the divine nature, *is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.*

## THE SECOND PART.

---

### PREFACE TO "DISSERTATIONS RELATING TO THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY."

**I**T is not a matter of light or trivial concern to write upon the sacred article of the Trinity. Many of the glories of our holy religion are derived from it, and so much of this doctrine as is necessary to the safety of our souls, is revealed with bright evidence in the word of God. The various and particular modes of explaining it can by no means be esteemed of equal importance with the doctrine itself: For men of wisdom and learning, and exemplary piety, have fallen into different sentiments in this attempt: And there will always be room for further enquiry, while we abide in this feeble and imperfect state. Here, in this world, we see but a glimpse of many of the deep things of God, and they are discovered to us but *darkly as in a glass*. Yet we are encouraged by a prophet; Hosea vi. 3. *to follow on to know the Lord*; and are required by an apostle 2 Pet. iii. 18. *to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of Jesus Christ*. A diligent christian would seek daily to arrive at some clearer ideas of the great God, whom he adores, and the Redeemer, with whom he has entrusted all his immortal concerns; especially, when we have just reason to believe, that there is much sacred truth which lies yet concealed in the mines of scripture, in the search whereof we may happily employ our labour and meditation: and since we have also ground to hope for the promised assistance of the blessed Spirit of God, who is appointed to guide his people into all truth, and to glorify our Saviour, by *taking of the things of Christ, and manifesting them to us*; John xvi. 14.

And as we are encouraged by scripture to seek a further acquaintance with the mysteries of the gospel, so we are sometimes constrained to it by the importunate objections of our opponents. There are, and have been, many writers, who will not allow it to be possible in any manner whatsoever, that true godhead should belong to each of the blessed Three. It seems proper therefore, for some persons to endeavour to make it appear, that there is a possibility in the reason and nature of things, for true and eternal deity to be attributed to the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit, without danger of those absurdities and inconsistencies which are pretended to arise thence. And though the modus, or peculiar manner of explaining this difficulty, be not necessary for every christian to understand in order to his own salvation, yet the providence of God may sometimes make it necessary for those who are set for the defence of the faith, to explain and vindicate this great point, as far as the holy scripture furnishes us with any traces of divine light, and the powers of reason, under the conduct of scripture, can afford us any assistance. And to encourage our search we may reasonably hope, there are several things in the gospel which are not surrounded with such impenetrable shades and darkness, as the writings of men have sometimes represented them.

When I wrote that little treatise, intitled, the *Christian Doctrine of the Trinity*, my design then was, only to give a plain and general account of what representations the scripture made of the sacred Three. And as my chief purpose in that book was to exhibit this doctrine to private christians in an easy view; so I declared in the title, that I had endeavoured to do this without the aid or incumbrance of any of those human schemes of explication, which had been contrived to solve the difficulties attending that doctrine. Yet it was no part of my intent utterly to renounce and abandon all those schemes, and methods of explication, which pious and learned men had already given us, or which might hereafter be found out to relieve these diffi-

culties. For though it might be possible, in some measure, to avoid the mixture of human schemes, when the only purpose of the writer is to lay down the doctrine of the scripture for the use of private christians, yet when an ingenious and learned author shall raise a variety of objections to obscure, refute, and confound that which I call the scriptural doctrine itself, perhaps it is impossible to give a tolerable answer to those objections without entering into some particular scheme of explication, and showing in what manner the sacred Three may be one God, and thereby declaring in what manner those objections may be solved, and the difficulties removed.

Though I was not a stranger to the various human explications, when I wrote that treatise, yet I confess with freedom, I was not at that time engaged in any one particular scheme. I thought the general doctrine of scripture was plain and evident, but as to the modus of it I was much in doubt: And upon that account I must acknowledge this benefit which I have received from the author of the "Sober appeal to a Turk or an Indian," which was written in answer to my book\*, viz. That by the arguments which he uses, he has almost precluded in my opinion some of those schemes of explication, and inclined my thoughts towards one particular mode of accounting for this difficult doctrine, which I have in a great measure exhibited in the following discourses.

Such as know little of these disputes, and have never ventured to read any thing but the writers of their own side, generally imagine that all things in their own particular scheme are clear as the light; and they are too ready to impute all the doubts or difficulties that are raised on these subjects to the want of a due regard to truth. They believe their own particular mode of explaining this great article with as firm a faith, and make it as sacred and divine as the article itself; and they suppose that their whole scheme is supported by all those scriptures which are made use of to prove the deity of the Son or Spirit. So unhappily has the christian world been taught to mingle human schemes with divine truths. And I cannot but take notice here, if a man has never so sincere a design to vindicate the same great doctrines which are professed and maintained by his brethren, yet if he happen to step aside from the common track of human phrases, and especially if he give an exposition of some important scriptures different from their sentiments and the established interpretation, he runs the risque of having heresy cast on himself and his writings, even while he labours by reasoning, and clear ideas, to defend those very propositions which they themselves believe.

I know it is a very difficult and hazardous undertaking, for a man to attempt to give a rational account of these mysterious parts of our religion, though he endeavour humbly to follow the track of scripture light; and there is much danger in it upon this account as well as others, viz. That what scheme of explication soever he follows, there are some hard names of modern or ancient error which lie ready to be discharged upon him. If he explain the Trinity according to the ancient Athanasians, with Bishop Pearson, Bishop Bull, and Mr. Howe, he is censured perhaps as a downright Tritheist. If he follow the scholastic scheme, which has been professed by most of the reformed churches, and which has been commonly called modern orthodoxy, he incurs the charge of Sabellianism. If he dare propose the doctrine of the pre-existent soul of Christ, and follow Bishop Fowler, Mr. Fleming, and others, he is accused of favouring the Arian and Nestorian errors, even though all this time he strongly maintains the proper deity of Christ, and a sufficient personality in the sacred Three to support their distinct characters and offices. It is hardly possible that the nicest care should exempt a man from these inconveniences: But I hope none of these things shall ever

\* Why I have not in these present dissertations proceeded farther in a reply to that writer, I have given an account at the close of the seventh dissertation.

discourage me from the sincere pursuit of truth, nor provoke me to lay aside the exercise of christian candour and charity.

I think the doctrine of the proper deity of the Son and Spirit is supported by some convincing arguments drawn from the word of God, though the manner of explication is attended with much difficulty. Surely those who have well known the Arian and Socinian controversies, and have given themselves leave to be acquainted with the force of argument on all sides, must acknowledge that it would be an invaluable happiness to the christian world, if any hypothesis of explaining the Trinity were current among us, which might have clear and distinct ideas affixed to it, that we might not be perpetually running to this refuge, "it is all mysterious and inconceivable, and therefore we must not search into it." I should be very glad, if a man might be permitted to imitate the blessed work of angels; 1 Pet. i. 12. and might *dare to look* into the glorious things of Christ, without being suspected of a profane curiosity, or a violation of the faith. It is my opinion, that a fair, easy and intelligible scheme of the Trinitarian doctrine, agreeable to holy scripture, would be the noblest and the securest guard against the Arian and Socinian errors, for then there would be no pretence to deny it.

A late anonymous writer on the "Doctrine of the Trinity" assures us, that "there is a number of men who are prejudiced against, and do reject this weighty article, and many reject christianity in general on its account, because they are persuaded it is expressly impossible, or contradictory, and inconsistent with reason. Many men labour under so strong a prepossession that this mystery is impossible, that till they be cured of this prejudice, by a sensible demonstration of the possibility of that abstruse doctrine, in some sense manifestly consistent with reason as well as scripture, no other arguments can have any effect with them, or be duly weighed by them."

This is one reason why I ventured into these enquiries: and if this great article could be well adjusted and represented in such distinct ideas as would remove all appearance of inconsistency, it would also better support protestant writers in their triumph over the inconsistent doctrines of popery, and particularly that of transubstantiation, without any fear of a retortion of the same charge upon ourselves. I know the papists retort this charge without reason or justice; but it must be confessed also, that it would be a happiness if we could cut off all shadows or pretences of occasion from those who seek this occasion against us.

Far be it from me to boast, that I have exhibited such a hypothesis here! I know there are some difficulties which attend my explication of things. All that I can say is, that I have made a humble essay toward it, and how far I have succeeded herein, must be left to the impartial judgment of those who will take the pains to read it, and honestly compare it with the word of God. As for the conviction, or silencing of all manner of opponents, I make no pretence to it. It is a very just observation of the learned Doctor Waterland, in his preface to his sermons on the *Deity of Christ*, "that in such sublime subjects as these, and in such controversies as depend on the interpretations of dead writings, the objector has much the easier part, as it is always easier to puzzle than to clear any thing; to darken and perplex than to set things in a good light; and to start difficulties than to solve them." Yet that I may not leave these dissertations utterly defenceless, I would attempt, in this place, to obviate a few exceptions that may be raised, though the reasons and foundations of them cannot be well understood till the discourses themselves have been perused.

Objection I. Perhaps it may be charged upon me, that I have not, in these dissertations, exactly confined myself, in every punctilio, to the same sentiments, which I had published some years ago, with relation to the Doctrine of the Trinity: And particularly, that though I continue to maintain the supreme deity of the Son and Spirit, yet, that I have expressed the doc-

trine of their personality in stronger, and more unlimited terms heretofore than I have done in these papers. Here let me first give one general answer and then descend to particulars: The general answer is this. When I apply myself with diligence to make further enquiries into the great doctrines of the gospel, I would never make my own former opinions the standard of truth and the rule by which to determine my future judgment. My work is always to lay the bible before me, to consult that sacred and infallible guide, and to square and adjust all my sentiments by that certain and unerring rule. It is to this supreme Judge of controversies that I pay an unreserved submission, and would derive all further light from this fountain. I thank God, that I have learned to retract my former sentiments, and change them, when upon stricter search and review, they appear less agreeable to the divine standard of faith.

Though a sentence or two from any man's former writings may be cited, perhaps, to confront his later thoughts, yet that is not sufficient to refute them. All that it will prove is this, that that man keeps his mind ever open to conviction, and that he is willing and desirous to change a darker for a clearer idea. It will only declare to the world, that he can part with a mistake for the hope of truth, that he dares confess himself a fallible creature, and that his knowledge is capable of improvement. It becomes the all-wise God, and not mortal man, to be unchangeable. It doth not belong to such poor imperfect beings, as we are, to remain for ever unmoveable in all the same opinions that we have once indulged, nor to stamp every sentiment with immortality. For a man to be obstinately tenacious of an old mistake, and incorrigibly fond of any obscure phrase or conception, because he has once admitted it, is the shame, and not the glory of human nature. The particular answers to this objection, relating to the personality of the Son and Spirit, are as follow, viz.

Answer I. My design in writing the *Christian Doctrine of the Trinity*, was to represent in the plainest manner, what appeared to be the most obvious ideas of scripture concerning the sacred Three, for the use of private christians. And as I supposed both their deity, and their personality, to be plainly exhibited in the letter of the scripture, I represent them both in that manner in that little book, without so great a solicitude about reconciling the difficulties arising thence, as may be necessary for a person who undertakes further to explain that sacred doctrine, and to vindicate it against the exceptions of learned men. I think it also proper to acknowledge, that I was at that time inclined to suppose these personal representations in scripture, especially so far as relates to the blessed Spirit, were really to be understood in the more proper and literal sense, than I now find necessary; and on that account I did then express the doctrine of three persons, or three distinct intelligent agents, in terms a little stronger, and more unlimited, than my judgment now approves. For since that time I have more carefully considered the Jewish idioms of speech, wherein powers, virtues, and properties are frequently personalized, or represented in a personal manner.

II. As it was my purpose, in that little treatise, to shew, that the scripture ascribes deity and personality, both to the Word and to the Spirit, so the business of my present dissertations, is to shew, how these two may be reconciled. Now, if personality and deity can scarce be fairly explained, and happily reconciled in a proper literal sense, I think it much more agreeable to scripture, to explain the deity ascribed to the Word and Spirit in a proper and literal sense, and to explain the personality in a figurative manner, than to construe the deity of the Word and Spirit into a mere figurative godhead, and sink their character into that of two creatures, in order to maintain their literal and proper personality.

III. I et it be further considered, that the common scholastic explication of the doctrine of the Trinity, which for some centuries hath been called or-

thodox, makes the difference between the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, to consist in mere internal relative properties. This is the term which is generally used to describe their distinct personality: Whereas the present scheme which I offer, supposes the Word and Spirit to be analogous to real distinct powers in the divine nature. Now a real distinction is something greater than that which is merely relative. I hope therefore, that those Trinitarians at least, who give their assent to the common orthodox scheme, will have no reason to charge me with making a less distinction between the divine persons than they do.

Objection II. Some persons, who pay a very great respect to the primitive christian fathers, may blame me, perhaps, for those parts of the fourth dissertation, wherein I allow so many of the inferior and diminutive expressions of those ancients concerning the "Logos," to be construed in their own proper literal sense, and apply them to the human soul of Christ in its pre-existent state.

Answer. Let it be observed in the first place that I have every where allowed the greatest, the brightest, and the strongest expressions of the ancients, concerning the true and proper godhead of our Saviour, to be construed according to their proper and genuine sublime ideas. I reverence the name and memory of Bishop Bull, and Bishop Pearson, whose excellent writings have effectually proved, that those primitive fathers did generally believe the true and eternal deity of Christ. And I pay all due honours to the learned labours of the reverend Doctor Waterland, and Doctor Knight, who have supported the same cause, and have given me an occasion to review the writers of the most early ages of christianity, whereby I have had the pleasure to find such a number of citations applied in this controversy with great justice; and it must be confessed, that they have so far exhausted this subject, that I could meet with very few expressions of importance on this theme, in those ancients which I consulted, which had not been cited in some of their writings, or the writings of their learned antagonists. I have therefore struck out many of the citations that I had made, both relating to the divinity, and to the interior nature of Christ, that I might not too largely repeat what had been done before: And would rather remit the reader to those worthy authors who have plentifully given us the various expressions of the fathers in this controversy.

I thankfully acknowledge the profit I have received from the labours of those who with so much skill and learning have defended the common faith: And heartily declare my agreement with them, that the doctrine of the godhead of Christ, was asserted and maintained by the fathers of the christian church. Yet with all due deference to their superior worth, I humbly take leave to answer the objections which the modern disbelievers of his proper godhead have derived from the fathers, in another manner, than most \* of these writers have done. Their arguments for the deity of Christ, are in my opinion, strong and conclusive; but surely it may be lawful to attempt the relief of difficulties in another way and manner, since their opponents have ever denied their solution of them to have been satisfactory. While we all agree to support the same doctrine of the deity of our blessed Lord, I think every man may be also permitted, without offence, to solve the objections that are brought against this doctrine, in such a various manner as is most suited to our different apprehensions of things; and by such a variety of solutions the doctrine itself, perhaps, may be better guarded

\* I say, most of these writers; for I know not any of them who has laid a foundation for the answer of these difficulties in the same manner as I have done, except the reverend author of the "Considerations on Mr. Whiston's Historical Preface," in his first and second letters to the author of the "History of Montanism," whose expressions on this subject, in several parts of those letters I have here cited, in proper places, with all due respect.



against assaults on every side. To conclude, I have nothing more to request of my readers, but that they would give themselves leave to peruse these dissertations with due attention, and without prejudice, or not to peruse [them at all. That they would not take offence at every inaccurate expression, and condemn the whole work for some incidental mistakes. I entreat that they would not set their invention at work, to oppose as fast as they read, lest such a temper should bar all the avenues of the soul against conviction and evidence. That must be glaring evidence indeed, and an argument of prodigious power, that forces its way into an unwilling mind ; I pretend to no such skill or demonstration.

If I have set any part of this subject in an easy light, agreeable to reason and scripture, I hope there may be some readers disposed to receive it. I entreat them to believe that it is possible for some of them to have been mistaken, as well as myself, in our former modes and scheme of explication of this great Doctrine of the Trinity, though the doctrine itself stand unshaken, and our assent to it as firm as ever. It is possible that an article which has had so many difficulties and obscurities attending it in all ages, may be a little further cleared and disentangled by labour and prayer, and the daily study of the holy scriptures. And if the blessing of God shall so far attend these feeble endeavours, as to lead any of my fellow-christians into clearer and more defensible ideas of these deep things of God, let them join with me, and give the glory to God the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ, who, according to the divine economy, instructs humble enquirers by the blessed Spirit.

But if it appear that I am mistaken in this hypothesis, I shall be very ready to receive a happier scheme of explication, wherein the doctrine of the sacred Three may be represented, both in their divine nature, and distinct personality, in a clearer light, and whereby this doctrine may be rescued with more glory and power from all the attacks that have been made upon it. Happy are the souls above, who "see God face to face," who behold the sacred Three in that divine light, where objections and darkness are banished for ever, and "the shadows are fled away !" The noise of controversy and wrangling is never heard in those regions ; but if it were possible for the happy inhabitants to differ in sentiment, and controversy could ascend thither, I am persuaded it would be managed without wrangling or noise. The gentleness and benevolence, the sweet serenity and candour that adorn every Spirit there, would reign through all their sacred reasonings ; and wheresoever a mistake was found, and rectified, among those holy disputants, the voice of joy and triumph would be heard on all sides at the bright and lovely appearance of truth. O that the disputes of christians on earth might be carried on with the same heavenly candour, and might end in the same harmony and joy ! Amen.

MAR 8, 1725.

## DISSERTATION IV.

*The Sentiments of the ancient Jews, and primitive Christians concerning the Logos, or Word, compared with Scripture.*

SECT. I.—*The General Senses of the Term Logos, and its application to Christ.*

Our blessed Saviour hath a variety of names and titles given him in scripture, to describe his personal glories, and his sacred offices in the divine economy.

These must be borrowed from human things, and from the languages of men, in order to bring them within the reach of our understandings. We cannot frame ideas of things divine and heavenly, as they are in themselves, and therefore it hath pleased God to condescend to lead us into some imperfect conceptions of them, by revealing them to us, under the names and resemblances of things on earth. The Logos, or Word of God, is a name whereby Christ is often represented in the New Testament, and particularly in the writings of St. John. Now it may assist us considerably in tracing out some of the glories of his person, if we search into the meaning of this name, and the reason of its application to our blessed Lord. The term *Λόγος*, in Greek heathen authors, does not only signify word, but it is used as commonly to express reason. In this sense the Platonic philosophers apply it to God as well as man.

And not only the ancient Greeks, but Philo the Jew uses the term “logos” in this latter sense, even when it is applied to God; and denotes hereby the reason, or wisdom of God. In his treatise “*De mundi opificio*,” he tells us, that the idea by which God made the world, and which he calls the *Κοσμοποιησις*, or the *κοσμος εκ των ιδιων*, that is, the ideal, or intelligible world could have no place but in the logos of God, as an intelligible or ideal city is in the mind, or reason, of the architect. And he adds a little afterward, that if a man will use plain words, he will say, the ideal world is nothing else than the logos of God the Creator; as an ideal city is nothing else than the reasoning of the builder; ο τε αρχιτεκτονος λογισμος. And this opinion, saith he, I have from Moses, and not from myself. The archetypal exemplar, the idea of ideas is the logos, the word of God. He sometimes supposes it to be a divine power, or *δυναμις*, that regulates or conducts the agency of other powers, viz. principality and goodness, which office particularly belongs to the divine reason, or wisdom. And in several places of his writings, he seems to put such a sense upon this term, the logos of God, as we most properly refer to divine wisdom or reason.

It is plain also, that several of the primitive christian writers include, if not chiefly intend, the idea of reason, in some places where they speak of that divine *logos*, which was always with God, even from eternity: For it was a common notion among them, that God was always λογικός, that is, rational: never αλογος, or ασοφος that is, irrational, never without his word, or, rather, his reason, or wisdom. Tertullian makes the *logos* to be eternal, as it signifies reason; and more ancient than the *logos* as it signifies a word, or speech: His language is this *Non sermonalis Deus, à principio sed rationalis Deus etiam ante principium*. That several of the Greek fathers speak of the *logos*, as divine wisdom is manifest, and that some of the Latin fathers, both elder and later, use the terms, *ratio* and *sapientia*, to express the *logos*, as well as *verbum* or *sermo*, I suppose will not be denied.

And even in scripture, the term *logos* sometimes seems to denote reason as well as word; for Christ who is the *Logos*, or Word of God, in several scriptures, is also supposed to be represented by divine wisdom in other places of the sacred writings, both in the Old and New Testament: As Prov. viii. where wisdom is described, which whole chapter is generally interpreted concerning our blessed Saviour, in his pre-existent state. Luke vii. 34, 35. *The Son of man is come eating and drinking, and ye say, behold a wine-bibber, &c. but wisdom is justified of her children*. Luke xi. 42. *Therefore also said the wisdom of God I will send them prophets, &c.* that is, the eternal word or wisdom, by whom God transacted his affairs of the government of the Jewish church.

And, indeed, there is a plain affinity between both these senses of *logos*; for a word or speech, is but the external representation of inward thought or reason; and reason itself is but a sort of internal speech, or the language of the mind. Thus by one we speak inwardly to ourselves, and by the other we speak to other persons. And therefore Christ, who is the divine wisdom; Prov. viii. is also the divine Word; John i. manifesting the wisdom of God; and the name *logos* implies both. So Calvin, both in his institutions, and his commentaries on John i. 1. represents Christ as the *Logos*, partly because he is the wisdom of God, and partly because he reveals the mind of God to men. John, saith he, calls the Son of God, *sermo, quia primum aeterna sit dei sapientia et voluntas, deinde expressa consilii ejus effigies*. And many other writers are of the same mind.

Yet I think in our theological discourses on the Messiah, since we have not one single term in English that signifies both reason and word, it may be proper generally to translate *logos* by the term Word, rather than reason.

I. Because the scripture in the New Testament seems rather

to favour this sense: For the same things which are attributed to *logos* in some scriptures, are in other places ascribed to *ρῆμα*: Now *ρῆμα* always signifies word.

II. Because the same term *logos* is used by the Jewish writers to translate their *memra*, which properly and literally signifies a word, and which is much used in their theological writings. If we enquire into the origin of it, perhaps it may be this, viz.

Moses relates the work of each day in the creation, to be performed by God's speaking; Gen. i. *And God said, This might give them the first hint or notion of the word, or memra, as a medium of God's manifestations and operations. And, perhaps it might be thus designed by the Spirit of God, since it appears that succeeding inspired writers copied after Moses. Ps. xxxiii. 6. By the word of the Lord were the heavens made. Ps. cxlviii. 5. He commanded, and they were created. Ps. cxlvii. 15; 18, &c. He sendeth forth his word, and melteth the ice. Pa. cv. 19. The word of the Lord came and tried Joseph.* And the frequent mention of the word of the Lord in the Old Testament, which came to the patriarchs and prophets, might give the Jews further occasion to speak of the "memra," or word. Such ancient divine hints probably introduced this term so often into their theology, and by that means into the writings of the New Testament.

III. Another reason why we interpret *logos*, the Word, is because this has been the most frequent translation of *logos* in most places, by the writers of the christian church, in all ages; which has something of weight in it, where we can see no sufficient ground to change.

IV. Because when *logos* is translated word, or speech, it includes reason? But reason does not include word.

V. The term word is more adapted to signify both the human and divine natures of Christ; whereas reason, or wisdom, seems rather to refer chiefly to his divine nature, as will appear in the following parts of this discourse. And, indeed, where the divine nature alone is intended, I cannot think it amiss, in some cases, to imitate some of the fathers, and former writers, and to translate it reason, or wisdom; as in other cases it should be construed the Word. But let us more particularly consider the import of the term *logos*, when it signifies a word, and the reasons of the application of it to Christ.

*Logos*, or word, when used in human affairs, is a declaration of our mind or will; and when it is taken for a word of command from a superior, it becomes also a medium of operation as well as manifestation. And so when it is used in a divine sense, it primarily and properly denotes some declaration of the mind or will of God; but if it be put for a word of divine effica-

cious command, then it denotes a medium of divine operation. Therefore when the term *word* is taken personally as well as divinely, it must denote some glorious person, by whom God reveals himself, his mind and will to creatures, and by whom he operates. In short, it is a personal representation of some glorious medium of God's manifestations and operations.

Now this character eminently agrees to our blessed Saviour: And it is reasonably supposed, that it is upon these accounts chiefly he is so often called the Logos, as it signifies Word.

I. As he was the medium of divine manifestation. So Irenæus speaks, libro ii. capite 56. "The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is revealed and manifested to angels and arch-angels, to principalities and powers, and to men by his Word, who is his Son: The Son reveals the Father to all to whom the Father is revealed." So John i. 18. *The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.*

II. As he was a medium of divine operation. So Irenæus expresses himself, "The Word ministers to the Father in all things: He made all things by his Word;" libro iv. capite 17, 37. So St. Paul and St. John explain each other, when they describe God the Father as creating all things by his Word, and by Jesus Christ; John i. 3. Eph. iii. 9. Upon a review of the whole we find, that the logos is the divine wisdom itself, a revealer of the divine wisdom, a medium of divine manifestations and divine transactions: And on these accounts it is probable, that our blessed Saviour first obtained, and still keeps the name of Logos, or Word, since his incarnation, as well as before.

Christ is called the Logos in his incarnate state; 1 John i. 1, 2. *The Logos, or Word of life, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled;* Rev. xix. 13. *he is represented as cloathed in a vesture dipped in blood, and his name is called the Logos, or the Word of God."* Nor does the apostle John only use this language, but the evangelist Luke seems to speak the same dialect, in the second verse of his gospel, when he calls the apostles eye-witnesses, and ministers of the Logos or Word: For if the term Logos be not taken in its personal sense, it is an improper way of speaking, to call them eye-witnesses instead of ear-witnesses.

It is manifest also, that the term Logos has sometimes a peculiar reference to our blessed Saviour, considered as distinct from flesh and blood, and is so used in those scriptures which speak of him in his pre-existent state. The beginning of St. John's gospel puts this beyond all doubt, if there were no other testimony. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. By him were all things made, and without him was nothing made that was made: And this*

ord was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory; John i. 1, 2, 3, 14.

There are many other places also, which may be fairly and reasonably interpreted concerning our blessed Saviour, as expressed by the term Logos, which Mr. Fleming reckons up "Christology," volume I. page 155, &c. As, John v. 58. *Ye are not the Word of God, or Logos, abiding in you; for whom the Father has sent, him ye receive not; Titus i. 2, 3. God who hath promised eternal life of old times, hath now manifested his Word, or Logos through preaching; Heb. iv. 12, 13. The Logos or Word of God is quick and powerful,—a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart: Nor is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; 2 Pet. iii. 5. By the Logos or Word of God, the heavens were of old; and by the same Word the heavens and earth, are now kept in store, reserved unto the present; 1 John v. 7. There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one: With some other texts.*

SECT. II.—*A. Difficulty mentioned, with a Proposal for the Solution of it.*

Now concerning this "Logos," or the pre-existent nature of Christ, or rather concerning Christ, or the Logos, in his pre-existent state, there are such glorious ascriptions given to him, as seem to raise him above the character of all creatures, viz. that he was God; John i. 1. *that all things were created by him and for him, whether in heaven or in earth, that he is before all things, and by him all things consist; Col. i. 16, 17. "that he upholds all things by the word of his power; that all the angels of God must worship him; that his throne, as God, is for ever and ever; and that in the beginning he laid the foundations of the earth; and the heavens are the work of his hands, &c."* Heb. i. 3, 6, 8, 10. Yet in these very places of scripture, as well as in several other texts, there are some expressions, which seem to represent him, even in his pre-existent state, below the dignity of godhead: As, when he is called the Son of God, and said to be begotten of the Father; which seems to denote too much derivation and dependence for pure deity: When he is said to be appointed the heir of all things by his Father: When he is called the first-born of every creature, and the beginning of the creation of God; when he is said to be sent by his Father, not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him, that he had a body prepared him by the Father, that the Son can do nothing of himself: And many expressions of the same kind. Now here lies the difficulty, how shall we interpret all these expressions in a consistency with each other? This has been a perplexing and laborious enquiry in all ages of christianity.

Most writers fix their eyes and thoughts so entirely upon the divine dignity of the person of Christ ; and out of a holy fear of sinking his character below godhead, have explained many of these diminishing expressions, as mere economical accounts of his sublimest nature, and attributed even these lessening characters to Christ considered as God, by the help of tropes and figures, by catechreses, and economical interpretation. On the other hand, there have been some, who out of a sacred veneration for the supreme majesty of God the Father, and in order to secure the unity of the godhead, have sunk all the sublimer and divine characters given to Christ, or the *Logos*, in his pre-existent state, and reduced them to some diminished and figurative sense, in order to reconcile them to the inferior characters of Christ ; and thereby they have not suffered the person of Christ, in any sense, to arise to the true dignity of godhead.

This has been a matter of dreadful contest in the churches of old, and has been again revived in the present age. The scriptures have been consulted through and through, by each party ; and yet there are some difficulties still attending the sacred subject, and the parties are not reconciled. I grant that scripture is the best interpreter of itself, and by comparing one part of the word of God with another, we are led into the meaning of many a difficult text, and find out many an important truth : And, in my esteem, the foregoing difficulties are resolved by the scripture itself. But when persons have employed their labour in this manner, and there still remains a darkness in their opinion, upon the language of scripture, they may, perhaps derive some degrees of light, by consulting the authors that wrote on the same subject, and lived nearest to that age when the scriptures were written.

And since the christian religion is built upon the same general foundations with the Jewish ; and the New Testament is a divine comment upon the Old, perhaps we may borrow some advantages for the interpretation of dark passages in the gospel from the modes of speech, and the common sentiments of the Jews in that age ; as well as from the primitive fathers of the christian church, who lived nearest to the apostolic times. It may be also observed, that the sacred writers of the New Testament, were Jews themselves ; and though they were converted to the faith of Christ, yet it is very evident, that they used several peculiar words and phrases, according to the sense and meaning of their countrymen, and brought several of the idioms of the Hebrew language into their Greek writings : This is agreed among all the learned. Upon these accounts the ancient Jews, as well as the first christians, may give us their assistance toward the better understanding of these terms and expressions, "The Word of God," the "Son of God," &c. and add some light to that doctrine which we derive from scripture.

ECT. III.—*The Sentiments of the ancient Jews concerning the Logos, viz. the Apochryphal Writers, the Targumists, and Philo the Jew.*

Since Logos, or the Word, is a name frequently given to our blessed Saviour, by the sacred writers of the New Testament; since he is also called the Son of God frequently: Let us therefore enquire a little what sentiments the ancient Jews had of this matter, and what they meant by the Logos; and in what sense he is the Son of God. The books of the Old Testament speak of the Son of God. Ps. ii. 7. *Thou art my Son; Ps. lxxxix. 27. I will make him my first-born.* Prov. xxx. 4. *What is his name, or what is his Son's name?* They speak also of the word and wisdom of God, which the ancient christian fathers understood as denoting Christ; Prov. viii. where he is called wisdom, has been cited already. See Ps. xxxiii. 6. where *the heavens were made by the word of God.* Ps. cvii. 20. *God sent forth his word and healed the people, &c.* Which word the seventy Jewish interpreters call the logos.

Upon this account the Jewish writers of the apocryphal books, speak of the word and wisdom of God in the same manner; Ec. i. 1, 4, 5, 9, 10. "all wisdom cometh from the Lord, and is with him for ever. Wisdom hath been created before all things: He poured her out upon all his works. The word of God in the highest, is the fountain of wisdom. Πηγή σοφίας λογος ο υψιστος: By which, it is probable, the author does not mean the written word, but the logos, or word that dwells on high. Verse 10. "She is with all flesh according to his gift." Now these expressions are very much a-kin to the beginning of St. John's gospel, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God. All things were created by him. This is the light that lighteth every man who cometh into the world.* So in the book of Wisdom, chapter xvi. 12. "It was neither herb, nor mollifying plaister, that restored them to health; but thy word, O Lord, which healeth all things." So Wisdom xviii. 5, 16, 17. "Thy almighty word\* leaped down from heaven, out of thy royal throne, as a fierce man of war, into the midst of a land of destruction, and brought thy unfeigned commandment as a sharp sword, and standing up filled up all things with leath; and it touched the heaven, but it stood upon the earth." Wisdom ix. 1. "O God of my fathers, who hast made all things with thy word." Verse 4. "Wisdom sitteth by thy throne."—And chapter vii. 21, &c. "Wisdom is called the breath of the power of God; a pure influence flowing from the glory of the

\* This almighty word λογος παντοκρατωρ, may seem the essential divine word, or may be referred to the glorious archangel called Logos, armed with almightiness by the indwelling godhead, that is, the angel of the covenant, who is the Jehovah, the true God. Of which hereafter more particularly.



Almighty ; the worker of all things ; the brightness of the everlasting light ; the image of the goodness of God." To which it is supposed the apostle might allude ; Heb. i. 3. " when he calls Christ, *the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person.* And it is probable that the author of Ecclesiasticus gives an intimation of the Son of God, chapter li. 14. " And I called upon the Lord, the Father of my Lord."

From all these citations we may derive this degree of light, that the writers of the New Testament, do not imitate the language of Plato, or other heathen philosophers, when they describe the logos, the word of God, or his wisdom, and that sometimes in a personal manner ; but rather that they follow the language of scripture, and of the Jewish church : And that they had many hints from the Old Testament itself, as well as from their traditional expositions of it, as Dr. Allix informs us, that their great expected Messiah was to be the Son of God, and the Word of God, as being the fittest characters of a person who was to represent the wisdom and grace of God amongst them ; and to be an illustrious medium of divine manifestations and operations.

It is allowed, indeed, that Plato may call the divine impressions on the works of nature, *λογα*, or words ; and he spake of the *λογος*, the word, or reason of the Creator ; but is much more probable from ancient history, that Plato, and other Grecians, borrowed that term from converse with the Jews, or their neighbours the Phœnicians, and the Chaldeans\*, than that the Jews should borrow it from him or them ; or that St. John, who was a poor Jewish fisherman, should be acquainted with the Grecian learning of the Gentiles, and imitate their phrases, when the same phrases were more common and ancient in his own nation. I proceed now to consider what we find concerning the word, and the Son of God, in the Jewish commentaries on scripture which are called the targums. Here I shall make a free acknowledgment, that what I cite upon this occasion, is borrowed chiefly from Dr. Allix, Dr. Owen, Dr. Lightfoot, Mr. Ainsworth, and Mr. Fleming. My acquaintance with the Chaldean or Rabbinical language, was never sufficient to read the rabbies, or their comments on scripture : But I may reasonably presume, that these learned authors have made faithful citations from these Jewish writers, and given a just account of their sentiments.

\* Grotius on John i. 1. affirms that the Greeks cite the creation of the sun and moon, by the word, out of the ancient books of the Chaldees : And that the writer of the orphic verses, thence borrowed his *θεος λογος*, and his *αυτος* ; *θεος*, the divine word, and the voice of the Father, whereby he made the world. That learned author, Mr. Theophilus Gale, in his " Court of the Gentiles," part II. book iii. chapter 3, and 9, has shewn at large how Plato borrowed his notions originally from the Jews, by the Pythagoreans, the Egyptians, and Phœnicians. And many other very learned men have been of the same mind.

The targums are paraphrases, or explanations of several parts of the Old Testament, in the Chaldee language, written by Onkelos, Jonathan, &c. The exact time of their writing is not agreed among the learned, but generally supposed to be in the same century wherein Christ lived, or at least in the next century following: They speak very frequently concerning the "memra" or the word of God, which is the same with the "logos," and they make it to signify these several things:

I. The word, or "memra," in these writings, often signifies God himself. There is a great number of places, in which when the Hebrew bible declares that God, spake or acted any thing, these commentators ascribe those speeches, actions, &c. to the "memra," or word. It was *the voice of the word\* of the Lord God walking in the garden*, that Adam heard: It was the word of the Lord was with the lad Ishmael, and helped him in the wilderness. It is by the word of the Lord their God I will save them, says the targum; where Hosea says, *I will save them by Jehovah their God*; Hosea i. 7. It was the word that saved Noah in the time of the flood, and made a covenant with him. It was the word that brought Abraham out of Chaldea, and commanded him to sacrifice, and in whom Abraham believed. It is the word that redeems Israel out of Egypt, and against whom Israel murmured. It is the word whose presence is promised in the tabernacle; whose protection was promised to Moses, when he desired to see God. It is the word whose commandments the Israelites were carefully to observe. It is the word that dwelt in the pillar of a cloud, and led Israel through the wilderness, and that spake out of the fire at Horeb. It is the word that created the world, that made man after his image, that spoke to Adam in the garden; that lifted up Enoch to heaven; and that talked with Moses in the tabernacle. It is the word to whom Moses prays, and who gives statutes to Israel. The word sent fiery serpents, and punished Israel for their various crimes. The word said, he had sworn to give Israel the land of Canaan; and where the scripture says to Abraham, *By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord*, there both Onkelos and Jonathan interpret it, "By my word have I sworn, saith the Lord." See Dr. Allix's "Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church," chapter 12, 13. See Dr. Lightfoot's "Harmony of the Evangelists, on John i. 1. and Horæ Hebraicæ in Locum.

That God himself is often signified by the "memra," or word, appears further by the use of the same term, with re-

\* This is the first place in the bible where the targums mention the "memra" of Jehovah; and it is remarkable, that the text itself mentions the "voice of God walking," before any word was spoken; Whence Dr. Owen infers, that this expression may denote, the essential word of God, the person of the *Sub.* See "First Volume on Hebrews," page 114, and 116.

gard to men also ; as Jonathan Ben Uzziel, on Num. xv. 32. *A certain man said with his word, I will go forth, and gather sticks on the sabbath day* ; where he said with his word, signifies he resolved in his mind, or with himself. Job vii. 8. *Thy eyes are upon my memra*, that is, upon me. *So my breath is in my memra* ; Job. xxvii. 8. that is, my breath is in me. *There is a league between my memra and thee* ; 2 Chron. xvi. 3. that is, between me and thee. See Fleming's "Christology," vol. I. page 437. and Lightfoot's "horæ hebraicæ, et talmudicæ, in John i. 1." where they bring other undeniable instances, to prove the memra sometimes is nothing else but a Chaldeism, denoting one's self: So the word of God sometimes denotes God himself.

II. The "memra," or the word of God, in these Jewish writings is used to signify any thing in or of God, whereby he transacts his divine affairs : It implies some one or more of his attributes, or his powers, his knowledge, his wisdom, his purpose, his command, his efficacy, his providence or his influence ; and where the Hebrew text metaphorically ascribes human affections, and human members to God, the targums use the word "memra," and thus it signifies his head, his face, his mind, his tongue, his mouth, his eye, his hand, or his feet : In general it means that divine power and wisdom, or, in one word, that sufficiency of God which he exerts in managing human affairs, or in revealing himself to the children of men. One targum saith, "God created the world by his word ;" where the other targum saith, "by his wisdom ;" Gen. i. 1. So the Lord gave Noah warning by his word ; the Lord judged the old world by his word ; and said, "I will destroy them by my word." And a great variety of such expressions may be found in Dr. Allix's *Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church*, and Mr. Fleming's *Christology*, in the places before cited.

Here let it be noted, that it is the custom of the Jewish writers, even the penmen of the bible, as well as other authors, to represent powers, attributes, virtues, agencies, &c. in a personal manner, and to describe them as distinct persons. Upon this account, in some places where the "memra" may be supposed to signify the divine sufficiency, or some particular distinction of power or property in the godhead, it is represented in a personal manner by these Jewish commentators. Whether they had a distinct idea of the Logos, or word, as a second personal agent in the divine nature, according to the complete ideas of the athanasian explication, is a matter too doubtful to be asserted with any great assurance.

III. The term "memra" is used by these targumists, for that angel who appeared to the patriarchs and to Moses, and assumed the name of God and Jehovah. It is the word of the

Lord that appeared often as an angel, to Abraham, in the valley of vision ; and Abraham worshipped, and prayed to the word of the Lord in these appearances. When the angel of the Lord appeared to Hagar, the targums say, "she confessed before the Lord Jehovah, whose word had spoken unto her ; and she prayed to the word of the Lord, who had appeared to her." When Jacob returned from Padan-aram, the word of the Lord, which in scripture is called a man, appeared to him the second time, and blessed him. When the angel of the Lord in scripture is said to appear unto Moses in the burning bush, it is said in the targums, "the word of the Lord spake to Moses there." It was the word of the Lord that appeared against the Egyptians at midnight, and his right-hand killed the first-born of Egypt ; which Moses ascribes to an angel. And in several other places, where the scripture speaks of an angel, as appearing, and assuming any divine character, these commentators introduce the "memra."

Now let it be noted, that it was a current opinion among the Jews, that there was one great arch-angel, superior to all the rest of the angels in power and dignity ; and whom God created or generated before all the others ; in whom he put his own name, and whom he employed in most of his important affairs which related to the patriarchs, and to his own people the Jews. This was the angel whom the Jews say, God promised to send before his people ; Exod. xxiii. 20, 21. *To keep them in the way, and to bring them to the promised land: Beware of him, (said God,) and obey his voice, provoke him not, for he will not pardon your iniquities, for my name is in him.* They say, this was the angel who wrestled with Jacob, and is called a man ; Gen. xxxii. 24. Some of the ancient rabbies acknowledge him to be the Messiah, and call him the angel Michael. It is the same angel, who going before the camp of Israel in the wilderness, in the pillar of cloud ; Exod. xiv. 19. removed and went behind them in the red sea, who by the rabbies is called Michael the great prince ; he was made a wall of fire between the Israelites and the Egyptians. This is Michael the great arch-angel, the prince of Israel ; Dan. x. 13, 21. Rev. xii. 7. See *Ainsworth on the Pentateuch*. This Michael is that high priest of heaven, who offers up the prayers of the righteous, so rabbi Menahem : He is the priest above, that offereth, or presenteth the souls of the righteous, saith another of their rabbies. See Dr. Owen's "Exercitations on the Hebrews," vol. I. page 121.

There was an angel who was called Metatron, which Dr. Owen supposes to be a corrupt expression of the Latin mediator, who by the rabbies is called the prince of the world, the prince of God's presence, the master or teacher of Moses himself ; he is the angel always appearing in the presence of God, of whom

it is said, *my name is in him*. Bechai, a great master among them, affirms, when he treats on Exod. xxiii. that this name Metatron signifies both a lord, a messenger, and a keeper. A lord, because he ruleth all; a messenger, because he stands always before God, to do his will; and a keeper, because he keepeth Israel. Some of the Jews have called him the chancellor of heaven, because he blotteth out the sins of Israel. See Dr. Owen on the Hebrews, vol. I. *Exercitations*, page 123. and *Exposition*, page 75.

And as the Jews suppose this angel to have the name of God in him, and to be one in whom God dwelt, and by whom God transacted his affairs, so it seems to be the same being whom the ancient Jews before Christ, call the Shekinah, that is, the habitation of God; and they sometimes denote this Shekinah by the names "memra" and "logos." They attribute the same things to this Shekinah, which they attribute to the word of God. They call the Shekinah the Adam above, after whose image Adam was created. They say, that God having committed to angels the care of other nations, the Shekinah alone was entrusted with the care and conduct of Israel. They acknowledge the Shekinah to be that very angel whom Jacob calls his Redeemer, and whom the prophets call the angel of the presence, and the angel of the covenant. This was that Shekinah who took possession of the tabernacle and the temple in the form of light and glory, and resided in the holy of holies. See more in Dr. Allix's *Judgment of the Jewish Church*, chap. 11.

I confess, the Jews sometimes represent this Shekinah to signify the holy Spirit: But it is no wonder that the imperfect notices which they had of the sacred doctrine of the Trinity might be paraphrased, explained, and commented upon, with some confusion both of names and things: Though what they have left upon record gives us sufficient hints of a certain glorious, angelic being, who had also godhead dwelling in him.

The LXX Jewish translators of the bible seem to have had some notion of this glorious arch-angel, and to suppose him to be the Messiah, whom they call the *child born, the son given*; Isa. ix. 6. *μεγαλης βουλης αγγελος*, the angel of the great counsel, while they ascribe to God, or Jehovah, who is *great in counsel*; Jer. xxxii. 19. the title of *κυριος μεγαλης βουλης*, Lord of the great counsel. It is to this arch-angel that Maimonides refers, when he says, "the angel, the prince of the world of whom the wise masters so often speak. *More Nevochim*, part II: chap. 6. *Nye against Allix*, page 76.

He that would read more of these testimonies, and citations, out of the targums, let him consult the 12th, 13th, and following chapters of Dr. Allix's *Judgment of the ancient*

*Jewish Church, and Fleming's Christology, and Dr. Owen's Exercitations on the Hebrews, particularly the 9th and 10th.*

IV. The "memra" or word, is sometimes described by them as the Son of God; so the targum of Jerusalem; God. iii. 22. "The word of Jehovah said, here Adam whom I created is the only begotten son in the world, as I am the only begotten Son in the high heaven. Allix, page 268. Dr. Allix also shews, that they called the Messiah the Son of God; as on Ps. lxxx. 15. where the psalmist says, the "branch which thou madest strong for thyself," the targum reads the words, "for thy Son's sake," and interprets them, "even for the sake of king Messias." This seems to be intimated in other places of the targums, and in other ancient Jewish writings: And it is sufficiently manifest, that the Jews, in the days of our Saviour, supposed the Messiah to be the Son of God; Mat. xxvi. 63, 64. Luke xxii. 76. though it does not so evidently appear by any of these Jewish writings, as Dr. Allix imagines, that they believed the Messiah to be a Son in the godhead itself. This leads me on to the next particular.

V. "Memra" is sometimes used by these Jewish authors to signify the Messiah. Dr. Allix hath spent a good part of his 16th chapter in the proof of this subject, and there is some weight in it: Though it must be acknowledged his proofs in this point are not so evident and express as one would expect, nor sufficient alone to convince an impartial and close inquirer. The learned Mr. Fleming therefore acknowledging the insufficiency of Dr. Allix's allegations, run through the targums himself, in those places where he thought it most probable to find any thing of this nature. See *Christology*, vol. I. page 139. and at last he fell upon some passages that seemed very plainly to relate to Messiah. One is this; Gen. xlix. 18. *My soul waits for thy salvation, O God.* Which the Jerusalem targum paraphrases thus, *My soul expects not the redemption of Gidon, which is a temporal salvation, nor the redemption of Samson, which is a transient salvation, but the redemption which thou didst promise should come through thy "memra" to thy people.* Which being compared with the context in the targum shews, that he means the redemption that should come through the Messiah. And, indeed, this is the chief proof that the targums any where by the "memra" can mean the Messiah, viz. that what they attribute to the "memra" in one place, they attribute to the Messiah in another, for both these names are frequent in their writings. The defence of this application of the names, see in *Fleming's Christology*, vol. I. page 141, 142.

Yet this learned author would have it noted also, that there are some few passages in the targums, wherein it is as plain, that the Messiah is distinguished from the "memra" of God,

as where it is said, "Moses shall go forth from the desert, and the king Messiah from Rome, and the "memra" of God shall be leader between them both, &c." But then he gives this reason for it, that "memra" denotes Christ with relation to his divine subsistence, and before his assumption of human nature, and the Messiah denotes him only as he was to appear visibly and become man, and therefore these authors generally distinguish the one from the other, page 143. And it is no wonder, since they had not a clear and distinct knowledge of the complete person of the Messiah, nor is it evident, that they believed that he should be the true and eternal God.

Objection. But is it not a vain attempt, to pretend to prove the doctrine of the Trinity from the Jewish rabbies, when it is evident in itself, and generally granted by learned men, that the ancient Jews had no distinct notion of this doctrine, nor did they generally believe the deity of their Messiah, according to your own confession ?

Answer. I am not proving the sacred doctrine of the Trinity from any of their writings. My present chief business is only to shew, that by various intimations and notices which they derived from the Old Testament, they are frequently led to speak of the word of God, or "memra," as a power of the divine nature ; that they also make "memra" to signify a glorious archangel ; and though the Jews themselves do not expressly join these two, to make one complex person, yet they attribute so many of the same things to both, that gives a great deal of countenance to the doctrine of the New Testament, which seems to have joined or united these two "memras" in the one person of the Messiah, that is, our blessed Saviour. But of this more hereafter.

I grant all the later Jews have an aversion to the doctrine of the Trinity, and the deity of Christ, and deny Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah : And therefore they apply a multitude of scriptures to David, Solomon, Hezekiah, Isaiah, &c. which their ancient rabbies applied to the Messiah, for fear lest they should agree to Jesus. But Dr. Owen, in his learned *Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, especially 8, 9, 10, 11. shews, that the targums abound in applying the scripture prophecies to the Messiah.

Before I make any more inferences, let us consult the writings of Philo the Jew ; he lived in Alexandria in Egypt, and was one of the ambassadors of the Jews to the emperor of Rome, a little after the death of our Saviour. He was a great writer, and a very learned man : His language is Greek, and he is supposed to write in our Saviour's life-time. In many of his books he speaks of the "logos," or the word of God, and used it in most of those senses in which the targums use it.

Now, though I have neither health nor leisure enough to throw away much of them in perusing such ancient Jewish folios, and allegorical writers\*, yet I have turned over three or four hundred pages of this author, and read all I could meet with there concerning the "logos," and have also searched out many other of the citations of Dr. Allix, in his *Judgment of the ancient Jewish Church*, and Mr. Nye, in his *Four Letters against Dr. Allix*, and must declare upon the whole, that their citations for the most part are just, though in some places Mr. Nye keeps nearer to the words and sense of the original author.

The senses in which Philo may be supposed to use the word "logos" are these:

I. Perhaps he may mean God himself by the Logos, when in his *Treatise of the Cherubim*, he says, "God has two supreme powers, viz. goodness and strength, or dominion, and between these is the Logos which unites, or reconciles them both." Compare this with his *discourse on the sacrifices of Cain and Abel*, where he says, "God accompanied with his two supreme powers, viz. dominion and goodness, he himself being in the midst of them." What he calls the Logos in one place, he calls God himself in the other. But whether he may not intend the divine mind, reason or wisdom, I will not determine.

I confess he does not so manifestly use the name "Logos" to signify God himself, as the targums do; though in many places, when God, or Jehovah, is said to visit the patriarchs, and transact affairs with them, Philo ascribes it the "Logos," or word of God. But it must be acknowledged that he does with much more frequency and plainness use the term "Logos" in the following senses.

II. Philo uses the word "logos" often for a particular divine power or property, which he frequently represents in a personal manner, and ascribes to it the characters that belong to a person, as the Jews are wont to do, in a figurative way. As he speaks of those two divine powers, (*γαραια*, viz. goodness and dominion, so he sometimes speaks of the "Logos," that is, the word, or wisdom, or reason, as of another power, the director and governor of both these. He calls all these powers "uncreated, eternal, infinite, immense and incomprehensible: By one of these powers all things were created; by another all things are governed." But he makes the "Logos" to be em-

\* Though Philo abound in unreasonable allegories, and turn the literal history of the bible into an allegorical sense, yet this very allegorical sense is a sufficient indication what his opinions were, even though his application of them to particular scriptures be never so ridiculous: And consequently this is sufficient to answer all the purposes for which I cite him.



played both in creation and government, though eminently in creation.

In his treatise *de mundi opificio*, he says, "the vast intelligible world, or the idea according to which God framed the visible world, can have no place but in the θεὸς λογος, or divine word, for the other powers of God do not afford it a proper place." And a little after he saith, "this intelligible idea, in plain words, is nothing else than the λογος τῷ Θεῷ, the word of God, or the reason of God creating the world." He speaks of God's creation of the world by the "Logos," as an instrument, ὄργανον, in several places. And in his *plantation of Noah*, he tells us, that "man's rational soul is the image of the invisible God, whose character, or express image is eternal reason, or his everlasting word, ἡ χαρακτηριστικὴ εἰς τὸ αἰδιον λογος, though whether these two last citations, refer rather to the angelic "Logos," may admit some doubt.

He supposes this "logos" of God to be the same as Sophia, or wisdom, which in his allegorical way he makes the "daughter of God, and the mother of all things, by which the world was brought forth. This is that wisdom which was with God before the world." See Dr. Allix, page 147, and Mr. Nye against Dr. Allix, page 71, 77.

Now that by this "logos," the divine reason, or wisdom, Philo does not mean a real distinct person, in the literal sense of the word person, is evident; because he says, "before the world was made God was μὸς, alone; εἷς, one Being; and ἡ ἐκ τελλων σιγῶν, not consisting of more:" And he often speaks of the person of God, as one; though he represents several powers in him. See Nye, page 60.

We may observe that Philo speaks of wisdom in the feminine and once he gives this reason for it, viz. to "preserve to God the character of a Father." So Dr. Allix, page 271. But Mr. Nye does not remember that this divine essential wisdom is ever called the Son of God; and he cites "Origen contra Celsum, book ii. page 79. saying, "I have often disputed with the Jewish rabbies: They would none of them acknowledge that the λογος, that is, the divine reason, word or wisdom, is the Son of God," page 51. Whence we may infer, that this name Son, seems rather to be appropriated to the Logos, considered as the great archangel; even as all the angels are in scripture called the sons of God. Dr. Allix, indeed says, page 122. "that Philo asserts the word of God to be the eternal Son of God," and quotes his book, *de confusione linguarum*. Now I have turned over that book, and have not found this express appellation: But what expressions of that kind I have met with there and in other of his treatises shall be cited under the following heads.

III. The term "Logos" is used frequently by Philo for a glorious angel, vastly superior to all other angels, whom he calls the most honourable "Logos," the archangel, prince of angels and stars; and as the Jews, and scriptures, call all angels Sons of God; so this "Logos," this archangel, according to Philo, is the first-born of all his Sons.

In his Treatise of *the Confusion of Tongues*, he persuades men to endeavour to be adorned like the first-born word of God, the most ancient angel, the archangel who has many names, who is called the beginning, αρχη, the name of God; the "Word of God; the man after God's image; and the seer of Israel." And he adds, Wherefore I commend those who had said; that we are all sons of one man, υιος ανθρωπου, for though we are not worthy to be called the children of God, yet we are the children of his most holy word, his αιων, everlasting image; for the most ancient word is the image of God." In another place, a little before this, where he is persuading mankind to peace, he says, "How comes it to pass that ye do not hate war, since ye profess to have the same Father, not mortal but immortal, even ανθρωπος θεου ος τε αιων λογος ων, a man of God, who being the word of the Eternal, must himself also be incorruptible."

Again, "from a companion of Moses, that is, Zachary a fellow-prophet, we have heard this saying, behold a man whose name is \* THE EAST, Ανατολη. This is a new sort of appellation, if we understand it of a man who consists of a body and a soul; but if it be understood of that incorporeal man†, who differs not from the divine image, you will confess that it is a most happy name for him: For the Father of beings caused this his most ancient Son to rise, ανηλυσι, whom otherwise he calls his first-born; who being born did immediately imitate his Father's ways: for seeing his archetypal exemplars, he did form copies exactly like them. This Philo speaks when he cites Zech. vi. 12. *behold the man whose name is, Ανατολη, the east, or the branch;* 'De confusione linguarum.' And these words bear a very near affinity to the words of our Saviour himself, John v. 19. *The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise.*

In his book, *de migratione Abrahami*, he says, that "God, who is the mind of the universe, ο υιος των ολων, has his "Logos," for his house.—What house can he have but his word, who is

\* The branch; Zech. vi. 12. is rendered ανατολη by the LXX. which signifies also the East.

† Now that Philo seems to mean a man here, or a human soul, may be proved; because he speaks of him in direct opposition to a worse sort of man, whom he also calls ανατολη, or the East, because he lived in the East: This was Balaam, who, saith Philo, hath a name like the former, but it is very different in reality.

elder than things created, which the pilot of the universe useth as a rudder, to steer or direct all things." This seems to refer to an angel who is his only begotten Son, prior to all mere creatures, and not ranked among mere created beings, one in whom God inhabits, and by whom he transacts his affairs of government.

Again saith Philo, *de agricultura*, "God governs this universe as a shepherd doth his flock; over-ruling and managing the earth, water, air, fire, and the heavens, sun, moon, things mortal and spiritual, having set over them his own righteous "Logos," who is his first-born Son; who takes upon himself the care of this sacred flock, as vicegerent of this great king: Therefore it is said, *Exod. xxiii. 20. Behold I send my angel before thee, to keep thee in the way.*

Again in another place, "nothing mortal can be formed, that is, immediately, after the image of the supreme God, and Father of all things; but only after the image of the second god, who is the "Logos" of God: For the reasonable part of the soul of man is the express image of the "Logos" of God." Though whether Philo meant the divine essential power, called "Logos," or the great archangel in this place, perhaps, may be questioned; but it is most agreeable to the last. See more in Mr. Fleming's *Christology*, volume I. page 248, &c. and Mr. Nye's Answer to Dr. Allix, page 75.

Philo asserts the great dignity of the angel that appeared to the patriarchs, and calls him eminently the Word. It was the "Word appeared to Adam; he appeared also to Jacob and Moses, though in the books of Moses he is called an angel. It was the Word that appeared to Abraham, as an angel, and that called to him not to hurt his son, when he was about to sacrifice him. It was the Word appeared to Hagar, and to Jacob, and delivered him out of all his troubles. It was the Word directed him how to manage Laban's flock, and advised him to return to the land of his kindred, that appeared to him in the form of an angel, and wrestled with him, and changed his name to Israel. It was the Word who led Israel through the wilderness. He was the angel in whom God placed his name; the prince of the angels who was in the cloud, and is called the divine vision of fire. He appeared to Moses, and the elders of Israel on mount Sinai. He appeared to Balaam like an angel; and it was the Word, who is the Son of God, that conducted Israel through the wilderness." See Dr. Allix's Judgment of the Jewish Church, chapter 12, 13.

"This word is not unbegotten, ἀγεννητός, like God and yet begotten, or made γενετός, like his creatures. He is a divine angel, θεῶν ἀγγέλων, and a minister of the gifts of God." "Quod deus sit immutabilis." And it is evident, that Philo makes a

great difference between the true God, and this "Logos," or Word: He abounds with instances of this kind, especially in his first book *De Somniis*. And when he makes God to appear to the patriarchs in form of an angel, he adds, "they understand the image of God the angel, his word, as though it were himself, because a little after he calls him, the mighty word, who is the deputy of God."

It may be also most properly applicable to this glorious archangel, what Philo saith of the word, in his *allegories of the law*, Book I. where he cites Jacob saying, *The God who hath fed me all my life, and the angel who redeemed me from all evil*: On which he remarks, that "Jacob speaks very properly of God himself as his feeder; and the angel, which is his word, as a healer of diseases, or deliverer from evil; and he gives this reason for it, feeding and nourishing are something in nature more considerable than deliverance, and therefore he ascribes the chief benefit to God, and the lower benefit to the angel. I mention not this, as approving the justness of Philo's criticism, but to shew what was Philo's opinion of this glorious angel, eminently called the "Logos." It must be granted, that Philo calls common angels also λογος, "Logoi," or words; but it is abundantly manifest to any man who reads Philo, and Mr. Nyc himself acknowledges, there is a great distinction that Philo makes between that first archangel, who is so far superior to all the rest, as to be formed before them all, and to be their Ruler or Director; and to be eminently called the "Logos" above all others.

IV. That the "Logos" is esteemed by Philo the Son of God, is manifest from the citations already made: But we may add further out of Dr. Allix, chapter 17. that when the question is put; *Prov. xxx. 4. What is his name? And what is his Son's name?* It implies, that God has a Son. And *Ps. ii. 7.* where God declares; *Thou art my Son*, it determines this character to belong to the Messiah. And Philo accordingly declares that the "Logos" is the most ancient Son of God, and his first born before the angels. And in a citation which Eusebius has out of Philo he makes him "the eternal word of the eternal God, begotten by the Father:" Though it may, perhaps, be doubted, whether Eusebius has cited the very words of Philo. And if Philo did use the words *αίδιον* and *αιωνιον*, and apply them to the son-ship of the "Logos," it may be justly questioned whether either Philo or Eusebius, considering their character and sentiments, meant any more than *πρω των αιωνων*, that is, "Before the worlds were made, or before all ages;" unless we suppose both the Jew and the christian to blend and confound the ideas of the divine eternal "Logos," or reason of God, with the first-born "Logos," or great archangel, which was too often done.

V. This "Logos," Philo supposes to be a Mediator between God and men; and though he does not distinctly call him the Messiah, yet he calls him a man, and attributes the office of Mediator between God and man to him. He calls him in his first book *de somniis* ο θεος λογος, της αρχαιουσις κεφαλη και ταυτα, "the divine word, the beginning and the end of the atonement." He supposes it was the "Logos" which appeared to the Jews on mount Sinai, and gave them the law, as a sort of Mediator between God and them. He affirms, that the "Logos" was the true and eternal Priest, *libro de profugis*. "That he divided the sacrifice when he appeared to Abraham, and that he was the priest of God. That the word is a Mediator between God and man; that he makes atonement with God." And many other things which plainly belong to the Messiah, our great High-priest, in scripture, does Philo apply to the "Logos." See Dr. Allix, chapter 20.

But for this purpose I need cite no other passage than what I met with lately in Philo's treatise, *Quis rerum divinarum hæres*. He saith, "The Father of all things has betowed this most admirable gift upon this archangel, that he should stand as a Mediator, μεθρις, that is, one on the borders of both, to distinguish between the creature and the Creator. He therefore is an intercessor, μετεις, with him that is immortal in behalf of perishing mortals. And, on the other hand, he acts the part of an ambassador, from the ruler to his subjects. And this gift he doth so willingly accept, that he glories in it, saying, "And I have stood between God and you." See Deut. xviii. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. being one who am neither unbegotten as God, nor made as mortals: but being something middle between these, ομηρουν, acting the part of a hostage with both: With the Creator as a pledge, in faith of this, that he may not ever be provoked to destroy or desert the world, so as to suffer it to run from order into confusion: And with creatures, to give them this certain hope, that God being reconciled, will never cease to take care of his own workmanship. For I proclaim peace to the creature, from that God who removes war, and introduceth and preserveth peace for ever." I find Mr. Fleming has transcribed this passage at large, in his *Christology*; and Mr. Nye has cited the most remarkable part of this passage also in his *four letters*.

From all these citations out of the targums and Philo's works, it seems plain, that the term "Logos" is sometimes attributed to that which is increated, supreme of all, of the essence of God, and incommunicably divine: It is at other times used to signify inferior nature, an angel, something that is derived, begotten, dependent, and much below the dignity of godhead. It must be acknowledged, that these ancient Jews mingle some confusion with their writings, and do not keep their supreme and

inferior ideas so distinct as one would wish. And this is not strange, because they wanted that clear revelation of the union of God and a creature, in one Jesus Christ, one complex principle of action, which we christians enjoy by the gospel.

And yet even the most part of christian writers seem to have unhappily fallen into the same confusions, when they treat of these transactions of the word, before the incarnation: And though they have framed different schemes for the reconciliation of these difficulties, it has been hitherto without any great success. And the reason, perhaps, is this, because each of them generally attribute all that is said of the "memra," or "Logos" merely to his divine and supreme nature, or they apply it all merely to his created, or inferior nature; or else they drop one of these natures entirely; and thus miss the mark, for want of supposing such an union between a divine and created nature, before the incarnation of Christ: Whereas this union discovers a proper complex subject for these different attributions. The christian writers who cite those passages out of the targums and Philo the Jew, interpret them according to their own scheme of divinity, and their particular sentiments of the person of Christ; as appears if we consider their writings.

Sandius is generally known to be a follower, or imitator, of the Arian scheme, and he applies as many of these glorious expressions as he can, to the great archangel, that first-born spirit, which the Arians suppose to be the divinest nature of Christ, and while he makes this to serve for a human spirit to the Messiah, he doth not allow any superior, or divine nature, to belong to him. He sums up his collections out of Philo, which he had elsewhere made, in these words, "The "Logos" is a second god, next to the first; and governs the world by command of the first God: That God himself and his word are two things: That the supreme God is unbegotten and invisible, and the God of the Logos; but the Logos is begotten and visible, the minister of God, and the intercessor with God for men, the ambassador of God to men, and a middle being, or medium, betwixt God and creatures." *Sandii Nucleus Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ*, page 108. See many other citations of his out of Philo, in his *Interpretationes Paradoxæ*, &c.

Mr. Nye, on the other hand, who hath been accused as approaching the Sabellian principles, seems, in his *Letters against Dr. Allix*, to drop this glorious spirit, or archangel, which is called the "Logos," as a mere Jewish notion; and does not make it enter into the composition of the person of Christ; but supposes the sublimer character of the "Logos," to belong to the essential wisdom of God, or the Word, which was personally united to the man Jesus at his incarnation. See his *First Letter against Dr. Allix*.

Dr. Allix, in his *Judgment of the Jewish Church* approaches nearer to the tritheistical hypothesis, and is charged with it by Mr. Nye, because he speaks of three creators, makers and gods, a Trinity of uncreated beings and spirits, see *Nye against Allix*, page 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 177, &c. Now on this hypothesis Dr. Allix distinguishing the divine wisdom, or Word, from God the Father, as a real, proper, distinct person, sometimes he applies what these Jewish authors say of the archangel, called the "Logos," to the eternal divine Word, or wisdom, that is, to the second person in the Deity; though this seems not to be agreeable to their sense, for these ancient Jews describe this angel as a superior sort of created, or derivative being, an effect, or production, of the will and power of God, as the christian fathers speak, and though not coming perfectly into the rank of other creatures, yet not as being the true God, or properly divine. Mr. Nye justly reprehends Dr. Allix for this, that he hath heaped together indifferently all that Philo says of several "Logoi," and applied all to the eternal essential "Logos," not being aware that this eternal essential "Logos" is very different from the great created "Logos" or archangel, who presides over the angels and stars. Letter II. page 80.

In short, all the moderns interpret these ancient Jewish writings, as every party of men is ready to interpret the scripture, to support their own hypothesis. But I cannot persuade myself that either Sandius, Dr. Allix, or Mr. Nye, in their sentiments, do sufficiently answer the expressions of these ancient authors: For each of them doth either join and affix divine characters to a dependent or created nature, or they apply inferior and creatural characters to a divine nature, or else they drop one or more of these senses of the word "Logos," and leave it out of the character of the Messiah. Whereas, if we would but give ourselves leave to suppose the Messiah, or the Logos, even in his pre-existent state as well as after his incarnation, to be a complex, or compounded person, and that the divine Logos, the eternal Word assumed a super-angelic, or inferior nature, called also "Logos" into union with himself before he took flesh upon him, and even before the world was made, this would reconcile all these ideas which seem inconsistent, and scatter the darkness that hangs over these ancient writers, and even over the scripture itself, if this opinion be not admitted.

The learned Mr. Robert Fleming,\* seems to come nearer

\* As Scotland has produced some great and illustrious instances of piety and devotion, some men of a heavenly mind, filled with the fire of divine love beyond their fellows, so this learned author, Mr. Robert Fleming is an instance of what might be expected from that nation also in respect of light and sacred knowledge, if they did but exert their genius with the same liberty of sentiment that he used; whose constant motto was, "Libere sed modeste."

to the sense of these ancients, and explains them more agreeably to scripture, when he supposes the eternal essential Logos to be a person in the godhead, and to be united to the created "Logos" or great archangel, which is the pre-existent soul of Christ; and thus the sublime and inferior expressions of the ancients concerning this complex being may be happily reconciled and explained.

**SECT. IV.**—*The Application of the Jewish Sentiments to the Scriptural Account of Christ.*

Give me leave now to enquire, whether scripture ~~doth~~ not lead us to this conception of things? Whether scripture does not set the Logos, or Word of God, in all these lights and views? Or, whether the scripture does not speak of Christ according to the five particular ideas whereby the ancient Jews interpret or explain their "Logos," though for conveniency sake I shall not mention them just in the same order.

**I.** That Christ, who is called the Logos in scripture, is the Messiah, admits of no doubt or controversy among christians.

**II.** That Christ, or the Logos, is the Son of God, is also asserted so expressly in many texts, as to forbid all dispute about it: And he has obtained this name in scripture, upon these accounts.\*

**I.** On the account of his investiture with the office of the Messiah; for hereby he was appointed to be the great High-priest, and King of his people: And this title was more eminently his due at his resurrection, ascension, and exaltation in heaven, to be a priest upon a throne, where his kingdom and power to save were more illustriously displayed, according to these texts; Ps. ii. 6, 7. "I have set my King upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said unto me, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me," that is, by intercession in heaven, "and I will give thee the heathen for thy inheritance, &c. Kiss the Son lest he be angry, and ye perish." Ps. lxxxix. 27. "I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth." Heb. v. 5. "Christ glorified not himself to be made a high-priest, but he that said to him, thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee." Acts xiii. 30. God hath fulfilled his promise in raising Jesus from the dead, as it is written in the second Psalm, *Thou art my Son to-day hath I begotten thee.*

\* Some may wonder, that I have omitted the eternal generation of his divine nature in this place. But I know no text that plainly calls Christ the Son, considered as pure God; and if revelation does not dictate the doctrine of a begotten God, reason does not at all require it. But I have given a larger account of this matter in another place.



2. He is called the Son of God on the account of the extraordinary birth of his body, which proceeded from the virgin Mary without a human father, by the immediate influence of God. Luke i. 35. the angel saith to Mary, *The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore that holy thing which is born of thee shall be called the Son of God.* This is most express language. But it is evident by the foregoing citations, that the Logos is not usually called Son of God by these ancient Jews, upon either of these two accounts, but rather on that which follows, which is the third idea of the term "Logos."

III. The Logos is the first-born Son of God, as he is a glorious, angelic, or, supra-angelic spirit, who was often called an angel under the Old Testament, when he appeared to the patriarchs. May not this be the human soul of our blessed Saviour? May not this illustrious spirit, this great archangel, which is called eminently the Logos, be the prince of angels, who was born before them all, and is the first-born of the creation? May not this be the only begotten Son of God in the high heaven, as Adam was here on earth, as having, perhaps, some peculiar mode, or unknown manner of derivation from the Father, different from the rest of the creatures: For even these ancient Jews, though they acknowledge him to be, in the general sense, a derived being, and not God, yet they call him rather the first-born of God, as though creation were too low a term to express his original, and would set him too much on a level with other creatures which, were so far inferior to him. And, why may we not suppose the human soul of Christ to be derived from God in some unknown, transcendent manner, distinct from other creatures, even as his human body was, and thus to become the peculiar Son of God, both as to his body and soul? One great reason that hath induced me to believe that the scriptures suppose the soul of Christ to be this pre-existent being, this glorious archangel is, because there are so many expressions of scripture both in the Old Testament and the New which represent Christ, before his incarnation, under some characters which are inferior to godhead, some of which I have hinted briefly in the beginning of this discourse.

Now, upon this supposition, that the soul of Christ is this most honourable "Logos," or chief angel, how properly is he called in the Old Testament *the angel of God's face or presence*; Is. lxiii. 9. *The angel of the covenant*; Mal. iii. 1. *The angel, the Redeemer of Jacob*: Gen. xlviii. 16. *The angel in whom the name of God was*: Ex. xxiii. 20. And, the "angel who could say, *I am that I am, I am the God of Abraham*;" Ex. iii. 2, 14, 15, &c. upon the account of his intimate and personal union to the divine nature? It might be here enquired also,

Whether the angel mentioned in Ec. v. 6. be not the same glorious archangel, that is, Christ. The words are these, *Say not before the face of the angel, it was an error: Wherefore should God be angry at thy voice?* Solomon is here advising us against rash vows. And he supposes some eminent angel, "in whom is the name of God:" as Ex. xxiii. 23. or who is called God, being present to hear the vow, especially in the house of God, as verse 1. It is certain the Jews had a common notion of some extraordinary angel in whom God dwelt, and the scripture often intimates it.

IV. The "Logos," or word, sometimes signifies the wisdom of the Father, or some special power, or divine sufficiency of the godhead, whereby all things were contrived and created, and which is represented sometimes in a personal manner by these Jewish writers; Ps. xxxiii. 6. *By the word of the Lord were the heavens created.* 2 Pet. iii. 5, 7. *By the word of God were the heavens of old, that is, were created, and by the same word they are preserved, and reserved for the fire.* And whether *ρῆμα* used on the same occasion, by which "the world was made, and is upheld; Heb. i. 3. and xi. 3. may not be the same with this divine *Λόγος*, is matter of enquiry, and in my maturest thoughts, it is not improbable.

In this sense Christ is also the Logos or Word of God, for God created all things by that Logos, who "was with God, who was God, who was made flesh, and dwelt among us;" John i. 1, 14. "He created the worlds by this his Son; Heb. i. 2. *He created all things by Jesus Christ;* Eph. iii. 9. He is that divine wisdom which was with God before the foundations of the world were laid, as Solomon describes in Prov. viii. 22—31. And if we can suppose this wisdom, or Word, assuming into union with itself the soul of the Messiah, or that great archangel, when he was first created, or generated, and using his ministration in its ancient divine operations and transactions, then all those superior and inferior expressions which are used in John i. 1—14. and in Col. i. 15—19. and in Heb. i. 2—11. and in Prov. viii. 22—31. and in John v. 19, 20, 26, 27, &c. may be applied to Christ as a complex person. Then it may be said concerning this person, *he was brought forth before the hills, the Lord possessed him in the beginning of his way before his works of old, he was set up from everlasting, that is, from the beginning, or ever the earth was, &c.*

On this text, in Prov. viii. 22. *The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way*, it may be farther observed, that the septuagint renders the Hebrew word *קָנָה* *ἐκτίθει μὲν*, that is, created me, which the primitive christian writers often cite, but are at a great loss how to explain it. Sometimes they apply it to the Father's constituting Christ Lord of the creation; which does

not seem to be the true meaning of it in this place. Sometimes they refer it to the production, or generation of the Logos, by the will and power of the Father, which is a superior sort of creation, and may be most properly applied to this angelic Logos, or human soul of Christ, which was created or produced by the will of the Father, and assumed into union with, or possessed by the divine Logos before all worlds, of which we shall say more hereafter. These are only remarks by the way: But it is manifest, that the word of God, or "Logos," in scripture, sometimes signifies an essential, co-eternal, divine power. And in that famous text; 1 John v. 7. *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one*; whether the Logos, or Word, signify this divine power, which is called the second person in the Deity, or whether it signify Christ in his whole complete person as God-man, is hard to determine.

V. In Heb. iv. 12. The Word, the Logos, denotes God acting by his word; Logos implies God himself, for a divine power is deity. And Christ is the Logos in this sense also: For the evangelist John says, *The Word was God*; John i. 1. and St. Paul calls Christ *God manifest in the flesh*; 1 Tim. iii. 16. He is the Lord, and the God of Thomas the apostle; John xx. 28. he is *God over all blessed for ever*; Rom. ix. 5. The divine essential power, called the Logos, is the true God, for every thing essential to God, is God. Nor is it strange at all, that Logos should signify God himself since it signifies the wisdom, or reason of God, for the same word "Logos," in its primary, or most usual sense, denoting the reason of any spirit, is upon that account used sometimes to denote the Spirit itself. Thus the human mind, and angelic spirits, are called λογος, among ancient Greek writers, particularly Philo and Origen; but Christ is called ο λογος, or the Word, emphatically, and the divine word. If therefore Christ be a divine power, called the "Logos," he is God himself.

Thus all these five applications of the terms "Logos," or "memra," or word, as used by the ancient Jews, are happily reconciled in our blessed Saviour; and a great part of that confusion which seems to be in their expressions is banished by this representation of things: Thus also there seems to be an illustrious light shed upon many dark passages of scripture, and the inferior and superior characters of the Messiah, Christ, or Logos, are naturally, and easily adjusted, by supposing his sacred person to be composed of a glorious, created spirit, inhabited by the divine, essential, or personal wisdom, or word. Thus he was the eternal Creator, and also the first-born of all the creatures, and in some sense existed as God-man before his incarnation. And this is what I have endeavoured to evince by the light of scripture, in

a distinct treatise of the *Glory of Christ as God-man*, which may shortly see the light\*.

In this view of things we have no need to make Christ to be the Son of God, properly in his divine nature, or to attribute any character of derivation, generation, or dependence, to his pure godhead, which carries a seeming impropriety in it. His Sonship, even under the Old Testament, as well as under the New, is better accounted for this way; and his angelic character, as the messenger of God in all ages, and the revealer of his will to the patriarchs, as well as to us, is preserved and explained, without sinking pure Godhead down to inferior characters, or attributing superior and divine characters, titles and prerogatives, to an angelic or inferior nature. The learned and pious Dr. Thomas Goodwin, that deep and happy enquirer into the sense of scripture, gives numerous instances wherein the divine nature of Christ must be supposed by way of prolepsis to be united to man in many of the expressions of scripture concerning Christ. Those glorious texts, John i. 1—3. Col. i. 10, 17. Heb. i. 2, 3. Phil. ii. 6. Prov. viii. 22—31. are all interpreted by him in this light, in his second book of the *Knowledge of God the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ*. Vol. II. fol.

“ It is Christ, says he, considered as God man, who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature, by whom, and for whom, all things were created in heaven or earth, visible or invisible, who is before all things, and by whom all things consist, who is the Son of God, whom he hath appointed the heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds, who is the brightness of his Father’s glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, who by himself purged away our sins, who was in the form of God, and thought it no robbery to be equal with God, who is the Word by whom all things were made, and who was with God in the beginning, who was set up from everlasting, and brought up before the hills,” &c. And that learned author contends, that these attributions cannot belong to the pure, simple divine nature of Christ, without taking in the inferior nature which was designed to be united to him, and therefore, in the language of scripture, it is mentioned in such a manner as though it were actually united.

There is very little difference between my opinion, and the sentiments of that great man in the exposition of all these scriptures, except only, that he attributes to the human nature of Christ before its existence, and considered only in its designed and future union with the divine nature, those same scriptural properties, characters, and transactions, which I would rather

\* This treatise was published in 1746.

ascribe to the human soul of Christ, supposing it actually existent, and considered always in a present, real, and personal union with his divine nature. Now, as he supposes those texts must necessarily be explained concerning Christ as God-man, so I suppose a literal interpretation of scripture is to be preferred before a figurative and proleptical sense, where it will consist with all other points of reason and revelation; and therefore I am ready to persuade myself, that the supposition of the real existence of the glorious human soul of Christ, as a super-angelic being, in actual union with the divine, eternal Logos, before the creation, as it happily corresponds with the ancient Jewish notions, so it will afford a better solution to many scriptural difficulties, will raise a nobler idea of the person of our blessed Lord, and add a lustre to the whole scheme of the gospel, as depending on his person, characters and transactions.— There is one objection will arise here, viz. how can the human soul of Christ be called an angel, since it is said in Heb. ii. 16. *He took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham.*

Answer I. The words in the original are, ἀγγέλων οὐ περιλαμβάνεται, &c. “He does not lay hold on angels, but he lays hold on the seed of Abraham,” that is, to bring them out of that bondage in which they were held in the foregoing verse.— Then it follows, verse 17. *Wherefore it behoved him in all things to be made like his brethren*, that is, It behoved him, who had a soul before, to take flesh and blood upon him now, since he came to lay hold on men, to rescue them from bondage. As the Greek words themselves do not signify taking the nature of angels, or of Abraham, so neither will the context allow that translation, as some learned men have supposed, particularly Camero. For it would be hardly consistent language to say, “He took not on him the nature of angels, but took on him the nature of the seed of Abraham, for which reason it became him to be made like his brethren, that is, to take flesh and blood upon him.” This would be proving “idem per idem.” Whereas the sense is very natural when we read it thus, “He does not lay hold on angels to rescue them, but he lays hold on the seed of Abraham, for their rescue from bondage. *Wherefore it became him in all things to be made like his brethren;*” that is, It became him, who before was a spirit, now to be made flesh, since he came to redeem those who are partakers of flesh.

II. But suppose our English translation were exactly true, yet the human soul of Christ may be called an angel in its separate state, though it be really a human spirit, or of a species of spirits different from the angelic world; for since the vulgar hypothesis supposes, the divine nature of Christ to be called an angel in the Old Testament, because of its appearances like an

angel, and being employed as a messenger from the Father, much more may we suppose the human soul of Christ to be called an angel for the very same reasons ; while at the same time it might have some peculiar distinguishing properties of a human spirit, which are unknown to us.

**Sect V.**—*The Sentiments of the Primitive Christians concerning the Logos, and their Application of this Name to Christ.*

Thus we have seen how the doctrine of scripture may be enlightened by some acquaintance with the writings of the ancient Jews. Now, if we find also, that the primitive christians have left us several traces and footsteps of the same notions if they speak the same sort of language, and correspond with these sentiments, it will be an additional confirmation of the doctrine which I have proposed. I shall confine myself, chiefly, in this enquiry, to the writings of the three first centuries, which all the world esteems to be of the chief importance, as being nearest to the days of the apostles. Yet even of these I shall cite but few at large in their own language, because I intend this discourse as a mere essay, or hint of thought to others, who may be much better qualified to pursue such a reconciling scheme, and not as a laborious proof and demonstration of my opinion.

I. That the primitive fathers, by the Logos, intended the Messiah in his pre-existent state, is a truth so abundantly manifest, and agreed on all hands, that it would be superfluous to make citations on this head.

II. That the Logos is also the Son of God, is as evident as the former : The writings of the fathers, through all the centuries, are full of it : But in what sense he is a Son, and when he began to be a Son, whether from all eternity, or sometime before the creation, is a matter of difference, and doubtful enquiry, which we shall examine by and by.

III. That the “Logos,” or Word, is a divine power, eternal, infinite, &c. analogous to mind, wisdom, or reason, is so apparent in their writings, as leaves little room for doubt ; though it is also represented often in a personal manner by the christian fathers, even as in the sacred and common Jewish writings.—The primitive fathers frequently call our Saviour the Word, or reason, the wisdom, the light, the virtue, and the power *Νεϋ*, or the mind, and sometimes *Θελημα*, or the will of God. Many of them argue for the eternity of the “Logos” upon this principle, that God was always *λογικος*, never *αλογος*, always rational, and never without his reason, his word or wisdom. Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Tatian, and several others, assert the Logos to be co-eternal with the Father, under the character of the divine word or reason, though not under the special character of a Son.

*Theophilus in his Second Book to Autolytus*, calls him the wisdom and power of the highest, and the word which was conceived in the heart of God, and by which he formed the world. This word was διαπαντος ενδιαιτησεν εν καρδια Θεου, and presently he adds, ταυτων ηχη συμβεβηκον εν αυτη και φρονησιν οντα, that is, always conceived in the heart of God: This word he had for a counsellor, being his own mind and thought, or prudence.

*Hippolytus, contra Noetum*, capite x. asserts that God being alone was many, for he was *υτι αλογος*, *υτι ασοφης*, *υτι αδυνατος*, *υτι αβηλιωτος*, neither irrational, nor unwise, nor impotent; or, neither without reason, or without wisdom, or without power, or without counsel; which words, saith the learned Dr. Waterland, correspond to the several names of the Son, and the holy Spirit, and mean the same thing.

*Tertullian, contra Praxeam*, capite v. says, "God was alone, because there was nothing eternal but himself; but even then he was not alone, for he had with him, *rationem suam, quam habebat in semetipso*, his reason, which was within himself."—And again, *contra Hermogenem*, "*Habuit deus sophiam suam; hac illi consiliarius fuit*. He had his wisdom with him; and this was his counsellor." He supposes reason to be eternal, and to be before the word. *Non sermomonialis à principio, sed rationalis deus etiam ante principium*, that is, God had not the word with him, or was not a speaker, from the beginning, but was rational even before the beginning:" See *contra Praxeam*, capite v. So that Tertullian chuses to translate the eternal Logos, reason; supposing him to become the Word, at or a little before the creation.

*Clemens of Alexandria, in Stromatum*, libro vii. calls Christ, or the Logos, *πατερικη τις ενεργεια*, a certain virtue, or energy of the Father. And Justin Martyr, in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, calls him a rational power\*, which is also called the glory of the Father. Now it is evident concerning the Logos, or Christ, as he is the wisdom, mind; or reason of the Father, that he must be truly and properly divine, necessarily existent, eternal, infinite, &c. as the Father; for he is of the very essence of godhead; an eternal divine power, which belongs to the nature of God; which was always with God from eternity; is for ever unchangeable; inseparable from God: And in this sense he is consubstantial and co-essential with the Father. Though it seems manifest, that the Logos in this sense is a power of the divine mind, and is not another conscious mind, distinct from the Father; yet it was the custom of the ancient Jewish writers, as well as of the primitive christians, sometimes to represent this Logos, this

\* Perhaps, by *δουλομας λογικη* in this place Justin Martyr may mean some supra-angelic spirit; but I cannot certainly learn from the context, what his idea was.

eternal reason, wisdom, or word, in a personal manner; and that not only because the scripture favours this dialect, or manner of speaking; but because the eastern nations frequently represent human as well as divine powers, in a personal manner; and the early christians learning their christianity from the apostles, and other converted Jews, were initiated and trained up in the phraseology of the eastern and Jewish writers.

It is granted, indeed, that we know how great the distinction is betwixt God the Father, and his eternal Word or wisdom: It is justly supposed to be great enough to lay a sufficient foundation for such a distinct personal representation, as the scriptural language and style give us. This divine Logos seems to be represented both in scripture, and in the primitive writers, as much distinct from the Father as the same essence admits of, or as distinct as may be, without being another conscious mind. Now this seems to be something more than a mere attribute; and therefore I call the Logos a divine power\*; imitating herein both the ancient Jews and the primitive fathers, who call him frequently *Σοφία*, and *Νύς*, and *Δυναμὶς τῆς Θεοῦ*, and particularly Clemens Alexandrinus, who makes him *πατρικὴ τις ἐνέργεια*. But since God and his co-essential Word do not seem to have two distinct consciousnesses, or to be two conscious minds; this eternal Logos can hardly be called a person, in the common and literal sense of the term, as a distinct man or angel, but only in figurative and metaphorical language, as some zealous Trinitarians have expressed it.

Let it be noted here also, that most of the ancient fathers which have been now cited, do not suppose this eternal Logos, to be an eternal Son; but that he became a Son by a certain generation, prolation, or filiation, which some of them call creation, some time before the world was created. Some of the ancients, indeed, seem to apply the word Son, to this eternal Logos:—And some of them have explained their meaning, that the Logos was *ὑδαθιτῶ*, *ἢ καρδία*, *ἢ σπλαγχνίαις*, that is, conceived in the heart, in the bowels of the Father; that he was potentially in the Father, from eternity, though not actually produced: Which was also the express sense of some in the Nicene times, and of the emperor Constantine, as Eusebius relates it, in his letter to the people of Cæsarea.

Or there is another sense wherein the Logos, or eternal divine wisdom, may be called a Son as well as a person, by a figure of speech: For in the ancient eastern and scriptural idioms, any thing that has either a logical or a physical sort of

\* In what sense the Logos, or divine Word differs from an attribute; how it appears to be something analogous to a divine power; and how it is taken sometimes to signify the divine nature itself, exerting a particular power; the discourse on the *Distinction of Persons* in the Trinity accounts for it. See Dissertation VII.



dependence, is sometimes called son or daughter. So the eternal wisdom, or reason, word, or will, flowing from the essence of God, may possibly be called a son. So, among ourselves knowledge, or intelligence, resulting from the essence of the human soul, may be called the offspring of the soul. And though I must confess, I doubt whether the scripture ever calls Christ the Son of God in this sense, yet where ancient writers use this form of speech, they may be interpreted in the same manner as later and more modern authors, who use the same phraseology, explain themselves; if there be no better interpretation to be put on their words.

Austin has written much of the Trinity, and he often derives the Son from the Father, in such a manner as wisdom and knowledge is derived from the essence of the mind. The school-doctors, and the middle ages of the church, and some general councils, have spoken the same sort of language. Calvin and his followers describe what sonship they attribute to the eternal word, or wisdom, in this manner: And Mr. Baxter, who differs from Calvin in other things, agrees with him in this. This has been a frequent representation of the sonship of the divine Word, amongst the most orthodox writers. It is in this manner the learned and ingenious Dr. Wallis accounts for the sonship of the divine nature of Christ, in his *Letters on the Trinity*, and many others of the modern and school Trinitarian authors do the same. Upon the whole it is plain, that the ancients generally if not universally suppose the "Logos" to be a co-eternal power belonging to God or the Father; though the most primitive writers do not generally express his proper distinct personality and sonship, until at, or some time before, the creation of the world. They suppose that there was then a generation, or a voluntary divine action put forth, whereby the Logos existed in a new state, and became the Son of God; and that it is in this sense that he is called in scripture, *the beginning of the creation of God, and the first-born of every creature*; Rev. iii. 14. Col. i. 15. "And it was at this time according to some of the Fathers, that the divine "Logos," or eternal wisdom, began to have a personality, or at least, a more distinct personality than it had before. *Baxter's Methodus Theologica*, page 96, line the last.

IV. I proceed now to shew that these ancient primitive fathers, believed the "Logos" to be true God: And there is no need to labour in the proof of this, for since they describe him as a divine power eternally and essentially belonging to the godhead, it follows, that they must attribute proper deity to him, for every thing essential to deity is true God. What Mr. Baxter says in his *Methodus Theologica de Trinitate*, seems to demand the assent of intelligent readers, *Christum esse dei ἑσῶν, seu sapientiam, in ecclesia uno quasi ore pronunciatum esse, seculo-*

*rum omnium testimonia probant.* 'The testimonies of all ages of the church, pronounce, as it were with one mouth, that Christ is the Logos, the word or wisdom of God.'

Let it be seriously considered, what a multitude of scriptures in the Old Testament, in which the one supreme God is plainly spoken of, are applied to Christ, or the Logos, by the primitive fathers: As, Gen. iii. 8, 9. *They heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden, and the Lord God called to Adam.* Gen. xix. 24. *The Lord, or Jehovah, rained upon Sodom, brimstone and fire from the Lord.* Gen. xvii. 1, 2. *The Lord appeared unto Abraham, and said, I am the Almighty God;* Gen. xxviii. 18. *The Lord stood above it, that is, Jacob's ladder, and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac, &c.* And many other texts there are, wherein the names, characters, and transactions of Jehovah, the Lord and God of Israel, are attributed by the fathers to the Logos, or Christ. While I have been reading in Justin Martyr's dialogue with Trypho the Jew, how he directly ascribes to Christ, those sacred names of the Lord of hosts, the King of glory, God the Saviour, God the Lord, our God and our King, in the xxiv. and xlv. Psalms; and other illustrious divine titles in the xlv. lxiii. xcvi. Psalms, and elsewhere; I have been ready to wonder, how any writers could fairly deny true and eternal godhead to be attributed to Christ, by any of the primitive fathers.

Besides all this, when I consider the characters of supreme deity, and of perfect unity with the Father, even in the same substance, which are ascribed to the Logos, or to Christ, by the primitive writers, I think there is evident proof, that they supposed true godhead to belong to him. Their language represents him as an essential power of God himself. Origen says, *Let him that dares to say, there was a time when the Son was not, consider that he also says, there was a time when wisdom was not, and when light was not.* And there are others of the ancients that argue just in the same manner, viz. that God could never be  $\alpha\lambda\omicron\gamma\omega\varsigma$ , or  $\alpha\omega\sigma\phi\omega\varsigma$ , that is, without his word, his reason, and wisdom. Origen further asserts, that the "omnipotence of the Father and the Son is one and the same; as the Son is one and the same Lord and God with the Father." He calls him "the divine Word, who is God by nature." Irenæus calls him *Ipse Deus*, or God himself; not another God, but the same God with the Father. This author abounds in expressions which make the Father and Son the one God. *Libro iv. capite 11. Qui igitur à prophetis adorabatur Deus vivus, hic est vivorum Deus, et verbum ejus qui locutus est Moysi, qui et Sadducæos redarguit, &c.* And at the end of the chapter he concludes, *Ipse igitur Christus cum Patre, vivorum est Deus.* "He who was adored

by the prophets as the living God, is the God of the living Mat. xxii. 32. and his Word who spake to Moses, and refuted the Sadducees. Therefore Christ, with the Father, is the God of the living." Again, he begins, libro iii. capite 6. in this manner, viz. "Neither the Lord, nor the holy Spirit, nor the apostles, would have definitively and absolutely called him God, who was not God, nor any one unless he were the true God." Then he goes on to shew, how Christ is called God; Ps. xlv. 6. *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* Ps. l. 1. *The God of gods the Lord hath spoken*; on which he comments thus, "What God is this of whom it is said, God shall come, even our God, and shall not keep silence? This is the Son, who says openly, *I am found of them who seek me not, &c.*

If we consult the ancients, with one mouth they all declare, that God alone is to be worshipped; and yet they declare also for the worship of the Son, or the divine Word: And when I read these expressions, I cannot suffer myself to believe, that while they wrote those things, they could deny Christ to be the true God. It is evident to me, they believed his godhead. But I forbid myself to proceed in this work: It seems to be a needless and useless thing, to prove that the fathers, in a multitude of their expressions, asserted the true deity of the Logos, after those great and learned authors, Bishop Pearson, Bishop Bull, Dr. Waterland, and Dr. Knight, have done it so effectually, in their large and laboured writings.

V. The remaining sense in which the ancient Jewish writers used the term Logos, is that of a glorious angel, or archangel, formed before the creation of the world; called the first-born Son of God; the man after the image of God; the one man who is the Father of all others; the beginning; the name of God;" and who was employed as a messenger to the ancient patriarchs, and an instrument, or medium, by which God transacted many other important affairs, with regard to this lower world. Now the great enquiry is, Whether the primitive christian fathers ever used the word "Logos" in this sense. Here I must acknowledge, that they speak with much confusion, and mingle the ideas of the increated or eternal Logos together with some inferior and creatural ideas, which they attribute also to the Logos. This would make one think, that some of them might have some obscure notices, intimations, and conceptions of this angelic Logos, as personally joined, and made one with the divine eternal Logos: Though neither the primitive christians, nor the ancient Jews, keep the ideas of these two beings distinct; for sometimes they seem to attribute different, and seemingly inconsistent properties and actions to one and the same single "Logos." But an enquiry into this matter is the business of the next section.

**SECT. VI.—An Enquiry whether the most Primitive Christian Fathers speak of the Logos as an Angel, or a glorious Spirit inferior to God.**

That I may give some general idea of the language of the fathers on this subject, I will range their sentiments under these four heads :

I. They represent the Logos as being produced by, or derived from God the Father, by his will and power. He is called by some of the ancients, a birth, *γεννημα* ; a production, *προβλημα* ; a second God, *δευτερος θεος* ; and sometimes, *θεος γεννηθεις* ; a made God ; and represented as being made God, *θειποιημενος*, by communication, or participation of the godhead of the Father. They speak frequently of the " Son's subordination to the Father, as to his being ; of his proceeding, or leaping forth, or being produced from the Father by generation, *being the first-born of every creature*. They speak of his " existence, and his godhead being derived from the Father, together with all his power and glory : " " Of his receiving all that he has from the Father : " " Of his being generated by the power, by the will, and even by the design and counsel of the Father\*." " Of his becoming God by the generation of the Father, which generation proceeded from his will." And Tatian calls him " a heavenly Spirit, begotten by the Father ; and the first-born work of the Spirit," *πρωτογονον υγιου*.

When they speak of God the Father, they greatly advance their style ; they bear witness to his self-existent, unbegotten, and underived nature and call him *αυτοθεος*, that is, God of himself ; which sort of expressions they utterly deny concerning the Son. When they explain that text ; John xiv. 28. " The Father is greater than I," the ancients generally confess it to belong to Christ in his pre-existent nature, before his incarnation : And

\* It is a frequent expression among the ancients, that Christ was begotten by the will, or counsel, and power of the Father ; And I humbly conceive, that the ancients in these places, speak of the temporal, voluntary and ante-mundane generation of the Son, and not of his eternal existence. The common sense of these expressions, by the will of God, or by the power of God, in scripture, doth not imply a necessity of nature, but arbitrary will. So St. Paul is often called an apostle by the will of God : And there are above thirty places in the New Testament, where the will of God carries the same idea. And throughout all the bible, when things are said to exist, or come to pass by the power of God, I think it always implies the voluntary, or arbitrary exercise of divine power. And the most early fathers use these phrases in the same sense.

Let it be observed also, That in the same primitive writers I have found the same phrase, " By the will of God," used several times, and applied to the incarnation of Christ, or his mission into this world by the will of the Father ; which is certainly his arbitrary will. I might add also, that Bishop Bull himself, speaking of the generation of Christ, *θεισσει και βουλη*, by the will and counsel of the Father, declares, *Frustra sudant theologi, ut hæc dicta concilient cum æterna filii generatione* Breves animadversiones in Gilbertum Clerk. Annotata ad paginam 117.

because the Father is the principle and original of the Son, therefore they say, he is greater. It is true, they sometimes make the nature of the Father and Son the same: But they had such a settled belief and universal maxim among them, that the Father had some pre-eminence and prerogative above the Son, that they express his priority and superiority to the Son, in various forms of speech. Bishop Bull affirms this in *Defensione fidei nicaenae* sectione iv. capite 2. *de subordinatione filii*. And capite 1. asserts, that "All the fathers without fear pronounced him *principium, causa et autor filii*, αρχη, αιτια, & αυτω τω υιω, principle or spring, the cause, the author of the Son, the cause of his being;" as well as that the Father is said to be the spring of his godhead and power. He is the fountain, the root, the head of the Son, and has the peculiar title of the only true God. As the Father is the cause, so the Son is *αυτωτος*, the thing, person, caused. And Bishop Bull expressly grants, that in the sense of the fathers, and in his own opinion, "The Son received not only his person, but his nature and deity from the Father. See "*Defensionem fidei nicaenae*," sectione iv. capite 1. § 7

II. The Logos is not only represented by these writers generated, and existing by the will and power of God, but a great part of the ante-nicene fathers, and some of the post-nicenes also represent the procession, prolation, production, generation of the Son, as temporary, and at some time before this world was made; or in order to form, make, or to adorn the world. It must be confessed, that the post-nicene writers speak more of the eternal generation than the primitive ancients have done, yet they make his ante-mundane production from the Father to be a generation also, and suppose this to be voluntary well as temporal.

Though all of them grant the co-eternal existence of the Logos, as a divine power, as the reason or wisdom of God, and in this sense some of them say, the Father was always a Father and never was without the Son, considered as the internal wisdom or reason of God, or considering God the Father, having the Son always potentially within him, yet many of the most early writers make the generation and distinct Sonship of the Logos, to be temporary and voluntary, and ante-mundane and speak not plainly of any other, as Justin, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and several more besides them. Some of the most ingenious, and learned defenders of the eternal godhead of Christ have constantly allowed the highest generation of the Son, spoken of by Justin, and several others of the fathers, to be temporal and that, perhaps, even the nicene bishops, meant the same, when they call the Son light of light, &c.

Tertullian saith plainly, "Though God is a Father, yet he was not always a Father, for he could not be a Father before

there was a son, now there was a time when the son was not." He speaks always of the generation of the Son as a voluntary thing, and brought about in time : He calls this the *perfecta natiuitas sermoneis*, though the "logos" considered as reason, was in the heart of God from eternity. So Theophilus, libro ii. ad Autolyicum, speaks of the Λογὸς which was always ἑδραζόμενος ἐν πατρὶσι θεῶν but afterwards God generated and produced this Word, ἔκτισεν τὸν λόγον ἐγγίνουσι προφορῶν, πρῶτον ἅπαντος κτίσις, Clemens Alexandrinus, who is a zealous asserter of the deity of the Logos, the divine word or wisdom, speaks of the Son of God as πρώτη κτίσις, the first created wisdom : And many of the fathers speak of σοφία, or wisdom, as created, when God sent her forth to make the world, and they imitate herein the words of the lxx. in Prov. viii. 22. "Where wisdom saith/ "The Lord created me the beginning of his ways." Κύριος ἐποίησέν με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ ὡς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἔμελλεν ποιεῖν ὡς ἡμεῖς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἔμελλεν ποιεῖν ὡς ἡμεῖς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, as some of them seem to explain it.

Not only the most ancient writers, but even some in the times of the Nicene council had this notion of the eternal existence of the Logos in God the Father, and the production of him as a distinct Son in time, or at least, not co-eternally. For Athanasius himself speaking concerning Christ, or the Word, says, "He who had an existence before was afterward begotten into a Son, Τὸν ὄντα πρότερον, ὑπερῶν γεννηθέντα ἡμῶν υἱόν. And the Emperor Constantine, in Eusebius's letter to the church at Cæsarea, says, that "with respect to his divine generation he had a prior existence before all ages, forasmuch as before his actual generation he was potentially in the Father after an unbegotten manner." And this we may suppose they spoke in direct opposition to the Arian error, who denied Christ to be any thing before he was begotten or born, and which was one of the errors which was anathematized in the council. Let it be noted also, that though the distinct generation of the Son is not supposed to be co-eternal with the existence of the Logos in the heart of the Father, yet it is by some of the ancients described as before all worlds or ages, πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων, and that must be in some unknown moment of the divine eternity.

III. This Logos, or Son of God, is represented under various other characters, which seem to denote an inferiority to the supreme God over all, and would lead one to suppose they might have some idea of an angelic being. He is called frequently an angel by the ancients, and yet they say, "It is impious to call the supreme God over all an angel." He is acknowledged to "receive all his power from the Father, and that he is subject to the Father ; that in all things he ministers to the will of the Father, and acts by his authority." He is sometimes said ὑπερῶν ἡμῶν ὑπακούω to serve the Father or to work under him ; that he is not

stronger than the Father, but inferior or weaker, so Origen, *ἰσχυροῦς ἀλλὰ ὑποτακτός*. That the Father is stronger, more powerful, more sublime, than the Son. So Tertullian. *Innatus nato fortius; infectum facto validius; quod, ut, esset, nullius eguit auctoris, multo sublimius erit eo, quod, ut esset, aliquen habuit autorem*. Contra Harmogenem, capite xviii. That the Son is the second God, or the next power after the first God; that he pays due honour to the Father by calling him "The only true God; John xvii. 3. owning *the Father to be greater than he*; John xiv. 28. and all this with regard to his pre-existent nature before his incarnation.

The learned Bishop Bull, that excellent defender of the deity of Christ, in his defence of the Nicene faith," section iv. chapter 3. acknowledges that "almost all the catholics before the days of Arius seem not to have known the invisible and immense nature of the Son of God, and they spake sometimes of him as though, even according to his divine nature, he were finite, visible, included in a certain place, and circumscribed in certain limits, while they, at the same time assert, and prove the Father to be immense, to fill all places, and to be included in none. Thence they infer, that it is not the Father that appeared as God and Jehovah to the patriarchs, but the Son." For this he cites Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Novatian, and mentions also Theophilus, Irenæus, Origen, and six other bishops, as speaking the same sort of language.\* I confess, Bishop Bull attempts a solution of this difficulty, both in that treatise, and in his remarks on Gilbert Clerk, and excuses the fathers, by "assigning invisibility to the real nature of the Son, but visibility to his economical character; it being condecant and agreeable that the Son should exhibit sensible tokens of his presence in certain places rather than the Father; because he had undertaken, even from the fall of man, to be a Mediator, and thus gave some pre-significations of his incarnate state, being sent by the Father to appear amongst men." But the various manners of solving these difficulties shall be considered more particularly in the following section; I insert this account of the writings of the ancients in this place, only as an intimation, that it is possible the ancients might have some confused idea of an inferior nature belonging to the Son before his incarnation.

IV. Another circumstance that would lead one to think, that some of the primitive ancients might have some intimations of a Logos inferior to God is, that they assert the very Logos himself to be made passible, and to suffer upon the cross; and that in a real and proper manner the Logos, or Word, was

\* It is worthy our notice, that Philo the Jew, in his book "De somniis," speaks the same language too, asserting that the "true God cannot be seen," but when he appeared to men it was in the form of an angel, of his most ancient and sacred Word, who is his deputy.

sensible of the sorrows which Christ endured for our sakes. Now we cannot suppose that they ever imagined that Logos which was the eternal word, or wisdom of God, to become passible, or to suffer pain or sorrow, any otherwise than in a mere relative manner, that is, as it was united to that soul and body which did suffer; for every thing of godhead is for ever impassible. And for this reason, when they write against the Patripassians, they abominate the thought of God the Father becoming passible. But there is a Logos which they suppose to become passible, and actually to feel and suffer shame and sorrow: It seems to be the labour of their expression, and the very thing in view, to shew, that the Word itself was passible and suffered. Irenæus was engaged in his writings against those who suppose that Christ fled away and left Jesus only to suffer, because they imagined that the true Christ was always impassible, and therefore his business was to shew, that the Word, the Son of God, became passible and suffered. See libro iii. capite 17, 18. and several other places. And Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho, speaks of the Son of God being *αληθως εν παθεισιν*, really in sufferings for us; and *λογου παθηοντα*, the word suffering\*. Thence I infer they might have some notion of a Logos inferior to godhead.

These are the four particulars whereby I proposed to enquire, whether the primitive fathers of the christian church might be supposed to have any notion of an angelic Logos, who is the Son of God, and yet inferior to the divine Logos, or the eternal word, or wisdom, of the Father. I have now finished my account of the Logos, as exhibited in the ancient christian writers. I dare not pronounce them all of one mind in the things I have mentioned, nor that the same authors are always steady in asserting the same things, either in a consistence with themselves, or with one another: But I think in the main, these opinions which I have recited in these two last sections concerning the Logos, seem to be the more general sense of the primitive fathers, before the controversy of Arius arose, or the council of Nice was called: And it is known also, that some of the ancients, both at that time, and afterward, express themselves almost in the same manner.

\* It is granted, that some of the ancients might perhaps believe a certain animal soul in Christ considered as a man, which was the immediate subject of the sensations of wounding, scourging, nailing, &c. for their philosophy did hardly suppose the rational soul in man to be capable of these sensations. But it seems to be their general apprehension that the Logos or Word itself did really and truly sustain, if not sensible pain, yet, sorrows and afflictions, in opposition to those who asserted him to suffer only putative, that is, relatively, or by construction.



SECT. VII.—*An Humble Attempt to Reconcile the Difficulties arising from the Various Expressions of the Primitive Fathers.*

Whosoever reads all this variety of language concerning the Logos, in these two last sections, where he is represented in the sublime characters of true and eternal godhead, and in the inferior characters of a dependent being, must readily confess that there is some difficulty in reconciling them. From these different expressions of the primitive fathers arises the controversy in the church in later ages, concerning their sentiments of the godhead of Christ.

The Arians, and all the rest who imitate their opinions, finding such a multitude of phrases, and forms of speech in these primitive writers, wherein the Logos is sunk below the dignity of godhead, they are tempted utterly to deny the true and proper deity of the Logos. And either they interpret the most sublime and divine characters given to the Logos in a rhetorical way, and reduce them to an inferior sense, by a hard and unreasonable strain of the words, or else they drop the sublimest expressions, as not belonging to Christ, or as inconsistent with the inferior characters given him; and then applying the inferior expressions only to him, they claim these ancients entirely on their side, though I think, without just reason. The athanasias, together with the scholastic Trinitarians, and all their followers, reading the several glorious, eternal, and divine characters, ascribed to the Logos, plainly find, that the ancients believed him to have true and proper godhead; and I think they prove it with sufficient brightness and evidence. But they are sometimes hard put to it to find out methods of accounting, how all the inferior and creature characters may be given to the self-same Logos.

Were there not such a number of expressions in these ancient writers which ascribe so different, and seemingly inconsistent characters, viz. both the properties of God, and a creature, to the Logos, we can hardly suppose that modern writers of such sense and sagacity, such probity and great learning, could run into so different extremes, could maintain such warm contentions to defend their own opinions, which are so widely distant, and that each should alledge and believe the ancient fathers to be on their side. There seems to be so much darkness and perplexity amongst the fathers in this matter, as constrained Bishop Bull, that great and sincere defender of the deity of Christ, to call some of their expressions *parum cautæ locutiones, dura, et incommoda, &c.* He makes a honest and ingenious complaint on this occasion, *admira hæc patrum dicta quis non planè obstupescat? Quo σοφῶ φαρμακῶ istius modi ipsorum dicta sanari possunt?* Defensione fidei nicaenae, sectione iv. capite 3. § 4. And in the beginning of this chapter he mentions a particular set

of expressions concerning the visibility and locality of the Son, and the invisibility and unconfinedness of the Father, which run through almost all the monuments of the primitive writers, and which seem to contradict the deity of the Son, and this is, says he, *nodus vindice dignissimus, fateor me ad istum lapidem alim offendisse, &c.* The sense, in English, is this: "These are hard sayings, uncautious expressions, and inconvenient speeches. Who is there would not stand amazed at such strange expressions of the fathers? What wise and happy method will reconcile them? What medicine will make them sound? This is a difficulty worthy of a solution; I confess I was once ready to stumble at this stone:" &c. So hard is it for a honest and good man not to acknowledge the perplexity, darkness, and seeming inconsistency of those venerable writers, on this subject! And the reverend Dr. Waterland, with the same ingenuity, now and then confesses the difficulty of reconciling some of their expressions, and gives up a few of them, as improprieties or mistakes.

I might take notice here also, that there are some writers of name and worth among the Athanasians, that speak with more freedom, and plainly declare, that several of the ancients, by their frequent ascriptions of creatural ideas to the Logos, laid a foundation for Arianism in the following ages, and therefore they will not abide by their sentiments, nor pretend to vindicate or excuse their expressions, because they cannot be all applied to the divine nature of Christ. But let us consider more particularly, how the learned authors among the Athanasians, who are most favourable to the ancients, attempt to remove this stumbling-block. So far as I can gather light from their several works, they seem to depend upon these following principles of solution:

I. That the temporal and voluntary generation of the Logos, which is the only generation many of the ante-nicene fathers speak of is not properly a generation, but a mere manifestation of him, when God created the world by this Logos, or Word; and that he was, indeed, eternally, and properly, a distinct person from God the Father, and that he was the Son of God from all eternity, though he was not discovered as such until the creation. All these words, of generation, prolation, production, &c. there-fore must mean nothing but manifestation. They make his eternal existence to arise from eternal generation, which those ancients do not mention, and they make his procession to create the world to be no real generation, which is the only generation those ancients speak of. And they add further, that where the Logos is said to be "begotten, or produced by the will, counsel, and power of God," when these words refer to this "temporary, ante-mundane generation, or manifestation," they may signify the free or arbitrary will of God the Father: But if

ever these words do refer to the eternal, and proper generation of the Son, that is, his emanation from the Father, then they must signify nothing but the acquiescence, or consent of the Father, to the natural and necessary emanation of this Logos, or co-eternal Son.

II. Some of the Athanasians suppose there may be some "real and natural subordination of an eternal Son to an eternal Father, though the divine nature be equal in them both," and that is, by supposing the Father only to be self-existent and independent, and by referring the Son's existence, and his godhead and power to the Father, as the spring and fountain of it, from which it is derived by way of natural and necessary emanation; and they think that this will account for all those inferior sort of expressions which are used concerning the derivation of the Logos from God the Father, and the Father being greater than the Son.

III. They add in the next place, that the distinctions of priority and posteriority of order between the Father and the Son, even in the divine nature, will solve many of the expressions of the fathers without a real subordination of nature.

IV. Another principle of accommodation is this, That the Son, though equal to the Father in nature, or essence, yet is economically subordinate, that is, it is appointed in the dispensations of God toward his creatures, that the Son should act an obedient and subjective part by the relation in which he stands, and the office which he sustains with regard to God and creatures: And that all this may be done by the divine condescension of the eternal Logos, and thus the inferior and creature sort of expressions applied to the Logos by the primitive Fathers, must be construed economically.

V. They suppose, in the last place, that the eternity and necessity of the existence of the Son, are sufficient to secure his true and proper deity, even though it be really derived from the Father, and therefore cannot be self-existent. They suppose also, that the eternal, necessary, and inseparable union of the Father, Son, and Spirit, is sufficient to secure the unity of the godhead, though they be really three distinct, intelligent agents or natures, and proper, different persons, almost in the complete and literal sense of the words as used among men.

I shall not make it my business to attempt to destroy any of these solutions. I freely acknowledge, that these methods of reconciling the strange, and jarring expressions of the primitive writers, are candid and ingenious; and some of them have some colour and support from scripture, as well as from the writings of the fathers themselves; yet after all the mollifying constructions of interpreters, I think still the difficulties can scarce be solved upon that hypothesis, without allowing too many cata-

chreases, and too hard figures of speech, by speaking of God like a creature, and of a creature like God. These lay a foundation for very obscure and perplexed ideas, and thereby introduce perpetual contests betwixt learned men, concerning the sense of the fathers.

May it not be lawful therefore, to propose another method of reconciling the various, and seeming inconsistent expressions of the primitive fathers concerning the Logos? The proposal is as follows: If the same single subject, the same simple Logos, cannot sustain such different and contrary characters, let us enquire, whether the Logos be not a complex subject, made up of two distinct subjects, each of which has had the appellation of Logos, or the Word, both in the Jewish and christian writings?

May we not suppose the Logos, or Word, considered as something in the godhead analogous to a power or virtue, to be infinite, uncreated, co-essential, and co-eternal with God the Father, as being of his very essence, and in this sense true God? May not this sometimes be represented in a personal manner as distinct from the Father? Would not this be the proper subject of the most sublime attributions given to the Logos?

May we not suppose also, that in some unknown moment of the divine eternity, God, by his sovereign will and power, produced a glorious spirit in an immediate manner, and in a very near likeness to himself, and called him his Son, his only begotten Son? Would not this be a proper subject for all the inferior attributions? Might not this be that Logos of Philo, and the other ancient Jews, who was called the first born of God, the eldest archangel, the man after God's own image? &c. and might not this be the human soul of our blessed Saviour?

Supposing further this angelic spirit to be assumed into a personal union with the divine Logos, from the first moment of his existence, might he not be called the Son of God also, upon this account? May it not be said, that true godhead is communicated to the Son of God in this manner, and that by the free will of the Father? *For it pleased the Father that the fulness of the Godhead should dwell in him; Col. i. 19.* And in this sense the Father may be called the author and the cause both of his existence, his godhead, and all his powers, for though the godhead of the Logos, or divine wisdom, be essential to the nature of God, and eternally independent, yet it may be communicated, that is, united, to an inferior spirit by the will of the Father, without any diminution of its divine independency. Now by virtue of this personal union, or inhabitation, of the divine mind, or wisdom, in this glorious angelic being, the Son becomes more eminently *the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person.*

'Then will it not follow, that this whole complex being, viz.

God and a creature, might be that Logos, or Word of God, which the scripture so frequently speaks of in the Old and New Testament? Might not this be the glorious God-angel, who appeared to the patriarchs, as an angel, and as a man; and assumed the names and titles of God, *Jehovah, the Almighty, the God of Abraham, &c.* Might not this be that sacred Logos, that Word of the Lord, who visited the prophets, and holy men of old, and brought divine messages to them? Might not this be that God, and Jehovah, *who led the Israelites through the Red Sea, in the pillar of cloud, and fire, and that Christ whom they tempted in the wilderness?* In short, might not this be that Logos, or glorious person, called *the Word of God*, by whom God transacted all his ancient affairs in the creation of the world, and in the government of his church? And would not this complex being be a proper subject to receive either the divine or creatural ascriptions which are given to Christ in scripture, and in the ancient fathers?

Might not this Logos, in the complex character of God and a creature, or the Son of God inhabited personally by eternal wisdom, according to scripture, *in the fulness of time*, assume flesh and blood into union with himself? Might he not thus be made *in the likeness of man*, become complete God-man, and be sent into this world that he might become a Redeemer and Saviour, by his death, his resurrection, and his succeeding advancement in heaven? May not this be the true scriptural notion and description of the person of Christ, or God incarnate, *God manifest in the flesh?* Is not this that Son of God who is *one with the Father*, as he is *the wisdom of God?* Who was *the angel of the Lord*, and the *angel of the covenant*, as he was the soul of Christ before his incarnation? And who is the man Jesus, the perfect Mediator, since he was made partaker of flesh and blood? And may not this be supposed to be the easiest and happiest way of reconciling the different and almost inconsistent characters, which are attributed to the Logos by the ancients. Where one single being is not a sufficient subject to sustain both characters, a complex subject may easily sustain them.

So some of the ancient philosophers supposed man to be one single being, and attributed all the powers and properties both of reason and vegetation, to the human animal: But the moderns having well considered, that the powers of reasoning, and the powers of vegetation, cannot belong to the same simple subject one being the property of matter, and the other of mind, they are led necessarily to infer, that man is a compound being, made up both of matter and mind: The scripture itself also confirms this inference, and assures us of the truth of it, by making the soul and body of man two distinct beings. Thus scripture and reason seem to agree to inform us, that as man, with his distinct

properties of reason and vegetation is composed of body and spirit; so they lead us to suppose, that the pre-existent nature of Christ, which is called the Logos, is composed, or constituted of God and a creature, or an inferior spirit, personally inhabited by the divine Word, to which the distinct properties of God and a creature may be attributed.

Sect. VIII.—*Considerations which tend to support this Construction of the Primitive Fathers.*

I. The ancient Jews, viz. the targumists, or commentators, and Philo, give us these descriptions, both of a divine and an inferior Logos, and they seem to have borrowed them from the Bible, and their old traditional expositions of it. Let it be observed now, that these persons lived near the time when the New Testament was written, and that the apostles themselves were Jews, and used the phrases of their country, and that the primitive christians learned their notions of theology from the apostles, and from others of the first christians, who were themselves converted Jews. Thence we may naturally and easily suppose, that those phrases, idioms, sentiments, and manners of thinking and speaking, which were borrowed by the Jews from their traditional sense of the Old Testament, might be the common and most natural language and sentiments of the first christians. The phrases and notions of both of them concerning the Logos, have something a-kin, and the strain of their expressions are plainly tinged by similar and correspondent ideas.

II. It is evident, from what we have said before, that the holy scripture gives the name of Logos, or Word of God, to a certain power of the divine nature, whereby *all things were created*; Ps. xxiii. 6. and 2. Pet. iii. 5. It gives the same name also to our blessed Saviour in his incarnate state; 1 John i. 1. 2. and Rev. xix. 13. So that here is a Logos who is true God, and a Logos who is a man. It is also manifest, that our Saviour, since his incarnation is a complex person: *He is the child born, and the mighty God*: Is. ix. 6. *He is God manifest in the flesh*; 1 Tim. iii. 16. *He is a man of the seed of David, and God over all, blessed for ever*; Rom. ix. 5.

It is generally agreed also, that before his incarnation, he was the angel of the Lord, and also the almighty God: *He was the God who fed Jacob, and the angel who redeemed him*: Gen. xlviii. 15, 16. He was the man who wrestled with Jacob, and God, the Lord of hosts, whose name and memorial is Jehovah; Gen. xxxii. 24. and Hos. xii. 5. which seem to imply a complex nature, as I have manifested at large in another discourse, of the glory of Christ as God-man.\* Now since the scripture has revealed to us a superior and inferior nature in Christ, to

\* This Discourse was published in 1746.

sustain the divine and creatural characters attributed to him, why may we not suppose the primitive fathers, under the influence of these scriptural representations, might be led to attribute both divine and creatural characters to Christ, the Logos, the Son of God, in his pre-existent state, though they do not evidently keep up the just and distinct ideas of two beings, united in one complex person.

III. Perhaps this construction of the ancient christian writers, may be the easiest and happiest method of reconciling their strange and jarring expressions, both to one another, and to scripture; and perhaps, it may be the only, or, at least, the best way, whereby we can affix clear, distinct, and intelligible ideas to them. Let us make a few experiments.

When Theophilus says, the Logos, or eternal word, which was always in the heart of God, was afterwards produced, generated, and became a son; this may be explained, by God's producing a human spirit, or angelic Logos, a first-born Son, by a voluntary act of his will, and then assuming this first-born Son into a personal union with his divine word, or wisdom: And thus he made this divine Word become his Son. The divine word which had an existence before, was then made his Son, by union with his Son. And this is very agreeable to scripture language; for when in John i. 14. *The word is seen to be made flesh*, all christians agree, that it signifies only, that flesh was assumed into a personal union with the Word. Justin Martyr, who in the judgment of the learned speaks the sense of the other ante-nicene fathers, assert the Logos "always to have co-existed with the Father, and that he was then begotten, when God by him created the world:" this may be exactly explained in the same manner as Theophilus. And all the rest of the fathers, before and after the council of Nice, who speak of the Logos existing eternally with God, before he was generated and became a Son, may be interpreted in the same manner.

When they speak of the generation of the Son, by the will and power of God the Father; when they assert the Father to be the cause, fountain, spring of his existence, and of all his powers; when they call him *conditio*, *δημιουργια*, *κτισμα*; a creature, and the first-born work of the Spirit, &c. Here is an angelic Logos, or human soul, a proper subject for these inferior ascriptions. And when the Father is said to be the author of his godhead, or to communicate godhead to him, this is done by the Father's voluntary act of uniting the divine Logos, that is, his own eternal word or wisdom to this angelic spirit, and by this union the angelic Logos becomes true God, and *the more express image of the Father*.

If the ancients speak of the divine wisdom, as being created,

first-created, the first of the works of God: If they call the Logos, God of God, the second God, light of light, &c. since it is granted these expressions may have a reference to the temporal ante-mundane generation, they may all be explained by the real derivation or production of the angelic Logos from God, who in the first moment of his existence was united to and made one with God's eternal Logos, that is, his divine word, or wisdom, and thus became a glorious and proper medium of God's manifestations and operations, which is the ancient and original notion of the Λογος, or word.

As the divine Logos becomes the Son of God, and receives inferior attributions, by a personal union to the angelic Logos, who is God's first-born Son, so the angelic Logos, or human soul of Christ, who is properly the Son of God, becomes true God, and receives supreme attributions, by his most intimate and rational union with the divine Logos, or godhead, and thereby becoming one complex person of action and passion. The common figure of the *communicatio idiomatum*, in all languages, makes this very easy and intelligible. Thus in the language of philosophy, and the schools, when man is called a rational animal we do not suppose that an animal body can be the subject of rational properties; but the animal is made rational by being rationally united to a rational spirit, and thereby becoming one reason, one complex principle of action and passion.

This would account also for any such expressions, as an inferior nature being made God, θεοποιημενος, by a participation of the godhead of the Father. The human or angelic Logos, who most properly the Son of God, was made, or became God, by the union of the divine Logos to him, even as in scripture language, *The Word became flesh*, by the union of the flesh to him; John i. 14. And in the same sense Justin Martyr calls the Logos σαρκωποιουμενος, made flesh. Nor is it strange that any expressions of Origen should be so interpreted, when we consider that he supposes the soul and body of Christ, even the whole man; to be made partaker of godhead, and to pass into God, or become God in the same manner, κεινομενηκοτα τη θεωτητι του μελαβιου εναντιον contra Celsum, libro iii. And the council of Antioch says, "The body that was born of the virgin was united to godhead, and was made God, τη θεωτητι ηνωται ημι τεθεικομεται.

This hypothesis easily explains how the Logos comes to be called the angel, for in his lower nature he is a separate created spirit, and thus may well be called the messenger, the minister, the servant of his Father. This shews how he is subject to the Father in all things, how he is employed, and sent by the Father on various transactions, how he derives his godhead from the Father, how the Father is God originally, and of himself; how the Son acknowledges the Father to be eminently the only



true God, though the eternal deity of the Father and the Son be really the same.

This supposition also makes it easy to conceive, how the Logos himself might become passible, and condescend to endure the sensation of sorrow, pain, and dying agonies: For if we suppose this angelic Logos to be the human soul of Jesus Christ, then as it was united to godhead in its pre-existent state, and often appeared in the form and majesty of God, so it was united to a human body at the incarnation, it emptied itself of its ancient glory, *κενῶσθαι ἑαυτὸν*, Phil. ii. 7. and became subject to the weaknesses, and the painful sensations of animal nature. Thus the Son of God himself really and truly suffered on the cross for sinners. A glorious and unparalleled example of humility, and amazing love, exerted in such a manner as the vulgar explications of this doctrine could never shew! Thus I have given my reasons briefly for supposing, that many of the expressions of the ancients may be construed into the notion of a complex Logos, or a double nature belonging to Christ before the incarnation, viz. the divine Word, and a created, or inferior spirit.

Objection. But it will be readily and immediately objected against all this discourse, that it is in vain for us to contrive suppositions, and invent schemes, how the language and expressions of the primitive fathers may be understood, when it is sufficiently evident from a multitude of places in their own writings, that they had no such notion of a complex Logos, made up of two distinct beings, viz. the true God, and an inferior spirit: It is manifest that they had but one single idea under the term Logos, and they ascribed all the superior and inferior characters to the same single spirit.

Answer I. If a man were to begin, and read over all the fathers with this very view and design, to search for a complex Logos, it is probable that he might find this opinion favoured in more of their expressions, since several of those ancients with whom I have the greatest acquaintance, use so many expressions that can hardly be construed into any just consistence any other way. Nor is this a mere fond and imaginary conjecture of my own: The learned author of *Primitive Christianity Vindicated, against Mr. Whiston, in his second Letter to the Author of the History of Montanism*, seems to indulge this opinion. He tells us that Origen supposed the human soul of Christ, united to his divine nature, to exist long before his incarnation. See page 43. "It is, says this author, a very ancient tradition among the Jews, that the soul of the Messiah existed from the beginning of the world. And some learned men are of opinion, that certain passages of scripture cannot be so easily and naturally interpreted without this notion: Such as John iii. 13. *No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even*

*the Son of man, which is, or was, in heaven; and Phil. ii. 7. That he emptied himself.* Origen was no stranger to this opinion, when he says, “perhaps the soul of the Son in its perfection, was in God, and his fulness, and coming out thence when he was sent by the Father, took a body of Mary.” And again upon these words of John the baptist, *After me cometh a man which is preferred before me, for he was before me; John i. 30.* He says thus, “That it is spoken of Christ, that we may learn that the man, or manhood, also of the Son of God, mixed with his divinity, had a prior subsistence to his birth of the virgin. This man, says the learned author, must be the rational soul; which is confirmed by the appearances of the Messiah made to the patriarchs and Jewish fathers in the form of a man, the proper indication of a human soul. Hence then we may justly infer, that the rational soul, united to the Word, was the first created essence, or first fruits of the creation, holy to the Lord, and claimed by the Son as his own right. For if he was to be first, or have the pre-eminence in all things, can that advantage be denied him in relation to his soul? Origen, who holds its pre-existence, seems to allow it to be first created. For speaking of the formation of wisdom before the world, he says, God created  $\mu\psi\upsilon\chi\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\phi\iota\alpha$ , an animated wisdom, or, wisdom with a soul. In another place he call this,  $\mu\psi\upsilon\chi\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\sigma\iota\varsigma$ . And this opinion appeared so very reasonable, that we find some marks of it in the later centuries. For the author of the mediations called St. Austin’s distinguishes between eternal wisdom, the Son of God, and the first created wisdom; which he makes to be a rational and intellectual mind.

Again, the same learned author, in his *Considerations on Mr. Whiston’s Historical Preface*, pages 55, 56. supposes “The Son of God may be called  $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\mu\alpha$ ,  $\kappa\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ , &c. not only in respect of his coming forth to create the world, in which sense he is the *beginning of all things*, but also in respect of a created intellectual nature, which he is supposed, by some, to have assumed at the beginning of the creation, as the first fruits of it.” And the same author grants, that “he may, perhaps be mentioned oftener by the ancient fathers in relation to his coming forth, and to his created nature, than his eternal subsistence.” And if it should be so in scripture too, which he doth not actually grant, yet he proposes this reason for it, viz. “That it concerns us, more to know him in this state of humility and condescension, than in that of his natural immensity and exaltation, since it is owing to his humility that we are both made and redeemed.” Now the author from whom I cite these passages has testified both his zeal and his learning in several of his works against the Arian cause.

The late reverend Bishop Fowler, in his defence of his dis-

course of the descent of the man Christ Jesus, gives his testimony also, that Origen was of this opinion: And perhaps this might be the occasion why that ancient writer sometimes exalts the Logos to such sublime characters of divinity, as represent him to be *αυτοσοφια*, &c. the very wisdom, the very truth of God himself, and makes him co-eternal with the Father, and at other times calls him *Θεος δευτερος*, *θεος γιγνησ*, *θεοπαμμυνη*, &c. a second God, a made God, &c.

I have also the concurring suffrage of Mr. Baxter, in his *Methodus Theologiae*, page 96. he seems to be of this opinion concerning some of the fathers, by what observations he had made in reading the ancients. For when he had there recited several of the expressions of the primitive fathers, viz. Justin, Tatian, Theophilus, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Dionysius Alexandrinus, &c. he adds *et videntur quidem eorum seculorum nonnulli putasse duplicem in Christo nondum incarnato naturam fuisse; primam divinam, quâ sapientia Dei seu λογος æternus fuit, & secundam, quam solam Arius agnovit, creatam super-angelicam, creaturarum primogenitam & ministram.* Some of the writers of those ages seem to think there were two natures in Christ before his incarnation: The first divine, whereby he was the wisdom of God, or his eternal Word: The second a super-angelic, created nature, first born of creatures, ministering to God, &c. which is the only nature the Arians allow." And the author adds, that "Gregory Thaumaturgus seems to have believed this double nature." I confess I was surprized, when I had almost finished this dissertation, to find such a sentence in this learned author. And it is evident that nothing but the various expressions of the fathers themselves could have constrained him to have spoken thus, since Mr. Baxter himself did not approve of this opinion; but it is plain that he could hardly interpret some of the fathers into any other sense.

II. Yet I readily grant, and believe, that the greatest part of them do not seem to have any distinct idea of a complex Logos, or a double nature in Christ before the incarnation; for they frequently seem to apply both increated and created characters to the same single being. But the question is, whether a reader can have any clear and distinct ideas under this language of theirs? Whether they can be made to talk very consistently with themselves in this strange phraseology? Are we not forced to correct the philosophy of those ancients, who apply rationality and vegetation to man as one simple animal substance? Do we not plainly find, that though their ideas are right in general, when they ascribe both these to man, yet they mistook a complex for a simple being? And might not the primitive fathers fall into such an innocent mistake in theology, when they determined too hastily,

at both the divine and inferior ideas ascribed to Christ in his e-existent state belonged to one simple Logos? Will all their vented relief of natural subordination, or economical subordination, of strong metaphors, and *catachreses*, ever fairly reconcile the variety, and seeming contradiction of their expressions, without such a supposition as this, of a complex, or twofold nature in Christ?

We may reasonably suppose, that they had derived from scripture, and from the apostles, and the traditions of apostolic men, the great doctrine of the Logos, being the eternal divine Word, or wisdom, whereby God contrived and created the world: they had also derived from the same springs the doctrine of the Logos, who was *the Son of God, the beginning of the creation, the first-born of every creature, the only begotten of the Father*; and that though he was produced, as they express, by his will and power, yet it was in some such immediate and superior way, is rather called generation than creation in scripture, *that in all things Christ might have the pre-eminence*; Col. i. 18. Now hence perhaps might arise some of their mistakes, or as Bishop Hall calls them, their strange, hard, and uncautious expressions.

1. Because scripture, or apostolic tradition, doth not directly call this inferior, or angelic Logos, who was the Son of God, a creature, and rank him with other created beings, some of them might raise him entirely up to godhead, and give him the very same, simple numerical idea, with the eternal Logos, or the divine Wisdom.—2. Because this angelic Logos was truly the Son of God, and his only begotten Son, therefore they might attribute a sort of Sonship to the eternal Logos, or divine wisdom, entirely abstracted from this angelic being.—3. When they found supreme and inferior characters attributed to a person whose name was the Logos, or Word of God, they did not infer the union of the divine eternal Logos, and of this first-born Son of God, who is so called the Logos, into one complex person, but they, by an easy mistake, might blend them together into one simple substance; and thus they attributed inconsistent properties and relations to one and the same simple subject. Whereas scripture seems to inform us, that these different properties might be more fitly and happily attributed to this glorious person, composed of the divine and the angelic Logos united, that is, the human soul of Christ with the indwelling godhead.

#### SECT. IX.—*Conclusion.*

Upon the whole it appears, that the ancient Jewish writers give us an account of a divine membra, or Logos, or word, which is of the very essence of God, and is represented as a power of the divine nature, and they speak also of another Logos or Word,

which is the first-born of all creatures, a glorious super-angelic spirit ; there appear also plain traces, and evident footsteps of the same divine and inferior Logos among the primitive christian writers. Now these ancient intimations and notices of a two-fold Logos in human writings, under the sacred and superior conduct of the Old and New Testament, lead us to suppose, that our blessed Saviour, who is the true Logos, or *Word of God*, had a double nature before his incarnation, and that his human soul had a real existence as the Son of God, and a personal union to deity before the foundation of the world.

From this representation of things there are these two very considerable advantages derived :

I. Hereby both the divine and the human natures of Christ receive more honour, and more exalted dignity, than the common representation of this matter will allow. If the Logos, in its divine sense, signify an essential power of the deity, then the divine Logos has proper supreme godhead, and, shall I say, share with the Father even in self-existence and independency, for the Logos belongs to the very nature of God ; and yet it is sometimes represented in a distinct personal manner, for wise purpose in the holy scriptures ; for it has a sufficient distinction from the Father to lay a just foundation for such a figurative personalit. Whereas, in the common and current exposition of these ancient writers, as well as of scripture, there are two many second and inferior characters ascribed to the Logos in its divine sense or to the divine nature of Christ. In the language of the primitive christians, and in the avowed declarations of the athanasian writers, he is denied the dignity of self-existence and independency, and is declared to derive both his real existence and his godhead, his power, and all his glory from the Father, and thus as the ancients assert, that by the Father's will too, though it will is sometimes construed into a mere acquiescence. Now the derivative characters or properties seem a little to diminish the lustre, and degrade the supreme dignity of the godhead Christ.

The human nature of Christ also in this my explication most gloriously exalted far above all the ideas of such a common human soul, which according to the usual hypothesis, began existence when the child Jesus was conceived or born : Where in the scheme which I propose, the human soul of Christ is sublime spirit\*, superior to all angels and every created being the first-born of every creature, and possessed of such capacities powers as, by virtue of the indwelling godhead, perhaps might

\* How this sublime and singular character is every way consistent with the idea of a true human soul, I have shown in a *Treatise on the Glory of Christ God-man*, which may possibly appear in the world hereafter. This treatise is published in 1746.

be some way employed in the great and wondrous transactions of creations and providence in past ages.

Now let it be considered to what a superior height this doctrine advances the whole person of Christ, God and man. Nor let those who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity be afraid to hear of its various glories:

II. Another considerable advantage that arises from this ex-planation of the Jews and the christian fathers into the sense of a complex Logos, is this, that it lays a foundation for reconciling those great and bitter contentions that have troubled the church in almost all ages from the beginning of christianity. Surely we would think it a mighty happiness, if there were any possibility of uniting the contending parties into one scheme of trinitarian doctrine, agreeable to the representations of scripture: And I now no hypothesis bids so fair for it as this, if the spirit of candour, and unprejudiced sincerity; the spirit of love and zeal, and unity, be given down from on high, to influence us all in our sacred studies on this subject.

In this scheme the athanasians, and all the orthodox trinitarians, find that sacred doctrine, for which they so justly, and zealously contend, viz. the true and proper deity of Jesus Christ personally united to an inferior nature, even of the soul and body of the man Jesus. The sabellians, and all unitarians, may find here the unity of the divine nature not divided into three conscious minds, or three infinite spirits, but diversified, or distinguished, into God the Father, with his two distinct, essential powers, the Word and the Spirit. Here the Arians and Semiarians may read all the exalted properties of their Logos, that is, the pre-existent soul of our Saviour, for which they shew so warm and constant a zeal in all their writings, and may be conducted onward to his indwelling godhead.

I confess, the two more eminent contesting parties in this very question, about the sense of the ancients, are the Arians, or Semiarians, and the Athanasians: And while one of them imagines the fathers, in all their expressions, intended a Logos inferior to godhead, and the other supposes them to ascribe and represent him as true and eternal God, it is my opinion, that all the expressions of the ancients can scarce ever be reconciled fairly and entirely to either of these extremes: But this supposition, that God and a creature united before the foundations of the world, may compose this glorious person, this Logos, leads the way to allow both of these parties to be in a great measure in the right with regard to the fathers, and happily to reconcile them in one sentiment and opinion, without the least derogation from the supreme deity of Christ, as revealed in the holy scriptures.

If I might venture into a comparison on this occasion, I

would liken the writings of the ancients concerning the Logos to a mine of rich metal, where two travellers taking up the oar, find some brighter, and some baser properties in the mass. One of them asserts, that the metal is all silver, and he gives the most favourable and exalted turn that he can to the coarser phenomena of lead, which discover themselves there. The other sinks and beclouds the brighter phenomena of silver, till he has construed the whole mine into lead. Here it is possible that a less knowing traveller may come by and happen to make such an experiment on the mingled mass as discovers that there is both silver and lead united in the same oar : by this means the different properties appear to belong to the different metal, and the contenders are reconciled.

Thus I have gathered what light and assistance I could out of ancient jewish and christian writings, to explain and confirm that doctrine concerning the Logos, or Word, which seems to be revealed and contained in the holy scripture : And I hope I have said nothing inconsistent with the divine grandeur or godhead of our blessed Saviour, nor with any necessary articles of faith. I am sensible the performance must on many accounts be very defective. But if I have been so happy, as to have given any hints, whereby persons of greater learning, health and sagacity, may be encouraged to pursue, to establish, or correct the hypothesis which I have proposed, and to introduce clearer ideas into divine things, by a further explication of this great mystery of godliness, I shall have cause to rejoice, and give thanks to God.

If I have asserted any peculiar opinions with too positive an air, and used the language of unbecoming assurance in doubtful matters, in the course of this dissertation, I here disclaim and retract it. I am but a searcher into the deep things of the gospel, and endeavour, according to my slender measure, to trace out the unsearchable riches and glories of the person of my Redeemer God and man. Now, upon the best survey I can take, both of the revelation of scripture, and the expressions of ancient writers. I am inclined to believe, that his human soul was formed, and united to his divine nature before the foundation of the world : And as both parts of the constitution of his person are called the Logos, or Word, so the whole complex person is manifested under the same name. I adore the word dwelling in flesh. I trust in him for eternal life, and call him, as Thomas did ; John xx. 28. *My Lord and my God.* To him be glory for ever and ever. *Amen.*

## DISSERTATION V.

*Of the Holy Spirit.*SECTION I.—*The general Ideas of the Word and Spirit.*

THE great and blessed God, considered in his own nature, is far superior to all our thoughts, and exalted high above our most raised apprehensions. It is utterly impossible for a creature to search out the Almighty Creator to perfection. When we shall be admitted to heaven, and behold him in the light of glory, we shall then see him as he is in himself; but even then, and forever, our knowledge of him will be imperfect, for we are creatures and not God, and our understandings will never be infinite. In this world we must be content to know him as he has revealed himself in the light of grace, and discovered himself in his word: and because we are not capable of taking in heavenly ideas in their own sublimest nature, God has been pleased to teach us the heavenly things that relate to himself, in earthly language; and by way of analogy to creatures, he has let us know something what God is.

Among all the creatures that come within the reach of our common and obvious cognizance, human nature is the most perfect, and therefore it has pleased the great and glorious God, by resemblances drawn from ourselves, to accommodate the descriptions of himself to our capacities. When he speaks of his own nature in the language of men, he often uses the names of human parts, and members, and faculties, to represent his own properties and actions thereby, that he may bring them within the notice of the lowest capacity, and the meanest understanding among the children of men. Therefore he speaks of his *face*, to signify the discovery of himself; his *eyes*, to describe his knowledge; his *heart*, to describe his thoughts; his *hand* and *arm*, to signify his power and activity; and his *mouth*, to denote his resolutions, or revelations.

But since in the composition of human nature there are two distinct parts, a soul and a body, and the soul is much the nobler and more exalted principle, it has also pleased God to rise above corporeal images, and to describe himself, his attributes, properties, power, and operations, by way of analogy to a human soul. We know by our own consciousness, or by an inward inspection into ourselves, that our soul, or spirit, is a being which has understanding, and will, thoughts, inclinations, knowledge, desires, and various powers to move the body: Therefore our Saviour has told us, *God is a spirit*, and the brightest and sublimest representations of God in scripture, are such as bear an analogy and resemblance to the soul of man, or a spiritual, thinking nature.



As the chief faculties of our souls are the mind and will, or rather a power of knowing, and a power of acting, so God seems to have revealed himself to us as indued with two divine faculties, his Word or Wisdom, and his Spirit, or efficient power. It is by this word, and this spirit, that he is represented in scripture as managing the great concerns of the creation, providence, redemption, and salvation : And these three, viz. God the Father, his Word, and his Spirit, are held forth to us in scripture as *one God*, even as the soul of man, his mind, and his will, are one spiritual being. Now though the soul be the nobler part in man, though the brightest, the fairest, and most correspondent resemblances of God, are borrowed from the soul, yet when we consider the terms which are used to express the sacred Trinity, as well as the divine essence, we find them borrowed from the body, as well as from the soul of man ; and probably this was done also, that the lowest capacities among men might attain some idea of them.

The first person in the Trinity is called the Father, which is a name given him as he is the first origin, spring and Creator of all things, as he is the former of the human soul and body of our Lord Jesus Christ his Son, and as he is represented as the prime Agent, employing his Word, and his Spirit, in the great affairs of creation, providence, redemption and salvation. Now this term Father is evidently derived from some resemblance which he bears to human nature, or mankind, in the body, as much as in the soul.

If we consider the second person in the Trinity under the character of the Son, this is apparently borrowed from mankind in the same manner. The term *Logos*, which denotes the second person in the Trinity, abstracted from flesh and blood, signifies both reason and word : And therefore we may suppose the sacred analogy borrowed both from the body, and from the soul of man. It is borrowed from the soul of man, as *Logos* signifies reason ; from the body of man, as it signifies a word ; or from body and soul together, as it signifies an external word, or speech manifesting internal wisdom or reason.

In the same manner the term Spirit, which denotes the third of the sacred Three, both in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, signify the breath ; it signifies also vital activity,\* and it signifies an intelligent principle. And therefore we may suppose the sacred analogy, and use of this word, to be derived both from the body and the soul of man. It is derived from the soul, as it signifies an intelligent principle of action ; it is derived from the

\* The term spirit, in other languages, as well as in English, signifies power, vigour and vital activity. It is so taken in several places of scripture : I need cite no more than, John vi. 63. *It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing : The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.*

dy and soul united, as it signifies vital activity and efficiency, though in this sense it seems to be chiefly borrowed from the soul.

There are several places in scripture where the Spirit of God seems to bear an analogy to breath, and to signify the breath of God; as Ps. xxxiii. 6. *By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his Spirit.* Here the term רוח, that is, breath, or spirit, is either a synonymous term for word, in the first part of the verse, which was formed by the breath; or it signifies the Spirit of God, as a divine power, by way of analogy to human breath. So Ps. civ. 1. *Thou takest away their breath, and the creatures die; Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, and they are created,* that is, thou sendest forth the breath of life by the agency of thy Spirit. So Job. xxxiv. 14. *If he gather his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together:* that is, If he withhold his vital influence, which gives breath to all animals. Job. xxxiii. 4. *The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life.* And, Mal. ii. 15. where the prophet argues, that God made but one woman for one man, *yet he had the residuum of the Spirit,* that is, more vital influence to create more women if he had pleased. These two last texts may refer either to the animal nature of man, which is maintained by breath; or to the rational soul, which in the Jewish philosophy was the vital principle of the animal, both which seem to be included in that metaphorical language in Gen. ii. 7. *The Lord God formed man out the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.*

Thus it appears, that as outward speech, and breath, are powers of the human body, as reason and vital activity, or efficiency, are powers of the human soul, so the great God, in scripture, has revealed himself to us as a glorious being, who has two eternal, essential, divine powers, which in condescension to our weakness he is pleased to describe by way of analogy to our souls and bodies; and this he doth by the terms דבר and רוח in Hebrew, Λόγος and Πνευμα in Greek, and in English, word and spirit, or speech and breath, or reason and vital activity, or efficiency.

Though I call the word and the spirit two divine powers, to import with the analogy which scripture seems to have established between the idea of God, and the idea of man, yet I am far from determining precisely, what, or how great, is that real and divine difference which is between them, or what is the true and inward distinction between the essence of God himself, who is called the Father, and his Word, and his Spirit. It is represented in scripture to be something more than such a difference as exists between divine attributes, or nominal relations, and yet it

seems to be something less than is between three distinct conscious mind, or three different intelligent agents, in the literal sense of the word. Perhaps in godhead the difference between the several powers, or principles of action, may be much greater than they are in a human, or created spirit. It is most likely there is no human idea that exactly answers it. This is a problem too high, and too hard for us to resolve, who know heavenly things only by way of distant analogy to things earthly, and have not yet learned the unspeakable words which St. Paul heard in paradise. This we know, that these two, viz. the Word and Spirit are often in scripture, as well as by the ancient Jews and first christians, represented as divine powers; yet they are also by the sacred writers, by Jews and christians, sometimes represented in a personal character, or in the way and manner of distinct personal agents. How this is to be accounted for, I have shewn in the sequel of this, as well as in other dissertations.

SECT. II.—*The particular Representations of the Holy Spirit in Scripture.*

Having spoken in the former discourse particularly of the Logos, or Word of God, in its several senses, as it relates to Jesus Christ, or the second person in the Trinity, I apply myself now more directly to say a few things concerning the third person, or the blessed Spirit, so far as I can derive light from the holy scriptures. Now if we consult them, I humbly conceive we shall find these following discoveries:—

I. The Spirit of God is represented as a principle of divine operation, as the active power, or faculty of efficiency belonging to the divine nature, in several places in scripture.\* It is exhibited to us as something in, and of God, which seems to be expressed and explained by power, virtue, and a principle of efficiency, or as a divine power belonging to godhead, together with the influence of it. See Luke i. 35. *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee*— which two expressions seem to be parallel and explicative of each other; for our Saviour is called the Son of God, in that text; for this reason, because the Father prepared a body for him; as Heb. x. 5. Or the power of God formed him in the womb in a transcendent manner above other children, without any earthly father.

\* Let it be noted here, that the word power is an ambiguous term both in the English, and in the learned languages; sometimes it signifies a faculty or principle of operation, and sometimes it denotes the force and influence of that faculty. Now the word being so often used, and these two senses of it being somewhat a-kin, it is hardly possible to limit the precise bounds of each of these senses or ideas in every place of scripture. My chief design therefore, in these citations, is to shew, that the idea of a certain divine power, or faculty, with its force of operation, runs through them all.

John iii. 34. Christ had the *Spirit of God given him without measure*, which is explained, Acts x. 38. *Jesus of Nazareth anointed with the Holy Ghost, and with power*, that is, the Spirit of God dwelt in him with its powerful influence, and was sent as descending upon him at his baptism. It was by Spirit that he wrought miracles, and cast out devils; Mat. 28. And yet when Christ taught the people, and diseased ones were brought to him, it is said, Luke v. 17. *The power of the Lord was present to heal them*. The apostles were ordered to wait at Jerusalem for the promise of the Spirit; Acts i. 4. ii. 33. that is, the Holy Spirit, which was promised to them, this in Luke xxiv. 49. is called their being *endued with power from on high*. The word is *δυναμις*; in the original, which verily signifieth force, not authority. When St. Paul preached to the Corinthians; 1 Cor. ii. 4. he confirmed his doctrine by *demonstration of the Spirit and power*, that is, the Spirit of God, or divine power concurring with him to work miracles for proof of his gospel.

When it is said; Ps. xxxiii. 6. *By the word of the Lord the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath, or Spirit, of his mouth*. This seems to be a parallel text to those scriptures where God is described as creating, or establishing the earth, or the heavens, by his wisdom, and by his power, that is, by his Word and Spirit, the two sacred persons being represented as divine powers, or principles of operation. When the creatures languish and die; Ps. civ. 30. *He sends his Spirit, and they are created*. Job xxxvi. 13. *By his Spirit he quickened the heavens*; and the Spirit of God made man; Job iii. 4. which works are frequently ascribed to the power, or influence of God. Zech. iv. 6. *God will accomplish his work, by might nor by power, that is, neither by armies, nor by the power of men, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts*: Spirit, or power of God, stands in opposition to the power of men.

Christ is said to be raised from the dead by the power of God; Eph. i. 19. and 2 Cor. xiii. 4. yet his resurrection is attributed to the Spirit; 1 Pet. iii. 18. *Quickened by the Spirit*. So resurrection is ascribed to the power of God; 1 Cor. vi. 14. which is attributed to the Spirit; Rom. viii. 11. In the phraseology of scripture the hand of the Lord, the finger of God, the arm of the Lord, are various expressions to represent the same principle of efficiency, and especially in miraculous operations. Now there are several places wherein these are used to represent the Spirit of the Lord, and the same effects are attributed to the blessed Spirit, which shew that a principle of divine power, or efficacy, is the thing meant by the term Spirit.

In the Old Testament, the influence of this divine power was exerted on Bezaleel and Aholiab: *They were filled with the Spirit of God*; the divine power influenced them *to devise curious works, to work in silver and gold, &c. for the tabernacle*; Ex. xxxi. 2, 3, 6. and xxxv. 31, &c. *So the Spirit of the Lord began to move Samson, at times in the camp of Dan*; to perform works of strength or courage; Judges xiii. 25. that is, the divine principle of efficiency wrought in him, or on him, for these purposes. *So the Spirit of the Lord came upon Ezekiel and lifted him up*, which is called the hand of the Lord in several other places. See Ezek. i. 3. and iii. 12, 14, 22. and viii. 1, 3. where these words seem to be used promiscuously. In the language of the apostles, the conversion of sinners, the assistance of ministers, the support of the afflicted, the preservation of the saints, &c. are sometimes expressly attributed to the power of God, which yet are the peculiar offices, or works of the blessed Spirit, and in other parts of the sacred writings are attributed to him.

I do not explain the term Spirit, as I said before, to signify that attribute of God, called power, or omnipotence, but rather, something in the divine nature which we may conceive of after the manner of men, by way of a power or faculty, represented in the various exercises or influences thereof towards creatures, and that frequently for their instruction, sanctification, comfort or assistance in any peculiar services, or miraculous operations. This seems to be the most common sense of it in the New Testament, and often in the Old. Upon this account it is called *the Spirit of knowledge*; Is. xi. 2. *the Spirit of wisdom and understanding*; Eph. i. 17. *the Spirit of holiness*; Rom. i. 4. and *the Spirit of grace and supplication*; Zech. xii. 10. with regard to its various effects.

And herein appears a very plain difference between the Socinian doctrine, and the scheme which I here propose; Socinus, Schlictingius, Crellius, and others of them, make the Spirit of God to signify the mere efficacy, or influence of God's power on creatures: And therefore they roundly and unanimously deny the holy Spirit to be the true God. But as Bisterfeld justly distinguishes in answer to Crellius, "the Spirit of God is indeed the power of God, *virtus Dei*, yet not that accidental power, which is the mere influence, or effect of divine agency upon the creatures, but that essential, or substantial power, which is called a person in the divine nature." And though it is hard to determine in every single text, whether the Spirit of God, mean the divine agent himself, or his influences, yet there are several scriptures wherein it implies true and proper godhead, or a principle of action in the divine nature, and not merely the influence of that principle, or the effects of that power, as will plainly appear in the following parts of the discourse:

Now it is no wonder that the name of *Spirit of God*, in the scriptural writings, should be given to a power of the true God, or sometimes to the influence of a divine power, since this name was used even by heathens in those eastern nations, in the same sense, concerning their false gods. Nebuchadnezzar the king of Assyria, and the king Belshazzar his son, and several of their courtiers, use this same expression, and say concerning Daniel, *that the spirit of the holy Gods is in him*; See Dan. iv. 8, 9, 18. and Dan. v. 11, 14. Pharaoh, king of Egypt, uses the same language; Gen. xl. 38. *Can we find such a man as Joseph, in whom is the spirit of the gods.* Elohim, that is, they supposed the powers of the gods dwelt in Joseph and Daniel, and instructed them in the knowledge of secrets. And if we had greater acquaintance with the ancient and oriental ways of speaking, it is very probable we should find, that when God spoke to his people the Jews, he used the same sort of language that was customary in those nations.

And if we consider the common phraseology of scripture, which speaks of God acting by his Word and Spirit, in a way of analogy to man acting by his natural powers of mind, will, conscience, his breath, his face, his eye, &c. far the greatest part of texts where the Spirit of God is mentioned, are most naturally explained, by supposing it a power of his nature. What objections may be raised against this first head, shall be considered afterward.

II. Though the Spirit of God be represented sometimes as a power, or principle of action in the divine nature, yet in several places in scripture it is set forth in a personal character, or under the idea of a person, distinct both from God the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ. The Spirit is spoken of in such a way as persons are represented in human language: I need not cite many scriptures to prove this; see John xv. 26. *But when the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.* John xvi. 13, 14. *When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth, for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak, and he shall shew you things to come: He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shew it unto you.* And several other passages there are in the word of God which represent the holy Spirit in a personal manner.

But it is not very hard to account for this personal representation of a power of the divine nature, when we consider,—1. That we know not how great is the distinction between different powers, or principles of agency, in so sublime and incomprehensible a nature as the godhead. *God is great and we know him not*; Job xxxvi. 26.—2. The powers of man, viz. his mind,

his will, his reason, his fancy, his conscience, are often represented as persons, in modern nations and languages; the man himself is sometimes described as conversing with his own spirit, with his soul, with his conscience, with his fancy, or reason, as though they were persons; and employing his reason or conscience, as agents, in any operation, even as God is said to send, or employ his own Spirit in his sacred affairs, as a divine agent.

Besides, we may consider, that this personal manner of speaking was very customary among the eastern nations, and the sacred writers. They frequently personalize not only the powers of human nature, but the virtues, vices, dispositions of men, and even things without life are often called sons and daughters, and exhibited to the reader, as though they were persons. But of this subject I have treated more at large in the dissertation on the word person,\* and would not repeat it here. See also some further solution of this difficulty under the answer to the first objection.

III. The Spirit of God is represented as so intimate with the divine nature, and so much one with God, that it is sometimes exhibited as God himself, even as the spirit of a man is properly the man himself, or his soul. It was common with Hebrew, Jewish writers, to speak of the spirit of a thing to signify the thing itself. See Eph. iv. 23. *Be ye renewed in the spirit of your mind*, that is, let your mind itself be renewed: Where we may suppose the same sort of pleonasm, as when the body, or flesh of Christ, is called *the body of his flesh*; Col. i. 22. So the Spirit of God is represented to us as one and the same with God, by analogy to human spirits; 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11. *The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God; for what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God*: that is, as the spirit of a man knows the secret things of his own soul by a primary and immediate consciousness, inherent in himself, and not derived from any other, so the Spirit of God is as much that God whose Spirit he is, as the spirit of a man is the man himself; and therefore he knows the secrets of the godhead by a primary and immediate consciousness inherent in himself, and not derived from another.

There are other scriptures wherein the Spirit may be taken for God himself, as, Ps. lxxiii. 10. *They rebelled and vexed his holy Spirit, therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them*. God himself seems to be the proper object of their rebellion and provocation. So when David says, 2 Sam. xxiii. 2, 3. *The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, the God*

\* See Dissertation IV.

of Israel said, he that ruleth over men must be just. That which is done by this Spirit is done by God himself; and that which is done to this Spirit is represented as done to God himself.

When in Acts xiii. 2. *The Holy Ghost said, separate unto me Paul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have called them,* it is very naturally interpreted as the voice of God by his Spirit, for it was God that called them to the ministry, and to him they were separated.

When Ananias, Acts v. 3. told a lie to the Holy Ghost, St. Peter says, verse 4. *Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God,* that is, to God dwelling in the apostles by his Spirit. So Is. xl. 13. *Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor, hath taught him?* The Spirit of the Lord here seems to be put for God himself, as the spirit of a man in the same sort of sentence would be naturally construed the man himself, or his soul.

Ps. cxxxix. 7. *Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?* The plain meaning is, whither shall I go where the knowledge and power of God cannot reach me? The Spirit of God is not a distinct being from God himself, or another conscious mind.

It is the Spirit of God, and it is God himself, who inspired the prophets; 2 Pet. i. 21. 2 Tim. iii. 16. Heb. i. 1. It is the Spirit of God which dwells in his saints, as in a temple, for they are called the temple of God; 2 Cor. vi. 16. compared with 1 Cor. vi. 19.

It is the Spirit of God that sanctifies his people, that gives light and comfort, and hope to them, all which are attributed to God himself, and that not as acting by an under-agent, or an inferior nature, but by some intimate and essential power of his own. And were it not for some personal characters which are sometimes attributed to the blessed Spirit, by a figurative, and eastern manner of speech, I am persuaded scarce any reader of the bible would ever have imagined, that the Spirit of God signified any thing else but a power of the divine nature,—the influence of that power, or God himself acting by that power. The proof of the deity of the holy Spirit is more particularly insisted on in the “Christian Doctrine of the Trinity,” propositions viii. ix.

To confirm this head, viz. that the Spirit of God, in some places may signify God himself, let it be observed, that the soul of God in several scriptures signifieth God himself. Is. i. 14. “Your new moons my soul hateth.” Is. xlii. 1. “My elect, in whom my soul delighteth.” Heb. x. 38. “If any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.” And this is a very common way of speaking among the Hebrews, for the soul



of a man signifies the man himself, as well as the spirit of a man does.

In confirmation of the same position let it be observed also, that as the term *Logos*, Word, or the Second of the sacred three, is sometimes used to include the whole divine nature, though it more directly and frequently is explained by wisdom, so the term spirit, though it more naturally and frequently signifies a divine principle of efficiency, yet it may be used sometimes in a more extensive sense for the divine nature itself, as I have mentioned in the "VII. Dissertation on the Distinction of Persons in the Godhead."

IV. As the Spirit of God, in some scriptures, signifies a divine power, or principle of efficiency in the godhead, and is called the third person in the Trinity, so in other texts the term Spirit denotes the influence, or operation of this power, together with the various effects of it communicated to men, which are usually called the gifts and graces of the holy Spirit. Nor is it strange at all that this term should be thus used; for as the Word of God in several places of scripture, does plainly signify the second person in the blessed Trinity, who hath been employed through all ages to reveal the mind and will of God to men, so there are many other places wherein the Word of God signifies the revelation itself, or the effect of the agency of this divine word: And it is much more frequently used to signify either the scripture, or some revelation of God to men, than to denote the second person in the Trinity.

Perhaps it is in this sense of influence and gifts, that we may best interpret some of those expressions, both in the Old Testament and the New, where the Spirit is said "to be given to men, to be poured out upon men, to be shed down on the apostles, to be given by the laying on of hands, to have the Spirit in greater or less degrees, to be full of the Holy Ghost, or filled with the Spirit, and anointed with the Spirit." It is true, that such sort of expressions may be much better applied to a certain power of the divine nature, in its various agencies, than to a real proper person, or distinct conscious mind, and this is one reason that inclines me to think that the Holy Spirit is not another conscious mind, or a distinct person, in the full, proper and human sense of the word. But still if some of these scriptural phrases be explained concerning the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit, as the effects of the operation of that divine power, it may render the scripture language a little more plain, easy and intelligible, in those places.

Note, There are some texts which mention the Word of God, wherein it is pretty hard to say, whether the person of Christ, or his revelation of divine things be meant, as John i. §5. "He called them gods, to whom the word of God came;"

cb. xiii. 7. "Those who have spoken to you the word of God;" and in the next verse, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and for ever;" Rev. i. 2. "John, who bare record of the word of God:" Which is the remarkable character of this apostle, because he spake much of the Logos, or of Christ under the title of the Word. And in like manner there may be some particular texts wherein it is difficult to determine whether the Spirit of God signify the very power of the divine nature itself, or whether it signify the effect of that power. I will mention but one, which is agreed to be dubious; Acts xix. 2. "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.—Some interpret the Holy Ghost here to signify his nature and existence and some make it only to denote the effusion of his gifts, graces, or influences. But I do not think that this difficulty is of any very great importance, while it is agreed that these various gifts, graces, and blessings, conferred upon men, are all entirely attributed to the Spirit of God, or to a certain divine executive power, or principle of efficiency belonging to the divine nature.

Thus I have represented the clearest and best ideas I have attained, concerning the Spirit of God, who is generally styled the third person in the sacred Trinity. As Christ, in his divine nature, is represented as the eternal word, or wisdom of the Father, which perhaps, may include in it the power of knowledge, or knowledge and volition; so the Spirit seems to be another divine power, which may be called the power of efficiency: and though it is sometimes described in scripture as a personal entity, after the manner of Jewish and eastern writers, yet if we take all the scriptures relating to this subject together, and view them in a correspondent light, the Spirit of God does not seem to be described as a distinct spirit from the Father, or as another conscious mind, but as an eternal essential power, belonging to the Father, whereby all things are effected: And thus the supreme godhead of the blessed Spirit is maintained in glory.

It is proper here to take notice, that what I have said elsewhere of the Logos, or divine Word, may be also applied to the blessed Spirit, viz. That sometimes it carries with it an inadequate idea of godhead, when it signifies a power in the divine nature; and sometimes an adequate idea, when it intends God himself exerting that power. And this is no strange and unnatural supposition, since the same sort of phraseology, is in frequent use when we speak of the soul of man, and its various powers; for sometimes by the words reason, will, conscience, &c. we mean those particular powers of the soul, which are inadequate ideas of the soul; at other times we mean the soul itself acting by one or another of those powers, and then the

idea is full and adequate. And it is my opinion, that there can scarce be any cavils framed against these representations of the Spirit of God in scripture, but what may be also raised against many of our human forms of speaking, concerning the spirit of a man, or some of his intellectual and active powers.

SECT. III.—*An occasional Reflection on the Glory of the Holy Spirit.*

As this explication of the doctrine of the blessed Spirit, seems to give a more easy and natural interpretation to most of the scriptures where he is mentioned, so it tends to aggrandize the character of God, and of his divine Spirit, and exalt him infinitely above all created powers. Perhaps, no creature has any real proper efficiency belonging to it, when abstracted from that universal influence of God, which is commonly called the divine concourse, whereby all beings are preserved and kept in actuation, according to their several natures, that is, according to the laws appointed by the Creator. And if so then the divine Spirit may be the proper universal efficient of all created beings and of all motion whatsoever. Let us enquire into this sentiment a little further.

When one body is moved by another moving body which impels it, I think it is agreed by the latest and best philosophers, such as Mr. Locke and Sir Isaac Newton, that this is not owing to any innate power in the impelling body, but that it is effected according to a law of motion, which the sovereign will of the Creator has appointed; so that the second body is not so properly moved by the first, as by the universal and all pervading force of that original divine efficacious volition, that one body should thus give place, when another of sufficient bulk and motion impels it.

This is yet more evident in the great law of attraction, or gravitation, which Sir Isaac Newton, has found to be observed in the corporeal world. He acknowledges that there can no mechanical reason be given, why all bodies should gravitate toward a centre, or why all the parts of matter should have a mutual tendency toward each other; but it is the Creator's original, and everlasting power and will, acting uniformly on all the parts of matter.

It is also this original will and power of the Creator, that gave a projectile motion to the several planetary bodies, and that this projectile motion concurring with, or rather resisting the gravitation toward their several centres, keeps the whole system of planets in their proper order and periodical revolutions.

And this is not only applicable to one body moving another; but when a spirit wills to move a body, it has no innate efficient

power of its own to put the least atom in motion. A spirit can neither touch nor be touched. The strongest and wisest man upon earth cannot move a grain of sand or feather, by a mere act of his will; yet he can move the whole animal body to which he is particularly united, by an act of his will. The true meaning of it is this, that God has appointed that whensoever the human soul puts forth a volition, the limbs and muscles of that particular animal body shall be effectually moved. This motion is really and originally owing to the divine original volition, and his universal efficient power. *Εν αὐτῷ γὰρ καὶ ζῶμεν, καὶ κινούμεθα, καὶ ἐσθμεν*, Acts xvii. 28. "In or by him we live, and are moved, and have our being."

Thus all the motion that is found in our material world is the proper effect of the prime divine volition and executive power, which continues through all ages, and pervades all worlds: which acts according to its own supreme appointed laws, and is the real but universal cause of all the motions of every atom in the universe: And though the particular motions are attributed sometimes to bodies, by way of attraction or impulsion, and sometimes to minds, or spirits, as the effects of their volition, yet it is really owing to the infinite and all-pervading efficiency of the great God that formed at first, and still preserves and actuates the whole material system of beings, in one uniform and unchanging manner of operation. What a glorious and magnificent idea does this give us of the blessed Spirit, the executive power of God: Well may it be said; Gen. i. 2. "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters," or the watery chaos; that is, put the parts of it into their several proper motions, towards the formation of a beautiful world. And when creatures die, "God sends forth his Spirit, and they are created again," and the face of the animal and vegetable world is renewed by the agency of this spirit; Ps. civ. 30.

And how happily does this scheme correspond with the doctrine of miracles, which when they were wrought by our blessed Saviour, or by his apostles, are still attributed to the Spirit of God. As it is he who manages all nature by settled rules of his own, or of the divine Logos, or wisdom, so it is he who unsettles the course of nature, and changes it when he pleases. It is he interposes with his immediate and miraculous influence, to act upon the various parts of matter, and give them motions, or appearances contrary to his own established rules. He can bid the sun stand still, the shadow go backward, and command the waters of Jordan to run towards their spring. He causes the blind to see, he unstops the ear of the deaf, and puts vital motion into the dead.

When the divine Logos, or Word, performs a miracle, it is by the efficient force of this divine power, the Spirit of God,

who is naturally and inseparably joined to the word. When Christ Jesus wrought miracles on earth he did it by virtue of godhead dwelling in him personally, in the character of the Logos, or Word, inseparably united to, and one with, the blessed Spirit, though for special reasons in the divine economy, these miracles are rather ascribed to the Holy Spirit than to the divine Logos, or Word. And when he condescends to make any of the children of men, conscious instruments of these miraculous performances, all that they can do is to lift up a prayer, and put forth a humble volition that such a supernatural effect may appear; but it is really by the agency of the blessed Spirit, that the laws of nature are counteracted: Nature herself obeys none but her sovereign, the miracle appears in its divine glory, and confesses the presence of a divine power.

Thus, by the concurrent demonstration of the Spirit of God, and of power, St. Paul preached the gospel among the heathen nations: The Spirit, as a divine efficient, impressed on his brain, and on his tongue, a train of languages which he understood not before, for he spake with a multitude of tongues; and the same blessed Spirit, as a divine efficient power, dictated to the apostle how to preach, and when to attempt a miraculous operation; and this glorious almighty agent produced the marvellous effect, surprized and amazed their eyes and their ears with sensible wonders, and enlightened and converted the souls of the blind heathens. He bid nature yield to miracle; he made heathenism in the heart give place to christianity, and turned sinners into saints. Thus the Spirit of God is the universal efficient of all the common events in the course of nature, and of all supernatural appearances, whether in the kingdom of nature, or of grace.

It is possible that some weak and unskilful reader may be ready to scruple this representation, as though it attributed all the visible actions of men, whether good or bad, to the Spirit of God, and thus tended to represent God as the author of sin.

But those who understand the doctrine of the divine concurrence to the works of inanimate nature, as well as to the actions of men, know, that there is a great deal of difference between the uniform universal agency and influence of a prime cause, according to his own original established laws of nature, and the particular agency of created intelligent causes. The particular actions of intelligent creatures may be very culpable, for abusing the general influence of the first cause to vicious purposes, while the prime, uniform, universal cause is blameless. The Spirit of God, though it be the universal efficient of all life and motion, yet is by no means chargeable with the guilt of a murderer, even though he gives vital motion and power to those limbs which perform a bloody action, for he does not incline the will of men to

any iniquity, nor are their limbs moved but by the original force of his law of creation, according to their own free will, and their own resolution.

It is granted by modern philosophers that the divine will, or power, is the immediate cause of gravitation; and it is evident, that if a man push a boy from a precipice, it is gravitation that dashes out his brains; yet the man is properly guilty of the boy's death, and not the divine power, which is an universal and uniform agent, according to the settled laws of the creation.

I thought it necessary for the sake of weaker readers, to remove this cavil by the way. But these last pages are rather an occasional digression, and a meditation "en passant." Whether this be approved or no, it does not at all effect my present hypothesis, of explaining the sacred Three. It is time now to endeavour to solve some of the special difficulties relating to the doctrine of the Trinity, that are supposed to attend on this representation of the blessed Spirit.

#### SECT. IV.—*Objections answered.*

**Objection I.** Is not the personal language, in which the Spirit of God is represented in scripture, too strong and emphatical, to be applied merely to a divine power? Is he not described as a real proper person, an intelligent being, distinct from God the Father and the Son?

**Answer I.** I grant the personal representations of the Holy Spirit seem to be strong in some places of scripture: But let it be noted, that the more general and constant language speaks of him as a power, or a medium of divine operation, in the very essence of God.

We must also consider that it was the frequent custom amongst the Jewish writers, and the Oriental nations, not only in their oratorical or poetical works, but even in their common phraseology, to speak of powers and qualities, under personal characters. Now it is no wonder at all that the blessed Spirit of God should be so represented, especially since we know not how great the real and divine distinction may be between God and his essential powers. This may be so great, for ought we know, as to lay a juster foundation for the ascription of personal characters to the blessed Spirit, than can be found amongst any human powers or properties whatsoever.

Is not the wisdom of man, as well as the wisdom of God represented in strong personal characters in the book of Proverbs? See Prov. i. 20—33. "Wisdom crieth without, she uttereth her voice in the streets, &c." Prov. ii. 10—12. iii. 13—20. iv. 6—13. ix. 1. as well as in the eighth chapter, where it is supposed the second person in the Trinity is meant. Is not charity represented as a person; 1 Cor. xiii? Is not the scripture

itself represented in a personal manner, as a prophet ha- fore-knowledge and a power of speaking? Gal. iii. 8. " scripture seeing that God would justify the heathen thro- faith, preached the gospel to Abraham." Is not the law scribed as a person? Gal. iii. 24. " The law was our sch- master to bring us to Christ." And in several other places. not the grace of God exhibited as a person, labouring toge- with St. Paul? 1 Cor. xv. 10. " I laboured more than they yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me." And may not the spirit of God, or his efficient power, be so described since it has so great, so universal, and all-pervading an ag- in the affairs of creation and salvation?

Are not the water and the blood described in a per- manner, as witnesses, " *α μαρτυρησάντες*; 1 John. v. 8. Take t- words in any scuse, yet they are not real proper persons: V- then may not the Spirit be called a witness, and be represe- personally too, whether in that verse it signifies a divine po- or the influence of that power?

Let it be observed as I hinted before, that among men- thing is more naturally represented in a personal manner, the several actions, qualities, or powers of human nature, virtue, vice, wisdom, fancy, reason, conscience, will, &c. this both in scripture, and in common writings. I will men- but one at present. The very approbation, and concurrent- timents of St. Paul are called his spirit, and represented- personal manner; 1 Cor. v. 4. " When ye are gathered toge- and my spirit with you;" Col. ii. 5. " Though I be abse- the flesh, yet I am with you in the spirit, joying and behol- your order." Now if the very will, inclination, and concou- sentiments of a man may be called the spirit of a man, and- presented as being present, and acting in a distant place, is t- not much more reason why a divine efficient power shoul- called the Spirit of God, and be represented as employed- acting in all distant places, by virtue of the divine omnipres-

Answer II. I might give a second answer to this objec- in this manner. It is granted by all Trinitarians, that ther- some places of scripture where the Spirit must be construed- power, or a divine influence, and must signify the gifts, gr- or operations of the Spirit, viz. Where the Spirit is repres- as poured out, as shed down, as communicated in greater o- degrees, &c. Now since the Spirit, if he be a proper, literal person, yet is confessed to be sometimes represented- power, why may he not be sometimes represented as a per- though in his own nature he be a proper, real, literal po- Things are represented in scripture as persons, more frequ- than persons are represented as things.

Objection. But here it will be objected still, If the S

God be but one power of the divine nature, how can it be described as vested with all manner of intelligent characters, powers, and properties, such as understanding, will, affections, &c? The Spirit has knowledge, for he searches the deep things of God;” 1 Cor. ii. 10. “ He has will, for he distributes gifts to every man severally as he will;” 1 Cor. xii. 11. “ He has affections, for he is grieved;” Eph. iv. 30. This seems to represent the Spirit as a complete person, and not as one power.

Answer I. To this I reply, first, I have already acknowledged that in some places of scripture the Spirit of God signifies God acting by his Spirit: So that the divine essence is included in the term, together with his almighty efficient power; and this gives a solution to that difficulty in several texts of scripture: God considered as acting by his Spirit, has also all other divine powers belonging to him.

II. But, in the next place, I add also, that wheresoever things are represented in a personal manner, or as persons, there all personal or intelligent characters, viz. understanding, will, affections, &c. are ascribed to them. Even human wisdom, as well as divine, in the book of Proverbs, has various intelligent and voluntary characters and actions ascribed unto it, when it is personalized. The same may be said of charity; 1 Cor. xiii. —8. It has knowledge and thoughts; “ charity thinketh no evil, charity believeth all things. It has a will and design; charity seeketh not her own. It has affections; charity is kind, it rejoiceth not at iniquity, but it rejoiceth in the truth.” That is sort of language is common among the Jews, may be seen abundantly in the apocryphal books of Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus, where all manner of powers, strength, knowledge, will, motion, &c. are ascribed to wisdom. Even inanimate things, when represented personally, have knowledge, will and affections, ascribed to them. The sun is said to have knowledge, for he knoweth his going down; Ps. civ. 19. The sun has affections for he rejoiceth to run his race; Ps. xix. 5. The wind itself, to which the Holy Spirit is compared; John iii. 8. has a will ascribed to it. “ The wind bloweth where it listeth, *οπου βλαση* where will.” By all these instances, and many others which might be added, it appears that though the blessed Spirit may have both understanding and will, and affections, attributed to it in scripture language, it may still be one divine power, and not a proper personal person, or a distinct conscious mind.

But I have said many other things toward the solution of this difficulty in the discourse about the “ use of the word person,” and in another that treats of the “ distinctions in the divine nature\*,” and I shall add something further on this head in the end of this discourse, by giving several specimens how even those



scriptures may be interpreted upon this foot, which represent the Spirit of God in the strongest language of personality.

Objection II. If the Spirit of God be really but a power of the divine nature, how is that consistent with those texts of scripture which speak of the power of the Spirit of God and the power of the holy Ghost ; Rom. xv. 13, 19. Can there be the power of a power ? Or, is this proper language ?

Answer I. Yes, the language is proper enough, while we remember that the word power in one place signifies a faculty, in the other, the force of that faculty : Are not reason and conscience powers of a human soul, and yet it is never thought improper to speak of the power, that is, force of these powers or faculties. May we not say, that one man subdued his appetites by the power of his reason ? And that the conscience of another man had power over his vices ? Even the divine will is represented in scripture as a power in the godhead, and yet it is very proper to attribute various effects to the power of the divine will : And by the same reason we may speak of operations wrought by the power of the holy Spirit, especially when he is represented as a divine power.

It is natural and easy in this case to suppose the word power, in those texts to be an attribute, or property of this divine power, or faculty, personalized : For when any thing is represented as a person, it is no impropriety at all to attribute powers to it.

Answer II. Or, if we should suppose the power of the holy Spirit to be a pleonastic expression, it is no more than is common in scripture, and there are many instances of it, as, Eph. i. 5. according to the good pleasure of his will, that is, the will of his will, so in Eph. vi. 10. " Be strong in the power of his might." Eph. i. 19. " Κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰχθύος αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐνεργήσει." " According to the working of the might of his power which he worked, or wrought." Col. i. 22. " In the body of his flesh." And a multitude of such oriental pleonasm are found in scripture.

Objection III. If the Spirit of God be properly a power of the divine nature, or a distinct principle of action, and not a real and proper person, or distinct intelligent being, how can we offer a doxology to the Spirit, and ascribe honour and glory to him, together with the Father and the Son ?

Answer I. Though I think it may be very proper, upon some occasions, to join the Holy Spirit in a doxology, and to offer glory and praise to him, together with the Father and the Son, yet I think it may be affirmed, that there is not any one plain and express instance in all the scripture, of a doxology directly and distinctly addressed to the Holy Spirit. Perhaps one reason among others, may be because both the Father, and the Son, considered as God-man, are proper, distinct persons, while the proper, dis-

and real character of the Spirit, is that of a divine power, principle of action, and it is only personalized by idioms of

low though there may be two or three examples of such a usage in the writers of the three first centuries, and though it is properly practised in many cases, yet if there be neither text nor pattern for it in scripture, it ought not to be esteemed constant, and so necessary a part of worship as modern ages have made it, and as I once thought it to be. For it is the scripture which alone could reveal the Father, Son and Spirit to us, and that must be the rule and ground of the particular worship we pay to each of the sacred Three. See a larger discourse on this subject in my "Christian Doctrine of the Trinity," proposition XX. question ii.

Answer II. Since I believe the Spirit of God to be co-eternal with God, and essential and necessary to his very being, and to be in the same sense true God, and since he is represented in scripture in a personal manner, or under the character of a distinct person, therefore forms of praise may be lawfully addressed to him, as well as peculiar blessings may be said to descend from him. Though scripture has not taught us distinctly to offer praise and adoration to the Holy Spirit, yet it has taught us to hearken to the voice of the Spirit, to obey the Spirit, to hope and wait for the strengthening, the sanctifying, and the comforting influences of the Spirit, and not to resist him; and since the Holy Spirit is true God, I think it follows by evident consequence, that we may offer him the sacrifice of praise for the blessings which he bestows. There is no more necessity that he should be a real, proper, distinct person, or another conscious mind, in order to receive such praises than in order to bestow such blessings. A figurative personality is sufficient for both.

Answer III. I add yet further, that if the Holy Spirit had not been represented in a personal manner in scripture, yet a distinct power of the divine nature may surely be as proper an object of doxology, as a divine attribute or perfection, which does not seem to carry in the idea of it so great a distinction as a divine person. I think there is no impropriety in ascribing praise and adoration to the wisdom, or the grace of God. May we not properly use such language as this, "We give thanks to the grace of God?" "Let us give praise to the almighty power of God?" "Let his mercy be given to God and his mercy?" "Let God the Father, his eternal wisdom, and his love, be glorified for ever?" Now these expressions may be sometimes used on particular occasions with propriety and devotion, though we are not necessarily bound to use them.\* I see no reason why we may not, upon

\* I might here take occasion to give a full answer to that objection which has been raised by some Trinitarians and Unitarians, against my proposal of occasional doxologies to the Holy Spirit, as prudence and expedience may require.

neration of the Son is the Father's communication of his own self-same individual, self-existent essence to the Son, together with the personal property of being begotten, in and by which property he differs from the Father."

And, "that the procession of the Spirit is a communication of the self-same, individual, self-existent essence, both from the Father and the Son, unto the Spirit, together with the personal property of spiration or proceeding, by which property he differs from the Father and the Son."

How strange soever this language appears to persons, who seek for ideas together with words, I seriously profess this is the justest, truest, and, I think, the plainest description that I can give of this opinion. If it be possible to make it plainer, I will repeat the same in another form of words.

The scholastic scheme supposes the eternal generation of the Son to be a sort of repetition of the self-same numerical divine essence of the Father, together with some new personal property called filiation, which joined to the divine essence, makes up the person of the Son: And that this repetition, or reproduction of the same divine essence with its new personality, is owing to the Father only.

It also supposes the procession of the Holy Spirit to be another sort of repetition of the self-same numerical divine essence of the Father, together with some new personal property, called procession, which joined to the divine essence makes up the person of the Holy Spirit: And that this repetition, or reproduction of the same divine essence with its new personality, is owing both to the Father and the Son conjointly; or as some rather say, it is from the Father as the original principle, by the Son as a medium.

There have been some writers, indeed, who thought it was not proper to say of the divine essence itself that it did generate, or could be generated or derived; and therefore they supposed only the personality of the Son to be generated, or derived from the Father, and the personality of the Spirit to proceed, or be derived from the Father and the Son. But when you enquire what these personalities are, they can only tell you, that it is filiation or sonship, and spiration or procession. Upon the whole therefore, according to this opinion, it is sonship is generated, and procession proceeds. But the generality of the scholastic, or orthodox Trinitarians go into the former sentiments, of the generation and procession of the divine essence itself, together with the distinct personalities.

With a solemn and unfeigned veneration I reverence the names and memories of those excellent men, those learned and pious authors of the last age, who asserted and defended these opinions. Nor do I think the devotion, and zeal, and piety, of

present times, equal to theirs. But when I enquire of my heart whether ever I could form any ideas of all this sort of guage, while I was taught it in my younger days, and firmly entered to these sounds, I must honestly confess, I could not. Sometimes I was ready to enquire further; but then I satisfied my inquisitive thoughts with this general notion, that it was incomprehensible. I found it sufficiently evident in scripture, that the Father was God, that the Son was God, and the Holy Spirit was God; and that they were usually represented in scripture as three persons: And though I had no distinct idea of the odus of it, yet I thought myself sufficiently defended, and entrenched in the forms of scholastic language, and armed with a set of phrases which make up this part of the common, or orthodox explication, without being too solicitous about conceiving that which was asserted to be utterly inconceivable.

I humbly adore the sacred Three, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, as one God, inconceivably glorious, beyond, and above, all the thoughts and reasonings of men: And therefore I could not willingly indulge an unreasonable, and ambitious curiosity, in any of the mysterious things of God. Yet where, after a laborious enquiry, and daily prayer, I think I have discovered some mistake in my former opinions, not as to the doctrine itself, but as to the mode of explaining it, I humbly hope may be permitted to part with a set of phrases which scripture never uses, which the popish schools composed, and which I never could understand, without the censure of heresy, or departing from the faith.

Let it be observed here, that the ancient Athanasian explication of the sacred doctrine of the Trinity, is a very different thing from this scholastic scheme, as I have manifested elsewhere. And though in the last century there were but few Trinitarians who knew and believed the ancient Athanasian doctrine, because they generally went into the scholastic hypothesis, yet in the present age this scholastic explication, of the generation and procession of the Son and Spirit, derived from the popish schools, supposed to be indefensible, even by some of the most learned and zealous defenders of the deity of the sacred Three.

But to return to the objection. If it were needful to maintain the eternal generation of the Son in his divine nature, and the eternal procession of the Spirit, in a way of derivation from the Father, there is scarce any scheme of explication that might be construed into a more rational and intelligible idea of it, than the hypothesis which I now propose: For if we suppose the eternal Word, and the eternal Spirit, to be two essential powers of the divine nature, they may be said to flow, at least in a logical sense, from the very essence of God the Father, as I have ascribed in other parts of these dissertations.

And as for that text on which this objection is founded John xv. 26. "The Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, whom I will send unto you." See a particular paraphrase of it at the end of this discourse.

**Objection V.** You have described the Spirit of God under various ideas; you make it to signify either a divine power, or God himself acting by his Spirit, or the agency and operation of this divine power, or the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit; thus, according to your account, there is not one single, settled, uniform idea, that belongs to this sacred name, the Spirit of God, or Holy Spirit, in scripture.

**Answer.** This is freely granted: And it is the Eastern custom, and particularly the Jewish manner of writing, to use the same word in various senses. This sort of writing runs through the scripture, both in the Old and New Testament. Shall I instance in the word law? Sometimes it signifies the five books of Moses, sometimes the ten commandments, sometimes a doctrine of religion, sometimes the gospel, and sometimes it denotes a principle of sin, or a principle of holiness. The word grace also, in one place, signifies the favour of God, in another a christian virtue, and in a third text it denotes beauty or decency; and the Greek word *χαρις*; signifies also thanks. The word faith sometimes means an act of the mind, believing the revelation of Christ, and sometimes the object of that act, that is, the truth, or the gospel. And many other words might be produced of the same kind, such as righteousness, flesh, body, soul, &c.

But let me come nearer the point, and give an instance of the name of the second person in the Trinity, that is, the Logos; or Word, sometimes it signifies a power of the divine nature; Ps. xxxiii. 6. and 2. Pet. iii. 5. "By the Word of God the heavens were of old." Sometimes it denotes God himself acting by his Word; Heb. iv. 12. "The Word of God is living and powerful, a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Sometimes it intends the complete person of our Lord Jesus Christ incarnate; Rev. xix. 13. "His name is called the Word of God." And at other times it means the Word of God, either written or spoken; as Prov. xxx. 5. "Every Word of God is pure." And in a multitude of other texts it has the same sense.

It is plain that the sacred writers had different ideas under the same word in different places, and if we should confine the terms faith, grace, law, righteousness, word, to one uniform sense and idea, it would be impossible to explain, or interpret, many texts of scripture.

Now, since many other words are used in this manner, in scripture, and even that sacred name, the Word of God, which denotes the second person of the blessed Three, why may not

the name Spirit, which denotes the third person, be construed with the same latitude ?

Let it be observed here, that it is not the custom of the sacred penmen to write according to learned rules, and forms of logic, nor to confine the same term always to the same idea. They generally chuse a more lax and vulgar way of speaking ; they use the same word in several senses, and apply the same term not only to the original, and chief idea, but to various things which are causes, effects, parts, properties, or adjuncts of that original idea : Which modes of speech, though they are very common and familiar, yet the critics afterwards invented learned names for them, viz. metaphor, metonymy, synechdoche, &c.

I add further, that the most orthodox writers on this subject have found it necessary to construe the term Holy Spirit in some variety of ideas : For they make it signify his influences, or his gifts, or his effusion on men, in such places where they thought it could never be applied to his person. The learned Mr. Pool, author of the *Synopsis Criticorum*," in his excellent little treatise of the " Deity of the Holy Spirit," affirms, that it must needs be taken so in many places of scripture ; page 64, 65, he cites several of them. And that learned author, J. H. Bisterfeld, in his answer to Crellius, about fourscore years ago, and all writers besides of the orthodox sentiments, confess the necessity of applying different senses to the term Holy Spirit, and that it must sometimes denote the effusion or influences thereof: As in John vii. 32. " The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified." The learned know that the word, given, is not in the Greek original, but they all explain it by the gift of the Spirit in their translation. And so in Acts xix. 2. " We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost : " Which most expositors interpret merely concerning the plentiful effusion of the Spirit at Pentecost. And in other places, where the Holy Ghost is said to " be given by the laying on of the hands of the apostles ; " as Acts viii. 18. it seems necessary to interpret it concerning his gifts, lest it appear too assuming to suppose a sacred person in the eternal godhead to be given to one man by the hands of another.

SECT. V.—*An Explication of various Texts, according to this Account of the Holy Spirit.*

The several texts already cited, and interpreted in the former part of this discourse, shew how necessary it is to understand this term, the Holy Spirit, with such a latitude, and in this variety of ideas. Here I shall add a few more scriptures, and those even of the greatest difficulty, and of the most considerable importance, to make it appear, that this discourse of the Holy Spirit, is adapted to explain the several descriptions that

are given of him in the scripture. The rest will easily fall in with it.

1. One of the most remarkable and important texts, where-  
in the Holy Spirit is represented as a person distinct from the  
Father, and the Son; is in John xvi. 13, 14. "When the Spi-  
rit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall  
not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he  
speak, and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify  
me, for he shall receive of mine, and shew it unto you." Here  
let it be noted, that the Holy Spirit, who inspired the prophets,  
and revealed the mind of God under the Jewish dispensation,  
was now appointed more explicitly to perform this work, in a  
more evident and conspicuous appearance than before, and a  
more plentiful and magnificent manner: and to empower multi-  
tudes to preach, prophesy, and work miracles in the name of  
Christ. Now as the Father did not design, under the gospel,  
to manifest his will by the appearance of angels, so much as in  
ancient times, and was about to recal the person of his Son from  
this lower world, this blessed Spirit, or the divine efficient power,  
was to reside in the church as the deputy, or resident, and prime  
minister, both of the Father and the Son. Upon these accounts  
it seemed proper to our Saviour who is the divine wisdom incar-  
nate, to describe this divine power by a strong prosopopœia, and  
a noble allegory, as a messenger sent forth from God for this glo-  
rious design: And because the extraordinary effusions of the Holy  
Ghost were not to be made till Christ was ascended to heaven to  
dispatch this messenger to the earth, and to send him on this  
great errand, therefore saith our Lord, "Except I go, the Com-  
forter will not come;" verse 7.

Now, when a messenger delivers what his principal gives  
him in charge, he is then justly declared a true and faithful mes-  
senger: But when he devises things of his own head, and de-  
livers them in the name of his principal, he is then said to speak  
of himself, and then he loses the character of truth or veracity.  
It is in this sense Christ, who was the messenger of the Father,  
says, "The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself;"  
John xiv. 10. that is, "I did not invent this doctrine, it is  
not a new contrivance of mine, but I delivered to you what my  
Father gave me in charge." And according to this allegory, when  
Christ says of the Spirit, under the representation of God's mes-  
senger, that he "shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever  
shall hear that shall he speak," the meaning may be twofold =  
1. That he should not teach any new doctrine, different from  
the doctrine of Christ,—2. That he should not act like a false mes-  
senger, and impose upon them; but he should deliver to them  
the doctrines of Christ as one entrusted and sent by the Father  
and the Son: And in this sense he justly deserves the character

of the Spirit of truth, as well as because divine veracity belongs to his nature as God, who is the God of the truth.

Perhaps this explication of this text may seem a little too unnatural and figurative to some persons, who are truly zealous for the deity of the Holy Spirit: But let them consider, that every interpreter of this scripture, who preserves the doctrine of its deity, is constrained to bear as figurative a sense as this is. And whatsoever subordinations are ascribed to a supposed, real, proper divine person, may be better ascribed to a divine power, under the subordinate character of a messenger in the divine economy. It is none but the Arians who can keep precisely to the letter of the text here, because they make the Spirit an inferior or created being.

II. Another remarkable text is; John xv. 26. "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, shall testify of me:" Which may be explained thus, the Spirit may be said to proceed from the Father, because God, in the person of the Father, is considered as exhibiting the prime physical idea or essence of godhead, and thus may be conceived as the original of the two divine powers, viz. the Word and the Spirit: Thus the word and the Spirit may be said to proceed from the Father, as powers from the essence.

Again, God the Father is considered as sustaining the prime moral idea or dignity of godhead, and thus has the original right and power of sending the Spirit, of bestowing the gifts and graces of his own Spirit, or of conferring gifts and graces by his own Spirit, and in this sense also the Spirit is said to proceed from the Father; the Father is the original agent, and sustains the supreme character in the divine economy, and as such he is called the Father.

Sometimes God condescends to confer these gifts by the ministry of the apostles, and by imposition of their hands. Many persons received the Holy Ghost by the hands of the apostles, as instruments, when in reality it was God communicated those sacred gifts, even as miracles were said to be wrought by men, when in reality the Spirit of God performed them. Sometimes Jesus Christ is said to send the Spirit from heaven, and then Christ is not only considered as the most glorious vicegerent, or minister of God, by whose mediation and ministrations, divine influences descend on the disciples from the Father; but he is considered also as one in whom the fulness of the godhead dwells bodily, as one who is God in human nature, as the eternal Word or wisdom of the Father dwelling in flesh. Now, in this respect the Spirit may be properly called the Spirit of Christ, and is said to be given, sent, and shed forth by Jesus



Christ, in a superior character of grandeur and authority, than is, or can ever be expressed concerning any of his apostles.

When divine wisdom is represented in a personal manner; as in Prov. i. 20, 23. it is frequently supposed to denote our blessed Saviour. Now wisdom speaks there in a majestic manner, "Turn you at my reproof, and behold I will pour out my Spirit upon you;" and when our Lord was departing from the world, "he breathed on the disciples, and said, receive ye the Holy Ghost;" John xx. 22.

The Son of God, or the man Christ Jesus, personally united to the eternal Logos, or divine Word, is God over all blessed for ever: And being now ascended to heaven he sustains the office of his Father's vicegerent, and deputed king in the sacred economy, and therefore the Spirit is represented as proceeding from the Father in an original manner, but as being sent by Jesus Christ; the authority of the Father and the Son concur in this matter. The Lamb is raised to sit upon the Father's throne, that is, to exercise his Father's authority; Rev. iii. 21. and therefore the river of the water of life, which may denote the blessed Spirit, is represented; Rev. xxii. 1. "The Spirit proceed from the throne both of God and the Lamb," that is, from the royal authority of the Father and the Son.

III. Text, 1 Cor. xii. 4. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." Verse 5. "And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord." Verse 6. "And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all." Which is easily explained thus: Though the gifts are different, it is the same divine Spirit, the same principle of efficiency, or power of God, that gives them. Though the administrations, or services in the church, are various, yet Christ is the same Lord and Master. Though there are diverse miraculous operations, yet it is the same God which worketh them all in all believers who receive them. Now, that the same Spirit in the fourth verse signifies a power in the divine nature, or God himself operating by this power, may be learned from verse 11. compared with verse 6. "By all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will. Both the will and the operation which are proper to God himself and which are ascribed to him; verse 6. are ascribed to the Spirit; verse 11. whereby it seems plain that the Spirit is sometimes construed to signify God himself, and sometimes to signify a power in the divine nature. Thus the scripture attributes true godhead to the Spirit, under some distinction both from the Father and the Son.

IV. Text, Isa. xlv. 3. "I will pour water on him that is thirsty, and floods on the dry ground. I will pour out my Spirit on thy seed, and my blessing on thy offspring." And, Joel i

28. "I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh." Acts ii. 13. "Christ having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." In these, and many other scriptures, it is evident that the Spirit of God is represented under the character or metaphor of water, which is more plainly expressed; John vii. 38, 39. "He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly flow rivers of living water: But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." Now, if the Spirit of God, in these texts, be explained to signify his influences, his operations, his gifts and graces, which are distributed and dispersed abroad like streams of living water in the church, and poured down or conferred on men, perhaps this may come nearest to the sense and idea of the sacred writers: And, as I hinted before, if we compare those scriptures herewith wherein the Spirit of God is said to be given by the laying on of the hands of men, such as Acts viii. 18. it will further confirm the explication of the term Spirit by gifts and influences.

V. The last text I shall mention, is that famous and contested place; 1 John v. 7, 8. "There are three that bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one: And there are three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one."

Now the three witnesses in heaven, in the seventh verse, may be well interpreted, God the Father with his two divine powers, the Word and the Spirit, which in this place, as well as in many others, are represented personally, for they are called *τρεις μαρτυρητις*, that is, three witnesses, or three persons bearing witness: And perhaps there may be some special congruity in representing them as three persons in this place, because they succeed each other, and chiefly witnessed in different successive economies or administrations; viz. the Father eminently under the Old Testament bearing witness to the gospel by prophecy. The Word eminently in his incarnate state by his own ministrations; and the Spirit eminently after the ascension of Christ by his extraordinary and divine operations: And yet these three are one, *ἢ ἑσται*, are one thing, one being, one deity, not considered in a personal manner, but as a nature or essence.

In the eighth verse, "There are three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit, the water, and the blood." These are represented also as three persons, for they are called *τρεις μαρτυρητις*. The best expositions that are given of them are these two:

1. They may be all considered as belonging to Christ himself, and then the water signifies the pure and holy doctrine and

life of Christ. And the blood denotes the sealing his doctrine by his own death and martyrdom, and there is this reason why these witnesses belong to our Lord himself, viz. because it is said verse 6. "He came not by water only, but by water and blood. And then it is the Spirit who beareth the third witness," that is, the glorious power of miraculous operations which attended our Saviour's preaching, Or,

2. They may be all considered as belonging to christianity, or exhibited among christians: And then the blood signifies the blood or atonement of Christ: Exhibited, perhaps, in the Lord's-supper, which witnesseth to the truth of the gospel by its power to speak peace to the guilty conscience: The water represents the grace of regeneration, held forth, perhaps, in the baptismal water, which by changing sinners into saints witnesses to the truth of the gospel: And the Spirit most probably signifies the miraculous gifts of the Spirit and the apostles and primitive christians, which join to confirm the same gospel.

I think it most proper to refer the term Spirit among the witnesses on earth to the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, because the term Spirit, considered as a distinct power in the divine nature itself, is described as a witness in heaven.

Thus I have endeavoured to explain the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and to apply this explication to the most difficult texts of scripture. Upon the whole, I conclude, that since the scripture represents him under the characters of true godhead, and under the character of a person distinct from the Father and the Son, since also it is exceeding hard to reconcile strict and proper deity with three strict and proper personalities in the godhead itself, in a fair consistence with reason and scripture, it seems to be most agreeable to the word of God, that we should explain the personality of the Spirit in a figurative sense, that we may better maintain his proper eternal deity, and his unity with the Father. This seems to be much more eligible than that we should explain his personality in a strict literal sense, for this would lead us into one of these two dangers, viz. either to make three distinct consciousnesses, or intelligent minds, in the one true and eternal God, or to sink the character of the holy Spirit into a creature, that we might save the proper personality.

I grant, when we have been accustomed all our lives to a particular set of words and ideas, it is pretty hard to persuade ourselves to make any little change in our ideas or words, even though the greatest advantages might be attained by it toward the defence of the gospel, and though it might remove some of the chief embarrassments which attend any particular article of faith. I wish heartily for myself and my friends, greater freedom of soul in the humble pursuit of truth. Yet I think I have

not much varied from the defensible parts of the common explication of the Trinity ; and I have taken care religiously to secure all the foundations of divine worship, which concern the honour of the Holy Spirit, and all our practical regards to him which concern our salvation.

I impose my thoughts on no man ; and if there be any thing found in all this discourse which may endanger any necessary part of our christian belief ; or which may diminish any thing of the divine honour which is due to the blessed Spirit, our sanctifier and comforter, I disclaim and renounce it utterly, and would be glad to receive a better explication which might be more secure from any such danger and inconvenience.

It is an easy matter for persons of wit and subtlety, and critical artifice, to embarrass the clearest explication of such sublime doctrines. It is easy to raise up a dust of confusion around the incomprehensible things of God, which have some darkness and difficulty in them when set in the fairest light. I wish every disputant of this sacred article, of the Trinity in unity, would set it in a better view, and represent it in more easy and distinct ideas, rather than studiously batter down every scheme without building up any.

While we are tracing out these abstruse and awful subjects by the light of scripture, in this dark world, I am sure it becomes us all to keep our spirits in a modest and humble frame, and in a constant dependence on the divine aids of that blessed Spirit, which searcheth the deep things of God, and reveals them to men. As in my feeble pursuit of these enquiries I have always laid myself at the foot of this heavenly Teacher, that according to the promise of our departing Saviour, I might be guided by him into all truth, so I would now humbly recommend these papers to him, that if there be any thing in them proper to lead christians into clearer conceptions of his own sacred nature and operations, he would condescend to make them happily successful for that purpose : And beseeching my Saviour, that whatsoever sentiments of mine are inconsistent with divine truth, he would graciously forgive and cancel them, and never suffer any thing that I have written to have so unhappy an influence, as to lead the meanest professor of christianity into a mistake, in matters of so glorious concernment.

However, since there is some difficulty and darkness attends our enquiries into the metaphysical nature and essence of the blessed Spirit, his unity with, and distinction from the Father and Son, and since he has not condescended to reveal this mystery to us in his word in evident and express language, we may be well assured, that he has not made our participation of his divine and salutary influences to depend upon any clear, explicit, and certain knowledge thereof. Many a humble christian has

been richly endowed with his gifts and graces, who had obtained but very imperfect and confused ideas of his abstracted nature. He has taught the holy penmen to write down his sacred titles and offices, as an enlightener, a sanctifier, and a comforter, in more plain and express language, than his sublime essence, and metaphysical idea or nature. And while we depend on his divine all-sufficiency for these purposes, and seek to God the Father, and his Son Christ Jesus, for the communications of his blessed Spirit, we have a divine promise that we shall not seek in vain: "If men, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to their children, how much more shall our heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" Luke xi. 13. And this is the spring of our light, and our hope, on this depends our present holiness and our eternal comfort. *Amen.*

## DISSERTATION VI.

### *Of the Use of the Word Person in the Doctrine of the Trinity.*

SINCE the word person has been used in most ages of the christian church, in setting forth the doctrine of the blessed Trinity, and hath been applied to those three sacred ideas, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, it becomes almost necessary when we write on this subject, to declare the sense of this word, as it is variously applied in discoursing on this doctrine.

The sense of the word person, in the common language of men, is one single, intelligent, voluntary agent, or a principle of action that has understanding and will; so three men, or three angels, are properly called three distinct persons. Now since it has pleased God in his word, to represent to us the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, under the character of three such intelligent agents, they may be called in human language three persons, according to this scriptural representation.

The distinctive character of a person is the application of the personal pronouns I, Thou, He, to any thing; and where-soever these are applied to any being, either simple or compound, that being is there exhibited in a personal manner, and may in that respect be called a person. Now, all the three pronouns, I, thou, and he, being frequently applied in scripture to the Father and the Son, and the pronoun he to the blessed Spirit, we therefore call them three persons.

I confess, I know of but two particular places in scripture where this word person is ever supposed to be used with reference to this doctrine.

One is in Heb. i. 3. where Christ is called "the express

image of his Father's person ;" And though the Greek word *hypostasis* sometimes signifies substance, as it is translated Heb. xi. 1. yet in this place it seems to intimate such a distinction of the Father, from the Son, as is strong enough to answer the word *persona*.

The next place is 2 Cor. iv. 6. The glory of God shines forth in the face, or person, of Jesus Christ ;" for the Greek word *ωσων* signifies also person. In the first of these texts person is applied to God the Father, and in the second to Christ incarnate : Though it must also be confessed, that the critics in the learned languages, will hardly allow either of these words, *Hypostasis*, or *prosopon*, among the ancient Greeks, to signify properly a person in the sense in which it is used in this controversy\*.

I confess, I am not aware of any text, where any term that expressly signifies person is applied to the Holy Spirit, or to the divine nature of Christ, considered apart from the man Jesus ; yet since the sacred three have such sort of distinct actions and characters attributed to them in scripture, as we usually ascribe to three distinct intelligent agents, we make no scruple to call them all persons, and think there is sufficient foundation for it in scripture.

Yet let it be noted, that though the word person may be fitly used, and applied to the doctrine of the Trinity, we are not to imagine that it should be always taken here exactly in the same sense and include precisely the same ideas, as when we call three men, or three angels, three distinct persons. This I gave notice of in my "Christian Doctrine of the Trinity."

In almost all arts and sciences as it been ever accounted a very lawful and practical thing to borrow several terms from familiar language and common speech, and to use them in a sense peculiar to some one art or science, though it be different from their vulgar and more usual signification. We may borrow a plain example from every mechanic trade ; as for instance, a watch-maker talks of a balance, a pinion, a hand, a spring, a barrel, a key, &c. and affixes ideas to those words very different from their original or common meaning. So when a metaphysician speaks of simplicity, passion, substance, subject, a patient, matter, form, &c. he gives those words a different meaning from what they have in common life. And why should it not be lawful in theology, while we are treating of sacred and divine sub-

\* *ἰσων* is supposed to signify a person ; 2 Cor. i. 11. "The gift bestowed on us by the prayers of many persons ;" and I think this is the only text where it necessarily signifies a distinct intelligent agent, and this does not refer to any of the sacred three, but to men only. As for *ωσων* ; some critics say, it must rather signify substance ; in Heb. i. 3. because in the apostolic age they think it was never used to express person.

jects, which are so much superior to our common ideas, to borrow the word person from familiar and common language, and use it in a sense that has some analogy to the common meaning of it, though it be not entirely the same.

In explaining this article of the Trinity it is well known that there are two special cases wherein we make use of the word person ; and both of them may require such a sense of the word as is a little different from the common usage ; for human languages have not furnished us with words sufficiently distinct and apposite to express divine ideas ; and therefore men have borrowed those words from common speech, which, in their opinion, come near to those divine ideas which they would express. The two cases are these :

The first is, when we apply the word person to three distinctions in the divine nature, and call the Word and Spirit persons as well as the Father ; all these being represented in scripture as intelligent agents, or principles of action, we call them three persons.

The second case is, when we apply the word person to the human and divine natures of our Lord Jesus Christ united, and call this God-man, this compound or complex being, one person.

In the first case we suppose three distinctions in one divine nature to be represented in scripture, under three personal characters or as three persons, who are all employed in our creation and salvation.

In the second case we suppose two natures united into one personal character, for the scripture represents God manifest in the flesh as one person ; 1 Tim. iii. 16. " He was seen of angels, and received up into glory.

The application of the word person to Christ as God-man, has been largely vindicated in my second " Dissertation on the Trinity," where I have made it appear, that as any two material beings which are united together, as two houses, trees, or fruits, may be called one complex house, one complex tree, &c. So the human and divine natures of Christ, though possibly each of them may be called one single person, yet when intimately united, may be called one complex person, or one complex principle of intelligent action and passion. I refer the reader to that discourse.

But when we consider the distinctions in the divine nature, and call the Father, the Word and Spirit, three persons, it requires a little farther explication in what sense the characters of personal agents may be attributed to the Word and Spirit as well as to the Father, and that shall be the subject of the present dissertation.

As in the case which concerns Christ as God-man, the word person has its signification enlarged to include two natures in it, which is more than common language admits ; so in this case, which concerns three persons in one divine essence, the word person has its signification narrowed, to admit rather less into it than common language generally includes. I think these things have been generally so understood by all learned Trinitarians ; at least in that common explication of the Trinity which hath been called orthodox for four hundred years, wherein three distinct consciousnesses or spirits, are not supposed to make up the god-head, but one single consciousness, only, or one single spirit.

Now, if the complete divine nature, or the infinite spirit, be represented as including in it two distinct powers, which are called the Word and the Spirit, by way of analogy to the human soul, which includes in it the powers of mind and \* will, and if we suppose the human soul acting by the mind and will, to represent God the Father as acting by his two divine powers, the Word and Spirit, it is evident that the Father is properly called a person, an intelligent voluntary agent, with very little or no alteration of the common sense of the word in human language ; and this appellation is what all the opponents of our doctrine will allow.

But when the Word and Spirit are called persons, which are supposed to be really but divine powers of the Father, whose inward distinction we know not, the term person is then used in a figurative or metaphorical sense, and not in so proper and literal a sense as when the Father is called a person. Yet that there is sufficient distinction between them to lay a foundation for such a distinct personal representation of them in scripture, will appear by the following considerations :

I. Are not the various faculties of man often represented under personal characters in common discourse ? How frequently is a man represented as conversing with his own mind, communing with his own heart, following the dictates of his own will, or subduing his will and subjecting it to his reason ? Do we not freely say, "My mind has laboured hard to find out such a difficulty, my will is resolutely bent to pursue such a course ; my mind denies her assent to such a doctrine ; or my will resists no more, but yields itself up to the conduct of my understanding ?"

\* Though I represent the divine Word and Spirit by way of analogy to the mind and will of a human soul, let it be observed, that the chief reason why I use the words mind and will is, because they are the two single names generally given to the two chief powers of the soul ; and as the mind denotes the knowing power, so the will is commonly understood to signify the active power. But if there were any single word that did include the intelligent and volitive power, and another single word that did denote the efficient or executive power of moving the body, I would much rather chuse two such names to set forth the divine Word and divine Spirit, as I have noted elsewhere because I think this would come nearer to the scriptural representation.



How frequently are reason and fancy introduced like two opponents or disputants. Is not conscience at every turn brought in as a person speaking to the sinner, as an accuser charging him with secret crimes, or as a judge approving the actions of a good man, and condemning a rebel, and all this under a personal character and in personal language? Are not dialogues introduced oftentimes between reason and fancy, between a man and his conscience? And this not merely in studied rhetorical language, but in common discourse.

And since human powers are thus represented as persons, why may not the Word and Spirit, which are divine powers, be thus represented also? And why may not God be represented as a person, transacting his own divine affairs with his Word and his Spirit under personal characters; since a man is represented as transacting human affairs with his understanding, mind, will, reason, fancy, or conscience, in a personal manner?

H. There is yet a further reason why we may expect such personal representations of the divine powers in scripture: For it is the custom of eastern writers and particularly of the penmen of the holy scripture to represent the several parts, principles, characters, or virtues of a man in a personal manner. So the body and the soul are called the outward and inward man; 2 Cor. iv. 16. So the principles of grace and principles of sin are represented personally, and have personal actions and characters attributed to them under the names of flesh and spirit; Gal. v. 17. These same principles are called the old man and the new man, which are personal names; Rom. vi. 6. Eph. iv. 24. So charity is represented as a person; 1 Cor. xiii. And understanding, or wisdom, is frequently made a person, in the book of Proverbs, even where it doth not so evidently signify the Messiah; and much more may it be exhibited as a person where Christ himself is presigned and designed.

It is so customary with eastern writers to personalize every thing, that even inanimate beings, as well as virtues and vices, are represented by them under personal characters. The sun and the wind have personal properties ascribed to them; Ps. civ. 19. "The sun knoweth his going down." John iii. 8. "The wind bloweth where it listeth." Here are knowledge and will attributed to mere corporeal beings.

The countries of Edom and Egypt, the cities of Tyre and Jerusalem, are called the daughters of Edom, and Egypt, of Jerusalem and of Tyre, &c. Job said to corruption, "thou art my father, as well as to the worm, thou art my mother and my sister;" Job xvii. 24. Sparks of fire are called the sons of the burning coal; Job v. 7. And the word son and daughter are applied almost to every thing in their style, which names de-

note personal ideas. It is no wonder then if in scripture the powers of the divine nature as described are persons.

III. I add further, that the Jews were wont to distinguish the powers of a spirit personally from that spirit : And this comes close and home to our present case. When they represent a man as purposing and resolving any thing in his own heart, they say he speaks to his memra, that is, his word, his understanding, his soul, his will, or any of his powers. So the great God is oftentimes distinguished from his memra, or word, or will, or powers, or affections, in the same Jewish writings. Thus the term memra, when put for God or man is often put for himself under a distinct personal character. There are some few places wherein this very word memra is evidently attributed to the Messiah, or Christ who was to come. See Mr. Robert Fleming's "Christology, vol. I. pages 137—142." where are many citations of this kind from the Jewish writings.

Philo the Jew, who wrote about the time our Saviour was upon earth, and has left his writings as one of the noblest monuments we have of the ancient Jewish sentiments, speaks frequently of distinct powers in the divine nature ; and represents them in a personal manner. He acknowledges that God has two chief supreme powers, one of which is called God, and the other Lord, and supposes these two powers to be uncreated, eternal, infinite, immense, incomprehensible, and speaks of them upon very many occasions. And though he does not directly give these two powers the name of mind and will, for he calls them sometimes dominion and goodness, yet he speaks of them as divine powers, by which all things are created and governed. He makes the Logos, or wisdom, another divine power, or God himself. "These things, saith he, being considered, as it appears how God is three, and yet but one ;" which in his allegorizing way he represents by the vision of Abraham ; when Jehovah appeared to him ; Gen. xviii. i. "And Abraham looked, and behold three men stood by him : " This vision, in a literal sense he expounds of the Logos, and two angels : By the mystical sense, he saith, here was denoted ο Ω, the great Jehovah with his two powers ; and he repeats this in another place : " In the middle is the Father of all things ; on each side of him are the two powers, the oldest and the nearest to the ο Ω." See Dr. Allix's Judgment of the Jewish Church, page 147. Thus we see there was some shadow of the Doctrine of the Trinity, among the Jews of the ancient synagogue ; though they were as zealous asserters of the unity of the godhead, as either the Socinians or the Arians can pretend to be : And it appears also by this sort of discourse, that they conceived of the sacred Trinity as God with his two powers, which I have taken more notice of in another place.

IV. To make this the more evident, I add also, that most

of the very primitive fathers of the christian church, when they speak of these things. describe the divine Logos, or eternal reason, or wisdom of God, as a personal power, or as a divine power under a personal character; and represent the Logos, or *Nus*, or *Σοφία*, that is, the divine wisdom, or mind, as a counsellor, with whom God consulted, in the formation of his works, and who was with God before all worlds, even from all eternity. And whosoever will read those early authors will find the Logos, or second person in the blessed Trinity, frequently so described, that every reader would imagine a proper divine power, rather than a proper literal person to be there represented; though sometimes also they figuratively affix personal names to this Logos, this eternal Word, or wisdom. See the Dissertation on the name Logos.

The common and usual explications of this sacred doctrine which have been esteemed most orthodox among the protestant churches, both at home and abroad, have supposed the distinctions of the sacred three in the divine nature not to arise to the complete, proper, and literal idea of person among men; because they generally make the essence of all the three to be numerically the same. Therefore it can be but a metaphorical or figurative personality which they allow; and they call them three persons, only by way of analogy to three men, or three angels, since there are not in their opinion, three distinct conscious beings in the godhead.

The most ingenious and learned Dr. Wallis, in his Letters on the Doctrine of the Trinity, makes no scruple at all to say, that the word person, when applied to the distinctions of the Word and Spirit in the divine nature, is metaphorical, analogical, and figurative: And he frequently uses this manner of speech, supposing that three literal persons would not consist with the divine unity, and yet I think, he has always been esteemed an orthodox Trinitarian. "We mean no more, says he, by the word person, but somewhat analagous thereto; the words person and personality here are but metaphorical, and so are the words Father, Son, generate, &c." See his Third Letter, pages 31, 39. I might cite many other writers who have been known and approved authors in this controversy in the last age, who make the distinction of divine persons to be a distinction of internal relative properties, in the self-same individual essence; which can never arise to the idea of a distinct, literal, and proper personality.

VI. To vindicate this metaphorical sense in which the word person is attributed to the sacred three, consider, that godhead, or deity, is ascribed in scripture to the Word, and to the Spirit; and there are also personal characters ascribed to them: Now if this sacred doctrine cannot be well explained in a proper and

ral sense, both with regard to the deity and to the personality, but we run into tritheism, and make three gods; I esteem it much safer to construe the terms of personality in a figurative sense, than to construe the terms of deity in that manner, and to show only a figurative godhead to the Word and Spirit: For the proofs of their true and proper deity seem to me stronger than the proofs of their literal and proper personality.

And, indeed, most, if not all, the common orthodox Trinitarian schemes, as I said before, agree with me in this, that the word person is not applied to all the sacred three in the full and literal sense of it, though the word God is attributed to them in the literal sense. If some have supposed a particular manner of subsistence, to be a person in the godhead; and others say, a person is the divine being in a particular manner of subsistence, and that the three divine persons are the same numerical divine being repeated in three manners of subsistence, it is much the same in this respect; for every one perceives, that neither of these are three distinct persons in the literal and proper meaning of the word; therefore it is plain the word person is here used by them figuratively or analogically, though they use the word God in its proper and literal sense.

VII. If the personal characters which are attributed to Christ in scripture are too strong, and proper, and literal, to be veiled by such a figurative personality, then let it be observed, that Christ had a distinct human nature, a soul and body in union with the divine Word; and surely this assumption of human nature strengthens the personal characters of I, thou, and he: this will abundantly solve the attribution of personal ideas to Christ. If the divine Word, in the sense and explication which we have given, be not sufficiently distinct from the Father, to be called a person, yet surely it may be allowed that the man Christ Jesus is a proper person, and his union to the divine Word does not abate or destroy his personality. The whole complex being, or God-man, may have a sufficient claim to personality, and all the personal pronouns I, thou, and he, are properly applied to him.

And as this sufficiently solves the personal ascriptions to Christ, since his incarnation, it will solve such personal ascriptions before his incarnation also: For I think there are many reasons to believe, that the divine nature of Christ formed and assumed his human soul into union with itself before the creation: that the soul of Messiah was the first of all creatures, was personally united to the divine Logos or wisdom before the world was, and continued so through all the ancient ages of the church, then appearing as the angel of the covenant, till at last he veiled himself in flesh and blood, and took upon him the likeness of man, which I have endeavoured to prove in another discourse.

VIII. If this scheme does not sufficiently account for distinct expressions of the personality of the Holy Spirit, let remember that the personal characters of the blessed Spirit are not expressed in so frequent, nor in so strong, and plain terms in scripture as those of Christ.

1. In all the New Testament there is only the pronoun *I* attributed to the Spirit, but I think neither *I* nor *τησιν*, nor *ω* are applied once in all that sacred book ; whereas *I*, *thou*, *he*, and *we*, are all ascribed both to the Father and Son.

2. The Holy Spirit is often described in the notion of divine power or influence, rather than a person. He is said to be given to men, to be shed forth, or poured out on them ; the apostles are said to be baptized with the Holy Spirit, even with this very same Spirit, who is yet in another place called the Comforter, and the Spirit of truth, and is represented in a strong language of personality as any where in the bible. Job xiv. 26. and xvi. 13, 14. compared with Acts i. 5. The believers are anointed with the Spirit. 1 John ii. 27. and filled with the Holy Spirit, in opposition to wine ; Eph. v. 18. And in Acts v. 5. and xi. 24. they are full of faith and of the Holy Ghost. As in 1 John iv. 13. "He hath given us of his Spirit," that is portion or measure of his Spirit. And in Tit. iii. 6. "He shed his Spirit on us abundantly," that is, in a large measure. There is a part of the Spirit which was on Moses, that was given to the elders of Israel ; Num. xi. 25. So a double portion of the Spirit which was in Elijah rested on Elisha ; 2 Kings ii. 10, 15. The Spirit is not given by measure to Jesus Christ ; John iii. 34. See more in the fifth dissertation, where he is represented as the power of God. All which modes of expression seem to describe properly a divine power in greater or lesser degrees of influence rather than a proper person : though at other times this Spirit may be represented personally in an oriental and figurative way speaking.

3. The Holy Spirit is represented at other times in the sense of some writers, as a complication of divine virtues, because in Rev. i. 4. it is called the seven spirits which are before the throne. And in Rev. v. 6. "The Lamb had seven horns and seven eyes which are the seven spirits of God ;" which seems to hold forth the seven-fold virtues or powers of God which dwell in Christ, that is, a perfection of divine powers to answer his eternal exaltation, by the residence of the Spirit of God in him in the completest manner.

4. Let us remember also, what was before mentioned, that though there be one scripture in the bible, viz. Heb. i. 3. where the word *hypostasis* or person, is attributed to the Father ; and one text, viz. 2 Cor. iv. 6. where the word *προσωπον* or person, is applied to the Son of God incarnate, yet I can find no verse

the bible where any word that directly signifies person is attributed to the Holy Spirit, and therefore the personal characters attributed to him may be supposed to be only figurative, and such as may be attributed to a divine power.

IX. If it should be granted, that the powers of a human soul, a finite being are not substantial and distinct enough to admit such personal ascriptions as belong to the divine Word and Spirit in scripture, yet the powers of a divine and infinite being may be substantial and distinct enough to support such ascriptions. We know little of the divine essence but by way of analogy to human souls : And as the divine nature, or God, has something in him transcendently superior to all our ideas of human souls, so the powers of a God, which, in condescension to our weakness are called his Word and his Spirit, may have something in them, even in this respect, so transcendently superior to the powers of a human soul, as to be more proper subjects of such personal characters and ascriptions as the holy scripture has attributed to them ; and yet their distinction or difference may not be so great as to make them distinct conscious minds.

X. I add in the last place, that if there be any expressions in scripture, either relating to the eternal divine Word, or the holy Spirit, which cannot be construed, or interpreted, concerning a particular power of the divine nature represented in such a figurative personality, I would then enquire, whether it may not be interpreted concerning the divine nature itself exerting that particular power : And in this sense the personality will appear more complete and more literal.

In this view of things the Logos, or Word, may signify God acting by his Word ; as Heb. iv. 12. " The Word of God is living and powerful,—and a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the hearts." And the Spirit of God may signify God acting by his Spirit, as when Ananias lied to the Holy Ghost ; Acts v. 3, 4. He lied to God acting by the Holy Ghost, God residing and operating in the apostles by his Spirit.

Now this representation of things approaches very near to the common orthodox explication of the Trinity, wherein the Son and Spirit are represented as having the same numerical divine essence with the Father, but considered in a particular manner of subsistence, or vested with peculiar personal properties. Yet at the same time, the scheme which I have proposed is free from the heaviest difficulties that lie upon the common orthodox scheme, viz. The eternal communication of the same individual divine essence from the Father to the Son and Spirit : For my hypothesis supposes the generation of the Son to refer to his pre-existent human soul, or to his body, or to his mediatorial office ; and the procession of the Spirit to refer to his mission rather than to his existence.

Now, if we review all these considerations, and join the force of them together, perhaps it will appear, that the explication of the Trinity, by the idea of a divine being with his two divine powers, will allow such a personality to the Word and holy Spirit, as may be sufficient to answer the representation given of them in scripture.

Yet I will by no means contend for the use of the word person to express the divine nature of Christ, or the Holy Spirit. I have often asserted, and repeat it again, that when I express the doctrine of the Trinity by three persons being one God, I mean no more, than that there "are three, who have sufficient communion in one godhead to have proper divine names, titles and attributes ascribed to them, and sufficient distinction from each other to sustain the various characters and offices that are assigned to them in scripture."

Perhaps the word person may be the best word we have to express the character of God the Father, or of Christ as God-man, in his complete constitution, as a complex being: Yet, perhaps, it may not be the very clearest and happiest term that could possibly have been found to express the characters of the Word and Spirit in a philosophical manner, considered as mere distinctions in the divine nature. But let it be remembered, that it is not the custom of scripture, nor the design of the great and blessed God, to represent either heavenly or earthly things to us in their own philosophical nature, where our concern in them does not depend upon a philosophical knowledge of them: And therefore in these matters God is pleased to accommodate his language to the sentiments of the bulk of the people to whom they were first written. So the scripture speaks of the motion of the sun, of the fixation, or establishment and foundation of the earth, of the pillars of the heavens, of the heart and reins giving instruction, as being the seat of the soul, according to the Hebrew opinion, though these things are not literally and philosophically true. Now since our salvation does not depend upon the knowledge of the precise points of unity and distinction, between Father, and Son, and Spirit; or whether the Word and Spirit be proper powers, or proper persons in their own sublime nature; but upon their divine all-sufficiency to fulfil their offices, and support their relations to us: It is very probable that God condescended to talk to his people according to their own way of thinking and talking, and to represent himself as acting by his divine powers under the character of persons, without giving us any account of the real philosophical distinctions in his incomprehensible essence, how great or how little they are: And the reason of this his conduct may be, because an exact and just philosophical account of these things is, perhaps, too transcendent for our conceptions in the present state, or that it was not

try to meliorate our temper and practice, or promote our  
on.

et it be further observed, that though the term person has  
ng and generally used in the christian churches to express  
inctions in the divine nature, yet it has not been univer-  
ade use of for this purpose; nor has the doctrine been  
ed only to this word, either in elder or in later times. Se-  
enturies had run out after the beginning of christianity,  
this word was publicly and frequently used. Justin Mar-  
very early writer, calls the distinctions in the Trinity, dif-  
nanners of being, *τροποι υπαξιω;*. Others of the Fathers  
Logos, or eternal Word, a power of God, according to  
guage of the ancient Jews.

ie "programma" of the emperor Justin, to which all  
rches gave their consent, as Evagrius witnesses, "His-  
Ecclesiasticæ, libro v. capite 4." saith, "We adore the  
in unity, and the unity in Trinity; an unity as to essence,  
ead, a Trinity as to properties or persons, *ιδιοτητα; ητοι*  
. Here person is explained by property. St. Austin,  
es the term person, explains the Trinity by modes or  
of the divine nature; representing the Father, Son,  
irit, as mind, wisdom, and love; or God considered as  
inal eternal mind, knowing and willing himself. J. Da-  
e, the first of the fathers that collected a regular sys-  
divinity, defines a person in the holy Trinity, to be  
al mode of eternal subsistence; *ο αναρχος τροπος της αιδιε*

ius also later christian writers, use the words mode and  
y, to describe a divine person, and that sometimes even  
essions of faith. The Wirtemberg confession calls the  
hree, properties as well as persons. The confession of  
æk church, 1453, calls the Father, Son, and Spirit,  
roperties, which are as it were the principles of all the  
roperties of God, and which are named three subsistences  
ons. The Polish confession, 1570, says, "They are  
their subsisting properties and dispensatory offices, yet  
ree are one." The same divine essence considered  
ticular mode of subsistence, is the common way where-  
ine person hath been represented by most of our modern  
cal writers. The sacred Trinity is usually described by  
the divine essence with three relative properties.

ie great Calvin, one of the chief glories of the reforma-  
cribes the Son and Spirit as the wisdom and power of  
Father; and yet he calls them persons. But he resolves  
uarrel with any man merely because he will not admit  
erson. See "Institutionum, libro i. capite 13." I  
ite many authors to this purpose, who, though they use



By a careful perusal of the Word of God, I hope I am arrived at a just and reasonable satisfaction in this general truth, that "there are three which are called the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, who are represented in scripture as personal agents, sustaining different offices and characters in the transactions of God with his creatures; and that these three having divine titles, properties and attributions given to them, must have such communion in the one godhead, or divine nature, as to lay a just foundation for these ascriptions." This is the general doctrine of the Trinity, which has been professed by the greatest part of the christian world, and this is what I mean when I say more briefly, "there are three persons who are one God."

Now, since this doctrine appears to carry in it a seeming inconsistency, it has been the labour of christians in all ages, to find out some particular schemes of explication, whereby the difficulties may be removed, and the seeming oppositions reconciled, whereby we may attain some clear conceptions, how one God may be exhibited under three personal characters.

Among the several schemes which have been proposed in order to reconcile the seeming inconsistencies of this doctrine there is not any one of them that has given so plain, full and satisfactory a solution to all the difficulties that arise, as to render all further attempts needless. There is yet room therefore for the employment of study and prayer, and humble endeavours to obtain clearer light.

Having surveyed the probabilities, and the inconveniences which attend the several hypotheses which I have seen I have ventured to indulge some degrees of assent to one particular sort of explication, which seems to me more correspondent to every part of scripture, and bids fairest for the reconciliation of some of these difficulties with which other schemes are encumbered.— But I am far from having arrived at an assurance herein, nor dare I be peremptory, or positive in the assertion of it; for even to this hour I look upon all these hypotheses but as particular human and fallible explications of that doctrine, which in general is divine and true.

No, though the knowledge of any of these particular schemes is by no means necessary to our salvation, yet if divine grace will assist us to set these things in a reasonable light, it will add a sensible pleasure even to our inward devotions, when we behold the great God, the object of them, in a more distinct and conspicuous view. And if by this means we can better defend the true scriptural doctrine of the Trinity from the objections of men, we shall do some honour to the truths of God and his gospel, and perhaps, by this means we may have the happiness of establishing the faith of christians.

In order to explain in what sense three persons may be one God, we should first enquire, whether these personalities be intrinsic to godhead or no. A late ingenious writer maintains, that though the scripture plainly reveals the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, to be three distinct persons, and to be one God, yet that the scripture does no where determine, that these three are distinct persons in the divine essence itself. He supposes also, that the Son and Spirit may have inferior natures, but being intimately united to the godhead of the Father, they may be said so far to participate of deity as to have all divine names, titles, and characters, ascribed to them, without the supposition of any manner of intrinsic distinctions in the godhead itself.— See “the Scripture Trinity intelligibly explained by a Divine of the Church of England, Dr. Thomas Burnet, Prebendary of Salisbury,” particularly pages 139—145.

Though the hypothesis of this author is formed with much ingenuity, and has some plausible appearances in it, yet I cannot give up my assent to it, for I freely declare it is my opinion, that the *Λόγος* and the *Πνεύμα*, that is, the Word and the Spirit in scripture are described as properly divine in their own natures; and yet in their divine characters are distinguished from God the Father.

There is another reason also, why I cannot give in to this hypothesis, and that is, we know from scripture that the Son has a nature inferior to godhead, but there is no sufficient evidence that the blessed Spirit has any such inferior nature, even while it is granted there are several economical inferiorities ascribed to him. The Spirit never seems to be represented as a complex being, or person formed of God and a creature united, though the Son be thus exhibited to us.

Though there be not therefore any express assertion in scripture, that there are three distinct personalities in the godhead itself, yet I cannot hitherto find any method of explication sufficient to adjust all the parts of this sacred doctrine according to scripture without supposing some distinctions in the divine nature. Then the enquiry follows, what sort of distinction is sufficient to answer the scriptural account of the blessed Three?

The distinctions, or differences which we can suppose in the godhead, are these which follow :

1. A distinction of names, and external relations derived from creatures ; this is drawn from God's relation to the works of his hands, as when the same divine essence, or God is called the Creator, the Redeemer, and the Sanctifier, because of the different operations and relations of God to men. By this some have explained the holy Trinity.

2. A distinction of names, and internal relations, which is drawn from different relative properties in the divine nature itself,

as they are usually called ; thus the Father, Son, and Spirit, are described by some as a threefold repetition of the self-same divine essence, with some inconceivable internal relations to each other which are called paternity, filiation, and spiration.

3. A distinction of modes, or properties, as when the different attributes of the divine nature, viz. power, wisdom and goodness, are represented as a sacred Trinity.

Note, Those who suppose the sacred doctrine of the Trinity to be sufficiently explained by either of these three distinctions, are called modal Trinitarians.

4. Another distinction is that of divine powers, as when the divine essence, with its two different powers of mind and will, or principles of knowledge and efficiency, are represented as the blessed three, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit. May I not call this real in some sense, since there is a plain reality in the distinction, though it arise not to distinct substances ?

5. A real and substantial distinction ; as when the Father, Son and Spirit, are supposed literally to be three proper, distinct, conscious agents, or three real, intelligent natures, which some have called three substances, three infinite minds, united to compose one godhead. And, indeed, if they are three distinct conscious principles, or have a different consciousness, I know not how to form any other idea of them than as of three conscious minds, though some writers are not so free in their expressions as to speak what the notion plainly intends. Those who explain the Trinity in this manner are called real Trinitarians.

If I might be permitted to speak with freedom my sentiments of these several opinions, I would say, that the three first of these distinctions do scarce seem to afford a sufficient difference for the various ascriptions which are given to the Father, the Word, and Spirit, in scripture ; and as for the second distinction, it has this further inconvenience, that it seems to be made up of words rather than ideas.

The fifth distinction, so far as my ideas of it reach, represents the godhead as containing in it three real, proper, distinct, intelligent agents, three natures, or three conscious minds. The fear of approaching to the doctrine of tritheism, or three Gods, withholds my assent, at present, from that scheme.

Among all these distinctions, and differences, therefore, in my opinion, the fourth seems to come nearest to the scriptural representation of things, which describes God and his nature to us by an analogy to our own intellectual natures, or our own souls. This distinction of the divine essence, with its two eternal powers of mind and will, is the greatest real distinction, and the most solid difference that we can conceive in one Spirit : And therefore I rather incline to it, because the doctrine of the sacred

free, as represented in scripture, seems to require the greatest distinction that can be conceived in a consistence with the unity of God, who is the infinite and eternal spirit.

If there be some distinctions, or differences, in the divine nature, greater than that of relations, modes, or attributes, and less than that of substances, I know not what name to give it better, than that of divine powers. Let us therefore suppose the great and blessed God to be one infinite Spirit, one conscious being, who possesses real, distinct, or different powers, which in sacred language are called the Word and the Spirit: And though this difference, or distinction, be not so great as to allow of different consciousnesses, or to make distinct Spirits, yet these two powers may be represented in scripture in a figurative manner, under distinct personal characters, as hath been shewn in the foregoing dissertations.

**SECT. II.—***A general Proposal of the Analogy between God and a Human Soul.*

That we may go on step by step, and make regular advances towards the design in hand, let us consider, that whatsoever clear ideas we frame of God by the light of nature, we derive them from an inward reflexion on our own souls, and their various properties and powers of understanding and will, &c. supposing still the transcendent superiority of God above ourselves.

Let us consider also, that the clearest and noblest ideas by which God reveals himself to us in scripture, are derived from the same notions which we have of our souls as spiritual beings: It is by this way of analogy that we learn and understand what God is, when he tells us he is a Spirit, and when he speaks of his knowledge, his wisdom, his will, &c. Thus divine revelation happily agrees with human reason, in teaching us who, or what God is, by a resemblance of his incomprehensible nature and powers to the ideas we have of our own souls and their faculties.

I grant, that God has been pleased to condescend so far to the lowest capacities, as to describe his powers to us, sometimes by analogy to the powers and parts of our bodies, such as, eyes, ears, face, hands, breath, voice, word, &c. But these are not the clearest or nearest similitudes, nor the sublimest likenesses he has given us of himself. And therefore when we are endeavouring to form our highest and most spiritual conceptions of God, we look rather upon that analogy to our own souls in which he has been pleased to exhibit himself to us.

Since reason and scripture agree to teach us the nature of God, and inform us, who, or what God is, by this analogy, I think in our enquiries on this sacred subject we ought to follow

this analogy so far as reason and scripture allow us. Now it is evident, that a human soul, in its nature, is one conscious mind and it is utterly inconsistent with the nature of it to have two or three distinct conscious principles, or natures in it, that include two or three different conscious beings; and since we are told, that God is one, and God is a spirit, it would be somewhat strange if we must believe that God is two or three spirits.

And as the nature of our souls teaches us to conceive the nature of God, so the powers of our souls, by the same dictum of nature and scripture, teach us to conceive the powers of God. Since the human soul has two distinct powers, viz. knowing power, called the mind, and the active power, called the will, why may we not suppose the blessed God to have two distinct powers, called the Word, and the Spirit,\* the one intelligent, and the other active?

Or, as the human soul has in it intelligence, volition, and a power of moving the body, so if there were any single term which signified both intelligence and volition together, I would chuse to apply that to the divine Word†: And if any single term signified the power of operation, or moving the body, I would apply that to the Holy Spirit; because I think this analogy and resemblance would come something nearer to the scriptural idea of the Word and Spirit; the one being represented rather as an intelligent, volitive power, the other as an intelligent efficient power. But since we have no such terms ready made, and my design here is not so presuming, as to express what the powers of deity are in themselves, but only to exhibit a so distant human resemblance of them, I shall content myself with the terms mind and will to express this analogy and resemblance, always supposing the term will to imply an active efficient faculty.

Here let it be observed, that in explaining these distinct powers in the divine nature itself, I chuse to call the second person the Word, rather than the Son; for as some late writers suppose that the sonship of Christ rather refers to his human nature

\* Though the names Word and Spirit, or speech and breath, are borrowed originally, some from the body, and some from the soul of man, yet the ideas which are represented by these names in scripture, are entirely spiritual and therefore we must derive our best conceptions of them by their analogies in our own souls.

† The Logos, or divine Word, in scripture, sometimes signifies a word of knowledge, or manifestation, and sometimes a word of command or volition, and therefore if we had one single term for the intellect and will in a human soul, perhaps it would more exactly represent the divine Logos. Let it be also observed, that some of the ancient fathers call the Logos, the *το θελημα*, or will of God, as well as the *σοφια*; or wisdom. And Calvin, in his commentary on the first verse of the gospel of St. John, says, "The Son of God is called Logos, sermo, that is, word or speech, because he is first the eternal will and will of God, *Dei sapientia et voluntas*," and then the express image of his counsel.

to his mediatorial office, than to his godhead, so I must declare, I am much inclined to that sentiment.

Let it be also observed that I use the name Word in this dissertation in his divinest sense, viz. to signify a power in the divine nature as, I think, it is several times used in scripture, and not in that inferior sense, for the soul of the Messiah, as it seems to have been used by some Jewish writers, and, perhaps, with some countenance from scripture also.

Though we must not imagine, that the Word and Spirit in the divine nature are exactly the same, as mind and will, or intelligence and power, in a created spirit, yet this is not a mere arbitrary illustration, or a similitude invented by fancy, for there seems to be a reasonable and sufficient foundation for it in the sacred writings; this will appear if we consider what follows:

The second person in the Trinity is supposed by learned writers to be represented in several places in scripture under the name of divine wisdom, or understanding, and that not only in that glorious chapter; Prov. viii. where it is generally agreed to have this sense, but also in the ninth chapter, where "Wisdom built her house, sends forth her maidens, and crieth to the simple, turn in hither." There are also other texts applied by some interpreters to Christ, or the divine Word, viz. Jer. x. 12. and ii. 15. and Prov. iii. 19, 20. where God is said to form or establish the world by his understanding or wisdom, as in other places, "God created all things by his Word;" John i. 3. or by Jesus Christ; Eph. iii. 9. And our Saviour himself is supposed to call himself the wisdom of God, referring to his pre-existent state; Luke xi. 49. "Therefore said the wisdom of God, I will send prophets, &c. And again, referring to his incarnate state; Luke vii. 34, 35. "The Son of man came eating and drinking, and ye say, behold a glutton and a wine-bibber, &c. But wisdom is justified of all her children."

Let it be noted too, that the ancient Jews represented the word of God, and the wisdom of God, in such a personal manner, as appears in the books of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom, in the Apocrypha, which some divines have applied to the Messiah. See more in the discourse on the Logos.

It is manifest also, that the Spirit of God is represented as a divine active power. Luke i. 35. "The Spirit of God shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." And our Saviour is said to be anointed with the Spirit, which is explained; Acts x. 38. "Jesus was anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power." And whereas in some texts it is said, Christ wrought his miracles by the Spirit of God; in other places it is called the finger of God. And Luke v. 17. when Christ wrought miraculous cures, it is said the power of the Lord was present to heal. So the apostle preached; 1 Cor. ii.

4. "In the demonstration of the Spirit and of power;" and other texts might be cited to this purpose. See the discourse on the Holy Spirit.

And as the ancient Jews, in their writings, concur with the scripture in representing the Logos, or Word of God, as the divine wisdom, so they describe the Spirit of God as another divine power; and some of them take the Spirit of God for his will, for which sense Doctor Allix, in his "Judgment of the Jewish Church," page 155. cites Maimonides, and others.

The wisdom, and the effective power of God, are joined in several places in scripture, as being employed in creating the world, Jer. li. 15. "He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom," which is repeated Jer. x. 12. and seems a-kin to Ps. xxxiv. 6. "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the Spirit, or breath of his mouth." And there are several other scriptures where the Word of God, and his Spirit, as well as where wisdom and power are represented as agents, or mediums, by which God created all things.

I do not pretend to produce all these scriptures as divine arguments or proofs of my hypothesis, but only to shew, that the similitude I make use of is not a mere invention of my own, but there is much colour for it in the sacred writings themselves, as well as in the sense of many christian interpreters.

May we not therefore conceive the Word and Spirit as two divine faculties, virtues or powers, in the essence of God? What if we should call the Word, for distinction sake, a divine power, or faculty of knowing and contriving all things? The Spirit an executive power, or faculty, which wills and effects all things? Or, as I noted before, what if the Word rather include knowledge and volition, and the Spirit the divine power of efficiency? Not that I would exclude all efficacy from the Word, or intelligence from the Spirit; for the holy penmen do not confine themselves to such a learned and philosophical accuracy. The ideas of these divine powers are oftentimes intermingled in scripture. Sometimes the properties of the Word may be attributed to the Spirit, and those of the Spirit to the Word; for they are both the inseparable powers of an intelligent almighty being, and have incomprehensible union and communion with each other.\* But

\* I might here cite some of the primitive christian fathers, as Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Tatian, Tertullian, Irenæus, and others, who speak of the word, wisdom, power, counsel, mind, reason, and will of God the Father, signifying by these various terms, his Word and his Spirit, which two Irenæus calls "semetipsum," or himself. The reader may find many such citations if he consult the learned Doctor Waterland and his antagonists in the "defence and opposition of the queries; particularly query ii. and viii. &c. concerning the divinity of Christ, his eternity, his generation, &c." The author of the questions and answers, which are joined with the works of

As God is pleased sometimes to represent his own knowledge and his agency by his wisdom or Word, and his Spirit, why may we not conceive two powers or faculties in the divine nature somewhat analogous to our mind and our will, though they are not the same, since the chief knowledge we can attain to of the blessed God is by analogy to our own souls.

Here let it be noted, that when I represent the Word and Spirit by divine wisdom and power, I do not conceive them merely as two attributes of the divine nature, as justice, goodness, eternity, infinity, &c. but as such distinct faculties, or, perhaps, more distinct than the understanding and will are in human spirits, which two are called powers, rather than properties of the soul.

I grant, that sometimes the terms attribute, property, power, may be used promiscuously for each other; but when there is a distinction made between them, the terms property or attribute, are applied to any sort of modes or qualities, especially the essential ones, that belong to a subject: So immateriality, immortality, finiteness, changeableness, &c. are natural attributes of the human soul: Kindness, justice, faithfulness, &c. are moral attributes of a good man. But the term power denotes a distinct principle of physical agency in the subject, whereby it is rendered capable of acting in this or that manner: So the understanding and the will, so the faculty of perceiving sensible objects, and the faculty of moving the body, are properly called the powers of the soul.

In the same manner, by way of analogy, we may suppose finiteness, eternity, unchangeableness, &c. to be the natural attributes of God; goodness, justice, truth, are his moral attributes; and none of these are properly physical principles, or capacities of action. But his Word, and his Spirit, seem to be represented in scripture as the physical principles of knowing, willing, and efficiency, and therefore I call them powers, because this sort of ideas seems to admit of a greater distinction both in God and in creatures, than those qualities which we usually call attributes or properties.

The reader will pardon the necessary impropriety, or unfitness, of some of these terms, when applied to the great and blessed God, since we are forced to borrow all our representations of divine things from analogy to human ideas, and the terms of human language.

I proceed now to set this distinction of the divine persons in Justin Martyr, says, "God, or the Father, and the Word his Son, and the Holy Spirit *πνευμα μιν καλα δυναμιν* are united as far as possible, for the Son is the wisdom, word, wisdom of the Father, and the Spirit is an emanation, as light from light." Question 139. The primitive fathers do not always confine their language to such a philosophical niceness, but sometimes use those terms promiscuously, whereby they explain the Word and the Spirit.



an easy light, and represent it in one contracted view, under the few following queries.

SECT. III.—*Several Queries to illustrate this Doctrine.*

Query I. As the soul includes in it both the powers of understanding and acting, that is mind and will, may not the soul properly represent the complete divine nature, or God? And may not his Word and Spirit be represented by the human mind and will, that is, the power of knowing and contriving, and the power of effecting.

Some of the ancients have represented the Father as the whole of the godhead, and the Son and Spirit as his powers. Hippolytus, an anti-nicene father, expresses himself in this manner, “ το δε παν πατης, εξ υ δυναμις λογος. The Father is the whole, from whom is the power called the Logos or Word.” Irenæus calls the Word and Spirit of God God’s own self, “ *semper e-  
tippium,*” for they are always present with him as his word and his wisdom, libro ii. capite 56. And Tertullian saith, “ *Pat-  
tota substantia est: Filius vero derivatio et portio totius. The  
Father is the whole substance, but the Son is a derivation and  
portion of the whole.*” *Contra Praxeam, capite 9.*

In some of the foregoing dissertations I have shewn, that not only the primitive fathers, but modern writers of the greatest reputation, have represented God as one spiritual being, and the Word, or Son, and the Spirit, as the wisdom and power of God the Father. And it may be made to appear, that this is not only the sentiment of single divines, but multitudes of them met together in synods, to form confessions of faith, have used the same manner of speaking. I shall mention only these two.

The confession of the French churches, 1561, saith, “ God is one only simple spiritual essence, and in that singular and divine essence there subsist three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Father, the first in order, the cause and original of all things; the Son his wisdom and eternal Word; the Holy Spirit his virtue, power and efficacy.”

The Dutch confession, composed 1561, and confirmed in a synod of the churches, 1579, saith, “ there is one only simple and spiritual essence, which we call God, and that in this one God are three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Father is the cause, origin, and beginning of all things visible and invisible; the Son is the Word, wisdom, and image of the Father; the Holy Spirit, the eternal virtue, and power, &c.

II. May not the soul be described as employing its mind and will in different exercises or actions? May not a spirit properly say, “ I employed my mind to search out such a truth, I engaged my will in such a pious resolution, or in the practice of such a duty?” And in the same manner, may not God be said to

employ his divine powers in his work of creation, viz. his Word in contriving, and his Spirit in effecting all things? Or in his works of grace, viz. the Word in redemption, and the Spirit in Sanctification? Thus God created all things by his Word and Spirit, and he saves mankind by the same Word and Spirit.\* The great God, by his word or wisdom, directs the agency of his Spirit or executive power.

III. May not the soul be sometimes considered as the prime agent, in distinction from the mind and will, while the soul is said to employ the mind and will in particular transactions? And thus, while the divine nature, or God, employs his two powers, the Word and Spirit, may he not sometimes in this view be esteemed, in an economical sense, the chief agent, and thus sustain a distinct sort of personality, even what is usually called the Personality of the Father, though it may not signify that he is the Author, or producer of the Word, or of the Spirit?

Is it not generally given as one reason, why Christ is called the Son of God in his pre-existent nature, viz. that he is appointed to his royal offices by God himself, considered as the supreme rector of the world? Now, if Christ may be called a Son in scripture, Ps. ii. 7. and Ps. lxxxix. 27. as being deputed to the mediatorial government, why may not God, the supreme rector of the world, who deposes him to this government, be called the Father on this account? Ps. lxxxix. 26. Surely I should suppose, that those who grant a filiation to be derived from the economy, might allow the same concerning paternity.

IV. Is God ever called the Father in scripture, as giving birth or origin to the divine nature, either of the Word or Spirit? Are they ever plainly represented as depending upon him, or derived from him, as to their divine existence? Does not the word Father rather signify the godhead, considered as the supreme head, as the spring and origin of all creatures, or as being the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ as man? Or, at most, as only sustaining the character of the Father, or chief agent, in the economy of creation and redemption?

V. May not the human mind and the will be represented in a personal manner, or as distinct personal agents, at least by a figurative way of speaking, though they are but two powers of the same soul? May I not use such language as this, "My mind

\* God is not only said to act by his Word and his Spirit, but he is sometimes said to send forth his Word, and sometimes his Spirit, yet all this may be very fairly expounded concerning two divine powers, since in other places of scripture God is said to send several things which have no proper personality, Ps. lvii. 3. "God shall send forth his mercy and his truth." Ps. lxxviii. 49. where the original Hebrew by the same word expresses "God sending forth the fierceness of his anger, wrath and indignation as he does the sending forth of evil angels." Ps. cxi. 9. "He sent forth redemption to his people." Ps. xx. 2. "The Lord send thee help from the sanctuary."

has laboured hard to find out such a difficulty ; my will is resolutely bent to pursue such a course?" And many other common expressions there are of the same nature, wherein the mind and will are still more evidently and plainly represented as persons.

And since human powers are thus represented as persons, why may not the Word and the Spirit, which are divine powers, be thus represented also ? and why may not God be represented as a person transacting his own divine affairs with his Word and his Spirit under personal characters, since a man is often represented as transacting human affairs with his understanding, mind, will, reason, fancy, or conscience, in a personal manner ? See this treated of more at large in the considerations contained in the " dissertation on the use of the word person."

VI. Have not the greatest part of the writers on this subject applied the word person to such sort of ideas, or distinctions in the divine nature, as would not bear the proper and literal application of that word, which properly and literally signifies a distinct conscious mind ? And therefore they have been constrained to use the word in an analogical and figurative sense. The reverend Doctor Wallis, in his letters on the " Doctrine of the Trinity," illustrates this doctrine of the Father, Son, and Spirit, by the essence, the wisdom, and the force, or executive power of a human soul, letter I. page 16. and freely acknowledges, that the name of person, when it is applied to this divine subject, is metaphorical, or figurative. And indeed, those who make the greatest distinction between the sacred three, viz. the true Athanasians do still suppose, that the word person is not taken in the most complete sense of three separate or separable spirits, as three men, or three angels, when it is applied to the doctrine of the Trinity.

VII. Since the mind and will make up the soul, and the soul acts by them in all things that it doth, may not each of these powers be called the soul ? May we not say, the mind is the soul, or the will is the soul ? So if the Word and Spirit are those divine powers by which God doth every thing, may not each of them be called God ? May we not say, the Word is God, and the Spirit is God ? May not what each of them does be appropriated to God, since they are the powers by which God operates ? And does not this bid fair for the true meaning of scripture, where such sort of language appears : And especially when we consider that this is the language of the ancient Jews, and the primitive christians, who called the Logos God, and attribute to God what is done by his divine Word or his Spirit.

VIII. Doth not this representation of things shew how the sacred three, that is, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, have sufficient unity, or oneness of nature, to be exhibited to us in scripture as one God, and yet how they may have a sufficient

distinction between them, to be set forth, especially in the language of the Eastern nations, where the scripture was written, as three personal agents? Thus there are three that dwell in heaven, and bear witness to the gospel, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one; 1 John v. 7. For the proof of the divine authority of this text, see the learned Dr. Calamy's Sermons at the end of his Treatise of the Trinity, which contain arguments in them that are hardly to be refuted.

SECT. IV.—*The Conclusion.*

Far be it from me to assert this explication of the sacred doctrine of the Trinity with any positive airs, or in assured language: Much less would I demand the assent of others, and pretend to determine their opinion or faith of this mystery, by any manner of comparing it with things human, even though the comparisons and resemblances are borrowed from divine revelation. All that I aim at here, is to gain, and give as clear and distinct ideas as I can of the words which the scripture uses, that as far as possible, in explaining the word of God, I might secure myself and others from talking without ideas. And since I think it is evident, that the scripture represents each of the sacred three as true God, and yet represents them sometimes, under distinct personal characters, my only design and ambition is, to make out at least some possibility of this sacred doctrine to the understandings of men, to secure it from ridicule and contempt, and to wipe off that unreasonable reproach of nonsense and absurdity, which has been by too many writers so plentifully thrown upon the deep things of God, merely because they seem too hard to be perfectly adjusted and explained by men.

Though I have used some human comparisons in this and the foregoing dissertations, and have formed some resemblances between the great God and the soul of man, yet let none imagine, that things divine can be exactly paralleled, or adjusted by any precise conformity to things human. I presume no farther, than to exhibit a sketch, or distant shadow of heavenly things. The name of God has something in it so superior to all our human ideas, that it may be doubted, whether his very essence may not be something almost as much superior to our ideas of a spirit, as a spirit is superior to a body.

When God is pleased to represent his powers and actions by corporeal images, such as hands, ears, eyes, seeing, hearing, &c. we are sure this is not proper, but analogical language. When God is described as a spirit as to his essence or substance; when scripture speaks of his understanding, his will, his Word, and his Spirit, it may bear an enquiry, whether, this be a most exact, natural, and univocal description of him; or, whether it be not rather a sort of similar representation of God by way of

condescension to our human ideas. It is hard, if not impossible, for us, in some cases, to say infallibly, that this or that is true concerning God the Father, his Word, or his Spirit, because it is true concerning creatures; that this or that cannot be true concerning God the Father, his Word, or his Spirit, because, perhaps, it cannot be true concerning creatures; for the most exalted ranks of creatures that we know, are very poor imperfect shadows of the Creator.

I cannot think it reasonable, indeed, to interpret the natural divine attributes, or perfections, such as knowledge, power, goodness, so entirely in an analogical sense, as that ingenious author, the archbishop of Dublin\* has done, because our common ideas of these words, knowledge, power, goodness, are more applicable to the divine nature in an univocal sense: Yet this sacred doctrine of three personalities relating to one divine essence, may with much better reason be explained or construed in this analogical manner, since our common ideas of Father, Word, Spirit, person, are not so applicable thereto in an univocal signification. I am well assured, that if such analogical explications be allowable in any part of theology, the doctrine of the Trinity lays the best claim to it.

I add further also, that every scheme and explication of this sacred doctrine amongst the real or modal Trinitarians, which hath had any manner of claim to orthodoxy does suppose the divine essence to have something in it that is not univocal to our ideas of a spirit: The most orthodox explainers are all forced to represent the distinctions of persons in the godhead, as something for which there is no perfect parallel in created spirits, and are forced to recur to analogical ideas, and analogical language.

Now if it be so, then who shall determine what differences and distinctions may be found in a nature or essence so infinitely superior to all our thoughts, so much unknown, and so incomprehensible? And, why may not the blessed God represent these distinctions in his own nature, in a way of personality, or as three distinct persons, supposing that such a representation will easily lead the bulk of mankind into such conceptions of his economical transactions with us, as are fit to engage them to adore, worship, trust in, and love their Creator, their Redeemer, and their Sanctifier? All these duties we may practise by the influence of scriptural revelation, without a philosophical or univocal idea of what the great God is in his own sublime, abstruse, and unsearchable essence. "God is great, and we know him not." Thousands of saints and martyrs have gone to heaven with triumph by the practice of these duties, under the influence of a humble faith, without further philosophical enquiries.

Dr. William King.

It will be replied then, "What has made the christians of all ages so curious to penetrate further into these deep things of God, than was necessary for their own faith and practice in order to salvation?"

To answer this let it be observed, that there may be some advantages for the increase of christian knowledge, for personal piety, and for the instructions of others derived from our pursuit of clear ideas in the great doctrines of the gospel. But to lay that consideration aside at present, there is another answer very obvious and easy, and it is this. The primitive christians found perpetual objections against the doctrines of their faith raised by the heathen writers; this constrained them to enter into a deeper enquiry, and the violent opposition that was made to those doctrines by the patrons of several errors in the first and following ages, set the christians in every age at work to draw out the matters of their belief into various human forms; and they did this in order to defend them against those who attacked them in a variety of methods of human reasoning and artifice. And particularly in the present controversy, when the opposers in all ages have endeavoured to represent the doctrine of the Trinity as utterly inconsistent both with reason and scripture, the believers of this doctrine have found it proper to search out some way and manner in which it is possible this doctrine may be conceived without such inconsistency.

For my part, I confess, that my faith, as a christian, had contented itself with more general ideas of this doctrine, without enquiring, so far at least, into the modus of it, had it not been for the various objections that are raised against the possibility of it in any form or modus whatsoever. And though I have now taken the freedom to declare, that I prefer the representation which I have given in these discourses above any other schemes of explication which I have seen, yet I am not so vain as to expect, that this hypothesis will immediately relieve every difficulty that attends the sacred doctrine of the Trinity. I am well aware of various exceptions that will be made, and I have carefully considered some of the most important of them in papers that lie by me. I have also made experiment, how happily this scheme furnishes out an answer to the chief exceptions of a considerable, but unknown writer, who has attacked my little discourse of the "Christian Doctrine of the Trinity," in a "Sober Appeal to a Turk or an Indian." Part of a reply to that book has been already made in the second and third dissertations printed last year. Several parts more are ready to follow this. But it was necessary to exhibit the scheme on which the solution of difficulties is founded, before I could pretend to solve the difficulties themselves: And the printed sheets have swelled to such a bulk already, as renders it very inconvenient to crowd all my design

into this volume. According to the acceptance that these meet with in the world, I may be encouraged shortly to the rest.

After all, I am free to declare, that I am not so fond particular hypothesis, but I shall be ready to relinquish another, that will afford a better interpretation of all the tures that relate to the blessed three, and a happier solution all the objections that have been raised against this article should rejoice to see so clear and bright an explication of in the christian world, as shall overcome and scatter all difficulties and darkneses that have hitherto hung about it, and set it in so divine and triumphant a light, as shall penetrate soul, diffuse universal conviction, and demand a ready and shaken assent. But, perhaps, it is above the privilege mortal state, to expect the accomplishment of such a wish the mean while, let us pay the homage of our understanding to the supreme incompreheensible, by firmly believing what God plainly revealed, and wait for the favours of higher illumination in the regions of light and immortality. *Amen.*

## PREFACE,

### “USEFUL AND IMPORTANT QUESTIONS CONCERNING JESUS THE SON OF GOD FREELY PROPOSED, &c.”

---

It cannot be of much importance for the reader to be informed who was the author of these papers: Yet if it will be any satisfaction, the author himself wishes to say, it is one who has spent many years of his life in diligent enquiry into the sacred doctrines of the gospel, by a constant and laborious search of holy scriptures, nor is he ashamed to add, with continual application to the help of all light and grace for the instruction of his holy Spirit that he might better understand the things discovered in his word. He also takes the freedom to say these papers are the product of that part of life when the powers of mind and body were in full vigour.

The author has sometimes been ready to suppose, that several of the questions here proposed, may be very useful towards the further explaining some of the parts of scripture which have been less studied, especially concerning God the Father, and the divine and human natures of his Son Jesus Christ, whom to believe, to trust in, and to love, is eternal life; and he thinks he can safely appeal to the honesty and sincerity of his own endeavours, to give a full answer to all these enquiries, according to the clearest light he could find in the holy scriptures.

He has one favour to beg of his readers, and that is, that they would not receive any of these papers by the mere dictates of their own reasoning powers, but that the subject is a mere matter of divine revelation; nor that they would take any sentiments or schemes of elder or later writers, whether schoolmen or fathers in their views; of any party, for the perfect test of truth and orthodoxy in these subjects.

Yet he freely and delightfully confesses these following articles borrowed from the Athanasian creed, viz. “We believe and confess the Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, is both God and man; God of the same substance with the Father, man of the substance of his mother, born into the world; perfect God and perfect man; of a reasonable soul, and human flesh subsisting together: Equal to the Father, as touching his godhead, and yet inferior to the Father, as touching his manhood: One, not by conversion of the godhead into the flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God, so as to become one personal agent, or one person; and as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man are one Christ, who suffered for our salvation, &c.

Though I freely and cheerfully acknowledge all this, yet I take no human arguments for a test of the divinity or truth of my opinions: And I could wish my readers would lay aside all other teachers, besides the mere writers of the scriptures, in such enquiries where the light of these divine truths will also be the brightest, which are not to be known by the mere light of nature, but are only to be learned by the revelation of God to his Son Jesus Christ, and to his apostles.

And if this practice be sincerely pursued, the author humbly hopes these papers may find acceptance among the diligent and honest enquirers after the truth, so far at least as to have his unwilling mistakes pitied and forgiven, his sincere endeavours accepted, to make known the scripture to his fellow-christians in those important articles that relate to God the Father, and



his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which are of so much importance to salvation.

Yet finally to avoid all objections and dangers of mistake, I think proper here to take notice, that there have been generally two ways our protestant divines allowed to explain the filiation or sonship of Jesus Christ, in his divine nature; the one is, the real and supernatural is granted to be utterly incomprehensible, relating chiefly to the natural Father and the Son; the other is scriptural and economical, relating the characters or offices in our salvation, which is more easy to be understood. I must acknowledge I incline most to the second, because this allows perfect equality, even oneness or sameness in the godhead, whether the Father or the Son, and thus it maintains the true godhead itself to be divided and self-existent in both; and upon this supposition I believe the these writers have been always esteemed perfectly sound and orthodox as the first.

## USEFUL AND IMPORTANT QUESTIONS

### CONCERNING JESUS THE SON OF GOD, FREELY PROPOSED, &c.

---

QUESTION I.—*What is the meaning of the Name Son of God, as given to Christ in the New Testament, where the Belief of it is necessary to Salvation.*

#### INTRODUCTION.

It is of some importance in the doctrine of the gospel, and especially in the great article of the blessed Trinity, to know the meaning of the name Son of God, which is so often given to our Lord Jesus Christ in the New Testament: for hereby we shall be better able to understand the chief import and design of these places of scripture.

But here I desire my reader to observe, that I am not entering into the highest and most sublime sense of which it is possible that our Lord himself might have the idea when he used this word; but what is the sense that Christ, or the apostles and teachers of the New Testament more directly designed to convey to those who heard them, and in what sense the people generally understood and did understand this name.

It is evident from several expressions of Christ, that he knew that his own words sometimes carried in them a much deeper and sublimer signification, than barely that which he designed to convey to the Jews, or even to his own disciples at that time: As when he says to the Jews, "before Abraham was, I am," John viii. 58. And so when he says to his disciples; John xiv. 10. "I am in the Father, and the Father in me," they could not know that glorious and sublime relation of Christ to the Father, and his intimate oneness with the Father, which Christ himself was perfectly acquainted with.

My chief business in this discourse therefore is only to shew what is the true idea or meaning of the word Son of God, which our Saviour or the sacred writers designed to convey to their disciples through all ages and nations by this name, and in which it was possible their hearers could understand them, or we who use the same words.

And in order to find this sense of it, let us consider those places of scripture wherein the belief of Christ to be the Son of God is made the great requisite in order to salvation, and a ne-

cessary ingredient of christianity. For in these places of scripture, these two considerations will offer themselves; first, that the sense of these words must be "plain, familiar, and easy to be understood; otherwise it could not be made a necessary article, or a fundamental of the christian faith. It must have also, secondly, "some apparent connexion with and influence into our salvation," otherwise the belief of it would not have been made so grand a requisite in order to be saved; for it is scarce to be imagined that the blessed God would appoint any mere arbitrary and unoperative speculations to be the terms of our enjoying his favour. Now both these considerations will give us some assistance toward our finding out the true sense of this title.

The texts of scripture, wherein a belief of Jesus to be the Son of God seems to be made the great necessary term of salvation, are such as these; John iii. 18. "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God." John xx. 21. "These things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." 1 John v. 13. "These things have I written to you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God." 1 John iv. 15. "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him." 1 John ii. 23. "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father." Acts viii. 37. "And Philip said to the eunuch, if thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest be baptized; and he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; and he baptized him."

Now if believing or not believing Christ to be the Son of God has salvation and damnation annexed to it by the sacred writers, then surely it is of considerable importance to know what this name means, that we may not include too little in it, and by leaving out some important part, expose ourselves to that anathema; nor include too much in it, and so be tempted to lay our weaker neighbours under the like condemnation for want of sufficient knowledge.

But blessed be God, since it is a name of such importance, he has not confined this name precisely to one single, narrow, abstruse and difficult idea, but has affixed it to several ideas in scripture, that so if we receive it in the most important sense, we may be secured from the scriptural condemnation, though we should not happen to understand and receive it in all the sublime senses which may be applied to it.

Let it be noted also, that perhaps the various imaginations and reasonings of men may have affixed more senses to this phrase than scripture has ever done: Yet, in order to give this

enquiry a fuller consideration, we will survey the several senses which have been usually put upon it; and this shall be the first argument which I shall use toward the proof of the true signification of this name in the New Testament, that is, by way of a disjunctive syllogism proposing several and excluding some of them.

**SECT. I.**—*The First Argument toward the Proof of the Sense of this Name, Son of God.*

This name, Son of God, hath been supposed to be given to our Lord Jesus Christ upon some or all of these five accounts.—**1.** Because of an eternal and inconceivable generation by the person of the Father in the sameness of the divine essence.—**2.** Because of the glorious derivation of his human soul from God before the creation of the world.—**3.** Because of his incarnation coming into this world by an extraordinary conception, and birth of a virgin without an earthly father, by the immediate operation of God.—**4.** Because of his resurrection from the dead, and high exaltation.—**5.** In order to point out that glorious person who hath in general some sublime and singular relation to God, and who also was to sustain the character and office of the Messiah, the Saviour of the world.

**1.** The first of these senses is patronized by many writers, viz. "That an eternal inconceivable generation of the person of the Son by the person of the Father in the sameness of the divine essence consubstantial, co-equal and co-eternal with the Father," is included in the name Son of God.

But I am persuaded this can never be the sense of this name in those several texts before cited: They can never signify, that it is necessary to salvation to believe Christ to be the "eternal Son of God as a distinct person in the same divine essence, proceeding from the Father by such an eternal and incomprehensible generation." For,

**1.** If this be ever so true, yet it is confessed to be inconceivable. Now, if it be so very inconceivable, so mysterious and sublime a doctrine, then I do not think the gracious God would put such a difficult test upon the faith of young disciples, poor illiterate men and women, in the very beginning of the gospel, and exclude them from heaven for not believing it.

**2.** Nor indeed is this eternal generation and consubstantial sonship clearly enough revealed in scripture for us to make it a fundamental article in any age, and to damn all who do not receive it. I cannot see evidence enough in the word of God to make the salvation of all mankind, the poor and the ignorant, the labouring men and the children, even in such a day of knowledge as this is, to depend on such a doctrine, which the most learned and pious christians in all ages have confessed to be attended with so many difficulties, which, after the labour and

study of near 1400 years, is so inconceivable in itself, and was at first so obscurely revealed; much less can I suppose this notion of the Son of God could be made a necessary and fundamental article in those dawnings of the gospel-day.— Besides,

3. There have been some very pious and learned men in several ages, who have acknowledged Christ's true godhead, and yet have supposed that the sonship of Christ referred rather to his human nature, or to his office of Messiah, than to such an eternal generation and consubstantial sonship: And there are some in our age who have given sufficient proofs of their good learning, and sincere piety, who heartily believe the eternal godhead of Christ, and yet doubt or disbelieve this eternal generation and derivation of his person, as God, and I will never pronounce an anathema upon them.

Objection I. But some will say, "If the name Son of God doth not signify eternal generation by the Father in the sameness of the divine essence or substance, yet surely it must at least import Christ's true and eternal godhead."

Answer I. This name son and sons of God is often used in the bible, and applied variously to men and to angels as well as to Christ: but it is never used in any one place to signify true and eternal godhead that I can find, unless it be in those places which are at present under debate. And therefore when Christ is called eminently and absolutely the Son of God, the meaning of it does not necessarily rise higher than that he is most eminent of all other beings, men or angels, that are called sons of God, without a certain determination whether he be God, or no, by the mere use of that name.

II. This name Son of God cannot necessarily signify true godhead any otherwise, than by supposing it primarily signify his co-essential sonship or that he is a Son of the same nature and essence with the Father, even as a son among men has the same specific essence with his father, and then consequently that the Son of God is true God, because his Father is so. Now, we have before proved, that this name cannot necessarily signify his co-essential or consubstantial sonship, and therefore it cannot necessarily signify his true godhead.

III. It is evident from some parts of the conduct of Peter and other disciples during the life of Christ on earth, that they did not heartily believe they had the true and eternal God among them, and that their Master was the true and eternal God, when they rebuked him, when they questioned his knowledge of some things, when they wondered, and were so astonished at his working miracles, &c. as I shall shew hereafter: Yet it is plain that they then believed him to be the Son of God; for this was made necessary to their salvation in that day, and they professed

this belief roundly, that he was the Son of God. Therefore this name does not certainly declare his divine nature.

**Objection II.** It will be said then, how comes it to pass, that when the high-priest asked our Saviour, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the blessed? And Jesus answered, I am;" Mark xiv. 61, 62, in verse 64. he charges our Saviour with blasphemy, if his calling himself the Son of God did not imply his true godhead?

**Answer.** It is evident that the design of the wicked Jews was to fix the highest and most criminal charge they could against him: But there was no sufficient foundation for this charge, which our Saviour in another place fully proves; John x. 33, 34, as I have shewn elsewhere, in what follows. Thus it appears, that though it be fully agreed that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, has true godhead belonging to him, because divine names and titles are given him, yet this name Son of God does not necessarily and certainly discover or imply it. Thus much for the first supposed sense of this name.

**II.** Some may suppose the name Son of God relates to his human soul, and signifies the glorious peculiar derivation of it from God the Father before the creation of the world, and that in this sense he is called the first-born of every creature, and the beginning of the creation of God; Col. i. 15. and Rev. iii. 14.

**Answer.** Though I am very much inclined to believe that Christ is in this sense the Son of God, and that his human soul had such a glorious derivation from the Father before the creation of the world, and that he is the first-born of every creature and the beginning of the creation of God, as in Col. i. 15. and that his human soul had as noble a pre-eminence above other souls in its origin, as his human body had a pre-eminence above other bodies, that so in all things he might have the pre-eminence; Col. i. 18. Yet I cannot think this precise idea is the very thing designed in those texts of scripture, wherein our salvation is made to depend on the belief of Christ being the Son of God; for,

1. Though the apostles Paul and John, and perhaps the rest of them, arrived at this complete idea of his glorious pre-existent human soul in due time, yet it doth not appear evidently that the disciples had all attained such an idea so soon as they believed that he was the Son of God, in a sufficient manner for their attaining the favour of God and a state of salvation.\*

\* I will not deny but that one considerable ground on which Christ was called the Son of God, at first, and for which he eminently merited that name, was the dignity of his human soul both in the native excellencies of it, and in the original and early generation, or peculiar way of creation of it before all other creatures: But as the belief of his being the Son of God, is made a requisite to

2. There have been thousands of christians in several ages of the church who have been saved, and yet have not entertained this opinion concerning the soul of Christ, that it had a being before the world was created, and that it was the first-born of all the creatures of God ; and therefore this cannot be the sense of that title in those texts.

III. I say therefore, in the third place, that this title, Son of God, is given to Christ, sometimes upon account of his incarnation and miraculous birth. Luke i. 31, 32. "Thou shalt bring forth a Son, and shalt call his name Jesus : he shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest ;" verse 35. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee ; therefore also that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called THE SON OF GOD."

Though God be the Father of all men by creation, and the Father of all the saints by a new creation or regeneration, yet in a more especial manner he is the Father of the blessed Jesus ; because his body was so formed or begotten by him, in so peculiar a manner, as no other man ever was.

But this cannot be the chief meaning of the name Son of God in the texts before cited : For surely the belief that the man Christ Jesus was begotten of God and born of a virgin without an earthly father, was not made the term of salvation any where that we can find in the New Testament. It is not this sort of sonship that Christ and the apostles lay so great a stress on, nor make the matter of their sermons, and the labour of their arguments, to convince the world of it in order to their salvation. This circumstance of his extraordinary birth, doth not seem to have any such special connexion with the redemption and salvation of men, as to have it made the peculiar matter of their faith and the very article on which their salvation was to depend.

Doubtless many a poor creature might become a true believer in Christ when he was upon earth, by the sight of his miracles, and hearing his doctrine, without the knowledge of this particular circumstance of his incarnation or birth ; and doubtless many a one was converted by the apostles without any notice of this part of the history of Christ ; for we scarce find so much as the mention of it in their preaching or writings. This therefore cannot be the meaning of this name, in those scriptures.

IV. In the fourth place, Christ may be sometimes called the Son of God, because of his resurrection from the dead, and his exaltation to universal dominion, by the peculiar favour and power of God. In this sense Christ is said to be begotten of

salvation, I suppose the idea of that title Son of God, arises no higher than to mean in general some glorious relation to God, partly natural, and partly economical, without a precise determination how far this relation reached, as will appear more particularly afterward.

God when he is raised from the dead ; Acts xiii. 32, 33. " And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again ; as it is also written in the second Psalm, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." And it is upon this account that he is called the first-begotten of the dead ; Rev. i. 5. and the first-born from the dead ; Col. i. 18. though the Greek word is in both places the same, viz. *πρωτογενῆς ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*, because he was raised immediately by God himself from the earth into eternal life.

His exaltation to the kingdom as heir of all things, is supposed to be a farther ground of this title. Heb. i. 2. " His Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things." Ps. lxxxix. 27. " I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth." And some divines are ready to think, it is in this sense he is called the first-born of every creature ; Col. i. 15. because he is Heir and Lord of all the creation. And some join his exaltation together with his resurrection in that prophecy ; Psalm i. 7. " Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee ;" because it is the chief sense in which the words of the second or of the eighty-ninth Psalm, now cited, could literally be applied to David in the day of his being raised from the earth and obscurity unto a throne : Now David in this his exaltation to the kingdom of Israel was a type of Christ, and was said to be the Son of God begotten that day, as a proper type and figure of our blessed Saviour.

But whatever may be the prophetic sense of those words of the Psalmist, it is certain that the name Son of God cannot directly and chiefly signify his resurrection and future exaltation in all those places of the gospel, where the belief of it is made the term of salvation.

1. Because he is very often called the Son of God, long before his death, resurrection, and exaltation, to describe the person who was to be thus raised and exalted. He is called by the apostle John, the only begotten of the Father, who lay in the bosom of the Father ; John i. 14, 18. and Paul calls him God's own Son, who was delivered up to death for us ; Rom. viii. 32. as a name that belonged to him long before his death, or indeed before his birth into this world : For when he was first sent into the world he was then the Son of God ; John iii. 16, 17. and xi. 27. and as such he was appointed the heir of all things ; Heb. i. 2.

2. This title the Son of God in those texts of the gospel does not depend upon his resurrection and exaltation, because the Jews were required to believe him to be the Son of God long before his death and resurrection. Nor did Christ himself in plain language openly and publicly preach his own death and resur-



rection to the multitudes. Therefore the belief of Christ to be the Son of God in this sense of the words could not in his lifetime be made necessary to salvation.

3. And let it be noted further, that at this time even the apostles themselves, who were true believers in the Son of God did not know that he was to die and to rise again, for Peter began to rebuke him, when he spoke of his own dying; Mark viii. 32. "And they knew not what rising from the dead should mean." Mark ix. 10. yet they all believed him to be the Son of God.

4. I might add, that it is abundantly evident from scripture that he was the Son of God, before he died or rose again, because he was only proclaimed or declared to be his Son by his resurrection and exaltation: The apostle Paul explains it thus; Rom. i. 4. "He was declared to be the Son of God with power, by his resurrection from the dead."

Nor is it any wonder that Christ in some scriptures should be represented as born or begotten of God at his resurrection, since it is the way of the sacred writers sometimes to represent a thing to be transacted or done in that day when it is published or proclaimed; and upon this account Christ may be said to be born or to be begotten, or to be made the first-born of God, in the day of his resurrection and exaltation, because he was then proclaimed and published to be the Son of God; even as a king may be said to be made that day when he is proclaimed or crowned.

V. The last sense in which Christ is called the Son of God, is to signify that "glorious person who was appointed to be the Messiah, the anointed Saviour who was derived from God, and did bear some very near and extraordinary relation to God above all other persons; and therefore he is called his Son, his own Son, his only begotten Son, his beloved Son." And since the several other senses cannot be admitted to be the precise idea and common meaning of the name Son of God in the New Testament, I take this to be the true idea of it, as it is generally used in the New Testament, and especially in those scriptures where the belief or profession of it is made necessary in order to the salvation of men in the writings of the apostles.

It includes some special and glorious relation to God; but whether that relation belongs to his flesh, or his human soul, or his divine nature, or to all these, is not so directly determined in those texts, because the chief design of them is but to point out the person and character of the Messiah.

Now let us consider the reasons to prove this to be the true sense of the name.

That the name Son of God doth originally respect the glory

llency of his person, and his near relation and resemblance to God, appears from the use of the word Son and Son of in several places of scripture.

or daughter or child in the hebrew tongue implies eminent things. 1. It notes some derivation of one thing from another. Men are frequently called sons of men. Israelites are called sons or children of Israel. So sparks are called the sons of the burning coal; Job v. 7. to signify the derivation of one from the other.

It is also an idiom of the Hebrew language, and a peculiarly speaking much in use among the Jews, to call one person by the name of any other thing or person whose quality and likeness he bears. So wicked men are called the sons of Belial, or Belial's; 2 Sam. xxiii. 6. So young men that were instructed and prepared for the gift of prophecy are called the sons of prophets; 2 Kings ii. 3, 5, 7. Proud men are named the sons of pride; Job xli. 34. Children of the devil, signifies a wicked man, one a-kin to the devil in malice and subtilty, Job i. xiii. 10. So the word sons of God signifies persons in a peculiar manner were derived from God, and had some resemblance of him.

Jesus was called the Son of God; Luke iii. 38. because he was formed in the image of God; and in an immediate manner derived his being from God without human generation.

Angels are called sons of God; Job i. 6. and ii. 1. and so called because they are glorious and excellent beings, with powers and perfections, in some measure like to God, and in the chief rank of his creatures, and not derived from each successive generations, but all created immediately by God self.

Angels are called sons of God in John i. 12. and many other places, both because they are like God, or created anew in the image in knowledge, righteousness and holiness; 1 Cor. ii. 9. Eph. iv. 24. and because they are said to be newly or begotten and born of God, John i. 13. and 1 John v. 1.

Magistrates are called gods, and sons of the Most High; Job i. xxii. 6. partly to denote that they are raised by God to authority; so David in the letter and type was the son of God; Psalm ii. 7. and was made God's first-born; Psalm 26, 27. as a type of Christ; and partly also to denote that their authority and majesty they resemble God the supreme magistrate and Ruler.

Jesus the Son of God who was with the three children in the furnace; Dan. iii. 25. is so called, to signify a glorious and excellent being, that had something divine or god-like

in him ; for this is the expression of Nebuchadnezzar, who is not supposed to know any thing of Christ or the Messiah.

Now it is evident that our Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of God, in a sense superior to men and angels, for he is called God's own Son ; Rom. viii. 32. his only-begotten Son ; John i. 14, 18. and his first-born, the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature, &c. Col. i. 15, 16. " The brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person, made so much better than angels, and has obtained a more excellent name than they ; Heb. i. 4. " For in all things he must have the pre-eminence ; Col. i. 18. These scriptural expressions plainly imply both derivation and resemblance.

Yet here I ask leave to insert one caution, and that is, though it is sufficiently manifest from the New Testament, and especially from Heb. i. that Christ is the Son of God in a sense far superior to angels, yet I am in doubt whether the disciples at first could have such an idea of his superiority to all angels : Perhaps their idea of the Son of God arose no higher at first than to suppose him superior to all their prophets and kings, who were called sons of God, though afterwards it grew up to an idea superior to all the angels of God.

But let us raise this idea of the name as high as we can suppose any of the disciples had attained before the death of Christ, or as high as could be requisite in order to salvation in that day, and I think it must be granted that this name Son of God, so far as it denotes the nature of Christ distinct from his offices, can necessarily be construed to rise no higher than to denote some peculiar and glorious likeness to God, some more near and excellent relation to God the Father, or some special derivation from him, some divine character more eminent than belongs to men or angels when they are called the sons of God, without any precise determination wherein this peculiar relation to God consisted. Now to proceed :

This glory and excellency of the person of Christ, which is originally denoted by the name Son of God, is part of his qualification for the office of the Messiah, part of the foundation of his office, and what made him a proper person to undertake, sustain and fulfil it.

Yet this excellency of his person, this likeness and nearness to God, is not the complete sense and meaning of the word Son of God in those forecited texts of the gospel ; but it includes a designation to his office, viz. that glorious person of extraordinary nearness and likeness to God, who was ordained to be Saviour of men : And though the name Son of God signifies both these, yet sometimes the scripture in using the name seems to have a more special regard to the excellency of his person, and sometimes to his office, and perhaps for this reason,

that a belief of his sonship in one of those senses, but especially the latter, in that day might be a sufficient ground for the faith and hope of sinners.

1. It may seem to have some special regard to the excellency of his person, where it is joined by the way of exposition to the word Messiah or Christ, as a further description of the person who sustained that office ; as in these scriptures, viz. Mat. xxvi. 63. the high-priest adjured Jesus to a confession, and said, " Tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God ?" Mat. xvi. 16. " Peter answered and said, Thou art Christ, or Messiah, the Son of the living God." John xi. 27. " Martha confessed, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God." Which expressions mean thus much, thou art the Christ or Messiah, that glorious person of peculiar relation to God who was ordained to this office.

It seems also to signify more especially the excellency of his person in those scriptures where he is called God's own Son, God's only Son, God's only-begotten Son, his beloved Son, his first-born, &c. because these are words of relation and peculiar endearment, and we cannot well say the only begotten Messiah, the first-born Messiah.

2. Yet there are many other places wherein the name Son of God seems to have a more special regard to his office as the appointed Saviour, though it is inclusive also of the peculiar excellency of his person, which makes him fit for his office ; John x. 37. " Do you say of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent, thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God ?" His being thus sanctified and sent by the Father is sufficient to give this name.

This is evident also where the word Christ or Messiah is not joined with it, and yet the design of the expression seems to be entirely the same as if the word Christ or Messiah had been used there ; as John i. 34. " John the baptist saw and bare witness that this is the Son of God," that is, this is the great promised Saviour. So verse 49. " Nathanael said, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the king of Israel," that is, thou art the Messiah, the king. So John ix. 35. Jesus asked the blind man who was healed, " Dost thou believe on the Son of God ?" that is, dost thou believe on the Messiah, the appointed Saviour ? For as such he was the proper object of belief. So 1 John iv. 15, " Whoso shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God," that is, he that confesses him to be the glorious appointed Messiah, and receives him as such, he dwelleth in or with God. The same is the sense of that word ; 1 John v. 5. " Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God," that is, the Messiah. And verse 20. " We know the Son of God is come ;"

that is, the glorious person who was ordained to be the Messiah is come into the world.

As in these places where the word Christ or Messiah is not mentioned, Son of God signifies more directly the Messiah or appointed Saviour, so there are other places wherein the word Christ is joined with it, where Son of God hath the same signification, and intends chiefly the office of the Messiah or Saviour; because in those texts the word Christ doth not properly signify a character or office, but the proper name or surname of the man Jesus, who was generally so called after his resurrection\*. The eunuch's confession must have this sense; Acts viii. 37. "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." that is, this man named Jesus Christ is the promised and appointed Saviour.

And in this same sense did St. Paul "preach Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God?" Acts ix. 20. that is, that the man Jesus Christ is the promised Saviour. For the grand question of that day was not whether Jesus were eternally begotten of the Father, nor whether he was the true and eternal God himself, nor whether he were formed in an extraordinary and miraculous manner as to his soul or his body, but whether he was the promised Messiah and Saviour of the world?

And if we consult the writings of the New Testament, especially the gospel and epistles of St. John, we shall find the name Son of God, and the name Christ, which in Hebrew is Messiah, used very promiscuously for one another, and sometimes with design to explain each other, and both to denote the great promised Redeemer, the Saviour of the world. This will appear if we read the following verses; John xi. 27. Martha confessed "I believe that thou art the Christ the Son of God, which should come into the world." 1 John iv. 14, 15. "And we have seen and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world. Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." 1 John v. 1. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." As a little after, "He that is born of God overcometh the world." And then, "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is anti-christ, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father." And that awful text, John viii. 24 is certainly to be interpreted the same way, "If ye believe not that I AM HE, ye shall die in your sins;" that is, as Christ himself explains it in the next verse, that I am "the same that I said

\* This is a common thing in our nation and language, where the surname of a man and his family is Smith, Taylor, Clark, Dyer, Steward, &c. being drawn originally from the trade, office or employment, which perhaps the first of the family enjoyed or practised.

unto you from the beginning ;" that is, the Christ, the Messiah, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. Nor is the absence of the word *HE* in the Greek any bar to this interpretation, for the expression is the same ; John iv. 29. *ὁ υἱός μου*, and John ix. 37. *ὁ υἱός μου*, where we were sure that Christ means that he is the Messiah.

It is well known that the Jews generally, and very justly, believed the person who was to be their Messiah and Saviour was to bear some very extraordinary relation to God, and to be his Son in a sublime and uncommon way and manner, though what particular sort of sonship it was, they could have but very dark and confused ideas ; yet they used the word Son of God emphatically to denote this glorious person : And the common purpose for which they used it, was to signify this great promised deliverer.

Now it is very easy to account for this, viz. that the Son of God, which originally signifies a glorious person near a-kin to God, might in common use come to signify his office, or the appointed King and Saviour of his people, just as the name Cæsar was originally the surname of a family, but afterwards came to signify an office, and to denote the Emperor : and perhaps the same might be said of the name Abimelech king of Philistia, or Pharaoh king of Egypt. So the word Israel at first was a name given to Jacob, thence it was derived to signify all the Jewish family or nation, and afterwards it came to signify the character of that family, viz. the Church of God ; and so it is used in Gal. vi. 16. *Peace be on the Israel of God.*

Thus I have gone over the several senses of the name Son of God, and there is the greatest reason to believe that it most usually and directly signifies that person who has in general some peculiar and sublime relation and likeness to God, and is appointed to be the Messiah or Saviour of men.

#### SECTION II.—*Other Arguments to confirm this Sense of the Name SON OF GOD.*

The next argument I shall produce for this sense of the name, is this : It is most reasonable to suppose that Son of God signifies the office of the Messiah, together with a connotation of his peculiar relation to God, or his being born of God in some eminent and transcendent manner, because the other name of Christ Son of man signifies the same office of the Messiah, together with a connotation of his being born of mankind, or his relation to man in some way of eminence. That the name Son of man, may properly denote the Messiah, there are some hints given in the Old Testament. I will mention four places.

I. The very first promise of the Messiah calls him the seed

of the woman, who was appointed to break the head of the serpent ; Gen. iii. 15. that is, one derived from mankind, or a son of man ; which is interpreted ; 1 John iii. 8. *The Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil.* The Messiah was to be the Son of God and the Son of man, to undertake this glorious service.

II. See Psal. viii. 4. *What is man that thou art mindful of him ? or the son of man that thou visitest him ? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels, &c.* which is interpreted concerning Jesus the promised Messiah, Heb. ii. 9. and so the literal and typical sense of the Psalmist is this : What is the first Adam, with all his seed, that thou art mindful of him ? Or what is the second Adam that thou visitest him ? &c. since he is made a little lower than the angels by his coming into the flesh, and becoming a second Adam.

III. Read Psal. lxxx. 17. *Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand, upon the Son of man whom thou madest strong for thyself.* Whether this refers to the hard work of atonement, which the hand of God would lay upon him, or whether it means the hand of God shall be with him, to support and establish him in his kingdom, may be doubted : Yet it is generally agreed, that the person here designed, is the promised Messiah, that holy, that mighty one, upon whom God devolved the care of our salvation ; Psal. lxxxix. 19. when he says, *I have laid help upon one that is mighty, I have exalted one chosen out of the people ;* that is, one who is to be eminently the Son of man, chosen out of mankind.

IV. Look into Dan. vii. 13. *I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days,—and there was given unto him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, &c.* which represents in prophecy, Christ's ascension to heaven in the clouds, and his receiving the kingdom from the hands of the Father.

I grant that in some of these ancient texts, the design of scripture is to represent this, that the promised Messiah was to have the nature, form and fashion of a man, but still his character as Messiah is also included or declared in the same text.—And this is particularly remarkable in this verse of Daniel, which as Doctor Sykes has abundantly shewn in his “*Essay on the Truth of the Christian Religion,*” is always supposed to be in view wheresoever this title is given to Christ in the New Testament. This is the name indeed, whereby Christ most frequently speaks of himself in the New Testament, and, as some have remarked, that as the sacred writers generally call him the Son of God to express his sublime relation to the Father, so he generally calls himself the Son of man, to signify his condescending relation to mankind.

It may be said concerning this name Son of man as is said concerning the name Son of God, viz. As there are some places where the Son of God, chiefly denotes his sublime relation to God distinct from his office; so there may be a place where the Son of man chiefly signifies Christ's relation to man nature, and his derivation from mankind, distinct from his office.—Yet as the most general sense of the word Son of man is to denote that eminent, that peculiar Son of God who is to be the Messiah, or Saviour; so the most general sense of the word Son of man is to denote that eminent and peculiar of man who was the seed of the woman, and was appointed at office of a Saviour.

First, I shall mention one text, for I can think of but one in the New Testament, where the Son of man may be supposed to signify Christ's relation to mankind, without denoting his office or referring to it. Mat. xvi. 13. *Whom do men say that I, the Son of man am?* that is, whom do men say I Jesus am, who appear in the common form of mankind? verse 16. Peter gives his opinion, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God*; that is, Thou art the Messiah, who hast a near and glorious relation to God, who art by way of eminence God's own Son. Yet even this text may be also explained to include the Messiahship, or the office of Christ thus, *how do men say that I am? What do men think concerning me who am indeed the great Son of man, the Messiah who was promised? What do they think of my person, who am the Messiah? What do they think of my office?* But in the next place let it be observed, that there are a multitude of scriptures wherein this word is plainly and only used to signify that eminent Son of man, who is the promised Messiah. I shall mention only these four, wherein it is evident that the scripture hath chief respect to his office; and where the mere signification of his human nature cannot answer the end and design of the text.

I. Mark ix. 12. *Elias verily cometh first and restoreth all things &c. And it is written of the Son of man, that he must suffer many things, and be set at nought*; which refers to the prophecies of Isaiah, David and Daniel concerning the Messiah; ii. Dan. ix. and Ps. xxii.

II. Luke xvii. 22. *The days will come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it; they shall say to you, See here, or see there; Go not after them, nor follow them.* Which is parallel to Mat. xxiv. 23. *If any man shall say to you, Lo here is Christ, or there, believe it not for there shall arise false Christs, &c.* Then it follows in Luke and Matthew, *As the lightning cometh, &c. so shall the coming of the Son of man be*; and as it was in the days of Noah: and, Luke adds also, in the days of Lot, thus shall it



*be in the day when the Son of man is revealed ; that is, when Jesus shall appear as the Messiah for the conversion of the Gentiles, or for the destruction of the Jews, or for the final judgment of the world.*

III. John v. 26, 27. *As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself, and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man ; that is, because he is the Messiah ; therefore, in order to sustain and fulfil the character of Messiah, it was necessary that he should have power to give life to the dead, and to execute judgment on the world.*

IV. John xii. 34. *The people answered him, We have heard out of the law, that Christ, or the Messiah, abideth for ever ; and how sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up ? Who is this Son of man ? It is as much as if the people had said, " We know of no son of man besides that Messiah or the Christ, who is to have a glorious kingdom, and abide for ever : What other son of man is there, or can there be, that must be lifted up or put to death ? Is there any other Christ or Messiah besides him who is to abide for ever ? "*

I might cite several scriptures more to this purpose, but these are sufficient to shew, that as the Messiah is sometimes called the Son of man, to signify his office with a connotation of his relation to mankind, and being in an eminent sense *the seed of the woman*, or the Son of man, the chief of all the sons of men ; so it is exceeding probable that he is also called the Son of God, to signify the same office, and withal to shew his sublime relation to God, or his being in a peculiar and transcendent manner the Son, by way of absolute eminence, above all men or angels who are sons of God ; even his first-born, his only-begotten Son.

Objection. But if it be allowed, that there are any places of scripture where the name Son of man denotes the human nature of Christ, or that he was really and truly man, why may not the name Son of God as well signify his divine nature, and denote that he is true and real God ?

To which I answer, that the case is widely different ; for the name Son of man is never applied to any person who is not true and real man ; and the scripture applying it absolutely and eminently to Christ, shews him to be the chief of the sons of men : But the name Son of God is applied often in the Old Testament and in the New, both to angels and to men, who are called the sons of God, and yet they are not true and real God ; and therefore when this name is given absolutely and eminently to Christ, it can necessarily be construed to signify no more, than the most eminent and chief of all who are called the sons of God, or one who is above them all, in character and office.

It may be observed also, that the name son of man or sons of men is given sometimes to any of the children of Adam or the race of mankind, and at other times to some eminent person among men, as Ezekiel the prophet is often spoken to, *Thou son of man*; but the name is much more abundantly attributed to our blessed Saviour, as he is the most eminent of all that ever had that appellation given them.

I acknowledge it is a great truth, that this glorious person the Messiah hath two distinct natures united in him, even the nature of God and the nature of man; and that Christ is true God and true man. But when he calls himself Son of God and Son of man, surely an eternal and consubstantial sonship of Christ, or even his eternal deity united to man, seems more than could be certainly collected from these names in that day and more than Christ himself directly designed by the use of these words.

The last argument that I shall mention to prove that the name Son of God denotes the character of the Messiah, including also his divine, original and sublime relation to God which renders him an all-sufficient Saviour, is this, that salvation is annexed to the belief of Jesus being the Son of God, in several texts which I have cited at the beginning of this discourse: This sonship therefore must necessarily signify and carry with it some *deas*, or characters that are directly suited to the sinful and miserable state of mankind, and that render him a proper object of their desire, dependence and hope. Now it is not the mere belief of his having a divine nature, nor of an eternal generation by God the Father, nor of his having a most glorious human soul, nor a miraculous birth, nor a resurrection from the dead, that renders him so directly suitable to the state and case of convinced sinners, and fit for the proper exercises of their hope and dependence, as the various offices and characters which he sustains as the Messiah, the Saviour of mankind, together with his all-sufficient capacity to fulfil those offices.

A poor convinced perishing sinner beholds him as a glorious person near to God, appointed to be a prophet to enlighten his darkness, a priest to atone for his sins and intercede for him, a king to rule and influence and defend him against all the powers of sin and hell, and all-sufficient for these sacred purposes:— And thence I infer, that a divine person who is the promised Messiah, the all-sufficient Saviour, is the most natural and probable sense of this title, the Son of God, in all those places of scripture where Christ is proposed to our faith under this name; however some of the other senses may be more remotely and indeterminately included therein. And though the deity of Christ is not directly signified by this name, yet by a comparison of it with other places of scripture, I think it may certainly be

deduced by just consequences ; for it is sufficiently manifest to us who have the whole New Testament to compare with the Old, that the Messiah must be the true God, or that godhead must be united to human nature, to make up the complete person and character of the Messiah.

SECT. III.—*Objections against this Sense of the Name answered.*

**Objection I.** The word son among men properly signifies one of the same nature with the Father ; and therefore Son of God, when it is applied to Christ, must signify one of the same nature with God the Father, that is, one who is true and eternal God ; and it has been generally so taken in this controversy by our divines. Now this sense implies much more than a mere likeness to God, or a derivation from him, or deputation to an office.

**Answer I.** The word son taken in its common senses and uses among men may be applied to several ideas, viz. a derivation from the father, a likeness to, or imitation of the father, a subordination, or some sort of inferior relation to the father, or a being of the same species, kind or nature with the father, and an individual being distinct from the father. Now it is plain that when human words and similes are used to represent divine things, there is no necessity that those words should include all their original ideas, nor indeed is it possible : It is enough to support the analogy, if but one or two of the same ideas are denoted by the use of the same word. Why may we not then suppose that the name Son of God, when applied to Christ, may signify his peculiar derivation from the Father as to his soul, or as to his body, or his subordinate character in his mission by the Father, or as being appointed by the Father to be his vicegerent in the kingdom, or his likeness to the Father in his natural qualifications and powers, or in his kingly office, together with his being another individual distinct from the Father ? Why may not one or two of these ideas, and much more all of them, be sufficient to account for the use of this name Son of God, without making it necessary that the word sonship in this place must include a sameness of nature ? Besides, it is evident that the word Son of God is applied to angels ; Job. i. 6. and to men ; Phil. ii. 15. 1 John iii. 1, 2. and even the term of begotten Son is applied to men ; 1 John v. 1. Yet neither men nor angels are of the same kind or nature with God their Father, and in these instances it is impossible that the idea of sameness of kind or nature should be included.

**II.** The word son in the language of men, wheresoever it means a sameness of nature, it always means the same specific nature, or a nature of the same kind and species ; but it never

the same individual nature, for it always denotes a distinct individual being. Therefore, in order to keep this part of the onship, and to maintain the parallel in this point, if we use the Son of God to signify one of the same nature with the Father, it must mean one of the same specific nature, that is, a distinct individual being of the same kind with the Father; we shall be in danger of making two Gods.\* But it is not that in order to support the analogy of the name Son, we never make the word Son of God to signify one of the same individual nature or essence, because it never signifies the language of men; and therefore there is no necessity that it signify one of the same nature in any sense when applied to Christ.

There are many places of scripture wherein Christ is called the Son of God, and the Son absolutely, and where God is to be his Father, wherein we cannot suppose the godhead of the Father to be or can be designed in the most just and natural interpretation of the text; such as are most of these which follow, John v. 18, 19. When the Jews had made a strange inference and charged Christ with making "himself equal to God, because he called God his Father," he answered, *verily, verily I say to you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he sees the Father do, &c.* This is not an expression which represents the Son as the true and eternal God, or that grants their equality; for it is plain that this expression represents him in a degree of impotence and dependence, that he could do nothing of himself. Nay this contradicts their inference, which is his equality with God, rather than confirms or establishes it.

The sense of this expression may be learned from John viii. 12. *I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.* Ver. 19. *For I have seen with my Father, and you do not see him: because he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.* Ver. 41. *Ye are of the devil, and his will ye do: he said unto the Jews, I have seen the Father, &c.* Now it is plain that the Jews had seen the devil do these things which they did, but it signifies that by the devil's influence and direction they practised these things: And so also, that Christ doth all by God's influence and direction, is the plain meaning of Christ's speaking of himself as he has seen with his Father. Nor will the following scripture destroy this interpretation, *Whatsoever things the Father doth, the Son likewise; that is, whatsoever things*

it cannot mean one of the same specific nature, and that Christ is not an individual spirit specifically the same with the Father, I have proved in other places: For it belongs to the very nature of the Father to be self-existent and underyived, and it belongs as much to the nature of a Son not to be self-existent, but to be derived; therefore their natures cannot be specifically the same. A nature which is not self-existent and self-sufficient, nor could exist without derivation, is not the same specific nature with that which is self-existent, and which cannot be derived.

the Father contrives and appoints, the Son executes and performs as commissioned by the Father, or the Son performs them by the Father's influence.

Then it proceeds, ver. 20. *The Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doth, and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel.* Hence it follows that the Father had not then shewn to the Son these greater works, or given him commission and power for the performance of them. But this can never be said concerning the divine nature of Christ, which can receive and learn nothing new. And though there are some expressions in that paragraph of scripture down to the 30th ver. which seem superior to the character of any mere creature, and which would have been hardly applied to Christ the man, if not united to godhead; yet Christ considered as the Son of God throughout that paragraph, is represented as dependent on the Father for all, and receiving all from the Father, which is hardly consistent with the idea of supreme godhead, if that were included in sonship.

Wheresoever Christ calls God his Father, he himself stands under the special character of a Son. Now John v. 30. when he says, *I can of myself do nothing, I seek not my own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me.* And John vi. 38. *I came down from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me;* that is, the Father, as ver. 39. This does not sound like the language of godhead, which is supreme and independent, and can do all things of itself, and by its own will.

John xiv. 28. *My Father is greater than I.* It is hardly to be supposed that Christ here intends to speak of his divine nature. The expression itself, as well as the context, would lead one to think that Christ considered as a Son is not here spoken of as the true and eternal God, who is the greatest of beings, and can acknowledge no greater than himself. John xiv. 31. *As the Father gave me commandment, even so I do.* This does not seem to be the language of supreme godhead, which receives no commandments from another. John xvii. 5. *Father, glorify me with thyself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* Surely Christ as God does not offer up prayers to the Father, and much less could he pray for the restoration of a glory which his divine nature once had, of which he seems divested at present. All this is hardly consistent with supreme deity belonging to his sonship, that is, either to be divested of glory, or to pray for the restoration of it.

John xx. 17. Christ says, *I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.* So 2 Cor. xi. 31. and 1 Pet. i. 3. the Father is called *the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Now the Father cannot properly be the God of the deity of Christ, that is, his Creator, his absolute governor, and

object of worship, which is the proper sense of my God in other scriptures. Nor is there any sufficient reason then why should construe the words my Father, as relating to the deity Christ, since the words my God cannot be so construed, and since both these titles seems so intimately connected and referring one and the same subject.

Mark xiii. 32. *Of that day and hour knoweth not the Son, neither the Father.* I confess it may be said in that paragraph he is called the Son of man, ver. 26. yet it must be granted that the true natural sense of the word is "Of that hour knoweth not the Son of God, but only God the Father." This text does so plainly shew Christ's ignorance of the day of judgment as he is the Son, that though it be granted the divine nature of Christ owns the day of judgment, yet as a Son he does not: therefore as a Son he hath not a divine nature, or true godhead.

John iii. 35. *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands.* Ver. 34. *God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him.* All this implies an inferiority and dependency. As a Son he receives all from another, which godhead cannot do.

Luke xxiii. 47. When the centurion or captain saw the miracles at the death of Christ, he cried out, *Verily this man was the Son of God.* He cannot be supposed to mean that this man was the true and eternal God, but only that he was a great and glorious person, like God, or some way related to God: or he was the person whom the Jews expected for their Messiah. His Roman captain could not imagine Christ to be God himself.

1 Cor. xv. 28. *Then shall the Son also himself be subject to him that has put all things under him, that God may be all in all.* This is a character of too much inferiority for true godhead. The argument stands thus: If the Son of God be true God considered as a Son, then he is originally and necessarily Lord of all, and then it must be said it is by his own voluntary condescension that he is so far depressed and humbled by the economy, as to become the Father's deputy and vicegerent; and when that economy ceases, he is of course exalted to his equality with the Father, and to his essential and natural lordship over all. But the representation of St. Paul is just the contrary: In any parts of his writings, particularly Phil. ii. he shews us, that the Son of God is not depressed but exalted by the economy of the kingdom. And he tells us in this text, that when the Son gives up this economical kingdom, he comes again into subjection; then shall the Son himself be subject to the Father; which plainly shews, that considered as a Son, he is naturally subject to the Father, and that at the end of this economical exaltation he shall return to his natural subjection, and shall be so for ever when God appears all in all. This is most evidently the meaning of the great apostle.

This text will not prove that Christ is not God, for he is so by personal union to the divine nature, he is *God manifest in the flesh*, he is God and man in one complex person. But this text, I think, does prove that his sonship doth not include godhead. And not only in this text, but in most or all these scriptures it is manifest, that the character of Christ as a Son is set far below the Father, not only in order or in office, but in knowledge, power, sovereignty, self-sufficiency and authority, which would naturally lead one to believe that his sonship in scripture cannot refer to his godhead or divine nature, wherein he is by our greatest divines acknowledged to be equal to the Father in power and glory.

Now while we maintain the true Deity of Christ, and that his complete person is God and man united; I see no necessity of applying all these texts to his godhead where his sonship is spoken of, since his sonship may be better referred to his inferior nature, or to his offices. And this will free us from those embarrassments and hardships to which we have been driven to keep up the sublime idea of godhead in these scriptures which call him a Son, and which at the same time carry so much of dependence and inferiority in them.

Objection II. Though it should be granted that there are several texts wherein Christ is called the Son of God, which cannot so well be referred to his divine nature, yet there are several other texts wherein Christ is represented as the Son of God, begotten and born of God, which seem much more naturally to refer to his godhead, and can hardly be construed into a lower sense, viz.

Text I. Prov. viii. 24, 25. where wisdom says, *Before the hills was I brought forth, &c.* which whole chapter is generally interpreted concerning the divine nature of Christ.

Answer I. It is not the design of my present discourse to prove that the divine nature of Christ has no sort or manner of derivation from the Father, real or relative: I neither affirm it nor deny it here. But that the name Son of God, in the New Testament, does not generally, if ever, signify his divine nature; this is my present theme: And therefore the allegation of this text out of Proverbs is not to our present purpose, nor is the name Son of God there used, nor is God called his Father.

II. I dare not deny this chapter to relate to Christ; yet it does not follow, that it refers only to his divine nature, as I shall shew immediately. And it must be acknowledged that it is very hard to prove, that this eighth of Proverbs does certainly denote the person of Christ. Athanasius himself sometimes explains it another way, Bishop Patrick, that noble commentator, will scarce allow it; and many others have been of the opinion, that Solomon means only wisdom as a principle of contrivance and

counsel, whether human or divine; or at most, the ideal world in the mind of God, though he uses such sort of personal characters in his description of this wisdom, in the Hebrew idiom. It is granted that many of the ancients explained it of Christ, at some of the fathers supposed it to mean the Holy Spirit; and all men know they were but very poor expositors, who dealt much in allegory, and in straining of plain texts to their purposes: and since they cannot tell whether the Son or the Spirit were meant here, it is possible it may mean neither of them, by all the arguments which they have produced; for none of them are very conclusive.

III. Supposing the divine wisdom in Prov. viii. primarily to signify the idea of the divine counsels and decrees about creation and redemption, it may be properly said, this wisdom was begotten or brought forth before the creation, and all this system of divine counsels being deposited with the pre-existent soul of Christ, in whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, his human soul of Christ, thus vested with divine ideas, it may be included in Solomon's idea of wisdom. And those who believe the doctrine of the pre-existent soul of Christ, have made it appear that if it refer to Christ, it is very probable this pre-existent soul considered as having the divine nature united to it, here represented as commencing its existence, its union with godhead, receiving its commission, and beginning its office. And the learned Dr. Thomas Goodwin, though he firmly believed the eternal generation of Christ, as the Son of God, yet he supposes this chapter to relate to Christ, as God-man, and not merely to his godhead.

Text. II. Is that remarkable one; Ps. ii. 7. *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*; which has been usually interpreted by our divines, to signify the eternal sonship of Christ to God.

Answer I. It is evident that in Acts xiii. 33. St. Paul applies this to the resurrection of Christ, and the beginning of his exaltation, and not to any eternal generation; so that we have a wise interpreter giving quite a different sense of it.—II. Besides, Christ is here said to become a Son by a decree which cannot signify eternal generation, but must relate to his office.—III. Again, it is spoken literally concerning the exaltation of David the type of Christ to his kingdom, and not concerning the natural production or generation of David; and therefore in the antitype it must signify mystically the exaltation of Christ to his kingdom, and not his natural eternal generation.—IV. Let it be further remembered that the Word, this day, never signifies eternity in scripture in any other place, and why then must it do here?—V. I add also, that this text is cited in Heb. i. where it is joined with God's promise in future times to be a



Father to Christ ; *I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son* ; which does not signify eternal generation. But in this verse I have spoken more largely in other places ; and shew that Bishop Pearson, Dr. Owen, and other zealous Trinitarian do not construe this text to mean the eternal generation of Christ

Text III. Mat. xxviii. 19 *Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.* Why is the Son joined with the Father and the Holy Ghost, who are confessedly divine, if the name Son does not include the godhead of Christ ? Answer. If Christ, considered as the Son of God, be personally united to the divine nature, or the eternal Word, he has godhead belonging to his complex person ; and therefore the name Son which signifies his personal character and office, may be well joined with the Father in this initiating ordinance, the whole complex person of Christ, who is the Son of God including true godhead.

Text. IV. Rom. i. 3, 4. *His Son Jesus Christ our Lord which was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead.* Now some say, here is a plain antithesis between the human nature and divine nature of Christ : the human nature, which is called the flesh, and the divine nature, which is called the spirit of holiness, and according to this divine nature he is declared to be the Son of God.

Answer I. There are several critics who believe the eternal generation of Christ, who yet do not suppose there is such an exact antithesis here ; but they construe the spirit of holiness, to signify the Holy Ghost who raised Christ from the dead, and who manifested, testified and declared him to be the Son of God with power by his resurrection.

II. There are others who chuse to support the antithesis and make the spirit of holiness to signify the glorious human spirit of Christ replenished with all holiness ; and suppose that the name spirit of holiness is here given to this human soul of Christ not only to aggrandize its character above all other holy creatures, but also to intimate that this spirit governed the animal nature, and kept it pure, as well as to distinguish it from the Holy Spirit, which is the third of the sacred Three. But I am not so well satisfied in this exposition, and therefore I dare not venture to maintain it. But there is a third answer, which I prefer to both these :

III. This text may be thus paraphrased : “ Jesus Christ our Lord, who was derived from the seed of David, according to his fleshly original, or, the influence of the flesh into his birth but was declared powerfully, by his resurrection from the dead, to be the Son of God, according to his supernatural and holy

original, or the influence of the Holy Spirit." So that the flesh here, does not mean any constituent part of Christ, or his very flesh or body, but the operation or influence of the flesh, or share that the flesh of the blessed virgin had in the conception of Christ: And so the Spirit does not mean any constituent part of Christ, but the influence or operation of the Holy Spirit in his first conception, or in his resurrection, on both which accounts he is called in scripture the Son of God. See Luke i. 35. and Acts xiii. 33. and both are ascribed to the Holy Spirit. There is a large confirmation of this exposition, in some notes on Rom. i. 3, 4. wherein it is shewn how the antithesis of the apostle is preserved, and that the apostle always uses *κατὰ σάρκα* and *κατὰ πνεῦμα* in an antithesis, to signify the influence of each principle, rather than for two constituent parts of a person.

Text. V. Heb. vii. 3. Melchisedec was *without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually.* Now this historical eternity of Melchisedec, whose father and mother, life and death, are not recorded, is made a type of the real eternity of Christ, considered as he is the Son of God.

Answer I. Since Melchisedec is represented here without a father, and yet as a type of the Son of God, it would destroy the doctrine of Christ's eternal generation from God the Father, rather than support it, since the very type here has no father.

II. This place refers more naturally to the priesthood of Christ than to his nature or existence. His priesthood was not derived by genealogical succession as Aaron's was: He had no father, no mother of the Levitical tribe, or of the family of Aaron, from whom his priesthood could descend; nor did he die and leave it to others by way of descent; but was constituted a single priest himself, without a predecessor, without a successor, and herein the priesthood of Melchisedec and the priesthood of Christ run very parallel, and greatly answer the apostle's design. And I think this sense is patronized by some expressions in Doctor Owen's comment.

Text VI. Heb. i. 6. *When he bringeth in his first-begotten into the world, he saith, let all the angels of God worship him; that is, let all the angels of God worship the first-begotten; now his first-begotten is Jehovah, Psal. xcvi. 7. for thence the apostle cites it.*

Answer. This first-begotten Son of God has true and eternal godhead personally dwelling in him, and united personally to him, and one with him; and therefore the whole complex person is called Jehovah, and is entitled to divine worship from angels and men.—God united to the man Christ: *God manifest*

*in the flesh was seen of angels*; 1 Tim. iii. 16. and worshipped by them. This text does not prove that the first-begotten is God, any other than by personal union with that Jehovah who is spoken of in the xcvi. Psal. The first-begotten Son of God is to be worshipped by angels, because of the indwelling godhead, the great Jehovah, with whom the man Christ is one.

The last text, and which affords perhaps the most important objection against my sense of the name, is John v. 18. compared with John x. 23, &c. If the title Son of God did not signify true godhead, why did the Jews charge Christ with blasphemy, and say, that he made himself equal with God, and seek to kill him, because he had said "God was his Father, his own Father, and as they construe it, making himself equal with God?" John v. 18. And why do they charge him again with blasphemy, when he said, *I am the Son of God?* John x. 33. *because that thou being a man, makest thyself God.* How could this be, if the name Son of God did not signify godhead? I have given some answer to that text in the fifth of John, in some of the foregoing pages. But to make it yet clearer, I proceed:

I. It is possible that some learned men among them might have a confused notion from the prophecies of the Old Testament, that the Messiah or the Son of God was to have true and real godhead in him, which godhead of the Messiah is a certain truth, and hath been sufficiently proved.—Now, because he called himself the Son of God, and represented himself as the Messiah, therefore they might infer that he assumed that godhead to himself which belonged to the complete character of the Messiah, and upon this account might charge him with blasphemy, by way of consequence.

Yet I have much reason to doubt, whether the Scribes and Pharisees did certainly know that the Messiah was to be the true God; for the whole nation of the Jews, with their priests and doctors, were most stupidly and shamefully ignorant of the true character and glory of the Messiah and his kingdom. Had the Pharisees themselves any notion that Christ was to be the true God, they would never have been puzzled and silenced at that question of our Saviour, Mat. xxii. 43, 44, &c. If the Messiah be the Son of David, how could David call him Lord? or, *If David calls him Lord, how is he his Son?* Their supposition of the godhead of the Messiah would have easily answered this difficulty, if they had had any such opinion.

Besides, we have little reason to suppose that the Pharisees knew more of the divinity of the Messiah than the disciples themselves did during the life of Christ. Now it appears from many parts of the history of the gospel, that they did hardly believe at all that he was the true God; or if they did, yet their faith of it was very low, wavering and doubtful; and yet doubt-

they firmly believed Jesus to be the Messiah and the Son of God, in a sense sufficient for salvation.

When Peter in the name of the rest had made so glorious confession, Mat. xvi. 16, *Thou art Christ the Son of the living God*, he could not mean that Christ was the great and glorious God; for in ver. 22. he took up his master very short, and *began rebuke him*. Surely he would not have rebuked the great God his maker, at least not immediately after such a confession of his godhead.

Now, if the apostles themselves were in a state of grace and salvation, when they can hardly be supposed to believe Christ to be the true and the eternal God, and yet they believed and professed him to be the Son of God, then that name Son of God doth not necessarily imply and include his divinity. But to turn to the objection. That which I take to be the plainest, the clearest, and the most scriptural solution of this difficulty is as which follows,

II. It is evident that the design of the wicked Jews in these scenes of the history was to bring the highest accusation against the Saviour, and to load him with the grossest calumnies that all their wit or malice could draw from his words or actions; Luke 54. *Laying wait for him, and seeking to catch something out of his mouth, that they might accuse him*. If ever he spake of kingdom, though he owned his *kingdom was not of this world*; John xviii. 36. yet they in their malice would construe it of sedition and rebellion, and make him an enemy to Cæsar. And so when he called God his own Father, and declared himself to be the Son of God, they in the fury of their false zeal construed it into blasphemy; as though to own himself to be the Son of God, were to assume equality with God: whereas Christ shews them plainly, that these words did not necessarily imply such a sense; and this is sufficiently manifest by the defence which Christ made for himself in both those places of the history. We need leave to repeat briefly what I said before.

If we look into John v. 18. when the Jews accused him that calling "God his Father he made himself equal with God," doth by no means vindicate that sense of his name Son of God, but rather denies his equality with God considered as a Son, ver. 19. &c. *Verily, verily I say—the Son can do nothing of himself: The Father sheweth the Son all things that he doth, and he will shew him greater works than these*. Thence I infer, that he hath not shewn him all yet; and ver. 30. *I can of myself do nothing.—I seek not my own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me, &c.* All which expressions sufficiently evince, that he did not intend to signify his own godhead, or equality with God, when he called himself the Son of God; for in his

very answer to their accusation, he represents himself inferior to and dependent on God the Father.

Now let us look into the other text where our Saviour is thus accused, and defends himself, viz. John x. 30—39. He saith, *I and my Father are one.* 31. Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him. 32. Jesus answered them, many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of these works do ye stone me? 33. The Jews answered him, saying, for a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, and because that thou being a man makest thyself God. 34. Jesus answered them, is it not written in your law, I said, ye are gods? 35. If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken: 36. Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said I am the Son of God. In which portion of scripture we may observe these three things:

1. That Christ doth neither plainly and expressly own nor deny himself here to be the true God, for this was not a proper time to satisfy the curiosity of the malicious Jews in such a sublime doctrine, in which he had not as yet clearly and fully instructed his own disciples. Yet,

2. He gives several hints of his godhead, or his being one with the Father, when he says, *I and my Father are one*; and when he says, ver. 38. *I do the works of my Father, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him*; by which he secretly intimated that the man Jesus had also a divine nature in him, and was personally united to God, though he did not think fit to preach his own godhead plainly at that time. And indeed if he had not been the true God, and in that sense one with the Father, we may justly suppose, that he would upon this occasion have denied himself to be the true God, and thus roundly renounced the conclusion itself which they pretended to draw from his words, as well as he did deny the justness of their consequence, from his calling himself the Son of God. And therefore since he did not renounce the conclusion, we may reasonably infer that he was the true God: But since he does deny the justness of their consequence, we may as reasonably infer that his mere calling himself the Son of God does not prove nor include his godhead: which appears plainer under the next particular. I say therefore,

3. The chief design of his answer, was to refute the calumny of the Jews, and the weakness of their inference, by shewing that the name Son of God, doth not necessarily signify one equal to God; but that the necessary sense of it here can rise no higher than to denote one who was nearer to the Father, and was sanctified, sealed, and sent by the Father in a way superior to all

former prophets, kings and magistrates, to whom the word of God came, and who, partly on this account, might be called gods.

Prophets or kings, judges or doctors of the law were called gods, and children or sons of the Most High, in Psal. lxxxii. 6. and in other places of scripture, because they came from God, they were commissioned by God, and carried with them some representation of the wisdom, power, authority, and dominion of God in the sight of men. Now our Lord Jesus Christ, the Messiah, the great prophet, judge, doctor or teacher, and king of his church, came forth from God in heaven, in a literal and more eminent manner, was sent by him into this world with a higher commission, and represented more of the wisdom, power, and dominion of God than any former kings or prophets ever did; and if they upon this account were dignified with the name or title of gods, or sons of God, much more right has the Messiah, to this name or title.

The argument which our Lord uses is *a minori ad majus*; he puts the reason of his more unquestionable and superior right to this title, upon the superiority of his character and mission, or his more immediate commission from the Father. His words might be paraphrased thus: They who were originally in and of this world were made prophets, teachers or kings, merely by the word of God coming to them, and giving them commission, either by the ordinary directions of the written word, or, at best, they received their authority from the word of God coming to them\* by some voice or vision, some divine message or inspiration, and yet they had the title of gods given them. Therefore the Messiah who was not originally of this world, but was with the Father, who was sanctified, that is, anointed with the Spirit, or set apart by God himself, who came forth from the Father in heaven, and was sent immediately by the Father into this world, may surely be called the Son of God without danger or blasphemy. If they are called gods, the Messiah may well be called the Son of God.

And he confirms the argument thus: *The scripture cannot be broken*, *ἢ δυνατὰν λυθῆναι*, cannot be contradicted. As he who acts contrary to a precept is said to break it, *λυθῶ*; see Mat. v. 19. John v. 18. and vii. 23. So he who contradicts an assertion of scripture is properly said *λυθῶ*, to break it. Therefore, since the scripture which cannot be contradicted, calls those ancient

\* Our Lord knew that he himself was the divine Logos or word of God, and it is likely that he used these words, *To whom the word of God came*, with this view and meaning in his own mind; "Surely if those are called gods, to whom the divine Logos or Word made a visit from the Father, the divine Logos himself who came from the Father may be well called the Son of God without blasphemy." But he did not think fit to express himself so plainly to the Jews at that time, though he has left it upon record in his gospel for our observation and instruction.

rulers, teachers or prophets, gods, as well as sons of God, he who is appointed the most glorious prophet and ruler, might have been justified by the language of scripture, if he had assumed the name God to himself, in direct and express language, and much more abundantly is he justified when he has only called himself the Son of God.

And indeed it is worth our observation here, that though the Jews built part of their accusation upon his saying, *I and my Father are one*, Jesus does not directly answer to those words, nor undertake to vindicate or explain them; because he might design in those words to intimate his godhead or his oneness with God the Father: Therefore he neglects and drops this part of the ground of their charge, and applies himself entirely to answer their accusation, as it was built upon his calling God his own Father, and himself the Son of God: And this he did because he knew that this name did not necessarily imply equality with God, and so he could boldly refute their inference and renounce the charge. Yet it should be observed also, that before Christ leaves them he leads them to his godhead, that is, to his most intimate union with the godhead of the Father, verse 38. *That ye may know and believe that the Father is in me and I in him*; that he and his Father are one, as he before expressed his godhead.

Thus I have explained myself at large in what I think to be the very scope and force of our Saviour's argument; and indeed if we take the word Son of God to signify necessarily in that place an equality with the Father; we plainly take away the force of our Saviour's argument and defence, and we leave the accusation of the malicious Jews in its full force against him\*. In short, our Saviour's answer must necessarily mean one of these two things, viz. Either when he called himself the Son of God, he did design to let them know that he was equal to God, but that he was no blasphemer, because it was a great truth: Or he designed to tell them that his words did not necessarily signify that he was equal to God, and therefore he was no blasphemer; that their inference was not just, and that they carried the charge further than his words would bear. One of these two must, I think, be our Saviour's design.

Now that he did not design the first of these, that is, to shew that he was equal to God, seems evident to me, because his answer cannot reach this sense; and if strained to this sense, it is very obscure and far-fetched: It might also have been spoken in much plainer language twenty ways, if it had been his design

\* The learned Dr. Waterland, whose zeal for the Deity of Christ, and whose skill in the defence of it, are sufficiently known, himself confesses that the Jews could not from Christ's own expression clearly convict him of meaning more than that he was God, in the improper sense of the word, as it had been used; Ps. lxxvii. 6. See his *Vindication of Christ's Divinity*, page 55.

tell the Jews, that he was equal with God ; and he would doubtless have proved it by plainer citations out of the Old Testament, which assert the divinity of the Messiah, had it been his design to declare and maintain his godhead at that time. But if we suppose his design was only to shew the falsehood of their inference, and that they had strained his words too far, then the whole paragraph is natural, and easy to be understood, in the manner I have explained it.

From all this it will follow, that the belief of Christ to be the Son of God in some more eminent sense than all the ancient prophets and kings were, that is, to be the glorious Messiah, is all that Christ directly and plainly designed in calling himself the Son of God ; and this must be all that was made necessary to salvation in those scriptures which required their belief in him as the Son of God. Thus I have made it appear that the name Son of God cannot necessarily imply his divine nature, much less the incomprehensible eternal generation of the Son in one essence with the Father. For though I firmly believe him to be true God, and in that sense one with the Father, yet I would not place the chief weight of this doctrine on such arguments as will not support it, nor build so important a truth on an insufficient foundation. But this thought leads me to the next section.

SECT. IV.—*What Advantage is there in not applying the Name Son of God to the Divine Nature of Christ ?*

After all, many a pious christian will be ready to enquire and say, Since you acknowledge Jesus Christ to have a divine nature, and to be truly and properly God, why have you taken so much pains to shew that his name the Son of God in scripture does not necessarily signify either his godhead or his co-eternal generation and sonship ? To this enquiry I hope I can give some satisfactory answers, and offer such reasons as may justify and support this attempt, and guard it from the just censures of every reasonable and intelligent reader.

I. I was willing to search the true sense of scripture in this point, and to understand the meaning of God in his word. Where any expression is used so very frequently in the bible as this name the Son of God is, and that in texts of awful and solemn importance, which determine the things necessary to our salvation, it is a great moment to know the meaning of that expression, that we may not include too little or too much in it : and this in order to understand the scripture aright in things necessary to salvation, and to have a true idea of what the Spirit of God means and intends : that we may not flatter careless hypocrites with hopes of salvation, by setting the mark too low, nor discourage humble believers by setting it too high : and that we may



not abuse ourselves by false and mistaken notions, and imagine that we derive them all from the word of God.

III. I was afraid to build my belief of the Deity of Christ upon feeble and insufficient foundations, and therefore I thought it necessary to examine this argument which is drawn from his sonship. The great doctrine of the godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, and faith in him as the true God, has been by many persons built chiefly on this name which is given him, viz. the Son of God; and that upon this bare presumption, that as a son amongst men has the same specific nature with his father, so the Son of God must have the same individual nature with his Father; but how weak this argument is to support such a doctrine, appears in the foregoing discourse. Now I would not have the faith of christians in any important doctrine, that is divinely true, built upon a supposition that is feeble or false, lest the adversaries take occasion to insult the faith of christians, and to decry the doctrine itself, as though it had no better arguments or foundations to support it. Besides, when christians have built their own faith and hopes upon a foundation so feeble and uncertain, they are more liable to have their creed shaken, and to part with the glorious doctrine itself; and therefore I would persuade them rather to build their faith on such arguments as will stand the test against all opposers: And I think most of those which I have made use of in the eighth and ninth propositions of the treatise of the *Christian Doctrine of the Trinity*, may lay a claim to this character, and will better support this faith than any argument derived from his mere generation or sonship.

III. It is necessary as far as possible to remove all cavils from every important doctrine of christianity, and such is that of the deity of Christ. Now if the doctrine of his deity be built on his sonship, then he must be true God considered as he is a Son; but the notion of a SON in all languages of mankind importing some sort of derivation and dependence, and the notion of godhead importing independence and self-existence, seem to carry sort of contradiction in them. And this becomes a mighty prejudice to the minds of men against their belief of the deity of Christ, when they are told, that he is God as he is a Son, or that his deity depends on his sonship, that is, his deity is included in his derived and dependent character.—Though I will not here assert that absolute self-existence and independence belong to every thing in and of God, for I know not what powers or properties of godhead depend on each other, yet I would not willingly prove the godhead of Christ from the very name which seems to exclude self-existence and independence, since there are many other and better proofs of it.

And though I dare not utterly renounce all those schemes

of explaining the Trinity, which make the divine nature of Christ to be in any way or manner whatsoever derived or communicated from the Father, for I must own myself lost in these unsearchables, yet I would not make the necessary proof the divinity of Christ to depend on such a notion as in the common language of mankind implies derivation and dependence: and by this means, I think, I better guard this sacred truth from some of the cavils that have attended it. Now if by this exposition of the name Son of God, I remove any of the great impediments out of the way of the Arians or Socinians from believing the true deity of Christ, then I shall account myself to have done service and honour to that glorious article of our faith.

IV. I would do something to take away that anathema and damning sentence which some parties of christians who believe the divinity of Christ have thrown on others, who also believe his divinity, merely for not explaining some particular scriptures in the same way and manner that they do, or for not using the same arguments to prove his divinity.

Since it is made a test for our eternal salvation in some places of scripture, whether we believe Jesus to be the Son of God, or no; and since there are now, and have been in former ages, many christians of great piety and worth who doubt of the consubstantial sonship of Christ, and the eternal generation of his person, even though they believe his true and proper godhead, I would not willingly encourage the scripture to be interpreted in such a mistaken sense, as should exclude all these pious and excellent persons from salvation, and forbid them the kingdom of heaven. For they may believe him to be true God, and to be also the Son of God, though they do not believe his godhead to be owing to his sonship. There are some persons who have been so severe as to pass a condemning sentence on all those who deny Christ the Son, considered as the Son, to be the true God: I hope they have done it merely through inadvertence, or because they thought it to be utterly impossible to maintain the godhead of Christ upon any other foot but that of his co-eternal and consubstantial sonship. But whatsoever be their reason for such unjust censure, yet I must confess I do not love to see condemnation and everlasting death thrown upon persons who believe the same scriptural doctrine of the deity of Christ that we do, but chuse to explain it another way.

Thus some of my motives to this enquiry are to do justice to the truths of God, and some arise from charity to the souls of men. Nor is my zeal for the honour of my Lord Jesus Christ in the least abated; for while I believe him in his complex person to be both the true and eternal God, and also the only-begotten Son of the Father, and while I profess him to be withal the great prophet and teacher, as well as the Saviour of his

church; I conceive that more honour is done him by searching out that true and exact meaning of his own words which this heavenly Teacher designed to convey to us, than by persuading the world to read his eternal godhead in those places where he did not design to reveal and express it to men.

---

**QUEST. II.**—*Did the Disciples of Christ fully believe that he was the True God during his Life-time, or not till after his Death and Resurrection?*

IN order to solve this question, let us make these following enquiries, viz. I. What notion the Jews had of their Messiah in general. II. What ideas or notions Christ taught his disciples concerning himself. III. What apprehensions or notions the disciples received and embraced concerning Christ. IV. What indications they may be supposed to give tending toward the belief of his godhead. V. What indications they give of their ignorance or doubt of it, or at least what evidences there are of the fluctuation and uncertainty of their faith in that matter. Now by balancing these things one with another, we may at last come to form some true judgment about the present question.

**SECT. I.**—*The Jews' old Opinion concerning the Messiah.*

I. What notion had the Jews in general concerning their Messiah?

Answer. Though the Old Testament furnished them with sufficient prophecies concerning his divine and human nature, his spiritual kingdom, his sufferings, his death and resurrection from the dead, yet so wretchedly blinded were they with the corrupt glosses of their teachers, and with their own foolish prejudices, that they did agree in no notion concerning the Messiah more universally than in these false and mistaken ones, viz. that he was to be a glorious temporal Prince, that he was never to suffer, nor to die, and consequently not to rise again, and that he was to exalt their nation equal to or beyond its ancient grandeur, and to raise them to a temporal sovereignty over all the nations of the earth.

And the disciples themselves were so rooted in these mistaken notions, that nothing could quite cure them but the actual death and resurrection of Christ, his ascent to heaven, and his pouring down the enlightening Spirit at the days of Pentecost. For we find it evident enough, that the two sons of Zebedee, James and John, hoped to be made great ministers of state, and sit at his right-hand and at his left, in a temporal kingdom; *Mat. xx. 21.* We read that when our Lord spoke of his own

death and sufferings ; *Peter rebuked him for it ; Mat. xvi. 22.* and none of them knew *what his rising from the dead should mean ; Mark ix. 10.* for they thought, together with the rest of the people, that Christ or the Messiah, *abideth for ever*, that is, must never die ; *John xii. 34.* And even after the resurrection of Christ they expected with some impatience the same temporal glory and grandeur when they said ; *Acts i. 16. Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom unto Israel ?*

But to descend to particulars, and enquire what opinion the Jews had of the nature of their Messiah, who or what he was to be.

1. They generally believed he should be a man of their own nation, of the tribe of Judah, of the seed of David, born at Bethlehem, who was to be the king of the Jews, and their Saviour. When Herod demanded where the Messiah "the king of the Jews should be born, the chief-priests, and scribes told him, at Bethlehem ; *Mat. ii. 5. And they said to him, in Bethlehem of Judah, for thus it is written by the prophet, And thou Bethlehem in the land of Judah art not the least among the princes of Judah, for out of thee shall come a governor that shall rule my people Israel.* And when Jesus asked the Pharisees ; *Mat. xxii. 2. Whose Son is Christ, or the Messiah ?* they roundly answered, *the Son of David.* Yet others of the Jews were so very ignorant and doubtful in this matter, that they refused Jesus, and denied him to be the Messiah, for this very reason, cause they knew his birth and parentage ; *John vii. 27. We know this man whence he is, but when Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence he is.*

2. They believed that he had an existence before he came into the world ; for we can hardly suppose that the Scribes and priests should be so ready in citing one part of this verse ; *Micah v. 2.* which shews him to be "born at Bethlehem, and take notice of the other part of it, a ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Yet it may perhaps be doubted whether this opinion was universal, because some instances they were stupid enough to believe one part of the chapter or period concerning the Messiah's glory, and neglect other part which related to his sufferings.

3. They believed that he had some glorious and eminent relation to God. This appears from the name of honour that the Messiah was universally known by amongst them, viz. the Son of God. The Scribes, the Pharisees, the priests, and all the Jews, talked with our Lord Jesus freely about the Messiah under this name and title, as being the common name of the Messiah, and perfectly well known amongst them, viz. that the Messiah was the Son of God in some superior and more excellent way. When Philip told Nathanael ; *John i. 46. We have*

found him of whom Moses and the prophets did write, that is, the Messiah; Nathanael being convinced that Jesus was he, presently saluted him by this name, *thou art the Son of God, thou art the king of Israel.*

4. The prophets in the Old Testament frequently intimate the divinity of Christ; and some few of the ancient Jews might probably believe that he was the memra, or word of the Lord, the shekinah or glorious habitation of God, of which the Chaldee paraphrast sometimes speaks. Dr. Allix in his *Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church* against the Unitarians, seems to be too positive and triumphant in this point, that this memra or Logos to which the Chaldee paraphrast ascribes the creation of the world, and the government of it, and particularly of the Jewish nation, is the Messiah in their sense. Mr. Nye and others utterly deny it. But the excellent Mr. Robert Fleming, in his discourse of *Christology*, volume I. pages 136—144. very judiciously follows a middle path, and tells us, "That he did not find one of the many citations used by Doctor. Allix that seemed to necessitate our judgment this way. Therefore he run through the targums himself in those places where he thought it most probable to find what he sought, and yet could find but few passages that seemed very plainly to relate to the Messiah."— Upon which he concludes, "That though the word memra is sometimes used for the Messiah, yet it is much more frequently used in other senses, and that the Jewish memra and Messiah are spoken of sometimes as two distinct beings or persons."\*

But what doubtful hints or plain evidences soever there might be from the books of the prophets or these paraphrastic authors, that Christ was to be the true God, yet the Jews in Christ's time did not generally believe it: And though some learned authors have asserted it, yet I never saw it proved.— Surely if the Pharisees had but embraced this opinion, they could never have been at a loss to have answered our Lord Jesus, when he asked them, Mat. xxii. 45, 46. *If Christ be David's son, how doth he in Spirit call him Lord?* It was plain by their silence and confusion, that they did not believe his godhead. Bishop Bull is of this mind as well as Dr. Whitby. See Bull's *Judicium Ecclesie Catholicae*, &c. capite i. sectione 13. and Whitby's

\* Mr. Fleming in that place tells us, that though he could not find the word memra and Messiah used as explicatory of one another in those places which are plainly prophetic of Christ, yet he supposes the reason might be this, that memra denotes Christ with relation only to his divine nature before his assuming human nature, and Messiah denotes him only as he was to appear visibly and become man; therefore it was hardly possible that both these words should be used of him at once. See "*Christology*, volume I. page 143." Thus it is evident that Mr. Fleming searched after this notion with a seeming inclination to find it true, yet he could not find so great and incontestable evidence of it, as to suppose that the ancient Jews generally embraced this opinion, that the Memra or Word of God was the same with the Messiah.

ommentary. In short, their notions of this matter were so very confused, so uncertain, so inconsistent, and so various, that they cannot be reduced to any certain or settled scheme of sentiments.

SECT. II.—*What Ideas did Christ give his Disciples of himself.*

II. I proceed now in the second place to enquire, what ideas or notions our Lord Jesus Christ taught his disciples concerning himself.

1. He takes particular pains upon many occasions to shew that he was sent from God, or received commission from heaven to teach the doctrines which he taught, and to perform those glorious and surprizing miracles which he wrought, to confirm both his doctrine and his commission. This is so largely insisted on in the fifth, sixth, and following chapters of the gospel by St. John, that I need not cite particular instances.

2. He proves by most infallible evidences, that he was the Messiah, the Saviour of mankind; and he endeavoured to lead his disciples out of their own national prejudices, and to give them a juster notion of the office of the Messiah, and his spiritual kingdom. This he did in several of his discourses.

But as to the proof that he himself was the Messiah, he did not labour this point so much by any long or direct discourses on this subject, as by his preaching grace and duty, so as never to speak before; by his miracles and his appearance upon all occasions, with the marks and characters of the Messiah upon him. To prove this, I shall give but one instance instead of any: When John the baptist sent his disciples to ask him whether he was the Messiah or no, Mat. xi. 3. *Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?* Our Lord answered them only, by bidding them tell John their master, that *the blind received sight, the lame walk, the dead are raised, and that the poor of the gospel is preached*, and let John and his followers judge by these characters whether I am the Messiah or no. Though I confess there are two or three occasions also which he took to profess himself the Messiah in direct and plain words; John iv. 19. and ix. 37.

He often takes occasion to declare, that he had a being before he came into this world. John iii. 13. *No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, &c.* John v. 38. *I came down from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me.* Ver. 51. *I am the living bread which came down from heaven.* John viii. 14. *I know whence I came, and whither I go.* John xvi. 28. *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; and now I leave the world, and go to the Father.* And his disci-

ples understood him in the plain literal sense, ver. 29. for immediately his disciples said unto him, *Lo, now thou speakest plainly, and speakest no parable.* John viii. 58. *Verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am.* And in his prayer to his Father, John xvii. 5. *Now, O Father, glorify me with thy ownself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* Ver. 24. *My glory which thou hast given me, for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.*

4. He assumes to himself the character of the Son of God, and that in a more eminent and superior way than men or angels are the sons of God ; for he calls himself *the only begotten Son of God* ; John xiii. 16, 18. *The beloved Son of God* ; John v. 20. which he also took care that his disciples should know, twice by a voice from heaven ; Luke iii. 22. at his baptism, and Luke ix. 35. at his transfiguration. He told them also that he was such a Son of God as knew the Father so as none besides knew him ; Luke x. 22. such a Son as that “the Father shewed him all things that himself did ;” John v. 20. and that “whatever things the Father doth, these doth the Son likewise ;” verse 19. that “the Father has committed all judgment to him, that all men should honour the Son as they honour the Father ;” verses 22, 23. and that “the dead should hear the voice of the Son of God and live ; and as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself ;” which things cannot be supposed to be spoken of any mere creature, and therefore by this sort of language, he gave some intimations of his union with godhead, or his divinity, though the mere name Son of God be not construed to so divine a sense.

5. He sometimes takes opportunity to acquaint them with his most intimate union or oneness with the Father, and his peculiar communion with him. For when he says, John x. 29. *My Father who gave me my sheep, is greater than all ;* yet he adds in the next verse, *I and my Father are one ;* which I think are intimations of a superior and inferior nature, and that the divine nature of the Father was in him. This also he discovers in some other places. John x. 38. “Believe the works that I do, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me and I in him. John xiv. 7—11. “If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also ; and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him. Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip ? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father ; and how sayest thou, shew us the Father ? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me ? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works. Believe me that I am in the

ather, and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very works sake."

6. There are also several other intimations that our Lord gave of his divinity, though it was not the doctrine that he thought it at that time to teach in plain and express language. When he tells them, that *where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them*; Mat. xviii. 20. the Greek words are *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*, which seem to denote a divine omnipresence. When he says to Peter, *I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven*; Mat. xvi. 14. it sounds god-like. When he promises the disciples, *I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gain-say*; Luke xxi. 15. When John ii. 19. *Destroy this temple and I will raise it up in three days*; he imitates divine language so much, that it might have led the disciples onward to the belief of his deity.

His active behaviour and conduct in several instances was such, as there is some reason to think he would scarce have practised, had he not been true God; such as his taking frequent occasion to shew that he knew their hearts and their secret thoughts; his godlike way in working some of his miracles, which seems to be the very same which a god incarnate would have used; his sovereign and god-like manner in casting out devils, and his conveying miraculous gifts, in the same way that God himself would probably have done; and his giving the holy Spirit to his disciples in such a manner; John xx. 21, 22. "As my Father hath sent me, so send I you; and when he had thus said, he breathed on them, and said unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghost," which seems to be an imitation of God creating the human soul of Adam; Gen. ii. 7. "He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."—Though it must be noted indeed, that this was after his resurrection, and so comes not within the reach of my present enquiry.

His passive behaviour also was such as we can hardly suppose he would have practised, had he not been God; for he admitted persons on several occasions to worship him, which we find both angels and apostles always forbid, lest they should seem to assume the divine prerogative and honour: He did not deny his godhead when the Jews charged him with assuming equality with God, &c. several of which circumstances, both of the active and passive conduct of our Lord Jesus Christ, are set in the fairest and strongest light towards the proof of his divinity, by Mr. Hughes in his *Two Essays*, on that subject. And some parts of the argument seem to carry great weight and force with them; but I would not venture to lay the whole stress of the cause there.

Thus though our blessed Saviour did not plainly and ex-



pressly declare that he was the true and eternal God ; for his divine prudence did not think it proper to express his godhead in such direct and glorious language at that season ;\* yet by all these methods of speech, and by this divine conduct of his, which I have described in the three last particulars, he seems to have given abundant intimations that his " human nature had a peculiar union to, and communion with godhead : But since the New Testament is complete, we can understand those hints better than his disciples could in that day. And though he did not use these words, that Jesus the Son of man is personally united to the divine nature, yet he said so much as in our apprehension now amounts to this sense, when he said, " I and my Father are one ;" John x. 30. " I am in the Father, and the Father in me. The Father who is in me doth the works. He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, &c." John xiv. 9—11. that is, he hath seen the glory and power, and grace of the Father, whose divine nature or godhead is also in the Son, and dwells in me bodily. And though we can never tell exactly what makes the personal union between the divine and human natures in Christ ; yet perhaps this may be a just evidence of a personal union with the godhead, viz. when the actions and characters and sufferings which Christ performed and sustained, might be properly said to be performed and sustained immediately by God himself. But I much question whether his disciples in that day did certainly infer so much from these words.

### SECT. III.—*What Idea the Disciples had of Christ.*

III. I come now to consider " what apprehensions or notions the disciples did receive concerning our Lord Jesus Christ in his own life-time."

It is not enough for me here to repeat the foregoing heads, and shew what Christ told them ; for we cannot say the disciples understood and effectually learned all that our Lord Jesus Christ taught them. It is evident in many other places of the history

\* It is no wonder that our Saviour did not freely and publicly declare his own godhead in plain and express language, when he did not chuse to declare himself the Messiah in such an evident manner of speech, but very seldom, and that privately too ; though the doctrine of his Messiahship was then of so much more importance.

But there are many special reasons also which might be given, why our Lord Jesus did not proclaim his own godhead during the time of his ministry on earth: I shall mention but one that is evident and sufficient, viz. that he must have done it either with plain and convincing proofs of it, or without them. If he had only asserted it plainly, without convincing proof, he had hastened the malice of the Jews to put him to death for blasphemy, before he had fulfilled all his designed ministry upon earth. On the other hand, if he had given most convincing proof of it while he asserted it, the Jews and Gentiles had been restrained from putting him to death at all ; for St. Paul tells us expressly, 1 Cor. ii. 8.—" Had the princes of this world known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory."

of the gospel, that he spoke several things to them which were above their present apprehension; the Spirit of God which was promised to descend upon them, was not only to bring to remembrance the things that Christ had spoken; but to give them a fuller understanding in the meaning of them. And as there were many things which Christ had to say to them, but forebore in his life-time, because they could not bear them yet; John xvi. 12. So there were some things which he did speak to them in a more obscure manner, by hints and intimations, which they could not at that time bear in the full light and glory of a divine explication. But if we search the evangelical history, I think we shall find that they received and entertained the following sentiments concerning him:—

1. They firmly believed that he was sent of God. Our Lord Jesus Christ himself was witness to this their faith; John xvii. 8. “I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them, and they have believed that thou didst send me.”

2. They were convinced that he was the true Messiah; John vi. 69. “We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ.”

3. That he had a peculiar and glorious relation to God, that he was the Son of the living God, which primarily referred to the dignity of his person, and oftentimes included in it also his character or office as the appointed Saviour. This was the substance of Nathaniel’s confession; John i. 49. *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.* This was also Peter’s confession; Mat. xvi. 16. *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God;* which he spake in the name of the rest, as well as John vi. 69. where the same words are repeated.

4. They believed also that he had an existence before he came into this world. When the disciples told him, John xvi. 30. *We believe that thou camest forth from God;* it is evident from the context that they did not only mean that he received his commission from heaven, and was sent by God to preach to the world; but that he had a being with the Father before he came into this world, as he himself expresses it; verse 28. *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world, and go to the Father;* which they understood in the literal sense, without metaphors, as they themselves express it: *Now thou speakest plainly, and speakest no parable or metaphor;* verse 29. And our Lord Jesus Christ in his testimony concerning them, seems to make these two distinct articles of their belief, viz. his pre-existence and his mission; John xvii. 8. *They have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.*

5. They believed also that God was in a most eminent and peculiar manner present with him, according to the multitude of

expressions he had used to that purpose, of his Father's being with him, and of the Father's dwelling in him: And this was the language of their sermons at first; Acts x. 38. Jesus of Nazareth did great things, for God was with him. But they did not seem to have any fixed and certain belief of such a peculiar and personal union of the man Christ Jesus with the true God during his life-time, as to give him the name and title of God. They had heard him say, that he and his Father were one; but they did scarce understand his oneness with the Father, and communion in the godhead in so sublime a sense, as was afterwards revealed to them, for they never called him God before his resurrection. Which brings me to the next general head.

SECT. IV.—*What Evidence they gave of believing his True Deity.*

IV. The fourth thing I proposed was to shew what indications the disciples may be supposed to give tending towards a belief of his godhead.—1. Upon some special occasions they worshipped him. The leper that was cleansed worshipped Christ; Mat. viii. 2. "The ruler that sought the life of his daughter, worshipped him;" Mat. ix. 18. "The woman of Canaan worshipped him," saying, *Lord help me*; Mat. xv. 25.—But all this was before he wrought the miracle in their favour; and probably it signifies no more than a great degree of humility in the manner of their petition, perhaps a bowing the knee, or falling on the face at his feet. The blind man, who was healed, worshipped him also, when he professed himself to be the Son of God; John ix. 38. and his disciples that were in the ship worshipped him, when he walked on the water and suppressed the storm; Mat. xiv. 32, 33.

But it may be doubted whether all this arises to the notion of religious and divine worship, since this word is sometimes used in scripture, referring to moral or civil honours paid to our fellow-creatures; 1 Chron. xxix. 20. *They bowed their heads and worshipped the Lord and the king.* Mat. xviii. 26. *The servant fell down and worshipped his Lord.* Rev. iii. 9. where Christ himself says to the church at Sardis, *I will make them to come and worship before thy feet.* And perhaps some that knew not that Christ was God, might pay this sort of worship to him here on earth, that is, a mere high degree of reverence and obeisance under the surprizing influence of the miracles which they heard of, or which they saw. When one of the ten lepers which were healed, came back; Luke xvii. 15. it is said, *with a loud voice he glorified God, and fell down on his face at the feet of Christ, giving him thanks, and he was a Samaritan.* Now it may be observed here, that the cleansed leper first glorified God, as the great Author and first cause of his healing, and then fell

down on his face in a worshipping posture at the feet of Christ to give him thanks, as the glorious means and miraculous instrument of his deliverance, not knowing that Christ who healed him, was himself the true God. Thus these persons did not seem to worship our Lord as the true and eternal God with proper divine worship. Yet it seems probable that he would have scarce accepted of any such imitation of divine worship, or indulged any thing that had the appearance of it, if he had not been true God. Many persons might pay Christ this high degree of honour and prostration without belief of his deity, though perhaps he would have refused it, had he been a mere creature; even as Cornelius worshipped Peter; Acts x. 25. when we have no reason to believe that he thought Peter was the true God. Yet Peter forbid it, lest it should have any appearance of assuming divine dignity to himself.

2. Simon Peter was greatly surprized at the multitude of fishes taken at once, when he let down his net at the direction of Christ; Luke v. 4, &c. When he saw it, *He fell down at Jesus's knees, saying, depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord.* Which expression may seem to import, "Thou art so holy and pure, O Lord, and hast something so divine in thee, and so much like God, who hates all sin, that such a poor sinful wretch as I am, have too much defilement in me to come so near thee, and may have just reason to dread thy presence." Whether he might at this season have an overwhelming glimpse of his divinity, it is not easy to say: But it may be easily said, that this miracle alone was not sufficient to give a just convincing proof of his godhead.

3. The apostles seem to make a petition to Christ for spiritual mercies in a way of divine worship; Luke xvii. 5. *and the apostles said to the Lord, increase our faith;* which address seems to have more of the appearance of religious worship paid to him by them, than any other expression I know of before the resurrection of Christ. Yet some would question whether this petition did evidence their firm belief of his godhead: For when they had seen him put forth his miraculous power on the bodies of men in such a glorious manner, when they found that he knew the thoughts of their hearts,\* and had an inward acquaintance

\* The mere knowledge of their thoughts was not sufficient to prove the divinity of Christ, since God has been pleased in former times to communicate this knowledge to his prophets; so Ahijah knew the thoughts of Jeroboam's wife, for God had told him; 1 Kings xiv. 5, 6. *The Lord said to Ahijah, behold the wife of Jeroboam cometh to ask a thing of thee, &c.* And much less can we suppose the disciples in that day of darkness and ignorance did from thence infer his deity. Yet I think that expression of Christ; Rev. ii. 23. *Ye shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and the hearts;* compared with Jer. xi. 20. and xvii. 10. gives us a good argument for his deity, or that he is one with that God who searcheth the heart as his peculiar prerogative; but this was long after his ascent to heaven.

with their souls, which appeared in several instances, and when they had seen and heard him forgive sins; Mat. ix. 2. and Luke v. 20. perhaps they might imagine that God had given him this spiritual power over their souls, and that he was commissioned to exercise this power, even as he commissioned his disciples to *heal the sick, to raise the dead, &c.* Mat. x. 18. and to forgive sins; John xx. 23. though he were not in his own nature the true and eternal God. For it is remarkable, that when he forgave the sins of the man whom he healed of the palsy, though the scribes and pharisees said, *Who can forgive sins but God?* and so charged him with blasphemy; yet the multitude only marvelled and glorified God who had given such power unto men; Mat. ix. 8. Now the multitude spoke honestly the sense of their hearts, but the scribes stretched his conduct to an accusation of blasphemy.

There is a parallel case in Mark ix. 22. where the man brought his son who was possessed with the devil, to our blessed Lord; *Master, says he, if thou canst do any thing, have compassion on us and help us.* Here it is evident, that the man had not so much as a firm belief whether Christ could work this miracle or no, much less can he be supposed to believe that Christ was the true and eternal God; then presently afterwards he cried out, *Lord, I believe, help thou my unbelief.* Now the utmost that we can reasonably imagine his sudden faith arrived at, was a belief that Christ was able to cast out the devil, and cure his son; yet he desires Christ to help his unbelief. Now the mere sudden expression of this request will hardly prove the poor man was convinced of the godhead of Christ; for it is possible he might mean only, shew thy power, and give some further testimony to assist my faith. But if he did believe Christ's deity, then we must suppose him transported by a sudden and divine impulse beyond the general faith of the apostles themselves, and carried above the dispensation of that day.

4. The disciples may seem to own his omniscience; John xvi. 30. *Now we are sure that thou knowest all things, &c.* but probably at that time they understood this "all things" in a limited sense; as 2 Sam. xiv. 20. where the woman said the same thing to David; so 1 John ii. 20. *Ye have an unction and know all things;* and verse 27. For the utmost inference the disciples make from it was, that "Jesus came forth from God," verse 30. not that he was God himself. It may be another reason also to think the disciples understood this word "all things" in a limited sense, because Christ himself had told them but a very little before this time, that he himself did not know the day of judgment; Mat. xxiv. 36; and Mark xiii. 32.

Though I think it reasonable for us to go farther than they did, and to apply several of the things I have mentioned to his

adbead, viz. his knowing their thoughts, his forgiveness of sins, &c. because we have a full account of these and many other actions of Christ, and we know so much of his divinity and glory from other parts of the bible; yet whether the disciples in that day did infer his divinity from any of these foregoing occurrences, and applied them to him as to the true God, may bear a just doubt and enquiry.

5. They believed that he was the Messiah, and the Messiah as spoken of in several places of the Old Testament, under the character and title of the true God. But as we cannot find that the learned Doctors of that age did generally understand those prophecies, or believe the true deity of the Messiah, so neither do we find any hint in the history of the gospel that the apostles themselves before the death of Christ understood those prophecies, so far as to apply them to the Messiah in that sense; but only thought him to be the greatest of prophets, and to be the appointed king of Israel and their Saviour.

6. They believed and confessed him to be the Son of God; but this title does not necessarily amount to any more than a glorious likeness to God, a nearer and more peculiar relation to God, a special office of Messiahship, and a more eminent derivation of his human nature from God than any other creatures, either angels or men, who are called the sons of God, could ever pretend: This I think is made pretty evident in another dissertation. Thus I have mentioned the fairest and strongest evidences that I can find of any degree of faith or belief that the disciples had of the deity of Christ during his life, and it is possible they might sometimes have a glimpse of that glorious doctrine.

**SECT. V.—***What Evidence they gave of disbelieving his True Deity.*

V. The last thing I proposed, was to shew, “what indications the disciples gave during the life-time of Christ of their disbelief of his godhead, or at least of the uncertainty of their faith in that matter.

1. If they had a firm and steady belief that he was the true God, surely we should have found them upon some occasion or another evidently expressing their faith in this matter, both for their own and their master’s interest and honour; since we never find that he forbid them to publish this to the world, though he did forbid them to publish some of his miracles, his transfiguration, his own prophecies of his death, resurrection, and ascension, &c.

And if they had not thought proper to publish to the world, that their master was the true God, yet we have much reason to suppose that, if they had believed it, they would upon some

occasion or other before his death, have addressed him as Thomas did after his resurrection, *My Lord and my God*; John xx. 28.

We cannot but suppose also, that amongst their many doubts and queries, they would have asked him this obvious and important one, how could he be God, and his Father be God also, and yet not two Gods? But we find nothing of this kind, though they put many a question to him both of less difficulty and less importance. Nor do we find that they talked of him to the world under any character of Godhead; but on the contrary, we always find them speaking of him as a man, and that not only in his life-time, but just after his death too, as a great prophet that was risen up amongst them; Luke xxiv. 19. *Jesus of Nazareth a prophet mighty in word and deed before God and all the people.*

2. If they had believed him to be the true God that made the heavens, and the earth, the winds and the seas, they would never have expressed so much surprize and wonder at his rebuking the wind and bidding the sea be calm; Luke viii. 24, 25. *They being afraid, wondered, saying one to another, what manner of man is this? for he commandeth even the winds and water, and they obey him.* I confess the word man is not in the original; but still their wonder at the obedience that was paid him by the elements seems an argument that they did not believe him to be the almighty God that made them. Now this is not the first time they were thus astonished and surprized; for when Simon Peter, a good while before this let down his net, at the command of Christ, and inclosed a great multitude of fishes, he was astonished and all that were with him; Luke v. 9. And if any of them may seem to have a glimpse of his divinity on this occasion, yet they had forgot or lost it again, when in chapter viii. They were as much surprized at his rebuking the winds and the waves.

You have another instance of this kind; Mat. xxi. 19, 20. *And when the disciples saw that the fig-tree which our Lord cursed, presently withered, they marvelled, saying, how soon is the fig-tree withered away!* And this was not long before his death neither, when we may suppose their knowledge was most advanced; whereas the disciples would never have marvelled that he could destroy a fig-tree by a word, if they had believed him to be that God who made all things by his word.

3. If they had believed Christ to be the great and glorious God, they would not have treated him with such indecent roughness, as they did upon some particular occasions; as Mat. xv. 33. when Christ said, he would not send away the people fasting, lest they faint in the way, the disciples made him a very rude reply, to say no worse of it, when they answered, *Whence*

*could we have so much bread in the wilderness to fill so great a multitude?*

Another instance of this kind appears in their free and unassuming address to Jesus; Mat. xv. 12. *Then came his disciples and said to him, knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended after they heard this saying?* without so much as air, or master to preface it. Whereby it is plain, they either at that time doubted whether he knew what offence the Pharisees took, else they gave him a reproof for speaking such things as would offend the Pharisees, and a caution lest he did it again. Neither of these suppositions sufficiently manifest they did not believe him to be the true God. So when he spake of his death and resurrection; Mat. xvi. 22. it is said, *Peter took him and began to rebuke him, saying, This shall not be unto thee, Lord.* Now we can hardly suppose that Peter would have been so free to take up such language to his great Creator, and to give him a rebuke to his God. I might add also, that though the Virgin Mary under the influence of rapture and inspiration excuses herself thus; Luke i. 47. *My Spirit hath rejoiced in my Saviour,* yet if she had firmly believed her Son to be God, she would not have chid him so severely when he was yet years old; Luke ii. 48. *Son, why hast thou dealt thus with us? because he stayed in the temple, and was left behind when they travelled homeward.*

4. If they had thought Jesus Christ was the "true God, who would never have tried to entertain the curiosity of their eyes, by shewing him how magnificent the buildings of the temple were;" Mat. xxiv. 1. *His disciples came unto him to view him the buildings of the temple; and one of them said unto him, Master, see what manner of stones and building are these;* Mark xiii. 1. and as St. Luke expresses it, *how it was adorned with goodly stones;* Luke xxi. 5. They must needs think this was but a poor entertainment to please that glorious God, who had formed and built this earth, and had spread abroad the starry canopy of the heavens.

5. They had frequent opportunity of observing that Christ was their thoughts, and on this occasion they once took notice; Mat. xvi. 30. and said, *Now we are sure that thou knowest all things.* Now if they had been convinced that he was the true God, they would certainly have declared their sense and faith of his Godhead, and not have contented themselves with this poor excuse; *by this we believe that thou camest forth from God, for thou hadst a being, or didst dwell with the Father, and camest from him.* And even when they arose to this degree of knowledge, our Lord takes notice, that their faith had not been very advanced so far as this, or at least, it had not been long



established and firmly rooted in this point : For verse 31. Jesus answered them, Do ye now believe ?

After all, I might observe this also concerning Martha and Mary, who were well acquainted with Jesus, and for whom he had a peculiar and special affection, as well as for Lazarus their brother John xi. 6. and he had so far acquainted them with his person and office, that they "believed him to be the Christ, or Messiah, the Son of God, which should come into the world," verse 27. Yet neither of them speak of any faith they had, that he had power in himself to raise the dead, though Jesus seems to have urged them to it, verse 25. The utmost faith which they express is this, *Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died*, verses 21. and 32. and verse 22. *I know that even now whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee.*

Upon the whole survey of things it appears that the disciples during the life of Christ had not arrived to any firm belief of his godhead : And if at any time they had a glimpse of his deity, it seems rather to be under the influence of a surprize and rapture, beyond the level of that imperfect dispensation, and beyond the common exercise of their faith in that day. And indeed Thomas seems to be under the power of such a divine rapture, when even after the the resurrection of Christ he was favoured with so sensible a conviction, and he cried out, John xi. 28. *My Lord and my God* ; which is the first plain and certain indication of any of the apostles believing the deity of Christ.

These things will give occasion to three or four more questions, viz.

Question I. "Did the disciples believe him then to be a mere common man ?"

Answer. No, I think not : For it is very probable that they were informed of his extraordinary conception, and his birth of the Virgin Mary his Mother, so that he came into the world in a diviner way, and superior to other men, having God himself for the Father even of his flesh : And thus *the holy thing that was born of the Virgin was called the Son of God* ; Luke i. 35.

It is probable also that they believed that sublime and near relation in which his soul stood to God, being the Son of God in a superior sense to all other men, even before his incarnation ; and that he had a pre-existent state, where he dwelt with God, and whence he *came forth from God when he came into this world* ; John xvi. 27, 28. Thus he was eminently the Son of God, as to his body and his soul.

They also believed him to be the Messiah, their anointed king, and the highest and greatest of all the prophets, the Redeemer of Israel, and their Saviour, and that in this sense also he was the Son of God. They knew him also to be endued with the Spirit of God in a most glorious and eminent degree ; or as

John the Baptist expresses it, to have *the Spirit given him without measure*; John iii. 34. And they knew the peculiar and intimate presence of the Father was with him, which he so often taught them in express words; John xiv. 10, 11. x. 30. that *he Father was in him, and he in the Father; and that he and the Father were one*: yet they did scarce arrive at the belief of a personal union of the human nature with the divine. All these things joined together exalted his character in their esteem, far above the common level of mankind.

Question II. If they did not believe the godhead of Christ who had such special advantages above other men, “may it not well be doubted whether there were sufficient proofs of his divinity ever given to mankind before his death?”

Answer I. By several scriptures of the Old Testament, I think the godhead of the Messiah might have been proved, and when they had compared these prophecies with the actions and life of Christ, they had plain evidences that he was this Messiah: The disciples therefore might have had reasonable ground to have inferred this doctrine of his deity. But so ignorant was that generation, so overrun with national mistakes, so unacquainted with scripture, and the true meaning of it, that the apostles in that day did not believe many other things concerning Christ, which were written in the Old Testament in as plain and express language as his godhead. Such were the predictions of his sorrows and sufferings, his death and his rising again, and his final exaltation: But we have Christ's own words for it, even after he rose again, that they were *fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken*; Luke xxiv. 25.

II. Some of the speeches which Christ made concerning himself do certainly represent him in too sublime a character for any mere creature; which I have mentioned before: and by some circumstances of his conduct, they might have found out his godhead, especially if they had compared them with his character as Messiah. But they laboured under the power of many prejudices, and as our Lord often charges them, that they were dull of apprehension, hard to be instructed, and *slow to believe*.

III. Though there might be a bare external sufficiency in the notices that Christ gave of his own godhead for their conviction, yet these were made more abundantly clear and evident to them, when according to the promise of Christ, “his Spirit brought to remembrance,” and explained the things that he had before said to them: then he *took of the things of Christ*, and revealed them to his apostles as he promised, John xiv. 26. and xvi. 14. I might add also, that all these notices and evidences of the divinity of Christ, stand in a much fairer light before us who have the whole history of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ; and the writings and sermons of the apostles, to

compare with the writings of the prophets; which it was not possible the disciples should do in so complete a manner, and to so great satisfaction during the life of Christ, had they been ever so sagacious, and ever so well prepared.

Question III. "How could the disciples trust in him as their Saviour, and commit their souls to him for salvation in his life-time, if they had not a firm faith in his godhead?"

Answer I. The way whereby the fathers before Christ were saved, was not so much by a direct act of faith on the person of the Messiah, who was to come, as by the direct and immediate exercise of faith or trust on the mercy of God, as it was to be revealed in and through the Messiah in due time. Now the dispensation of those three or four years which past during the life of Christ, was a sort of medium between the law and the gospel: and the acts and exercises of the apostles' faith or trust and dependence, like that of the patriarchs, might be more directly placed on the mercy of God himself for salvation, as it began to manifest itself in and by Jesus the Messiah, now come into the world. So St. Peter expresses it, 1 Pet. i. 21. *You who by him do believe in God.*

Though they were frequently called to believe in Christ, you find they were so unskilled in a direct act of divine faith him, that our Lord was fain to repeat the command with great solemnity but just before his death. John xiv. i. *Ye believe in God, believe also in me:* as if he should have said, "Ye have a long time trusted and professed your faith in God and his mercy, make me now also the direct object of your faith - trust, as ye have made God the Father."

II. Under the great darkness and confusion of their notions in that season of twilight, they sometimes paid too little honour to Christ, because they had too low an esteem of him; and sometimes the honour they paid him through the influence of rapture and surprize, though not too high in itself, yet it might be above and beyond the clear discernment of their understandings and their own settled judgment concerning him. Thus they might now and then exert some faint acts of divine faith on him, while in the main they were doubtful of his godhead. But a gracious God makes great allowances for such weaknesses in faith and practice, where the divine discoveries which he makes to men, have but imperfect degrees of light and evidence.

Question IV. "Does it not follow then, if the disciples were in a state of grace, and yet doubted of the deity of Christ; surely the deity of Christ was not a fundamental article in that day?"

Answer I. Fundamentals are different in different seasons and times, nations and ages; for as God makes more or less discoveries of divine truth to men, so more or less is necessary to be

believed in order to salvation. Surely it was not a fundamental article for Peter to know, and believe the sufferings and death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin, and his resurrection from the dead, at that time when he rebuked our Saviour himself, because he spake of his dying; Mat. xvi. 22. And when none of the apostles knew *what rising from the dead should mean*, as Mark ix. 10. yet the belief of the death and resurrection of Christ was certainly a fundamental article, and necessary to salvation in a little time afterward; and is become necessary to christianity itself; 1 Cor. xv. 14, 17. *If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain, ye are yet in your sins.* The doctrine of the divinity of Christ therefore may not be supposed to be a fundamental article in the time of Christ's life, because we have reason to believe the apostles were in a state of grace and salvation, before there is any sufficient evidence of their faith therein: But it will not follow thence, that the same doctrine either is or is not a fundamental, after it has been more fully and clearly revealed by the complete writings of the New Testament: And indeed a truth ought to be revealed very plainly and with convincing evidence, before it can be ever called a fundamental.

It has been the constant method of divine wisdom in all ages, to communicate to man the glorious discoveries of the grace of God by slow and gentle degrees, and not to overwhelm our faculties at once with a flood of divine light. He knows the weakness of our frame, he knows how dark are our understandings, how feeble our judgments, how many and great our natural prejudices, and how hard it is to surmount them; and he demands our belief in measures answerable to his discoveries. It is according to the growing evidence of any divine revelation, and the gradual advantages that any man has to know and understand that revelation, that God justly expects the growing exercises of our faith. Thus that faith which is necessary to salvation, consists of more or fewer articles, according to the different ages of the church, and different degrees of revelation and divine light. Thus though our Lord Jesus Christ was true God when he came first to be manifest in the flesh, yet the complete glory of his person and the beams of his godhead did not discover themselves in a triumphant and convincing light during the days of his humiliation: and though it was necessary then, to all those who had a clear knowledge of his doctrine and miracles, to believe that he was the Messiah: *Except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins*; John viii. 24. yet it doth not seem at that time to have been made necessary to believe his deity, since the discoveries of it were but imperfect, and it is plain that his own apostles hardly believed it.

It is certain, that after the resurrection of Christ, and the

days of Pentecost, the apostles by degrees had more divine light let into their souls by the Holy Spirit, whereby they arrived at a fuller knowledge of the glory of his person and his godhead; yet it is very probable that the idea which I have before described, is the highest they attained in his life-time; and that not only on the account of the arguments I have used already, but because this notion was so fixed and rooted in their minds, that they generally described our Lord Jesus Christ in this manner, in all their first ministrations of the gospel, and they thought it proper to teach others in the same manner as they had learned. So St. Peter, Acts ii. 22. tells the men of Israel, *Jesus of Nazareth was a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves know; ver. 24. whom God has raised up, having loosed the pains of death.*

Again, Acts iii. 13. *The God of our fathers hath glorified his Son Jesus whom ye delivered up, &c.* And he cites Moses to shew what he was, ver. 22. *A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me.* So when he preached to Cornelius a Roman, Acts x. 38. *God hath anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed with the devil, for God was with him, &c.*

And St. Paul himself preached Christ under this inferior character at first, though he came not a whit behind the chiefest of the apostles in knowledge; 2 Cor. xii. 11. and Gal. ii. 8. In his sermon at Athens, he says, *God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead; Acts, xvii. 31.* Thus they begun with the human nature and the offices of Christ, and the peculiar assisting presence of God with him, before they taught any thing of the mystery of his own godhead or personal union with the divine nature.

And indeed there is a good deal of reason, why they should not at first reveal and display the glorious doctrine of the Trinity and the godhead of Jesus, though they had known it ever so well. It was not fit they should break in all at once upon the blind Jewish nation, nor upon the blinder Gentiles, with the blaze of Christ's divinity. For, to speak humanly, it would have filled the minds of strangers with surprizing doubts and scruples, and raised in them an utter prejudice against all further attention to the gospel, if they had been told at first of three persons who were each of them the true God, and yet all three but one God\*.

\* There is a remarkable instance to this purpose in the "Conferences of the Danish missionaries with the heathens of Malabar." The missionary speaking of the Son of God, the Malabarian replied, Who is his Son? and is he also God? Missionary. He is God blessed for ever. Malabarian. But pray Sir, recollect

not proper to be the very first lesson in christianity. The work of the conversion of the world was done by degrees ; nature could bear. Thus God hath treated men in all things ; he led them on " from faith to faith ;" Rom. i. 17. Thus Jesus Christ treated his disciples ; John xvi. 12. *I have many things to say to you, but ye cannot bear them now.* The apostles treated the Jews and Gentiles, to whom they preached ; I Cor. iii. 2. and fed them with milk and not with meat, for they were not able to bear it. Thus by slow degrees he led them from the knowledge of Jesus, the Son of God ; from the knowledge of Jesus the Son of God ; from the discovery of Jesus the prophet, to the discovery of Jesus the Messiah ; from the revelation of Christ the eternal life and God ; from the doctrine of the presence of God with the doctrine of his personal union with godhead, " in whom dwells all the fulness of the godhead bodily ; Col. ii. 9. " *God over all blessed for ever ; Rom. ix. 5. by this glorious and personal union with the eternal God.*"

Have not you been just now inveighing against plurality of Gods ? If you find, you have yourselves more than one ; the Father is God, and the Son is God, then you have two gods. Missionary. We do not believe two gods, but one God ; though at the same time, we firmly believe, that there are three persons in one divine essence ; and yet these three persons are not three, but one God : And this we believe as a great mystery, &c. And then he goes on to say, that it is by the understanding and the will proceeding from the soul, which is naturally one and the same thing with the soul. Upon which the Malabarian replied ; I find, said he, that you, with your subtil ways of arguing, make the Trinity consistent with unity ; and if your explication is absolutely true, it will make others understand what you mean, pray allow us the same advantage in explaining the doctrine of our religion, and putting it in the most plain and simple light we can, for the excluding the absurdities imputed to us ? And he answered us, it will follow, that our plurality does not destroy the unity of God more than your Trinity does. We worship the gods upon no other account because they are the vicegerents of the Almighty, whose administrations in governing the world, as he did employ them at the beginning and forming the same. And our God appearing among men at various times and under different shapes, had at every apparition a different name which contributed very much to the multiplying of the number of gods ; whereas in truth, they are but different representations of the same God under different aspects and appearances. See " Confessor, number xi." The apostles had dealt so imprudently with the Heathens or with the Jews, in presenting the doctrine of the Trinity at first in the fullest expressions, they raised the minds of their hearers, and exposed themselves and their salvation by Jesus the Messiah to such difficulties and wrangling disputes. But you find no controversies of this kind raised in their first

QUEST. III.—*Could the Son of God properly enter into a Covenant with his Father to do and suffer what was Necessary to our Redemption, without a Human Soul ?*

## SECTION I.

IT is granted that the generality of our christian writers believe that it was only the divine nature or godhead of Christ had an existence before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary, and became incarnate ; yet whensoever they would represent the exceeding great love of the Father in sending his Son into our world, that he might suffer and die for us, and when they would describe the transcendent love of Christ, in his coming into our world, and his submitting to death for our sakes, they usually represent it in such language as can never agree to his divine nature in any propriety of speech, but only to the pre-existent human soul of Christ, with its descent into flesh and blood, and the sufferings of his human soul for us. And it is evident that the scripture itself leads them plainly to such a representation of things : so that while they are explaining the transcendent degree of the love of God and Christ to sinners, according to scripture, they are led by the force of truth into such expressions as are indeed hardly consistent with their own professed opinions, but perfectly consistent with the revelation of scripture, and the doctrine of the pre-existent soul of Christ. I was lately looking into the sermons of that most excellent, practical and evangelical writer, the late Mr. John Flavel, in his treatise called *the Fountain of Life Opened ; or, a Display of Christ ;* where I found the following expressions :

Sermon II. page 13. in quarto, where the excellent author is describing the glorious condition of the non-incarnate Son of God, he says, “ Christ was not then abased to the condition of a creature, but it was an inconceivable abasement to the absolute independent being to come under the law ; yea, not only under the obedience, but also under the malediction and curse of the law ; Gal. iv. 4. *God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law.*

Page 14. “ He was never pinched with poverty and wants while he continued in that bosom, as he was afterwards. Ah blessed Jesus ! Thou needest not to have wanted a place to have lain thy head, hadst thou not left that bosom for my sake.” And here the author quotes Mr. Anthony Burges, in his lectures on John : “ He that was in the bosom of the Father and had the most intimate, close, and secret delight and love from the Father, how unspeakable is it that he should deprive himself of the sense of it, to put himself, as it were out of heaven into hell !” Mr. Flavel then proceeds, “ He never underwent reproach and shame in that bosom : There was nothing but glory and honour reflected

him by his Father, though afterwards he was despised and  
 of men. All the while he lay in that bosom of peace and  
 e never knew what it was to be assaulted with temptations,  
 besieged and battered upon by unclean spirits, as he did  
 ards : The Lord embraced him from eternity, but never  
 ed him till he stood in our place and room. There were  
 ngs or withdrawments of his Father from him ; there was  
 loud from eternity upon the face of God till Jesus Christ  
 t that bosom. It was a new thing to Christ to see frowns  
 ace of his Father. There was never any impressions of  
 her's wrath upon him, as there were afterward. There  
 death to which he was subject in that bosom. All these  
 were new things to Christ ; he was above them all, till for  
 kes he voluntarily subjected himself unto them." Then,  
 e author has shewn how great was the intimacy, the dear-  
 he delight, which was between the Father and the Son,  
 red in their divine nature, he draws some inferences, page

I. What an astonishing act of love was this, for the Father  
 the delight, the darling of his soul out of his very bosom  
 r sinners ? Never did any child lie so close to a parent's  
 s Christ did to his Father's, and yet he willingly parts  
 m, though his only one, the Son of his delight ; and that  
 h, a cursed death, for the worst of sinners. O matchless  
 love past finding out ! if the Father had not loved thee  
 never parted with such a Son for thee."

II. Adore, and be for ever astonished at the love of Jesus  
 to poor sinners, that ever he should consent to leave such  
 n, and the ineffable delights that were there, for such poor  
 as we are. O the heights, depths, lengths, and breadths  
 measurable love !" " It is admirable, says Mr. Burges on  
 xvii. that Christ should not only put himself out of com-  
 ut out of that manifested honour and glory he might have  
 d to himself." " If ever you found by experience what  
 be in the bosom of God by divine communion, would you  
 uaded to leave such a bosom for all the good that is in the  
 ' And yet Jesus Christ, who was embraced in that bo-  
 ter another manner than ever you were acquainted with,  
 est it, and laid down the glory and riches he enjoyed  
 or your sakes. *What manner of love is this ?* Who ever  
 s Christ loves ? Who ever denied himself for Christ, as  
 denied himself for us ?" Then after the third inference,  
 s :—

7. How worthy is Jesus Christ of all our love and de-  
 he that left God's bosom for you, deserves a place in your  
 ."

Exhortation. If Christ lay eternally in this bosom of love,



and yet was content to forsake and leave it for your sakes, then be you ready to forsake and leave all the comforts you have on earth for Christ."

Again, Sermon IV. page 35. "Consider how near and dear Jesus Christ was to the Father: He was his Son, his only Son saith the text: The Son of his love: The darling of his soul: His other self; yea, one with himself: The express image of his person: *The brightness of his Father's glory*: In parting with him, he parted with his own heart, with his very bowels, as I may say. Yet to us a Son is given; Isa. ix. 6. And such a Son as he calls his dear Son."

Now if we suppose the human soul of our Lord Jesus Christ to have had a pre-existent state of joy and glory in the bosom of the Father through all former ages of the world, and even before the world was created, then these expressions are great and noble, are just and true; and have a happy aptness and propriety in them to set forth the transcendent love of God the Father in sending his Son, and the transcendent love of Christ, the Son of God, in coming from heaven, and leaving the joys and glories of his Father's immediate presence in heaven, to take on him such flesh and blood as ours is, and in that flesh and blood to sustain shame, sorrow, pain, anguish of flesh and spirit, sharp agonies, and the pangs of death.

And this love is exceedingly enhanced, while we consider that this human soul of Christ was personally united to this divine nature; so that hereby God himself is joined to flesh and blood; "*God becomes manifest in the flesh.*" 1 Tim. iii. 16.

But on the other hand, if we suppose nothing but the pure divine nature of Christ to exist before his incarnation, then all these expressions seem to have very little justness or propriety in them; for the divine nature of Christ, how distinct soever it is supposed to be from God the Father, yet can never leave the Father's bosom, can never divest itself of any one joy or felicity that it was ever possessed of, nor lose even the least degree of it; nor could God the Father ever dismiss the divine nature of his Son from his own bosom. Godhead must have eternal and complete beatitude, joy and glory, and can never be dispossessed of it. Godhead can sustain no real sorrow, suffering or pain.—The utmost that can be said concerning the deity of Christ is, that there is a relative imputation of the sorrows, sufferings and pains of the human nature, to the divine, because of the union between them; so that the sufferings acquire a sort of divine dignity and merit hereby: It is granted indeed that this relative and imputative suffering may be sufficient in a legal sense to advance the dignity of the sacrifice of Christ, to a complete and equivalent satisfaction for sin; yet the exceeding greatness of the love of the Father and the Son does not seem to be so sensibly

manifested to us hereby, for all this abasement of the godhead of Christ is merely relative and not real.

And as it is plain that the divine nature of Christ could not be separated from the bosom of his Father, when he came into this world and took flesh upon him, so neither could the human nature leave this bosom of the Father, if it had no prior existence, and was never there. Therefore in the common scheme of this glorious and pathetic representation of the love of Christ leaving the joys and glories of heaven when he came to dwell on earth, has no ideas belonging to it, and it can be true in no sense, since it can neither be attributed to the human nor to the divine nature of Christ, nor to his whole person. I grant that the figure of communication of properties, what is true of one nature may be attributed to the whole person, or sometimes to the other nature; yet that which is not true concerning either nature of Christ separated, nor concerning the two natures united, cannot be attributed to him at all: So that parting with the bosom of his Father, and forsaking the joys and glories he possessed there, are, according to the common scheme, words of which we have no ideas.

But now if we conceive the soul of Christ in its pre-existent state, as the first-born of every creature, the darling of the soul of God, who, as it were, lay in the bosom of the Father, to come forth from the Father and come into this world; John xvi.

1. to part with the joys and glories it was possessed of there before the foundation of the world; John xvii. 5. to dwell in a humble mansion of flesh and blood, pain and sorrow, to be cramped and confined in human limbs, and to sustain the pangs and punishment of a cursed death on the cross for the sake of rebellious creatures. This is amazing love indeed; this has a surprising and sensible reality in it, and should awaken all the powers of our souls to admire and adore both God the Father for sending his Son Jesus Christ, and Christ himself for consenting to such an abasement.

SECTION II.—It has been made evident in the foregoing section that our best divines following the track of scripture light and the sacred dictates of the word of God, have set the transcendent love of God the Father in sending his Son, and the love of Christ in his incarnation and death, in a most beautiful and striking light, if we suppose the soul of Christ to have had a pre-existent state of joy and glory with the Father before the world was. But I fear their expressions are scarce consistent with any clear or just ideas or conceptions, while they deny each of the human nature of Christ, that is, his soul as well as body, to exist before his incarnation.

There is yet another and a very remarkable instance where our protestant divines in a very just and affecting manner re-

present the covenant of redemption between the Father and the Son according to scripture, upon the supposition of the pre-existence of Christ's human soul: But according to the common or scholastic explication of the distinction of persons in the Trinity, and the denial of this pre-existent soul of Christ, we can have no ideas under all their glorious and affectionate representations of this transaction between the Father and the Son. Let us enquire a little into this matter.

The common or scholastic explication of the Trinity, which has been long universally received by our protestant writers, and has been called orthodox for these several hundred years, is this, viz. That God is but one simple, infinite and eternal Spirit:—Thence it follows, that the divine essence, powers, and essential properties of the Father, the Son and the Spirit in the godhead, are numerically the very same essence, powers, and essential properties: That it is the same numerical consciousness, understanding, will and power which belongs to the Father that belongs also to the Son and to the holy Spirit; and that the sacred three are distinguished only by the superadded relative properties of paternity, filiation and procession; but their thoughts, ideas, volitions and agencies, according to this hypothesis, must be the very same numerical thoughts, ideas, actions, and volitions, in all the sacred three.

Now having these excellent Sermons of Mr. Flavel before me, who has well represented this doctrine of the covenant of Redemption, and the transactions between God the Father and his Son before the world was, I would cite some part of that discourse, in order to shew how well his representation of this matter agrees with the doctrine of the pre-existent soul of Christ, though it can never agree to the common explication of the Trinity without it. See Sermon III. page 23, &c.

“ 1. Consider the persons transacting and dealing with each other in this covenant: These are God the Father, and God the Son: the former as a creditor, the latter as a surety: the Father stands upon satisfaction, the Son engages to give it.”

“ 2. Consider the business transacted between them, and that was the redemption and recovery of all God's elect.”

“ 3. The manner or quality of this transaction: It was federal, or in the nature of a covenant: It was by mutual engagements and stipulations, each person undertaking to perform his part in order to our recovery, The Father promiseth that he will hold his hand and keep him; Isa. xlii. 6. The Son promiseth that he will obey his Father's call to suffering, and not be rebellious; Isa. l. 5. and having promised, each holds the other to his engagement.”

“ 4. Consider the articles to which they both agree: God the Father promises to invest him with a three-fold office, viz. to make him a Priest; Pa. cx. 4. The Lord hath sworn and will

pent, thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedech; Heb. v. 5. Christ glorified not himself to be made a High Priest, but he that said unto him thou art my Son. God the Father promises to make him a Prophet; Isa. xlii. 6. I will give thee light to the Gentiles, to open blind eyes. And to make him King; Ps. ii. 6, 7. Ask of me, and I will give thee the inheritance. Further, the Father promiseth to assist him, to strengthen him for this work: Isa. xli. 6, 7. I will hold thy hand, that is, I will underprop and support thy humanity when it is ready to sink under the burden. He promiseth to crown his work with success, to accept him in his work, and to reward him for it with great exaltation; Ps. ii. 6, 7. I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said unto me, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. It is spoken of the Father of his resurrection when he had just finished his suffering, and so the apostle expounds and applies it; Acts xiii. 33. in Heb. xii. 2. This was "the joy that was set before him which encouraged him to endure the cross, and despise the shame."

‘ In like manner Jesus Christ re-stipulates and gives his assent to the Father, that upon these terms he is content to take flesh, to divest himself as it were of his glory, to come to the obedience and malediction of the law, and not to refuse to undergo the hardest sufferings it should please the Father to inflict upon him. Ps. xl. 6, 7. Then said I, lo, I come, I delight to do thy will, O God.

‘ 5. These articles were by both parties performed precisely and punctually.”

‘ 6. This compact between the Father and the Son bears date from eternity, before this world was made; while as yet we had no existence, but only in the infinite mind and purpose of God; 2 Tim. i. 9. "The grace which was given us in Christ before the world began" was this grace of redemption, which everlastingly was thus contrived and designed for us. Then the council or consultation of peace between them both, as we take that scripture; Zech. vi. 13.

‘ Page 28. God the Father and God the Son do mutually rely upon each other in the business of our redemption. The Father relies upon the Son for the performance of his part. The Son so far trusted Christ, that upon the credit of his promise he came into the world and in the fulness of time to become a sacrifice for the elect, he saved all the Old Testament saints.—so doth Christ in like manner depend upon and trust his Father for the accomplishment of all this promise, that he shall see the elect; and that all the elect that are yet behind, yet unrege-nerated, as well as those already called, shall be preserved to the heavenly kingdom.”

Page 29. This excellent author, represents this transaction between the Father and the Son before the world was in a way of dialogue: He supposes the Father to say, "My Son, here be a company of poor miserable souls that have utterly undone themselves, and now lie open to my justice; justice demands satisfaction for them, or will satisfy itself in the eternal ruin of them. What shall be done for these souls?" And thus Christ replies: "O my Father! Such is my love to, and pity for them, that rather than they shall perish eternally, I will be responsible for them as their surety; I will rather chuse to suffer thy wrath than they should suffer it; I will rather chuse to suffer thy wrath than they should suffer it; charge their debt all upon me, I am able to discharge it: And though it impoverish all my riches, and empty all my treasures, (for so it did indeed; 2 Cor. viii. 9. *Though he were rich, yet for our sakes he became poor;*) I am content to undertake it."

Here I again desire my reader to observe, I cite not the words of that great and excellent man to refute them, for I greatly approve of almost every expression; much less would I expose that venerable author, whose memory and writings I sincerely reverence and honour; but my design is to shew what is the usual language of our best divines on this subject, for I might cite passages of the like nature out of a multitude of excellent writers. This is only a specimen of one for the rest.

Now in reading over such accounts of stipulations and contract between the Father and the Son before the foundation of the world, what proper conceptions can we frame, or what clear ideas can we possibly have, while we suppose nothing but Christ's divine nature transacting this affair with the Father; and while at the same time we believe the divine essence, perfections and powers the understanding, will, thought and consciousness of the Father and of the Son to be numerically one and the same, since in the godhead or divine nature, they are but one and the same infinite Spirit? The mere personalities, viz. paternity and filiation, cannot consult and transact these affairs in a way of contract, proposal and consent: It is nothing but two distinct consciousnesses and two distinct wills can enter into such a covenant; but in the common explication of the Trinity, the distinct personalities of the Father and the Son do not make any real distinct consciousnesses or distinct wills in the one infinite Spirit.

And let it be further noted also, that according to several of the articles of this covenant, one of these beings or persons covenanting, seems to be inferior to the other, and to be capable of receiving orders, commission, support and recompence from the other: But if only the deity of Christ existed at that time, and the deity of Christ and of the Father have but one and the same numerical consciousness and volition, one and the same numerical power and glory, what need of orders and commis-

ions, what need of promises of support and recompence? How can the pure godhead of Christ be supported, or be recompensed by the Father, who has eternally the same numerical glory and power? In short, all these sacred and pathetic representations of stipulation and articles in the common scheme, can amount to no more in our clear ideas, and in a proper conception of things, than the simple decree or volition of the one eternal, infinite Spirit.

I grant we may suppose the great God in a figurative manner of speech consulting thus with his own wisdom, with the divine powers or principles of agency in his own nature, as a man may be figuratively said to consult with his own understanding, or reason, or conscience: But in literal and proper language, it seems to be nothing else but an absolute decree of the great God, that the man Christ Jesus, when formed and united to godhead, should undertake and fulfil this work, four thousand years after this world was made. And thus, according to the common hypothesis, that very intelligent being which was to come into flesh, and to sustain all the real sufferings, gave no such early antecedent consent to this covenant. It was only the godhead of Christ, which is impassible and could really suffer, nothing, did decree that the human nature should exist hereafter, that it should be united to the godhead, and should sustain agonies and death for the sins of men.

I would enquire farther also, according to this explication of things, what possible difference can we conceive between the love of the Father in sending his Son, and the love of the Son in consenting to be sent on this compassionate errand, if there were not two distinct consciousnesses, and two distinct wills, if it was only one simple numerical volition of the great God? And how doth this abate our grand ideas of the distinct and condescending love of our blessed Saviour, in his consent to this covenant, since that part of him which really suffered, that is, his inferior nature, had then no existence, and therefore could give no consent to this early covenant of redemption. If some of these difficulties may possibly obtain any tolerable solution, by introducing many figures of speech, and be thus explained, according to the common explication of the Trinity, without supposing the pre-existence of the human soul of Christ, yet I am much inclined to think they can never be all solved or explained upon that hypothesis.

But on the other hand, if we give ourselves leave to conceive of the human soul of our Lord Jesus Christ in its pre-existent state as the  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , the first-born of every creature; Col. i. 15. as the  $\alpha\rho\chi\eta$ , that is, the beginning or the chief of the creation of God; Rev. iii. 14. lying in the bosom of the Father; John i. 18. and intimately united to the eternal God, then

here are proper subjects for these federal transactions in the covenant of redemption before the foundation of the world. And a most glorious and divine covenant it was between the Father and the Son in this view of things for the salvation of poor ruined man.

Though this blessed soul of Christ were united immediately to the divine nature, yet God the Father might part with it, as it were, out of his own bosom, that is, divest it of heavenly joys and glories\* by its own consent, without dissolving the union: God the Father might prepare a body for it, and send it to dwell in flesh and blood: God might inflict the punishment of our sins upon this blessed soul of Christ incarnate, and afterwards give it a high exaltation, not only to the glory which it had with the Father before the world was, but to superior joys and glories as the reward of its sufferings, according to scripture; John xvii. 5. and Phil. ii. 9.

And this blessed soul of Christ united to godhead, is a proper subject to enter into these articles, to accept of the terms of this covenant of redemption, to consent to part with the bosom of the Father, &c. And thus Christ, when he came forth from the Father, and came into this world; John xvi. 28. laid aside *that glory which he had with the Father before the world was*; John xvii. 5. *and though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor*; 2 Cor. viii. 9. And thus the Father and the Son manifest their transcendent love to poor rebel sinners in this federal transaction, this covenant of redemption before time began, which is the foundation of all that was ever done in time toward the restitution of the posterity of Adam, to the favour and the image of God, and to everlasting happiness. Every thing coincides admirably well in this scheme, and answers the various expressions of scripture on this subject, without straining the words by needless tropes and figures: It becomes so plain, that he that runs may read it, and every private christian may understand these early grounds and foundations of his hope.

#### ADVERTISEMENT.

Note, in a few months will be published a large and more complete treatise on this subject, viz. "The pre-existent Soul of our Lord Jesus Christ."\*

\* Note, This divesting of the soul of Christ of its primitive joys and glories does not require a dissolution of its union to the divine nature; for the godhead may be still united, and yet may influence the human soul in greater or less degrees, and in various manners, as to light, support, joy, glory, &c. according to different occasions and circumstances, which must be exceeding different in a state of humiliation and of exaltation; and the manner and the degree of influence must always be determined only by the divine wisdom.

\* This hath been published, and is entitled "the Glory of Christ as God-man displayed."

**QUEST. IV.**—*Is the Godhead of Christ and the Godhead of the Father one and the same Godhead ?*

**THERE** are several considerations which lead me to agree with this general opinion of almost all our divines in the two last centuries, viz. that the godhead of Christ is the same individual godhead with that of the Father ; and that his divine nature is not another infinite Spirit distinct from the Father, whatsoever sublime distinctions there may be in that one infinite Spirit, one of which, viz. the Word or wisdom, may perhaps have a more peculiar respect to the second person in the Trinity, viz. the Son ; and the other, viz. the power of God ; to the Holy Ghost.

1. If the divine nature of Christ be another distinct principle of self-consciousness and volition, another distinct spiritual being, or another spirit, this approaches so near to the doctrine of another God, that it is very hard to distinguish it. For so far as our ideas of arithmetic and reason can reach, this seems to be plain truth, " If one infinite spirit be one God, two or three finite spirits must be two or three Gods." And though the patrons of this opinion suppose these three spirits to be so nearly united as to be called one God merely to avoid the charge of polytheism, yet it must be granted, that this one God must then be one complex infinite being, or spirit, made up of three single finite beings or spirits ; which is such a notion of the one true God, as I think neither reason nor revelation will admit. And if this were the true notion of the one God, it is very strange that scripture should not clearly and expressly reveal it.

The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the God of Israel, the Almighty, and Jehovah, is the proper style and title by which God the Father was known under the Old Testament : and it is under these titles and characters that he often appeared to the patriarchs : yet it is agreed by all Trinitarians that it was Jesus Christ appeared to the Patriarchs, and assumed this style and these titles of godhead ; which we justly suppose he could not have assumed if he had not had true godhead belonging to his complex person. And not only so, but this true godhead must also be the godhead of the Father, otherwise he could not have assumed those very titles by which God the Father was always known to the church, and by which they worshipped him as the God and Father of all. If the deity of Christ were another distinct person or spirit, his assuming those names whereby God the Father only was known to the Israelites, would lead them into mistake and confusion.

**Objection.** I know it may be objected here, that Christ's assuming the names and titles of God the Father would lead them into as much confusion and mistake, by leading them to believe that Christ was God the Father, and it may be urged yet further, that these titles thus assumed, would prove that Christ



was God, no more than that it does prove that Christ was the Father.

**Answer.** If Christ has the same godhead as the Father, and if in these ancient appearances Christ came in the name of the Father, as his representative, there is no great inconvenience nor confusion if he were taken for God the Father, speaking and acting in and by *the angel of the covenant*, or Jesus Christ in his pre-existent state : But there would be great confusion and inconvenience in Christ's assuming these divine names, if he had not godhead belonging to him, for then we should take a creature for God.

3. Several scriptures of the Old Testament, which are cited by the writers of the New Testament and applied to Christ, do most evidently refer to the great one God, the God of Israel, the Almighty, the Jehovah in the Old Testament, whom all that read the Old Testament before the days of Christ must suppose to mean God the Father of all ; such as Ps. lxxviii. 18. *Thou hast ascended on high* ; cited Eph. iv. 8. And Ps. xcvi. 7. *Worship him all ye gods* ; cited Heb. i. 6. and Ps. cii. 24, 25. *O my God, of old thou hast laid the foundations of the earth* ; cited Heb. i. 10. And Isa. xl. 3, 4, 5. *Prepare ye the way of the Lord* ; cited Mat. iii. 3. And Joel ii. 32. *Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered* ; cited Heb. xii. 26. And Isa. viii. 13, 14. *Sanctify the Lord of hosts, and he shall be for a stone of stumbling* ; cited 1 Pet. ii. 6. 8. and several other places.

Now we cannot suppose, that all the holy men before Christ were utterly mistaken in their application of these texts to God the Father, since there is a plain and proper sense wherein this application is true. And yet these texts are properly applied to Christ, if we suppose the godhead of the Father and of Christ to be the same, and that the man Christ Jesus was the shekinah or habitation of the great God intimately and personally united to him, and so made one person with him, but still under the character of filiation or mediation. And in this sense Christ was Emmanuel, or God with us ; Mat. i. 23.

Besides, let it be further considered, that the design of the apostles in the citation of these texts, and the application of them to Christ, was to prove the glory, dignity and divine grandeur of the complex person of Christ : But this citation of these texts, and the application of them to Christ, will scarce prove the godhead of Christ, unless he has the same godhead with that of the Father ; nor indeed will they prove the dignity or glory of the person of Christ any other way ; but as they shew that what was spoken of old concerning the godhead of the Father must necessarily belong also to Christ. If Christ considered as God were another distinct spirit from the godhead of the Father, I think

se citations of the apostle out of the prophets would hardly prove his godhead; nor do I see how they could prove the grandeur and dignity of his person, unless it were granted that the Word of the Father was his godhead, that Christ and the Father are one in this respect.

4. When Christ expresses his own godhead in the New Testament, it is by declaring his oneness with the Father, that the union of the man Christ Jesus with the same godhead is in the Father. *I and the Father are one*; John x. 30. *that hath seen me, hath seen the Father. I am in the Father, and the Father in me. The Father in me doth the works*; John xiv. 9, 10. And it must be observed that there is not any place in the New Testament where the miraculous works of Christ are ascribed to any distinct godhead of his own different from the godhead of the Father, or the godhead of the Spirit of God that dwelt in him: And it is not reasonable to suppose that Christ would have always used these modes of speaking, and attributed his own works to the Father and his Spirit, if he himself had another godhead or divine nature different from that of the Father and the Spirit: For why should his miraculous works be attributed to the aids of another infinite spirit which was not united to the man Jesus, and never be ascribed at all to that distinct spirit which is supposed to be united to him? I am sure such a sort of representation leads our thoughts away from supposing Christ to have any godhead at all, if it be not the same as the Father's.

5. If the godhead of Christ be another distinct spiritual being different from the godhead of the Father, I do not see any clear and reasonable manner, how the Trinitarians can solve the difficulties which arise from those scriptures, where God the Father is represented as the only true God, and under that idea distinguished from Jesus Christ; as John xvii. 3. *To know thee is only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* Cor. viii. 6. *To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things.* Eph. iv. 5, 6. *There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all.* Now we can scarce suppose the highest nature of Jesus Christ to be another infinite spirit distinct from God the Father, without excluding it from godhead in these express scriptures: but they may easily be explained to admit Christ's godhead, if we suppose Christ to be spoken of in these places chiefly in his inferior characters as man and mediator; and yet he may be united to, and inhabited by the one true and eternal God, who is at other times called the Father, as being vested with different relative properties, and first in the great economy, as I have sufficiently shewn in other papers.

I add also, those texts in the prophets, where it is said; *I*

*am God, and there is none else, there is none besides me, I know not any*; Isa. xlv. 6, 8. and lxxv. 21, 22. give a further confirmation to this sentiment. For, whether we suppose the Father or the Son to be the speaker here, it is still with an exclusion of any other being, any other spirit from the claim of godhead besides the one infinite Spirit, the one true and eternal God, the God of Israel; and if our Saviour Jesus Christ be not that one true eternal God, that one and the same infinite Spirit with the Father, these exclusive sentences would hardly admit Christ and the Father too, to be the one true eternal God. It is granted indeed that Christ is another spirit as he is man, and that other, viz. the human spirit, is not in himself properly God; but only by being united to true godhead, even the man Jesus may be so called by the communication of properties. But since the godhead of Christ is still the very same godhead with that of the Father, Christ is not excluded from godhead by these strong exclusive expressions.

6. When our Saviour foretold that his disciples should leave him alone, he adds, John xvi. 32 *And yet I am not alone because the Father is with me.* Now if his godhead had been distinct or different from the godhead of the Father, he needed not the presence of the Father with him for his support; his own godhead would have been all-sufficient: But if his own godhead be the same with that of the Father, then there is no difficulty in the expression.

There are several places in the New Testament, where the words God, Christ, and the Lord in the same paragraph are used very promiscuously, so that one can hardly tell where Christ is spoken of, and where God the Father; particularly, Rom. xiv. 6—12. Other places where God the Father and Christ are called our Saviour promiscuously, and perhaps God our Saviour, &c. Tit. i. 3, ii. 13. Jude verses 4, 25. at least there is some difficulty in such places to determine which is meant; which would hardly have been left liable to so promiscuous a construction, if Christ had not been true God, and if his godhead had not been the same with that of the Father.

8. That the primitive christians worshipped Christ, is sufficiently evident from the sacred history: Yet we never find that the Jews of that day, who were implacably set against them, ever accused them of idolatry, or creature-worship, though that charge would have best served their purpose to blast and destroy this new religion. Nor can we reasonably suppose, that if the Jews had made this objection, the sacred writers would have omitted to tell us so, because this would have been so important and forcible an objection against christianity, that it would have required a very particular answer, that so christians in all ages might have been taught to defend their practice.

Thence we must infer, that when the primitive christians worshipped Christ, they cannot be supposed to worship a mere creature, or any other but the true God of Israel; for the Jews would then certainly have charged them with creature-worship or idolatry. Now this true God of Israel was God represented as the Creator, the Author, and the Father of all; it was that God who sustains the supreme character of dominion and majesty, and maintains the dignity and the rights of godhead; it was that God who so often foretold the sending of his Son Jesus Christ, and this is God the Father. It is therefore this one godhead, which is in the Father, which is the same with the godhead of his Son Jesus Christ, but under a distinct personality: It is the same one God whom the christians worshipped, when they worshipped Christ as *God manifest in the flesh*. It was the same divine nature or godhead which the ancient Jews had been used to worship, as dwelling in the cloud of glory upon the mercy-seat, and was now come to dwell in flesh and blood, to become Emmanuel, "God with us, to become God manifest in the flesh." Now there is such a mutual inhabitation and personal union between the one eternal God, and a creature in the person of Christ, as renders this complex person a proper object of worship, and this stands clear of idolatry, even in the sense of the Jews themselves, who were wont to worship God as dwelling in the cloud.

And indeed this is the only notion of the worship of Christ that could possibly agree with their own law, and with their first commandment given in Sinai, and with all their own former ideas of worship, as due only to the one God: and it is the only notion that could have been received by them without difficulty and opposition. If therefore the Son or Word be truly God, this godhead must be the same in substance with the godhead of the Father whom the Jews worshipped, otherwise he would be another God, and the Jews could not have failed to charge the christians with gross idolatry. Upon the whole therefore there seems just reason to conclude, that whatever sacred and unknown distinctions may be in the divine nature itself, and however these distinctions may lay a foundation for God's discovery of himself under three personal characters, as the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, yet the godhead of the Father seems to be the same one infinite and eternal spirit which in some particular principle or power of its own nature, or under some peculiar distinction or relation, is united to the man Christ Jesus; and hereby Jesus becomes one with God, one complex intelligent agent or person, and hereby Christ comes to have a right to those divine titles, the Lord God, the Almighty, Jehovah, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, &c.

And by this means the great and fundamental article of all

religion, the unity of the true God, is maintained inviolable: And thus we must effectually preclude all the objections and cavils of the Arian and Socinian writers against the doctrine of the blessed Trinity, and the deity of Christ, as though this doctrine introduced more gods than one. For if we suppose the man Jesus Christ in his soul and body to be both an intellectual and corporeal shekinah or habitation of the one God, the God of Israel, we may justly call Jesus Christ, *God manifest in the flesh*; 1 Tim. iii. 16. a man *in whom dwells all the fulness of the godhead bodily*; Col. ii. 9. a man of the seed of David, and yet *God over all blessed for ever*; Rom. i. 3. ix. 5. Nor is there so much as the appearance or shadow of our owning two or three gods, which has been too often, and with some appearance of reason charged upon some other modes of explaining this sacred doctrine.

QUEST. V.—*Is there an intimate union between the Lord Jesus Christ and God the Father.*

THOUGH I do not remember that the words, unite, or union\*, are any where found expressly in the writings of the New Testament, yet the idea which is designed by these words is often found in scripture: and it is the usual custom of the sacred writers to express this idea of the union of several things together by being one with another, or by one being in another, and sometimes by each being in the other mutually.

The union between the body and the soul is represented by the soul's being in the body; 2 Cor. v. 6. *at home in the body*; and xii. 3. *whether in the body, or out of the body, &c.* The union of saints to God is expressed by mutual inbeing; 1 John iv. 16. *He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God dwelleth in him.* Our union to Christ is often expressed by *Christ being in us and our being in Christ*; John xv. 4, 5. Rom. xvi. 7. and being *in the Lord*, verse 11. and in many other places. Sometimes union is expressed by both being one: so the saints who are all united in one common head are called *one body and one bread*; 1 Cor. x. 17. And as the union between man and wife is expressed by their being *one flesh*; 1 Cor. vi. 16. *so he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit*, verse 17. The union between Jesus Christ and God the Father is expressed by all these ways, viz. by an inbeing of Christ in the Father, and the Father in him, and by oneness with the Father, in the writings of the apostle John. See John x. 38. *I and my Father*

\* It is granted that *συνεσις* or unity is twice found in the New Testament, viz. Eph. iv. 3, 13. but *νωσις* or *νωσις* is not used by the sacred writers: Nor is *συνεσις* used to signify the union of two things together into one.

and one; John v. 38. and xiv. 11. *I am in the Father, and the Father in me.*

But let it be always remembered that our union to God or Christ is but a mere faint shadow or resemblance of the union of Christ to God the Father; which vastly surpasses ours, and is a superior kind. This union between Christ and God the Father is so near, so intimate, so peculiar, as gives occasion for the New Testament to cite and apply to Christ many passages out of the Old Testament: which relate to the God and Father.

All the names, the characters, the properties, and the actions of the Father are given to Christ in several instances and various expressions, which are not true, nor can be admitted concerning our union to God.

Though there be but one godhead, and *one God, even the Father*; 1 Cor. viii. 6. yet by the intimate union of the man Christ Jesus with this one godhead or divine nature which is in the Father, Christ is the Lord Jehovah, he is *God manifest in the flesh*; 1 Tim. iii. 16. he is *God over all blessed for ever*; Rom. ix. 5. which would be blasphemy to say concerning Christ. So Christ is *he that searches the hearts and the reins*; Rev. ii. 23. Christ is the *alpha and omega, the first and the last*; Rev. i. 11. What the Father doth, the Son doth also in many respects: The Father created all things, so did the Son: and what the Son doth, the Father is said to do; John xiv. 10. *The Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works.*

It may not be amiss here to transcribe a few verses from this chapter; John xiv. in order to give us a clearer idea of this union and communion between the Father and Christ; since it is the design of our Lord in this place to instruct Thomas and Philip in the knowledge of God the Father and of himself; John xiv. 7—11. “If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also: And from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him. 8. Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. 9. Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father? 10. Believest thou not, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself: But the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works. 11. Believe me that I am the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the many works sake.” Upon this scripture I beg leave to make these three remarks:

Remark I. This is not spoken concerning the union, the indwelling, or indwelling of any distinct divine nature of Christ, in the divine nature of the Father, but rather concerning the union

of his human nature to the same godhead that is in the Father; and that for these three reasons :

1. Because the disciples at this time were not particularly acquainted with any distinct divinity of Christ, and therefore he cannot be supposed to speak to them of this his divinity, and tell them where it was, viz. in the Father. It was as man that he conversed with them ; but as a man who had God ever with him, and he is now further explaining the intimacy of this union between God and man in his own person.

2. Though the deity of Christ considered as the eternal word or wisdom of the Father, may be said to be or dwell in the Father, yet God the Father is not said to be in his wisdom, or to dwell in his wisdom ; whereas this inbeing and indwelling of Christ and the Father are mutual in the text, *I am in the Father, and the Father in me* : it denotes the union of two really distinct Beings in one.

3. Because Christ makes this his union with the Father an exemplar or similitude of the union of the saints with God ; John xvii. 21. *That they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that also may be one in us.* The union and communion between the man Jesus and God the Father, though it is vastly superior to that of the saints, yet it is still voluntary and of mere grace, and in this respect it may properly made use of as a very glorious exemplar of our union to God and Christ : But the inbeing of the eternal word or wisdom in the Father is so essential to godhead, it so infinitely transcends all his voluntary and condescending union to us, and is so infinitely different from it, that it does not seem to be a proper exemplar or pattern thereof, I much rather conclude therefore, that the union here described is the union between God the Father and the man Christ Jesus, or between the same divine nature which is in the Father and the human nature of Christ.

Remark II. Jesus Christ neither in this place nor in any other doth ever ascribe his divine works to any other divine power of his own, or to any other godhead of his own, distinct and different from the godhead of the Father. *I live by the Father* ; John xiv. 19. The Father is in me, and it is the Father in me that doth the works ; John xiv. 10. It is but one godhead of the Father and the Son ; not two divine natures or two godheads, for this would seem to make two gods. Nor has the Holy Spirit to whom sometimes Christ ascribes his works, any godhead different from that of the Father.

Remark III. Let it be observed further, that when our Saviour tells his disciples, and particularly informs Thomas and Philip, that by " seeing and knowing the Son, they see and know the Father also," he does not give this reason for it, viz. that he is the very image of the Father, or the representative or

is vicegerent of the Father, though these are great truths : but gives this reason, that there is a most intimate union or oneness between the Father and him. *I am in the Father and the Father in me* : and so near and so intimate is this union, that he attributes the words which he speaks and the works which he does to the Father, verse 10. that is, to the godhead of the Father dwelling in him. Thus "Christ and his Father are one ;" John 30. One godhead belong to both.

From all this we may reasonably infer, that when the names, titles and works of the true and eternal God are prophetically attributed to Jesus Christ under the Old Testament, or historically in the New, it is not so much because his human soul is the image, representative or deputy of the Father, as the Arians say ; but because the very godhead of the Father dwells personally in the man Jesus : *the fulness of the godhead dwells in him bodily* ; Gal. ii. 9. so as on some occasions to give a sufficient ground for the representation of Christ as God-man, or one complex person including a divine and human nature ; though on other occasions Christ is represented as a man, and is called *the man Christ Jesus* the Mediator ; as in 1 Tim. ii. 5.

And as we find divine names and characters are given to Christ at and after his incarnation, because *the fulness of the godhead dwelt bodily* in the man Jesus ; Col. ii. 9. and thereby became *God manifest in the flesh* ; 1 Tim. iii. 16. so before his incarnation, when the angel of the Lord who appeared to the patriarchs calls himself the Lord, God, Jehovah, God Almighty, and the God of Abraham, we very reasonably account for it in the same manner, viz. That the fulness of the godhead dwelt in him spiritually, that there was the human Spirit of our blessed Saviour in his pre-existent or angelic state, inhabited by the great and almighty God, and composing as it were one complex person, one complex intelligent agent in those appearances.

Objection. But does not this represent Christ as being the Father ? Doth not this suppose God the Father to be incarnate, which is contrary to the common expressions of scripture, and use of the primitive church ?

Answer I. Almost all the protestant writers that have been quoted most orthodox for some hundreds of years past, both in foreign countries and at home, have universally supposed the very same numerical godhead of the Father to be the godhead of the Son, and that it is the same infinite Spirit, the same understanding and the same will, which exists in the Father with one relative property, that is also incarnate in the Son with another relative property : Only they suppose the superadded idea or relative property of fatherhood is not incarnate, but the superadded relative property of sonship. Now I cannot reasonably fear any just inferences from those who follow this doctrine of all our reformed



predecessors, because their opinion comes so very near to, or rather is the same with what I have asserted, though they add some human phrases to it, of which I have not yet been able to attain any ideas.

II. Though the same numerical godhead belong to the Father and to the Son, yet it is not proper to say, the Father is incarnate, because the idea of fatherhood superadded to the godhead, includes the idea of the prime Agent, and supreme Ruler in the divine economy; whereas the idea of incarnation belongs properly to one that is sent in order to become a Mediator between God and man, and this belongs properly to the Son, as I shall shew immediately.

III. Though in general we may suppose the very godhead of the Father to be united to the man Christ Jesus, according to these expressions in the tenth and fourteenth of John, and elsewhere, yet some have supposed there are other scriptures which represent Christ in his divine nature, as the word or wisdom of the Father, as a peculiar essential principle of self-manifestation in the divine nature: And if scripture does represent the great God under the peculiar idea or character of his wisdom or word, as manifesting itself in flesh, it is not so proper to say, God the Father was incarnate, but that the word or wisdom of God was made flesh, though the godhead of the Word is the same with that of the Father; for the wisdom of God is God. But I insist not on this answer, and therefore proceed.

IV. The pre-existent soul of Christ, in whom the divine nature or godhead always dwelt, is properly the Son of God, derived, from the Father before all worlds, as his only-begotten Son, *the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person*; Heb. i. 3. And this glorious human soul who lived many ages in an angelic state, and was the angel of God's presence, does seem to be the more immediate subject of incarnation. The Son of God properly took flesh upon him, and, shall I say, became as it were a medium, in and by which the divine nature of godhead was united to flesh and blood. Thus Christ is properly called God manifest in the flesh, because true godhead always dwelt in his human soul who is now incarnate: and he is properly called the Son of God manifest in the flesh, or Christ come in the flesh, because his human soul, who was properly the Son of God, was more immediately the subject of union to flesh and blood. And thus the expressions of St. Paul and St. John are reconciled; 1 Tim. iii. 16. *God was manifest in the flesh*: and 1 John iii. 8. *The Son of God was manifested*; and 1 John iv. 2. *Jesus Christ is come in the flesh*.

This sort of exposition of these texts wherein Jesus Christ and God the Father are represented as one, or as mutually in-being and indwelling in each other, seems more exactly agree-

to the whole tenor of scripture, and best maintains the unity of the godhead, which is the foundation of all religion both natural and revealed; nor is it liable to those cavils, objections and inconveniencies with which other expositions are attended.

This exposition is free from those obscurities which attend mutual inbeing and indwelling of the Father and the Son considered purely in their divine natures, which the learned have denied *ἐμπροσθεν* and circum-incession. We can hardly suppose the Saviour intended that notion in John xiv. 7, &c. because it is so mysterious and sublime beyond all the ideas that Philip and Thomas could frame at that season: And therefore he cannot imagine that Christ would go to amuse them with such unsearchables, when they desired some instruction from him in the knowledge of God the Father.

This account of things plainly, intelligibly, and effectually represents the true, proper, and eternal deity to God the Father, and our blessed Saviour, and that in two distinct persons, without producing any other godhead besides the godhead of the Father. Thus God the Father is the only true God originally, and Jesus the Son of God, by union to, and communion in the head of the Father, is also "the true God and the eternal;" 1 John v. 20. *And this is eternal life to know the Father only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent;* John 1. 8.

---

QUEST. VI.—*Is Christ the express Image of God the Father in the human Nature, or in the divine;*

ANSWER.—*In the human Nature.*

IN several places of scripture our Saviour is represented as the image of God: 2 Cor. iv. 4. *Christ who is the image of God.* Col. i. 15. *The image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature.* Heb. i. 3. *The brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person, whom he hath appointed heir of all things.* Now it is an important enquiry what sense in which Jesus Christ is the image of God the Father. It has been the custom of many theological writers to suppose Christ in his pure divine nature to be this image of the Father to which the scripture refers: but there are some reasons which seem to oppose this opinion, and incline me to withhold my assent from it at present.

1. That our protestant divines have almost universally supposed the godhead or divine nature of Christ to be the self-same, simple, numerical godhead, nature or essence which the Father has, and differing only in his personality, or manner of subsist-

ence, that is, filiation ; whereas the Father's manner of subsistence is paternity. Now, according to this doctrine, the divine nature of Christ can neither be the image of the Father in his essence, nor in his personality and subsistence. The divine nature of Christ cannot be the image of the Father's essence because it is numerically the very same essence, and nothing is said to be the image of itself. Neither can the peculiar subsistence or personality of Christ as God, be the image of the Father's personality or subsistence ; for sonship or filiation is by no means an image of paternity or fatherhood, but is rather the very reverse, or contrary to it. A derived manner of subsistence can never be the express image of an undervived manner of subsistence. If therefore the person of Christ considered as God, be the same numerical godhead with the Father, together with a distinct personality, that is, filiation, and if he is neither the image of the Father's godhead nor his personality ; then Christ, considered merely in his divine nature, cannot be the express image of the Father.

2. Another reason why Christ as God, is not the image of God the Father, is because he is called the image of the invisible God. Now the godhead of Christ is as much invisible as the Father's godhead is ; and therefore when he is called the image of the invisible God, it must signify, he is that image whereby God becomes visible, or is made known to men ; and for this reason this title of Christ must include such a nature in Christ whereby the invisible God is made known to mankind, that is, it must include something of his inferior or human nature, and perhaps has a prime reference thereto.

3. When Christ is called the image of God in some scriptures, it would naturally lead us to conceive him distinct from, and in some sense inferior to that God whose image he is ; and therefore it doth as naturally lead one to conceive Christ's godhead is not denoted in those scriptures ; for the godhead of Christ and the Father is one, whereas the image is something inferior to the original. Let it be noted also, that every man is called the image of God ; 1 Cor. xi. 7. And therefore this seems to be too low a character of Christ, considered in his pure godhead. But there are three senses in which Christ is the most noble image of God.

1. This title most admirably agrees to Christ considered as man : His human soul is the first, the greatest, the wisest, the holiest, and the best of all created spirits : The man Jesus is the wisest, holiest and best of men, formed after the image of God in the greatest perfection ; and probably his human soul in his pre-existent state was the first-born of every creature, and the beginning or chief of the creation of God, and who hath more of resemblance to God in all natural and in all moral perfections than any man ever had, or than the whole creation besides.

2. And if it be further considered that this glorious man Jesus Christ even in his pre-existent, as well as in his incarnate state, is intimately united to his divine nature, that is, to the same godhead that belongs to the Father, or to the eternal Word or wisdom of God; then the very perfections of God himself shine through the human nature of Christ, in a most resplendent manner: Christ as God-man is indeed *the brightness of his Father's glory, and the most express image of his person*: and in this sense it may be granted that Christ is such an image of God as to be also God himself, *God manifest in the flesh*; 1 Tim. i. 16. *God over all blessed for ever*; Rom. ix. 5. Thus far we have seen in what sense Christ may be called the image of God the Father, in the very constitution of his person: Let us also now consider him,

3. In his character of Mediator; and so he becomes the image of the invisible God in yet a farther sense. He is the Father's ambassador to us, and in that sense he is the image of God, inasmuch as he represents God among men. He is also *King of kings and Lord of lords*, vested with a sovereign dominion over all things by the appointment of the Father; and therefore he may be called the express image of his Father's person, as he is appointed heir and Lord of all things: And as Adam was the image of God, in his dominion over creatures in this world, so Christ is a much more glorious image of God the Father in his dominion over the upper and lower worlds. Thus, though our blessed Saviour considered in his pure godhead or divine nature cannot be so properly called *the image of the invisible God, or the express image of the Father*, yet considered, 1. as man, 2. as God-man, or 3. as Mediator, those ascriptions may very properly belong to him.

Note, In another treatise which will be published in a few months, concerning the glory of Christ as God-man,\* and the pre-existence of his human soul, there will be an abridgment of a larger discourse of the Rev. Dr. Goodwin's, concerning "the Honours and Royalties of Jesus Christ considered as God-man; and of his being the express Image of the Father."

QUEST. VII.—*Are the Worship of God and his Son Jesus Christ consistent with one another?*

1. GOD is a Spirit, that is, a being who has understanding and will, infinite in knowledge, and in power, and in every perfection.

2. There is but only living and true God, that is, one infinite Spirit. And I express myself thus, lest if we suppose more

\* This was published 1746.

infinite spirits than one, we should give occasion to say, we believed more gods than one. Three infinite spirits seem to me to be three gods.

3. This one true God is the only proper object of divine or religious worship. This doctrine was asserted by Moses, supported by the prophets, and confirmed by the Lord Jesus Christ himself.

4. In scripture Christ expressly calls God the Father *the only true God*, as distinct from himself; John xvii. 3. And the apostle Paul confirms it, *To us there is but one God, even the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things*; 1 Cor. viii. 6.

5. Jesus Christ, who is the Son of God, is evidently represented in scripture as another distinct Spirit different from God the Father, both before and after his incarnation. Before his incarnation he had a distinct consciousness or understanding, whereby he knew and was conscious of his own appointment to various services and his own mission by the Father; he knew all the offices he himself was to sustain, the flesh and blood he was to take upon him, and the work that he was sent to do by the Father's appointment. These personal consciousnesses of Christ are all different from the personal or individual consciousness of God the Father. Christ had also a distinct will, different from the Father, whereby he consented to what the Father's will ordained concerning him, he accepted of the mediatorial office at the Father's hand, and by his own will submitted to that incarnation which the will of the Father appointed for him: All this before he was actually incarnate. *Lo, I come to do thy will O God; a body thou hast prepared for me*; Psal. xl. 6. Heb. x. 5. As for his appearance after his incarnation, it is sufficiently evident he is another distinct spirit, different from the true and eternal God the Father; for he was conscious of his wearing flesh and blood, and of all the sensations of hunger, thirst, and pain, which he derived thence: He was then complete man in body and soul, who knew and worshipped and obeyed his Father and his God. His own words confirm this: *I came not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me*; John vi. 38 *Father, not my will, but thine be done*; Luke xxii. 42.

6. Yet this Son of God often appears in scripture as the object of divine or religious worship. It is thus in some places of the Old Testament, when he appeared as the angel of God's presence; for Abraham, Moses and Joshua worshipped him as *the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, and as *Jehovah*, and as *the captain of the host of the Lord*: and in Psal. xlv. 11. we are required to worship him; *He is thy Lord, and worship thou him*. And that we have several examples of worship paid to our Lord Jesus Christ in the New Testament, especially after his resurrection and his ascension, is evident from the writ-

ings of the evangelists and the apostles. St. Stephen worshipped him, *Lord Jesus receive my spirit* : Acts vii. 59. and St. Paul, 2 Cor. xii. 8. *For this I besought the Lord thrice.* And all the saints and angels in heaven do worship him ; Rev. i. 12, 13.

7. Thence it must follow that Jesus Christ the Son of God, though he be a distinct Spirit, yet he must be some way one with the true and eternal God, that he may be a proper object of religious or divine worship. Thus he expresses himself ; John x. 30. *I and my Father are one.* He must be some way the same God, or the same infinite Spirit with the Father, while he is also another distinct inferior Spirit, different from the Father.

8. Scripture does not teach us to conceive how this can be, but by so near an union between this supreme or infinite Spirit and the inferior or finite Spirit, as may constitute one compound person, one complex agent or principle of action, one complex object of honour, that is, God and man. And thus the Son of God seems to be represented often in scripture as a complex person, or as two distinct spirits or beings in a personal union. In the Old Testament he is the man who conversed with Abraham and who wrestled with Jacob ; he is *the angel of the covenant, the angel in whom the name of God is, the angel of the presence of God, or a messenger sent from God, and yet he is also the Jehovah, the God of Abraham and Isaac, the I am that I am.* He is spoken of as *the child born, the Son given* ; and yet *the mighty God, and the holy one whom the angels adore.* He is represented also in the New Testament as the man that died, rose, and ascended to heaven ; and also as the Jehovah or God of Israel, who is described in the lxviii. Ps. compared with Eph. iv. 8. as *ascending on high, leading captivity captive, and receiving gifts for men. He is God manifest in the flesh* ; 1 Tim. iii. 16. or a man in whom dwells all the fullness of the godhead bodily ; Col. ii. 9. He is the Word who was with God, who was God, and who was made flesh, and tabernacled among men ; John i. 1, 14.

Now this near, intimate and unspeakable union between the man Jesus and one eternal God lays a sufficient foundation for divine names, titles, attributes, worship and honours to be ascribed to Jesus Christ the Son of God. He and the Father are one ; John x. 30. that is, so united, that one godhead is in both by this union. He is in the Father, and the Father in him. It is the Father in him that doth his wondrous works. John xiv. 6. He was in the beginning with the Father : *The Word was with God, and the Word was God* ; John i. 1.

9. With regard to the blessed Spirit of God, though I think the godhead is ascribed to him, and personal actions are some-

times attributed to him in scripture, yet as we are not expressly, plainly and particularly informed, whether he be a really distinct principle or power in God or has a proper distinct personality of himself, so neither are we expressly required to worship him in any text of the bible that I can find. Nevertheless, as divine attributes and actions, and sometimes personal characters are ascribed to the Spirit of God in the language of scripture, I think the reason of things sufficiently authorises and allows religious or divine worship to be paid to him, though we may not precisely know the manner how he is God, or how far he is a distinct person.

10. What particular distinctions may be in the godhead or divine nature itself, and how great these distinctions may be, scripture does not so evidently assert, nor so clearly explain them to us. And in this place I would not on the one hand go beyond scripture, nor on the other hand would I talk without ideas. But so far as I have represented this matter of divine worship, I think there are ideas, and those borrowed from scripture too, which go along with my words all the way; and I must acknowledge this is the clearest conception I can arrive at in representing this subject, after many years study of the scripture, and much prayer for divine instruction.

11. If we could once persuade ourselves to try to read every scripture that relates to the doctrine of the Trinity as placed in this light, without any prejudicate opinions derived from other human schemes, I think that doctrine would be found much more easy and intelligible than it is generally made; and the worship of the only true God would stand ascertained and confirmed; and yet Jesus Christ the Son of God being one with the Father, or being God and man in one complex person, might become the object of religious worship, according to the representations of scripture, and without any offence to human reason.

12. If this be the true state of things, then the one eternal God abides still the only object of worship; whether he be considered as absolute in himself under the character of the Father of all, or as united to the man Jesus Christ, and dwelling in him by a personal union. Thus the Father and the Son are both worshipped, but when the Son is worshipped, it is as one with the Father and to the glory of the Father; Phil. ii. 11.

And among other reasons this is one, why *it has pleased the Father that all the fulness of the godhead should dwell in him bodily*; Col. i. 19. ii. 9. that being so nearly united to God, or one with him, he might be a proper object of divine worship together with the Father. Rev. v. 14. *Blessing and honour, and glory and power be to him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb for ever.*

QUEST. VIII.—*What is the Worship paid to our blessed Saviour, who is the Image of God?*

Proposition I. THERE is something in the reason and nature of man that directs and inclines him to own and worship some God, or some superior Being, from whom himself and all his enjoyments are derived, and on whom his expectations depend.

II. Reason and revelation conspire to teach us that there is but one true God.

III. This one true God has required expressly in his word, that he alone should be the object of our worship or religious image: and it is several times repeated with much solemnity in the Old Testament and in the New.

IV. There is something in the nature of man that inclines him to reverence and respect the image of that Being which he worships: And the reason is evident; because the image is supposed to be something more within the reach of his senses, and therefore more suited to his bodily nature, than God who is the invisible and unseen object of his worship: or at least, because he can have the image sensibly present with him when he has not the original: and the image being supposed to have the likeness or resemblance of the original object of worship, it refreshes the memory and brings to mind the excellencies of the divine original.

If we love or honour a friend, a father, or a king, we desire to have their pictures or images near us, we pay a sort of esteem, love and veneration to those pictures, upon the account of their likeness to the original persons: and we also pay our esteem, love and veneration to the absent original by the means of these pictures. It is from this principle that the heathens in all nations, who have worshipped the sun, moon, and stars, or their kings, heroes and ancestors, have generally made statues and images of them, and either revered and worshipped the images or worshipped the originals in and by those images, or both. And for this reason, in the corrupt antichristian state, they did not only worship *the beast with seven heads and ten horns*, but they made an image thereof and worshipped it: Rev. xiii. 14, 15.

V. God has expressly forbidden men to make any image of himself and worship it, or even to make it a medium of paying his religious homage and worship to himself. The second command is most express in this matter; and this is in general esteemed by all protestant writers to be the plain sense of that commandment: And one chief reason of the command is because mankind is so prone by nature to worship images which they have made themselves.

VI. God himself has never shewn or given us any express



image of himself but one, and that is his own well-beloved Son Jesus Christ. Heb. i. 2. *He is the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person. He is the image of God,* 2 Cor. iv. 4. and in Col. i. 15. *He is the image of the invisible God.* Now this expression seems to have a prime reference to his human nature; or, as the learned and pious Doctor Goodwin asserts and proves, it must at least include his human nature in it, because every thing that relates directly to the divine nature of Christ is as invisible as God the Father, and therefore his divine nature considered alone would never have been so particularly described as the image of the invisible God.

VII. The great God himself has required us to make this his image the medium of our worship paid to him. Eph. ii. 18. *By him we have access unto the Father.* Col. iii. 17. *Give thanks to God even the Father by him.* And he also requires men and angels to worship this his image. John v. 23. *That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.* Heb. i. 6. *Let all the angels of God worship him.* Thus far has the blessed God indulged or encouraged that natural inclination in man to reverence the image of that divine Being which he worships.

VIII. To this end it has pleased the great God in a special manner to assume into the nearest union with himself this his own Son, and thereby to render him a more complete image of himself: Thus the Son, who is the express image of the Father and the brightness or splendor of his glory; Heb. i. 3. is also one with the Father, as Christ expresses it; John xiv. 10. *He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father:* And the reason he gives is this, *I am in the Father, and the Father in me.* John x. 30. *I and my Father are one,* that is, by this union, as it is explained verse 38. And this is done not only to render him capable of his glorious offices, but of divine honours too; that Jesus Christ might be worshipped, and yet that according to God's original command, that which is not God might not be made the object of our worship. Since there cannot be more gods than one, and since proper deity could not be communicated to the man Jesus, who is the image of the invisible God, to render him a partaker of our worship any other way, therefore proper deity is united to him that he might be one with God. And thus as the Word who was God was made flesh; John i. 1, 14. by his personal union to flesh, so the man Jesus may be said to become God, or to be God, by his personal union to God.

Thus the human nature of Christ being a creature most like to God, and being inhabited also by godhead, is the brightest image of the invisible God, and is one with God himself, and that as our divines express it by a personal union: And thus he is taken into as much participation of that worship which men

pay to God, as a creature is capable of receiving, and as the original law of worshipping none but God can admit. See Dissertation III.

IX. When the ancient heathens worshipped the images of their gods, the best way they could ever take to vindicate it was under this notion, that they supposed their gods to inhabit their own images, and thus they worshipped the image together with their God dwelling in the image: but with far better authority and with infinitely more justice and truth may christians worship the Son of God who is the only appointed image of the only true God, subsisting in a personal union with the indwelling godhead.

X. This may be illustrated by a very lively similitude. A vast hollow globe of crystal, as large as the sun, is in itself a fair image or resemblance of the sun: But if we might suppose the sun itself included in this crystal globe, it would thereby become a much brighter and nobler image of the sun, and it would be in a sense one with the sun itself, or one complex being. And thus the same honourable ascriptions which are given to the sun because of his light and heat, might be given also to this crystal globe considered as inhabited by the sun itself, which could not be done without this inhabitation. Then whatsoever honours were paid to this globe of crystal would redound to the honour of the sun, even as the divine honour and adoration paid to our blessed Saviour arises from the personal union of the human nature with the divine, and finally redounds to the glory of God. Phil. ii. 11.

Let it be observed here, that though I borrow an emblem or a resemblance of this divine doctrine from the world of nature or from the heathen nations, yet the doctrine itself is entirely derived from scripture, and might easily be confirmed by many more citations out of the sacred writers.

AN ESSAY  
ON  
THE TRUE IMPORTANCE OF ANY HUMAN SCHEMES  
TO EXPLAIN

*The Sacred Doctrine of the Trinity.*

SHEWING,

- I. *That no such Scheme of Explication is necessary to Salvation.*  
—II. *That it may yet be of great Use to the Christian Church.*—III. *But all such Explications ought to be proposed with Modesty to the World, and never imposed on the Conscience.*

---

SECTION I.

**T**HE first of these points is already argued in a discourse on the *Christian Doctrine of the Trinity*, proposition XV. and we only take leave here to mention those heads of argument, and to enlarge a little on the same subject.

1. “Any particular explication of the scriptural doctrine of the Trinity can never be necessary to salvation, because, though the doctrine itself of three personal characters which have communion in one godhead, be clearly revealed, yet the modus how they are one, and how they are three, is not clearly and plainly revealed.” And indeed if this modus be revealed at all in scripture, yet it is in so obscure a manner, that we can come at it only by laborious reasonings and a train of difficult consequences; whereas all necessary articles are and must be clear and plain: and if they are not contained in express words, yet they must lie open and obvious to a natural and easy inference.

2. Any particular explication of this mystery is not necessary to salvation, because “the most pious as well as the wisest and most learned christians have had very different sentiments on this subject, and gone into different schemes of explication;” and that in the several ages of christianity, as well as in our present age. The very mention of the venerable names and opinions of Dr. Cudworth, Bishop Bull, Bishop Stillingfleet, Bishop Fowler, Bishop Pearson, Dr. Wallis, Dr. Owen, and Mr. Howe, is sufficient to confirm this second reason.

3. “We may pay all due honours to the sacred Three, which are required in scripture, while we believe them to be represented as three personal agents, and as one in godhead, without any particular explication how they are one, and how they are three.”

Now it is evident that scripture hath more directly and expressly laid our salvation upon the special divine characters or offices which the Father, Son, and Spirit sustain in the bible, and upon the peculiar blessings which we derive from them, and the peculiar honours to be paid to them, rather than upon any explication of their intimate essence and union, their nature and difference; and therefore such a nice explication is not of necessity to salvation. It is evident to me, that divine and religious ascriptions and honours are paid to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in scripture, and I think they are due to them all. How how these divine honours can be paid by any who deny them, have some true and proper communion in the eternal godhead, cannot well understand. But I can easily conceive that divine honour may be given them without knowing exactly the precise limits and boundaries of their union and distinction. See more *the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity*, Proposition XXI.

Do we not find it sufficient in all the common affairs of life, to manage a thousand concerns wisely with regard to the human mind and body, and with regard to each particular being of the animal, the vegetable, and the intellectual world, if we do but know whether it be an animal, a vegetable, or an intellectual being, without any determinate, philosophical notions and ideas of the essences and specific differences of all, or any of these, and without determining how far they agree, and how far they differ? And why may it not be so in the affairs of religion? A man may be a very wise man, and dispose and direct his affairs admirably well with regard to his king, his bishop, his father and his friend, by that common and general knowledge which he hath of their capacities and powers, their several offices and the relations they stand in to him, without any precise acquaintance with their particular natural constitutions, or the relations they stand in to one another. He may be a most discreet manager of his affairs, and speak and do all things in proper time and place, without knowing philosophically what place is, or what is time: and he can be contented with this ignorance, and be a wise man still. And why may he not be a christian with the same degrees of knowledge of the things of christianity, that is, without philosophical science of the abstract nature of God and Christ.

A poor labourer or a shepherd believes Jesus Christ to have the proper divine powers of knowing, managing and governing all things; therefore he prays to him, and trusts in him as his Lord and his God, without any notion either of self-existence and independency, or without the least thought of consubstantial generation, eternal sonship, and necessary emanation from the Father; all which ideas some writers include in the divine nature of Christ, though perhaps without any sufficient authority from scripture. He believes him to be the true God, and Son of

God, and the appointed Mediator to bring him to God; therefore he honours and adores him, and depends on him under that character, without any notion whether his sonship belong to his human or divine nature. He believes him also to be the son of man, but perhaps he may not ever have heard whether he had an earthly Father or no, or that he was the son of a pure virgin. Now what is there in all this ignorance that forbids him to be a true christian and a sound believer? But I would pursue this argument a little, under some more parallel instances.

The learned world well knows what corporeal notions the famous ancient father Tertullian had of the soul of man; what immaterial and refined opinions Des Cartes and his followers have entertained concerning the presence or place of spirits; and what were the contrary sentiments of Dr. Henry More and his admirers. Now may not a Tertullianist take proper care for the salvation of his soul, though he thinks the nature of it be corporeal! May not the soul of a Cartesian find the right way to heaven, though he believes his soul has no relation to place, and exists no where, or in no certain place? May he not *worship God* with acceptance *in spirit and in truth*, though he conceive God himself, as an infinitely wise and powerful mind void of all extension, and who hath no relation to place? And though he suppose his omnipresence to be nothing else but his universal knowledge and power and agency, through all times and places? And may not a Morist with the same acceptance worship the same God, though he believes him to be infinitely extended and penetrating all bodies and all possible spaces? What is there in these philosophical particularities, that forbids a man to be truly pious, while he believes his soul to have an immortal being after this life, and while he supposes God to have all the requisite properties and powers for a Creator and Governor, and Judge of the world.

You will say, some of these persons hold gross inconsistencies, and believe impossibles, while they suppose "a corporeal soul to be immortal; or a God infinitely extended through length, breadth and depth, who is a pure Spirit:" and therefore such a soul cannot be immortal, and such a God cannot know, or govern, or judge. I answer, It may possibly be so: These may be great inconsistencies; and yet a man may sincerely believe them both, who does not see the inconsistency of them. And if we must be condemned to hell for believing inconsistencies, then woe be to every son and daughter of Adam. What man is there in the world free from all error? And yet every error which he holds, is perhaps inconsistent with some truth which he believes: It is hard to write anathema upon a man's forehead, because of some inconsistence in his opinions, while he

believes all necessary truths, and practises all the necessary duties relating to God and Christ, and his own soul.

You may perhaps object and say, that he that believes the soul to be corporeal, by consequence does not believe it to be immortal; or he that believes God to be infinitely extended in length and breadth, by consequence does not believe God to be a spiritual being, who can know and judge human affairs: And thus in the same manner by the consequence of his own suppositions, the man that holds these doctrines may perhaps be proved to be a brute and an atheist. I reply, And must all the consequences that can be drawn from the mistakes of any man be imputed to that man as his own opinions; This would make dreadful work in the christian church. The Arminian would reduce the Calvinist into blasphemy and atheism; and likewise the Calvinist the Arminian. By this uncharitable method each of them would be called Atheists and blasphemers, and be utterly excluded from christian communion by such a perverse practice as this.

I would add yet further, that by such uncharitable constructions as these, the Cartesian christian might say, I cannot join in worship with Dr. More, and his followers, for we have not the same object of worship: I worship a God who is a pure spirit, a pure thinking being, without extension or dimension; but they worship a being infinitely extended, that is, infinitely long, broad and deep. The Morist might cry with the same zeal, I cannot worship with a Cartesian, for we worship not the same object: He adores a God that is properly in no place; but I worship that God who penetrates all things and places; and is expanded through all. Now if such objections as these are indulged and supported, no two persons could join together in any part of divine worship who had such different ideas of the divine essence or attributes, lest they should imagine they worship two distinct or different deities. And if this were admitted, where could we find two persons who had so exactly the same ideas of God as to hold communion in one worship?

This wretched practice of imputing all the distant consequences of any man's opinions or mistakes to him, is quite contrary to our Saviour's general rule; Mat. vii. 12. *What you would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.* Let these objectors be pleased to consider that doubtless they themselves in some parts of their religion are guilty of some errors or mistakes in their opinions; for no man's knowledge is perfect: and if those errors should be pushed home to their utmost consequences, perhaps they might terminate in blasphemy, atheism, or mere nonsense: But no man would be willing to be treated in this manner himself, viz. to have all the utmost consequences of his mistaken opinions be imputed to him, therefore he ought not

to treat his brothers so ; according to that universal rule ; *What ye would that men should do unto you, that do ye also to them ;* Mat. vii. 12. Now to apply these things to the present case :

Suppose, for instance, Timon and Pithus both believe Christ to be the true God : but Timon supposes him not to be self-existent, because he saith, he is a Son, derived from the Father by an eternal generation. On the other hand, Pithus believes him to be self-existent because he is God. Now has Pithus reason to say, that because Timon doth not believe the self-existence of Christ, therefore by consequence he does not believe his divinity ? Or, should Timon be permitted to conclude, that because Pithus believes the self-existence of Christ, therefore by consequence he does not believe his sonship ? Would it be agreeable either to the reason of a man, or to the charity of a christian, that these two men should anathematize one another, or seclude each other from christian communion because of the consequences of their opinions, while they both profess to maintain that *Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, and has such communion in and with the eternal godhead, as that both of them profess him to be true God, and both pay him divine worship.

Now what I would infer from hence is this, that since the different explications of the doctrine of the Trinity may be so abused to give such occasions for contest, where christians are not wise and charitable, I would rather exclude all the particular modes of explication from the terms of christian communion, than I would exclude one christian from the church of Christ.— Where a man professes that there is but one God, and yet that Father, Son and Spirit, have such a distinction from each other, and such a communion in and with this one godhead as renders them all-sufficient for the characters and offices which they sustain in the gospel, and pays proper honours to them accordingly, I would never constrain him to determine any farther upon these difficult points of the union and distinction of the sacred three ; of the self-existence, the eternal generation, or eternal procession of the Son and holy Spirit. Nor whether they are three natures united in one godhead, or whether one individual nature only.

To sum up the whole, it is evident to me, that the holy scripture itself, as I have already proved elsewhere, lays the stress of our salvation upon a belief that Christ is the Messiah, the appointed all-sufficient Saviour, a trust in the proper atonement or sacrifice of Christ for the forgiveness of sins, a dependence on his grace and Spirit for light and holiness, and a submission to his government, much more than it does upon any precise and exact notions or hypotheses concerning his divine and his human nature ; even though the union of the divine and the human nature in him are in my judgment necessary to render

salvation complete. Scripture teaches us to concern ourselves not regeneration and grace to be received from the blessed Spirit, more than about the nature or essence of that Spirit which regenerates us. It makes our eternal interest depend upon the glorious characters, offices and operations of the three persons of the blessed Trinity, and our respective honours paid to them, rather than upon our philosophical and exact acquaintance with their inmost essence or essences, and their personal distinctions. I must believe that the great God will make merciful allowances to sincere souls for their different sentiments, or for their ignorance and darkness in so sublime and mysterious an article, which almost all parties allow to contain some unknowns and inconceivables in it.

SECT. II.—“ Yet where God is pleased to give greater degrees of light and knowledge, if we can further explain these mysteries of christianity in clear ideas and proper language, it is a piece of excellent service done to the gospel of Christ.” A clear and happy explication in what manner the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are to be conceived as three personal agents, and as having communion in one godhead, would carry in it many desirable advantages.

1. This would be like a ray of sacred light let into some of the most dark and difficult passages of the word of God. This would help us to unfold many scriptures which at present lie hid in obscurity; or at least it would afford us the true sense of several texts which by reason of the various expositions of them have hitherto given but an uncertain sound and doubtful ideas of divine truth. It would clear up a large part of the word of God to our understandings, and teach us to read the sacred transactions of the Father, Son and Spirit in the bible with more abundant edification.

2. This might teach us to perform our various duties of prayer, faith, love, and obedience to the sacred Three, so as scripture requires it, in a more distinct and rational manner than we have hitherto done. The humble christian would love and adore his heavenly Father, his Saviour and his Sanctifier with much more inward pleasure, when he should be enabled to do it with much clearer and more explicit ideas of their divinity and distinction.

3. Such a happy explication of the mystery of the blessed Trinity would vindicate this doctrine against the cavils of the unbeliever as well as against the scoffery and insults of the profane world. This would make it appear how the Son and the Spirit might be true God without injury to the divine honour of the Father. There have been some Antitrinitarian writers who have denied the possibility of the godhead of the Son and Spirit in any sense or *modus* at all; and have pretended to prove



that every model and manner of explication of this doctrine hath some absurdity and inconsistency belonging to it. Now it would be certainly of considerable service to the truth to exhibit some scheme, some manner of explication to the world, wherein it is fairly consistent with the reason of things and the language of scripture, that the Son and Spirit may have communion in true godhead as well as the Father: And that though there be but one God, yet the divine names and attributes may be ascribed to the sacred three, as having communion in this one godhead.

4. This would be a glorious means of vindicating the protestant religion against the charges which are brought by the papists, who tell us, that we refuse their doctrine of transubstantiation because it seems inconsistent to sense and reason, and yet we believe the doctrine of the Trinity which is charged with the same inconsistency. We often find fault with them for making the words mystery and supernatural an asylum and refuge whereby to screen themselves from the charge of a most absurd opinion, that is, "of bread becoming flesh, and yet retaining the properties of bread at the same time." They in the like manner find fault with us for making the same words mystery and supernatural a refuge for ourselves, while we profess three distinct persons in one God.

I confess there are many things to be said, and that with great justice, to vindicate the conduct of protestant writers in the doctrine of the Trinity, which can never serve to defend the popish doctrine of transubstantiation: for one is a theme or subject that concerns the deep things of the divine nature; the other relates but to flesh and bread, which are objects that fall entirely within the compass of our senses and our reasoning powers; and we can much better judge and determine what is and what is not a real inconsistency in the one than in the other. Yet after all it would be a vast advantage in the defence of our religion against the assaults of the papists, and it would vindicate christianity most gloriously in the eyes of Jews, heathens and all infidels, if we could find some plain, easy, natural and obvious account of this matter how the sacred Three which are represented in scripture under distinct personal characters have a communion in one godhead.

5. I add farther, that if it were possible to exhibit a scheme of explication which should be so plain, so easy, so agreeable to the light of nature, and yet so happily correspondent with scripture as to captivate the assent of the learned and unlearned at the very proposal of it, what a glorious advantage would the church of Christ obtain by this means towards its unity and peace! What a blessed end would be put to those shameful quarrels and contentions on this subject, that have in every age

ore or less divided the christian world and laid it bleeding with any wounds ?

There are some difficult parts of our holy religion which have been so far explained by the united labours and prayers of pious and learned men, that controversies about them are well nigh ceased, and the disputes brought to an end. The humble believer has been enlightened and taught to understand the articles which he professes : The profane caviller and the subtle critic have been baffled by the mere force of argument set in a clear and easy light : and why may we not hope for the same success in his sacred article of the Trinity, by humble and laborious enquiries into the word of God, with a dependence on the aids of the divine Spirit, who is promised to *guide us unto all truth* ? John xvi. 13.

It must be acknowledged indeed, there has no public-received scheme been yet so successful to explain this doctrine but what has several difficulties attending it, and has left too much room for the cavil of unbelievers. Nor have any of these schemes hitherto very much assisted the unlearned christian in the practice of his devotions, or blessed him with much clearer and juster ideas of the matter than his own reading of the bible had given him before.

And it must be confessed also with sorrow and shame, that some writers have invented or enlarged special explications of the sacred doctrine with too great a neglect of scripture in their studies. They have affected to be wise in words without ideas. They have set forth their own learned explications of the doctrine of the Trinity, in sounding scholastic phrases and hard words, with great assurance ; and have helped men to talk roundly on this sublime subject with a great exuberance and fluency of such language as has been established into orthodoxy. This sacred doctrine has been too often dressed up by authors in abundance of metaphysical phrases borrowed from the popish schools, but without any clearer conceptions of the truth than their primitive predecessors had attained, or than their meaner brethren possess without that learned language.

But though nothing has hitherto been done so effectually as we could wish, to remove all difficulty and confusion, yet there is a bold man that will venture to lay an everlasting bar upon our event prayers and humble study of the scripture, and upon all his labours and hopes of the present and future christian ages, merely because the ages past have not been favoured with those happy hints whereby to unfold these sacred mysteries, and to reconcile the difficulties that attend them.

SECT. III.—“ But after all, whatsoever light or knowledge we may suppose ourselves to have attained in the explication of his sublime doctrine, we ought not to be over solicitous to prose-

lyte other christians to our particular scheme ; much less to impose it on the consciences of others : We should ever take care lest by anxious enquiries into things less necessary, we should unhappily divert ourselves or others from those duties and practical regards, which we all owe to the Father, Son and Spirit, and which all parties agree to be necessary to salvation."

It is an important lesson both of natural and revealed religion, that we should lay out our greatest concern and zeal on things of the greatest consequence : and we have already proved, that it is of much higher moment to wait for divine benefits from the sacred three, and to pay our proper respective honours to the sacred three, so far as scripture requires it, than to know how far they are the same, and how far they are distinguished. Indeed when we have arrived at any farther light in some divine doctrine, we ourselves may find greater clearness of thought, with more ease, satisfaction and pleasure in the practice of especial duties ; yet the most enlightened persons ought not to give unnecessary and unreasonable disturbance to all those who practise the same duties, though they do not attain so clear ideas as God may have blessed and favoured them with.

If we labour in our zeal to proselyte the learned to our scheme, the most part of them are so deeply rooted in their old opinions, so immoveably established in their particular forms, so self satisfied in what they believe, so much prejudiced against any further light, that we shall probably do nothing but awaken their learned anger, to fix the brand of heresy upon us, and to overwhelm the hints of any brighter discovery with clamours and hard names, and drown them in noise and darkness.

If we are too solicitous to persuade the unlearned christian to come into any better explication of this doctrine than he has learned in his younger years, we have the same huge prejudices to encounter here as in the learned world ; nor can we hope for much better success, if we attempt to change his ancient opinion by a hasty and industrious zeal. Hard names and reproaches are weapons ever at hand, and common both to the wise and the unwise, the Greek and Barbarian. The vulgar christian is as expert at them as the scholar.

Besides, if he be a person of weaker understanding whom we address with our new explication, and we set ourselves hard at work to shake his old notions, but in the mere modus of things, we may happen to unhinge him, as it were, and throw him off from his centre ; we may embarrass his mind with inward contests, which may be too hard for him ; and we may tempt him to lay out too many of his thoughts and hours on some particular explications of this doctrine, on the substance of which he had long before built his pious practices and devotions, though mingled with some innocent mistakes.

Yet these accidental inconveniences are not a sufficient reason for our supine and perpetual contentment with confused sentiments and unintelligible speeches about the modus of sacred things, if clearer ideas are any ways attainable. There are just strong motives that may excite us to search into the depths of God, and to propose all our improvements in knowledge, to the world and the church, though there are no reasons or motives sufficient to impel us to impose our improved notions on others, or to raise contentions and quarrels on the account of them.

All our particular illustrations therefore, or clearer conceptions of this sublime doctrine which God at any time may have revealed us with, should be proposed to the christian world with great modesty, with a humble sense of our fallible natures, with a gentle address to the wise and to the unwise, without imposing on their judgments or dictating to their faith, and with a zealous care to maintain all those necessary practical regards to the holy Trinity, which are of so much greater importance.

And if it be an unreasonable thing to dictate to our fellow-Christians, and urge our particular sentiments on them in these mysterious points, how much more culpable and domineering is to establish any especial form of human explication of this sacred doctrine as a test of orthodoxy and christianity! How vain presumption it is with a pretence of divine authority to impose our human explications upon the consciences of men, and to bid them all the sacred blessings of especial communion in the sacrament, unless they testify their assent to such a particular hypothesis or scheme of explication, which the imposers confess to be human, and yet impose it in their own prescribed form of words.

The persons who are guilty of this uncharitable practice may curse their impositions, and their excommunications with their own names, and call them pure zeal for the divinity of Christ; but I suspect it will be found in the great day to deserve no better a character than a mistaken zeal for the honour of Christ, mixed perhaps with zeal for the divinity of their own notions, which they had incorporated with the plain and express revelations of the godhead of Jesus Christ our Lord.

He that makes a private and particular explication of any doctrine which is dark and doubtful in itself, and not clearly revealed in scripture, as necessary as the doctrine itself, which is plain and clearly revealed, puts the matter of faith and opinion on the same foot, and intrudes too much upon the authority and dominion of our Lord Jesus in his church.

## PREFACE

### TO THE "GLORY OF CHRIST AS GOD-MAN."

**O**UR Lord Jesus Christ is the author, the foundation and the glory of our religion. The scripture teaches us to describe this blessed person two ways; that is, as a man who is one with God, or as God who is one with man. He is called sometimes *God with us*; Mat. i. 23. *God manifest in the flesh*; 1 Tim. iii. 16. that is, God dwelling in our mortal nature. At other times he is described as *the man Christ Jesus, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily*; 1 Tim. ii. 5. and Col. ii. 9. A man of the seed of David after the flesh, who is *God over all, blessed for evermore*; Rom. ix. 5. A man whose flesh Thomas the apostle saw and felt, and yet called him *my Lord and my God*; John xx. 27, 28. Upon such scriptures, as these my faith is built.

And as it is the most general sentiment of the christian world in our age, so I must acknowledge it is very evident to me, that our blessed Saviour is often represented in scripture as a complex person, wherein God and man are united, so as to make up one complex agent, one intellectual compound being, God joined with man, so as to become one common principle of action and passion. Christ wrought miraculous works, and yet it is "the Father or God in him who doth these works;" John xiv. 10. "The God and the man are one. And on this account the child Jesus may be well called the mighty God;" Is. ix. 6. And God himself is said to *redeem the church with his own blood*; Acts xx. 28. And to *lay down his life for us*; 1 John iii. 16. This intimate or present union between God and Christ allows him to say; John x. 38. *I am in the Father, and the Father in me. And verse 30. I and the Father are one.*

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

It is granted that many things relating to the ever blessed Trinity may have heights and depths in them which are unsearchable by our understandings. Though we learn from scripture, that true and proper deity is ascribed to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and that they are represented often in scripture as distinct personal agents; yet after all our enquiries and prayers we may be still much at a loss to describe exactly wherein this distinct personality consists, and what is the distinct communion of each of them in the divine nature. We have never yet been able with any strong evidence and clear certainty precisely to adjust this sacred difficulty, how far they are one, and how far they are three. Several schemes and hypotheses have been invented for this purpose, and the best of them falls short of solving all questions relating to this doctrine completely to our satisfaction, though some of them are evidently much more agreeable to scripture than others. As it is our great happiness, that the knowledge of any such particular schemes of explication are not necessary to the salvation of men, so neither are any of those different schemes of the Trinity at all needful to our present enquiries concerning that glory of Christ, which is the subject of this treatise.

Let no humble christian therefore be jealous of losing his own form of explaining the Trinity by reading these discourses, nor let him be afraid of being led into any particular human schemes or explications of that divine

I have so far laid them all aside in this book, that there is scarce any of them, and that in a very slight and transient manner.

glories of Christ, both in his divine and human nature, which are ded, are not necessarily confined to any particular schemes or hypothesis the Trinity. All that I pretend to maintain here is, that our blessed must be God, and he must be man; God and man in two distinct natural one person, that is, one complex personal agent. Those who believe doctrine may read these treatises without danger or fear; for I say endeavour to search out divine truth, and promote the knowledge of Christ, as far as possible, without offence to the bulk of the christianity of the truly pious and religious of every party.

These three discourses were written at three distant and different times: before my readers will be so candid as to bear with a small repetition of the same thoughts, or with reference from one discourse to another, they are expressed in so regular a manner as though I had all three conceived from one view. Though the order in which these discourses stand be not according to chronology, yet it is such an order as I thought most likely to lead my reader by degrees into these discoveries of the glory of

In the first of these discourses I have maintained the "godhead of Christ announced under the Old Testament." The doctrine itself is entirely conformable to the common sentiments of all our divines, and I have confined my arguments as seem to me most effectual and convincing. I perfectly trust the generality of my readers will concur with me in these sentiments, though I will not say I have borrowed my method of argument and reasoning from any but the sacred writers. In the second and third discourses I will find some things, which though they are derived from scripture appear to be more uncommon, and which have not been taken notice of by many authors. With regard to these, I beg leave to make these things known to those who will seriously, and with a honest heart peruse what I have written.

It is not that they would suffer themselves to believe with me that we have not attained to all knowledge, nor particularly apprehended all those things that are contained in the bible concerning our Lord Jesus Christ: and that I do not permit themselves also to think with me, that we are all fallible and that it is possible for us to have been mistaken in some points, of lesser moment, which we have been taught to believe before we were set upon the study of searching the word of God for ourselves: for the best of us have been our teachers *know but in part*, and therefore they could not instruct others *but in part*; 1 Cor. xiii. 9. Though they have known the truth, yet perhaps they have not spoken all the truth which lies in the holy scriptures.

It is not that my readers would not be startled and discomposed at any thing that may seem new and strange to them at first appearance, nor be frightened or alarmed, as though heresy were in it, because it may differ a little from the notions which they have hitherto received. That very same notion in itself, whatsoever, which may perhaps surprize us at first, by reading it in a new way may become plain and easy and certain: and I can assure you there is not one sentence in all these discourses but what is very consistent with a firm belief of the divinity of Christ, and a just and sincere acknowledgment of the most eminent and glorious truths of the gospel, as they are held by protestants among us against the Socinian and Arian errors.

It is not that they would not rashly conclude that any christian doctrine is lost, or the deity of their faith endangered, or the proper deity of our Lord Jesus Christ neglected, if they should be led to interpret a few texts of scripture in another manner than they themselves have been formerly used to do: for it must be acknowledged, that some pious and zealous writ-

ters for the truth have mustered together out of all the bible whatsoever text could possibly be turned by art or force to support any one doctrine which they undertook to defend, just as ancient heretics have done to support their errors. Now among this great number of scriptures, it may be easily supposed, that there is here and there one which is not so fit and apposite to their purpose, and which does not carry in it naturally that sense which has been imposed upon it; or at least which does not contain that force of argument which has been generally believed; and yet the same point of doctrine may remain immovable, without the help of that particular text.

Now though they have been learned and wise and pious men that have used these scriptures to support some particular doctrine of scripture or article of faith, yet it is possible they may have been mistaken in the application of them. Latter days, and the maturer age of the world have given light to many passages of the bible which were not well understood in the days of the fathers: and though I read their writings with sincere reverence, yet not with an absolute submission to their dictates. The same doctrines and articles of faith which they espoused and defended in their time, may be still espoused and defended with as much zeal and succession in our day by some new arguments brought to support them, though in reason and justice we are constrained to drop some of the old ones. Besides, There is more honour done to the cause of christianity and the gospel, by building all the articles of it upon such scriptures only as are firm and unshaken to support them, than by multiplying feeble shews and shadows of defence. We expose ourselves and our faith at once to the insult and ridicule of our adversaries, by persisting in a mistaken exposition of scripture, and by maintaining every colour or false appearance of argument, even though it be in the defence of a most important truth. We ought to make use of all the advantages of encreasing light, nor continue in a wrong application of scriptures to support any point of our faith in opposition to their most open and evident meaning. Though truth is infinitely preferable to error, yet men may use insufficient arguments for one as well as the other. And in our days, I conceive a wise and thoughtful man will not be charmed at once with a title-page, merely because it pretends to many hundred proofs of the godhead of Christ.

4. I request that they would consult their bible with diligence, as I have done, especially in the places which I have cited, and like honest English readers would look only at the sense as it lies before them, and neither consider nor care whether it be new or old, so it be true: For he that doth this, is much more likely to be led into the truth than a greater scholar, full of his own notions which he has learned in the schools, who brings his own opinions always to direct and determine his own interpretation of scripture whensoever he reads it; and thus he interprets every text, not so much according to the plain, obvious, and easy sense of it, and in correspondence with the context, as he does in correspondence with his own opinions and his learned schemes.

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

6. That they would apply themselves with sincere diligence to consider the evidence of scripture for any of the opinions that I have proposed or maintained, rather than labour to invent objections as fast as ever they can against it, as though they knew it was false before-hand; for if we read a treatise which contains ever so much truth, with a previous aversion to the doctrines of it, and a resolution before hand to object against it all the way, we hinder ourselves from attending to the force of reason, and prevent our minds from taking in the evidence on which any doctrine is founded. I grant it is necessary that all just objections should have their due weight, and they ought to be well considered in our enquiries after truth; yet when any doctrine has

any and strong arguments from scripture and reason advanced to support it, the difficulty or two which at present seem hard to be solved, should not utterly forbid our assent, since, as Bishop Fowler well observes, *There are scarce any notions so plain as to be incapable of being obscured and called in question, except the first and self-evident principles, or the immediate consequences of them.* Because we understand not what is difficult, we must not merely for that reason deny that which is clear and plain; and if we will cease to believe any proposition until we are perfectly able to master all objections against it, we may be sceptics all our days, both in matters of philosophy and religion, and even in some doctrines of the highest importance, and with our pretences to learning, may finish our lives like mere fools.

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

8. While I am tracing these early and sublime glories of our blessed Redeemer, by the gleams or the rays of light which are scattered in several parts of his word, I entreat my friends, that they would not be too severe in their censures of any mistaken step, while I own myself fallible, and am ready to retract any mistake. If they should meet with any expressions which in their opinion do not stand so perfectly just and square with other of my sentiments in some distant parts of these essays, I would persuade myself they will be so candid as to interpret them in a consistence with the general scope and design of my argument, and with my avowed sense of things in the more important points of religion.

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

9. That they would not imagine that all these notions and opinions, which may be something new and strange to them, are pure inventions of my own, and mere sallies of imagination. I must acknowledge indeed that I have endeavoured to carry on the hints I have met with in some great and honoured writers to a further length, and to trace the golden thread of these discoveries through far distant scenes and ages, by the light both of reason and scripture: But as I have no ambition to assume these discoveries to myself, so I ought in justice to stand secure from these censures which a heated and warm zeal for ancient land-marks, is ready to throw upon every thing that bears the appearance of novelty.

I have therefore in the end of some of these discourses or enquiries, cited several writers of name and eminence, and called in the assistance of their authority to cover these essays from the sudden and severe reproaches of those who reverence the names of those great, and learned, and pious men. And what such venerable authors thought very consistent with orthodox doctrine, and so useful and necessary to support the honours of our blessed Lord, I humbly hope and request that my readers will not hastily abandon and re-



ject as heresy, and renounce it at once without due consideration of the arguments. And as for those who have a great regard for the writings of so ingenious and so pious a man, so evangelical an author, and so great a divine as Dr. Thomas Goodwin, I might recommend to them the perusal of his treatise of the "Royalty of Jesus Christ, as God-man," which I have abridged here; and before they read these essays I might entreat them to read his abridgement, though I dare not pretend to give my assent to all his opinions in these papers, or support them.

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

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

THE  
GLORY OF CHRIST AS GOD-MAN DISPLAYED,

BY A

*Survey of the Visible Appearances of Christ as God, before  
his Incarnation.*

---

DISCOURSE I.

SECTION I.—*An Historical Account of these Appearances.*

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

Now that this matter may be determined with more evidence and certainty, let us first trace out the account which the Old Testament gives us of the various seasons and occasions on which our Lord, the Lord\*, the Lord God, Jehovah, the Almighty, the God of Abraham, &c. is said to appear amongst men, with a view to his remarks on him in passing ; and afterward we shall be en-

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

Now let it be observed, that in almost every place which I have cited to shew the various appearances of the Lord to men, it is the name Jehovah is used, which the reader will not distinguish by capital letters in the English bible.

abled to draw more particular inferences from these scriptures concerning the deity of Christ and his appearances before his incarnation.

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

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

Now it is very probable, that when God had made man, he appeared to him in man's own shape, and thus made it known to Adam, that he had formed him in his own image, even as to his body; that is, in such a form or figure as God himself did, and would frequently assume, in order to converse with man: And perhaps God also might acquaint Adam with the natural and moral perfections of his own soul, viz. knowledge, righteousness and holiness, wherein he resembled his Maker, and bare his likeness, as well as that God himself sometimes assumed the figure of a man. Let it be noted here also, that when God blessed some part of the animal creation, it is expressed only, *God said*, but not to them as hearers, *be fruitful and multiply*, as verse 22. that is, God put forth a divine volition or command concerning the multiplication of inferior creatures; but he spake to Adam and Eve directly as his hearers, and most likely with a human voice, for he said unto them, *Be fruitful and multiply*; and told them that he had given them the fruits of the earth for their food, and that he had given it also to the fowls and the beasts: Whereas God is not said to speak thus concerning food to the beasts or to the fowls themselves, but only told Adam what he had appointed for their common food, This looks a human appearance conversing with him, and will appear more evidently in what follows:

Gen. ii. 16. *And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, of every tree in the garden thou mayest freely eat; but the tree*

*of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it. Verse 19. And the Lord God brought every beast of the field and every fowl of the air to Adam to see what he would call them. Verse 22. And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. All this seems to be the transactions and language of the Lord God appearing in human shape, and with human voice to Adam. Gen. iii. 8. "And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day, and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden.—9. And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, where art thou?—10. And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden and I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid myself.—11. And he said, who told thee that thou wast naked, &c. Verse 13. And the Lord God said unto the woman, what is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, the serpent beguiled me and I did eat. Verse 21. Unto Adam and his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them," &c.*

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

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

household in a human shape, and after the manner of men: and then Cain went out from the presence of God. But whatsoever shape appeared to them, I think it must be granted, that God appeared in a visible manner, where the expressions are so plain and so strong, where the repetitions are so many, that the Lord, that is, Jehovah, the Lord God appeared, and sat or walked, and did and spake this or that. In so many transactions and dialogues it is very hard to suppose that there was nothing else but a created angel came assuming the name of God. Surely such sort of representations would lead all common readers into a gross mistake, if God himself were not here at all in a special and visible manner.

It is very probable there might be some glorious light, some awful brightness, that frequently surrounded and invested this human form in which God appeared and conversed with man, and which might be called his divine form, that he might be thereby in some measure distinguished and well known as God. Doubtless the Lord, Jehovah, when he came down to visit men, carried some ensign of divine majesty with him, some splendid cloud or luminous rays about him when he designed that men should know God was there. It was such a light appeared often at the door of the tabernacle, and fixed its abode on the ark between the cherubims, and by the Jews called the shekinah, that is, the habitation of God. And thence God is described in scripture as *dwelling in light, and clothed with light as with a garment*; Ps. civ. 4. but in the midst of this brightness there seems to have been sometimes a human shape and figure. And probably this heavenly brightness was that divine clothing, that form of God of which Christ divested himself when he came to tabernacle, or dwell in flesh, with a design of humiliation, though he might converse with men heretofore arrayed in this lightsome robe, this covering or habitation of God, which also he put on at his transfiguration in the mount, when his garments were white as the light; and at his ascension to heaven, when a bright cloud received or invested him, and when he appeared to John; Rev. i. 13.

And as God visibly conversed with Adam and his family, so also with several of the patriarchs. He was seen often by them, especially such of them as were most eminent for holiness in a degenerate age, and conversed familiarly with them in a visible manner: And thence probably came the phrase, *Enoch walked with God*; Gen. v. 22. 24. and *Noah walked with God*; Gen. vi. 9. which in process of time became a common phrase to signify a pious man, who conversed much with God in a spiritual manner, though those visible appearances were not then vouchsafed to him. When God had chosen Abraham to be his peculiar favourite, he appeared to him frequently; Acts vii. 2.

A God of glory appeared to our father Abraham when he was in Mesopotamia, and said unto him, get thee out of thy country, &c. And when he came into the land of Canaan; Gen. 12. 1. The Lord appeared unto Abraham, and said, Unto thyself will I give this land; and there he built an altar unto the Lord, who appeared unto him; or, as the Hebrew expresses it, he was seen by him. These seem to be visible appearances surrounded with light or glory, and therefore it is said, the God of glory appeared to him.

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

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

\* Here let it be observed, that the ancient Jews, such as the targumists and commentators on scripture, and Philo, represent the Memra, the Logos, that is the Word of the Lord, as appearing to the patriarchs in almost all these places where God is said to appear: and of this divine Word they give us two different notions, as I have shewn elsewhere: The one is, that it signifies something in and of the true and eternal godhead, some distinct principle in the divine nature itself, which is called the Word or Wisdom of God, whereby God revealed himself to men. The other is the idea of some most excellent angel in whom God dwelled, and by whom God manifested himself; and who was upon that account called the Word of God. Their writings lead us plainly to both these ideas, or is it at all unreasonable to suppose, that both these ideas may be united in one, and thus compose a sort of complex person, an angel inhabited by true godhead under the idea of divine Wisdom. Some have called this person a god-angel in all these visible appearances; and why may not our blessed Saviour be his god-angel by reason of his human soul pre-existent and united to godhead in his unincarnate or angelic state, that is, before he became complete God-man, and afterward he was made a little lower than the angels by dwelling in flesh and blood? The more of this matter is in other writings. But this, I do but just mention: I pass along, and in the margin only, because I would not enter into any method of explaining the internal distinctions in the godhead in these discourses: especially since these discourses agree well enough with any known scheme of eternal distinctions in the godhead.

called no more Jacob but Israel, for as a prince hast thou power with God, and with men, and hast prevailed ; and Jacob called the name of that place, **PENIEL**, for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved\*." Now if we compare this history with Hosea xii 3, 4, 5. we shall find that this person who wrestled with Jacob, and is here called a man, and also God, is by the prophet called God, and an angel, and the Lord God of hosts, even Jehovah. The words are these, *By his strength he had power with God, yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed ; he wept, and made supplication unto him, he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us ; even the Lord God of hosts, Jehovah is memorial.*

Gen. xxxv. 9. " And God appeared unto Jacob again when he came out of Padanaram, and blessed him. And God said, I am God Almighty, be fruitful and multiply, &c. And God went up from him in the place where he talked with him. And Jacob called the name of the place where God spake with him **Bethel**." Gen. xlv. 2. " God spake unto Israel in the visions of the night, and said, I am God, the God of thy father, fear not to go down into Egypt." In Gen. xviii. 3. Jacob rehearsed the former appearance of God to him ; " God Almighty appeared to me at **Luz** in the land of Canaan, and blessed me." And verse 15. he blesses Joseph thus, " God before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads," that is, the Sons of Joseph. And in this recognition of the former appearances, and favours of God, Jacob seems to make the God of his fathers, Abraham and Isaac, to be the same person with the angel that redeemed him from all evil. After this I find no more such appearances of God unto men, till that glorious apparition to Moses in the burning bush.

Exod. iii. 2, 3. " And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire, out of the midst of a bush ; and he looked and behold the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed. Verse 3. And Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt. Verse 4. And when the Lord saw that he turned aside to see, God called to him out of the middle of the bush, and said, **Moses, Moses**.— And he said, here am I. Verse 5. And he said, Draw not nigh hither ; put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground. Verse 6. Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of

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

and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God. Verse 7. And the Lord said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, &c. Verse 13. And Moses said unto God, Behold when I come into the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say unto me, What is his name? What shall I say unto them? Verse 14. And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: And he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you. Verse 15. And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, the Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you; this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations." Chapter iv.

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

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

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



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

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

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

After this you have a multitude of instances, wherein the Lord or Jehovah conversed freely with Moses upon every occasion; whether under any visible appearance or figure, the scripture does not acquaint us, except in the following instances:—

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

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

## SECTION I.

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

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

Exod. xix. 2, 3. "Israel camped before the mount Sinai, and Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain. Verse 9. And the Lord said unto Moses, Behold I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee. Verse 18. And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke because the Lord descended upon it in fire. Verse 19. Moses spake and God answered him by a voice. Verse 20. And the Lord called Moses up to the top of the mount, and Moses went up." Exod. xx. 1. "And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me, &c. Verse 19. And the people said to Moses, Let not God speak to us, lest we die.—Verse 21. "And the people stood afar off, and Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where God was; and the Lord said unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven." Thus God gave his laws to his people from Mount Sinai; but neither Moses nor the people did at this time see any similitude or figure; for so Moses tells them; Deut. iv. 12. *And the Lord spake unto him out of the midst of the fire: Ye heard the voice of the words; but ye saw no similitude, only ye heard a voice.*

And indeed it is probable that Moses never saw any form of the countenance, or face of a man, in all the appearances of God.

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

Yet there remains some difficulty still in what sense God said, *Thou canst not see my face ; for there shall no man see me and live*, when it is probable that Abraham and Jacob long before, and afterward Joshua and Gideon saw the face of that angel who is called Jehovah : and my reason for it is this, because they took him to be a man when they first saw and spake with him, and therefore at first perhaps there was no peculiar lustre of glory, or cloud to conceal his face and distinguish him from a common man.

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

that *light which no man can approach unto*; and upon this account it is added, *whom no man hath seen, nor can see*; 1 Tim. vi. 16. For in this sense, our God would be a *consuming fire*; Heb. xii. 29. and that in the most literal sense.

It is very probable, that the unsufferable blaze of the glory on the mercy-seat was always allayed with the cloud intervening, which might be an emblem or type of God manifest in the flesh; that is, God dwelling personally in the man Jesus, or in the flesh at his incarnation. And it is probable also for this reason, that the high-priest, when he went into the most holy place, was to make the smoke of the incense arise between this glory and himself, that he might not die by his curiosity or too near approach.

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

Exod. xxiv. 9. "Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel. Verse 10. And they saw the God of Israel, and there was under his feet, as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness. Verse 11. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not his hand:" that is, he did not destroy them though they saw God, and it follows, *Also they saw God, and did eat and drink.* Here it is probable they saw nothing but a very bright or fiery cloud, as in verse 10. But out of the midst of it God perhaps might converse with Moses; otherwise how could they know that this was the God of Israel? But I am inclined to believe they saw nothing of any human form; though indeed it is expressed, *there was a paved work of sapphire under his feet*, which may signify only beneath him, that is, beneath his fiery cloud: but it is certain, his face they

saw not. The children of Israel were so prone to idolatry, that God never gave them, nor perhaps even to Moses, the sight of an human face in all their visions, that there might be no foundation for framing an image like him; Dent. iv. 16. And it is evident that when Moses "went up into the mount, verse 16. it was only a cloud covered the mount, and the glory of the Lord abode upon mount Sinai; and the sight of the glory of God was like devouring fire on the top of the mount;" whence probably St. Paul might derive that expression; Heb. xii. 29. Our God is a consuming fire.

Exod. xxv. 21. "And thou shalt put the mercy-seat above upon the ark. Verse 22. And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee, from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims, which are upon the ark of the testimony;" Exod. xxviii. 30, 35. When Aaron goes into the holy place where the mercy-seat stood, he is said to go in before the Lord. Upon this account the Lord of hosts is said to dwell between the cherubims; 1 Sam. iv. 4. and 2 Sam. vi. 2. and Psal. lxxx. i. and xcix. 1. On this account also when the ark was moved from place to place, God himself is said to remove; Psal. xlvii. When David carried the ark into Zion, verse 5. *God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet.* And when the ark came into the tabernacle or temple; Psal. xxiv. 7. *Lift up your heads, O ye gates; be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in: The Lord of hosts, he is the King of glory.* And when Solomon built the temple and brought in the ark of God to it; 2 Chron. vi. 41. Solomon said, *Arise, O Lord God, into thy resting-place, thou and the ark of thy strength: which is repeated; Ps. cxxxii. 8.*

And concerning Zion it is said; Psal. lxxviii. 18. "This is the hill which God desireth to dwell in. Verse 17. The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: The Lord is among them as in Sinai, in the holy place." As God appeared on Sinai in a visible cloud, in fire or glory where thousands of angels surrounded him, so God dwelt in Zion over the mercy-seat in a visible and bright cloud, between the cherubims, representing the attendance of angels. Then follows, verse 18. *Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive,* which is applied to Christ; Ephes. iv. 8. Thus the ascent of the ark of God to Zion, was a type of the ascension of Christ to heaven: For as God dwelt upon the ark between the cherubims in a bright cloud, under the Jewish dispensation, and thence communicated his mind to men, and was there solemnly invoked and worshipped, so the "fulness of the godhead dwelt bodily in the man Christ Jesus;" Col. ii. 9. and thus God in Christ reveals himself to us, and is worshipped and invoked by us under the christian dispensation; but still with this difference, that

he union between God and man in Christ Jesus is much more near, more intimate and glorious, so as to make one complex person or God-man, and it is so constant as never to be dissolved; for Christ, who is the seed of David, after the flesh, is by this union *God over all blessed for evermore*. See Rom. ix. 5.

Ex. xxxi. 18. "When God had made an end of communing with Moses on mount Sinai, he gave unto him two tables of testimony, tables of stone written with the finger of God." This seems to intimate a human shape giving the tables to Moses, but not the vision of a human face. In Ex. xxxii. 2. When Israel had offended God by the golden calf, he said, "I will send an angel before thee, and I will drive out the Canaanites, &c. for I will not go up in the midst of thee, for thou art a stiff-necked people, lest I consume thee in the way." It is the opinion of Doctor Owen on this place, that the angel which God in his anger told them he would send before them, when he himself refused to go up in the midst of them, was different from that angel whom he promised to them; Ex. xxii. 21. "in whom the name of God was:" But upon their mourning and repentance, and upon the intercession of Moses, verse 4. and 14. God says, *My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest; which is much the same thing as if he had said, the angel of my presence shall go with thee, for so this angel in whom the name of God dwelt, is called; Is. lxiii. 9. In all their afflictions he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them.*

Ex. xxxiii. 9. "Moses entered into the tabernacle, and the cloudy pillar descended and stood at the door of the tabernacle, and the Lord \* talked with Moses, and all the people saw the cloudy pillar stand at the tabernacle door, and all the people rose up and worshipped, every man in his tent-door. Verse 11. *And the Lord spake to Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend.* Yet, as I before intimated, perhaps this signifies only free mutual discourse like human and friendly conversation; for a few verses afterwards, God refused to let Moses see his face, verse 23. *Thou canst not see my face, for there shall no man see me and live.*

Upon this account it may be queried, whether Moses ever saw the likeness of a human face in all the appearances of God to him: yet there seems to be the similitude of the back of a man as to the shape of his body, in which God appeared to Moses at

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

his request; for the Lord said, verse 21. "Behold there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock. Verse 22. And it shall come to pass while my glory passeth by that I will put thee into a cleft of the rock, and I will cover thee with my hand while I pass by. Verse 23. And I will take away my hand, and thou shalt see my back parts, but my face shall not be seen."

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

It is possible that these expressions of God's covering Moses with his hand while the glory of God past by, and Moses seeing the back parts of God, may signify no more than this, that in this particular appearance of God he arrayed himself in beams of light of such unsufferable splendor, that it would have destroyed the body of Moses had not God sheltered and protected him; and that the back parts which Moses saw, may only signify this same bright appearance after it was gone to a safer distance. Or we may suppose that there was a human form in this appearance, darting unsufferable light from his face, which for that reason could not be seen; and that Moses saw the similitude of the back of a man, after he was past to some distance from him.

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

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

Levit. ix. 1, 4. "Moses called Aaron and his sons and the

s of Israel, and said, to-day the Lord will appear unto you. 5. And all the congregation drew near and stood before the Lord. Ver. 6. And Moses said, this is the thing which the Lord commanded, that ye should do. And the glory of the Lord shall appear unto you. And when Aaron had offered the appointed offerings for himself and for the people, verse 23. Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle of the congregation, and came out and blessed the people; and the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people. Verse 24. And there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt offering, the fat, which when all the people saw they shouted, and fell on their faces." Here it may be observed, that the Lord is to appear to them; ver. 4. when ver. 23. *it was the glory of the Lord appearing to the people*, that is, a bright light and consuming fire, verses 23, 24.

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

It is not easy to say what the precise difference is between the various ways of God's ancient discoveries of himself to men: I think thus much is very plain, which I before hinted, that though the common method of God's converse with the people with Aaron was by a voice proceeding from the bright cloud or *hekinah*, yet that Moses was admitted to a more intimate converse with God in a way of dialogue, as one man talks freely with another, which the scripture calls face to face, and mouth to mouth: and on some particular occasions he beheld God in the form or likeness of the body of a man, for it is said, *He shall behold the similitude of the Lord*, though perhaps a cloud of glory might always cover his face, because the face of God was not to be seen by him.

Num. xxii. 9. "And God came unto Balaam, and said, What men are these with thee? And Balaam said unto God, Behold, the king of Moab hath sent me, saying, Come now curse this people, that is Israel. Verse 12. And God said unto Balaam, Thou shalt not go with them, thou shalt not curse the



people ; and Balaam said to the princes of Balak, *The Lord Jehovah refuseth to give me leave to go with you.*" And verse 22, &c. there is the angel of the Lord meeting Balaam on the road to Moab, and conversing with him ; but I do not find that this angel either assumes the name of the Lord, or is so called by the sacred writer : unless we may infer thus much by comparing what the angel said unto Balaam ; verse 25. *The word that I shall speak unto thee, that shalt thou speak,* with chapter xxiii. 3, 4. " Balaam said to Balak, peradventure the Lord will come to me : and God met Balaam. Verse 5. And the Lord or Jehovah put a word in Balaam's mouth, and said, Return unto Balak, and thus shalt thou speak, &c. Again, verse 16. And the Lord or Jehovah met Balaam, and put a word in his mouth, &c." Chap. xxiv. 2. " Balaam lift up his eyes, and the Spirit of God came upon him, and he took up his parable, and said, The man who heard the words of God, who saw the vision of the Almighty, having his eyes opened, hath said, How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob ! &c." Whether this be sufficient to determine this angel to be Jehovah, I leave to the reader.

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

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

Joshua v. 13. " When Joshua was by Jericho, he lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold, there stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand : and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries ? Ver. 14. And he said, Nay, but as the captain of the host of the Lord am I now come ; and Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my Lord unto his servant ? Ver. 15. And the captain of the Lord's host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ; and Joshua did so." Chap. vi.

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

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

Judges vi. 11. "And there came an angel of the Lord, and sat under an oak which was in Ophra: and Gideon threshed wheat by the wine-press. Verse 12. And the angel of the Lord appeared to him, and said unto him, the Lord Jehovah is with thee, thou mighty man of valour. Verse 13. And Gideon said unto him, O my Lord, if the Lord Jehovah be with us, why is all this befallen us? Verse 14. And the Lord Jehovah looked upon him, and said, Go in this thy might, and thou shalt save Israel from the hand of the Midianites: Have not I sent thee?" Here is a long dialogue between the Lord and Gideon. Verse 20. "And the angel of God said unto him, Take the flesh and unleavened cakes, and lay them upon this rock, and pour out the broth; and he did so. Verse 21. Then the angel of the Lord put forth the end of the staff that was in his hand, and touched the flesh and unleavened cakes, and there rose up fire out of the rock and consumed the flesh and the cakes, and the angel of the Lord departed out of his sight. Verse 22. And when Gideon perceived that he was an angel, Gideon said, alas, O Lord God, for because I have seen an angel of the Lord face to face. Verse 23. And the Lord said unto him, peace be unto thee; fear not, thou shalt not die." On this transaction I make these few remarks:—

1. This angel had doubtless a human shape, figure and voice, for he sat under an oak; and Gideon brought him a present of flesh and cakes to eat, thinking at first it might have been a man of God or a prophet; though when the angel bid him offer it in sacrifice, and then consumed it by a miraculous fire, he perceived that it was no man, but an angel of God; and it is hardly to be supposed, but that Gideon saw his face. 2. Here is an angel of the Lord, who by the sacred writer is several times called Jehovah; for these names the Lord or Jehovah, and the *angel of the Lord*, are used promiscuously by the histo-

rian, though Gideon did not know it was God himself. 3. The language which this angel speaks, is not such as would immediately determine Gideon to believe it was Jehovah or God himself who appeared, and therefore we find Gideon does not worship him nor address him as Jehovah. 4. Though Gideon does not expressly call this angel, God or Jehovah, but only perceived at last that he had seen an angel of the Lord, yet we may suppose that in his recollection he took it to be that peculiar angel in whom God resided or dwelt, for he feared he should die because he had seen him. Now though there was an ancient and current opinion among the Israelites, that none could see the face of God and live, yet there does not seem to have been any such notion that death would ensue upon the sight of a common angel. But however, whether Gideon supposed this angel to be inhabited by Jehovah or no, it is plain that the sacred historian calls him Jehovah.

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

I do not remember any appearance of God to David. He saw the angel of the Lord that was sent to spread a pestilence among the people, by the threshing-place of Araunah the Jebusite; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16. And David spake unto the Lord of

Jehovah, when he saw the angel that smote the people, *and said, O, I have sinned, and done wickedly.* But it does plainly appear by all the circumstances of the history, that this was that peculiar angel in whom God dwelt, or that the angel was called Jehovah. The Lord appeared also to Solomon; 1 Kings iii. 5. and ix. 2. but it was in a dream by night, whence therefore I derive no inferences at present. 1 Kings xxii. 19. The prophet Micah said, "I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right-hand, and on his left: and the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab, &c." But his seems to be a vision divinely represented to the imagination of the prophet, from whence therefore I infer nothing concerning God's real appearances. Job iv. 13. When Eliphaz represents the apparition of a spirit before his face in thoughts from the visions of the night, he does not give us sufficient ground to form any conclusions concerning the real appearance either of God or an angel, in a book of such sublime poetry, wherein this is introduced in a manner of what the poets call a machine.

Is. vi. 1. "In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Verse 2. Above it stood the seraphims, each one had six wings, &c. Verse 3. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy is the LORD of hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory. Verse 5. Then said I, Wo is me, for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips, and dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips, for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts. Verse 8. Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I, send me. Verse 9. And he said; Go and tell this people, hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. This appearance of the Lord or Jehovah to Isaiah in his glory is expressly attributed to Christ by the apostle; John xii. 39, 40, 41. *These things said Isaias when he saw his glory and spake of him.*

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

Ezekiel often had the sight of God or of Jehovah. In chapters i. iii. viii. and x. &c. But as it is expressly said in Ezek. i. 1. *As I was by the river of Chebar, the heavens were opened and I saw the visions of God*; so whether all these appearances were not purely visionary, may be questioned: however it may not be amiss to transcribe a few expressions of the

sacred writer on this subject. Ezek. i. 26. "Above the firmament that was over the heads of the living creatures was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone, and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance as a man above upon it, from his loins upward and downward, as it were the appearance of fire, and the appearance of a rainbow round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord, or Jehovah. And when I saw it, I fell upon my face, and I heard a voice of one that spake. Ezek. iii. 22. "And the hand of the Lord was upon me, and he said, Arise, go forth into the plain, and I will there talk with thee: Then I arose and went forth into the plain, and behold the glory of the Lord stood there, as the glory which I saw by the river of Chebar." Ezek. viii. 1. "As I sat in mine house and the elders of Judah sat before me, the hand of the Lord God fell upon me; then I beheld and lo, a likeness as the appearance of fire from his loins downward and upward, &c. And he put forth the form of an hand, and took me by a lock of mine head, and the Spirit lift me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem: and behold the glory of the God of Israel was there according to that vision I saw in the plain." Ezek. x. 18. "Then the glory of the Lord departed from off the threshold of the house, and stood over the cherubims. Verse 20. This is the living creature that I saw under the God of Israel by the river Chebar, &c."

Dan. iii. 25. Nebuchadnezzar when he had cast the three Jews bound into the fiery furnace, said, *Lo, I see four men loose walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt, and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.* It is not to be supposed here that Nebuchadnezzar knew the Messiah or Christ, who was the Son of God, but he means to express a divine and a God-like form\*, which, verse 28. he calls the angel of the God of Shadrak, &c. though probably it might be the peculiar angel of God's presence, in whom was the name of God, and who is the only-begotten Son of God.

Daniel had several visions, and in some of them God appeared to him, or Jesus Christ in the form of man; Dan. vii. 9, 10, 13, 14. I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and

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

the hair of his head like the pure wool : his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him, thousands of thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him ; the judgment was set, and the books were opened. I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him ; and there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him ; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Let it be observed here, that I do not number this among the proper, and real appearances of Christ or God ; for it is called a dream which Daniel had, and the visions of his head upon his bed, as verses 7, 13. yet it was a dream divinely inspired. Here the Ancient of days represents the divine being, or God himself, clothed in light or brightness white as snow or wool : one like the Son of man coming with the clouds of heaven, seems to be the Son of God or Jesus Christ, who is also the Son of man, ascending in the clouds of heaven, and he came to the Ancient of days, that is, to God the Father, and received his dominion, glory and exaltation at his ascension into heaven in a bright cloud : and it is probable, that from the language of this dream or vision, Christ borrows his name, the Son of man : and it is evident that our Saviour's description of his own future appearance as the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven ; Mat. xxvi. 64. is borrowed from this vision, and his real ascension to heaven and his exaltation there, is but an accomplishment of this prophetic scene.

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

Dan. x. 5. *I lift up mine eyes and looked, and behold a certain man clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with fine gold, &c.* Here is the description of an appearance very like the appearance of Christ to the apostle John ; Rev. i. 13. but whether this was the angel of God's presence, viz. Christ, or another angel, is hard to determine. Verse 10. "Behold, an hand touched me, and set me upon my knees and upon the palms of my hands, and he said unto me, O Daniel, a man greatly beloved, stand upright, for to thee am I now sent—Fear not, for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand and chasten thyself before God, thy words were heard

and I am come for thy words. But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days : but lo, Michael, one, or the first, of the chief princes came to help me, and I remained there with the kings of Persia. Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days. Verse 20. Then said he, Now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia :—there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince.\* Here it is very probable that the prince of the kingdom of Persia is one of those fallen angels, principalities and powers of darkness, who by divine permission governed the heathen nations, and were worshipped amongst them as gods, for the apostle tells the christians that the Gentiles sacrificed to devils ; 1 Cor. x. 20. all under Satan their sovereign, who is the *god of this world*, until Christ at his resurrection and ascension *spoiled these principalities and powers*, and dispossessed them of their dominions ; Col. ii. 15. and led them captive ; Ps. lxxviii. 18. and took the heathen world for his possession, and into his own government. It cannot be a good angel, because he withstood the good angel that was sent to Daniel with a divine commission twenty-one days ; and because the angel who was sent to Daniel went afterwards to fight with this prince of Persia.

It is also very probable that Michael is Jesus Christ, because he is called your prince, that is, the prince of the Jews, and one, or the first of the princes, that is, the prime archangel\*. And in Dan. xii. 1. he is called *Michael the great prince, which standeth for the children of thy people*, that is the prince or king of the Jews, for such was Jesus Christ under the ancient dispensation ; this was the known character of the Messiah among the Jews ; and as king of the Jews he was sent into this world, then he came to his own, yet his own received him not ; John i. 11. — What confirms this sentiment is, that in Rev. xii. 7. when *there was war in heaven, Michael and his angels fought against the dragon and his angels*, Christ as the head of the good angels, and Satan as the head of the evil angels maintained a war in heaven, that is, in the church, until the great dragon was cast out of the church, that old serpent called the Devil and Satan which deceiveth the whole world. Then follows a loud voice in heaven, that is, the church, saying, *Now is come salvation and strength, and the kingdom of our God and the power of his Christ*, that is the power of Michael prevailed over the dragon, for *the accuser of the brethren who accused them before God day and night is cast down by the prevalent inter-*

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

cession of Christ pleading for them, and by his dominion over all things which God gave him at his ascension into heaven.

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

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

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



place? And why should it be expressed that he fled from the presence of the Lord, unless God had manifested some visible presence to him?

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

Zeck. i. 7. "In the second year of Darius came the word of the Lord unto Zechariah, saying ; verse 8. I saw by night, and behold a man riding upon a red horse, and he stood amongst the myrtle trees, and behind him were red horses speckled and white. Verse 9. Then said I, O my Lord, what are these? And the angel that talked with me said, I will shew thee what these be. Verse 10. And the man that stood among the myrtle trees said, These are they whom the Lord hath sent to walk to and fro through the earth. Verse 11. And they answered the angel of the Lord that stood among the myrtle trees, and said, We have walked to and fro through the earth, and behold all the earth sitteth still, and is at rest. Verse 12. Then the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Judah against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years? Verse 13. And the Lord, that is Jehovah, answered the angel that talked with me with good words and comfortable words. Verse 14. So the angel that communed with me said unto me, Cry thou, saying, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I am jealous for Jerusalem, &c. Here observe this angel of the Lord which stood among the myrtle trees had the form of a man, ver. 8. and is not called Jehovah: He seems to be our blessed Saviour interceding for Jerusalem; for we do not find common angels introduced as intercessors in scripture; there is but *one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus*. And the Lord, or Jehovah, answered him comfortably. Perhaps this answer of the Lord, or Jehovah, was a voice without any figure or appearance. But after all, it is difficult precisely to represent this whole scene, and to adjust every part of these transactions: There seems to us to be some confusion in it, for want of knowing the various ways and methods of God's discovery of himself and his mind to the prophets.

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

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

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

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

III. There are several instances of the appearance of angels who do not assume to themselves any of the names or characters of God ; so that it is evident that it was not the custom of common angels when sent by the great God to carry messages to men to assume divine titles, or speak with an air of divine authority in themselves, without the preface of—Thus saith the Lord—but there was one angel peculiarly distinguished from the rest *in whom the name of God was* ; as Exod. xxiii. and who is properly called *the angel of God's presence* : Isa. lxiii. and *the presence of God* ; Exod. xxiii. and *the angel* emphatically ; as in Ec. v. 6. and who is very probably the same with the messenger or *angel of the covenant* ; Mal. iii. 1. And this also was the common opinion of the ancient Jews, as is shewn in a dissertation on the Logos.

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

Thence we may confirm this inference, that the angel who under the Old Testament assumed divine titles, and accepted religious worship, was that peculiar angel of God's presence in whom God resided, or who was united to the godhead in a peculiar manner, even the pre-existent soul of Christ, who afterward took flesh and blood upon him, and was called Jesus Christ on earth. And therefore since his incarnation no angel has ever appeared that durst call himself God, and assume divine titles, or accept of worship ; but has rather expressly forbid the worship of him ; as Rev. xix. 10. and xxii. 10.

IV. It is very plain and obvious to every reader, that one of the most glorious and illustrious apparitions of the great God, even that wherein the seraphs adore him as the Lord of the whole earth, and who filled the earth with his glory, and wherein Isaiah calls him, the King, the Lord of hosts, is expressly applied to our Lord Jesus Christ in the New Testament ; John xii. *These things said Isaias, when he saw his glory and spake of him.* Now this may be a key to explain the rest, and makes it very probable that Christ was the person who thus often appeared.

V. It is generally agreed by all christian writers, even from the most primitive times, that God considered under the idea and character of pateruity, and in the person of the Father, is

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

That expression of St. Paul; 1 Cor. x. 9. adds weight to this argument, *Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them tempted and were destroyed by serpents*. St. Paul well knew that when God sent his angel to lead Israel in the wilderness, he bid them, *Beware of him, provoke him not, he will not pardon your sins, for my name is in him*: And the apostle here seems plainly to refer to this same person, this angel, even Christ, whom they tempted or provoked, and he did not pardon them, but sent serpents to destroy them; and yet the person who was thus tempted and provoked, is also called the Lord God. Deut. vi. 16. *Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted him in Massah*.

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

To all this let me subjoin some testimonies both of Ancients and Moderns as they are cited by Bishop Bull in his "Defence of the Nicene Faith," section i. chapter i. section xi. Trypho the Jew in his dialogue with Justin Martyr maintains, that there were two present in the appearance made to Moses in the burning bush, viz. "God and an angel; that the angel appeared in the flame of fire, and that God in the angel spake with Moses." To which Justin replies, that that may very well be granted

according to the christian doctrine. And indeed Trypho's opinion seems to have been generally received and approved amongst the more ancient Jews; for Stephen teaches us, it was an "angel who appeared to Moses in the bush;" Acts vii. 30. and yet that God himself spake these words to Moses; verses 31, 32, 33 *I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham, &c.* compare Exodus iii. 2. with verses 4, 5, 6.

Athanasius, oratione quarta contra Arianos. "He that appeared was an angel, but God spoke in him." Clemens Alexandrinus. "The Son of God who led Moses was an angel, bringing with him the evangelical and principal power of the Word:" A little after he adds, "The Logos or Word was an angel;" and he calls the Son of God the mystical angel. Austin contra Maxim; libro iii. says, "I ask who appeared to Moses in the fire? The scripture itself declares it was an angel appeared; but that God was in that angel, who can doubt?" Gregory in his preface to Job the second, says, "The angel who appeared to Moses is sometimes called an angel, and sometimes God; when he that speaks outwardly is governed by him that is within, he is called an angel, to signify his obedience, and the Lord to denote the inspiration." And Grotius himself on Gal. iii. 19. confesses that he who gave the law in Sinai was a singular or special angel, attended by other angels; yet not a mere angel, but one with whom the Logos was present. Now it is well known, that by the Logos, Grotius means the divine Word or Wisdom.

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

Objection I. Since the true God appeared and resided in the fiery bush, in the flame on mount Sinai, in the pillar of cloud and fire that conducted the Israelites, and in the bright light that shone sometimes at the door of the tabernacle, and then dwelt on the mercy-seat between the cherubims; the Socinians say, Why may not any of these things be called the true God or Jehovah, as well as the angel in whom God dwelt? And especially since God spake out of the midst of this cloud or fire, as well as he spake by the angel, so that all these were representatives, symbols, or tokens of the presence of the true God. And this objection of the Socinians may be further enforced, when we consider, that when this bright cloud moved, God is said to move; where this bright cloud dwelt or rested, God is said to dwell or rest. God himself is said to go before the Israelites in the wilderness when the cloud went before them. God dwelt in the bush when the fire was there. God is said to dwell between the cherubims; Ps. lxxx. 1. because the bright light was there. *God is gone up with a shout; the Lord, that is, Jehovah, with*

the sound of a trumpet; Ps. xlvii. 5. when the ark where God dwelt was carried up to Zion: and upon this occasion David addressed God; Ps. lxxviii. 18. "Thou hast ascended on high, when the ark was carried up to the hill which God desired to dwell in," verse 16. What more than this can be said concerning the angel? Or what greater reasons can be given why this angel should be called God rather than the cloud or fire, which so might be called God in a figurative sense, because they were symbols of the divine presence?

Answer. In order to set this matter in a true light, we may consider the following things: 1. Whatsoever be our conception of the distinct personalities in the divine nature, yet the godhead has been generally allowed to be one and the same in all the three persons. If therefore Christ be God, he is the same one God as the Father, that is, he has the same, and not another godhead.

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

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

4. Whatsoever habitation God assumed, that habitation itself, whether corporeal or intellectual, is not called God merely upon the account that God resided there, unless you include also

\* The Hebrew word shekinah signifies a habitation or dwelling; and it was the name which the ancient Jews gave to that bright cloud or fire wherein God dwelt upon the ark between the cherubims, and in which he often appeared to the patriarchs and to Moses. They also gave the same name of shekinah to the glorious Spirit in and by which God acted or manifested himself to men, whether in a visible or invisible manner; that is, whether he came with a cloud of light, or with a voice, or only by silent and secret influences; for they call this shekinah by the names of Memra, Logos, or the Word of God; and they not only suppose this shekinah to take possession of the tabernacle and the temple, and to reside there in the form of light, but it was a saying amongst them, that "where two or three are met together to read or study the law, the shekinah is with them," though in an invisible manner; which is parallel to the words of Christ; *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them*; Mat. xiii. 23. See Dissertation iv. on the Logos, section iii.

the divine inhabitant, that is, God himself; so that neither the cloud, nor the bush, nor the fire, nor the man, or angel, are ever represented as God, or called Jehovah, without including the idea of that godhead that resided or inhabited in them. So when it is said, *God is gone up with a shout*; Ps. xlvii. it doth not mean merely the ark which was carried up to Zion, but God dwelling on the ark or the mercy-seat. And in the same manner the gestures, motions and appearances are ascribed to God, which were visible in that body in which God at that time resided, and which he made the symbol of his presence; but this body is never called God when taken alone, without including the present godhead or almighty Spirit residing there.

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

6. It is very probable that the great God never resided, if I may so speak, immediately in any corporeal habitation without the medium of an angelic\* or intellectual being by whom he spoke and acted, and by whom he moved this corporeal habitation as he pleased. We have good reason to suppose that the angel of God's presence, the angel of the covenant, the angel in whom was the name of God, was still the more immediate abode or residence of God, whether he dwelt mediately in a cloud, or light, or fire, or a human shape. And on this account in the narration of the same transaction it is expressed sometimes that the angel of the Lord appeared, and sometimes the Lord God himself appeared, for instance, to Moses in the bush, to Abraham, &c. The names God, or the Lord, or the angel, are

\* Note, Though in several places I represent Christ in his pre-existent state as an angel according to scripture, yet I always suppose this pre-existent soul of Christ to be a proper human spirit, that is, such a spirit as by its own nature is suited to act in vital union with a human animal body. These things are proved at large in the last of these discourses. The reason why he is called an angel, is partly because he was then an unbodied spirit, and lived as angels do, not united to an animal body; and partly because he was sent as the Father's messenger, which is the meaning of the word angel in the original languages, Greek and Hebrew.

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

used promiscuously in these narratives. Thus it was not properly the cloud, light, or fire, but the angel who was intimately and immediately united to godhead; and it was this angel who assumed the names, titles and characters of God, Lord, and Jehovah; for we may reasonably suppose that the union between God and this glorious angel, that is, the pre-existent soul of Jesus Christ in its non-incarnate or angelic state, was incomparably more near and intimate than the union of the great God with a pillar of cloud or fire; and upon this account the angel may be called God in a more proper manner than the fire, cloud or bush could ever be, because of the intimacy of the union which made God and this angel one complex person.

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

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

9. Observe also, that God did not always or constantly dwell in the same corporeal habitation, that is, cloud, or fire, but God constantly resided in this angel of the covenant, this angel of his presence, who was his own Son: He kept the same intellectual habitation always, though he frequently changed his corporeal habitation. God who was always united to this unbodied human spirit or angel did also sometimes assume a cloud, a fire, a bush, or the figure of a man to appear in under the Old



Testament, but it was only for a season ; and these were only so many different præludiums to his future incarnation or dwelling in flesh : So that the angel of God's presence or human soul of Christ in his angelic state, who was the constant shekinah or habitation of the godhead, was one with God, and might be much better called God than the cloud or fire which were but occasional habitations.

10. When this glorious angel, the human spirit or soul of Christ, together with his divine inhabitant the indwelling godhead, descended from his angelic state, and was made actual partaker of flesh and blood ; he was then made a little lower than the angels ; Heb. ii. 9. He took human flesh into a constant partnership of his person, and became a man. *The Word, who was God, was made flesh ;* John i. 1, 14. This never was said, nor could it ever properly be said concerning the cloud or the fire. When God was manifest in the flesh, this flesh was united into one person with the angel, and became the human or bodily shekinah, or constant habitation of God. *In him dwelt all the fulness of the godhead bodily ;* Col. ii. Then Jesus Christ who was in all former ages the God-angel in a proper and complete sense, became God-man. Though the cloud or the fire could not properly be called God because they were not thus united into one person with God, nor in the angel in whom God dwelt, yet the man Jesus as united in a personal manner to the divine nature, might properly be called the true God. It could not be said concerning the cloud or fire, that they were assumed to be parts of the person of Christ, but it might be said concerning this angel, that is, the soul of Christ, and concerning his body, they were parts of his complex person ; and thus Christ in his complex person hath the names of deity and humanity given him, he that is *of the seed of David after the flesh, is God over all, blessed for evermore. Amen.* Rom. ix. 3, 4, 5.

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

Answer I. We may answer this difficulty thus : Though the angel who revealed the will of God to the patriarchs and prophets was really Jesus Christ the Son of God, yet he then spake by a corporeal medium and organs, which he assumed for that occasion to form a voice, which medium was not part of his person, or personally united to him ; therefore the Son of God did not speak immediately to men by himself, that is, by his own person, but spake by the prophets, and by corporeal shapes, &c.

et when he assumed flesh and blood actually into a personal union with himself, when he made this flesh a part of his person, and became a complete man by a miraculous conception, then he was more completely the Son of God both in soul and body, and then as the Son of God he spake immediately by himself, for his own complete person, that is, soul and body; to mankind; or God spake to mankind by the very person of his Son, which was never done in the same manner under the Old Testament.

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

II. But I give yet a further answer to this objection in the following manner, viz. Though the angel by whom God spake to the prophets and to the patriarchs was really Jesus Christ or the Son of God, yet he did not appear at that time under his divine character as God's own Son, but he appeared in his angelic character, or as a heavenly messenger, which was suited to the pre-existent state of the soul of Christ; whereas under the New Testament God speaks to us by his Son Jesus Christ under the special and known character of his own Son, as being now revealed to have been the only-begotten Son of God in his co-existent state; John i. 14, 18. and as having a more conspicuous or sensible character of his divine sonship added to him, for his being born of a virgin without an earthly father by the immediate influence of the Spirit of God; Luke i. 35. and was named the Son of God on this account; and had also a further claim to this honourable title Son of God, when he was raised from the dead, as St. Paul explains that expression of the Psalmist, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*; Ps. ii. compared with Acts xiii. 33. and is therefore called by the same apostle, *the first-born from the dead*: Col. i. 15. It is plain therefore, that though Christ was the Son of God in his pre-existent state, yet he appeared and acted rather under the character of an angel of God, and not under the character of a Son till the days of the gospel.

It is the frequent custom of scripture to speak of things as they appear to men, and not always just as they are in themselves, for this is most suited to the bulk of mankind. Therefore the scripture speaks of the sun's rising and going down, and its joining to run a race, and of the heavens being fixed upon

pillars, &c. which are all modes of expression according to appearance, and not according to the reality of things. So when the angel, who is called God, wrestled with Jacob, it is said a man wrestled with him, because he appeared as a man; Gen. iii. 24. So three men came to Abraham; Gen. xviii. 2. because they appeared as men, though one of them afterward evidently was known to be God, and the other two were angels. And so Christ never appearing to the patriarchs and prophets, and instructing them under the character of the Son of God in the Old Testament; and being much unknown to the world under that name, it was no wonder that the apostle should represent God as beginning to speak to us by his Son under the New Testament: \* This method of solving the difficulty will have an happy influence also to remove the following objection.

Objection III. Though this angel spake oftentimes in the name of God under the Old Testament, though he assumed the glorious titles of God, and spake words which must properly belong to God, yet it does not follow, that this angel was the true God, or that there was any such personal union between the divine nature and this angel, because there are other instances wherein the titles and names of God are assumed, and words proper to God are spoken, wherein it is very evident from scripture that God was not the speaker. Consider what the scripture declares concerning the giving of the law at mount Sinai: It is expressly said; Exod. xx. 1, 2. *And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, &c.* Yet St. Stephen tells them; Acts vii. 53. *They received the law by the disposition of angels.* And St. Paul, Gal. iii. 19. says, *the law was ordained by angels in the hand of a Mediator.* And Heb. ii. 2, 3. it is expressly called, *The word spoken by angels,* and distinguished from the word spoken by Christ. *If the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which first began to be spoken by the Lord?* Now if the words at the giving of the law were spoken either by the person of the Father, or by the person of the Son of God, then the apostle's argument is lost, since it is built upon this supposition, that the gospel is published by a person superior to him, or them who published the law. But the apostle's argument is certainly strong, and thence it will follow, that the angel who spake the law was neither God himself, nor Jesus Christ, and yet he assumes divine language, *I am the Lord thy God, &c.*

\* The Arians themselves in their scheme seem to be as much puzzled with this difficulty, how to suppose that Christ as an angel gave the law, and yet that God spake not by his Son till under the gospel: And some of them are forced to accept of this sort of solution. See "Modest Plea, part 1." So that they have no reason to object it against us.

**Answer.** It was not only the sense of all the ancient writers, the most primitive fathers of the christian church, but it is allowed by most of the Arians themselves who make this objection, that Christ himself was present at Sinai and was employed in giving the law; Ps. lxxviii. 17. *The Lord is among them as in Sinai,* even he who ascended on high and led captivity captive; Eph. iv. 8. Now the law may still be said to be given, declared or published by angels who attended by thousands as ministering Spirits on the Lord Christ, and yet the words might be spoken by Christ himself, the great God man, or God-angel, or the angel in whom God dwelt, at the head of them: for he appeared there, not as the Son of God, for he was then utterly unknown under that filial name or character, but he appeared in his angelic character as the great, the peculiar, the extraordinary angel or messenger of the covenant, the angel of God's presence, the angel who spake to Moses in Mount Sinai; Acts vii. 38. and spake to the people also, as the angel in whom God dwelt, or, which is much the same, as the great God dwelling in the angel.

Now in the New Testament when this glorious person appeared amongst men as the Son of God, when he was discovered to be so in his body by his extraordinary conception; Luke i. 35. when he was further made the Son of God by his being begotten from the dead, as St. Paul explains David; Acts xiii. 33. Col. i. 18. and declared *with power to be the Son of God by his resurrection from the dead.* Rom. i. 4. when he was preached by the apostles as the only-begotten Son of God, both in his incarnate and in his pre-existent state; John i. 14, 18. he sustains hereby a superior character to that of an angel, a servant, or mere messenger of God, even that of God's own Son: and if the word spoken by angels, or by Christ himself in his angelic state and character, attended by ministering angels, if this word be steadfast, and if all transgressions against it were severely punished, how shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation which began to be spoken by the Lord? that is, by the same angel in his character of Lordship, since he appeared to be God's own Son, and the heir and Lord of all, not as an angel or messenger, but as sovereign Lord of his church. The very same person may have much greater authority and influence when he sustains a new and superior character.

Perhaps you will say then, Why did not the apostle represent it thus? If Christ was that angel, why does he so apparently distinguish him from the angels who spake the law? I answer, Because though the apostle might know he was the same person, yet the bulk of the people to whom he wrote might not know it, nor understand these distinct characters of the same person, and it would take up too much time and pains to prove that notion to

them in that place, nor would it answer any valuable purpose at that time sufficient for such a digression.

That Christ himself was the speaker of the law at Mount Sinai may be further evinced out of Heb. xii. 25, 26. "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh, that is Christ; for if they escaped not that refused him that spake on earth, that is Moses, for he that despised Moses's law died without mercy, much more shall not we escape if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven, that is, Christ;" for it was he who came personally down from heaven, which Moses did not, and it was he who after his death spake by an audible voice to St. Paul from heaven, and by his spirit to all the apostles. Christ therefore is he that speaketh from heaven\*. Now it follows, verse 26. *Whose voice then shook the earth*, that is the voice of Christ, and not Moses, which shook Mount Sinai, which "quaked greatly when the Lord, or Jehovah, descended upon it in the fire;" Exod. xix. 18. And it is the same person who in Haggai ii. 6. hath now promised, as the apostles cites him, saying, *Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also the heavens*; and the prophets tell us, this is the Lord of hosts. The person therefore who spake at Mount Sinai, was both Christ and the Lord of hosts.

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

It might be added also, that it is expressed so often and so strongly by the sacred historian, that God spake the words of the law, that the Israelites heard God speaking to them out of the fire, and that it was the voice of God, that out of heaven God made them to hear his voice, and that they might know that

\* A great and ingenious writer has very lately in his "Essay on the various Dispensations of God," pages 135—141. asserted, that he who spoke on earth, means not Moses, but Christ himself, in his pre-existent state under the character of an angel; and that he who now speaks from heaven is the same person, even Christ under the exalted and superior character of a Son; this is very agreeable to the sentiments advanced under the answers to the second and third objection; and perhaps may be the very truth. But still it is Christ who is that Jehovah who spake in fire, and shook the earth, at Mount Sinai, and who now speaks from heaven. This that learned author maintains against Mr. Pierce with great evidence, pages 136—144. and against another considerable writer, pages 1—156.

Jehovah he is God in heaven above; Exod. xx. Deut. iv. 10, 13, 38—39. that all things concur to persuade us that the angel who spake the words was also Jehovah, or the God of Israel.

**Objection IV.** Is there any necessity that we should suppose God himself to be thus personally united to this angel who appeared under the Old Testament? Is it not sufficient to suppose that a glorious angel might come as a representative and deputy of the great God? and being clothed with divine authority, and representing the sacred Majesty of God, might he not assume the communicable names and titles and worship of God, as being God's representative or ambassador to the children of men? And this objection is yet enforced from this consideration, that some persons have pretended, that in the eastern parts such as delivered messages from others, did use to speak in the same manner as those very persons would have done in whose name they came, for which some have cited one or two historical passages out of the bible.

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

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

2. Supposing that such a conduct might be customary between man and man in common affairs of life, yet when was it known that the ambassador of an earthly monarch ever took so much upon him, or spoke in this language? What ambassador ever said, I am the king of France or Spain, or I am the king of Egypt or of Babylon? What ambassador did ever receive such honours, as that his master could receive no higher if he were personally present? What prince would ever endure any thing like this to be done by or to his representative? When Rabshakch was sent with a threatening commission from Sennacherib, he does not himself assume the words of his prince; *Isai. lxxvi. 4, 12, 13.* for Rabshakch said, *Thus saith the great king, the king of Assyria, What confidence is this wherein thou trustest? And again, Hear ye the words of the great king, the king*

of *Assyria*: And again, *My master hath sent me to speak these words*. Thus neither in eastern nor western nations do we find ambassadors use the style, and assume the name and honour of their princes to themselves: and who can believe that the only ambassador that calls himself by his master's name assumes his master's titles, and style to himself, and receives the homage that is due to him, should be the ambassador of the great God the Creator and Lord of the world? But this leads me to the third consideration:

3. If this were ever practised by the ambassadors of earthly princes, yet it would by no means follow, that a messenger from the great and eternal God, the King of heaven, should personate this great God himself in delivering his errands, without any evident hints to distinguish the ambassador from God himself. There is an infinite distance between the great God and a mere creature, even the most excellent creature, and that when it is employed as an ambassador for God. There is some proportion between the highest prince and the lowest of mankind; and therefore though one man may personate another, yet no creature can with safety to God's honour or to man's duty personate the great God. There is a much greater danger in mistaking a creature for God, and paying that worship to a creature which is appropriated to God, than there is in mistaking the meanest man for the greatest monarch: One would be a misdemeanor between man and man, the other seems to be plain idolatry, and paying the peculiar honours of God to a creature.

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

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

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

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

6. The ancient Jews would by no means allow of this notion of an angel's assuming the names and titles of God. It is so by the opinion of Trypho, which Justin Martyr relates, that the ancient Jews supposed God himself to be present with an angel; for that they never dared to imagine that a mere angel would call himself the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, or would admit such divine honours as Moses and Abraham, and Joshua paid to him in the name of God. "Such an opinion too absurd and horrid for them to entertain," as Bishop Bull presses it; and he adds, "it is a sort of impiety to imagine that angels would ever assume such a dignity, or that God would communicate his incommunicable name to them, or any authority such a representation of himself, in which a mere creature is presumed to himself all those things which belonged to God."

The learned Camero in his Annotations on the Hebrews, chapter ii. verse 2. very well expresses it, "Though lawyers put on the persons of their clients, yet it was never heard of an ambassador when he delivers the commands of his prince, or spoke otherwise than in the third person, my prince speaks." The prophets give us an illustrious testimony of this matter who continually introduce this solemn form, *Thus saith the*



Lord. And in visions angels profess themselves to be sent of God." Grotius himself confesses, that it "was not a mere angel gave the law in Sinai, but an angel with whom the Logos or divine word was present."

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

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

II. If the Lord Chancellor not only spoke words belonging to the king without any such preface as, Thus saith the king. If he not only assumed the proper name and the titles of King George, the king himself being absent or invisible, but if the historians also declared that it was King George that spoke the words, if they called it the voice of King George, and if the spectators called him king, addressed to him as king, and worshipped him as such, would there not be abundant ground for a most pernicious mistake among all those who in after-ages should read this history? Now this is the present case, Jehovah or God himself is invisible, and was not seen by eyes of flesh; and not only the angel who appeared in the Old Testament assumed the divine names and titles of Jehovah or God himself, without any distinguishing preface of, Thus saith the Lord, but the sacred historian declares to us, it was God appeared, and it was God spake, it was the voice of God, even of Jehovah, the God of Israel; and the persons also with whom he conversed, viz. Abraham, Moses, and the children of Israel, &c. called him God and Lord, and worshipped him as such. Now let us put all these things together, and there seems to be an unavoidable occasio

ven for a very dangerous mistake to all the readers of this history, if God himself, even Jehovah, the God of Israel, did not appear; if the angel who appeared and spake was not so habited by God, so united to God and so intimately one with God, as to lay a foundation for all this representation of things.

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

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

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

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

complex person, made up of soul and body, for the same reason we may suppose that the great God and this angel of his presence make up a complex person also ; and this is properly called a personal union.

**Objection VI.** If it was Christ himself who spoke to Moses ; Deut. xviii. 18. when " the Lord said, I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee : " If it was Christ himself said in Exod. xxiii. 20. *Behold, I send an angel before thee, beware of him, provoke him not, for my name is in him :* If it was Christ who spake to the prophets, *Behold, saith the Lord, I will raise up to David a righteous branch :* Jer. xiii. 5. And if Christ be this very prophet, this angel, this righteous branch, then it must be interpreted that Christ says, " I will raise up myself a prophet, &c. I will send myself an angel before thee, and I will raise up myself a righteous branch to David ; " which seem to be strange sort of interpretation.

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

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

**Answer.** I am persuaded that some of the ancient Jews and the patriarchs did believe that this was an angel in whom the great God or Jehovah resided or inhabited in a peculiar manner ; particularly when Jacob said, I have seen God, when Moses was afraid to look upon God, when Abraham spoke to him as to the great God ; but there were several things wherein their light was deficient and very imperfect if compared with ours.

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

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

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

4. I might add also, that the Jewish writers in later ages by which the Greeks came to obtain a confused notion of God's transacting his affairs with men, and manifesting himself to them, by his Logos or Word, which sometimes they interpreted as his own essential Wisdom, or the idea, scheme, decree of all things that was in God; and sometimes they made it to signify a very glorious angel, the first-born of every creature, in whom God dwelt, and by whom he transacted his affairs with the children of men. And though they had not the same clear and distinct ideas of these matters as the New Testament reveals to us concerning the union of God and man in one complex person, yet their writings there appear many hints and intimations of a kind, as I have proved in a dissertation on the Logos.

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

dwelt in a peculiar manner, and in and by whom God was to reveal himself to men in the latter times\*.

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

---

## APPENDIX TO THE FIRST DISCOURSE.

---

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

### OBSERVATION I.

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

Psalm lxxviii. 7, 8. "God went forth before his people,

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

and marched through the wilderness, dwelling in the pillar of cloud and fire; the earth shook, the heavens dropped at the presence of God. Sinai itself was moved at the presence of the God of Israel, when he came down upon mount Sinai in fire; verses 16, 17. God hath desired to dwell in Zion, yea, the Lord, Jehovah, will dwell in it for ever: The Lord is there even as in Sinai in the holy place, that is, in the visible glory upon the mercy-seat, even as in the fire upon mount Sinai, verse 18. Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, and received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that is, probably for the heathen world, that the Lord God might dwell amongst them." This is plainly applied to Christ; Eph. iv. *When he ascended on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. Now he that ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?* which most evidently intends our blessed Saviour.

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

Psal. cii. 15. "The heathen shall fear the name of the Lord, and all the kings of the earth thy glory;" and probably the recalling the Jews follows, verse 16. "When the Lord shall build up Zion, he will appear in his glory: The Lord shall declare his name in Zion, and his praise in Jerusalem, when the people are gathered together, and the kingdoms, that is, of the Gentiles, to serve the Lord. Verse 25. *Of old thou hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands; they shall perish, but thou art the same, &c.* This is expressly attributed to Christ; Heb. i. 10, 11. The apostle introduces it to prove his dignity above angels, and shews that he is the Jehovah, that God who created the heavens and the earth, &c.

Isa. vi. 1. "I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple, &c. Verse 5. *Mine eyes have seen the king, the Lord of hosts, &c.*" which is a nar-

native of some visible appearance of God. And the holy evangelist interprets it concerning our Saviour; John xii. 41. *These things said Isaias, when he saw his glory and spake of him.* Here is the great God appearing in a visible manner, and Christ is that God or Lord of hosts.

Isa. xxxv. 1, 2, &c. "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad, the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose. The glory of Lebanon shall be given to it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon;" that is, the Gentiles shall have the glory of being a church of God, even as the land of Israel had been: "They shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God. Your God will come with a recompence, he will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped, the lame man shall leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing; for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert, &c." Compare this with Isa. xxxii. 1, 2, 3. *A king shall reign in righteousness, a man shall be as an hiding-place from the wind and a covert from the tempest, and the eyes of them that see shall not be dim, and the ears of them that hear shall hearken, &c.* The same things are here foretold concerning the appearance of God, and the appearance of a man, which plainly refer to the miracles which were wrought when Christ appeared, who is God and man, or God dwelling in man, and it is applied to Christ's appearance on earth by himself; Mat. xi. 4, 5. where he sends word to John, that these evidences attended him, which are the characters of the Messiah, and which were foretold. Now there is no place in the Old Testament more plainly foretels them than the words I have cited.

Isa. xl. 3. "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert an high-way for our God; the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together." Here the glory of God is foretold to become visible, and that all flesh shall see his glory. This is plainly applied to Christ, where John the baptist is said to *prepare the way for the Lord*; Mat. iii. 3. Mark i. 3. Luke i. 16, 17. even for the Lord, Jehovah, that all flesh might see him, that is, Jews and Gentiles who include all nations.

I might proceed to the 9th, 10th and 11th verses. "Say to the cities of Judah, Behold your God: Behold, the Lord God will come—and his reward is with him, and his work before him; he shall feed his flock like a shepherd." Which words seem to refer to Christ who is Immanuel, God with us, whom the cities of Judah did behold, even God manifest in the flesh, and becoming visible, who assumes the character of a shepherd; John x. and of whom it is said, *Behold, he comes,*

*his reward is with him ; Rev. xxii. 12. and who in the next verse calls himself the alpha and omega, &c.*

Isa. xlv. 21, 22, &c. "There is no God else besides me, a God and a Saviour : Look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none else." Here God is evidently represented as a Saviour of the Gentiles : Unto me shall every knee bow, and every tongue shall confess : Surely, shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength, in the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory." Now, that this belongs to Christ eminently appears, 1. because this prophecy of Christ as Jehovah our righteousness, is repeated twice by the prophet Jeremiah, chap. iii. 6. and xxxiii. 16. And the doctrine of Christ as our righteousness is frequently taught us in the New Testament ; particularly 1 Cor. i. 30, 31. *Christ is made unto us righteousness* ; and, 2. it may be remarked that the same inference is made, viz. *that according as it is written, he that glorieth in the Lord* ; and, 3. this same prophecy of the exaltation of Christ that every knee should bow to him, is expressly explained ; Rom. xiv. 9, 10, 11. and Philip. ii. 9. and is applied to Christ in both places.

If it should be objected here, that Christ is represented in both those epistles as exalted to this honour by the Father, upon the account of his sufferings, and therefore it cannot belong to the Godhead, whose honour is originally and eternally due to the divine nature of God : It is granted that the human nature is thus exalted by the Father, as a reward of his death ; in Phil. ii. and Rom. xiv. it is also granted, that *Christ died, and rose and lived, that he might be Lord of the dead and the living*. But since the same words are used in both places, and this prophecy in Isaiah is expressly cited ; Rom. xiv. 11. and applied to Christ, it may primarily signify the eternal glory of the Godhead, united to the man Jesus, or God manifest in the flesh ; and in secondary sense, it may imply all the share of these honours at the human nature of Christ which suffered and died, is capable of receiving, by its personal union with the divine, which honour can belong to no other creature, because no other being thus united to God, or one with God.

Joel ii. 28, 32. "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, &c. and whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, Jehovah, shall be delivered ; for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call ; which probably means the Gentile church. Now this text is expressly interpreted concerning Christ ; Rom. x. 12, 13. *There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek ; for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him ; for whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved,*



that is, upon the name of Christ : for this is the very scope of the place, and this the next verse proves. "How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe on him whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?" All which plainly refers to our blessed Saviour.

Observation II. The primitive fathers of the christian church, even the earliest writers, such as Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, &c. copy after the sacred writers of the New Testament; and wheresoever they find the great God, the Creator of all, Jehovah, the Lord God of Israel, represented, as becoming a Saviour to men, and especially where he is described as becoming visible, either in the ancient dispensations, or under the New Testament, or in the day of judgment, they make no scruple at all to apply these texts to our Lord Jesus Christ. Instances of this kind are very numerous in the writings even of the three first centuries. Justin Martyr affords us several citations to this purpose; and while I have been reading him as well as Irenæus, I have wondered how it could be denied, that either of them professed Christ to be true God. Justin interprets the following scriptures with reference to Christ.

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

Irenæus explains many of the same texts in the same manner, and several others, viz. Gen. iii. 9. "The Lord came to Adam in the evening and called him, and said, Where art thou? Because in the latter days this very same Word of God comes to call man." Ps. l. 1. "The mighty God, even the Lord hath spoken," whom Irenæus calls, the God of gods. What God is this? Even he of whom he said, "God shall come

ably, even our God, and will not be silent. This is the Son." lxxvi. 1. "In Judah God is known, and his name is great Israel." Is. lxxv. 1. "I was made manifest to them that I had not after me," that is, to the Gentiles. Is. xxxv. 4. Behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with recompence, he will come and save you." All these places *verbum* applies to Jesus Christ, and a great many others may be found in several of the primitive fathers, some of which are cited by the learned Dr. Waterland in his First Defence of the Queries concerning the Divinity of Christ, p. 17, page 28, &c. and in Mr. Alexander's Essay on Irenæus, p. 17, p. 6.

**Objection I.** One pretence of the Arians against these fathers' belief of the divinity of Christ, as expressed in these texts is, that they suppose Christ in these places is introduced only in the person of the Father, and as his messenger, and not as God.

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

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

**Answer I.** Some great divines have attempted to reconcile these inferior characters of the *Logos* to true and eternal godhead, by supposing that both a real derivation and some natural as well as economical inferiority may be allowed to belong to the *Logos*, even in his divine nature. But this I leave to those who defend the doctrine of a derived God.

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

III. Whether the different expressions of the fathers in different parts of their writings can be reconciled or no, yet this is plain, that in some places they do in the most evident and obvious manner interpret and ascribe the supreme scriptural titles of Jehovah, Lord of hosts, and the God of Israel, &c. to the Logos, or to the Son of God ; and this is all that I insist upon here.

Observation III. The ancient Jews in their interpretations of scripture practised the same thing as the apostles and the christian fathers ; and where God is represented in a visible manner conversing with men, or coming to save them, they make no manner of scruple to ascribe these expressions of scripture to the Word of God, the Memra or Logos, and sometimes to the Messiah. This may be seen abundantly in several parts of Dr. Alix's Judgment of the Jewish Church against the Unitarians, chapters xiii, xiv, xv, xvii, xix, xxvi. And in Dr. Owen's Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews, numbers ix, x, xi.

Now amongst the ancient Jews the Memra or Logos, that is, the Word of God, often signifies God himself, or something in and of God, some divine principle belonging to the essence of God, whereby he transacts his affairs with creatures ; and it also signifies sometimes in their writings a very glorious archangel, or a spirit superior to all angels, in whom God put his name, and in whom the true God resided in a peculiar manner, as in his house or his habitation, which they called the shekinah. This I have shewn at large in my dissertation concerning the Logos ; and I have there made it appear how both those ideas may be united in one Messiah. But however that matter stands, yet thus much is evident, that those scriptures where God is represented in a visible manner, or where he is represented eminently as a Saviour, or bringing salvation to his people both Jews and Gentiles, have been interpreted concerning Christ or the Word by the ancient Jewish church, by the apostles, and by the primitive christian writers ; whence I think we may infer these three things :

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

2. That the godhead of Christ is the very same with the godhead of the Father ; and that his divine nature is the same infinite and eternal being, the same Jehovah or God of Israel

whom all the highest titles in the Old Testament are ascribed, Christ himself says; John x. *I and my Father are one.* The Father and Son are not two infinite spirits, or two Gods, but one and the same God.

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

## DISCOURSE II.

*An Inquiry into the extensive Powers of his Human Nature in its present glorified State.*

---

### SECTION I.—Introduction.

GOD united to man, and dwelling in a human body, is one of the mysterious glories of our religion. It was so without controversy amongst the primitive christians, as St. Paul acquaints young Timothy the evangelist; 1 Tim. iii. 16. *Great is the mystery of Godliness, God manifest in the flesh.* The union of the divine and human natures in the complete person of Christ the Mediator, is one of those sublime wonders which could never have been found out by the reason of man, and which were revealed slowly to the church in successive ages. There were types and emblems and glimpses of it in ancient days; but the fuller discovery of this mystery is reserved to adorn the New Testament. In these latter days we have a most evident and certain revelation made to us, that Christ Jesus the Mediator, who was of the seed of David according to the flesh, is God over all, blessed for ever; Rom. ix. 5.

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

The most necessary and important doctrines of the gospel concerning the person of Christ are plainly written in the Word of God, that the weakest christians may read and learn them, and be saved. These have been known and acknowledged by all true christians, in all ages of the church. But there are others also of some importance, which are contained in scripture, and yet may not have been universally received among christians. Some of these perhaps have not been observed in our reading

the bible hitherto, because our education has given us no hint of them; these may become the subjects of our delightful search and profitable enquiry, when we meet with the first notices of them in the world. It is our duty to *grow in grace and the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ*; 2 Pet. iii. 18. and to seek what further acquaintance with him we may gain by an honest and impartial search into the word of God. This will carry several advantages with it, viz. 1. This will be for the exaltation of Christ himself; for we shall pay him more just honour in every respect, when we know more of him, and are better acquainted with the various excellencies of his sacred person.—2. This will tend to the illustration of the gospel, and the confirmation of our faith; for the whole scheme of christianity, and particularly all that doctrine that relates to the person of Christ, is so harmoniously connected, that when we gain further light into any one part of it, it sheds some degrees of divine brightness over all the rest.—3. This will better furnish us with answers to the adversaries of our religion; for the more we know, the better we can defend our knowledge, support our profession, and vindicate the name and honour of our blessed Saviour.—4. This will render the word of God itself more glorious, both in our own esteem, and in the eyes of the world, when we see the darker and more perplexed passages of it unfolded, when we find a way to solve those difficulties, which have often puzzled us and our forefathers, and when we remove those incumbrances which have given our adversaries a handle to assault our faith, and to depreciate the Word of God as a volume of obscure and inconsistent things.

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

In many instances it must be confessed, it is difficult, if not impossible, for us to say exactly how far the human nature is the immediate subject of some sublime honours and actions, and how far they must be ascribed to the indwelling deity; to find the precise limits of the agencies or honours of the two natures in Christ in every respect, is a mystery too deep for our present penetration. Yet since the scripture has abundantly manifested the exaltation of the man Jesus to the right-hand of

God, to enjoy inconceivable degrees of power, authority and splendour, it is proper for us to do so much honour to the man whom God the Father delights to honour, as to read and understand as far as we can the peculiar glories of his special advancement.

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

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

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

ACT. II.—*Scriptural Proofs of the Exaltation of the human Nature of Christ, and the extensive Capacities and Powers of his Soul in his glorified State.*

That the great and blessed God condescended to assume any man soul and body into a personal union with himself, was a matter of free and sovereign favour; and that he should chuse a one human spirit, and this body which was born of the virgin Mary, to be the subjects of this privilege, was the effect of the same goodness and the same sovereignty; *God spake in vision to his holy one, and said, I have exalted one chosen out of the people; Ps. lxxxix. 19.* It is a favour at first altogether unmerited, and which the man Jesus could not claim. *It pleased the Father that in him all the fulness of the godhead should dwell bodily: Col. i. 19. and ii. 9.* It was a matter of divine will and pleasure that God should dwell in that particular spirit, and manifest in that particular flesh and blood which was born at Bethlehem. Thence it will follow, that the influences and privileges derived from this union are limited by the will and pleasure of God; and the honours and powers which accrue to the human nature on this account are suspended or bestowed, increased and diminished, according to the wise counsels and determinations of the divine will.

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

This will appear if we consider that Christ was God-man in the days of his humiliation: He was *Emmanuel* or *God with us; Mat. i. 23. He was God manifest in the flesh; 1 Tim. iii. 16.* He was that Word who was God, made flesh; *John i. 1, 14.* And our divines very justly affirm, it was the same godhead which is in the Father that dwelt in Christ: *I am in the Father, says our Lord, and the Father in me; John xiv. 10. I and the Father are one; John x. 30.* Yet while he lived upon earth, this divine union did not exert its influences to the utmost, either as to knowledge or power or authority; for the child Jesus grew in wisdom as well as stature; *Luke ii. 52.* and the glory of judgment which was known to the Father was unknown to the Son at that time; *Mark xiii. 32. Of that day and that*



hour knoweth no man, neither the Son, but the Father. His knowledge was imperfect, and his authority on earth, before his death, appeared rather the authority of a prophet than a king: In his younger years he was subject to the commands of his parents; Luke ii. 51. And when he appeared in the world, it was as a man, sent from God, to reveal his will and to obey or fulfil it. He declared he was no king on earth, that is, a temporal king, for his kingdom was not of this world; John xviii. 36.—He paid tribute to Cæsar; he would not be the divider of an inheritance among contending brethren; Luke xii. 13, 14. He had not where to lay his head; ix. 58. The man Jesus here on earth lived among men, and had not complete knowledge, nor could he have complete power.

It pleased the Father, and it was agreed in the covenant of redemption, that the man Jesus should arrive at his exaltation by degrees: It was agreed that he should practise the most profound instances of humility and submission to God, as well as the most astonishing act of pity and charity toward men, in becoming a sacrifice for their sins and dying upon the cross, before he was to receive his promised honours. The Father thought it proper to bestow the most sublime advancement upon him as a reward of his sufferings; and to suspend his rich reward till his work was done, that he might at once display his own grace, his equity and his truth in the glorification of the human nature of his Son Jesus, and that he might be a more proper pattern for all his followers. This doctrine runs through many pages in the Old Testament and in the New.

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

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

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

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

ii. 33. of Christ exalted by the right-hand of God. If we enquire more particularly of the person who is thus exalted, the context assures us, it is *Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God*; ver. 22. It is that very man of the seed of David, according to the flesh, who was appointed to sit on his throne, ver. 30. It was the man that was taken and crucified and slain, ver. 28. The man whom God raised from the dead; ver. 32. who was thus exalted by the right-hand of God, ver. 33.

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

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

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

This argument will be further enforced, if we consider, that his exaltation after his labour and sufferings, is represented and proposed to us as a pledge and pattern of our exaltation after we

have laboured and suffered, on purpose to encourage us in our labours and sufferings. Now this must be the exaltation of his human nature or the man Jesus, who did both labour and suffer as well as we.

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

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

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

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

Observe also that he is made and declared *worthy to take this book and to open the seals of it, because he was slain and has redeemed his saints to God by his blood, verse 9.* Surely it was

not the godhead, but the man Jesus who was slain ; and it is the man, not the godhead, who is become worthy on this account to read this book of divine counsels. " This is that revelation which God gave unto Jesus Christ, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass, and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John ;" Rev. i. 1.

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

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

1. Since the human nature of Christ at least must be allowed in some sense to complete the person of the Mediator, and it is his human nature that is thus raised from the dead by the mighty power of God, and set at the right-hand of God in heavenly places, it is but reasonable to conceive that the human nature receives this exaltation, this power and dominion over all things, though I grant it must be considered in union with the divine: But if we do not suppose it to be the human nature which is thus dignified and endued with authority, then we shall be forced to interpret this text thus, viz. that God raised his human nature from the dead, and set his human nature at his own right-hand, that is, on high above the clouds: But has put all things under the feet of his divine nature considered as Mediator ; which seems to be but a shifting and evasive exposition, if the words will admit a sense that is plainer and easier: And no man who reads it with an unbiassed mind would put this strained interpretation upon it.

2. Of what use is the frequent declaration of this power and government conferred upon Christ after his ascension, if it be not conferred on his human nature, and if his human nature does not exercise it? The divine nature of Christ had this power, and exercised this government before: As God he always did, and always will govern the world, though there had not been a word spoken in scripture of any exaltation of Christ to this government: And since godhead is united to the man Jesus, godhead in this united state would continue to govern the world as

before, and that even during all the humiliation of Christ: What alteration then does arise from this declared exaltation of Christ, after his labours and suffering? And besides,

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

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

Yet here I would give notice once for all, that I do not exclude this sort of scriptures from an economical sense: I mean thus, they may have a respect to Christ in his complete person as God-man, and as Mediator; or as a man united to godhead, and they may and must signify his exaltation in his mediatorial character to these honours and authorities; without the indwelling godhead several of them seem to be too sublime for a man: But still the most natural, obvious, and primary meaning of them, refers to that human nature, which alone can be the proper subject of real abasement and advancement, which alone could really suffer, and which alone could receive real exaltation; for the divine nature in itself is utterly incapable of either. It is the man who is exalted, even the man Jesus who is called the Mediator, but it is the man who is one with God. He obeyed and suffered and died as man, but united to God: He rose and was exalted as man, but still united to God. I beg pardon if I have dwelt too long on this point, or repeated any thing which I have said before. The doctrine itself seems to require it of n.e., that if possible I might leave no scruple on the minds of pious readers who are honestly searching out the truth, and would secure the honours of their blessed Redeemer.

It may be enquired here, "What acts can the man Jesus

put forth in his human nature toward the government of heaven and earth ?”

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

Let me ask, may not Christ keep the wheels of nature in their courses, and administer the providential kingdom by virtue derived from the indwelling godhead ? May he not exert his dominion amongst all the material elements, and the inhabitants of air, earth and water, as well as amongst the spirits of the invisible world ? Shall prophets and apostles and captains have a resemblance of such power given them on earth, and shall not Jesus the Son of God have the substance and plenitude of it, especially now in heaven ? Could a Moses divide the sea with his rod, and turn flints into rivers of water ? Could a Joshua say to the sun, Stand thou still, and forbid the moon to move ? Could a Paul make fevers and dropsies depart at his word, and flee at the appearance of his handkerchief ? Acts xix. 12, Could Peter heal the sick with his shadow passing over them ; Acts xv. 15. and command Tabitha to arise from the dead ? And shall we not suppose the man Christ Jesus in his exalted state, with all the power and glory of indwelling and united godhead ; I say, shall we not suppose him able to rule time and nature as he pleases, and to manage all things in heaven and earth, all things mortal and immortal ?

Or if we lift our thoughts to the angelic legions and survey their powers, must we not suppose the power communicated to our exalted Saviour to be far superior to theirs ? Shall it be within the power of a single angel, when sent with a pestilence, to destroy seventy thousand of Israel in order to punish David's sin ; 2 Sam. xxiv. 15, 16. or to slay a hundred and fourscore and five thousand Assyrian soldiers in the camp of Sennacherib in one night ; 2 Kings xix. 35. or shall it be within the reach of Satan's power and commission, as he is the *Prince of the powers of the air*, to raise storms and hurricanes, and to send lightning from heaven ; Job i. 16, 19. and shall not the blessed soul of

our exalted Redeemer have more transcendent power than angels or devils? Why should it not be within the reach of his human will by methods of unknown influence to govern the winds and the waters, the earthly and the heavenly bodies, to subserve the the councils of his Father and his own gracious purposes towards his people?

Or if it should be doubted at present by any of my readers, whether Christ's own human power reaches to an immediate management of all these affairs at so prodigious distances, yet we may be assured, as I hinted before, it is not above the power of human nature, so exalted and so nearly united to God, to give orders of this kind to the standing or fallen angels, which the divine nature has taken care shall be punctually and exactly fulfilled: and thus *he shall reign till he has brought all his enemies under his feet*: 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25. But a further pursuit of this subject is reserved to the following section: I proceed now to the third instance of power and dignity to which the human nature of Christ is exalted.

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

Besides it is impossible that the divine nature should be really and properly "exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour, &c." for it would be humiliation and not exaltation for the pure divine nature to accept of these titles and perform these offices even by way of deputation and vicegerency to the Father, when it had supreme authority originally and eternally in itself without any donation or deputation. It will be said here, "What can the man Jesus do toward the giving repentance and forgiveness?"

I would humbly enquire whether it were not his human nature sent forth his apostles when he was here on earth? And is it not the same man Jesus who sends his ministers abroad into the nations in his present exaltation in heaven? Is it not still the man in whom godhead dwells? Is it not he who gives apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers to publish this doctrine of repentance and forgiveness in his name? *He that ascended on high after he had descended into the lower parts of the earth? He that received gifts for men; Ps. lxxviii. 18. and gave these gifts unto men for the perfecting the saints, for the work of the ministry, and for the edifying his body; Eph. iv. 8, 12.*

And though we may reasonably suppose the man Jesus considered alone has not now, nor could ever have sufficient power in

himself abstracted from deity, to change the hearts of men, make obstinate sinners become penitent, and seal the forgiveness of sins with comfort to their consciences ; yet the man Jesus may say, " Father, I will that this and the other obdurate sinner be reclaimed, softened and sanctified : Father, I will that his sins be forgiven him : " And hereupon the blessed Spirit of God works this divine change in the sinner, and seals this forgiveness to the soul. Why may not Jesus work wonders of grace on the souls of men, in the same way as he wrought miracles of healing on their bodies ?

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

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

And thus the man Jesus being now exalted to a more sovereign sort of agency, to " quicken whom he will ;" John v. 21. hath a special interest in those titles, a Prince and a Saviour, and in bestowing repentance and forgiveness ; Acts ii. 31, 32, 33. because his will is made as it were the agent. He ascended to heaven, he received the promise of the Spirit, he poured down



those gifts of the Spirit on his apostles and the primitive christians, for the ordinary and extraordinary works of grace, for it is by his will these things were done.

IV. "The human nature of our Lord Jesus Christ has some influence in the succour and support of tempted christians;" Heb. iv. 15. The apostle assures us, "We have an high-priest who was tempted in all points as we are, but without sin; and he can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities," that is, he has a human sympathy arising from his human sufferings, and therefore we are encouraged to "come to the throne of grace to find help." And chapter ii. verse 18. "In that he himself has suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted." Now since his ability to succour tempted souls does arise in part from his human sympathy, and from his own experience of sufferings and temptations in his human nature, it leads us naturally to conceive that even his human soul has some hand in the succour of tempted saints.

1. Because the divine nature is not rendered more able to succour them by all the temptations that the human nature sustained. The divine nature is infinitely and eternally able to succour without any regard at all of the human nature, whether that had been tempted or no.

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

Observe further, that Christ is represented as the head of the church in many scriptures, and the saints as his members: now this headship must be referred specially to his human nature, though not excluding the divine, because the members and head must be of the same nature. The second chapter to the Hebrews, seems to be written with this design, to shew the necessity of Christ's incarnation, in order to sustain the proper and appointed relations to his own people, viz. "Because the children were partakers of flesh and blood, therefore he took part of the same, that he might be a brother, a priest, a father, a succourer of the tempted, &c." Nor can any relation seem more necessarily to require his having a human nature, than that of head and members. Now in what sense can the man Jesus bear the relation of such a vital or sympathizing head united to

body, the church, if he has no particular knowledge of the wants, sorrows and sufferings of his particular members; if he has only a mere general confused knowledge that he has members on earth who endure sorrow and suffering, though he knows not how many, nor which they be, nor is he able as man to do any thing for their particular relief? Would it not be strange to say, He has the most near and intimate relation of headship to his members, as he is man and of the same nature with them, and yet he cannot do any thing for the support or succour of any of them, by the powers of the very nature whereby he sustains this relation, and whereby chiefly he becomes their head? It is granted that the indwelling godhead capacitates him for the supply of the wants of his members, by furnishing him with grace; but I think that human nature by which he eminently sustains this relation and becomes a head, may be allowed to be an intelligent and conscious medium of conveying these supplies.

V. If it should not be allowed that Jesus Christ, as man, can bestow effectual succour and relief on his tempted saints, yet rely he is able to make particular intercession for them. It is upon this account he is declared "able to save to the utmost those that come to God by him, because he ever lives to make intercession for them, Heb. vii. 25. Now we cannot suppose it is the divine nature which properly and directly intercedes or pleads for us in heaven, but the man Jesus, who gave us a pattern of that intercession here on earth; John xvii. though it may be the divine nature united that renders this intercession so universally powerful and prevalent.

Nor can we suppose that Christ intercedes merely in general for all his saints without knowledge of their particular persons, or their present particular circumstances; for this is more than every christian on earth does or should do: we could all intercede or plead in that manner for all the saints; Job. vi. 18. though our pleadings have not the same efficacy as his, nor are we supposed to have the same knowledge of their wants.

When we are told that our great High-priest, whose special work and office in heaven is to make intercession for us, "is ascended into the heavens, and that he can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, having himself been tempted as we are;" we never imagine that this does not refer to the human nature

of Christ, since none of these expressions are applicable to his deity: And can we think that the scripture would represent our encouragements to apply ourselves to him as an intercessor in such tender and sympathetic language, if he knew only in general that there were thousands of tempted saints on earth, but had no particular knowledge of their persons, their special kinds

of temptation and present distress, which might awaken this sympathy, and engage his special representation of their cases to the Father.

VI. "The human nature of Christ united to his godhead is exalted to receive honours from men and angels in the upper and lower worlds, upon the account of its obedience, sorrows, and sufferings." It is one part of the reward promised to men of piety, that they shall enjoy glory and honour as well as immortality and peace; Rom. ii. 7, 10. And surely our blessed Saviour has at least a right to share in the general promise made to men, and to have his transcendent and perfect piety rewarded with transcendent honours and glories.

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

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

Read what the apostle declares; Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11. "Christ humbled himself and became obedient to the death of the cross, wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of the Father." Surely it is the human nature that seems to be exalted here to this dignity, as it stands united to the divine; and this is manifest, not only because the divine nature could not receive this exaltation, having an original and underived right to worship, but also because his human sufferings are the reason of his exaltation.

I am ready to believe that the human nature of Christ knows and beholds all the knees bowing to him, and hears all the tongues confessing him, or else how can this be a proper recom-

ience for the sufferings of Christ in his human nature? Does the godhead derive recompences from the sufferings of the man? Or can God be said thus to exalt the pure divine nature to be the object of adoration? Has the human nature of Christ no share in this reward? Or is the human nature of Christ recompensed some other way, that is, by making a luminous figure in heaven, arrayed in bright ornaments above the clouds, or stars, but ignorant of the honours done him by the church on earth, while yet these very honours done him on earth are declared to be his appointed recompence? How unreasonable and absurd is such a supposition.

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

Answer. I think the human nature of Christ is no otherwise capable of religious worship, according to the statutes of heaven, but by being thus gloriously united to the divine: but when it is thus united, the whole complex person may be made the object of religious worship if God see fit, since the person who is worshipped is really one with God, and has personal communion with the divine nature: But for the further removal of these objections and all the difficulties of this kind, see my dissertation of the "Worship of Christ as God-man and Mediator," Dissertation III. proposition viii. ix. where I have not only proved it from scripture, but cited the testimony of some of our greatest writers to support it, such as Turretine and Dr. Owen.

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

John v. 27. because he is the Son of man," that is, the man the Messiah.

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

VIII. It might be added in the last place, that our blessed Saviour considered as man, "has some unknown and most extensive ways of communicating his presence; his influence and his glory to all the millions of saints in the heavenly world;" for the heaven of each of them consists partly in "being present with Christ; 2 Cor. v. 8. and beholding his glory which the Father gave him;" that is, the glory of his human nature, or at least as God-man; John xiv. 3. and xvii. 24. Now it is but a poor, low, and carnal idea of the heavenly state and blessedness, if we conceive the common rank of saints to have no nearer access to Christ, and no more participation of his presence, or views of his glory than merely to dwell in the same spacious regions of heaven, and to behold a man afar off raised on a high throne and arrayed in light at a great distance. Surely the immediate presence of the man Christ, and immediate communion with him, shall be something more near, more intimate, and more blissful than such a distant sight of him.

Shall it be said, That the powers of every glorified saint shall be vastly enlarged, to take in the blessed prospect and enjoyment, though the object may be far off? And may it not be said also with more reason, that the powers of our glorified Saviour shall be much more enlarged to communicate himself and his glories to the meanest and most distant inhabitants of

aven? May he not make himself, even in his human nature as well as his divine, immediately present with them all, a most extensive diffusion of his human as well as his divine glories?

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

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

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

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

enough to take in all the most important affairs of this lower world, and perhaps every person that is under his government, though his knowledge should not reach all lesser circumstances?

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

The human soul of Christ is the brightest image or copy of the divine nature that is found among mere creatures; and though it may not receive all the infinite variety of particular ideas of human affairs, which are in the divine mind, yet it may receive as a transcript from the divine mind, so many of the largest and strongest of those ideas which relate to human affairs, as may be sufficient to qualify him for the judge of all, under the immediate influence of indwelling deity. So a man may transcribe a copy of the hebrew bible, viz. all the letters or consonants of it, sufficient for himself to read and understand it, though he leave out every point, vowel and accent, which sometimes may be more in number than the letters themselves.

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

I answer, If this be so, yet since the human soul of Christ can do so much as I have mentioned toward the cognizance and judgment of mankind, he may justly have this work assigned to him, considering its union to godhead; and where the faculties of the human soul of Christ are exerted to their utmost, and yet fall short, the divine nature which is always present, abundantly supplies all that defect by a constant, immediate and unknown motion and influence. "God has ordained a man to judge the world;" Acts xvii. 31. and yet God is judge himself. Selah. P. l. 6.

and here let it be observed once for all, that I can hardly myself leave to think that any created spirit whatsoever know every individual circumstance of every being, and action both in the world of bodies and the world of souls. Dr. Goodwin supposes the man Jesus capable of all; rather suppose it belongs only to the omniscience of God. If to take in with one infinite, simultaneous and extensive all the shapes, sizes, situations and motions of every single of which this whole globe of earth is composed, with all animal and vegetable productions, and all the other planetary, the sun, moon and stars, with every action and circumstance of all their inhabitants. I content myself rather to think prerogative only of God the Creator, the infinite Spirit, perfectly acquainted with every motion of the mind, every thought and manner of action that belongs to all the inhabitable inhabitants of the intellectual world, both men and angels. Should it be granted that any creature could oversee and govern every minute affair that relates to the worlds of spirit and matter, and every thought and atom that belongs to all, sometimes I think this would approach so near to the astonishing properties and prerogatives which God hath assumed and peculiarized to himself in this world, that it would take away that plain and obvious distinction between God and the creature which ought to be maintained sacred and inviolable. Scripture seems to limit my thoughts about a creature's power in this manner.

Whatsoever therefore I may speak in this treatise according to the most raised apprehensions I have of the "extent of the intellectual powers of Christ," I can hardly suppose to reach any farther than to take a just cognizance of all the greater and more important motions and actions, circumstances and relations of the material and immaterial worlds on the government of them chiefly depends; and perhaps even this may be impossible without his peculiar union to the divine nature. He may thus have a simultaneous and comprehensive view of all the greater affairs of every inhabitant of the upper and lower worlds, and may also have a successive particular knowledge of any minuter circumstances that attend them, whenever the indwelling deity sees it necessary to communicate it to him for any special occasions. As the general army standing on a hill surveys the troops engaged in battle; can distinguish perhaps every regiment, and their changes of ground, when they charge, and when they retreat, but cannot follow every sword that is drawn, nor hear every groan; yet the particulars of this kind which relate to the single soldiers are distinctly told him. Where that great author Doctor Goodwin, whose opinions I cite at the end of this book, indulges



his imagination to fly beyond these limits, I am constrained to leave him, lest I should seem to deify a creature, and intrench upon the supreme majesty of God.

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

When we narrow and limit our conceptions of the extensive powers of the soul of Jesus, and bring them down too near to our own, it is because we have too high a conceit of ourselves, and too low an idea of the great and glorious God. We are ready to fancy the difference between God and ourselves so small, as that a mind so vastly superior to our own, as I have described, must be raised immediately to godhead: whereas by the view of the powers of angels, which I have hinted before, it is possible there may be endowments and excellencies equal to all the millions of men on earth united in one spirit, which may be yet but a created being, and infinitely inferior to the great God. And surely if there be such a spirit of such extensive excellencies and endowments, it is divinely proper that this spirit should be the soul of Jesus who is so intimately united to God, and who in *all things must have the pre-eminence*; Col. i. 18.

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

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

Can the same God perform the same wonders in the world of spirits? Can he not form a spirit of such extensive capacities as may be equal to a million of common human souls?

Let us think again, what strange difference there is between the life and activity of an eagle and an oyster, or between a greyhound and a snail, and yet both are animals. May not therefore the soul of our Lord Jesus Christ exceed common souls both in the activity and extent of its powers as much as the most sprightly animal exceeds the dullest and most stupid? As far as sun beams exceed smoke and ashes, or as far as the sun exceeds our common fires? *For in all things he must have the pre-eminence;*" Col. i. 18.

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

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

Such a glorious created mind as belongs to the Son of God may be capable, for ought we know, of extending its thoughts backward to far distant ages, and forward beyond time, and reach far into eternity, and may also spread them abroad over the nations of mankind, and all their chief affairs, and yet not be perfectly infinite as the knowledge of God is\* ; for divine know-

\* It is worthy of our observation how Mr. Locke in the "Essay on the Human Understanding" describes the largeness of a man or an angel's memory, Book II, chapter x. section 9. "It is reported of that prodigy of parts, Monsieur Pascal, that till the decay of his health had impaired his memory, he forgot nothing of what he had done, read or thought in any part of his rational age."

ledge extends at once infinitely backward and forward through both eternities, and reaches to all possibles, as well as to what is actually past and future.

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

Surely we have good reason to believe that the soul of Christ is the most intelligent, the most knowing and active creature that God ever made, and has the largest native powers; and it seems divinely agreeable that it should be so, that he might be a proper subject for the favour of a personal union with the godhead, and a proper medium whereby the great God might with honour transact his affairs among the children of men, as well as that he might be a most suitable mirror to display the divine perfections in their fairest and strongest light. Surely there is no created nature which in itself comes nearer to the perfections of God than the man Christ Jesus. No creature is a fairer image of God than the soul of Christ is, and thereby it becomes the fittest instrument for an indwelling God to act by, and yet it is infinitely inferior to godhead.

III. But if the native powers of the soul of Christ in its first formation, or during its abode on earth in a humbled estate, were not sufficient for these purposes of government and judgment, yet may they not be sufficient in its present glorified state? The powers of a soul confined in flesh and blood may be but of a narrow extent in comparison of those extensive powers which are ascribed to the man Jesus Christ now in heaven. Who knows what "amazing enlargement may attend all the natural powers of man when advanced to a state of glory?" Perhaps a common spirit released from flesh and blood, and exalted to a glorified state, may extend its powers a thousand times farther than the greatest spirit dwelling in flesh can do.

And we may suppose also that when this spirit is again united to a glorified body, its own powers of activity, knowledge and influence may be yet farther enlarged abundantly, rather

*The several degrees of angels may probably have larger views, and some of them be endowed with capacities able to retain together, and constantly set before them as in one picture all their past knowledge at once."*

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

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

The very extent of the power and presence of a glorified body itself may be prodigiously large in comparison of our bodies of flesh and blood. A drop of oil may be contained in a pepper corn, and not extend its influence beyond it : But place this drop on a burning lamp, and the blaze will diffuse its particles of light, when it is thus kindled, perhaps to two miles distance in a dark night ; thence it is evident, that these diffusive particles of oil will fill a sphere of four miles diameter : A most amazing enlargement of a single drop ! And why may not a glorified body, especially when it shall be called a spiritual body, as much exceed flesh and blood in its extent of powers as a drop of oil kindled into a blaze stretches itself beyond its own first or native dimensions ? Behold our blessed Lord after his resurrection, even before he was fully glorified, comes with his body twice *into the midst of his disciples when the doors were shut* ; \* John xx. 19, 26. Much less doth a glorified body seem to be subject to the present laws, restraints and limitations of corporeal motion.

What if we should suppose a glorified soul to have as sovereign and immediate an influence over every atom of its own glorified body as our souls at present have over our grosser limbs ? What if it be made capable of ranging and disposing the atoms, of which the body is compounded, in what form it please, and of diffusing them through unknown spaces ? Hence would evidently

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

result the safety and immortality of that body, and its prodigious vital activity on the material world. Our safety would be in our own power, and our influence amazing, if we could place every atom of our bodies in what form we chuse, and keep it then during our pleasure. And then surely we may allow the glorified soul of our blessed Saviour to be possessed of this power in a much superior degree, and to exert it in a far more transcendent manner: And thus *the Sun of Righteousness*, even in the operation of his human nature, may answer all the parallels of this illustrious metaphor. The natural powers of his body thus sublimated and refined may move, for ought we know, as swift as sun-beams, which may travel many thousands of miles in a minute: It may diffuse its influences like the sun in a most extensive sphere: It may reach our world, and the moon almost the same moment, and penetrate earth to the centre.

If the face of our Lord on the mount of transfiguration did *shine as the sun, and his raiment as the light*; Mat. xvii. 2. If his body appearing to St. Paul was dressed in such a *light from heaven as exceeded the brightness of the sun at mid-day*; Act. xxvi. 13. What diffusive and distant influences may such a glorified body be capable of on the elementary world of air, earth and water, under the command of such a glorified soul as that of our Saviour?

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

Now suppose God should create a most illustrious spirit, and unite it to the body of the sun, as a human soul is united to a human body: Suppose this spirit had a perceptive power capacious enough to become conscious of every sun-beam, and all the influences and effects of this vast shining globe, both in its light, heat and motion even to the remotest region: And suppose at

the same time it was able by an act of its will to send out or withhold every sun-beam as it pleased, and thereby to give light and darkness, life and death in a sovereign manner to all the animal inhabitants of this our earth, or even of all the planetary worlds. Such may be the "glorified human soul of our blessed Redeemer united to his glorified body;" and perhaps his knowledge and his power may be as extensive as this similitude represents; especially when we consider this soul and body as personally united to the divine nature, and as one with God.

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

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

Let us dwell a little longer upon these delightful contemplations. If a soul had but a full knowledge and command of all the atoms of one solid foot of matter, which according to modern philosophy is infinitely divisible, what strange and astonishing influences would it have over this world of ours? What confusions might it raise in distant nations, sending pestilential streams into a thousand bodies, and destroying armies at once? And it might scatter benign or healing and vital influences to as large a circumference. If our blessed Lord in the days of his humiliation could send "virtue out of him to heal a poor diseased woman who touched the hem of his garment" with a finger, who knows what healing atoms or what killing influences he may send

from his dwelling in glory to the remotest distances of our world, to execute his Father's counsels of judgment or mercy? It is not impossible, so far as I can judge, that the soul of Christ in its glorified state may have as much command over our heavens and our earth and all things contained in them, as our souls in the present state have over our own limbs and muscles to move them at pleasure.

Let us remember that it is now found out and agreed in the new philosophy of Sir Isaac Newton, that the distances are prodigious to which the powerful influence of the sun reaches in the centre of our planetary system. It is the sun who holds and restrains all the planets in their several orbits, and keeps in those vast bodies of Jupiter and Saturn in their constant revolutions; one at the distance of 424 millions, and the other at the distance of 777 millions of miles; besides all the other influences it has upon every thing that may live and grow in those planetary worlds. It is the sun who reduces the long wanderings of the comets back again near to himself from distances more immensely great than those of Saturn and Jupiter: And why may not the human nature of our Lord Jesus Christ both in soul and body have a dominion given him by the Father, larger than the sun in the firmament! Why may not the Son of God be endued with an immediate consciousness and agency to a far greater distance?

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

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

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

In answer to this, we must all confess that the doctrine of unions is one of the most unknown and unsearchable difficulties

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

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

1. "As to the communication of knowledge to the man Christ by his union with the deity." We may try to illustrate this matter by the similitude of the union of a human soul to a body. Suppose a learned philosopher be also a skilful divine, and a great logician; we may reasonably conclude that there are some millions of words and phrases, if taken together with all the various senses that attend them, which are deposited in his brain as in a repository, by means of some correspondent traces or signatures; we may suppose also millions of ideas of things, human and divine, treated up in various traces or signatures in the same brain. Nay the organ of sense may impress on the brain millions of traces belonging to the particular objects of that sense; especially the senses of discipline, the eye and the ear: The pictures, the images, the colours, and the sounds that are reserved in this repository of the brain, by some correspondent impressions or traces, are little less than infinite: Now the human soul of the philosopher, by being united to this brain, this well-furnished repository, receives all these names, words, sounds, images, lines, figures, notions, and sensations. It receives all these ideas, and is, as it were, mistress of them all. The very opening of the eye impresses thousands of ideas at once upon such a soul united to a human brain; and what unknown millions of ideas may be impressed on it or conveyed to it in successive sensations, whensoever she stands in need of them, and that by the means of this union to the brain, is beyond our capacity to think or number.

Let us now conceive the divine mind or wisdom as a repository stored with infinite ideas of things past, present and future; suppose a created spirit of most extensive capacity intimately



united to this divine mind or wisdom : May it not by this means by divine appointment become capable of receiving so many of those ideas, and so much knowledge as are necessary for the government and the judgment of all nations ? And this may be done two ways, viz. either by the immediate application of itself as it were by enquiry, to the divine mind, to which it is thus united, or by the immediate actual influences and impressions which the divine mind may make of these ideas on the human soul, as fast as ever it can stand in need of them for these glorious purposes.

Since a human brain, which is mere matter, and which contains only some strokes and traces and corporeal signatures of ideas, can convey to a human soul united to it, many millions of ideas, as fast as it needs them for any purposes of human life; how much more may the infinite God or divine mind or wisdom, which hath actually all real and possible ideas in it, in the most perfect manner, communicate to a human soul united to this divine wisdom, a far greater number of ideas than a human brain can receive; even as many as the affairs of governing and judging this world may require.

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

II. Having shewn how the human soul of Christ, by virtue of its union with the divine nature, may be furnished with most amazing treasures of knowledge, I proceed now to enquire how the human nature of Christ may attain vast effective powers, and may be said to have a hand in bringing about the various revolutions of providence, in managing the affairs of the government of the world, and forming the wonderful scenes of the last judgment ; and all this by virtue of its union to the divine nature. Let us consider what power or influence the human nature of Christ might have upon the miracles which he wrought whilst

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

When he cleansed the leper; Mat. viii. 3. his soul willed that leprosy should depart, and his tongue pronounced these words, *I will; be thou clean*; and immediately the effect followed, the leper was healed. Whether the human soul of Christ had in that day sufficient knowledge and power given it to change the crisis of the blood, to remove the tainted atoms from the body of the man, and to place all the fibres of the diseased flesh in a proper and healthy form, this may be matter of doubtful enquiry: But if the divine power united to the manhood made this sovereign and healing change, and was pleased to make use of the intermediate volition of the human will, and language of the human tongue for this purpose, still the man Christ Jesus has his share of agency in this work; and therefore he is said to *go about working wonders and healing diseases, for God was with him*; Acts x. 38.

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

It was much the same thing when he cast out devils, and commanded them to depart from the bodies which they possessed. Whether it was the terror of his known character that fell upon them and frightened them, or the compulsive power of his deity drove them out, this may perhaps be doubted: But suppose the demoniacs were dispossessed by divine agency, yet the man Jesus has the honour of this miracle, as being the conscious in-

strument of his godhead therein. *It was Jesus of Nazareth who healed those who were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him; Acts x. 38.*

Yet we should take notice that in the days of his humiliation on earth, his power was limited; for he had not the knowledge of all God's counsels, *he knew not the day of judgment*, and therefore could not govern the world till his resurrection and ascension, when the Father *delivered all things into his hands; Mat. xxviii. 18.* and gave him the book of his decrees; *Rev. v. 7—9.* We may observe also that when he raised Lazarus, he prayed to the Father for that miracle; *John xi. 41.* as acknowledging publicly a particular dependence for each miraculous operation; *I know that thou hearest me always, and I thank thee thou hast now heard me.*

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

Thus if the exalted powers of the man Jesus in glory are not conceived to be sufficient in themselves for the complete execution of those great offices to which he is advanced, yet his human soul being united to his godhead, and always under the infallible influence of divine wisdom and counsel, and having such a most extensive acquaintance with the affairs of the upper and lower worlds, the man Christ may give forth all the commands of God whereby the world is governed, and *every knee may bow to him, and every tongue confess that Christ is Lord to the glory of the Father; Phil. ii. 10, 11.*

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

Perhaps the powers of any other human soul would be dissolved and destroyed under such impressions from indwelling divinity as the soul of Christ constantly receives, and by which he is fitted for his high post of mediation and government. Were it possible that the divine power should continually condescend to effect whatsoever a common human soul willed, yet this human soul perhaps has not natural powers sufficiently large to make a conscious instrument of one thousandth part of what the soul of Jesus knows and wills, and does by virtue of the indwelling godhead. *In all things he must have the pre-eminence;* 1. i. 15—18.

Upon this representation of things, the various language of scripture appears to be true, and is made very intelligible. Christ says, *he can do nothing of himself, he knew not the day of judgment when he was here on earth, &c.* and yet he is said to *know the hearts of men, and to know all things*; for as fast as the divine mind united to him was pleased to communicate all these ideas, so fast was his human nature capable of receiving them. *The Father, in succession of seasons, shews the Son all things that himself doth;* John v. 20. But God had shewn him but some lesser things comparatively at the time when Christ spake this; for at that time he assures the Jews, that *the Father would afterwards shew him greater works than these.* Thus, I have shewn before, the union of the human nature to the divinity, being purely arbitrary, or owing to the will of God, the seasons and measures of divine communications made to the man Jesus must be arbitrary also, and limited or enlarged according to divine will and appointment.

Upon this same representation of things also it may be justly said in scripture, that "God governs the world, God only knows the hearts of all men, and God himself is the Judge, and yet Christ is the searcher of hearts, the Judge and Lord of all; because though the man Jesus may have these titles and characters attributed to him, yet it is not merely the man considered ab-

stractly in himself, but it is the man united to God, it is the person of God-man: or you may say, the divine nature, or the godhead acting in and by the man Jesus, who performs all these wonders, and which makes the man Jesus the conscious and intelligent medium of these performances; and thus he gives him the honour of being the agent.

By this account of things, there is a fair answer given to the objection that might be started against the first part of this section, viz. "If the human soul of Christ, which is but a creature, may have such a vast and astonishing extent of knowledge and power, does not this represent a creature approaching too near to the idea of God?" Does it not invest a creature with some of those prerogatives which are mentioned in scripture, as peculiar and appropriate to deity? And does it not thus take away the distinction which God has given between himself and creatures, as well as enervate several of our scripture proofs of the divinity of Christ? I have indeed, in some measure anticipated this objection, when I limited the knowledge and power of the man Jesus, only to the greater and more important concerns and actions of the material and intellectual worlds, on which the government of them chiefly depends: And even this must be a very amazing and comprehensive knowledge and power for a creature to possess: But every thought, and every motion, and every atom of the worlds of souls and bodies, in my opinion is known only to God, and belongs to infinite omniscience alone.

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

If it were possible that a mere creature could be framed by divine power, capable in itself of some of these operations which God has assumed to himself, as his own prerogatives, such as governing and judging the world, searching and sanctifying the hearts of men, &c. yet since the great God, who is jealous of his own honour, has appropriated these characters and operations to himself alone, I think we may be assured that he would never form such a creature with these characters and operations; or at least, that he would never discover such a creature to us in our world, lest he should thereby take away the inviolable criteria or

ns which himself has given us to distinguish between God and natures. Or if ever such a glorious creature were formed and covered to us, he would certainly be intimately and personally ited to the divine nature; and thus have proper godhead telling in him, lest we should be unavoidably exposed to the danger of taking one for God who was not God, and paying the honours to a person who was not divine.

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

To conclude this subject, though such speculations as I have indulged in this discourse, are by no means necessary to our salvation, yet they may be applied to several excellent purposes in christianity. They may cure us of our old narrow conceptions of the glories of the exalted human nature of Christ, and raise us nobler ideas of that illustrious person, whom God the Father hath advanced to so sublime a degree of power and majesty at his own right-hand. These speculations may give a much higher esteem of our blessed Saviour, and a more affecting sense of his sorrows and sufferings in the value and dignity of them, when we observe how glorious a person he is in himself, and what a rich and surprizing recompence God the Father has made upon this account. They may teach us to pay more just and agreeable honours to the person of our Redeemer God-man, and excite us to a nobler practice of gratitude, to do and suffer any thing for his sake; who has done and suffered so much for us on earth, and who continues to do so much for us in heaven. We are it must be a culpable defect in us, willingly to withhold any part of that esteem, affection and love from the man Christ Jesus, which he has so richly merited at our hands by his amazing condescension, by his former mortal agonies, and by his present extensive benefits. We would not willingly treat any of our

fellow-creatures at so low and unworthy a rate, as too often we treat the Son of God, who died for us and is exalted to the Father's throne; Rev. iii. 27. and iv. 21.

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

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

All the honour which we pay to the man Jesus, must redound to the glory of the indwelling godhead, and to the honour of the Father; yet we should look upon ourselves under special obligations, to pay particular honour and love to whom honour and love are due, and not forget the interest of the human nature of Christ in the smart of his sufferings, and in the glory of his exaltation, when we pay religious worship to our Emmanuel, or God with us. See these things more discoursed at large in my "Third Dissertation on the Trinity."

Such raised sentiments as these concerning the power and dignity of our exalted Redeemer, may discover to us the sense and beauty of several expressions of scripture which before were unobserved or unknown; and may make it appear with what propriety the scripture speaks concerning the rewards and recompences which Christ received, on the account of his sufferings:

It discovers also the distinct capacities with which he is furnished to fulfil those glorious offices of government and judgment, that the Father has invested him with.

While we give a sacred freedom to our meditations on this subject, we may feel ourselves inspired with holy breathings toward the upper world, where the person of our great Redeemer dwells at the right-hand of God. Such an elevation of thought may awaken in us yet further degrees of humble and sacred curiosity to arrive at a better acquaintance with the great "Theanthropos," or God in our nature, *whom having not seen we love, and in whom, though now we see him not, yet believing we rejoice*; 1 Pet. i. 8. This should make us long until the time comes, when our doubtful and imperfect guesses at his glory shall vanish; when we shall view him no longer through the arkness of a glass, but see him as he is, and behold him face to face. Then shall it appear, that eternal life in our possession is it, as well as in our way to it, consists in the *knowledge of the one true God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent*, John vii. 3. Then shall the Son of God himself, and all the saints together, rejoice in the accomplishment of that glorious language of his intercession; John xvii. 24. *Father, I will that they to whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me: and this will be a great part of our heaven. Amen.*

#### SECT. IV.—*Testimonies from other Writers.*

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

If we were to consult the writings of ancient fathers, Doctor Whithy\* assures us in his Annotations on Philip. ii. 9. that they refer this high exaltation of Christ, not to his divine but human nature; and that the apostle speaks not here of the exaltation of his divine nature by the manifestation of his concealed glory and power, but of the exaltation of that nature which had suffered, for this is represented in scripture as the reward of his passion; Heb. ii. 9. *We see him, saith the apostle, who was made*

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



a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour. And again, the elders about the throne said, *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches*; Rev. v. 12. Though it was given to the man Jesus Christ, because *the fulness of the godhead dwelt in him*; Col. ii. 9.

He adds also, at verse 11. "Seeing the Father thus exalted the humanity of Christ, since he united the Logos to the human nature; what hinders that this exaltation should be said, to be to the glory of the Father, from whom he received even the divine nature?" I might cite several other testimonies from Dr. Whitby's Annotations, and every learned reader knows that in those Annotations he is zealous upon all occasions to oppose the Arian doctrine.

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

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

If you consult the remonstrant divines, they have the same opinion of the matter; see *Limborch's Theology in Latin*, book v. chap. xviii. "Though we have excluded all creatures from being the object of divine worship, yet this must not exclude our Lord Jesus Christ the Mediator; for though as he is man he is a creature, yet by means of his mediatory office he is so highly exalted above all creatures, that religious honour must be given him as Lord of all. And in section xiii. if it be objected, that omniscience and omnipotence are required in order to render any being adorable, I answer, not essential and absolute omnipotence and omniscience, but so much as is necessary to know all the thoughts and prayers of the worshippers, and to supply all their necessities; but we have shewn that both these belong to *Jesus Christ* as mediator." Yet this author is a hearty defender of the blessed doctrine of the Trinity according to the common sentiments of christianity, as appears in book iii. chapter xvii.

A very ingenious gentleman of the church of England, who has discoursed of the "future state, and the progressive knowledge of the saints there," page 46, writes thus; "Our Lord Jesus Christ remains a true man in his glorified state, and yet certainly his presence is much more extensive than when he

earth. He may perhaps as easily inspect the whole of this earth, and the heavens that encompass and surround it; for he is the sovereign of mankind. He is *prince of the earth*. He is the governor of the world. The laws which they ought to live, and by which they must be ruled, are his laws.

Besides, he is our great intercessor with God almighty; can he intercede for what he knows not, or know what he cannot hear? How can all the prayers of his people come to him, unless his presence be very diffusive, and extend to the whole fabric of earth and heaven? I am not about to affirm the reality of Christ's bodily presence, nor to determine the manner how he is present; but that Jesus Christ even in his human nature, does view and take cognizance of the affairs of the world, cannot be doubted. Page 49, *Christ is the head of the church* even in his human nature: How can he know the wills and the necessity of special communications to the several single members of his body, without a largeness of power?

In brief, Christ Jesus considered as man and mediator is the head and general administrator of all the affairs of this human world; what is done in it, he does it, for *all power in heaven and earth is given unto him*. *Great is the mystery of God*; and certainly, even the man Christ Jesus is a far more glorious person than the most of christians, yea, or of christians themselves, do conceive or apprehend. He is called *the Sun of righteousness*, and compared to light, and doth enlighten all the world. *He is the express image of his Father's person*; that is, perhaps the most lively character and expression of the Father's glory, that is, among created beings. He is sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high; that is, he is, next the Father, the most illustrious essence in the world.

Let no man misunderstand me in what I have said concerning the human nature of Christ Jesus. I do not deny his humanity, nor the union thereof to the human nature; I extend the scope of his human nature no farther than the nature of his human office doth require it. And touching the doctrine of the Trinity, and the union of the eternal word with the human nature, I esteem it the great essential as well as the great mystery of the christian religion, and do very heartily believe it."

Thomas Goodwin in his treatise of 'the Heart of Christ' part iii. says, "The understanding of all the occurrences of Christ hath notice and cognizance of all the occurrences of his members here. And for this the text is clear; for scripture speaks this for our encouragement, that Christ is united with the feeling of our infirmities. Which could not be

a relief to us, if it supposed not this, that he particularly and distinctly knew them ; and if not all as well as some, we should want relief in all, as not knowing which he knew, and which he knew not. And the apostle affirms this of his human nature, as was said, for he speaks of that nature that was tempted here below. *As all power in heaven and earth is committed unto him* as Son of man, as the scripture speaks, so all knowledge is given him of all things done in heaven and earth, and this as Son of man too, his knowledge and power being of equal extent. He is the sun as well in respect of knowledge, as of righteousness, and *there is nothing hid* from his light and beams, which do pierce the darkest corners of the hearts of the sons of men ; he knows the sores and distresses of their hearts. Like as a looking-glass made into the form of a round globe, and hung in the midst of a room takes in all the species of things done, or that are therein at once ; so doth the enlarged understanding of Christ's human nature take in the affairs of this world, which he is appointed to govern, especially the miseries of his members, and this at once.'

The same author in his second volume in folio, book iii. page 95. has a large treatise upon the " Extensive Glories and Powers of Christ considered as God-man," wherein he exalts his human nature to a most amazing degree.

Mr. Baxter in his Annotations on Phil. ii. 9. affirms, " God highly exalted him in the manhood in which he suffered, and hath given him greater dignity and honour and renown than any creature ever had ; that to his dignity and power all creatures should be subject, and angels and men and devils should by their submission respectively honour his name." And in his Paraphrase on Heb. ii. 9. " As his death was suffered in the common nature of man, so he died to bring man to glory with himself, and therefore this text may be well understood of the advancement of man both in Christ and in his church." Thus we find there are some learned writers of most of the sects and parties in the christian world who have declared themselves freely to embrace this opinion, and to believe the most extensive knowledge and power of the human nature of Christ in his present glorified state.

### DISCOURSE III.

*Tracing out the early existence of his Human Nature as the first-born of God, or as the first of all Creatures, before the Formation of this World.*

#### SECTION I.—Introduction.

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

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

Now if by a more careful inspection into the word of God, we shall find it revealed there with unexpected evidence, that the “human soul of our Lord Jesus Christ had an existence, and was personally united to the divine nature, long before it came to dwell in flesh and blood;” and that by this glorious person, God the Father managed the affairs of his ancient church as his own supreme minister and as the great Mediator and king of his people, and that at a certain appointed period of time God sent down this blessed soul, willingly divested of primitive joys and glories, to take flesh in the womb of the virgin, to dwell in the body of an infant, and grow up by degrees to the perfection of a man, and in this body to suffer a thousand indignities and injuries from men and devils, and to sustain intense pains or agonies

from some unknown manifestations of the wrath of God against sin, and at last submit to death and the grave ; I say, if we should find such a doctrine contained in the scripture, will not such thoughts as these spread a new lustre over all our former ideas of the glory of Christ, even in his human nature, and add to the condescensions of our blessed Saviour considered as God and man in one person ? How happily will it make the whole scheme of our religion, and the book of God which reveals it, more intelligible and delightful to all those who love christianity ? And it will render this sacred volume much more defensible against the men who doubt or deny the blessed doctrines of it. But that I may not anticipate my design, let us proceed to unfold this doctrine by degrees, according to the following propositions.

SECT. II.—*Some Propositions leading to the Proof of the Doctrine Proposed.*

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

John i. 1. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. Verse 3. All things were made by him. Verse 14. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us. John xii. 41. These things said Esaias when he saw his glory, and spake of him : Wherein the apostle John attributes to our Lord Jesus Christ that actual glorious appearance which Isaiah saw of the Lord of hosts, chapter vi. 1—4. John iii. 13. No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven : ο υψι εν τω ουρανω, or, which was in heaven, for both senses are agreeable to the greek. John viii. 58. Before Abraham was, I am. John i. 15. He that cometh after me is preferred before me, says John the Baptist, because he was before me : εμπροθεν μου γεννησεν ος πρωτος μου ην. One of these words which we render “ before me,” seems necessarily to signify a priority of time, and it is hard to say which or both of them cannot do so, but the same thing cannot be proved by itself. The verse may be construed thus, “ This is he of whom I said, he that comes after me had a being before me, for indeed he was before me, that is, he is more excellent than I ; or thus, he was preferred before me, because he had his being before I had mine, though as to his natural birth as man, Christ was six months younger than John. So Dr. Goodwin and many others interpret this text. But I proceed to other scriptures, which prove the existence of Christ before his incarnation.*

John iii. 30, 31. *He that cometh from above, is above all ; he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth : He that cometh from above, is above all. 1 Cor. xv. 47. The first*

man was of the earth earthy; the second man was the Lord from heaven. John vi. 33. *The Bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.* Verse 8. *I came down from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me.* Verse 51. *I am the living bread which came down from heaven.* Verse 62. *What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend where he was before?* John xvi. 28. *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.* John xvii. 5. *Glorify thou me, O Father, with thy ownself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* 2 Cor. x. 9. *Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.* 2 Cor. viii. 9. *Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor.* Philip. ii. 6, 7. *Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation—and was made in the likeness of man.* Colos. 15. *Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature, for by him were all things created—and he is before all things.* Heb. i. 2. *His Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds.* 1 John iv. 3. *Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God.* Rev. iii. 14. *Christ is called the beginning of the creation of God.* Ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως; τῆς οὐσίας.

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

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

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

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

It appears probable to me also, that when our Lord says; *John viii. 58. Before Abraham was I am, he does not only*

mean to express his pre-existence, but his divine nature also, I AM being the name of God; Exod. iii. 14. And the great modern refiner of the Arian scheme Doctor Samuel Clarke allows so much as this, viz. That from our Saviour's using the words "I am" instead of "I was," he might possibly intend to insinuate that he was the person in whom the name of God was, viz. Jehovah, or "I am." And he adds, "This indeed cannot be denied;" though he will not allow him here to describe himself as the self-existent Being. See Doctor Clarke's Scripture Doctrine, chapter II. section iii. number 591.

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

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

Such are these; John iii. 31. *He that cometh from above is above all, &c.* 1 Cor. xv. 37. *The first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is the Lord from heaven.* John iii. 13. *No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.\**

IV. "But there are some texts which insinuate the existence of Christ before he came into the flesh, which in their most natural, obvious and evident sense seem to refer to some intelligent nature belonging to our Lord Jesus Christ, which is inferior to godhead." This will be made evident under the following proposition.

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

\* I confess I have cited this text in a former treatise to prove the omnipresence of Christ as God, and perhaps that may be part of the true meaning of it; but I have lately found two or three writers of name who heartily believed the godhead of Christ, and yet suppose this text may refer to his pre-existent soul, because *ο υς εν ουρανω*, which we render, "who is in heaven," may be as well rendered, "who was in heaven," the participle *υς* being equally capable of the past as well as the present tense or time. So St. John himself expresseth the time past, "he was," by *υς*, chap. ix. 25. where the blind man cured by our Lord, says, "I was blind," *τυφλος υς*. And St. Paul expresseth, "who was," in the same manner twice, *υμας οντας νεκρους*, Eph. ii. 1. and verse 5. "You who were dead." Beza himself inclines to construe this word, "who was in heaven," in this text. Upon the whole, I doubt whether this text will certainly prove Christ's divinity, and whether it may not more directly refer to his pre-existent soul.—For since there are proofs enough of the divinity of Christ, which are strong in my opinion and unanswerable, I would not constrain such passages of scripture into this service whose force and sense are rendered doubtful by any just rules of criticism.

If there be any such scriptures, they must refer either to the human soul of Christ, which was afterward united to his human body, or to some other super-angelical nature, as some call it, which might belong to our Saviour, besides his human soul.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The appearances of Christ to the patriarchs are described like the appearances of an angel, or a man, a glorious man

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



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

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

Let us argue a little further on these appearances of Christ to the patriarchs: Does it not seem more congruous that a human soul should animate that human body which eat and drank with Abraham under a tree, and should actuate those human limbs, when a man wrestled with Jacob? Is it not beneath the grandeur, decency and dignity of the supreme Majesty of heaven, to supply the place of such a human soul for the purposes or actions of animal nature? And that the great and eternal God himself in an immediate manner should converse in so humane and familiar a way as this angel did with several of the patriarchs? That the glorious and almighty Godhead should itself animate a human body to visit Abraham, and tarry with him some hours under a tree, while his wife made cakes, and dressed the flesh of a calf for God to eat? That the eternal God animating a body should eat of the calf which was dressed with milk and butter; *Gen. xvii. 1, 2, &c?* That the Almighty and ever-blessed God himself should immediately wrestle with Jacob in human limbs, which he assumed, and that a good part of the night should be spent thus wrestling until break of day; *Gen. xxxii. 24, &c?* That the eternal godhead itself should talk so

familiarly with Gideon, and let Gideon use such a familiar way of talking with God, as is recorded Judges vi. 1—11? Doth this suit with the supreme glory and dignity of eternal godhead and pure divinity? Doth it not seem more agreeable that God should do all this by the intermediation of a human soul, appearing in a visible shape, than that the infinite majesty of God should immediately abase itself in such a manner?

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

He might also upon this supposition, with more justness and propriety of speech, be called a man, when he appears in the form of a man, and with the appetites, passions, and actions of a man; Gen. xviii. 2, 4, 5, 8, 17. and xxxii. 24. for the soul is the chief part of a man, and especially when that soul appeared in a human body. And yet at the same time he might be properly called God, the Lord, and Jehovah; for this man or angel, this human soul in an assumed body was personally united to God, or had the fulness of the godhead dwelling in him by a personal union; though the more immediate agent in these animal and common actions of life was the human soul, rather than the eternal and blessed God.

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

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

The first text I shall mention is, that famous one in the prayer of Christ; John xvii. 4, 5. *I have glorified thee on earth:*

*I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thy own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* It seems very plain from these words that Christ parted with some glory which he had in heaven, when he came down to finish the work which God gave him to do on earth, and he prays to be restored to it again. I appeal to every reader, whether this is not the most obvious and natural sense.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The words, *with thy ownself*, in our Saviour's prayer, seem to determine it to be a real glory which he once had in God's own presence. This seems so evidently to be the sense and meaning of our Lord in his prayer, that if persons were not unacquainted with this doctrine, of the pre-existence of the soul of Christ; or if they had not some prejudice against it, one would think that every reader should naturally, and necessarily take it in this sense. That it is the human nature of Christ that was thus glorified in its pre-existent state, may be confirmed from verse 24. *Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world*. Now this would be a very small thing for Christ to say, as to his divine nature, or godhead, that the Father loved him before the creation; but it is great and glorious, and every way suitable to his purpose, to be spoken by him as a man, referring to his pre-existent state and nature, for it gives a grand idea of him as the early and ancient object of his Father's love. Nor can this ancient love be referred only to the decree of God, for this decretal love of God may be spoken of the saints also; the Father loved them as foreseen in his eternal decrees: Whereas the plain design of Christ is, to request that enjoyment of divine love for the saints in their measure, which he himself actually tasted and enjoyed before the foundation of the world.

so that with regard to his divine nature, he prays only for the manifestation of the glory; but in respect of his human nature, he prays for the real communication of that glory which might belong to such a sublime union with the eternal godhead.

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

Note further ; he does not pray for the disciples, that they may enjoy such love as is supposed to be peculiar to the internal distinctions in the godhead, but such sort of love in their degree, as he himself enjoyed in his pre-existent soul ; which exposition also renders all the latter verses of this chapter more intelligible : Verse 21, 22, &c. *that they may be one as we are one, and—thou hast loved them as thou hast loved me.* The love which the great God bears to Christ as man, and the union of Christ as man, to the godhead, is made a pattern of the union of the saints to God, and the love of God to them : But we can hardly suppose the ineffable, eternal and essential, and necessary union and love between the sacred distinctions in the godhead itself, can be a pattern of the unnecessary, unessential, and voluntary union and love between God and his saints. Yet the union and love between Christ as man, and God his Father, may be made a pattern of the love and union between God and believers ; though we must always maintain a high sense of the unknown and sublime difference between the union of the man Christ to the divine nature, or to any particular distinction in it, and the union of the saints to God : The one is so near, as that what God himself speaks and does, is attributed to Christ ; but it would be blasphemy to attribute this to the best of saints.

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

The second scripture I shall cite for this purpose, to shew that some things inferior to godhead are ascribed to Christ, before and at his incarnation ; is in Phil. ii. 5, 6, 7. *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, verse 6. who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God ; verse 7. but made himself of no reputation,  $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , which is more exactly translated, he emptied himself\*, and took upon him the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men, as it is in the Greek,  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \alpha\theta\eta\upsilon\omega\pi\alpha\tau\omega\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\iota$ .*

Here the apostle's design is to set Christ before them as a pattern of humility ; and this he doth by aggrandizing his former

\* See Doctor Goodwin's exposition of this text in a few pages following See pages 812, 813.

state and circumstances, and representing how he emptied himself of them, and appeared on earth in a very mean and low estate. Therefore he saith, *Who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God*; that is, his human soul, which is the chief part of the man, being in union with his godhead, was vested with a god-like form and glory in all former ages; thus he oftentimes appeared to the patriarchs, as the angel of the Lord, and as God or Jehovah, with a heavenly brightness about him, or clothed with the divine shekinah, the robe of light, and spake and acted like God himself. This seems to be the form of God, which the apostle speaks of; nor did he think it any robbery or sinful presumption so to do, that is, to appear and act as God, since he was united to the divine nature, and was in that sense one with God\*: Yet he emptied himself, that is, he divested himself of this god-like form or appearance, this divine shekinah, and coming into the flesh, he consented to be made in the likeness of other men; nay, he took upon him the form of a servant instead of the form of a God, that is, instead of the glorious vestment of light, in which he once appeared and acted as God; he now came in a mean servile form, and humbled himself even to death, &c. as it follows: Now that this text is most naturally interpreted, concerning the pre-existent soul of Christ and its humiliation, and not concerning the abasement of his human nature, will appear, if we attend to these things:

1. It is the chief design of this scripture to propose to the Philippians a wonderful example of humility and self-denial.

\* I might have omitted the paraphrase of these words, "who thought it not robbery to be equal with God," since I am constrained to confess that I am not fully satisfied in the true meaning of them. Those who will read with an impartial eye what Doctor Whitby has written in his Annotations on this text, even while he was zealous against the Arian doctrines, and took all opportunities in his comments to refute them, and who consider at the same time what sense the ancient Greek writer Heliodorus in several places, and the Greek fathers generally put upon this phrase, will be ready to believe they signify, that Christ did not think equally with God to be *απαυμων*, a thing to be seized, a thing to be assumed by him, he did not think proper to appear like God, or assume equality to God in his humble state: and so this sentence expresses one part of his humility. On the other hand, he that peruses what the learned Doctor Waterland has written in his sermon on this text, may be inclined to doubt of this exposition of Doctor Whitby and the fathers, and to construe these words as part of the most exalted dignity of Christ, according to our English translation: though Doctor Waterland himself does not deny that the ancient Greek writer Heliodorus, and most of the ancient fathers, expounded it in the sense which Doctor Whitby gives of it.

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

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

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

Besides, the form of God can never be proved to signify his divine nature in this place; for there is no expression like it in scripture, that signifies proper divinity. Nor indeed does *μορφή* properly signify nature or essence any where in the bible, that I can find, but only appearance, shape, or likeness. See the large citation out of Dr. Thomas Goodwin, within a few pages following, pages 812, 813. Observe also that the form of God stands here expressly opposed to the form of a servant: Now Christ was not directly and expressly in the condition of a servant in the civil life here on earth, though he "condescended to perform servile offices upon some occasions; but at the same time he claimed the authority of a master, over those very persons for, or towards whom he performed servile offices: The condition of our Saviour therefore, whilst on earth, though it was always mean, yet was not properly that of a servant; and consequently, since his being in the form of a servant, cannot possibly signify more than his acting sometimes as a servant, though he was not such by condition of life, it is plain that his being in the form of God cannot possibly signify his being by nature the very God." But rather his appearing sometimes heretofore and acting as God. So Dr. Bennet, on the Trinity, chapter VII. page 45—50. who is a zealous defender of the deity of Christ against Dr. Clarke.

3. Consider further, it seems to be that same nature emptied itself which was afterwards filled with glory as a recompence: And it is the same nature that is said to humble itself, which was afterwards highly exalted by God: Now this was

not the divine nature of Christ, but the human ; therefore it must be the human nature of Christ that emptied itself in this text ; because it appears very incongruous for the apostle to say, that the divine nature emptied and abased itself, and that the human nature was exalted as a recompence of this abasement.

I grant it was great condescension in the divine nature of Christ to unite itself to a creature, such as the human soul of Christ was, how glorious so ever that creature might be ; and it is yet greater condescension in the godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, thus united to the human soul to take human flesh upon it, or flesh in union with that soul, and for God himself to be thus manifested in the flesh : And in my judgment the infinite merit of his sufferings arises from the union of his divine nature to the soul, and thereby to the body of the man Jesus : But this does not seem to be the precise meaning of the apostle in this place ; for he rather sets before us an example of the humility of the man Jesus Christ, who existed as a spirit personally united to God, or one with God in all former ages, and was increased in glories suitable to this union ; yet he laid aside those glories, and waved the resplendence of his character, and person, when he joined himself to flesh and blood ; he laid aside the god-like forms and appearances, which perhaps he had worn both in heaven and on earth in times past, and emptied himself when he came now into the world to be incarnate, that is, when he came into the complete likeness and fashion of a man ; for he appeared in a mean form, like a servant, and humbled himself even to the cursed death of the cross.

Lest any of my readers should be offended with my exposition of this text, I will here add Dr. Thomas Goodwin's interpretation of it, volume III. book iii. chapter vii. page 106. ' That nature or creature which the Son of God shall assume, be it man or angel, must by inheritance exist in the form of God ; Phil. ii. 6, 7. which form of God I here take not to be put for the essence of God, neither is the form of a servant taken for the nature of a man. The form of God here is that god-like glory, and that manifestation of the godhead which was, and must needs be due, to appear in the nature assumed ; for form is put for outward appearance and manifestation in respect of which, Christ as God-man is called *the brightness of his Father's glory* ; Heb. i. 2. Brightness, you know, is not the substance of the light, but the appearance of it—And in this respect Christ, God-man, may be said in a safe sense to be equal with God, as here in the text ; not in essence, but in a communication of privileges, that as God hath life in himself, alone, which is a royalty incommunicable to any mere creature, so this Son of man when once united unto the godhead, is also said to have life in himself ; John v. 26. this equality, or *ισότης*, not being to be understood of



express his incarnation and mission, though without any reluctance. John vi. 38. *I came down from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me.* Now would it not sound very harsh to suppose the godhead of Christ, saying, *I came down from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me,* when it is utterly and eternally impossible that the godhead of Christ should have any will different from God the Father?

It is in the same manner that our Lord speaks in prophecy concerning himself, Psal. xl. 8. *I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea thy law is within my heart.* Now that this refers to his incarnation in an especial manner, we may learn from the epistle to the Hebrews, where this prophecy is cited and explained, chapter x. 5, 7. *When he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and burnt-offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me;—lo I come to do thy will, O God.* This seems to be the proper language of his human soul, and not of pure godhead. Those who refuse to expound this concerning Christ's pre-existent soul, apply it to his inferior and delegated character as Mediator, and as the Father's servant employed in this great errand. But I appeal to every one who reads the words, whether this language does not naturally seem much rather to belong to an inferior being, than to the eternal godhead assuming an inferior character.

Consideration IV. "Christ represents his own coming into the world, and being sent hither by the Father, in such a manner as naturally leads one to suppose he had a real and proper dwelling in another place\*, and in another manner before he came into this world, and that he then changed his place and company and manner of life; all which seem more agreeable to a human spirit, than to a divine person."

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

\* I do not here enter into that philosophical question, whether separate souls have proper places or no, or any local motion, but I speak after the common manner of speech, and the language of scripture.

† Some may object against this text, and say, That it cannot mean that the human soul ascended where it was before, for the human soul in its pre-existent state cannot be called the Son of man. I answer, 1. That the name Son of man ordinarily signifies no more than man, or some considerable man, and when applied to Christ it means the Messiah. 2. It is at least a more proper term to signify Christ's human soul, than it is to signify his divine nature, and to say, "What if ye shall see the Son of man, that is, the human nature ascend where

John viii. 14. *I know whence I came, and whither I go.* John vi. 28. *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: Again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.* In which words his being with the Father, and his being in the world, seem to be two opposite states, and are represented as consistent with each other in that sense in which Christ speaks his Father's company and absence; but the pure divine nature can hardly be represented as absent from the Father, even while he resides in this world, nor as returning to him afterwards.

Let it be noted also, that as soon as Christ had spoke these words, his disciples answered, *Lo, now thou speakest plainly, and speakest no parables;* that is, there is no difficulty or obscurity in these words. No enigmatical or allegorical speech, saith Beza. But surely there is difficulty and obscurity in them, if we must construe them by figures, and not in the obvious sense; especially if his coming from the Father, that is, as God, must be taken in a figurative sense, and his going to the Father, that is, as man in a literal. There are other expressions of scripture to the same purpose, John iii. 13. *No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, who is, or was in heaven,* as the Greek participle *ὢν* may be properly interpreted in the time past or present; and thus it may be construed to signify either the divinity of Christ, or rather his re-existent soul\*.

John iii. 31. *He that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth. He that cometh from heaven is above all.* John iii. 3. *Jesus knowing that he was come from God, and was going to God.* Eph. iv. 9, 10. *Now that he ascended, what is it, but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?*

Is the son of man, that is, the divine nature, was before?" And yet this must be the exposition of the place, if Christ had no pre-existent soul, and I am sure this is much harder, and more catachrestical than the sense I have given.

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

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

This perhaps may be better interpreted concerning his descent into the womb of the virgin, than into the grave, for David uses the same expression, Ps. cxxxix. 15. where he says, *His substance was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth.* Besides, it was the soul of Christ that descended from heaven, but not into the grave. Now, saith the apostle, *He that descended thus, is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens*; that is, the soul descended to assume a body, and then being embodied, it ascended above the heavens.

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

**Answer I.** When this manner of speech is used concerning God, it must be interpreted figuratively or analogically, because the literal sense cannot be true: but where the literal sense is just and plain and easy, there is no need to run to figures.—II. Let it be noted also, that when God is said to descend from heaven, or ascend thither in the Old Testament, perhaps it is so expressed to shew that this God is Jesus Christ, or the human soul of Christ, united to the godhead in the pre-existent state, as shall be shewn hereafter, by whose service God the Father managed a thousand affairs of the ancient ages, and more especially such as had any relation to the welfare of the church, or the holy seed.—III. But besides, when we consider the frequency of these expressions, Christ's coming down from heaven, coming from the Father, and coming into this world, they seem to bear a plain and just antithesis to his departing from the world, his returning to the Father, his ascending into heaven, which are mentioned at the same time: Now all these latter expressions are plainly understood by every reader concerning the human nature of Christ, and give us good ground to infer that the former expressions concerning his descent from heaven should be attributed to his human nature too; that is, to his human soul, which is the chief part of it.

Under this head, Bishop Fowler adds for a further proof of it; 1 Cor. xv. 47. *The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven:* Which, says he, the apostle speaks of Christ's original in opposition to Adam's, thus; his soul was created on earth, a body being made out of the earth for it; but the soul of Christ was created in heaven and therefore he is called the Lord from heaven. This is abundantly more intelligible, to me at least, than how the eternal Word should come down from heaven, otherwise than as in union with the soul of Christ; since the eternal Word ever filled all things with

his presence, and therefore could never for a moment leave heaven, that is, really and properly, but only in an analogical sense.

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

Some would construe these words, *The Lord from heaven*, to signify the divine nature of Christ. But let it be observed, that the apostle's design here is only to shew how the man Christ Jesus shall be the pattern of saints raised in glory; and it is no part of his purpose here to represent saints as bearing the image of God, or his divine nature, but only the image of his glorified human nature, and therefore these glorious expressions rather refer to his human soul. Now put all these things together, and we can hardly suppose our blessed Lord or his apostles should express his real and proper human descent from heaven in plainer words than those which have been cited, or in words more fitted to lead every common reader into this plain and easy sense.

To conclude this section, if the most natural and obvious sense of scripture leads us to believe, that there was a glorious Being who is sometimes called an angel, and sometimes a man under the Old Testament, who was clothed with peculiar rays of glory, and assumed divine prerogatives, and yet in other parts of his character and conduct appears much inferior to the majesty of pure godhead, and that this illustrious Being emptied and divested himself of his peculiar riches and glory when he came to dwell in flesh, that he was capable of having a will different from the will of his Father, as appears in those words of us, *Father, not my will, but thy will be done*; Luke xxii. 42. and that he did really leave his dwelling with the Father, and come down into our world, I know not to what subject all this can be so well applied as to the human soul of Christ, and its existence before his incarnation.

SECT. IV.—*Miscellaneous Arguments to prove the same Doctrine.*

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

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

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

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

But if we suppose the human soul, united to the divine nature at its first creation, and being thereby fully capacitated for this amazing work; receiving the proposal with cheerfulness from God his Father from the foundation of the world, and then from an inward delight to glorify his Father, and from a compassionate principle to the children of men, undertaking this difficult and bloody service, and coming down into a human body to fulfil it : this highly exalts the merit of his love, and the condescending

glory of his labours and his sufferings. And indeed this voluntary consent of his to become incarnate and to suffer, is plainly represented in several places in scripture; Psal. xl. 6, 7. Heb. x. 6. *Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, these were not sufficient to expiate the sin of man; thou hast prepared a body for me; then said I, lo I come, that is, to dwell in this body, to undertake this work; I delight to do thy will, O my God.* "And these two expressions; Psal. xl. 6, 8. *My ears hast thou bored, and thy law is in my heart, are more proper, saith Dr. Goodwin, vol. III. book iv. pages 142, 143. to apply to the soul of this human nature, and to be understood to be the voice of his human nature, rather than of the divine: He was willing and obedient to do God's will, as a servant to do his master's.*" And this great author thought this consent so necessary, that he rather ventures to introduce a most miraculous scene, than to have this early consent of Christ as man omitted; and therefore he supposes that in a miraculous way the human soul of Christ did give itself up to this work from his very birth.

His own free consent appears plainly in these words, *He humbled himself*; Phil. ii. 7. He emptied himself of glory when he became man, and died for sinners. And he himself took part of flesh and blood with this design, that he might die, "that he might through his death destroy the works of the devil;" Heb. ii. 14. He declares further his own free consent; John vi. 38. *I came down from heaven to do my Father's will.* And John x. 17, 18. *Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again. No man taketh my life from me, that is, against my free consent; but I lay it down of myself, that is, of my own choice and voluntary engagement.* "This thought I propose, says the defender of Bishop Fowler's Discourse, to be well considered by all free and ingenuous minds, and by all those who would not in the least derogate from the honour of their blessed Mediator Christ Jesus," and the amazing love that appears in his mighty undertaking.

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

I grant the divine nature which is in Christ from eternity

contrived and agreed all the parts of this covenant. But does it not add a lustre and glory, and more conspicuous equity, to this covenant, to suppose the man Christ Jesus, who is most properly the Mediator according to 1 Tim. ii. 5. to be also present before the world was made, to be chosen and appointed as the Redeemer or Reconciler of mankind, to be then ordained the head of his future people, to receive promises, grace and blessings in their name, and to accept the solemn and weighty trust from the hand of his Father, that is, to take care of millions of souls?—Read the following scriptures, and see whether they do not imply thus much; 1 Tim. ii. 5. *There is one Mediator between God and man, even the man Christ Jesus.* Eph. i. 3, 4. *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world.* 2 Tim. i. 8, 9, 10. *God hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.* Tit. i. 2. *Eternal life, which God hath promised before the world began.* Now to whom could this promise be made but to Jesus Christ, and to us in him, as the great patron and representative of believers; Rev. xiii. 6. *All that dwell on earth shall worship the beast, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.* Whether these words, “from the foundation of the world,” refer to the slaying of the Lamb by way of anticipation, or rather to writing of the book of life, yet they certainly refer to the transaction of this important affair with the Lamb, and therefore this expression is used several times in the book of the Revelation.

It was by virtue of this covenant, and the sacrifice of his own blood which Christ was to offer in due time, that all the benefits of this covenant were derived upon mankind in the various ages of it ever since the fall of man; therefore Christ was a Saviour from the beginning of the world; and those who apply all these things merely to the divine nature of Christ, as consenting to this covenant upon the proposal of the Father, yet they suppose the human nature of Christ to be included in it, in the view of God the Father, by way of “prolepsis,” or anticipation. But surely it seems much more proper to explain these things concerning the human soul of Christ as actually united to the divine nature, and actually consenting to this covenant, since the human nature was to endure the sufferings; and then we need not be constrained to recur to such proleptical figures of speech to interpret the language of scripture, since the literal sense is just and true.

Thus it appears, if we consider this covenant as made be-

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

Observe also, what was intimated before, that this one Mediator is particularly called the man Christ Jesus; 1 Tim. ii. 5. that the human nature may appear to be signally concerned in the mediation; and for the same reason, the book of life is said to belong to the Lamb, which name is applied to the human nature of Christ, in union with the divine, with much more propriety than it can be applied merely to the divine nature without such an union.

III. Another argument for this doctrine of the existence of the soul of Christ before his incarnation may be derived from the scriptural descriptions of Christ's coming into the world. This is always expressed in some corporeal language, such as denotes taking on him animal nature, or body, or flesh, without the least mention of taking a soul." Read the following scriptures; John i. 14. *The word was made flesh and dwelt among us.* Rom. 8. 3. *He was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh.* 1 Cor. xviii. 3. *God sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh.* Gal. iv. 3. *God sent forth his Son made of a woman.* This word cannot necessarily imply the soul, for his soul could not be made of the soul or body of the Virgin Mary, but his flesh or blood was made out of hers. Phil. ii. 7, 8. *He was made in the likeness of men, and was found in fashion as a man.* Now shape or fashion peculiarly refer to the body rather than the soul.

And in the second chapter to the Hebrews, where the apostle treats professedly of the incarnation of Christ, he seems to suppose that his soul existed before, and that he was like the children of God already in that respect; but verse 11. For as



as much as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that he might in all things be made like his brethren, as verse 17. And if he be said to take on him the seed of Abraham, verse 16. yet it is certain that the human body of Christ has a very proper and literal right to that name, rather than the soul, though the word seed may more frequently include both. Again, it is said by the same apostle in Heb. v. 7. *In the days of his flesh he offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears*, that is, when he had taken flesh upon him, and dwelt in it. And Heb. x. when God the Father sends his Son into the world, he is said to prepare a body for him, but not a human soul, verse 5. *A body hast thou prepared me.*

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

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

Perhaps it will be objected here, that the word flesh in many places of scripture signifies mankind or human nature, by the figure "synecdoche," including the soul also. It is granted that flesh doth sometimes signify mankind, and this objection might be good if the scriptural language never used any thing but the word flesh to denote human nature, and never distinguished the flesh and the soul: But since there are a great number of scriptures where the flesh or body is distinguished from the soul or spirit of man on many occasions, it seems very natural and reasonable to expect there should be some one passage at least in all the bible wherein the divine nature of Christ should be said to assume a human soul, as well as a body or flesh, when he came into our world, if this spirit or soul had no existence before the incarnation. And we have the more reason to expect this also when we observe, that there is mention made of the soul of Christ himself in several places of scripture on other occasions; as Is. liii. 10. *Thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin.* Verse 11. *He shall see of the travail of his soul.* Luke xxiii. 46. *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.* Acts ii.

1. *His soul was not left in hell.* John xii. 27. *Now is my soul troubled.* Mat. xxvi. 38. *My soul is exceeding sorrowful.*— Luke x. 21. *Jesus rejoiced in spirit.* John xi. 28. and xiii. 21. *Jesus was troubled in spirit.* Now since we have the human soul or spirit of Christ mentioned several times in scripture on other occasions, and yet never once mentioned with relation to his incarnation, but always find his coming into our world described by taking flesh and blood, body, the fashion of a man, the likeness of sinful flesh, &c. there is much reason to suppose that Christ had a human soul before, and did not then begin to have it.

IV. “Though the Jews were much at a loss in our Saviour’s time in their sentiments of the Messiah, and had very various and confused notions of him, yet it is certain that amongst many of the learned of that nation, and probably amongst many of the vulgar too, there was a tradition of the pre-existence of the soul of the Messiah.” Philo the Jew, who lived very near the time of our Saviour, interprets several of those scriptures of the Old Testament concerning the Mediator or Logos which we do: He calls him the Son of God, and yet he makes him expressly a man, the prince of the angels, the prophet of God, the light of the people; and though he talks with some confusion on his subject, and gives him some such characters as seem to make his Logos truly divine, and one with God, yet other characters also are such as seem to be inferior to godhead, and very happily agree with this doctrine of the pre-existent soul of Christ in union with his divine nature, as will plainly appear in what follows.

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

In other places Philo makes the Logos or word to signify that glorious archangel which the ancient Jews suppose to be the supreme of creatures, formed before all the angels and all the other parts of the creation, “in whom was the name of God,” who was sent to conduct Moses and the Jews into Canaan; Exod. xxiii. 20. This glorious spirit Philo calls “the most honourable Logos, the archangel, prince of the angels and

stars, high-priest in this temple of God, the world, who stands in the limits between the creature and the Creator, the eldest, the first-begotten of the sons of God, who under God governs the world, and who doth humbly mediate for us mortals with him that is immortal."

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

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

But they speak in some confusion, because they seem not to have had a clear idea of this personal union between God and a creature. Whereas christians being instructed in this doctrine by the New Testament, may clearly understand how by this glorious being, this complex person, viz. our Lord Jesus Christ, God created the world, and God governed the affairs of his ancient church: and that standing in the limits betwixt God and the creature, both by his nature as well as his office he becomes the high-priest, and mediates between mortal men and God who is immortal, according to the language of the ancient Jews.

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

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

Bishop Fowler cites some notable traditions of the Jewish rabbies to this purpose; one in an ancient book amongst the Jews called Pesikta, viz. That "after God had created the world, he put his hand under the throne of his glory, and brought out the soul of the Messiah, with all his attendants, and said unto him, Wilt thou heal and redeem my sons after six thousand

years? He answered, I am willing so to do. Again therefore, said God unto him, And art thou willing to suffer chastisements, for purging away their iniquities? And the soul of the Messiah answered, I will suffer them, and that with all my heart."

And there is, saith he, a cabbalistical representation of their expected Messiah's being in heaven, in another old book of high esteem among the Jews, intitled *Midrash Conen*, viz. "In the fifth house sits the Messiah, Son of David? and Elias of blessed memory said to this Messiah, Bear the stroke and judgment of the Lord, which he inflicts on thee for the sin of Israel, as it is written by Isaiah, he was wounded because of our transgressions, &c." Now though we allow no more credit to these traditions than to other Jewish tales, yet it discovers their ancient notion of the pre-existence of the soul of the Messiah: and the learned Mr. Fleming tells us, that it was an inducement to him to favour that opinion, "because the Jews seemed to have laid down this as an undoubted maxim in all ages, that the soul of the Messiah was made before all the creatures, as all must own that are in the least acquainted with their opinions and writings. *Christology*," book III. chapter v. page 467. That this was an ancient opinion of the Jews is confirmed by other writers also.

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

V. "Since it pleased the Father to prepare a body for our Lord Jesus Christ by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, and by a peculiar manner of conception, that his body might have some peculiar prerogative, and that he might be the Son of God in a superior sense with regard to his flesh, as Luke i. 35. so it is not unreasonable to suppose that the soul of Christ also, which was to be united to godhead, should have this peculiar prerogative, to be derived immediately from God before any creature was made, and to enjoy this union with the divine nature, and glories suitable thereto before its union with an earthly body." And thus in consideration of its formation before all creatures in a most immediate manner by the will of God, as well as its nearest resemblance to God himself above all other spirits, his human soul might be called also the Son of God and his only-begotten Son, in a transcendent manner above all other beings, whether men or angels, who are sometimes called sons of God. But this thought perhaps will be set in a clearer light, when we come to explain a variety of scriptures according to this hypothesis

in the next section ; and it may be yet made plainer still, whenever I shall publish another dissertation which I have written on the name Son of God\*.

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

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

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

Text I. Col. i. 15—19. Christ is described as the “ image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature, for by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, &c. All things were created by him and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist ; and he is the head of the body the church, the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence, for it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell, or as it is expressed in the second chapter, verse 9. for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily.” Here are some expressions which seem too sublime for any mere creature, viz. *All things were created by him and for him, and by him all things consist.* But when it is said, *He is the image of the invisible God ;* this cannot refer merely to his divine nature, for that is as invisible in the Son as it is in the Father ; therefore it seems to refer to his pre-existent soul in union with his godhead, who is the brightest, the fairest and most glorious image of God ; and so he appears to the world of angels in heaven, and by his frequent assuming a visible shape heretofore, became the image of the invisible God to men, and dwelt here for a season on earth.

\* This dissertation was never published.

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

If we join the expressions of the first and second chapters of the Colossians together we may explain the one by the other. *He is the image of the invisible God; by him and for him were all things created, and in him all things consist, that in all things might have the pre-eminence, &c. for it pleased the Father that in him should dwell all the fulness of the godhead bodily*. All the godhead dwelt in him as a spirit, or spiritually before the incarnation, and bodily since: thus the nineteenth verse of the first chapter comes in properly as a reason for all those attributes both supreme and inferior, viz. because God was pleased to unite that the divine nature should be united to this glorious being, the human soul of Christ, now appearing in a body.

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

II. The next scripture I shall cite for this purpose is that striking description of our Lord Jesus in the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, wherein there are sufficient evidences of his divine nature: but there are some such expressions as seem to imply also a nature inferior and dependent. He is represented as *laying the foundations of the earth, and the heavens as the work of his hands; he upholds all things by the word of his power*: which expressions carry in them an idea too sublime for mere created nature. And the citation of the first of them in the hundred and second Psalm, proves yet farther that Christ is Jehovah the Creator.

But when he is called a Son, a begotten Son, this seems

to imply derivation and dependency : and perhaps the sonship of Christ, and his being the only begotten of the Father, may be better explained by attributing it to his human soul existing by some peculiar and immediate manner of creation, formation, or derivation from the Father before other creatures were formed; especially if we include in the same idea of sonship, as Doctor Goodwin does, his union to the divine nature, and if we add also his exaltation to the office of the Messiah as King and Lord of all ; which some zealous Trinitarians suppose to be the chief thing meant when God saith, verse 5. *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* Now this matter being set in a fair and full light, and established by just arguments from scripture, would take off the force of many Arian pretences against the Trinity, viz such pretences as arise from the supposed derivation of one person from another in pure godhead, and a supposed eternal act of generation producing a co-essential son, which things are not plainly expressed in any part of the bible, and which are acknowledged on all sides to be great and incomprehensible difficulties.

Heb. i. 3. Perhaps these words, *the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person,* may be better explained, if we suppose the divine nature of Christ to be united to his pre-existent soul, when it was first created : This human soul of Christ was then like a glass through which the godhead shone with inimitable splendor in all the perfections of it, wisdom, power, holiness and goodness ; thus Christ was his Father's most perfect image, or copy, both in his own native excellencies, bearing the nearest resemblance to God as an only-begotten Son, and he was also *the brightness of his glory ;* because the perfections of the Father shone through him with more illustrious rays than it was possible for any mere creature to represent or transmit them, who was not thus united to a divine nature.

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

Besides, let it be yet further considered, that when Christ is called in Colossians i. 15. *the image of the invisible God,* and

in Heb. i. 3. *the express image of his Father's person*, it must be understood either of his divine nature or his human. If it be understood of his divine nature, it must mean that he is the image of the Father's essence or of his personality, for the personality together with the essence, make up the complete character of God the Father.

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

Nor is Christ in his divine nature an express image of the personality of the Father. Sonship is no image of paternity: A derived property or subsistence is no image of an undervived property or subsistence, but just the reverse or directly contrary to it. Since therefore Christ in his divine nature is neither the image of his Father's essence, nor of his Father's personality, these words must be spoken with regard to Christ's human nature; and in this respect he is the express image of his Father, or the image of the invisible God; and that, these three ways:

1. As the human soul of Christ is a creature, which has the nearest likeness to its Creator. This Son of God is a most glorious Spirit, the brightest and nearest image to the Father, the eternal glorious Spirit; far nearer than the angels who are also the sons of God, or than Adam who was the Son of God too; for his properties and perfections are much greater than their's, and bear a much nearer resemblance to the properties and perfections of God the Father.—2. The human nature of Christ is the image of the invisible God the Father, as he often assumed a visible form under the Old Testament, and appeared, and spake, and acted as God in a visible glory; and so he is the proper image of the invisible God, Col. i. 15.—3. As he took upon him, in the fulness of time, a visible body of flesh and blood, and therein appeared as one in whom the fulness of the godhead dwelt bodily, the visible image of his invisible Father.



But I proceed. The holy writer in Heb. i. 8. adds further, that *he was appointed heir of all things*, which seems to be not so applicable to the pure godhead of Christ; for godhead has an original and eternal right to all things, and does not come at it by way of inheritance or derivation, much less by being an appointed heir. Doctor Goodwin is so well persuaded of the sense of these words, that they are not properly applicable to pure godhead, that he again supposes the holy writer to speak by way of anticipation, and to view the divine nature of Christ in union with the man, though he acknowledges the things which are now spoken of, were transacted before the world was.

There are other expressions in this chapter which seem to refer to some being inferior to godhead. Verse 4. *Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.* Verse 9. *Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity, and therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows;* that is, has given thee the holy Spirit as a comforter, in a superior measure. These things cannot be supposed to be spoken of the godhead of Christ: and yet they seem to be spoken concerning Christ before his incarnation, and then they point out to us the pre-existence of his human soul; whereas if they are spoken of him after his incarnation, then they prove nothing of his pre-existent glory, which seems to be the design of this chapter.

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

And since there are so many expressions in the first chapter which ascribe ideas to Christ which are inferior to godhead, as well as some sublimer expressions which appear incommunicable to any but God; I would enquire whether the introduction of this pre-existent soul of Christ here may not be a happy clue to lead us into the very mind and meaning of this portion of scripture, rather than to suppose the godhead of Christ is al-

ways intended here: For by so doing we embarrass ourselves with this difficulty, which the Arians frequently fling upon us, of attributing something derivative and dependent to the divine nature, and ascribing something too low and mean to the godhead of Christ. I might add also in confirmation of this thought, that had the sacred writers' only design been to prove the divine nature of Christ, there are several passages in the Old Testament which are of equal force and significance with any which he has cited, and which are more evidently applied to the Messiah by the prophets themselves: But if we suppose him to speak of the whole pre-existent glory of Christ, then the citations seem to be well chosen and well mingled to represent his two natures, both divine and human, and the glory of his sacred person resulting thence.

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

III. Another difficult scripture which is made more easy and plain by this doctrine, is the eighth of Proverbs, ver. 22, &c. where wisdom is represented as brought forth, and dwelling with God before the world was. May not this be happily attributed to Christ's pre-existent soul united to the divine nature, or the person of the Mediator God-man? For it is said, *the Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before his works of old: I was set up from everlasting: Before the hills was I brought forth: I was by him, and was daily his delight.* These words admit of two or three remarks:

1. These expressions, "I was possessed or acquired, I was set up, I was brought forth, seem to express and imply something inferior to pure godhead, which is underived and independent; yet it seems to be the proper description of a

being distinct from God the Father in the literal sense,\* for these words intimate so much, "I was by him as one brought up with him, I was daily his delight, I rejoiced before him, and my delights were with the sons of men." If these things be taken literally, they mean a real person inferior and distinct from God.

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

Mr. Fleming citing these verses at large, "Christology, book III. chapter v. page 469," adds, "What we render in verse 24 and 25. brought forth, the targum renders, by being born in the first verse, and by being created in the next. But the Hebrew word is the same in both, and is justly rendered by Arias Montanos, "formata;" that is, framed, formed or made: As the septuagint to the same purpose renders it by τρομας, which is of the same import. And what else can he mean, when in verse 30. he represents himself, as one brought up with God, or as the targum says, "as one nourished up at his side?" Surely, if this be meant of the first-created Spirit, who is now the soul of the Messiah, no expressions can be more plain as well as natural: Whereas if we understand them immediately of the Logos, as the second person of the Trinity, we must get over abundance of figures, that can never, I think, be properly either explained or accommodated; besides our being involved in endless criticisms about words."

Dr. Goodwin also is positive that these expressions cannot refer to the second person considered in his eternal generation, but they must be referred to Christ as God-man, because they denote an act of the divine will. "Goodwin of the knowledge of God, volume II. page 111, and 189." The learned Dr. Knight supposes this birth of divine wisdom is here coming forth into a human figure and subsistence, or her entrance into the

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

substance of the first-created nature, that is, the human soul of Jesus Christ, at the moment of its creation. By this means the Word as man became the head of mankind, who were to be made by him after his image and likeness; and as the first-begotten, he had the right of primogeniture or government over the rest.—See his “*Considerations on Mr. Whiston, &c.* pages 108, 109, &c.”

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

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

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

All other places of scripture wherein the Son of God is represented, either as receiving or invested with sublime powers from God, or as bearing any inferior characters, have a most

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

Advantage II. "This doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul of Christ not only explains dark and difficult scriptures, but it discovers to us many beauties and properties of expression in the word of God, and casts a lustre upon some of those passages whose justness and beauty were not before observed." Let me mention a few of them:

1. When man is said to be *created in the image of God*: Gen. i. 27. it may refer to the God-man, to Christ in his pre-existent state. God says, *Let us make man in our image, after our likeness*; the word is redoubled perhaps to intimate that Adam was made in the likeness of the human soul of Christ, who was the first of God's creation, as well as that he bore something of the image or resemblance of the divine nature itself: And hereby Christ has the honour of being set up as the first and fairest image of God, and the grand pattern of all human souls who were to bear his likeness.

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

3. And not only human actions are attributed to God, but

even the very name of man is given to that glorious Being which visited the patriarchs of old: He assumed a human shape, and appeared as a man; and even the soul itself might be so called by "synecdoche," which puts a part for the whole. And yet this glorious appearance is also called God, and the Lord or Jehovah. It was a man that wrestled with Jacob; Gen. xxxi. 24. and yet he is acknowledged and adored as God. That extraordinary man, who is called *the man of God*, when he appeared to Manoah; Judges xiii. is supposed to be the Messiah: His countenance is described like an angel of God, and his name is called, "secret or wonderful," verse 6, 18.\* so in Ezekiel's vision, chapter i. 26. upon the likeness of the throne was the appearance of a man above: And in the prophecy of Daniel we meet with several of his appearances in the form of a man. Chapter iii. 25. "The fourth man walking in the midst of the burning fiery furnace was like the Son of God." So chapter viii. verse 15, 16. *There stood before me as the appearance of a man*, and this man bid Gabriel make Daniel understand the vision: And chap. x. 5. *A certain man clothed with linen, whose loins were girded with gold*, is described very nearly in the same form and dress as Christ appeared in to St. John; Rev. i. 13. and vii. 13. *One like the Son of man came to him that sat on the throne, &c.* which is parallel to Rev. i. 7. It is possible that most times when the angel, who is also called God, favoured the patriarchs with a visit, he appeared in the form of a man, thus the great "Theanthropos," or God-man, put on a human shape frequently as a prelude, figure and prophecy of his own incarnation.

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

4. Another instance of the justness and beauty of scriptural language we find in Zech. xiii. 7. where the man Christ is called the neighbour of God, or the man who is near to him, as it may be rendered; *Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow or neighbour, saith the Lord of hosts.* The word רֵעִי which we render my fellow does never signify any sort of equality, but conjunction, nearness or neighbourhood:

\* It is the same word נִסְתָּר wonderful, which is attributed to Christ as one of his names, in Isai. ix. 6; which the angel here assumes when Manoah asks his name.

It is often rendered neighbour in scripture. It denotes the man that was with God, or near to God, by the intimate union of the human soul to the godhead, and was the shepherd of the flock of God, or the keeper of Israel in all former ages. So the vulgar-Latin renders it, *coherentem mihi*, cleaving to me; and because of the union between the divine and human nature it may be very properly expressed, my neighbour."

I might take occasion here to remark also how appositely God himself is sometimes called the "Shepherd of Israel;" Psal. xxiii. 1. Psal. lxxx. i. *He shall feed his flock like a shepherd, he shall gather the lambs in his arm, and carry them in his bosom*; Isa. xl. 11. which is a prophecy of Christ, though he is called the Lord God in the foregoing verse. 'This language has great propriety in it when we consider the human soul of Christ united to godhead, acting the part of a shepherd towards the Jewish nation, "leading them through the wilderness like a flock," and watching over them as a shepherd in the land of Canaan. How beautiful is this idea when we observe that both in prophecy and in history, in the Old Testament and in the New, this office is appropriated to Christ; Ez. xxxiv. 23. *I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David*. John x. 14. Jesus calls himself "the good Shepherd;" and St. Peter echoes to the voice of Christ, and calls him the *chief Shepherd, and the Bishop of souls*; 1 Pet. ii. 25. and v. 4.

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

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

it seems to import his human nature in an especial manner; for *there is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*; 1 Tim. ii. 5. The manhood is eminently represented in the person of the Mediator, though the godhead being united, rendered all his actions infinitely efficacious and powerful.

6. It presents us also with a fair and rational account why God himself was called King of Israel, and took upon him the political government of that peculiar nation; and we learn why the Messiah had also this title given him, *the King of the Jews*, when we consider the pre-existent soul of the Messiah personally united to the divine nature. That God was often called the King of Israel, is sufficiently manifest in many places. 1 Sam. xii. 12. Samuel reproved them when they wanted another king to reign over them, "while the Lord their God was their King." David and Isaiah often called God the "Creator of Israel and their king, the Redeemer of Jacob and his king, the holy one of Israel and his king;" Psal. lxxxix. 18. Isa. xli. 21. Isa. xliii. 15. And in the vision of Isaiah, chapter vi. verse 6. the prophet says,—*Mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts*, which is properly applied to Christ by John the evangelist, chap. xii. verse 51. He is called the "King of glory;" Psal. xxiv. 7, 9, 10. When the ark was brought up to Zion, he is intitled the "King of Zion;" Zech. ix. 9. which is attributed to Christ; John xii. 25. and the common name of the Messiah was the "King of Israel;" John i. 49. Nathanael saith to Christ, *Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel*. All these expressions are very natural, and just, and proper when we consider the soul of Christ in its pre-existent state united to the divine nature, and becoming a pattern and protector of the holy seed, assuming the Jews above any other nation, into a peculiar relation to himself. And upon this account is said in John i. 11. *He came to his own u; la idia*, to his own property or possession, to his own people the Jews, but the Jews, his own subjects received him not.

Now if we suppose the soul of our blessed Redeemer in union with his godhead to be the appointed or anointed king of the Jewish church and nation, through all the ages of that economy, and if we consider that when he took flesh upon him and came down to dwell in the midst of them, according to the prophecies of the Old Testament, he was renounced, disowned, scorned, reproached, scourged and crucified by his rebellious subjects; and when we remember that all these sorrows were sustained in obedience to the will of his heavenly Father, and in compassion to sinful man; how just and meritorious a foundation does this lay for his exaltation to a greater and more extensive kingdom, even to be raised to the government of all churches



and all nations? He was King of the Jews for many ages before he came in the flesh; and when he rose from the dead, he became "King of the Gentiles, and Lord of all things in heaven and earth," as a reward of his sufferings; Phil. ii. 8—11. God at first "set his King of Israel on his holy hill of Zion;" Psal. ii. 6. and when he had declared him to be his Son at his resurrection, he says, *Ask of me, and I will give thee, &c.* So at his request he "gave him the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost ends of the earth for his possession;" Psal. ii. 8. He was of old the King of Jacob, and when he had "washed us from our sins in his own blood, and became the first-begotten from the dead, he had then a new name given him, King of kings, and Lord of lords, and Prince of the kings of the earth;" see Rev. i. 5. and xix. 16. And though some of these titles are divine, and belong to the divine nature of Christ originally, yet here they are ascribed unto him as God manifest in the flesh, or as a man united to God; nor are they too high for that whole person who was God as well as man. Besides, when his human nature had suffered, it was then exalted to a greater participation of, or a nearer resemblance to divine honours than before.

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

Is there not some ground from scripture to believe that the great God governs the world by the intervening agency and ministration of good and evil angels? As his Son Jesus Christ was King of the Jews, so the good angels were specially employed under Christ to do good offices for his people. And may we not suppose that the Gentile countries, those sinful nations of the earth, were distributed by divine providence under the dominion or government of several evil angels in the time of God's ancient dispensation before the coming of Christ? Is there not reason to think that the heathen nations for their abominable iniquities might be so far judicially abandoned of God, as to be left very much under the dominion, possession and power of evil angels, since they *sacrificed to devils*; Deut. xxxii. 17. 1 Cor. x. 20. "And chose devils for their gods?" Belzebub is the known god of Ekron;" 2 King i. 2, 3. "who is called the prince of devils;" Mat. xii. 24. And other names of the gods of the Gentiles are probably the names that several devils might assume to themselves, and teach the Gentiles to worship them under those names. And since Satan is called *the god of the world*; 2 Cor. iv. 4. that is, the being whom the heathen world worshipped, and since he is called *the prince of this world*; John xii. 31. and xiv. 30. that is, he whom the heathen and sinful part of mankind obeyed, may not "evil angels be those principalities and powers, those spiritual wickednesses in high places;"

Eph. vi. 12. who are the "rulers of the darkness of this world," that is, of the dark and miserable heathen world?

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

Though the heathen nations were left under the dominion of evil angels, yet since Israel was God's peculiar people, may we not reasonably suppose God set a good angel over them to be a prince, even his own Son in his pre-existent nature, who was *the angel of the covenant*; Mal. iii. 1. and the *angel of God's presence*; Isa. lxiii. 9. and the "angel in whom his name was;" Exod. xxiii. 25; And may not Christ himself be this Michael the archangel, the prince of Israel? It has been observed by some writers, that the scripture never speaks of archangels in the plural number: Perhaps there is but one archangel, and that is Christ.

Observe further, that Christ's kingdom is directly opposite to the devil's kingdom. His grand design is to oppose and destroy the work and power of the devil: and this seems to be Michael's appointed work in scripture, for he is sometimes brought in as "contending with devils;" Jude verse 9. Rev. xii. and as he has other angels under him to "fight against the dragon or devil;" verse 7. so has Christ. And he is called the prince of Daniel's people; Dan. x. 21. that is, the prince or king of Israel; so is Christ. Observe also, that Michael is called one, or rather the first of the chief princes, as it is in the margin; Dan. x. 13. which is very agreeable to the character of Christ, who is the first and supreme angel, governor, and the prince of Israel, who were God's own kingdom or people\*.

Now in this view of things, when we consider our blessed Lord as having his dominion extended from sea to sea, and

\* Some think the glorious person who appeared and talked with Daniel, chapter x. 5. was not Gabriel but Jesus Christ, because he is described much in the same manner as Christ is described. Rev. i. 13—16. in his appearance to John; and if so, then Michael cannot be Christ, but must be his prime minister in the government of Israel. But by comparison of these chapters, it is plain that this glorious person may much better be supposed to be Gabriel who conversed with Daniel, chapter ix. 21; and who is there called the man Gabriel whom he had seen in the vision at the beginning, which probably refers to the vision of the man Gabriel in Daniel viii. 15. and then Michael the archangel must be Christ the king or prince of Israel.

reigning over the Gentile nations even to the ends of the earth since his ascension to heaven, may we not justly suppose this is one part of his exaltation, that by him the prince of this world should be cast out, that is, turned out and despoiled of his old dominion among the nations, as well as out of the souls of men, according to John xii. 31? And that all these evil angels, who by divine permission were formerly governors of heathen kingdoms, were then captivated, spoiled and dispossessed of their government, and made slaves to the sovereign will of Christ? Is there not reason to conceive that these are those "principalities and powers which he spoiled of their dominions, and made a shew of them openly to the invisible world, triumphing over them;" Col. ii. 15\*. Is not this the "captivity which he led captive, when he ascended on high far above all heavens, that he might fill all things," that is, with his influence, and so might govern all nations; Eph. iv. 8, 10? Is it not upon this account that he is described in that magnificence of glory by the prophet David; Psal. lxxviii. 17, 18. *The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels. The Lord is among them as in Sinai, in his holy place. Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men, even for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them.* Was not this the day of his triumph over Satan and his angels, who had been gods and kings, princes and lordst of the nations, when thousands of holy angels are represented as the chariots of God attending him in that solemnity? Then he led captive a great captivity, even those principalities and powers that had been the rulers of the darkness of the heathen world; then he received gifts for men, and that not only for his ancient subjects the Jews, but for the rebellious Gentiles also, who had been the subjects of Satan, under the power of the devil, led captive by him at his pleasure. And the Psalmist says it was all

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

I confess Mr. Pierce supposes these "principalities and powers" must mean good angels, whom he believes to have been governors of the Gentile nations till Christ's time: and the chief reason he gives for it is, that the *Colossians* are forbid to worship them, ver. 18. for they are dispossessed of their government by the exaltation of Christ: whereas had they been evil angels or devils, there would have been no need of forbidding the christian *Colossians* to worship them.

To this I answer, That these *Colossians* were but young converts, and might not know that these were evil spirits whom they were tempted to worship, but only some invisible powers by whom God governed the nations in former times. And let it be observed too, that the apostle in the course of his argument excludes all angels from worship, verses 10, and 18, 19. and not merely evil angels, verse 15.

† The heathen idols, or devils, whom they worshipped, had such names as signify their dominion; *Baal* and *Bel* denote a lord, *Moloch* denotes a king, *Adrammelech* and *Annamelech* denote kings, &c.

ne with this design, that the Lord might dwell among them, at is, that the heathens might become the people, the kingdom, the habitation and sanctuary of God, as the nation of the Jews had been before; that Christ who is God-man, and who was King of the saints or the holy nation of Israel, might become King of all nations.

Now what a glorious scene of things opens itself to us by this interpretation of a few scriptures? How naturally and how easily do all things coincide and lead us to this amazing prospect of the victory of Christ over the devil? How illustrious does he appear in this dispossession of evil angels of their dominions on earth, at least so far as to make them become his slaves, and act peculiarly by his permission? How magnificent does this doctrine present the ascension and exaltation of our blessed Saviour? And how gloriously does the God-man Christ-Jesus, who in ancient ages was the king of Israel, aggrandize and extend his present title and dominion as King of nations, and Lord of all, upon his death and ascension to heaven?

7. This opinion of the pre-existent soul of Christ is made use of by Dr. Knight, in his "Primitive Christianity vindicated against Mr. Whiston," page 85. to explain those reproofs given Job by Eliphaz; Job xv. 7. *Art thou the first man that was born? Wast thou made before the hills? Hast thou heard the secret of God? And dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself? Let us consider each of these four sentences distinctly.*

"Art thou the first man that was born? *Μη πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων γενῆς;* ; Wast thou born the first of men?" as it is in the septuagint. Art thou that primitive Spirit, "the first-born of the creation?" Col. i. 15. *Wast thou made before the hills?* Adam was formed after the hills, but this first man the Messiah, speaking of himself in the person of wisdom, says, *Before the hills as I born, or brought forth;* Prov. viii. 25. which in the Hebrew are the very words of Job applied to the first man with only a change of the second to the first person: The first man and the divine wisdom, or Messiah, are all one, that is, by the personal union of this first man to the divine word or wisdom. *Wast thou heard the secret of God?* The septuagint add to this, *Did God use thee as a counsellor?* But the Messiah by the way of eminence is called the counsellor; Isa. ix. 6. in the septuagint, *the angel of the great counsellor;* and perhaps it is he to whom God said, *Let us make man;* Gen. i. 26. *And dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself?* Does all divine wisdom dwell in thee? It is only in the Messiah in the person of Christ *are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge;* Col. ii. 3. From these interrogatories put to Job, Dr. Knight infers, that the ancients had a notion of such a wonderful being, such a glorious and first-created human spirit. As for myself, I dare not

any, this interpretation carries full and sufficient conviction with it ; yet both the sacred pen-men of this book, as well as the seventy Jewish interpreters, in this passage may be fairly explained in this manner, and cast no unfavourable aspect on the pre-existence of the soul of Christ.

8. This doctrine in the judgment of some great authors gives us a fair idea of those passages of scripture wherein God is said to create all things by Jesus Christ ; Eph. iii. 9. not merely by his divine nature, but by him considered as God-man, and called by the names Jesus and Christ. This I confess has something so sublime in it, that I dare not indulge my own thoughts too far on this subject. Creation is a divine work, and the scripture always describes it as the prerogative of God to create. Nor can I believe that the real and proper power of forming any thing out of nothing is less than infinite, or that it can be communicated to any creature whatsoever. The light of nature and scripture fully agree in making this work an incommunicable prerogative of godhead : Nor can I persuade myself that God would give so much as a shadow of this glory to a mere creature who was not personally united to God, and thereby became one with God, lest it should too much intrench upon those divine titles, prerogatives and operations, whereby he distinguishes himself from his creatures. And upon this account I think it is a good proof that Christ is God, because the scripture joins him with the Father in the work of creation.

Yet there may be some proprieties and condescencies in it, that when this first-created spirit or soul of Christ was framed, and united to the divine nature, he should not be a mere idle or inactive spectator of the first works of God. But I chuse to represent this matter here no further in my own language, but propose it as it is represented by two great divines, Doctor Thomas Goodwin and Mr. Robert Fleming.

Doctor Goodwin in his treatise of the " Knowledge of God, page 177." asserts, 'That all things were created by Christ, " he having been some way the instrument, as he is Christ God-man, anointed, of the creation as well as, actually, of redemption." And though the Doctor supposes the human nature to be then united to the godhead only in decree, yet he says concerning Christ, page 178. " If he were at all to be made a creature, it was his due personal privilege to have been first himself made, and himself to have been God's instrument in creation, and to have uttered those words which were spoken by God, *Let there be light*: But for other ends it was suspended." The same author makes it the title of chapter XI. page 180. " That Christ as God-man is the Creator of all things, proved by scripture, viz. 1 Cor. viii. 6. by whom are all things. John i. 1, 2, 3. *All things were made by him, and without him was nothing*

*de that was made.* That the Logos or Word connotes the son sustaining before God the personage of God-man, by whom, as such, all things were created." And he interprets the 1st of Proverbs to the same sense.

If it be enquired, How it is possible that the human nature of Christ, even though it be united to the godhead, can have any thing to do in the work of Creation, I might give an answer out of this author's own words, that is, Christ might utter the same words, *Let there be light*; and as God's word and instrument might create all things, as he wrought miracles here on earth. Now to speak that word, *Let there be light*, which the mighty power of God attended with divine efficacy, was a great illustrious honour put upon the human nature or soul of Christ; but surely it is not above the power of a creature to speak such a word.

It may be objected, *That no words could be spoken when there was no air to form the sound of a voice*; therefore in the description of Moses this language is metaphorical, and signifies the act of the will, or a volition that there should be light.

But as the Doctor explains Christ's instrumentality in the creation of the world by his way of working miracles, this may well be applied to a volition of the soul, as to a word of the tongue. We may suppose this human spirit might as well will there should be light, as when he cleansed the leper. Mat. viii. he said, *I will, be thou clean*. As in that miracle the human soul put forth this volition and the divine power performed the cure, so in the creation this same glorious spirit might have this honour put on it, as to exert such a volition concerning the several creatures, and the almighty power or godhead united to it seconded this volition with its own creative efficacy.

Though the will of this human soul might have no more real influence in causing creatures to exist than the tongue of Jesus had in curing the leper, yet God may be said to *create all things by Jesus Christ*, even as he wrought miracles by him; and Jesus Christ himself also may be properly called the Creator, in as much as the divine nature, being personally united to the human soul, performed this work. Now the godhead cannot be said to give away any of its own incommunicable prerogatives to a mere creature by any sublime expressions of a kind, which attribute the creation to Christ, because the soul of Christ is not a mere creature; for by its near and intimate union to the divine nature, it becomes one with God: which honour is not given to any creature whatsoever, but to the man Christ Jesus.

This representation of things perhaps may prevent the

surprising and offensive ideas which Doctor Goodwin's expressions may arise on a sudden in the minds of those who are affrighted at every sound they have not been accustomed to hear.

Now surely if Christ considered as God-man by way of anticipation, or in the decree of God, be vested with this due dignity, and thus employed in creation, it can never be supposed that the actual existence of his human spirit, at that time in union with his godhead, should impair or diminish the degrees of this privilege: and I am well assured, there is much more evidence in scripture that his soul was actually the first-born of the creation," than there is that it was to have been so, and that this right was suspended four thousand years, which is Doctor Goodwin's sense of the matter.

Mr. Fleming in his *Christology*, book III. chapter v. page 451. humbly supposes that the second person of the Trinity was from all eternity pitched upon to be the grand organ of all the divine operations, "ad extra:" But since the second person is equally infinite as the Father and Holy Spirit, it is inconceivable that he should be the immediate organ of the production of finite beings, any more than the other persons: Therefore a creature was formed that should have as much of divinity as was possible to be imparted to it; and since the very notion of a creature includes imperfection when compared with the Creator, therefore this creature was personally united to the Son of God, and by virtue of this union and relation it has the name and designation of the Son of God. Hence it comes to pass, that sometimes the person of the Son of God is denoted by these names Logos, shekinah, memra; at other times this organized creature is represented as the Son of God: Then he supposes the angels themselves as well as Adam were created by the second person acting through this glorious creature as an organ, and made after the image of this shekinah, or original man, though with various degrees of perfection and resemblance. Thus *God made man in his own likeness*. This was that intelligent being that appeared to angels, to Adam, to Moses, to the three martyrs in the fiery furnace, and he appeared in the same bright figure to the three apostles in the mount of transfiguration.

But rather than follow these great men all this length, and set my seal to every thing they propose, I chuse at present to say in the words of Mr. Fleming, That "to give a nice or exact adjustment of all these things, may be reserved to Christ, to teach us when we come to heaven." And as I am well assured of the doctrine of the deity of Christ from many scriptures, so if there be any thing which I have asserted that runs counter to that doctrine, I desire it to be expunged and forgiven.

Thus I have reckoned up two considerable advantages

ich may be derived from this doctrine of the pre-existent soul Christ, viz. *That it explains and reconciles many dark and difficult passages of scripture, and it casts a new lustre on other texts, whose beauty, justness, and propriety were not before so much observed.* I proceed now to mention some other advantages of it.

**Advantage III.** Another argument for this doctrine, drawn from the consequences of it is, That "it does exceedingly aggrandize the personal glory and dignity of our Lord Jesus Christ," of whom we never can have too high an esteem, while we keep within the bounds of scripture.

This supposition admits and confirms all the honours paid to him by other hypotheses, and adds yet other honours to him. It allows him all the supreme dignity and perfection of the divine nature, and the titles and attributes of the true God by virtue of the personal union, and it also better secures and maintains the honour of his deity, by guarding it from those inferior attributions and characters, which otherwise must be ascribed to him before his appearance in flesh; and this it doth by proposing a nature below godhead, which is a fitter subject of these inferior attributions.

It allows him also all the honourable and peculiar prerogatives of his conception and the birth of his body, upon which account, as well as others, he was called the Son of God.

And besides this, it supposes his human soul to be a most glorious spirit, which had a long prior glorious existence before incarnation, and to be the first-born of the creation of God, and to have been present with the Father, surveying and approving of his works of creation, and perhaps also employed him in adorning and disposing various parts of the new-created world; so far as any thing below pure godhead was capable of being employed in that work. Perhaps it will be objected,

**Objection.** That this exalts his human nature indeed, and raises it as high as the Arians have raised the notion of their Logos or soul of Christ, which they suppose to be the substance nature he has, and call it his godhead or divinity. But it may be easily replied here,

**Answer.** And what if we do take in all the advantages which the Arians so much boast of, and thereby support our own faith more honourably? This will bereave their scheme of its fairest allurements and strongest supports. What if we do advance the human nature of Christ as high as their Logos? But whilst we strenuously maintain the necessity of true and proper godhead to belong to the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, in order to answer the many divine names, titles, attri-



butes, operations and worship, which are ascribed to him in scripture, we can be in no danger of compliance with the Arian error, which attributes all these divine characters to the man Christ Jesus, and denies his personal union to the godhead.

The aggrandizing of the man Jesus has not been esteemed dishonourable to his deity. Doctor John Owen affirms "the nature of the man Christ Jesus to be filled with all the divine graces and perfections whereof a limited created nature is capable," *Meditations on the Glory of Christ*, page 112." And Doctor Thomas Goodwin asserts the man Jesus, by virtue of union to the divine nature, to be "as glorious a creature as can possibly be made by God, vol. III. book iii. chapter vii. page 104."

And what injury can it be to our holy religion, or what hurt can it do to the gospel of Christ, to suppose his soul to be as glorious and sublime a being as any thing can be which is not God? This is doing honour to the man whom God the Father *delights to honour*, and in whom *the godhead dwells bodily*: And while it wonderfully exalts our esteem of the human nature of Christ, it does not diminish the least degree of honour or adoration due to his deity.

Nor can any danger arise to the sacred doctrine of the satisfaction and atonement of Christ, from this exaltation of his personal excellencies and honours; but rather it sheds a new glory upon this doctrine, and renders our blessed Saviour so much the fitter to undertake that great, that glorious and dreadful work. Suppose it should be said that this human soul, this man Jesus, according to this opinion, is *worth ten thousand of us*, as the people said to David. Then certainly he is so much the more proper person to become a surety for ten thousands of sinners; his life is the more valuable sacrifice to redeem millions of lives; and the death of a man so transcendently excellent is a fitter price to ransom innumerable multitudes of men from death. Yet the infinite merit of his sufferings to satisfy for the infinite offences of mankind, in my judgment arises still from the dignity of his whole person, who is God as well as man, and includes in it the infinite deity united to a finite or created nature; and probably for this reason, was that expression used, Acts xx. 28. *God purchased the church with his own blood.*

IV. "This doctrine greatly magnifies the self-denial and the condescending love of our Lord Jesus Christ, in his state of humiliation and death; it casts a thousand rays of glory upon all the scenes of his humbled estate; it makes his subjection and obedience to the will of the Father appear much more illustrious, and his charity and compassion to perishing mankind stand in a very surprising light."

Conceive of this glorious human spirit, the only begotten

Son of God, who was vested with such dignity before the creation of the world, united personally to the divine nature, and thus adored by angels, appearing often to the patriarchs in the form of God, with rays of divine majesty, and governing the nation of Israel, or church of God during all the former ages: Behold this holy and happy spirit descending from heaven, to take upon him, not flesh only, but *the likeness of sinful flesh*; and according to the ancient covenant between him and his Father, now uniting himself to animal nature in very mean and despicable circumstances, and actually, really and sensibly feeling the hardships of poverty and a low estate: See that illustrious being who had been surrounded with ministering angels for many ages, coming into our world with all the marks of poverty and meanness: Behold one higher than angels, supreme above principalities and powers, thrones and heavenly dignities, *made a little lower than angels*, by being confined to flesh and blood, or made for a little while, *ὀραχὺ τὴν* \* lower than the angels, and even below the common rank of men, brought forth in a stable, beside the ox and the ass; this very being himself was united to the flesh and limbs of a helpless infant, *wrapped in swaddling bands, and laid to sleep in a manger*: See this glorious Spirit who was replenished with all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge necessary for his illustrious re-existent state, cramped and confined in its operations by the feeble engine of the body of a babe, and willingly submitting to have a veil of darkness cast over its most sublime intellectual qualifications, and recover his ideas by human degrees: for the child *Jesus grew in wisdom and knowledge, as he grew in nature*, Luke ii. 52. Contemplate this most excellent Being enduring all the feeble and innocent frailties of an infant state, rearing out the years of childhood among the poor and necessitous children in the lower ranks of life, himself the reputed Son of a carpenter, and subject to his earthly parents; he that was with God when he built the heavens, and said, *Let there be light*, the first among those *sons of God who shouted for joy* when he laid the foundations of the earth. Behold him now sweating perhaps and toiling with the saw and the hammer, as tradition tells us, to make plows, harrows and yokes for oxen: Consider this blessed soul, the ancient ornament of heaven, and the rightest created spirit there, now spending thirty years together in utmost obscurity, who had lived for four thousand years in the midst of divine splendors: Trace him wandering through the villages from town to town, hungry, thirsty, and weary: Follow this illustrious man travelling on foot to preach the gospel, attended with a few poor fishermen, instead of the chariots of God and the legions of angels, legions and chariots that

It is either for a short season, or in a small degree.

waited on him at mount Sinai, when in majesty and terror he delivered the law : Consider this very person abused, reproached, and called a blasphemer and a devil, who was the fairest image, and the delight of God his Father, and rejoicing always in his presence before the earth or her mountains were made : Look upon this innocent, this holy soul arraigned, at the impious tribunal of Pilate, and condemned to the shameful cross as a scandalous malefactor.

See the ancient and original King of Israel, who had made David and Solomon, and all their race his deputies for many generations ; see him crowned with thorns instead of glory ; see him scourged, buffeted, nailed to the cursed tree between two thieves, his hands and feet pierced, his limbs stretched out in grievous torture, and himself groaning and expiring in blood and anguish. Behold this original favourite forsaken of God his Father in that dreadful hour of darkness, and assaulted by the armies of hell with rage and impudence and horrid temptations : Think of this holy soul just departing, his soul by the force of exquisite torment perhaps driven out of the sacred mansion of his flesh, even that body which the Father had prepared for him ; he was banished out of this world by those very criminals, those merciless rebels for whose salvation he came down to dwell in it. Think of that ancient darling of heaven, now made the sport of the Jewish rabble, a sacrifice both to the fury of men and to the arrows of vindictive justice, while he was amazed with inward agonies, and *his soul exceeding sorrowful even unto death*, when the sword of God awoke against the shepherd of his Israel, against the man that was his neighbour, his companion before the angels were made.

Collect all these strange and astonishing ideas together, survey them in one view, and say, how divinely glorious was the love of God in parting with such a Son from his bosom ! How amazing was the condescension and self-denial of this glorious Saviour in giving himself for us ! How inimitable was his submission to his heavenly Father's will ! His zeal for his Father's honour, and his god-like charity and compassion to sinful man ! When we contemplate his holy soul in his pre-existent and exalted state, fore-knowing and surveying all these indignities, these agonies and deaths, and yet resolving to descend into flesh at his Father's proposal, and to endure them all for the redemption of sinners, to what an inconceivable height of sacred astonishment doth this raise all the wonders of his painful life and his love ! and how doth it awaken all that is tender in the bosom of a christian, and penetrate the very heart with divine affection and gratitude to the Son of God his Saviour.

When we conceive of this pre-existent soul of Christ, this glorious, this holy and happy Spirit, with pleasure consenting to

his Father's proposal of this most surprizing abasement and bloody agonies, it gives us an example of such profound humility, such absolute obedience to God, his Father, and such unspeakable love to sinful men, as far surpasses the greatest instances that he ever gave, or ever was capable of giving while he was here upon earth, if we suppose, according to the common opinion, that he was merely born, and trained up for this service without his own previous consent. This idea of the love of Christ answers those sublime characters which the apostle gives of it : Eph. iii. 18, 19. *It is a love that has lengths and breadths in it, that has heights and depths : it is a love that passes knowledge.*

You will reply perhaps, " That most part of this representation is true in some sense, if you only suppose the divine nature of our Lord Jesus Christ existent before his incarnation, and consenting that his human nature should suffer all this." I answer,

Many of these things, by the help of tropes and figures, may be said concerning the deity of Christ, or God manifest in flesh ; but if we leave out the figure of communication of properties, and speak in such plain and natural terms as scripture seems to use generally on this occasion, it signifies only " God's will that the man Christ should suffer these sorrows, and that the man Jesus passively consented to suffer them when it was revealed to him that he was born and made for this purpose." But the divine nature itself could really suffer nothing of all this ; the utmost condescension of the godhead was, that it stood related to the man who endured these sufferings : And infinite condescension it was indeed, for *God manifest in the flesh* to be thus dishonoured and unglorified. But the godhead itself is impassible still, and cannot really suffer pain or loss ; nor undergo proper sensible humiliation, shame or sorrow.

Whereas by aggrandizing the human nature of Christ, by this doctrine of his pre-existent state, we see that very same glorious Being itself who suffered all this, actually leaving the bosom or beatifying presence of his Father, really divesting himself of his primeval glories and joys in the literal sense, and without a figure, and freely devoting his very self to all these calamitous circumstances : We see that very same Spirit descending from heaven to take a body upon him that he might be capable of all these various stages of misery, and of sustaining these scenes of sorrow, anguish and death, persevering in his resolutions till the dreadful work was all finished. Now where we can explain the language of scripture in a literal and proper sense, where we can also by this literal sense do unspeakable honour to God the Father and his love in sending such a Son, to Jesus the Saviour, and his grace in coming down from heave

to suffer such sorrows, and at the same time, can lay a just foundation for raising our own love and zeal, and gratitude both to the Father and the Son, to such unknown and superior degrees, and can set before our eyes such an astonishing example of humility, charity, and self-denial; surely these are such advantages to the Christian scheme, and such honours to the blessed gospel, as should not be slightly rejected.

It should be also considered that the Arians raise a very common and plausible objection against the vulgar explication of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ, because that scheme allows no real self-emptying, no literal and proper abasement and suffering of the Son of God, but only a relative abasement by being united to the man who did suffer. The author of the "Sober Appeal to a Turk or an Indian," endeavours to expose the common scheme of the doctrine of the Trinity; because it supposes only a "relative humiliation, a relative or nominal suffering of the Son of God by his uniting himself to a man, while he himself really suffered nothing, underwent no diminution, but was all the while possessed of the highest glory, and of the same unchangeable blessedness, page 145." Whereas this doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul of Christ sets the whole scheme of the self-denial and sufferings of Christ, in as glorious and advantageous a light as their doctrine can pretend to do; and yet at the same time secures the divinity of Christ, together with all the honours of its condescending grace, by supposing this pre-existent soul always personally united to his divine nature. Thus all this sort of pretences for the support of the Arian error is destroyed at once, by admitting this doctrine.

V. This doctrine of the pre-existent soul of Christ, not only casts a new lustre upon several parts of the gospel, and displays the glories of the person of Christ, and the wonders of his love in a fairer light, but it also "enables us to defend the doctrine of the deity of Christ with greater justice and success against many other cavils of the Socinian and Arian writers." For while we keep this doctrine in our eye, we are by no means constrained to interpret any expression in the Old Testament concerning the divine nature of Christ, which carries in it something inferior to the majesty of godhead: Here we have a subject proper to receive these meaner attributions. There is no need to call the mere godhead of Christ a man, an angel, a messenger; there is no need to animate a human shape with pure deity in order to wrestle with Jacob, to eat and drink with Abraham, to appear in the form of a flame in the bush to Moses, to travel through the wilderness in a cloudy pillar in the sight of all Israel, in order to direct the motion of their camp: There is no need to suppose the pure godhead talking with Joshua, and conversing familiarly with Gideon, nor holding a plumb-line in his hand while he stood upon the wall in view of Amos. The

Arian will tell us, that these things seem to be too mean and low condescensions for the great God of heaven and earth to practise; and thence they infer, that the person to whom these things are ascribed cannot be true God. Behold then this glorious Spirit, the Son of God, the soul of Jesus Christ, the man personally united to the divine nature appearing to perform these actions, to sustain these inferior characters, and to solve all this difficulty; and yet he is rightly called God, Lord, Jehovah, and has the perfections and honours of godhead ascribed to him; for he is God as well as man, though his human nature is the immediate agent in these inferior transactions.

VI. As this doctrine casts a beauty upon various passages of scripture, and upon the whole scheme of the christian faith, so "there is not one scripture, nor one point or article of our faith that can receive any evil influence from it, no dangerous consequences, that I know of, can possibly attend it. Some of the most zealous and learned defenders of the sacred Trinity have acknowledged to me, that they could see no danger of heresy in it, nor any injury to sacred truth, though they themselves had not seen this doctrine yet in a convincing light.

And as there is no article of the christian faith that is endangered by it, so "neither does it alter any of the particular schemes of doctrine which divines of various parties have espoused." You may still follow the sentiments of John Calvin, or Arminius, or the intermediate schemes of Monsieur Amyrald and Mr. Baxter; for this doctrine makes no innovation in all the peculiar matters of dispute between these great men, but sets the whole contrivance of our salvation according to any of their schemes in a better light, and throws perhaps an impartial brightness upon the gospel, though it should be explained in any of their particular methods.

"Nor does it in the least interfere with any particular schemes which men have invented to solve the difficulties of the blessed Doctrine of the Trinity." If this sentiment of pre-existence be allowed, the godhead of the sacred persons may still be explained, either according to the ancient athanasian scheme, which Bishop Pearson, and Bishop Bull have defended; or according to the modern or scholastic athanasianism, which Dr. Chyrenell, Dr. Owen, Dr. South, Bishop Stillingfleet, and others have well displayed; or according to the hypothesis of Dr. Fowler, the late Bishop of Gloucester; or that of the late learned Mr. John Howe; or according to the sentiments of the great and learned Dr. John Wallis, an eminent member of the assembly of divines. This sentiment of the pre-existent soul of Christ has a friendly aspect upon any scheme that maintains the godhead of the sacred Three; and may be easily assumed and ingrafted into any one of them? But the Socinian and Arian errors are inconsistent with it, as I have explained it.

To conclude this last set of arguments on this subject, I beg leave briefly to recapitulate them in this manner. There are many dark and difficult texts of scripture which have puzzled interpreters in several ages, and which have hung heavy upon the various schemes that support the doctrine of the deity of Christ. Now suppose there could be one single clue found out, which leads us into such a solution of all these difficulties, and such an interpretation of these scriptures, which has the following advantages attending it, viz.

1. Which gives the most natural and obvious, and literal sense; so that every common reader that had no pre-conceived notions or schemes of thought, would readily run into at the very hearing of it.—2. Which puts learned men to no trouble of figures and metaphors, such as “prolepses;” that is, speaking of things before they are done; or “catachreses;” that is, calling the eternal God, without actual union to human nature, a man, or an angel, or a messenger, a captain, &c.—3. Which is most consistent with, and most agreeable to all other parts of the word of God, both in the Old Testament and in the New, and renders the exposition of many other texts easier and plainer than before, and sets the several parts of scripture in a beautiful harmony:—4. Which interferes with no particular scheme of divinity, nor makes any alterations in the important articles of our faith: And thus it does not widen the common differences of the several parties of christians, but freely allows each of them their own sentiments in the common controversies of religion: And yet,—5. Which assists us to answer the objections of our opponents against the divinity of our blessed Saviour, and also allures them to embrace the truth:—6. Which aggrandizes the personal glories of our Lord Jesus Christ, and raises his condescension and his love to most amazing degrees:—7. Which spreads a new lustre over the whole gospel of Christ, and the various transactions recorded in the word of God.

I say, suppose such a single clue were found out to lead us into the understanding of the holy scripture in such a manner as I have described, I would humbly ask, whether it does not bid fair for the truth of the gospel, and the very meaning of the sacred writers? And whether it has not sufficient force and allure-ment in it to invite our assent? Such is the doctrine of the pre-existence of the human soul of Christ.

#### SECT. VI.—*Objections answered.*

When any doctrine has been proved by sufficient force of argument, there may be still various difficulties that remain to perplex it. But if those difficulties are not of equal force or evidence with the arguments that have been before produced for the support of it, we may reasonably give our assent to the doc-

ne, and wait until providence may afford a fairer light to scatter the clouds that hang upon it. There is one learned author,\* who has written upon this subject, speaks with so much freedom to tell us, that "in this doctrine of the pre-existent soul of Christ, the difficulty of every thing vanishes, except that of bringing men off from expounding the scripture by human authorities as the key of divine oracles; and without doubt, saith he, were the difficulty will lie, when all is said." So confident is he of the truth of it, and that on solid and sufficient reason.— However, that I may make it appear that the difficulties and objections which attend this doctrine may have a fair solution given them, I have left the last section for this purpose, in which they are ranged in a fair just order; and I hope the opposers, if any can be found, will have no reason to complain that I have not displayed them in their complete light and strength; and perhaps this means the tender and scrupulous christian may have some stumbling-blocks removed that lay in his way, and be more easily induced to receive this doctrine, and to pay proper honour to our sacred Lord.

**Objection I.** "Is not Christ frequently in scripture called man? Now this glorious Being with such extensive powers you describe, is something above a human soul; it is far above angels, and therefore though it be united to a body it will not make a man."

**Answer I.** The name of man denotes a nature, which is made up of a mind or spirit united to an animal body in human shape. But the name angel signifies originally a messenger, and denotes the character of an office sustained by a spirit, either with, or rather without a human body, and is most frequently used in scripture; though angels have often appeared in human shapes, being appointed by the great God to assume such a shape on proper occasions.

**II.** All the idea which I have of a human soul is this, viz. a created mind or spirit which hath understanding and will, and rational powers, and which is fit to be united to a human body, in such a manner as to exert the powers of a man, to feel the appetites and sensibilities and passions of a man, as to receive impressions or sensations, whether pleasant or painful, by the organs of that body, and is also able to actuate and influence all the animal powers of that body in a way agreeable to human nature. Now though the powers of the human soul of Christ may be as much superior to the most exalted man or angel, as the powers of the most exalted man are superior to the powers of an idiot; yet it does not hinder it from being properly called a human soul,

\* Mr. Joseph Hussay, who was really a man of learning, though he had some odd and peculiar sentiments.



supposing it still capable of, and fit for such an union to a human body as I have described.

III. The powers of the human soul of Christ in his new glorified state, are represented in the word of God to be so extensive beyond and above men or angels, that might give as just an occasion for this objection as any thing I have asserted concerning his pre-existent state, and yet he is still a man. What large and comprehensive faculties of understanding and will may be communicated to a glorified creature, is far above our skill to determine: Now Christ was in glory, or was a glorified creature before he was in flesh, even *before the world was made*; John xvii. 5. And therefore his ancient powers in the pre-existent state might be very great, and yet his soul might still be a human soul. But if no mere creature were capable of such powers and honours as are attributed to Christ in his exalted state, yet we cannot determine what vast and amazing capacities such a creature may be endued with, who was always personally united to God; and it is in this view, it is Christ as a man united to godhead, who has such extensive powers as may fit him to govern, and to judge the world, as I have shewn in a former discourse, to which I refer the reader.

I add further, that it was the perusal and study of some of those scriptures wherein so vast and extensive a knowledge and power are attributed to the man Jesus in his present glorified state, that led the way to my more easy belief of the powers and glories of his ancient state of pre-existence: And thence I thought I might infer, that since the man who has these amazing glories and powers now, was once without them here on earth; therefore the same human soul might be with God the Father from the beginning of the world; might enjoy some part of these powers and glories, and yet for a season divest himself of them at his incarnation, and then be restored to them again with a most illustrious addition as a reward of his sufferings; John xvii. 5.

Objection II. Some persons have been ready to cry out against this doctrine, as though it supposed the "pre-existent nature or natures of Christ to be united to a mere carcass, if it were united only to an animal body without a soul or spirit."

Answer I. In ancient and more ignorant ages, this might perhaps be a stumbling-block to some weaker philosophers, who would mingle their mistaken philosophy with their christianity, and falsely imagined that an animal body was a mere dead carcass, without some immaterial being in it, some superior vital soul or spirit: But in the present age, when it is generally believed by the best philosophers, that animal bodies may have animal life in and of themselves, and all correspondent animal motions and powers, without any spiritual intelligent thinking

stance superadded to them, this objection vanishes. Christ's co-existent soul united to his divine nature, assumed a living animal human body when he became incarnate; for it is now agreed that the human thinking rational soul does not give animal life to the organized body, which life arises from the circulation of the blood, inspiration and expiration of air, &c.

II. But suppose the human body were lifeless, without a rational soul, why may not Christ's rational pre-existent soul be united to this body, and give life to it as well as a new created soul? Therefore this objection vanishes in all the views of it.

Objection III. "How can you suppose so glorious a Being, as you have described, who was present at the creation of the world, who governed the nation of Israel, and transacted the affairs of the church for four thousand years, should lose all its best treasures of ideas, and its extensive faculties, and become ignorant as a human infant, and grow up by degrees to knowledge and wisdom? Yet this is asserted concerning Christ in his childhood, Luke ii. 52. *Jesus increased in wisdom and stature.*

Answer. If such a sentiment as this can be fairly accounted for according to reason and scripture, then the objectors must allow that it adds a most astonishing lustre to the humility, condescension, self-denial and love of our blessed Lord. Now let us see whether it may not be explained according to the common laws of union between a human soul and body.

Amongst these laws of this union, which are appointed by our Creator, it is evident from manifold experience that this one, viz. "That though the soul may have in itself ever so many ideas, or powers ever so glorious and extensive, yet while united to animal nature in this manner, it can exert them no farther than the organs of the animal will admit, or than those organs are fit to assist in such operations." There have been many instances wherein persons of eminence and skill in arts or sciences, have had the brain, with all the traces and images which were impressed upon it, so confounded by some disease, that they have lost almost all their ideas, and all their skill; they have forgot even their native language, and they knew not their own names: Sometimes by slow degrees they have recovered their ideas and words again, and perhaps in some years have revived at their former excellencies; the brain has recovered its traces and images again, and the soul has recognized them with a pleasure, and that in much less time than it was first employed in acquiring them.\*

\* This may be represented by an easy similitude. Suppose an organist of exquisite skill in music should have all the pipes of his instrument filled with mud, he could neither excite with his hand, nor receive with his ear, any of those rich varieties of sound which belong to the organ, until by degrees the bellows and pipes were cleansed; and thus by degrees he would form and hear broken fragments of tunes, until the muddy obstacle being quite removed, the grateful harmony will be recovered, and the former skill of the organist appear.

Yet further, let us suppose the soul of the greatest philosopher or mathematician united to the body of a new-born infant: This soul would find no images or traces on the brain of the babe correspondent to his ancient ideas; but on the other hand it would receive incessant impressions and sensations from the infant brain, according to the laws of union, derived from the sensible objects around it, or the natural inward motions and appetites that attend the infant state; and thus all its ancient and learned ideas would be as it were obliterated for a season, or rather concealed and overwhelmed, or buried by the impetuous impressions of animal nature, and by the constant importunity of such sensations and images as belong to a new-born child. It is true indeed that such a learned soul would recover its own ideas by much swifter degrees than one that had never possessed them; and it would form proper traces and images on the young human brain with much greater speed and facility than other children could attain them, whose souls never had these learned ideas.

And is it not possible that this may be the case of the holy child Jesus? His glorious soul might submit to have its former numerous and sublime ideas at its first union to animal nature, so concealed and overwhelmed by the importunate and overbearing impressions of infant-animal nature, that it might recover them again only by such degrees as flesh and blood would admit; and thus he was made for a little while lower than angels; as Heb. ii. 9. and so might grow in wisdom, and knowledge and stature together; as in Luke ii. 52. And indeed if we compare this with Isa. ix. 6. and Isa. vii. 14, 15. those verses may be naturally explained to this sense. He was a child born, he was a son given; a virgin conceived and bare a son, and called his name Immanuel: *Butter and honey did he eat, that he might know to refuse the evil and chuse the good*; that is, he was nourished with the common food which they gave young children, that he might grow up by degrees to human understanding, and knowledge of distinction between good and evil.

It seems also agreeable to the history of the gospel, that our blessed Lord attained the knowledge of things by much swifter degrees, and far greater facility than common children; for at twelve years old he was found discoursing with the Doctors in the temple: And when he first preached to the Jews, they wondered how this man should know letters, having never learned; John vii. 15. And then in his manly state, he knew his near relation to God, and his pre-existent glory, as many of his own speeches testify. According to this representation, Mr. Fleming in his *Christology*, book III. page 455. supposes "the notices of former things to be so far obliterated from the memory of this glorious spirit, as was just necessary to his being fitted for a state of trial in a human body. But he did so far remem-

is former exaltation and glory in general, as frequently to glorify it, and to plead it sometimes in prayer to his Father ;” particularly in John xvii. 5.

I am not so fond of this representation of things as to persuade myself that my readers will readily receive such a strange representation of scenes passing over the soul of our blessed Lord ; especially if they have never accustomed their understandings to go any opinion different from the common track : Yet I can assure solemnly, that after my best searches into the word of

I can see nothing unscriptural, absurd or dangerous in this representation ; and I am well assured it gives the highest testimony to our blessed Redeemer for this surprizing instance of condescension to his Father, and condescending love to mankind : Is there any thing we can imagine that will set his admirable patience and humility, and his inimitable love in a nobler light ; or aggrandize the love of the Father in parting with such a Son out of his bosom, and confining him to such a state of life in a body and such amazing humiliation.

Objection IV. “ Is it not said frequently in the New Testament, that Christ was exalted to glory and honour, and to the government of all things after his resurrection, as a reward of his sufferings and death ? Now if the human soul of Christ in its pre-existent state, being in union with the divine nature, had performed all his good and happy works, and might be employed in most glorious works, even at the creation of the world, and afterwards in the works of providence ; then how can this pre-existent Spirit be said to be exalted as a reward of his sufferings by having the government of the world given to him after his resurrection, or by being advanced to glory and honour and dominion in heaven ?”

Answer I. I have already shewn, that how great and glorious were the powers of Christ before his incarnation, yet he was not made governor not only of the church, or of God’s people the Jews, during all former ages of his pre-existent state, and thus he was called the king of the Jews ; but after his sufferings he was advanced to sovereignty over all nations and made *head over all things*, and all nations of mankind for the church’s sake ; Eph. i. 22.

I. What affairs he transacted, and what honours he receiving in his pre-existent state among the children of men, was, for the most part, in his Father’s name, and as sustaining the character and person of God his Father : Now since his sufferings and death he is advanced to receive these honours in his own name, as well as raised to a government of much larger extent than at the creation he had no honour from creatures, and after his resurrection he had not such sublime and distinct honours paid

to his human nature before his incarnation, as he has now in heaven.

III. It is very plain that though the human soul of Christ might enjoy a glorious degree of honour and happiness before his incarnation, yet having properly the nature of a human soul, it could not arrive at its perfection of appointed happiness, but by its union with a human body; even as the spirits of departed saints enjoy a glorious degree of honour and happiness in the world of spirits; yet neither their honour nor happiness is complete until the resurrection, when they shall be rejoined to immortal bodies, and their happiness and honour shall be completed by unknown sensations of pleasure. Besides, that sensible survey, those various sensations and eye-sight of their own exaltation, which they acquire by the means of their union to a glorified body, is a farther kind of honour and happiness than in a separate state they were capable of. Thus the human soul of Christ having passed through the sorrows of life, and the painful sensations that arose from its union to our flesh in such poor and inferior circumstances, having suffered shame and reproach, and a thousand indignities from men, and having felt the agonies of death as a ransom for them, was exalted both to greater honour and greater happiness at his resurrection and ascension, by being united to a body raised in power and in glory, than he could have been without it.

1. He was exalted to greater degrees of happiness, by receiving all that intense pleasure, and those unknown sensations of delight, which are capable of being conveyed to a spirit by the medium of a body, a glorious body; and this as a reward of his sensations of pain in the body of his humiliation.

2. It is most probable that he is and shall be exalted also to greater degrees of honour, by seeing and hearing, or taking in perhaps by some corporeal methods, all the honours done to him by the whole human and material creation, and in beholding with a vast and comprehensive survey, all the subjection and obedience of the known and unknown worlds of spirits dwelling in flesh, paid to him; and particularly all the acclamations and worship of all the glorified saints paid to his divine person as dwelling in a human body, and this as a reward of that shame and reproach, and those uneasy passions which he might sustain in animal nature in his humbled state.

Thus it appears how the soul of Jesus Christ, though it had very great powers and dignities and blessedness in its pre-existent state, yet may receive a most sensible addition to its honours and happiness when he was raised from the dead and ascended to heaven in a glorified body. There are parallel instances in scripture which confirm this account of things; John xvii. 22. our Saviour says, *The Father loved him before the*

andation of the world ; and yet his Father's love is said to be continued to him, and to be bestowed on him, on the account of his obedience ; John xiv. 10. *If ye keep my commandments shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love.* John x. 17. *Therefore doth the Father love me because I lay down my life.* We must naturally suppose this to imply some additional instances and effects of the Father's love bestowed, or to be bestowed on Christ, because of his obedience unto death : And what additional instances, manifestations or effects of the Father's love did the man Jesus receive, if his exaltation to superior degrees of honour and glory in heaven be not reckoned among them ?

Objection V. " If the human soul of Christ had a being before his incarnation, how comes it to be expressed, that God is manifest in the flesh, and that *the Word was God, and this Word was made flesh* ? Would it not have been much more proper to say, the soul of our Lord Jesus Christ was thus made flesh, or manifested in flesh ? "

Answer I. The most usual way of expressing the incarnation of Christ is, by representing the Son of God as *coming in the flesh, Christ coming into the world, the Son of God made a woman, the Son of God sent into this world, &c.* This is the most frequent language of the New Testament : Now these words do most properly include, if not chiefly denote the soul of Christ under the character of the Messiah. This was the Son of God which was intimately united to flesh and blood. It is possible that the name, Son of God, may not so directly refer to the godhead of Christ, as it does to his human soul and his body ; for since the idea of sonship carries in it the notion of derivation and dependence, and inferiority, we should not without great necessity apply such such ideas to godhead, whose very nature is to be supreme, underived and independent. This hath been made to appear more at large in an essay on that name " the Son of God," which see.

It is granted there are two or three places which represent the divine nature or God himself as appearing in the flesh ; and this may be written in those few places, with a special design to magnify the mystery of the incarnation, and spread a divine glory over it : always remembering that it is a great truth that God himself was incarnate," though the more immediate subject of union to flesh was the human soul.

II. It might be noted also, that evangelical interpreter of scripture Dr. Goodwin explains the Logos or Word, even as it is described in the first chapter of St. John's gospel, so as to include the idea of God-man, and to take in the human nature of Christ as well as the divine, when *the Word was with God, and when all things were made by him.* That author indeed opposes the human nature to be united at that time only in the

had a pre-existence, which some learned men suppose, then doubt less they believed the soul of Christ to have the same prerogative.

Besides the several expressions which our Saviour used concerning "his coming down from heaven, his returning thither again, his being sent by the Father not to do his own will, his praying for the restoration of a glory which he had before the world was, and his speaking of the love of God which he enjoyed before the foundations of the world," all these expressions might justly and naturally lead them into the idea of the pre-existent soul of Christ, since it is pretty evident that they had but very little thought or belief of his divine nature before his resurrection. Some of their own expressions seem to intimate their assent to this doctrine of his pre-existent soul, when they tell him, *Now we are sure that thou comest forth from God*, John xvi. 28, 29, 30. And they seem to understand him in the literal sense, and without a parable or figure, when he told them, *He came forth from the Father, and came into this world; but he was now leaving this world, and returning to the Father.*

As for the writings of the apostles St. Peter and Paul, these seem to manifest this doctrine, if the exposition which I have given of various parts of their epistles be just and true. The apostle John speaking so often of Christ's coming 'in the flesh, seems to manifest that this was his conception of the matter, as as though he supposed his soul to have an existence before.

As for the primitive writers of christianity of the first two or three hundred years, they express themselves in so inaccurate and confused a manner concerning the pre-existent nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, that it is hard to say what was their sense, or whether they had any uniform, regular and settled ideas on this subject. Sometimes their language plainly denotes some pre-existent nature of Christ to be truly divine, and part of the very essence of God the Father, even his mind, his wisdom, &c. others of their speeches seem to sink it far below the

thou willing to suffer chastisements for the purging away their iniquities? And the soul of the Messiah answered, I will suffer them, and that with all my heart."

The late Dr. Thomas Burnet of the Charter-house in his book "De statu mortuorum & resurgentium," page 249 speaks thus, "Judæi & inter patres, &c. that is, the Jews and some among the christian fathers have determined, that the soul of the Messiah had an existence before his incarnation, and before the very origin of the Jewish nation, before the law, and through the whole economy of the law and the prophets." Now if they supposed this soul joined with the Logos, by which he means his divine nature, they might well agree that this was the shekinah of the patriarchs and the prophets, and that these motions and returns from heaven from heaven to earth, and his appearances whether in human shape or not, may be attributed to the Messiah, which can never belong to mere divinity. And indeed I can scarce understand Justin Martyr and other of the fathers, who from the invisibility, infinity and omnipresence of God the Father would prove that he never appeared, neither could he descend or ascend, or change his place: for unless the soul of the Messiah did pre-exist in union with the Logos, that is, his divinity, I cannot see how these arguments, drawn from invisibility and omnipresence, can be of any force with regard to God the Father any more than to God the Son.

dignity of godhead when they speak of his temporal generation and derivation from God as the author and cause of his being, from which the Arian writers have taken occasion to suppose they were engaged on their side. Now as this doctrine of the pre-existent soul of Christ united to true godhead, happily reconciles many difficult places of scripture, so perhaps if it were wisely applied upon a diligent review of the writings of some of the fathers, this same doctrine might reconcile some of their strange expressions which seem contradictory and inconsistent : at least I am sure it would have secured them from some of the absurdities which they seem to have fallen into.

It is worthy of our notice, that many if not most of the ancient *antenicene* fathers, when they spake of the generation of the Son, understand by it a voluntary generation or manifestation some time before the world began, in order to create that world ; though they suppose the divine Logos or Word to exist in God, or in and with the Father from all eternity. That great and zealous defender of the Athanasian faith, the learned Doctor Waterland, allows this in his citation from several of those fathers ; see " Second Defence of the Queries," pages 104, 107, 288—292. and his Third Defence, page 25. Particularly Ignatius had this idea of the generation of the Son. Justin Martyr speaks of no generation higher than that voluntary antemundane generation otherwise called manifestation. The Logos became a Son according to Justin, by voluntary appointment ; it is the procession makes him a Son, and that was voluntary. The Son proceeded light of light in time according to Justin, and according to many more beside him, particularly Hippolytus, and perhaps even the nicene fathers. Tatian who was Justin's scholar, speaks only of a temporal generation or procession. And Athanasius and Theophilus speak of no higher generation than this. Clemens of Alexandria and Tertullian may be both allowed to go upon the same hypothesis, and Hippolytus was undoubtedly of the same mind, for he says, " The Father begat the Son when he willed and as he willed," that is, sent or shewed him to the world. Tertullian supposes the " sonship properly to commence with his procession, so that the Logos became a Son in time, and was not yet a Son until he came out to create."

We might ask here now, whether all these expressions may not be reconciled, if we suppose the deity of the second person of the trinity, as some persons have done, to be an eternal divine principle in godhead, which is represented in scripture as a person called his Logos or *sophia*, his word or his wisdom : And that sometime before the creation of the world, God created, generated, or caused to exist the human soul of Jesus Christ in an immediate union with this word or divine principle, and gave the whole complexum the same name, viz. The Logos or Word, and ordained this glorious Being, viz. his own divine Word or



Logos united to the human spirit, to operate in creating and adorning the world, the human spirit having a subserviency therein to the divine principle, so far as it was possible for anything beneath God to be employed in an inferior or ministerial manner in such sublime and divine work. Does not this give a fair, a natural and easy explication of these glorious expressions of scripture concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, that *by him God made the worlds, and created all things by him, and without him was nothing made that was made?* For the name Jesus Christ seems to imply something more than the mere divine power or principle called the Word.

But I retreat, and mention no more of any attempt to give a particular idea of the divine nature of Christ, since this doctrine of his human soul's early existence is consistent with any known scheme of explaining his true and real deity.

Origen seems to be a believer of the pre-existent soul of Christ, when he says, "Perhaps the soul of the Son in its perfection was in God and his fulness, and coming out thence when he was sent by the Father, took a body of Mary;" and again, upon these words of John the baptist, *after me cometh a man which is preferred before me, for he was before me;* John i. 30. He says thus, that it is spoken of Christ, "that we may learn that the man (or manhood) also of the Son of God, mixed with his divinity, had a prior subsistence to his birth of the virgin." Origen also seems to allow this human soul to be the first-created; for speaking of the formation of wisdom before the world, he says, God created *Εμφυχον Σοφιας*, "An animated wisdom, or wisdom with a soul." And this opinion appeared so very reasonable, that we find some marks of it in the later centuries.—For the author of the "Meditations, called St. Austin's," distinguishes between eternal wisdom the Son of God, and the first-created wisdom; which he makes to be a rational and intellectual mind. See more of this kind in the learned Dr. Knight's "Primitive Christianity Vindicated," in answer to Mr. Whiston, page 45.

But after all, though it be a doctrine, that has so many happy advantages attending it, yet it is not necessary in order to make a man a christian, and therefore many primitive christians might not believe it. It casts a beauty indeed upon the whole christian faith, but it does not make a part of the essence of it. Now there are many such beautiful doctrines which might have a veil of darkness or confusion thrown upon them very early in the christian church, especially amidst the reign of antichrist, and again after some ages may emerge into light and entertain the christians of such a later age with the brightness and pleasure of them: How was the doctrine of the millennium long obscured, that is, "the happy state of the church before the end of the world?" It was known and believed in the first centuries, but after the third it was counted a sort of heresy for several ages;

and yet now it has arisen into further evidence, and has obtained almost universal assent, so this doctrine of Christ's pre-existent soul, though it might have lain dormant several ages, yet since that excellent man Dr. Henry More has published it near three score years ago in his "Great Mystery of Godliness," it has been embraced, as Bishop Fowler asserts, "by many of our greatest divines, as valuable men as our church can boast of; though most of them have been too sparing in owning it, for fear, I suppose, of having their orthodoxy called in question."

The most modern authors and writings which have professed this doctrine publicly, are these that follow.\*

1. Doctor Henry More, of "the Mystery of Godliness."
2. Dr. Edward Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester, in his "Discourse of the Descent of the Man Christ Jesus from Heaven," and his "Reflections on the Examiner of this Discourse," (Dr. William Sherlock, Dean of St. Paul's.)
3. "A Defence of the Bishop's Discourse, by a Presbyter of the Church of England."
4. "A Second Defence, by the Publisher of the First."
5. "Mr. Robert Fleming in his First and Third Volumes of 'Christology.'"
6. A very great man cited, but nameless, by Bishop Fowler in his Reflections, &c. page 111.—
7. Mr. Joseph Hussey, in his Treatise of "the Glory-man."
8. Dr. Francis Gastrell, Bishop of Chester, in his "Remarks on Dr. Clarke's Scripture-doctrine of the Trinity," page 47.
9. Mr. Nelson's learned friend, Dr. Knight, in Answer to Dr. Clarke, pages 65, 103.
10. Dr. Thomas Bennet, in his "Discourse of the Trinity in Unity."
11. The learned Dr. Thomas Burnet of the Charter-house, in his book, "De statu mortuorum & resurrectione," published after his death.
12. "The Doctrine of the Trinity intelligibly explained, by Dr. Thomas Burnet, rector of Westkington in Wiltshire, and prebendary of Salisbury."
13. Dr. Knight's "Primitive Christianity Vindicated," in answer to Mr. Whiston's bold assertions.

In three of these books I confess this opinion is but just mentioned, as the certain and probable opinion of the author, but in the rest it is strenuously asserted and maintained, and in some of them with great degrees of assurance: And I think every one of them do profess and maintain the real and proper deity of Christ in that or other parts of their works, so that there is no Arian among them all.

After authors of such learning and reputation in the world, as some of these which are named, I have ventured to propose this doctrine once more to the public. It is attended with a variety of arguments drawn from the holy scripture for the support of it, and I have stated much stronger objections than I have ever met with in opposition to it from any

\* Note, This was written at least twenty or thirty years ago, many more persons may be now found who have acknowledged it.

English or foreign writers, and I do not find them impossible to be answered.

I dare not assume that air of assurance which Bishop Fowler has done in several parts of his writings on this subject, when he tells us, "that there is no christian doctrine more clearly delivered than this, and even immediately by our Saviour himself, and often repeated by him; and let the opposers of it be as magisterially positive as they will, yet there is not more plain and undeniable evidence for any one article of faith than there is for this doctrine; and that this is the sense in which most certainly the disciples of our Lord understood his declarations." See his "Reflections on his Opposer, Dr. William Sherlock, pages 3, and 23." Yet I think I can join with him when he asserts that "our Saviour never said a syllable which so much as seems to contradict the plain literal natural sense of the words by which he chose to express this doctrine; and that it is worthy of our observation that there is no one text in the bible, that the Bishop knows of, whose plain and natural sense so much as seems to thwart the plain sense of those scriptures that he has produced to support it; and he adds, what controverted point is there in religion of which we can say the like?"

I easily persuade myself that most christians will agree with me thus far, That if this doctrine be true, it gives a natural and easy solution of a great number of difficulties in the word of God, it adds beauty as well as clearness to many expressions in the New and Old Testament, and it enables us to answer many inconveniencies and appearing absurdities which the Arians fling upon the common explications of the Trinity.— But if there be any sufficient argument to refute this doctrine and to prove it false, I am not so fond of it as to persist obstinately in the defence, nor make all things truckle and yield to this supposition.

The great doctrine of the deity of Christ, and his sacred office of mediator, may perhaps be maintained without it; but then we must return again to explain some of these difficult texts of scripture by hard tropes and figures; we must speak of Christ as God-man before his taking our nature upon him by way of "prolepsis," or anticipation. We must apply many inferior expressions of scripture to the divine person of Christ, considered in his office as mediator, which might otherwise and much better be applied to his human soul; we must construe some phrase into truth economically which can never be true in their real and natural sense. We must indulge some catachresis or improprieties of language in the bible, which might be literally and properly expounded by the scheme now proposed: We must solve other expressions by the doctrine of communication of properties between the divine and human natures of Christ, in the same manner as we did before; some of which solutions, I confess, are certainly necessary and always will be so, to ex-

plain some scriptures that relate to the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the well-known methods of speech in all nations and ages. But we would never chuse these interpretations, where there is a more plain literal sense which is perfectly accommodated to the text.

As this doctrine, so far as we have gone in explaining it, has given abundant light to many scriptures, there are also other texts which if we drop this doctrine we must leave under a heavy cloud still, among the *αὐτὰ* and *δυστονηὰ* the unsolvables and the things hard to be understood; and we must still be daily waiting upon *the Father of lights*, until he shall give us further discoveries of his own meaning in those passages of his holy word, which I think are made sufficiently plain in and by this scheme: We must wait until providence and grace shall join to furnish us with a better clue than this to lead us into the mysterious glories of the person of our blessed Redeemer, the more complete knowledge whereof is reserved to entertain saints and angels in the future ages of blessedness. There it is certain, if we shall be so happy as to accept of his gospel, we shall *see him as he is, and behold him face to face*; then shadows shall flee away, and darkness vanish for ever, for *in his light we shall see light*. Amen.

---



---

#### APPENDIX :

ON, "A short Abridgment of that excellent Discourse of the late Rev. Dr. Thomas Goodwin, on the Glories and Royalties that belong to Jesus Christ considered as God-man, in his third Book of "his Knowledge of God the Father and his Son Jesus Christ, page 85," in the second Volume of his Works.

---



---

**H**AVING found occasion in several parts of the foregoing discourse to cite some passages out of this learned and pious writer, who soars far higher than I dare to do in describing the glories due to the human nature of Christ Jesus, I thought it might be very entertaining to many of my readers, as well as serviceable to the doctrine here proposed, to draw out an abridgment of that discourse which he wrote concerning the "Glories of Christ as God-man," so far as it relates to this doctrine. Hereby the pious reader will easily perceive, that the manner in which I have expounded many scriptures, is nobly patronized and supported by this great author, whose name and memory are honoured among evangelical writers, and continue in high esteem among many private christians of the present age; and whose special character it is to have searched deep into the hidden treasures of the word of God, and drawn out thence many peculiar glories which belong to the person and offices of our blessed Saviour. Though I call this an "abridgment" of Dr. Goodwin's discourse, yet it is necessary I should tell the world that it may rather be called a "Collection of his Sentiments in his own Words;" for I have never added or altered any words but where

it was necessary to make the sense plain, and to connect the sentences : So that both the sentiments and the language are all his own.

In chapter I. page 95. He lays the foundation of his discourse on Col. i. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. and transcribes all the verses. *Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: All things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist: And he is the head of the body the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead: that in all things he might have the pre-eminence: For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell: Then he writes thus, All this fulness, and the particulars thereof mentioned in this text, are attributed to Christ as God-man, either as actually united or to be united in one person. To take off prejudices, saith he, it is meet the reader should know how that holy and greatest light of the reformed churches Calvin interprets the first passage, *He is the image of the invisible God, viz, "It is he alone by whom God, who is otherwise invisible, is manifested to us: I know how the ancients are wont to expound this, because they had a controversy with the Arians, who held Christ "to be a mere creature;" they urge this place for Christ's being of the same essence or nature with the Father; but in the mean time they omitted what was the chief thing in the words, namely, how the Father hath exhibited himself in Christ to be known by us."**

Then the Doctor adds, page 101. That all and every one of these particulars before rehearsed are those glories which as so many several pieces do, make up this pre-eminence, and are parts of that fulness which is said to dwell in him: and the apostle makes all this fulness to reside in Christ by an act of God's good pleasure. Hence I infer of all these parts and pieces, that they must be understood of him as God-man; for had they been spoken of him singly as God, they are natural to Christ, and not at all subjected to God's good will, page 102. But take all these as spoken of Christ as ordained to be God-man, all this might indeed be the object of God's decree and the act of his good pleasure, and it was the highest act of grace and God's good pleasure to ordain that man to such an union.

Chapter II. pages 103, 104. *Christ is the image of the invisible God*, which words are resolved into this assertion, That in that man Christ Jesus, by virtue of his union with the godhead, there is inherent a fulness of all divine perfections, which may make up an image of the attributes of the godhead, in so transcendent a way of excellency and emiency, as is incompatible and incommunicable to any mere creature remaining such. The godhead of Christ is as invisible as the godhead of the Father; but Christ is such an image as makes the godhead manifest.

d visible. In Christ as man united to the second person, there is a resultance, an edition of the godhead in all the perfections of

He is the "express image or engraven image; Heb. i. 3. He shines, the brightness of his Father's glory;" as the beams of the sun are to the body of the sun, so is Christ God's image; and this similitude the apostle there useth and applies it to him because he was man, namely, as he was *appointed heir of all*; which phrase as he is merely the second person might be used of him: thus Beza, Cameron, and others have understood it. This image is such a system or fulness of perfections really inherent and appertaining unto the manhood; by virtue of that its union with the divine nature; as although infinitely coming short of the attributes that are essential to the godhead, yet is the comest image of them, and such as no mere creature is capable of. This in general may be made out of that parenthesis; in John i. 14. *And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only gotten Son of God.*

Page 105. To give two or three instances of some of these perfections peculiarly, and incommunicably dwelling in the human nature of Christ; as wisdom, power, independency and sovereignty.

1. There is a wisdom in Christ's human nature which is so high an intimation of the attribute of wisdom in God, as no creature, nor all creatures could reach to, nor have attained; and therefore they, though they be called wise, yet not wisdom, as Christ God-man is called; 1 Cor. i. 24. And the reason why so transcendent a wisdom is in him as man is given; Col. ii. 3. *Christ are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge:* not objectively only, but subjectively also, as whose knowledge himself inherent contains in it *all treasures of wisdom.* Now the reason of all this fulness of wisdom in Christ is there given, *verse 9. that in him dwells the fulness of the godhead bodily.*

Christ is not omniscient as God is, but it is a similitudinary omniscience, as Zanchy calls it, an image of God's omniscience, God's knowledge extends itself not only to all that is made or done, but to all that he can make or do; which is an infinity. Christ's human nature, now glorified, knows all that God hath done or meant to do. It had, by virtue of its union with the divine nature, a right to know both things past, present, and to come; and so it is in a sense a kind of omniscience, incommunicable to any other.

2. The same holds in his power. It is not equal with God's: yet there is a similitudinary omnipotence in Christ's human nature, both in that he can do whatsoever he will, his will agreeing with God's in every thing, and in that all that God will ever fetch upon to be done he is an instrument of; Mat. xxviii. 18. All the businesses of the world run through his hands and his head: and therefore he is called *the power of God*; 1 Cor. i. 1. and *the arm of the Lord*; Is. liii. 1.

John v. 19, 20. *The Son can do nothing of himself, but*

*what he seeth the Father do ; and whatever the Father doth, the Son doth likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doth.* Here we have, 1. That whatever God doth, or means to do, the Son hath a hand in it. 2. That the Son knows all that is done by the Father. Here is both the omniscieny we speak of, and the omnipotency, in the terms we stated it, as respecting all God's works, " ad extra," even all that ever was done. And this, 3. in an incommunicable way to any mere creature, for this is given him that he " might be honoured even as the Father is honoured ;" verse 23. And this, 4. in a similitudinary way, *ομοιωσις*, likewise, or in like manner : And 5. all this Christ speaks of himself as the Son of man ; and it is one of the greatest keys to John's gospel that multitudes of such speeches are spoken of him, both as God, and a God-man. But to put it out of all doubt, he speaks of himself in this discourse as he is the Son of man united to God, he himself in the close of all expressly explains it so. Verse 27. The Father has given the Son *authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man.*

3. Another attribute in Christ, which is such an image of what is in God, as is incommunicable to any mere creatures, is independency and sovereignty. This is one of the chiefest flowers in that crown of his glory. God might annihilate creatures at pleasure, and yet in so doing rob them of nothing, which they can lay a just claim to as their own : but it is not thus with Christ's human nature ; now it is assumed into union with the second person, for it is invested with the royal prerogatives of the persons with whom it is one ; it hath an independency like unto God's ; such as is communicable to no creature : therefore, says, Christ, verse 26. *As the Father hath life in himself, so he hath given to the Son to have life in himself.* It is said to be given him, but by this union he is invested with this indisposable prerogative to have life in himself, and not to hold it by gift, though at first it were obtained so. Indeed it was a free act of grace in God at first, but in doing of it God did a wonder in the world, of all the greatest : For he sets up an independent creature, a creature backed with such a right to his being, that now himself cannot pull him down, nor dissolve that union again. And what a glorious image of God's independency is this ? I might shew the like also in holiness and all other attributes ; and it is a noble subject to spend pains upon, to set forth and cut out every limb of this vast image of all God's attributes that are in Christ merely upon his personal union. I have limbed out only these two or three parts of it, that by the like proportion we might infer the vastness of all the rest.

Chapter III. page 109. *Christ is the first-born of every creature :* This is not spoken of him simply as second person only, so as that his eternal generation as Son of God should be only intended ; yet it does establish his godhead, for these things

could not have been said of him had he not been God. The first-born or first-begotten of every creature is spoken of him as he is admitted into the catalogue or society of the creatures, or as he is become one of them. Or take him as he is the Son of God ordained to human nature, and then to have his name stand highest among the rest of the creatures. It is spoken of him in respect of a dignity and birth-right that this God-man hath at that instant he is admitted amongst the creatures; Pa. lxxxix. 27. *I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth*; Prov. viii. 23. *I was set up from everlasting*. The phrase, *I was set up*, will less permit us to understand it of his eternal generation, for that was an act of God's will.

Page 113. *For whom all things were created*, Col. i. 16. Christ as God-man is set up as an universal end of the whole creation of God. His person decreed to subsist in man's nature was considered by God to be of that worth and distance above the creatures that their very being and existing was to become absolutely and simply his propriety, of which prerogative no mere creature is capable. Page 114. Suppose God would decree him to be God-man and to subsist in a human nature, and likewise withal would ordain multitudes of other things, viz. angels and men, &c. then it becomes the necessary due of this Christ, and that as God-man, to be set up by God in his decrees as the end of all those things. This did become that man's due and the necessary consequent of that union with God's Son; and accordingly that God should cast his decrees for Christ's glory as well as for his own. Hence we read Heb. i. 2. *He is appointed heir of all things*.

And if it be affirmed, that then Christ needed not to have merited any glory to himself, this surely is a truth, though it may not be made use of to exclude another title unto this his own glory, namely that of purchase; for it is no dishonour to him to have two claims. Page 116. It is certain that all God's works "ad extra," whereof the union of the divine and human nature of Christ is one, are the objects of God's decrees, Col. i. 19. *It pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell in him*. And again, Psalm ii. 6, 7. *I will publish the decree, I have set my king on my holy hill of Zion*: And upon this decree his kingdom over all is his due and inheritance.

Chapter IV. page 120. This human nature is made God's fellow, as Zechariah calls him, Zech. xiii. 7. "The man, God's fellow," is advanced to a fellowship in this society of the Trinity, and therefore to him God communicates proportionably without measure, as John iii. 34. page 121. By means of taking up one reasonable creature, a man, into this highest union, he communicates the riches of his knowledge and wisdom, to the utmost that they are communicable to that creature so united; for it is his due to know more at the first instant of that his union than all the angels: For by virtue of that union he is presently in his



Father's bosom, John i. 18. *The only-begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.* God can hide nothing from him which he means to do; he draws nearer to God infinitely than Moses did, or angels ever did or shall.

Chapter V. Whercin the Doctor shews, that the glory which Christ, as God-man, had assigned him before the world was in his election by the Father signified in John xvii. 5. *Glorify me now with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* Page 124. It is not the glory of the second person simply or alone considered, for this was not a thing to be prayed for, it is naturally and essentially his due; and he had it as much now at the time when he prayed as he had from everlasting: The word, "Now glorify me," necessarily implies a suspension of a glory due before; and it argues a glory to be given in time; for both which reasons it concerns the human nature, not the divine. The subject of the glory prayed for is the man, Austin was convinced of this, though he was engaged against the Arians as much as any in his time. It is the man, or rather the person of God-man in union together is the subject prayed for: It is the petition of the person who had been humbled, who had glorified God on earth, and had finished his work and waited for this glory until now; and it is a glory suspended until this work was done. This will never be unriddled, says the Doctor, page 126. so fairly any other way, as by predestination, that is the glory he was ordained to, as God-man; for he had before the world was, the title of God-man elect, although not of God-man united or made flesh. He bore the title and repute of it, and went under that name with God the Father. Verse 24. is explained to the same purpose, and must be interpreted of Christ as God-man, when he says, *The glory which thou gavest me, for thou lovedst me from the foundation of the world.*

Chapter VI. page 151. The author declares that Christ being the second person did bear and sustain the glory of being God-man, all along from his predestination thereunto, and as an officer elect, he hath the title and honour accordingly, and had the glory of it before his Father. When he appeared to the patriarchs and was with the people of God in the wilderness, and appeared as captain of the host of Israel, these acts were done as bearing the personage of God-man, and all along from everlasting he acted as such in that capacity together with his Father. Isa. ix. 6. One of his names is the everlasting Father, that is, a Father from everlasting, and therefore he must be said to have borne that relation of a Father to us from that time. In the Trinity, take them considered as mere persons, there is but one Father; therefore this title must be given to Christ in God's decrees, upon the consideration of his being God-man in his undertaking and acting accordingly. Paul tells us, Heb. ii. that Christ is a Father considered as he is a man, verse 13. *Lo I, and the children thou hast given me.* And Isaiah tells us he

s this from everlasting, before he actually assumed the same nature : He must be *the everlasting Father*, representatively, by assuming the personage of God-man, afore his Father, and undertaking that relation.

Chapter X. page 173. Col. i. 16. *For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, &c. all things were created by him and for him.* Page 177. His subserviency to God in the creation is set forth here in three parts, *in avro* in him, *di avro* by him, and *as avro* for him.

1. In him, as the exemplary cause; that is, God set up Christ as the pattern of all perfection; for so that human nature united and quickened by the godhead, must needs be even above angels themselves; and he drew in scattered pieces in the act of the creation, the several perfections met in that human nature as a pattern. And in man's creation this seems to have been considered by God in that speech, *Let us make man according to our image*; that is after that man who was to be united to God, whom we in our decrees have set up as the pattern and express image of the invisible godhead.

2. *By him all things were created*; he having been some way the instrument of the creation as he is Christ God-man united, as well as he is actually of redemption. And page 3. Christ is the medium of God's creation. Page 178. If we were at all to be made a creature, it was his due personal privilege to have been himself first made, and to have been God's instrument in creation, and to have uttered those words which were spoken by God, "Let there be light, let there be sun, moon, &c." even as it was his due when he assumed our nature, to have been filled with all that personal glory which he hath now in heaven. But for the accomplishment of other ends his was suspended, namely, that he might first become sin and a curse for us; so I say, it was his due to have existed in his human nature first, and then as God's word and instrument, he should have created all things, as he wrought miracles when he was here on earth; and though it was suspended for glorious ends, that God gives him the glory of creation virtually, that he created all things by him, and by virtue of his incarnation. And in creating, to shew that he should have done it as his Word, or Word to be made flesh, he accordingly acts his part, in Gen. i. 3. *God said let there be light*, which but for this very mystery needed not have been. Yea such seems to have been his subserviency to God herein, that John contents himself only to have said, that *all things were made by him*; and further adds, *without him nothing was made that was made.*

Chapter XI. page 180. Christ as God-man is the Creator of all things, proved by 1 Cor. viii. 6. *One Lord Jesus Christ, whom are all things*, page 181. This is not attributed to man as man, singly considered; nor is it a property of God considered singly as God only, but as a man who was one person

with God, or God-man; nor are these things attributed to him merely by way of communication of properties, whereby what was proper only to the divine nature is attributed to the manhood: but these all by way of influence and virtual efficacy, are attributed to him as God-man, as truly as the works of redemption, mediation, &c.

Page 183. His being appointed Lord, will send us to a higher date than his actual ascension to heaven, even to afore the creation; yea, even to eternity; Heb. i. 2. *God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds:* Yea, and because as God-man, he was appointed Lord of them, therefore it was also that God commissioned him to make them, considered as God-man, to make his title of lordship even as Son of man proper and direct, and adequately full to him, and there needs no more to verify this, viz. that as God-man he made the worlds, and virtually as man, as well as efficiently, both as God and man in the sense it hath been explained in.

Chapter XII. page 184. That Christ, as God-man, is the Creator of all things, is further proved from John i. 1, 2, 3. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, the same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, &c.* This name "the Word of God" imports both his being the image of God the Father, as the second person, and the image or manifestation of God to us in human nature. Many of our protestant divines have altogether declined the first sense and betaken themselves to the latter, viz. That Christ is called the Word, in relation to his being manifested in a human nature, and therein to manifest the whole God unto us. This is not appropriated to him only as the Son of God and second person; but as united to human nature; Rev. xix. 13. *He was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood, and his name is called the Word of God.* Page 187. That repetition in the second verse, viz. John i. 2. *The same was in the beginning with God,* imports that the second person did then sustain, and take on him another relation, even the person of the Mediator, and enter upon the office, acting the part and sustaining the place and reputation of it.

Page 189. Compare this with Prov. vii. 22. and the titles, the Word and wisdom are in effect and significancy the same in the original languages. Solomon speaks but the same things of him there that John doth here: "The Word was with God in the beginning, that is, the Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, I was by him rejoicing before him;" and so it may explain what is meant by the beginning here, namely, the beginning of creation, and therefore is not meant of his eternal generation; for so Christ is not the beginning of God's ways, for the ways of God are his goings forth toward his creatures. That speech is all one with Col. i. 15. *The first-born of every creature, being in God's decree of creation the first, the corner-*

stone, the beginning of the rest, so as it must be meant of Christ, as God-man.

Page 190. We find; 1 Cor. i. 24. that Christ is said to be *the power of God and the wisdom of God*; both which are spoken of him, not as they are essential attributes, in God's nature; for the person of Christ, as a person, is distinct from the attributes which are common to all three; and so, he is not styled the attribute of wisdom, but they are thus spoken of Christ manifestatively, and instrumentally, and executively, and as he is from God, and made use of by God towards us, and in things that concern us, to be the whole scene and manifestation of God's wisdom, and "substratum" of his counsels concerning us. And so also the executive power by whom God effects all he doth. That observation evidently demonstrates this, which Cameron, and many others, have made, by comparing Moses; Gen. i. and this first of John together, which many things parallel lead to: That whereas Moses in the creation mentions God the Father and the Spirit, two of the persons, yet he veils the Son under that so often repeated speech used of the creation, that, God said, *Let there be light*; God said, *Let there be a firmament*, which could not be without mystery; and what other mystery could it be, than that Christ was that Word by whom God created all things? When therefore Christ is termed the Word of God, the meaning is, he is the power of God, in being his instrument and agent in all he doth, or means to do.

Page 191. Thus God elected us and bestowed all things upon us before the world was, even in Jesus Christ; Eph. i. 4. as then bearing this person of God-man. And thus all the promises which the written word of God contains, were made for us unto Christ, as really bearing that person; and 2 Tim. i. 9. *They were given us in Christ before the world began*. Notable to this purpose is that place, Tit. i. 2, 3, where the apostle first says, *That God promised eternal life before the world began*: A promise is a word given forth, and is more than a purpose with ones self; for it is to another: There was a promise made to Christ as then with God. Now merely as second person, he is capable of no promises, but only as he is God-man. It is the Son of God as he is "Jesus Christ, in whom all promises are, yea, and Amen"; 2 Cor. i. 19, 20.

Page 192. When God came to make creatures, he did it by Jesus Christ, as sustaining this person of God-man; Eph. iii. 9. *God created all things by Jesus Christ*; and John adds, *Nothing was made without him that was made*; merely to shew the instrumental general dependence God had of him in this work: He was all in all, as we say of one that is a right-hand to another; he does nothing without him: Such was Christ to God; not that God had not power essential to have created without him; for it is by that power that Christ did it; but that this

power, God's-will, would never have put forth, but for his assuming to be God-man.

Chapter XIII. page 197. Christ God-man is subservient to God in all the works of his providence; he upholds and supports all things; he governs the world, and he shall judge it.

First, "For the upholding all things." That is evident in this text of Col. i. 17. *By him do all things consist*; he is the corner-stone that keeps the building and all the parts of it together; Heb. i. 2, 3. it is said, "He upholds all things, by the word of his power, and it is spoken of him not simply considered as a second person, but as God-man, for so he is heir appointed.

Secondly, Whilst the world stands, he governs it, easeth God of that burthen, and is his prorex for him: *All judgment is committed to the Son*; John v. 22. "For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son:" "And the government is upon his shoulders;" Isaiah ix. 6. And then,

Thirdly, When he hath thus governed the world with a greater advantage unto God, then this man Christ Jesus will judge it also at the last, and give all men their accounts; Acts xvii. 31. "He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world,—by that man whom he hath ordained." God would not employ a mere creature in this work, it was too great a honour; and yet it was meet it should be done visibly and audibly, and to the satisfaction of all men's consciences, both concerning themselves and others. God would have a person in the Trinity manifest in a creature like unto us to do it, armed with power and authority, because he is God; and yet a man that should deal with creatures in their own way; in a rational and audible way convince them, and visibly sentence them, so as they should be able to see and hear their judge as man, and yet fear and dread him as being God. And this is a high and great service, which Christ as man shall do for God; for a man in a vocal manner to be able to clear the accounts of the world, (which how entangled are they!) and punctually to give every man his due in righteousness! A man, that shall be able to convince all God's enemies of all their hard speeches they have spoken against him, as Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied; Jude verse 14. able to give a full and satisfactory account of all God's ways and proceedings, which men cavil at; to justify God's decrees, which men quarrel with, and think much at; and his children whom men despise and bear down: One able to bring to light the secrets of all hearts, so as all men shall judge of every man; 1 Cor. iv. 5. *Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: And then shall every man have praise of God. One able to search the deep things of God and bring forth his counsels, for the "books are opened;" Rev. xx. 22.*

Lastly, After all this, Christ is the founder of that other

world into which he brings his children." That personal fulness that is in God-man is reserved by God as a subject of that depth and glory to take up, together with his own perfections, the thoughts of men and angels for ever ; Rev. xxi. 23. *That city had no need of the sun nor moon to shine in it, for the glory of God did lighten it and the Lamb is the light thereof.* When those two great volumes, this of his word, and that of his world, which now in this life are put into our hands, to read the characters of his glory in by faith, when both these shall be folded up and clean laid aside, then will the person of Christ, God-man, be set forth to us, to entertain us for ever with the sight of the glory of God in the face of Christ.

Having drawn out this little abridgment of this excellent treatise, I take the freedom to make these few remarks on it :

I. This learned and pious author plainly manifests that he could not expound several scriptures which speak of Christ both in the Old Testament and the New, without taking in his human nature to be the joint subject of such ascriptions, because there are so many things expressed in them below the dignity of god-head : And therefore he supposes the human nature of Christ to exist in the view or idea of the Father from everlasting, and to have all those glorious actions and characters ascribed to him as man united to God, or as God united to man. And it is to be observed, that he does this not in one sentence or two, or in one page or two, but it is the chief design of that whole discourse of the "glories and royalties that belong to Jesus Christ considered as God-man," which fills up more than a hundred pages in folio.

II. He supposes the man Christ Jesus not only to have an existence in the divine idea through all the various ancient transactions of creation, providence, &c. But he asserts that he ought actually to have existed the first of all creatures, and to have been as it were an under-agent in the creation of the world ; but that this actual glory was suspended for four thousand years, merely because he was to bear sin and the curse for the redemption of men.

III. He rises much higher in his ascriptions to the man Jesus Christ, than I have dared to do in any part of my discourse, and invests him with much more sublime powers than any angelic spirit ; and yet he supposes his soul to be a human soul still, and calls him a man : He gives him most illustrious prerogatives, on the account of his virtual union to his divine nature, all which he asserts to be his early due had he actually then existed.

IV. The actual pre-existence of the man Jesus, or the human soul of Christ, and his actual union to his divine nature can never withhold or diminish any of those sublime characters, those illustrious honours or prerogatives which this author saith were his due, had he then existed, and which he supposes to be attributed to him in scripture by the figure prolepsis, and by way of anticipation, and which were given him by God the

Father, supposing him then to exist in his idea long before his actual existence.

V. *And* exposition of all these scriptures will appear much more natural, easy, and plain by the doctrine of the actual pre-existence of the soul of Christ, than by the mere decree of his existence, or supposition of it only in the idea and foreknowledge of God. In this sense of actual existence, the meanest Christian may read and understand what he reads. And it is a general rule among divines for the interpretation of scripture, never to introduce figures of speech, nor to explain the word of God in a figurative sense, but where the plain, obvious, literal sense has something in it inconsistent or improper.

VI. There is not one scripture in all the bible which denies the actual existence of Christ's human soul before the foundation of the world, but there are many which in this author's judgment cannot be explained without the supposition of his virtual existence then in the idea of God, and therefore they are supposed to be spoken of him as though he did actually exist by the help of tropes and figures.

Now I leave it to the judgment of any candid reader, whether those scriptures which are written for the use of the unlearned, ought not much rather to be explained in their most easy and obvious sense, than to spread so many and such hard figures of speech almost all over the bible, the Old Testament and the New, without evident necessity: and it is very reasonable to believe, that had this evangelical writer lived in an age when the doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul of Christ had been freely proposed to the world, he would have embraced it with great readiness and pleasure.

VII. Though these more elevated sentiments and bolder expressions, which I have cited from so great an author, are by no means a standard of truth, nor indeed can I follow him in some of these sublimities, neither do I cite his magnificent expressions concerning the man Jesus Christ, nor his expositions of scripture as a sufficient proof of what I have advanced; yet it will appear to the world by this collection, that I have not ventured upon such expositions of the bible, nor such exalted sentiments and language concerning Christ's human nature, without a honourable precedent. If I am mistaken, yet I may reasonably hope that while I have erred and wandered under such a leader, and in so good company, the censure will be but light and gentle, since most of the reproaches which may be cast on me on this account will fall heavy on this venerable author, whose name has been honourable, and his praise great among the churches.

END OF VOLUME VI.











