

Lord Jesus Christ
424. 33

SUPREME DEITY
OF OUR
LORD JESUS CHRIST,
MAINTAINED.

IN A LETTER
TO THE

DEDICATOR OF MR. EMLYN'S

"INQUIRY INTO THE SCRIPTURE-ACCOUNT OF

"JESUS CHRIST."

INSCRIBED TO THE REVEREND THE CLERGY OF ALL
DENOMINATIONS IN NEW-ENGLAND.

WHEREIN

MR. EMLYN'S OBJECTIONS,

ARE FAIRLY ANSWERED, AND SHOWN TO HAVE NO VALIDITY

BY THE LATE REVEREND AARON BURR,

PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE IN NEW-JERSEY.

JOHN I. 1.—" IN THE BEGINNING, WAS THE WORD; AND
" THE WORD WAS GOD."

JOHN XX. 28.—" AND THOMAS SAID TO HIM, MY LORD,
" AND MY GOD."

JOHN III. 16.—" HEREBY WE PERCEIVE THE LOVE OF
" GOD—BECAUSE HE LAYD DOWN HIS LIFE FOR US."

JOHN V. 20.—" JESUS CHRIST :—THIS IS THE TRUE
" GOD, AND ETERNAL LIFE."

BOSTON:—RE-PRINTED:

BY EDWARD E. POWARS,

IN COURT STREET,

MDCCLXII

Edward E. Powars

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following Pamphlet is occasioned by the re-publication of Mr. Emlyn's "Enquiry, with a dedication to the *Clergy of all denominations*," about 30 years since, in this town. No reply was then made to it, and the controversy ended for the time. It is republished now, with the hope, that it may be followed with similar consequences. Extracts from Mr. Emlyn's Enquiry were printed here some time since; and it was doubted by the friends of the doctrine of Christ's real Divinity, whether it was best to make any reply to a book, which has been so often answered. — Their doubts upon this subject, and their disinclination to revive a controversy generally pursued with too-much warmth and bitterness, have retarded this publication. It is now made with a sincere desire, that the minds of men may be convinced of the truth of this important doctrine, and that the honour of the Author and Finisher of our faith may be promoted. Those who view Him as really GOD, and who consider this doctrine as fundamental in the christian faith, do not wish to revive this controversy; they desire to enjoy their own sentiments in peace, and they are content that others may have the same privilege; but they feel themselves bound to support what they esteem to be truth, with that modesty and candour, which are always dictated by the gospel of Christ. — The established character of the author will render any commendations of the work unnecessary; and, a perusal of it will, we doubt not, give pleasure to every candid reader.

A LETTER TO THE DEDICATOR OF MR. EMLYN'S ENQUIRY, &c.

S I R,

IT may perhaps be accounted a bold dissent from custom, if not a breach of good manners, to begin an epistle of this nature, without a formal apology, representing my own inability, my want of time for accuracy, or, that I undertook it with great reluctance; and therefore, that all faults and imperfections, must be imputed to those who urged me, rather than to myself. But as these fashionable *prologues* (though they commonly discover a greater penetration and accuracy, than the pieces themselves, to which they are *annexed*) are seldom much regarded, and perhaps rarely sincere; you will excuse me if I ease you of the trouble of reading one, before you come to the real matter and design of this letter.

THE main end of speaking and writing (especially when any thing of a religious nature and importance, is the subject) should be, to be thoroughly understood—And this end (I am bold to affirm) is what I have aimed at, how far soever I have missed it in what follows.—I have but one favour to beg, before I acquaint you with my general design; and that is, that you would not look upon it as any designed reflection upon your own genius, penetration, or learning, that I have carefully avoided those laboured distinctions, criticisms, and niceties, which tend to bewilder and confound, rather than in the least to instruct, by far the greater part of mankind; who are strangers to scholastick niceties, and the various methods and arts of sophistry; and are often easily puzzled and imposed upon by the mere charm of words, which either have no meaning at all, or the true sense of which they never come at. What I have principally consulted is, to discover truth; and express it in a manner plain and intelligible, even to the lowest and most vulgar capacity; the subject being such as equally concerns the high and low, the wise and simple, the learned and illiterate, to understand: And should this end be answered, I shall be entirely easy, though you and the world should judge that here is nothing either learned or new: In a word, I am far from thinking, and as far from desiring you should think, that I here present you with any thing worthy of praise and admiration: An honest meaning is the only commendation it pretends to; which will more effectually recommend it to every honest man, than the greatest appearance of learning and penetration, without this.—Not doubting, therefore, but that I am writing to a gentleman, highly deserving of this character, to one who, with an honest heart,

seeks

seeks to know the truth as it is in JESUS ; and is not knowingly and willingly under the influence of any prejudice or partial inclination ; I proceed without further ceremony, to acquaint you,— That I have with the utmost application, seriousness and candour I am capable of, read and considered, the Reverend Mr. *Emlyn's Inquiry into the Scripture-account of JESUS CHRIST* ; which you have been pleased to dedicate, *To the Reverend the Clergy of all Denominations in New-England*. I forbear all remarks upon your dedication, and the grand motive which induced you to procure a new impression of this Inquiry in New-England, 'till I have laid before you my observations upon the Inquiry itself, which I shall confine to as small a compass as I possibly can ; and be so particular as to omit nothing of your author's reasonings, that can be thought to have any weight in it ; and then, perhaps, such remarks will appear more just and reasonable, than they might do here.

I BEGIN with your author's first chapter, where he proposes two things, in order to maintain the subordination of Jesus Christ, or his inequality to God the father.

I. " THAT the term *God*, is used in scripture in different senses, *supreme and subordinate*.

II. " THAT our Lord Jesus speaks of another as God, *distinct from Himself*, and owns this God to be *above, or over Him*."

UPON the first of these, I would only observe, what I suppose your author intends by it ; which is, that Jesus Christ may be called a God in scripture, and yet not be the supreme God : A point never yet denied by any who have read the scriptures.—But, it is inquired, whether *Jesus Christ* is not stiled *God* in such a manner, and under such circumstances, as plainly denote him to be *God supreme* ? He is in scripture stiled, *The Mighty God*,*—*Emmanuel*, which being interpreted, is, *God with us*.† It is affirmed by *St. John*, that the *Word*, i. e. *Jesus Christ*, was *God*.‡ And the apostle says, *God was manifest in the flesh*,§ meaning *Jesus Christ*. *St Paul* tells us, *HE is over all, God blessed for evermore*.||—And *St. John*, that *Jesus Christ* is the *true God and eternal life*,¶ &c. Now, it is enquired—Whether *Jesus Christ* is not here stiled *God* in such a manner, and under such circumstances, as plainly denote him to be *God supreme* ? Your author allows Him to be *Lord of Lords* (indefinitely) but imagines, that notes an inferior character, compared with that of *God of Gods* ; and refers us to *1 Cor. viii. 5*, for a proof of it : —But how it appears from hence, that *Jesus Christ* is not *God*, I must confess, is more than I can see ; since we may with equal propriety thence infer, that the one *God* is no *Lord*, as that the one *Lord* is not *God*. If it be said, that the term *God* implies *Lord* also, but not the contrary ; I answer, it by no means follows that *Lord of Lords*, does not imply *God* also, but that it does ; since *God* is a
Lord

* *Isai. ix. 6.* † *chap. vii. 14.* *Matth. i. 23.* ‡ *John i. 14*
 § *1 Tim. iii. 16.* || *Rom. ix. 5.* ¶ *1 John v. 20.*

Lord of Lords, i. e. Lord of all Lords, indefinitely, must therefore be God of all Gods; and if there be no Lord above Him, there is no God above Him, since every God is a Lord. And in this light, the words of Sir Isaac Newton, which your author refers to, appear against him, (if fairly cited.) That great man defines God from his dominion; and observes, that considered as the object of our worship, he is a Lord in the most eminent sense; and therefore, should rather be defined from his dominion, than from his perfections.—— Whenever then we speak of God, we consider him as Lord also.—— Lord of Lords, indefinitely, must therefore imply God. Though every Lord is not God, yet the Lord of Lords, is God; this implies the most extensive dominion; and if, according to Sir Isaac, we are to define God from his dominion, what more concise and proper definition can be given of Him, than that of Lord of Lords? If God is to be defined from his dominion, what more noble or just description can be given of Him, than the Apostle gives of Jesus Christ, that *He is the blessed and only Potentate; the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, &c.* I might add, that Sir Isaac was of opinion, that from true dominion, it follows, that God is living, intelligent, and powerful; and therefore, as the Apostle attributes the most extensive dominion to Jesus Christ, so we may thence infer, that He is living, intelligent, and powerful in the most eminent sense, i. e. that He is God of Gods, or God supreme: But, perhaps, some men will rather chuse to consider Sir Isaac, when he talks at this rate, as a *Philosopher*, than a *Divine*; for, were this allowed, it would be of itself a compleat answer to your author, as he finally states the question, “Has Jesus Christ any God over Him, who has greater authority and greater ability than Himself, or not?” Certainly not; for the Apostle evidently attributes the most extensive authority or dominion to Him; he styles Him the *only Potentate; the Lord of Lords*; and power or ability (according to Sir Isaac) follow from true dominion: None, therefore, has greater ability than *He, who has the greatest and most extensive dominion.*

BUT not to pursue this too far.——I proceed to observe upon sect. II. Your author having stated the question, “Has Jesus Christ any God over Him, who has greater authority and greater ability than Himself, or not?” proposes hence to demonstrate the affirmative, by shewing, First, that “Jesus Christ expressly speaks of another God than Himself.” Secondly, That “He acknowledges this God to be above, or over Himself:” And, lastly, That “He wants those super-eminent and infinite perfections which belong only to the Lord God of Gods.”

FOR the first of these, he refers us to *Mat. 27. 46*, where our Saviour cried out upon the cross, *My God, my God, &c.* and to *John 20. 17*, where after His resurrection, He sent to His disciples, (by the woman who first saw Him,) saying, *I ascend unto My Father and your Father, and to My God and your God.* Here I would observe, That those who oppose your author, consider Jesus Christ as Man, when

When thus praying to and speaking of God; that though the divine and human natures were united in His person, yet that the human only prayed and complained to God, &c. and therefore that such passages are no evidence that He is not truly God supreme.— And it must be confessed, that if there be any just grounds for such an interpretation, it entirely destroys the force of such passages to prove any thing in favour of your author's opinion: And the plain intelligible reason to be assigned for this interpretation, is, that He is frequently stiled God in such a manner, and under such circumstances, and such things are predicated of Him, and attributed to Him, as more plainly denote Him to be the *supreme God*, than the texts your author refers to denote the *contrary*. Some of these I have already mentioned, as, that He is stiled *the mighty God, Emmanuel, God blessed for evermore, the true God, &c.* without any limitation or restriction, and in like manner, infinite, unlimited knowledge is attributed to Him*: And the knowledge of men's hearts†: And He tells us, that He is *Alpha and Omega; the beginning and the ending: HE, which is, which was, and which is to come; the Almighty; that He and the Father are One*—that *what things soever the Father doeth, those doeth the Son likewise; that as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom He will.* § And many other things are predicated of Him, which can belong only to God Almighty: Not only men, but angels, are commanded to *worship Him*||: And His dominion and authority are established forever, ¶ &c. Now we must either suppose these representations and descriptions of Jesus Christ to be false and groundless; or that those texts which (if literally understood of His person) represent Him inferior to God, are to be interpreted in the manner mentioned, viz. of His human nature only, and not of His person, which is Divine:—For, it is agreed on all sides, that those texts (which if literally understood of His person) represent Jesus Christ as God, and those which represent Him as inferior to God, equally belong to the canon of holy scripture. The question is, Which we are to understand in their literal and most obvious sense; those which represent Him as God, and equal to the Father; or those which represent Him as subordinate and inferior? For both these cannot be understood literally, or of His person: But either those which represent Him as inferior to God, must be understood of His human nature only, or those which represent Him as God, must be understood of his office. The former of these, I humbly think, the most reasonable, viz. that those texts which represent Jesus Christ as inferior to God, are to be understood of His human nature only, and not of His person, which is Divine; and that those which represent Him as God, are to be literally understood of His person, that He is *the true God, God blessed, &c.* My reasons for which, are these.

14.

* John xxi. 17.

† Rev. ii. 23.

‡ chap. i. 8.

§ John v. 19

and onward.

|| Heb. i. 6.

¶ chap. i. 8. &c.

1st. THAT there is no propriety in describing Christ as to His office, by calling Him *God*, according to the common and ordinary use of that term in scripture, and the general acceptation of it among men. The term *God* is used and generally understood to denote that infinite, eternal, self-existent Being, who created and preserves all things; and if, with Sir *Isaac Newton*, we define God from his dominion, still the term (when accompanied by no restriction or limitation) denotes One that has true, universal, underived and everlasting dominion; such as is attributed to Christ, *Thy throne, O God, is forever*: And which can belong only to God supreme: So that it amounts to just the same, whether we define God from his perfections, or his dominion; still its a very improper and uncommon use of language to describe Jesus Christ as to His office by the term *God*, without any restriction or limitation; and much more so still, to describe Him as to His office, by attributing that to Him which belongs only to the supreme God. But,

2dly. THERE is not the least intimation where Jesus Christ is stiled God, either in the texts themselves, or in what precedes or follows, that *this* is to be understood of His office, and not of His person. Where magistrates are stiled Gods, the very next words explain it, and tell us what we are to understand by it: And in like manner, where *Moses* and *Angels* are called Gods, no one, who attends to the whole discourse, could easily mistake the meaning, or not see that the term God was there used in an inferior and metaphorical sense. But there is no foundation for this, where Christ is stiled *the true God, God blessed forevermore; God whose throne is established forever, &c.* Here is no room to suspect that the term God is used in an uncommon, or improper sense, or that it denotes any other than that Jesus Christ is actually that true God, God blessed, &c. He is said to be. Much less is there any room for any such construction, where *that* is attributed to Christ *which* belongs to the supreme God alone: I mean infinite knowledge, eternal self-existence, religious worship and homage, &c. which I shall shew to be distinctly attributed to Him, in another place.

I proceed to observe,

3dly. THAT from what has been said, it appears, there is the utmost danger, that such descriptions (if they are to be understood of the office of Christ only) will give men wrong conceptions of Him: They naturally lead us to look upon Him as the *true God*, and to adore and worship Him as such. And surely that God who is jealous of his own honour, and will not give his glory to another, i. e. will suffer none to receive the homage and worship which is due to him, nor give his creatures any just occasion to look upon any other as God besides himself; HE, I say, would never have represented Jesus Christ as God, if he was not truly such: He never would have laid such a snare for us, such a temptation before us, to esteem and honour One as God, who is no God.—If it be said, That this plea holds equally good on the other side of the question,

and

and that there is as great danger of our contracting too low an opinion of the Lord Jesus (if He is truly God) from those scriptures which represent Him inferior to God, as the contrary : I answer--- That the manifest danger of deception here is by no means equal :

Firſt,—BECAUSE the design of our Saviour's coming into the world, and the miracles which he wrought while manifest in the flesh, were such as naturally tended to give mankind (I mean such as believed Him to be the Christ) high and adoring thoughts of Him, and such as would lead them to reverence and worship Him as God, and to give that honour and glory to Him which is due to God alone ; and indeed this disposition appeared in those who knew Jesus to be the Christ as soon as He was born*. And while He was manifest in the flesh, He frequently received worship and homage from those who were convinced that He was the Christ—From the women of Samaria†, from the leper,‡ from a certain ruler, who was a God by office§, from the whole ship's crew||, &c. Those who saw His miracles, and believed on Him as the Christ, were ever disposed to worship, reverence and exalt Him. If it be said, that they worshipped Him because they thought Him more than a mere man, even a God, this will favour the interpretation I maintain, that He is truly God ; since He never forbid them or told them to worship God, and not Him ; that He was their fellow-servant, and the like ; as the Apostles constantly did, when such worship was offered to them¶ : This I think truly observable, that our Lord Jesus never in the least suppressed or discouraged this disposition in people to reverence and worship Him : And if He is not God supreme, it is to me, something unaccountable ; since I have ever thought Him to be the only proper object of religious worship ; and that to attribute it to any creature was blasphemy, a robbing of God of his honour. But if it should be said, that this was not properly religious worship (which I shall hereafter shew in other instances is plainly attributed to Christ) but a reverence and respect they paid Him as a superior dignified creature ; yet this is sufficient for my present purpose, to shew that those who believed Him to be the Christ, knew the design of His coming, and saw his miracles, had very high and adoring thoughts of Him ; which led them to pay Him, at least, the greatest reverence and respect that can be due to a mere creature : This your author observes. p. 52. (though with a different design) is the case with mankind since the Apostle's days, and the shutting up of prophecy : Those who esteem Jesus Christ as the Saviour of sinners, are disposed to think and speak very highly of Him ; and consequently, will much more readily embrace, and easily believe, the description which represents Him as the true God, God blessed forever, &c. than that which represents Him as a mere man, inferior and subordinate to God, provided these descriptions are founded upon equal authority, as is the

present

© JU G4

* *Matth. ii. 11.* † *John iv.* ‡ *Matth. viii. 2.* § *Chap. ix. 13.*
 ¶ *Chap. xiv. 33.* ¶ *Acts x. 26, and xiv. 15.*

present case: So that for this reason 'tis plain there is greater danger of our being deceived by those texts which represent Christ as the true God, &c. If He is not God; than by those which represent Him as inferior to GOD, if He is God: This is on supposition that He is as expressly, as clearly, and in as unlimited a manner represented to be inferior to God, by one part of sacred writ, as He is to be God by another part; which I humbly think is not the case: For,

Secondly, To put the two descriptions or representations of Jesus Christ upon an exact parallel, the question must be, Whether He be God or man? But this is not the question in debate; it being agreed on both sides, that He is truly man; at least, that He was so far a man when manifest in the flesh, as to be subject to all our common wants, pains, and sinless infirmities: But the question which arises is,—Whether He was a mere man, or God man?—Whether He was a mere human person?—Or, Whether the Divine and human natures were both united in His person? And, Whether He is more plainly represented in scripture as God-man than as a mere man? And in this view of the question, I think there is scarce room to doubt but that description of Christ, which represents Him as God, is most obvious and clear, and has vastly the advantage of the *other*, which represents him as man and inferior to God: This will appear plain if we consider that those texts which represent Him as man, and inferior to God, may be literally understood of His manhood, or human nature, and not contradict those which represent Him as God: But the contrary would not hold true, that those which represent Him as God, may be literally understood, if we understand the other of His whole person: And it is an established maxim, never to put a figurative interpretation upon scripture, where the most obvious literal interpretation is true and consistent; and if this be true, if this be the surest and most natural way of interpreting scripture, it follows, that we should understand those texts, which represent Christ as the true God, literally of His person; and those which represent Him as man and inferior to God, literally of His human nature, or manhood only. Upon the whole then, I think it appears, that was a man, destitute of all prejudice and prepossession, who esteemed Jesus Christ as the Saviour of lost sinners, to read the Bible, and consider those scriptures which represent Him to be truly God, and those which your author thinks represent Him as inferior to God; he would be most likely to understand the former literally of His person, and the other of His human nature only; and consequently, the danger of deception from those texts, which represent Jesus Christ as God, is greater, if He be not God, than the contrary: We must, therefore, to vindicate the goodness of that God of truth, by whose inspiration the scriptures were given, in not laying a snare for us, or a temptation before us, to give that honour and worship to another which is due to himself alone; I say, in order to this, we must suppose, that Jesus Christ is truly God, and that it is His holy will that all men should honour the Son even

as they honour the Father: He gave us the scripture to profit ~~us~~ and not to puzzle, ensnare and confound us — They are for *doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness*; that the *man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works*, 2 TIM. 3. 16, 17; and not for riddles, for deception, or sophisms, that the man of sin may be furnished with ways and methods to evade the truth, and maintain falsehood and unrighteousness. We must therefore, if we consult the nature and design of the scriptures, conclude, that the most obvious and literal interpretation, when consistent with reason and common sense, and the scriptures in general, is to be preferred to any forced or figurative one whatever: And if so, then the interpretation which we put upon those scriptures, which represent Christ as inferior to God, viz. that they are to be understood of His manhood, or human nature only, is to be preferred to your author's interpretation, which supposes the most explicit, unlimited assertions of the supreme Deity of Jesus Christ, and His equality to God, even the Father, are to be understood of His office, and not of His person; That He is *the mighty God, the true God, God blessed forevermore, God whose throne is established forever*, by office only; that men and angels are commanded to worship Him; that eternal existence, infinite knowledge, immense presence, &c. are attributed to Him, only on account of His office, and not for any personal inherent perfection's sake He is possessed of essentially and independently. Your author, indeed, attempts very largely to shew the absurdity of this interpretation; and that there is no such foundation for it as I here suppose; and his reasoning upon this head I shall distinctly consider: I would only observe, at present, that in case I shew the vanity and sophistry of his objections, and maintain my interpretation against them; the consequence will be, that his arguments to prove the inferiority, or subordination, of Jesus Christ to God the Father, or that He is not truly God, are of no force: If my interpretation be just, it is an easy, plain solution of all those texts of scripture, which seem to represent Christ as inferior to the Father: — Thus when he cries, *My God, My God*; and *I ascend to My God*; it is the human nature that speaks, and is spoken of; it is the human nature that is distinguished from, and opposed to the Father, or to God, including the whole Godhead; so He is inferior to the Father, or the Father is greater than He, i. e. than *He*, considered as man, and as mediator; it being an act of the greatest condescension in Him to become such; but not as to His person and essence, with regard to which, the Son is *true God, God blessed for evermore*; so, *the Father hath put all things under Him*; as man or mediator, *Himself being excepted*; for as God, He could receive no such denomination and authority; and *when all things are subdued to Him*, as man or mediator, then, as such, He shall be subject to God, *who hath put all things under Him*, that God may be all in all, that God may be the head of the mediator, the mediator, the head of the church, and the church by him victorious over the last enemy, DEATH, and triumphant in glory; so that, as God, His

throne is established forever, and His kingdom shall have no end. This is a plain and easy solution of your author's irresistible text, 1. Cor. 15. 24. to 29. — And had he took in the two preceding verses, it would have carried its own confutation with it; it being very evident from thence that the apostle is speaking of Christ as man: He tells us, verse 22d, that *as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive*, i. e. all men shall be made alive in Christ; all the dead shall attain to the resurrection by Him: *Some shall arise to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt*: He then proceeds to tell us, verse 23, in what order they shall rise, — *But every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits*; certainly he means the man Christ; and in this character he discourses of Him in the following verses, as the first-fruits from the dead; but I think it renders the apostle very unintelligible, to suppose that he speaks of Christ exactly in this light, in verse 22, where he says, *All shall be made alive in Him*: All who? All men: In what order? The man Christ the first: What! Christ be made alive in Christ? Surely, the Christ that is the first-fruits, that is made alive from the dead, is not exactly the Christ, in all respects, by or in whom all are made alive: If it be said, that Christ is not the agent, but the cause of the resurrection, the difficulty is no ways removed, since his own resurrection, is included with that of other men: And of this man Christ, that is the first-fruits from the dead, the apostle discourses in the following verses, tells us, that *He must reign till all enemies are put under His feet*; that *the last enemy is Death*; that *God is excepted out of those things which are put under Him*; that *when all things are subdued to Him, then He Himself, this man Christ, the first fruits from the dead, shall be subject to God, who put all things under Him, that God may be all in all*. So that if we take the apostle's whole discourse, there is evidently just ground to understand the words your author refers to, of the human nature of Christ that was made alive, verse 23, and not of His person, in or by whom, this, and all other men shall be made alive, v. 22.

— As man, or considered as the first-fruits from the dead, He shall be subject to God, who put all things under Him; and as such He is dependent upon God; but considered personally, *He is God, whose throne is forever and ever*, HEB. 1. 8. — But, says your author, the very next verse explains this a different way; where it is said *before God, Thy God, hath anointed Thee above Thy fellows*; intimating, that when considered as God, *whose throne is forever and ever*, He had a God over Him, and is Himself a God only by delegation or exaltation: But how can we understand the words in this sense, if His exaltation is so soon to end as your author supposes? *Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever* — But, *Thy throne, O God, shall be overthrown at the end of the world*: — Nay, though Thou art He, (as in verses 10, 11.) *who in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; the heavens are the works of Thine hands*; yea, though *Thou shalt remain when they are perished*, though *Thou art the same when they are changed*; yet, *they shall no sooner perish, be folded up, and changed,*

than

than Thy authority and dominion shall cease, and Thy exaltation be at an end:—This is evidently the language your author makes the apostle speak, when he considers him as speaking personally of Christ, in verse 9, *therefore God, Thy God, hath anointed Thee above Thy fellows*; and as this is chargeable with the last degree of absurdity, I humbly think we are to understand them of His human nature: *That God hath anointed the man Christ with the oil of gladness above His fellows*, His fellow-creatures, as a reward of His love to righteousness and hatred of iniquity; but that Christ, considered personally, is God, *whose throne is for ever and ever; who laid the foundation of the earth, and built the heavens; and who shall remain, and be the same when they are perished and changed.*

AND the same easy and natural interpretation of scripture, which has hitherto shewn the fallacy of your author's reasoning, entirely destroys the force of his arguments in chap. II. Thus when our Lord Jesus says, *Of Myself, I can do nothing*, JOHN 5. 30; if He spoke this with regard to His power of doing or acting, it is to be understood of his manhood, or human nature only, the power of which (as of all other created beings) was derived from and dependent upon God—But I rather chuse to think our Saviour spake with this regard to His will; intending by it, that He had no private will opposite to, or separate from the Father's will—My reason for this is, that He declares verse 19, that *what things soever the Father doth, those also doth the Son likewise*; and ver. 21, that *as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the SON quickeneth whom HE will.*—Here seems to be no want of power in the Son; He has as great power as the Father; but their will is one, He can do nothing of His own will separate from the Father's; for *whatever the Father does, that also doth the Son likewise*—They are one in essence, and one in will, as appears beyond all contradiction from ver. 23. *He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father*; and how can this be true, unless the Father and Son are essentially one: And this His oneness with the Father He again represents in the plainest manner, chap. 14. 9, 10. *He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father; I am in the Father, and the Father in Me*—and intimates ver. 11, that His works were enough to convince men that He was one in essence with the Father, they being such as none but the great God could achieve—*Believe me for the very works sake*—believe what? Certainly what He had just asserted—*He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father, —I am in the Father, and the Father in Me.* And your author's supposition, that “our Lord considers “Himself (personally) in opposition to the Father,” chap. v. is certainly groundless; at least there is no weight in the reason he assigns for it, viz. “Because he says the Father hath given Him all power or authority to execute judgment;” for our Lord tells us in what character the Father gave him this authority, and what capacity He received it, viz. as the son of man.—He had asserted in ver. 21, that *as the Father, so He quickeneth whom he pleased*; and

ver. 23, that *He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father*; and ver. 26, that *as the Father had life in himself, so he had given to the Son to have life in Himself*; (independent life, surely, or else he had given Him no more than he has the whole animal, yea the vegetable creation:)—Alter our Lord had asserted these things, He proceeds to tell us, that *the Father had given Him authority to execute judgment also*; He adds (least any should think there was a contradiction or inconsistency in His discourse, in His having equal power with the Father to raise the dead, &c. and receiving power from the Father to execute judgment;—I say, that there might be no room for this, He adds) why, and in what capacity He received this authority from the Father, viz. because He was the *son of man*—therefore the Father gave, and He received authority to execute judgment.—But in *some other nature* or capacity, He had equal power with the Father, to quicken whomsoever He would—*had life in Himself*—was *one with the Father*—And what could this be, but the *divine*? what but *true God*?—It is supprising to me, that your author could read these chapters of St. John's Gospel, and pick out those scraps which he brings to support his cause, without being convicted and confounded by the surrounding contexts, which asserts our Saviour's supreme Deity and Godhead in almost every verse.

I proceed to your author's

2d INSTANCE: Wherein he thinks our Lord Jesus disclaimed a perfection which belongs only to the supreme God, viz. That of *absolute goodness*—which he grounds upon *Matth. 19. 17.*—*Why callest thou Me good? There is none good but one, that is God.* Your author affirms it to be evident, that Christ here distinguishes Himself from God, and denies of Himself what He affirms of God.—And even were this the case, the interpretation I have hitherto maintained is a natural and easy solution, viz. That He distinguishes His *human nature* from God, and denies of that only what He affirms of God.—But for my part, I can see no grounds for your author's method of interpreting this text.—I think all must allow that the truth of his interpretation entirely depends upon the opinion which the young man had of Christ, who received this answer from him. And this I am ready to think very difficult exactly to determine: However, there is evidently the greatest probability, that he did not look upon Him to be God: And if so, then the answer he received from Christ, may be fairly understood as a check or reproof upon him, for attributing that to Christ while he thought Him a mere man, which belongs to God only; for, *as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he*;—and therefore, the young man was reproveable for attributing that to Him, which belonged not to Him in the character or capacity he viewed Him in; though it justly belonged to Him in His real personal character:—This is undeniable.—And now I humbly think, it most probable, that the young man did not look upon our Saviour to be GOD,

FIRST,

A LETTER to the DEDICATOR

FIRST,—Because the prevailing opinion among the *Pharisees* and *Jews* in general at that day, concerning the *Messiah* was, not that He should be *God manifest in the flesh*, but a mere son of *David*, a temporal Prince and Saviour; and if the young man thought Him to be the *Messiah*, yet that his opinion of Him, was agreeable to the common *Pharisaical* notion of the *Messiah*, is altogether probable; since he was one from among the multitude; and there is not the least intimation that he thought differently of Christ, from what the rest thought of the *Messiah* in general. Nothing can be inferred concerning his opinion of Him, from the question he asked Him, more than this, That he thought Him, as *Nicodemus* did, a teacher came from God; or one able to instruct him.

AND

SECONDLY.—What very much confirms it, that he did not take our Saviour to be God, is his conduct after he had received instruction from Him.——*He went away sorrowful*. What! That he had been instructed immediately from the mouth of God?—No: That the instructions were so opposite to his darling lust: But would any man who had reason and sober thought enough to frame an opinion any way, if he verily believed that the great God immediately enjoined a thing upon him, dare to neglect it?—Or, would a man thus believingly taught from God's own mouth, go away sorrowful, that he must deny himself one thing to please this God? No, verily; a man that would act at this rate, must be abandoned to the greatest degree of hardness and stupidity: But the character of this young man is very differently represented:—He had kept, at least externally, the *second table* of the moral law from his youth; was inquisitive what he should do to be saved; yea, he was a youth of so much innocence and virtue, that our Saviour loved him: In short, he lacked but one thing to make him a good and perfect man in the sense of scripture; and surely he would not have lacked this one thing, had he verily believed this great God from his own mouth recommended it to him.

BESIDES,

THIRDLY, If our Saviour knew the young man thought Him to be God, and was conscious to himself at the same time that He was not God, (as your author supposes) I say, If this be the case, it is difficult to assign a reason for his answering him in this manner: *Why dost thou call Me good? There is none good but one, that is God*.—This implies only an inquiry why he called Him good; i. e. upon what account; and not a denial that He was good:—He affirms that *none is good but God*; but this is not denying Himself to be God.——Had He designed such a thing, if His manner of expression is not altogether unintelligible, it is evidently very liable

to be misunderstood, and but little favours such a design.—Had He designed to have cured the young man of a mistake, in thinking Him God when he was not, would He not rather have plainly told him, I am not God; or you are wrong in calling Me good?—But on the other side, It is easy to assign a reason why our Saviour did not more fully declare His God-head to this young man.—The captious, designing Pharisees were about Him, seeking occasions and opportunity to accuse Him; but as *His time was not yet come*, He was careful to give them none, that their ignorance, ill-nature, and prejudice, could possibly improve against Him at that time. But what improvement they would have made of it, had He asserted Himself to be GOD, we may learn from the account given of His accusation and trial, *Matth. 26. and Luke 22.* When He intimated before the *Sanhedrim*, that He was *the Son of God*, the general cry was, *What need we any further witnesses? for we ourselves have heard of His own mouth.* And, *John 5. 18.* *The Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He said, that GOD was His Father; making Himself equal with God,* as they interpreted it: And our Saviour is so far from denying absolutely that their interpretation was right, that He immediately asserts his oneness with the Father; though in such a manner as to prevent their making an immediate improvement of it against Him:—He says, *What things soever the Father doth, these also doth the Son likewise.*—From hence it appears, that our Saviour carefully avoided such expressions as that even the Pharisees themselves could judge sufficient to accuse and condemn Him by, till His time or hour was come; and therefore thought not proper to assert his Divinity, or God-Head, in plain, explicit terms to the world; not even till *He was declared to be the Son of God with power, by a resurrection from the dead.*—And this, If I mistake not, lets us into the foundation and design of that charge our Saviour gave his disciples, *Matth. 16. 16. and Luke 9. 22.* When *Peter*, (speaking the sentiments of the other disciples) declared Him to be *Christ the Son of God*; i. e. God by nature, and not merely by office and delegation:—He strictly charged and commanded them, that *they should tell no man that thing*:—But why? What is the reason of this charge?—HE adds, *Because the Son of Man, not the Son of God most properly and by way of eminence (so called) must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes*:—Intending certainly, that it was inconsistent with the purposes of infinite wisdom, and His then present state of humiliation and approaching sufferings, that HE should be publickly preached and proclaimed to be *what HE really was*, and what His own disciples *thought Him to be*:—And no wonder, when HE gave His disciples such a charge not to proclaim the *dignity of His person*, and His *real character*, till after His sufferings, that He should decline doing it Himself.

A LETTER to the DEDICATOR

UPON the whole then :—From what has been said, it appears, (if not very plain, yet) most probable, that the young man did not look upon *Christ* to be *God* :—That our Saviour's answer, *Why dost thou call Me good ?* &c. is to be understood as a check, or reproof, upon the young man, not for his words simply considered ; but for his applying them to *Christ*, while he entertained his then present opinion of Him :—I say, that His answer is to be understood in *this* light ; and not as a denial of His own goodness of Deity, since the words do not plainly express any such denial :—And no reason can be offered why our Saviour should not plainly express it, if this was His design : But on the other hand, that there is good reason why He did not absolutely assert and publickly declare His Divinity *at that time* ; such a declaration being inconsistent with the purposes of infinite wisdom, the state of humiliation He was in, and the scene of sufferings He had to pass through.——So that if we are to judge according to the greatest degree of evidence and probable testimony, we must judge that there is no sufficient ground for your author's interpretation of our Saviour's answer to the young man.

I proceed to the

3d, and last INSTANCE, where your author supposes our Lord disclaimed a perfection which belongs to the *supreme God*, viz. Mark 13. 32. *Of that day knows no man ; no, not the angels of heaven ; nor the Son ; but the Father.*——This I look upon to be the most plausible argument in favour of your author's opinion. As to the other instances he produces, if we consider their obvious circumstances, and the general current of scripture, they are no ways to his purpose ; and even *this* is fairly over-balanced by other scriptures, which affirm in the most positive, unlimited manner, that *He knows all things ; that He searcheth the reins and the hearts, &c.*—For this is not a positive assertion that He did not, personally considered, *know the day and hour* ; but, *of that day, and hour knoweth no man ; no not the angels ; nor the Son*, i. e. the son of man, or the human nature : He did not then know it, considered as the prophet and teacher of mankind : It was what He could not then reveal in this character ; it being kept as an inviolable secret from all created beings ; what no ways concerned them to know ; yea, the knowledge of which would be dangerous and hurtful, for the reason assigned : For this being kept such a secret is, that *all might watch* : A duty that would in a great measure be superceeded by a revelation of that day and hour : Therefore, *of that day and hour must no man know ; no, not the angels ;—nor the Son*, considered as man ; or the prophet and teacher of mankind : This I think a plain and natural solution of these words, in consideration of the circumstances attending them, and those other scriptures, which positively affirm, that our Lord *Jesus knows all things ; that He searcheth the heart, &c.*——That they are to be understood of Him considered as *man*, or
the

the prophet and teacher of mankind, and not personally.—I have therefore nothing to do now in order to maintain my cause, but to remove your author's objections against this interpretation, and the arguments I have brought to support it. And this I shall attempt to do in a brief and familiar manner, though your author has dwelt very largely upon it; conscious, that his whole hypothesis was depending, and must inevitably fall if he failed in this point.

He therefore objects :

OBJ. 1st. "That our blessed Lord Jesus, if Himself was the supreme God in any nature of His own, could not have said such things in any consistency with truth and sincerity:—HE could not say *Himself could not do*, and *did not know*, the things, which, if He were God supreme, He *could do*, and *did know*, &c."—As to the *first* of these, viz. "Our Saviour's saying, that *He could do nothing of Himself*," I have already shown it evident from the context, that it is to be understood of his *will*; that He had no private will of His own separate from the Father's; and not of His *power*: For, *What things sever the Father doeth, those doeth the Son*; and, *as the Father quickeneth whom He will, so doeth the Son*.—And as to the *second*, He doth not positively deny His *knowing the day*, &c. *personally* considered; but considered *as man*; or in the character of our prophet and teacher.—So that the question is plainly this, viz.—Whether our Lord Jesus, if the divine and human natures were united in His person, could not affirm, that He did not know *that as man*, or considered as our teacher, *which He did know*, as GOD, consistent with truth; and this, without any express limitation or reserve?—In order to determine *this*; the time, manner and circumstances of His speaking, must be considered: For it must be allowed, that at one time, and under certain circumstances, a reserve or limitation may be necessary to render a speech consistent with truth; when at another time, and under different circumstances, the same speech may be equally true, without any such reserve or limitation's being expressed.—This might be illustrated, were it necessary, by various examples.—The truth and consistency of a particular speech or sentence, often depends upon the circumstances of the time; the knowledge of the hearers; or the preceding or following discourse of the speaker:—For it is no argument, that a man speaks inconsistent with truth, because we misunderstand him; or because what he says is not true in the light we consider it: If so, every man must be a liar that has the misfortune to be misunderstood; and at this rate, perhaps, some would make our blessed Saviour as great a liar as the father of lies himself.—Now to apply this to the present case in the most familiar manner:—If the disciples understood Him to speak of His *human nature*, or of Himself considered as the prophet and teacher of mankind, and *not* of Himself *personally*, when he

said, that *the Son did not know the day and the hour*; then with regard to them, His speech or saying was consistent with truth:----- HE did not deceive them; but what He said in the sense He intended it, and in the sense they understood it, might be strictly true, though the Son in *another nature*, or character, did *actually know*, what is here said He did *not know*.-----And if from what is revealed to us concerning our blessed Saviour, we have sufficient reason to conclude, that this of *His not knowing the day*, is to be understood of Him considered as *man*, or as our prophet and teacher, and *not personally*; then we have no reason to complain or object, that what he says is inconsistent with truth and sincerity: And that we have no sufficient reason to suppose this, your author has not yet proved; and to infer it from the speech or sentence itself, singly considered, is absurd; since its being consistent or inconsistent with truth and sincerity, depends upon the circumstances of the time at which it was delivered; upon our Saviour's whole discourse with His disciples; and upon their knowledge or notion of what He said:---I say, it depended upon all these with regard to *them*: And with regard to *us*, it depends upon the whole record God gave of his Son. If He has not sufficiently revealed to us, that this is to be understood of His *human nature* only; but of Him *personally* considered; then it is true, that supposing Him to be GOD, is making Him speak inconsistent with truth. But while He has revealed to us, that it is to be understood of Him considered as *man*, or our teacher only, and not of Him *personally*, the above supposition implies no contradiction or inconsistency, with the strictest truth and sincerity. He that hath told us, *the Son did not know*, &c. hath also told us, what we are to understand by the *Son*, when this knowledge is denied of Him, *viz.* That we are to consider Him as *man*, as our prophet and teacher, and not in His *divine* nature, as *truly God*; though He is to be thus considered, when it is said, *He knows all things*; the *hearts of men*, &c.-----This indeed is not delivered to us in the same words and terms I have used; but it is plainly taught in that record God hath given of his Son; at least your author has not shewn, that this is not revealed to us by the same scriptures that tell us, *The Son knows not the day*, &c. So that though our Saviour did not make an immediate express reserve when He said, *The Son did not know the day*, yet it amounts to just the same, if the disciples understood Him with this limitation; and if the scriptures, which give us an account of Him, teach us to understand those words in this limited sense, it is the same case;-- We have as little reason to complain and object, that his saying, *The Son did not know*, &c. is inconsistent with truth, if He be GOD, as if He had immediately added, *You are to understand this of Me as man*; I speak it of the *Son*, considered as the prophet and teacher of mankind, or the like.-----Would it not be a very unreasonable criticism, for any one to take a single sentence of a discourse delivered from the pulpit, or at the bar, a sentence that depended upon what preceded or followed for its *true sense*,

Or for the *meaning* which the speaker intended, being explained and limited to certain bounds: I say, would it not be barbarous and unreasonable to select such a sentence; and declare, that because when understood in its utmost possible latitude, in a sense very different from what the speaker intended, it was inconsistent with truth, therefore it was really so in *every sense*, and cannot be reconciled with the truth and sincerity of the speaker; but is to be declared an absolute falshood? Just so barbarous and unreasonable is it for your author to select this *single sentence* of our blessed Saviour, and declare, That it is not true of the Son, considered in the light or character in which he spake of Him; in which His disciples understood Him; and in which the holy scriptures teach us to understand Him; because it is not true of the SON considered in His utmost latitude, if He be GOD. — This may be further illustrated by the very instances your author brings to support his objection; Though there is a wide difference between two arms, or two eyes, belonging to one man, and two infinite distant natures being united in one person; the cases are too unlike and unparrallel to prove any thing of each other, and therefore are not to your author's purpose, in the light he considers them; but may serve to illustrate what I have said. — Thus, supposing a man to have two eyes, the one vivid and piercing, by which he could discern minute atoms and objects at a great distance; the other dull and short-sighted, affected only by near and shining objects: Supposing this man discoursing with me concerning the sight of his poorest eye; or, being asked by me, how far, and what objects he could see; should answer, "I can see no farther than such a particular object, and there are only such and such large and shining objects that I can discern;" would this be inconsistent with truth and sincerity, because he could and did see farther and other objects with his best eye? — Or, if without any previous discourse of the matter, he should say, "I do not see such and such things; there are certain objects I do not discern:" — But should add, that he meant by his dull, short-sighted eye; for with the other he could discern minute atoms and objects at a distance; could his first assertion in this case be justly deemed inconsistent with truth, if the later were true? Surely no; he intended no falshood; and I am not deceived: — If I take and consider his whole discourse together, it appears every way consistent; and, in short, it would argue great ignorance, prejudice, or ill-nature in me to object, that it was not true and consistent. — And now to apply this to the present case. — Supposing our Lord Jesus to have two distinct natures united in his person, viz. the divine and human; the *divine* knows all things, the *human* does not: The disciples who are previously informed of this double character, apply to Him in the character of *man*; or inquire of Him as their prophet and teacher; not as a *divine person*, *When the day should be?* — He tells them, that *He*, (or the *Son*) *did not know*; while the *divine nature*, or *He*, the *Son*, in a different character, *did know*: —

Or

Or without their previous knowledge of His two natures, and double character, (if you chuse to have it so) He tells them, *Of that day the Son knows not*; but adds, that He intended by *Son*, the *Son of man*; or the Son considered as the prophet and teacher of mankind; for that the Son, as *God*, or a *divine* person, *did know it*.—The first of these assertions cannot be justly deemed inconsistent with truth, because the latter is true. And that the disciples either thus understood our Lord at the very time, or were thus instructed by Him soon after, is evident; because they soon after attributed infinite, unlimited knowledge to Him: *Lord, thou knowest all things*. And they are examples for us; and we are to consider the whole scriptures as one continued discourse. When we judge of the person, offices or religion of our blessed Saviour, we are to explain and interpret one part with another, by the exercise of the best reason, without prejudice or partiality. Thus it renewedly appears, that your author's objection is groundless; till he first shews, that *the record God has given of his Son*, no where affords us sufficient grounds to conclude that the particular sentence or sentences in debate, are to be understood agreeable to the above interpretation. I have dwelt the longer on this point, because your author lays great stress upon it; and indeed sounds his other objections, in great measure, upon this supposition, that this is just, true and unanswerable.—Thus largely shewing the vanity of this, will therefore open the way, and vastly facilitate the removal of the rest.—I beg leave, however, to add, that your author has laid aside the subtilty or good sense he seems in some other places to be possessed of, when he makes such a horrid and obvious abuse and misapplication of *Dr. Stillingfleet's* words, to prove his own reasoning fair; and insinuates, “that some on the other side own it, just when out of the heat of this controversy, and contending with the *Papists*.” Was I a friend to your author's opinion, or verily believed it reasonable and true, I should be truly grieved to see it vindicated by such a quibble.—Is there any room to compare a *Papish Priest*, who falsely pretends to personate God, to JESUS CHRIST; if He is really God? Or, does it follow by any parity of reasoning, that because their pretence is vain, that they know some things as *God*, which they know not as *men*; therefore our blessed Saviour, if the divine and human nature were actually united in His person, could not know any thing as *GOD*, which He did not know as *man*? Surely there is a wide difference between *falsely pretending* to be God, and being *really GOD*; or else we may make God almighty himself an impostor: And if here be a *difference*, then your author's reasoning upon this head, and application of the Doctor's words in his favour, is unjust and unreasonable.

BUT I proceed to,

DEL

Obj. 2. viz.----“ That Jesus Christ intended no such distinction
 “ of *two natures*, because He puts not the distinction or opposition
 “ between the *Son of man*, and the *eternal Word*, (as some speak,)
 “ but between the *Son* and His *Father*; not the Son knows, but
 “ only the Father. Which is as much as to say, None knows but
 “ the Father; therefore the Son could not know in any nature, &c.”
 —I have not used exactly your author's words, but taken the
 whole of his meaning. —In answer to which, I would observe,
 That though the distinction, or opposition is not expressly put be-
 tween the *Son of man*, and the *eternal Word*, in the very same verse, or
 the next following; yet that the disciples understood it *then*, or were
 taught to understand it, with the distinction thus put between the
human nature and the *divine*, or the *eternal Word*, is evident from
 their afterwards attributing to the *eternal Word*, or Christ *personally*
 considered, infinite, unlimited knowledge: And that we are to
 understand the distinction or opposition thus, is evident from the
 current of scripture; which declares our blessed Saviour to be *God*
manifest in the flesh; proclaims his *divinity* and equality with God the
 Father. —And this I have shewn, vindicates our Saviour's asser-
 tion, if He was really GOD, from the imputation of falsehood or
 inconsistency with truth, equally as if He had made an immediate
 express reserve; and by parity of reason, and plain consequence,
 this vindicates Him in not putting the distinction or opposition im-
 mediately and in express terms, if He did know as GOD, between
 the *Son of man* and the *eternal Word*; or between his *humanity* and
divinity. —So that it by no means follows, that our Saviour did
 not intend this distinction of *two natures*, because He does not im-
 mediately and in express terms put the distinction or opposition be-
 tween the *son of man* and the *eternal Word*: There was either no
 occasion of expressing this distinction *then*, they knowing it *before*,
 or He taught it them *presently after*, and hath sufficiently revealed it
 to us by His word; if divested of prejudice, we with good and ho-
 nest hearts read and consider it. —But then, “ Are not all ex-
 “ cepted from this knowledge, but the Father only? How then can
 “ the Son have it in any nature?” —Answer. The general term
 of *Father* here comprehends the whole *God-head*; so that the *Son* and
Holy Ghost are included under it, as well as the *Father*. —But how,
 What proof or ground is there to suppose that by the term *Father*,
 we are to understand *three distinct persons* here; and that the *son of*
man stands opposed to all these included under the term or appella-
 tion of *Father*? —Answer. Because the holy scriptures tell us,
There are Three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and
the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One. —That the *Father and*
Son are One. —That *he that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father.*
 —That *he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father.* —
 That the *Son is the true God, God blessed forever.* —That *He knows*
all things —That *He searcheth the reins and the hearts, &c. i. e.*
 in short, The *God-head*, or *Deity*, is plainly represented as subsist-
 ing

A LETTER to the DEDICATOR

ing in *three distinct persons*, who equally partake of the divine essence, and of all natural and moral perfections; and consequently of knowledge.——Hence we conclude, That as all but the Father are excepted from the knowledge of *that day*; so by the *Father*, is intended the *Deity*, or *God-head*, or all the *three persons*, in which it subsists: And this reason remains good, till it be shewn, that no such things as the above-mentioned are contained in the holy scriptures, that Jesus Christ is not represented as GOD, equal with the Father; that infinite, unlimited knowledge is not attributed to Him, &c. which your author has not done, unless his reason and grounds for supposing that by the term or appellation of FATHER, cannot be intended *three distinct persons*, or the *whole God-head*, if it subsists in *three persons*, is an over-balance, for reasons I have mentioned, to conclude the contrary: For certainly the most substantial reason, the greatest degree of evidence and probability, ought to be followed. Let us therefore view your author's reason, and see what proportion it bears to the other.——His reason then (if I mistake not) is this, That if the above method of interpretation be good and just, “ he should despair of ever understanding the scriptures above all books that ever were written.” It is indeed a question with me, whether any book of human invention is so difficult to understand, as the holy scriptures, in many parts: The reason why, is plain; because they treat of the most sublime truths; truths above the comprehensions of our reason; and deal much in parables, metaphors and figures of speech:—Besides, the stile and manner of expression in those idioms or languages, in which they were originally delivered, is very different from ours at present: We are also very much unacquainted with the situation, manners, customs, habits, &c. of the countries and nations of which they treat:—All which things contribute to render many parts of them abstruse, and hard to understand: And for these and other reasons, many who are either *unlearned*, or *unstable*, wrest them to their own destruction.——So that their being more difficult or hard to understand, than any other book in general, is no argument that the above interpretation is wrong. And to apply this reason to the particular case before us, it amounts to no more than this, That if the above interpretation be allowed, this particular sentence,———*Of that day knows no man, &c.* is hard to understand, when considered *single* by itself, without any regard to the other scriptures; for if we take, and impartially consider, the whole scriptures, they evidently direct us to this interpretation; as I have shewn to be the case, notwithstanding all your author has yet offered to the contrary.——And is it a good or sufficient reason to reject an interpretation grounded upon a variety of plain scriptures, merely because the text itself, to which the interpretation is applied, if considered *single* by itself, is hard to understand, according to this interpretation:——Surely it is not; and therefore the prop of this *second* objection is weak and insignificant: And not much unlike it is the *third*; which

I PROCEED to consider :

Obj. 3d. "The interpretation must needs be unjust, which, if admitted, will make all, even the most plain speech, *uncertain*, and utterly insignificant; as this interpretation of Christ's words would do."——In answer to this, it might be sufficient to say, that like those already considered, it is entirely founded on the supposition that the holy scriptures afford no grounds for such an interpretation (which yet remains to be proved).——For if scripture explains itself, there is certainly no just cause to complain or object, that it is unintelligible:——Or if it interprets some particular texts or sentences, in a manner different from the most common and ordinary use of speech; it cannot therefore be justly objected, that all speech is hereby rendered uncertain and utterly insignificant.——This is to suppose that no text or sentence of scripture whatever can possibly need any explaining——That every text in the bible is to be literally understood in its utmost latitude, and ought not to have any limited or figurative interpretation put upon it; but be understood precisely according to its letters and syllables: Which any one who has ever read the bibles must see would make horrible work indeed with scripture, fill it with the most palpable falsehoods, and gross contradictions:——In short, it would render every figurative expression, (in which the scriptures abound) entirely useless.——We must either understand them *literally*, or render them obnoxious to this objection.——For every interpretation that fixes a limited or figurative sense upon scripture, must, at least in measure, have the same tendency with this your author objects against, to render plain speech uncertain and unintelligible. I would enquire how we are to understand the *Psalmist*, when he calls the Lord his *Rock*?——The prophet, when he affirms of the *Jew*, "They have made their faces harder than a rock;"—And our Saviour, when he says, "I am the vine, ye are the branches."——I am the door.——This bread is my body: This wine is my blood, &c"? I am persuaded your author never thought that these expressions were to be *literally* understood; but explained them by his senses, reason and other parts of scripture, which give them a *figurative* interpretation, different from the *literal* and common meaning of these very words and syllables: And why may not we complain, that plain speech is hereby rendered uncertain and utterly insignificant? And still further, if possible, to shew the vanity of this objection; and that your author can with no propriety urge it against the above interpretation; I would observe, that he must continually swallow it himself in its fullest force, or renounce his own opinion: For what will he tell us when we ask the apostle's meaning where he declares Christ to be *God blessed forevermore*—the *true God*—*God, whose throne is established forever, &c*? Will he tell us, these expressions are to be understood of His *office*, and not of His *person*? Astonishing! How uncertain and insignificant is the most plain and positive speech!—I might also urge our Saviour's

A LETTER to the DEDICATOR

Saviour's own expressions, such as, *I and the Father are ONE; what things sever the Father doth, those also doth the Son likewise* :----- *He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father, &c.*—All which, and many more, to become consistent with your author's opinion, must undergo an interpretation no less tending to render plain speech uncertain and insignificant, than this he objects to : So that when your author inquires, in what words Jesus Christ could in brief have denied Himself to be God more plain and full than this or that, the same method of interpretation would not evade ? The question may be returned, at least with equal force and propriety.—In what words could He or His apostles have affirmed Him to be *truly God*, more plain and full than they have done in a variety of instances, and which your author's interpretation would not have evaded ?—But I would not be thought by this to put the two interpretations upon a level in point of reason and scripture-evidence : That which your author opposes has vastly the advantage ; not only for reasons I have already mentioned ; but as having the general current of scripture in its favour ; vastly beyond what your author's can pretend to, which seems principally to depend upon the single text now in debate.—And further, what I look upon much in favour of the interpretation I am pleading for is, that it is founded upon expressions which either Christ Himself uttered when professedly and designedly discoursing of Himself ; or were uttered by the apostles, when designedly speaking of Him, and describing of Him to mankind.—Whereas *this* text, which your author lays the greatest stress upon, (and indeed many of the others) may be termed *accidental* (if any thing that came from the blessed Jesus may be so termed) i. e. He was not professedly and designedly speaking or discoursing of Himself ; He was not describing Himself, telling who and what He was, or the like ; but engaged upon a different subject ; and these words seem to be more properly an *episode*, or *circumstance*, of the discourse, than a proper part of the discourse itself : And this I humbly think, gives no small advantage to the interpretation your author opposes.—I should have looked upon the words your author builds his hypothesis upon, in a very different light, and I am persuaded some others would have urged them with greater warmth and resolution, if possible, had they been a part of a discourse wherein our Saviour Himself, or his apostles were designedly speaking concerning Him, or giving a description of Him, to others who desired or wanted information.

BUT not to enlarge further here, —

I PROCEED TO

OBJ. 4. viz. " That this interpretation does plainly overthrow the cause that is designedly maintained by it, and may be turned against it : For if it be just and true to deny Christ absolutely what

what belongs to Him in *one* nature, because there is *another* nature in which it belongs not to Him; then, since to be the CHIEF GOD belongs to Him (according to the above method of interpretation) only in *one* nature, and not in respect of the *other*, or *human* nature; it follows, that it may as justly be said, Jesus Christ is not GOD, nor to be worshipped, or trusted as such; nay, that He was not before the Virgin *Mary*,—and the like; and this without adding any limitation or restriction, any more than our Lord does in the place mentioned."

ANSWER.——This also is founded upon the old supposition, That scriptures afford no reasonable grounds for the above interpretation; nor describe or represent our Lord Jesus in any other light than your author does:——For if we are to believe our Lord Jesus to be such as the *general current* of plain scripture represents Him to be; and this represents Him to be GOD as well as *man*; then the objection ceases, and your author's conclusion is false.——But that we are to believe on, and speak of, our Lord Jesus as being such as the general current of plain scripture represents Him, cannot be denied by those who hold the scriptures to be a *perfect rule* for our *faith* and *practice*; and that the scriptures represent our Lord Jesus to be GOD as well as *man*, has not yet been refuted: And to urge the *present objection* for this end, will appear unreasonable, if we consider more distinctly what every one must allow, viz.

1st. THAT our blessed Saviour was at liberty, by his own mouth, or that of his apostles, to reveal Himself, the design of His coming into the world, and the nature of His religion and doctrine, in just what *form*, and at what *time* He pleased: And accordingly, while *manifest in the flesh*, He revealed *these things* to His own disciples in a *gradual manner*; and kept many things, relating to the nature and design of His kingdom, and doctrine, *secret*, even from them, till after His resurrection and ascension: For it was the *Holy-Ghost*, sent by the Father, in His name, that was to *teach them all things*, and *bring all things to their remembrance*.

2^{dly}. It cannot be denied, That after our Saviour had fully revealed Himself, the design of His coming into the world, the nature of His religion, &c. His disciples, and all who enjoyed this revelation, were obliged to *believe on Him*, and *speak of Him*, according to this *whole revelation* taken together; *one part* being compared with and explained by *another*; and not according to *particular texts* or sentences, while the revelation was in its *infancy*, or imperfect state.——And if this be allowed (as I think it must be) then it follows, that it would be unreasonable in us, who enjoy this *whole revelation*, to believe or speak of our blessed Saviour, and His religion, the grand subject of it, *exactly according to particular sentences and phrases*,

A LETTER to the DEDICATOR

delivered while in its *infancy*, and that are explained and interpreted by *others* of equal authority; i. e. in short, Since the scriptures represent JESUS CHRIST to be GOD as well as *man*, it would be absurd and unreasonable in us to speak of HIM *absolutely*, and without any *limitation* or *reserve*, either as GOD or *man*—We may consistently and safely say, that JESUS CHRIST, considered as *man*, or with regard to His *human* nature, is not GOD, nor to be worshipped; that He was not *before* the *Virgin Mary*, &c.—But to speak of Him absolutely and without any limitation in *this form*, would be absurd; because the *record* God hath given of Him, represents Him to be *truly* GOD, attributes *worship* to Him, declares Him to be *eternal*, &c.—So should any one preach that the *human* nature of Christ was not GOD; or, should one say, I believe that Jesus Christ, considered as God, was not conceived by the Holy Ghost, nor born of the *Virgin Mary*, nor crucified under *Pontius Pilate*, nor dead nor buried, &c.—this would be just; for, His *divine* nature, which the scriptures affirm He had, was not capable of these things:—But should any one speak thus of Him in *absolute* terms, without any limitation or reserve, he might justly be accused of falsehood (if nothing worse) because the *scriptures* represent Jesus Christ to be both GOD and *man*; to be incapable of suffering in His *divine* nature, and to have actually suffered, &c. in His *human*.
 —And, (as has been observed) we are to consider the scriptures as one continued discourse or record, which God hath given of his Son; of whom it is our duty to believe and speak (when we use *absolute* terms) according to the *complex* description or representation here given of Him.—Your author thinks it strange if any thing is to be believed relating to the supreme Deity of Christ, that this is not taken notice of in the *apostle's creed*, since this must be most important.—Is it not strange, that he could not see the Divinity, or Godhead of Christ, asserted in this brief summary of the Christian religion, when He is styled, THE ONLY SON OF GOD? How is He, His *only* Son?—By creation?—No; angels and men were created by God likewise:—By a special adoption?—No; good men are entitled to this:—By the office of a messenger; or ambassador?—No. He cannot be *alone* in His Sonship if this be it; for angels are dignified with this office; and even the despised ministers of the gospel:—Where then shall we go to find Christ *alone* in His Sonship, but to the *Fountain* of the Deity; where neither our senses, nor our reason can extend; and say, He is the ONLY SON OF GOD; which is the same as to say, He is TRUE GOD, equal with the FATHER?

OBJ. 5. It remains to consider your author's *fifth* and last objection, against the above method of interpretation, viz. —
 "That it weighs something with him, that the Evangelists never take any occasion (when, as he says, they had so many) to sub-
 join any caution against taking Christ's words in their obvious

the sense (i. e. in the sense he interprets them) when He says, of that hour knows not the Son, &c."

ANSWER. — As this is not offered as a proper objection, but only what weighed something with your author, who (we may suppose) was easily attracted to *this way* of thinking, and required no great weight to move him down the declivity, it would be a waste of time to consider it particularly and largely; — It will be sufficient to enquire, why the Evangelists did not subjoin a *caution*, when they penned these expressions of our blessed Saviour, Matth. 16. 18. *On this Rock, I will build my church* — and chapt. 26. 26, 27. *Take, eat, this is my body* — *Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood*, &c. — A *caution* here, was certainly as necessary, as in the instance or instances referred to; and the Evangelists had as many occasions to subjoin a *caution* to the one as to the other. — The most obvious reason why they did not, in either of them, appears to me to be this: — That the Evangelists spake and wrote as they were inspired or moved by the Holy Ghost; who did not suggest to them the necessity of such a caution. — The Evangelists (as I imagine) never thought, that the *Pope's chair* would be founded on *one*; the doctrine of *transubstantiation* on *another*; and the doctrine of *Arius* on the *third*, of these instances: — But infinite wisdom has seen fit (for wise and holy ends, no doubt) to permit them *all*: — Though I am far from thinking that the want of such cautions, as your author requires, will be any excuse either for *Papists*, or *Arians*.

Thus I have considered your author's hypothesis, — the *scripture* upon which he grounds it, — and shewn how entirely it is overturned by a fair and natural interpretation of other scriptures: — That his *objections* against this, are vain; such as either have no foundation at all, or may be retorted upon him in their full force. — His next attempt is to shew, That there is no just foundation in scripture for this interpretation; before which his opinion must fall; that the scriptures urged against him are capable of a different turn, &c. — This, therefore, deserves to be particularly considered; it being now the only thing that can shelter the opinion, I am supposing, from certain ruin. — And upon an impartial inquiry, I doubt not but this will also appear a refuge of lies.

PART II. Observations upon Chap. 3d of Mr. Emlyn's Inquiry into the scrip- ture account of Jesus Christ.

HERE your author proposes, *first* ; to answer the objections against his hypothesis ; or, *refute* the arguments, usually brought from scripture, to prove JESUS CHRIST to be really GOD, equal with the Father :—And he tells us, That because Omniscient is that infinite perfection, which is with the greatest show of reason, or plausible testimony alledged to belong to Christ ;—therefore he chooses to single out *this* in particular. But I am much mistaken, if he had not *another* and a *truer* reason in his own breast for this conduct, viz.——That his reasoning upon *this* topic has a greater appearance of truth, and is better adapted to deceive the inconsiderate and untable, than it could be upon some *others*, which are alledged in vindication of the supreme Deity of Jesus Christ ;——That this is actually the case, I doubt not, will be made to appear hereafter.——

I SHALL, in a few words, expose the fallacy of his reasoning, upon the *very* topic he has singled out ; whatever *end* he proposed in choosing *this*, rather than *another*.

It is alledged, in vindication of the *supreme Deity* of Jesus Christ, That the disciples attributed to Him, infinite, unlimited knowledge. —John 16. 30. *Now we are sure that Thou knowest all things, &c.* — And, chap. 21. 17. *Lord, Thou knowest all things, &c.* Now, infinite, unlimited knowledge, is an incommunicable perfection, and can belong only to the *supreme God* ; and therefore, if the disciples testimony be true, CHRIST is the *supreme GOD* ; since they expressly attribute such knowledge to Him.——There is no way to evade this argument, but by proving the disciples testimony to be *false* ; which is what your author attempts.——He tells us, “ These expressions are words of admiration from the disciples not yet inspired ; and are intended only to express a very great and comprehensive knowledge, far from infinite, divine Omniscience.”

His reasons for this, are,

1st. “ THAT Christ Himself says, *Of that day and hour, knows not the Son.*”

THIS I have already shewn, is to be understood of His *human nature*, and not of Him *personally* considered ; and that your author's objections against this interpretation, are groundless ; so that it but poorly

ly supplies the place of argument here, to prove the disciples' testimony false; or that they intended *any thing less* by these expressions than, *infinite, divine Omniscience*.—And,

2dly. I must confess my inability, to see the least force in argument *second*.—What! Does it follow, that these expressions of the disciples are to be understood with a *limitation*, as intending no more than a great or extraordinary degree of knowledge; because the woman of Tekoah told King David, 2 Sam. 14. 20.—*That he was wise according to the wisdom of an angel to know all things on earth?*—Or, does the expression of St. John, 1 John 2. 20. *Ye know all things* (which he expressly limits to the matters or truths, concerning which he was writing) does this prove, that the disciples are to be understood in a *confined, or limited sense*; when without any *limitation, or reserve*, they attribute the *knowledge of all things* to Christ?—Or, Is the high opinion of the Jews had of their prophets, an argument that we should have a lower opinion of our blessed Saviour?—Or, Because they assigned an *almost universal knowledge* to *them*, must we assign a *limited knowledge* to *Him*?—The most that can be infered from these passages is, That under certain circumstances, the disciples might possibly express themselves pretty much in *this manner*; and yet intend no more by it, than a *very great and comprehensive knowledge*; because there are examples in scripture of expressions, *somewhat similar*, which did not intend *infinite, divine Omniscience*: I say, *somewhat similar*; because I challenge a single instance to be produced from scripture, where an expression of the like nature was uttered with that air of *assurance*, which is manifest in this of the disciples:—*Now we are sure, &c.*—Or, where the expression itself, or what immediately precedes or follows, does not plainly confine it to certain bounds; or, shew that it is to be understood in a *limited sense*.—But this is not the case here:—The expression is uttered with an air of *assurance*:—The terms are *strong and explicit*, and neither what precedes, or follows, so much as intimates, that they are to be understood, or were intended, with any *limitation*.

For,

3dly. It is to the last degree absurd, to conclude, that the disciples did not intend *infinite, divine Omniscience*; because they infer from our Saviour's knowledge, that *He came forth from God*.—This is the *very thing* I would infer from it,—That HE proceeded from the Father; and *equally partakes of the Divine Essence, and all possible perfections*:—Or, If we understand His *coming forth from the Father*, of His mission into the world; the inferring this from His knowledge, is no argument that the disciples did not look upon Him to be *Omniscient*, and intentionally attribute this perfection to Him.——But I am much mistaken, if the disciples were

were not thoroughly convinced and assured of His *divine mission* long before this; and therefore think it most probable, that by *coming forth from God*, they intended His *supreme Deity*, and *equality* with the Father; which they inferred from His *infinite knowledge*. They surely believed Him to be at least, a *prophet sent of God*, long before this: HIS miracles were a most convincing proof of this:—Even some of the *Pharisees* declared, that *no man could do such miracles, except God was with him*.—But here the disciples are convinced of something new:—*Now we are sure, that Thou knowest all things*; and hence, *We believe that Thou camest forth from God*, i. e. That *Thou art a divine person*; a partaker of the *divine essence*, and all *divine perfections*.—Besides, Had the disciples ascribed that, in such *strong and explicit terms*, to our blessed Saviour, which belonged *not* to Him, is it not strange that He gives them no reproof, or caution?—Was He such a lover of *hyperbolical encomiums and fulsome adulations*, as to allow His own disciples, without the *least rebuke*, to attribute that to Him, a *creature*, which belongs only to the *Creator*? I add, That if our Saviour had not *infinite, divine Omniscience*, or such a knowledge as belongs only to *GOD supreme*; St. Peter's argument, That He *knew his love* to Him, is groundless.—For, from what, short of an *unlimited knowledge of the hearts of all men*, could he infer His knowledge of *his heart*, or *love* to Him?—St. Peter must have argued very foolishly, as well as falsely, to have inferred, That Christ *knew his heart*; or, (which is the same) his *love* to Him, merely because He *knew many things*; or had a great and comprehensive knowledge; or, indeed any knowledge, short of *infinite, divine Omniscience*; or, that of *the hearts of all men*, which belongs only to *GOD supreme*.

BUT that our Lord Jesus had *infinite, divine Omniscience*, and the *knowledge of men's hearts*, in particular, appears not only from *these* and other expressions of the like nature:—But,

SECONDLY.—From His own words, *Rev. 2. 23*.—Where He claims it as His sole prerogative, to *search the reins and the hearts*; and, *all the churches shall know, that I am HE which search the reins and the hearts*:—Now Solomon declares, *1 Kings, 8. 39*.—*Thou* (i. e. God) *even Thou only; knowest the hearts of all the children of men*; and *Jerem. 17. 10*. God declares by the prophet.—*I the Lord search the heart; I try the reins, &c.*—Here the great GOD is, as plainly as words can express, distinguished from all others, by His *knowing and searching the hearts, and trying the reins of all men*.—It belongs to Him only, to *search the hearts*; and to *give to every man according to his ways, and the fruit of his doings*.—And therefore, since our Lord Jesus declares Himself to be, *HE who searcheth the reins and the hearts; and gives to every one according to his works, HE must be the great and supreme GOD*:

He expressly claims that as His sole prerogative, by which the great God is distinguished from all others.——HE does not say, the churches shall know that I search the reins and the hearts; but, that I am HE; which, if words have any force in them; yea, if the expression is not altogether unintelligible, implies, I am HE, who is distinguished by this character; or, the churches shall know that I am THE GOD, who searcheth the reins and the hearts, to give to every one according to their works.

LET us now inquire what your author had said to invalidate this, which he promises a serious consideration; and, with an air of seriousness, insinuates that, “It is no wonder that Solomon should not know of any other to whom the excellency, viz. the knowledge of the hearts of all men, was communicated, than God only.”——If I understand him, he means that it is no wonder if Solomon was ignorant that his excellency was, or could be communicated from God to any one:——If so, this is a point I shall not even attempt to dispute; it being the very thing I would infer from the words of Solomon, that he thought the knowledge of the hearts of all men peculiar to God; that He only, has an underrived, independent and unlimited knowledge of the hearts of men; which is an incommunicable perfection or excellency; a distinguishing character of the supreme God; though in some low degree, and at some particular times, one man may have the knowledge of another’s heart by revelation from God; i. e. in short, God may reveal to his creatures, things which they could not know, or discover by any other means: But does it hence follow, that Christ’s knowledge of men’s hearts is communicated to Him? Or, that it is derived from and dependent upon any one?—Does it follow, by any rules of reasoning, excepting those your author hath invented, that our Saviour’s knowledge of the hearts of men, was derived from another, because that of the prophets and apostles was; who at certain times, and in some degree, had this knowledge? Surely no; an appeal to the reason and sober thought of every person, is a sufficient answer to such forced and unnatural conclusions.

BUT,

“DOES not Christ Himself own, that He knew what He reveals in the seven epistles to the seven churches by revelation from God? It was the revelation which God gave to Jesus Christ, &c.”

ANSWER——To give this any weight at present, the truth and justness of your author’s objections in chap. 2d. must be granted; but the vanity of these hath been already shewn, and therefore the method of interpretation I have maintained against them, is a plain and natural solution of this, viz. That God gave this revelation to Christ, as man, or as our Mediator, and therewith a commission,

A LETTER to the DEDICATOR

to *show* it to his servants; so that this revelation's being given to Him in this character, is no argument against His *Divinity*, or His infinite, divine Omniscience.

It would be trifling; to take notice of his quibbling answer to those who say, that Christ's searching the heart, imports it to be *His own act*. —

He argues,

SECONDLY, "That there is no absurdity in attributing this knowledge of the heart to Jesus Christ, though He be *not* the Most High GOD. That He knows things with some *limitation* as to the degree, and in dependence on His Father as to the manner, he thinks appears from what he has already said; and therefore concludes that the knowledge of the heart attributed to Him, must be such as is consistent with His *subordination* to the Father's *greater* knowledge."

BUT as I have already shewn, that those texts from which Christ's *Inferiority*, or *subordination* to the Father has been argued, are to be understood of His *human nature*, or of Him as *Mediator*; and not of Him *personally*; and removed the objections against this interpretation; so the conclusion your author makes is invalid: — There is no necessity, nor any sufficient reason yet produced, that the knowledge of Christ must be such as is consistent with any *subordination* to the Father's knowledge.

It has not yet been shewn, that the Father has greater knowledge than He; and therefore it can with no propriety be concluded, that His knowledge must be *subordinate* to the Father's: — This is begging the question.

AND now, should the point be granted, which your author labours so long upon, viz. — "That it can never be demonstrated, that it exceeds a *finite capacity* to know the concerns of all on this earth, when the enlarged understanding is assisted in the highest manner by *divine influence* and revelation." — Yet this can no ways militate against the infinite, divine Omniscience of Jesus Christ: — At least, it will be as difficult to show, that whatever cannot be demonstrated to be absurd or impossible is true of Him, as that a finite being cannot possibly know all the concerns of this earth.

YOUR author's argument stands thus: — "It cannot be demonstrated impossible, that a *finite being* should by any means know the concerns of all on this earth; and therefore though Christ knows the concerns of all on this earth, yet he is a *finite being*, and has not infinite

"Infinite, divine Omniscience." This is plainly your author's sense; though not exactly his words; or else I cannot see to what purpose he asserts, that it cannot be demonstrated impossible for a finite being to know the concerns of all on this earth. But there needs no words to shew his conclusion to be *arbitrary* and *groundless*, thus far. — And should it be further granted, that Christ as *mediator*, or *man*, knows, from time to time, the various miseries, cases, and necessities of His servants; which is the most that your author pretends to; yet it does not follow, that He is not Omniscient; or that He did not intend to represent Himself as the **OMNISCIENT GOD**, when He says, *All the churches shall know, that I am HE which searcheth the reins and the hearts.* — Though I think it highly necessary, that the Judge of men and angels should be **Omniscient**; and therefore that none is qualified for *this*, but the **MOST HIGH GOD**; who is declared to be *Judge Himself*, Psal. 50. 6. compared with Heb. 12. 23. — Yet to shorten the work, and refute your author's reasoning in his own way, I give him the point he contends for, viz. That Jesus Christ, as *man*, may, from time to time, be acquainted with the wants and miseries of His servants; yet I argue, that He intended to represent Himself as the *Omniscient God*, from the manner of the expression; and indeed the whole force of the argument lies in this: For if it be demonstrated absolutely necessary, that our *Mediator* and *Judge*, should be the *omniscient God* any other way, there would be no need of this, or any other text, to prove it: — Your author therefore evidently flies from the question, and quits himself of the argument which he pretends to answer. — Instead of shewing, that our Saviour does not represent Himself to be *Omniscient*; he challenges a demonstration, that it is absolutely necessary, that He should be, and utterly impossible that He should know the miseries and wants of His servants without this: i. e. in short, he requires some other proof, or demonstration of Christ's *Omniscience*, before he admits His own words as a proof of it: — A method of reasoning I must confess entirely new to me, till I read your author! — I always thought that *one*, or at least *two* *unanswerable arguments* were sufficient to prove any point, whether civil or theological: — And upon this footing our Saviour's *Omniscience* is clear and undeniable: For (as I have already shewn) His disciples ascribed *infinite, unlimited knowledge* to Him: — And here He Himself claims a distinguishing character of **Almighty GOD**; that by which, His *infinite, divine Omniscience* is frequently represented. — *Thou, even Thou only, knowest the hearts of all the children of men* — *I the Lord search the heart; I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and the fruit of his doings*: — And, *Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I, even I will both search My sheep, and seek them out.* — These are expressions by which **GOD** almighty distinguishes himself; the characters of his *Omniscience*, by which his universal, underived and independent knowledge of the hearts of men, is most emphatically represented;

sented :—This is one of the characters by which He is known :—
 See Psal. 7. 9.—*For the righteous God trieth the heart and reins, &c.*
 —Jerm. 11. 20. *But, O Lord of Hosts, that judgest righteousness,*
that triest the reins and the heart, &c. and many other texts to the
 same purpose, might be produced, were it necessary, where GOD
 Almighty is expressly distinguished and characterized by his *search-*
ing, trying, and knowing the reins and hearts :—The conclusion,
 therefore, is plain and undeniable, that Christ is the *almighty, om-*
niscient GOD, since He expressly declares Himself to be, *He which*
searcheth the reins and the hearts, to give to every one according to their
works :—Nor does any thing your author has said, in the least
 militate against this conclusion ; but, granting all that he contends
 for, it remains good, viz.—“ That Solomon did not know of any
 “ other to whom this excellency was communicated.—That it
 “ cannot be demonstrated absurd and impossible, that a finite capa-
 “ city should know the concerns of all on this earth, &c.—And,
 “ that Jesus Christ, as man, may by the assistance of God, know,
 “ from time to time, the miseries and wants of His servants.”—
 Though all this be granted as true ; yet it no ways militates against
 the truth of the conclusion, that CHRIST is the *omniscient GOD* :—
 Which does not depend upon a demonstration that these things are
false, as your author insinuates ; for these may all be true, and yet
 the premises from which I draw my conclusion, be strictly true like-
 wise :—Thus, GOD Almighty is frequently characterized
 and distinguished in scripture by his *searching, trying and knowing the*
hearts and reins of men.—But JESUS CHRIST is thus cha-
 racterized and distinguished ; nay, what is more, He expressly as-
 serts Himself, without any *limitation*, and in the strongest terms, to
 be *HE which searcheth the reins and the hearts* ; therefore He must
 be the ALMIGHTY GOD. Now, which of these propositions do
 the points your author contends for, militate against ?—Does it
 follow, that GOD Almighty is not thus characterized and distin-
 guished, because Solomon thought that He, and He only, was ?—
 Or, because it is not demonstrably absurd and impossible, that a
finite capacity should, by the assistance of God, know the concerns
 of all on this earth ? Or, that Jesus Christ, as man, should by this
 means know the miseries and wants of His servants ? Surely no :—
 For if GOD is any where emphatically and plainly distinguished
 and characterized in scripture ; it is by His *searching, trying, and*
knowing the hearts of men :—I challenge an instance to the con-
 trary of this ; or where GOD Almighty is more plainly and em-
 phatically distinguished from all others, by any *character* whatever,
 than He is by *this of searching, trying, and knowing men's hearts* ;
 and if so, then allowing your author's reasoning just, He is no where
 distinguished by any perfection or excellency ; nor is there any
 thing by which we can know Him from some of his creatures —
 If the same expressions which are brought to distinguish and cha-
 racterize the Great GOD, are applicable to his creatures, they

do not distinguish him at all :—Thus ; e. g. to say, that if *searching the heart*, &c. when applied immediately to God, means, that *none knows the heart as God does*, so universally, so immediately and independently (as your author owns :) and yet *that*, when applied to Christ in the *very same words*, it means no more, than that He has a derived, limited power of *searching the hearts*, is very absurd :—'Tis as much as to say, The very same expressions which denote the universal, immediate and independent knowledge of the *supreme GOD*, and distinguish him from all created beings ; denote no more than the limited, derived and dependent knowledge of *CHRIST* ; and distinguish Him only from some ignorant, short-sighted mortals.

AGAIN,——

SECONDLY,—It cannot be alledged, that any thing your author has said, militates against the *second* of the propositions, from which the conclusion is deduced, that *CHRIST* is *GOD omniscient*, viz. That HE is characterized and distinguished in the same manner, that the *supreme GOD* is, by *searching the reins and the hearts, to give to every one according to their works* :—This is a plain fact, which admits of no dispute, That Jesus Christ actually in the *strongest terms*, and *most explicit manner*, declares Himself to be HE *which searcheth the reins and the hearts*.——And therefore it follows, that *CHRIST* Himself is the *supreme, omniscient GOD*, who *only knows the hearts of the children of men* ; and who is distinguished from all others, by *searching and trying the reins and the hearts*.——I add, That the expression *I am He*, as it is spoken of *CHRIST*, seems to be peculiarly appropriated to the *supreme GOD* in scripture.——Thus, Isaiah 41. 4. *I the Lord, the first, and with the last, I am He* : chap. 46. 4. *I am He*, &c. 51. 12. *I, even I, am He that comforteth you*.——The great *GOD* here distinguishes himself from all others, by saying, *I am He* ; this evidently denotes his great power, might, and supremacy : And this expression, if I mistake not, is no where in scripture used in the same manner by any but God himself, Our Saviour's using it in this manner, is therefore a probable argument that He intended to represent *Himself* as the *supreme GOD* ; and to distinguish *Himself* from all, that by revelation, or a derived power, obtain a *knowledge of the hearts of men* ; as God distinguishes *himself* from all *subordinate comforters*,—when he says, *I am he which comforteth you*.——But what confirms it, that our Saviour intends here to represent *Himself* as the *supreme, omniscient GOD*, is His expressly claiming another *distinguishing character* of God Almighty, in the preceding chapter, ver. 8 and 11.——See, Isa. 44. 6.—*Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts, I am the First, and I am the Last* ; and chap. 41. 4. 48. 12. In all which places, the *supreme GOD* distinguishes and characterizes himself in this manner—

I AM

I AM THE FIRST AND THE LAST. And in the *same man*,
 nor our Saviour distinguishes and characterizes Himself. — *I am*
Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, saith the Lord;
which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty. —
 I AM — THE FIRST AND THE LAST. — And what can
 be the import of these expressions, but that HE is the Eternal, Self-
 Existent, Almighty GOD? — Or, What could our Saviour
 intend to represent Himself to be, unless what the prophet *Isaiah*
 declares of Him, (no doubt by divine inspiration) that He is *WON-*
DERFUL, COUNSELLOR, the MIGHTY GOD, the everlasting
FATHER, the PRINCE OF PEACE, chap. 9. 6. Or could He in
 any stronger or more emphatical terms, have declared Himself to
 be, in the most eminent sense, *Eternal, Immortal, and Omnipotent?*
 — Besides, *creating power*, which necessarily implies *Omni-*
potency, is expressly attributed to Him, John 1. 3. *All things were*
made by Him; and without Him was not any thing made that was
made. — Heb. 1. 10, 11, 12. *And Thou, Lord, in the beginning*
hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of
thine hands, &c. — And since these *other distinguishing characters*
 of the *supreme GOD*, are expressly claimed by, and attributed to our
 Lord Jesus, there is no room to doubt, but that He intended to re-
 present Himself as the *omniscient GOD*, by saying, *All the churches*
shall know that I am HE which searcheth the reins and the hearts. —
 And considering how plainly, frequently and emphatically these
distinguishing characters of the *supreme GOD* are claimed by and at-
 tributed to CHRIST; it is absurd and arbitrary to require argu-
 ments for His *supreme DEITY*, from any other topics than these,
 which as plainly assert and prove it, as words can do. — Thus
 it appears that this argument for the *supreme DEITY* of CHRIST,
 remains good, notwithstanding all your author's labour to refute
 and overthrow it: — And indeed all that he himself pretends to,
 is, to have shewn it possible for Christ, by revelation from God, to
 know the miseries and wants of His servants, though Himself be not
 God; which is far from shewing that Christ is not God, or that
 He did not intend to represent Himself as God; and no ways af-
 fects, or weakens the argument I have used to show that He inten-
 tionally claims a *distinguishing character* of the *supreme GOD*. —
 To conclude this head; should any one be disposed to make the
 trial, and apply our author's reasoning against the *Omniscience* of
 CHRIST, against His *eternal Existence*, or *almighty creating Power*,
 as asserted in scripture; I am much mistaken if they would not
 have the mortification to be disappointed, and find themselves un-
 able to dress *falsehood* with so great an appearance of *truth*, as your
 author has done upon this topic: — And this will easily account
 for his preferring *this to any other*; and likewise prove him mistak-
 en, when he insinuates, that the same reasoning he has used here,
 will hold equally true when applied to any other divine perfection
 attributed to Christ: — If he means thus, there is as good a
 foundation

foundation for this way of reasoning against any other perfection, as that of *Omniscience*, I readily join with him:—But if he intends by it, that the same way of reasoning (or indeed any other), would have the like semblance of truth, when applied to those *other perfections* I have mentioned, as when applied to *this of Omniscience*, it is what I very much scruple:—It must be confessed, his reasoning here has a very specious appearance of truth; and may overset the ignorant and unstable; for which reason, I have dwelt the longer upon it; and more distinctly and particularly exposed its *fallacy*, than I should otherwise have done; and more largely vindicated *this point of Christ's Omniscience*; because some of my reasoning in the former part of this letter is grounded upon it; and as I have maintained this, so whatever depends upon the truth of it, remains good.

SECONDLY.—I proceed to argue the *supreme Deity* of JESUS CHRIST from that *worship and homage*, we are commanded to pay Him; and consider your author's objections against it.

THE *supreme DEITY* of JESUS CHRIST, is argued from the *worship and homage* we are commanded to pay to Him. Thus, the *suprem: GOD* only is the proper object of the religious worship and homage of his creatures, Mat. 4. 10. *It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God; and Him only shalt thou serve.* The disciples of our Saviour, yea angels, have refused to receive homage from men, they being all equally servants to their common Creator:—And, indeed, reason teaches us, that all our religious homage and praise, should be *ultimately* to the *supreme GOD*.—That whatever homage we pay to any created being, it should be *subordinate* to that which we pay to GOD, who is the Fountain of all Being; and from whom, men and angels derive all their happiness.—“This is a point never disputed, that I know of, by *Arian or Socinian* doctors.”—And, now that *religious worship* is to be paid to Christ, as the *ultimate object* of it, appears,

1st. FROM *John* 5. 23. That *all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*:—That is, says your author, “as truly, not as greatly; because the Father hath committed or given all judgment to Him.”—If I understand him here, he supposes that Christ's having *all judgment committed to Him*, is the sole ground and foundation of that *honour* which we are commanded to pay to Him; and therefore, that *this honour* must be *inferior* to that which we owe the Father:—Or, that though we are truly to honour Christ, yet we are not to honour Him as we honour the Father, or with the *same honour*:—But this conclusion is entirely overthrown by what follows in the very same verse.—“He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father.”—But if the Son's having *all judgment committed to Him*, is the sole ground of

of His claiming honour and homage from us, it will be difficult to show how and why His honour is so inseparably connected with the Father's. — If it be said, that he who neglects to honour the king's officer, or ambassador, neglects to honour the king himself. — I answer, that though such an one would neglect to honour the king in this particular instance; yet he might honour him in other instances; he might respect and honour his person and government in general, though he neglected to honour even the highest officer in his kingdom: — But here it is indefinitely declared, that he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father: i. e. he does not duly honour or glorify the Father, who refuses to honour and glorify the Son, as he does the Father. — Honour must therefore be due to the Son upon some other grounds, than that of His having all judgment committed to Him; even because He is true God; equal with the Father; and therefore as great and true honour is due to Him as to the Father; as great faith, love, fear, worship and obedience is due to the Son as to the Father. — It is absurd to suppose, that the honour of Almighty GOD, as due from us, is inseparably connected with the honour of any mere creature; and therefore since His honour is thus connected with the honour of Christ, to suppose Christ a mere creature, is absurd,

AGAIN,

2dly. THAT the same honour, homage or worship, is due to the Father and Son, and upon the same grounds, appears from Matth. 28. 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.

— Now, that baptism is an act of religious worship, can admit of no reasonable dispute: — It is represented in the new testament, as an essential branch of christianity: — It was constantly required of all who came into the church, or made a profession of Christ's religion in the apostle's time: — And our Saviour Himself makes it ordinarily necessary to salvation under the gospel, Mark 16. 16. — Moreover, if we consider the thing signified, or represented by this sacrament; the temper with which it should be received; whether personally, or for others; and the end that should be aimed at, and answered by it; it must appear to be a most important and solemn act of religious worship and homage: — And that it is so, as properly and immediately, with respect to the Son and Holy Ghost, as it is with respect to the Father, admits of no controversy. We are as truly and properly baptized in the name of the Son and Holy Ghost, as of the Father; and therefore this is an act of worship paid as immediately and as properly to the Son and Holy Ghost, as to the Father: — But, says your author, “ We are baptized in the name of the Son, because, All power in heaven and earth was given to Him: ” — Which he gathers from the preceding verse, — All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth; — therefore, go and baptize, &c. Now,

Now, it is plain, beyond all contradiction, that if Christ's having all power given Him, is asserted here as the only proper grounds of our being baptized in His name; the very same is the grounds of our being baptized in the Father's name; for the same reason (if any at all) is assigned for the one as the other:— And we may with the same propriety infer, that we are baptized in the Father's name, because all power is given to the Son, as that we are baptized in the Son's name for this reason; and therefore, it cannot be hence inferred that this is the proper and only ground of our being baptized in the name of the Son:—It is plain, that Christ's having all power given Him, is mentioned here only as the ground of His sending, or commissioning His disciples (as the Mediator between God and man, to teach and baptize all nations; and not as the reason of their being baptized in the name of the Son:— And thus it renewedly appears, that we are commanded to pay religious worship and homage to CHRIST, as the proper and ultimate object of it:— And that, as easy as your author insinuates it to be, he has not shewn, nor offered any thing of reason to the contrary. I might produce other instances, to the same purpose, were it necessary.— As *Phillippians* 2. 10.—*Hebrews* 1. 6.— Where, All the angels of God are commanded to worship HIM.— But it will sufficiently confirm what has been said (if there be need of farther testimony) to produce instances from scripture, where religious worship is evidently given to CHRIST, as the proper and ultimate object of it.

I FORBEAR mentioning the many instances of His receiving worship from His own disciples, and others, before His crucifixion and ascension; because it may be said, perhaps, that this was not religious worship; nor any thing more than what was common to pay to persons of distinction among the Jews:— Though I must confess I see no reason to suppose it any other than such worship as the disciples refused to receive, because they were men; and such as the angel refused to receive from St. John, because he was his fellow-servant.— The very same word is used in the original, for that worship which Christ received without any hesitation, as for that which the apostles and the angel refused, because they were men and fellow-servants.— From whence, I might argue, That this was such worship as no dignity of office, or nature, short of the DIVINE, was entitled to.

BUT there are also various instances, where religious worship and homage was paid our Lord JESUS, by the apostles after His ascension.

1. THERE is no more immediate act of worship and homage paid to Almighty GOD, than that of adoring Him, as the Creator and unchangeable Upholder of the universe:— And this homage, the author

author to the epistle to the *Hebrews*, chap. 1. 10, 11, 12. expressly attributes to our Lord JESUS :— *And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning, hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of Thy hands; they shall perish, but Thou remainest, &c.— Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail.*— Now, in what more solemn and immediate manner can we address the great GOD, and acknowledge and adore Him, as the Creator of heaven and earth; not to say, as an eternal, unchangeable Being?— It is most immediately applied to Him :— *And, Thou, Lord, &c.*— and terminates in Him, without any reserve or limitation. The Lord JESUS, therefore, who is thus addressed, is the proper immediate and ultimate object of this solemn, religious adoration.

AGAIN;

2. THE apostles, in almost all their epistles, *Bless the churches, or persons to whom they wrote, in the name of the Lord JESUS :— The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you*, is the common conclusion :— Which plainly implies an immediate supplication, or prayer to Christ for grace. And how Arian and Socinian doctors can use this apostolical form of blessing the church, and acquit themselves of idolatry, or worshipping a mere creature, while they look upon the Lord Jesus as such, I must confess is a mystery to me.

3. St. Peter attributes everlasting praise and dominion to Christ; see 1 epist. 4. 11. *To whom be praise and dominion forever and ever, amen.*— And, 2 epist. chap. 3 ult. *To Him be glory both now and forever, AMEN.*— Strange language this, to a mere creature?— *To one whose praise, dominion and glory must cease at the end of this world!*— But not to multiply arguments in so clear a case, I shall only mention those instances of religious worship and homage paid to CHRIST, Rev. 5. 12, 13, 14. *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 the earth, and under the earth, &c.— heard I, saying, blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever : And the four beasts, or living creatures said, amen :— And the four and twenty elders fell down, and worshipped Him that liveth forever and ever.*

To conclude this head; St. John tells us, Rev. 21. 22, in his description of the *New-Jerusalem*, that he saw no temple therein; for the Lord God Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple of it; and ver. 23. *The Lamb is the light thereof :—* Whence it plainly appears, that JESUS CHRIST, or the LAMB, shall be the object of our worship and praise, after your author divests Him of His powers, dominion, and dignity. — When we shall no longer need a temple

Temple made with hands; when all external ordinances, means and instruments of worship shall cease; then *the Lord God Almighty, and the Lamb*, shall be our temple and our sun; the place and object of our worship and praise shall be one, through an endless eternity.— Thus it appears that JESUS CHRIST is, and forever shall be, the immediate, proper and ultimate object of the *worship and homage* of all created beings.

BUT your author attempts to answer all that has been said, or can be said, to support the doctrine of CHRIST's *Divinity*, at once, by offering it as his judgment, that this subverts the gospel doctrine of his *mediation*.

BEFORE I particularly examine and answer his reasons for this, I beg leave to premise a few things, viz. (1.) That a consideration of the plain proofs and arguments which have been offered for the *supreme Deity* of JESUS CHRIST, will make a wise man exceeding cautious how he yields his faith to the contrary; without plain and intelligible arguments, or an over-balance of evidence and proof; either from scripture, or reason, or from both. (2.) In consideration of what has been said in vindication of the *supreme Deity* of CHRIST, it would be foolish to deny and disbelieve it, merely because there is something in it mysterious, hard to understand, and above or beyond the comprehension of our reason.—To believe things which are *contrary* to reason or common sense; or to invent and forge mysteries without any foundation, and recommend them for doctrines of truth, which ought to be believed, is absurd and foolish:—But to believe there is no truth *above*, or *beyond* the comprehension of our reason, is equally so; especially if they be such as respect the divine nature, perfections and attributes, which are *incomprehensible*: and which *none by searching can find out*.—Thus the ingenious and learned Doctor Leng observes; “That if a revelation from God is necessary to teach us any thing concerning the divine nature, and his designs towards mankind, and in relation to a future state, more than what we could naturally know before; it must of necessity be something which our reason could not discover:—And as far as the nature of an infinite being is concerned in it, it must exceed our finite capacities by the very nature of things; and yet the belief of it, when so revealed, may be very reasonable, so long as it implies no contradiction.”—He adds, “And indeed it would be a much greater prejudice against a revelation's being from God, if it had no marks in it of any thing but what human reason could have discovered without it.”—See Leng's sermon at Boyle's lect. p. 503. (3.) Before I distinctly consider your author's opinion, I would observe in general, what the common notion of *Trinitarians* is; and that which I imagine he intends to oppose, concerning Jesus Christ as our *Mediator*—It is briefly this, that in the one Godhead or Divine Essence, there are

three real differences, or distinct persons, represented and distinguished in scripture, by the names of *Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost* :—That these three *equally* partake of the one God head, or Divine Essence :—That the *second* of these divine persons, (viz. the SON,) in order to the redemption of mankind from moral evil and depravity, and eternal death and misery, (the just and necessary consequence of their rebellion and apostacy from God) freely and voluntarily engaged to be our *Mediator* and *Advocate*, to vindicate the honour and authority of the divine law, by assuming the human nature into a *personal union* with the divine ; which in due time he actually did, and hath forever vindicated and established the honour and authority of the divine law by His perfect obedience and sufferings :—That after His obedience and sufferings were completed, HE, (the *man Christ Jesus, personally united to the DIVINE NATURE*) ascended into heaven, to the place of GOD's most immediate presence and glory ; where He continues to offer and plead the worth and merit of His obedience and sufferings, in the behalf of sinners ; by virtue of which, divine grace and goodness, I mean *moral and mental excellencies*, such as are necessary to qualify us for a glorious immortality, as well as *natural enjoyments*, are freely dispensed to mankind ; and in particular to His true and sincere disciples, who have this confidence above others, that if they *ask any thing in His name, and agreeable to His will, they are heard* ; and that, *of His fulness they shall receive, and grace for grace*.——This in general is the common notion those have of JESUS CHRIST, as *Mediator*, who oppose your author.

LET us now inquire, Whether any thing he has said, shews *this notion* of JESUS CHRIST, as *Mediator*, to be false, or inconsistent :——And, Whether it is not perfectly agreeable to the *scripture account* of this matter.

1st. THEN—It is objected, “ If we must have one who is *supreme* God and man, for our *Mediator* with God ; then, when we address to Jesus Christ as the *supreme* God, where is the *God-man*, that must be our *Mediator* with him ? To say, He mediates with *Himself*, is the same as to say, we must go to Him *without* a *Mediator*, &c.”

ANSWER—It is not pretended, that GOD, or the Deity of Jesus Christ, simply considered, is our *Mediator* with God ; nor yet, that Christ as *meer man*, is to be worshipped :—But, agreeable to what has been premised, that the *human nature*, or the *man Christ Jesus*, though as united to the *divine*, acts as *Mediator*.——So that when we address to Jesus Christ as the *supreme* God, our *Mediator* is the *man Christ Jesus* united to the God, or *divine nature*.——Where then is there any want of a *Mediator* ?——Here is one, as truly and properly, as when we address to GOD the Father, the *man Christ*

Christ Jesus, or the human nature as united to the divine, is our Mediator, whether we address, adore or worship the Deity of the Father, Son, or Holy-Ghost. — But,

2dly. — It is objected, That this is still to make Christ Mediator with Himself; — the man Christ mediates with the God Christ: — Besides, the man is not God-man.

ANSWER. — It is true, this is supposing that Christ, as man, but united to the divine nature, mediates with Himself as GOD: — But this by no means subverts the doctrine of His mediation, when we address to Him as GOD: — Nor yet does it make the Deity, which we address to, or adore, a Mediator, with Himself. — The man-Christ, as united to the divine nature, is our Mediator with GOD the Father, Son and Holy-Ghost: — And this man-Christ, it is not pretended, is to be addressed to, adored, or worshipped, as a divine person; or the ultimate object of our religious homage; which would be gross idolatry. So that we neither include the Mediator, by whom we worship, and the object of our worship, in one, nor confound them together. — We address to JESUS CHRIST, as being the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person; Heb. 1. 3, i. e. We adore and worship HIM as GOD, exclusive of any personal union with our nature; but we esteem Him as man united to the divine nature, to be our Mediator; — and as such we go to GOD by Him. — Thus, When I pray to JESUS CHRIST, it is as GOD; and I humbly hope to be heard and answered through the mediation of the man Christ Jesus, who is every way qualified for this office, by virtue of His union to the divine nature.

BUT it will perhaps be objected: Is not this supposing mankind destitute of a Mediator till the incarnation of the SON of GOD? — If it be the man Christ Jesus that is the Mediator, — Who was Mediator before there was such a man? — And, Did not the DIVINE WORD (or LOGOS) immediately interpose and act as Mediator upon the fall of our first parents, and so for 4000 years before He was made flesh, or assumed the human nature, and while the human nature was a child, &c?

ANSWER. To remove these difficulties, let it be observed, —

FIRST, That the mediation of Christ consists of two parts, the intercessory and expiatory. Heb. 11. 25. He ever liveth to make intercession for them. 1 Pet. 3. 18. For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust. — And, Heb. 10. 14. By one offering, he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified, &c.

SECONDLY — The expiatory part of Christ's mediation is the ground and basis of the intercessory. — To suppose an advocate

Intercessor

Intercessor who has nothing to plead or represent in favour of those He intercedes for, is absurd :—And to suppose that our Intercessor represents or pleads any personal accomplishments or qualifications of mankind in their favour, is no less so. For would our personal accomplishments and qualifications, recommend us to GOD, we should no longer need a Mediator or Intercessor :—Such an office would be quite superfluous. We must therefore conclude, that our Intercessor has something of His own to plead and represent in favour of mankind, in order to their obtaining the divine favour and forgiveness.——And if so, if this is the condition of our acceptance with God, that some One represent an adequate merit of His own in our favour, we must conclude that the Mediator between God and man, did actually plead and present an adequate merit of His own in favour of man immediately upon his fall ; or as soon as he fell under such circumstances as to need a Mediator (which all agree was soon after his creation, and at the time of his eating the forbidden fruit) otherwise His mediation would be insufficient, i. e. The *Divine Word*, did actually intercede for man, and plead an adequate merit in his favour, immediately upon his fall, or first transgression. But then,

THIRDLY—Let it be observed, That the *expiatory* part of this mediation which is carrying on between God and man, consists in yielding perfect obedience to, and suffering the penalty annexed to, the broken law ; and as the *Divine Word* (or *Logos*) was incapable of either of these, so He could never plead in man's favour the actual performance and execution of this fundamental part of the mediation.——He therefore (as hath been premised) engaged to vindicate the honour and authority of the divine law, by assuming the human nature into a personal union with Himself ; which, in these circumstances, was capable of performing *this* part of the mediation, of bringing in an everlasting righteousness, or a merit adequate to the offences of all mankind :—And *this* engagement the *Divine Word*, (or *Logos*) pleaded and represented in favour of mankind, till such time as the engagement was fulfilled and executed by the obedience and sufferings of the man *Christ Jesus*, personally united to the *Logos* :——Hence He is stiled, *The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world*.——But since He hath performed the *expiatory* part of the mediation, He, the man *Christ Jesus*, as united to the *Divine Word*, (or *Logos*) ever liveth to plead the actual performance and execution ; and represent the worth and value of it in favour of mankind.——And, as the man *Christ Jesus* is personally united to the *Divine Word* (or *Logos*), so the same person pleads and represents His perfect righteousness and bitter death in our favour, who pleaded and represented his engagement to obey and suffer in favour of mankind immediately after their fall.——The *Divine Word* (or the *Logos*) and the man *Christ Jesus* are one person :——Hence there seems to be a special propriety in stiling our Mediator (when we consider Him

merely

merely as such) *The man Christ Jesus*; or, *the man Christ Jesus our Mediator*.—HE, as united to the *divine nature*, actually performed the *expiatory* part of the mediation between GOD and man; and though the merit and value of this was pleaded and represented in favour of mankind long before there was such a man; yet now *He* (the *man Christ Jesus*, as united to the *DIVINE NATURE*) ever lives to perform this: *HE is our merciful and faithful High-Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people; for in that HE Himself hath suffered, being tempted, HE is able to succour them that are tempted,*

In short, *the man Christ Jesus*, as united to the *LOGOS*, was, in effect, the *Mediator* between God and men from the fall of our first parents.—HE was such by engagement and promise from the *LOGOS*; and the merit and value of His future righteousness and sufferings, were represented in favour of man as soon as his fallen circumstances required any such recommendation.—If it be inquired, *How this promise and engagement could be a sufficient ground of man's acceptance with God, and what right the LOGOS had to enter into a promise and engagement, in which a man to be born 4000 years after, was so directly and immediately concerned?*—*I answer*—That I see no way to solve this, if we allow the *LOGOS* to be no more than a *mere creature*: But if we allow Him to be *true God*, the answer is obvious and easy; for as God is unchangeable, and hath all power, wisdom and perfection, so his promise and engagement is as safe a ground to act, believe and hope upon, as actual performance and execution:—And as to his right of making such a promise and engagement;—HE had the same right to do this, that He had to create man or any other being.—Besides, as *the man* who was so directly and immediately concerned in the fulfilment of this promise, was to be personally united to the *LOGOS* who made it; so the promise itself was personal:—The person that promised, was the person that should, and has, fulfilled this promise; which effectually removes the supposed difficulty.

BUT it is objected,

3dly, THAT the *human nature* of Christ can never be an *effectual* Mediator (according to those your author opposes.)—No, not though it were *personally united* to the *divine*,—because they deny this *human nature*, so united, to have the knowledge of the secret, mental prayers, the inward desires and distresses of all christians: or, to know any one's heart:—And how then can He be a *compassionate Intercessor* in cases he knows nothing of? &c.

ANSWER,—It is indeed denied, that the *human nature* of Christ, though personally united to the *divine*, has an *inherent* knowledge of the cases and desires of christians, or the hearts of men, i. e. that *Jesus Christ* knows all things merely by virtue of His *human nature*.

— But

But it is acknowledged, that the *divine nature* knows all things; and that by virtue of the *union* of the *human nature* to it, all needed knowledge is communicated or imparted from the GOD to the man, so render the latter an *official Mediator*, a *compassionate Intercessor*, a *merciful High-Priest* and *Advocate for us*.—No man in his senses ever yet pretended, that the man *Christ*, who is our Mediator, could not and did not know the cases and desires, &c. of mankind:—But then it is denied, that He has an *inherent* knowledge of these things.—The man *Christ*, who is our Mediator, knows our cases, wants, desires, &c. by virtue of His *union* to the *divine nature*:—And surely your author could not think His mediation ineffectual on this account, viz. because His knowledge of our cases, desires, &c. is not *inherent* in the *human nature*, exclusive of the *divine*, to which it is united;—Especially for the very same reason. He must renounce His own account of the Mediator:—For He supposes that His knowledge comes by revelation from GOD; if not universally and at all times, yet in some degree, and at some times, and in particular the knowledge He had of the churches of *Africa*.—“If any should ask (says he, p. 30.) “How Jesus Christ comes to know all that He reveals in the seven epistles to the seven churches, &c. the very first words of the book of the Revelations may be an answer.—It was the revelation which God gave to Jesus Christ, &c.”—He adds, “No wonder then, that He says, He knows their works,—their hearts, and their approaching judgments, when His own vast abilities are assisted by God’s revelation.”

AND now let me inquire,—How can Christ can be an *official Mediator*, if He does not know the cases, wants and desires of His Servants, but by revelation from another, even the GOD be meditates with?—Nay, farther, your author supposes our Mediator to be inhabited by and related to GOD, in order to this office:—By which expressions, if he means any thing, I think it must be this, viz. That He is immediately under the *divine influence* and direction; is qualified for and assisted in this office by GOD himself.—And what comfort or hope can we have from this mediation? The same GOD we address to, must influence, direct, and assist the Mediator, by whom we address Him, and through whom we hope for acceptance; and Almighty GOD influences, directs and assists *one creature* to meditate with him in the behalf of *another*: And does not this make the mediation of Christ all mere form and ceremony? It is GOD influences, assists and directs in the mediation; it is his wisdom, power and goodness that is employed in the mediation; and therefore the mediation is in effect his own:—It is GOD that mediates with himself, by Jesus Christ; and no longer Christ that mediates with GOD:—And in this view of the thing, will it not be proper, when we address to Almighty GOD, to beseech him, in the first place, to influence, direct and assist the man Christ Jesus to mediate with him in our behalf? And yet a question

Question remains, — By whom, or through whose mediation shall we make this necessary request? — We must go directly and immediately to God, and pray him to direct, assist and reveal our wants to our Mediator; or enable Him to mediate for us: — And what is this better than to have no Mediator? — Thus fell and plain does your author's objection stand against his own account of the Mediator; and has no force at all against that which he opposes; because it is not pretended that the *man Christ Jesus* is not acquainted with our cases, wants and desires; by virtue of its union to the *divine nature*, so far as to render Him an *effectual Mediator and Advocate* for us: — But that the *man Christ* has not this knowledge inherently, or exclusively of the union of the *human* to the *divine nature*. — The knowledge of the *man Christ*, or Mediator, is communicated or imparted to Him from the *divine nature*, or DEITY, by virtue of this union, in a manner different from what is commonly called divine revelation, or inspiration, such as the prophets and apostles had: — But what the particular modes and properties of this union are, or in what manner and degree the *human* partakes of the powers and properties of the *divine nature*, by virtue of it, I shall not pretend to determine; it being vastly above the reach and comprehension of my weak, shallow reason: — It is sufficient for my present purpose, that nothing your author has offered, in the least militates against this account of Christ's mediation, or at least nothing but what equally militates against his own.

I SHALL now inquire, whether it be not every way agreeable to *scripture*, as well as *reason*: —

1st. — It is not pretended, that the scriptures any where tell us in express terms, or in just so many words and syllables, that there are *Three persons in the God-head*, or *ONE divine Essence*. — But that the Godhead, or divine nature, is spoken of under the notion of *three real differences*, or *distinctions*; I think beyond all contradiction. — St. *John* tells us, 1 epist. 5. 7. — *There are Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these Three are One*: — And these *Three*, the Father, the Word (or Son) and the Holy-Ghost, are frequently spoken of as really *distinct* from each other. — St. *John* wishes to the elect lady, *grace, mercy and peace from God the Father; and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father*: — And our Saviour tells His disciples, *John* 14. 26. — *But the Comforter, which is the Holy-Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, &c.* — And we are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy-Ghost; and blessed in their names *distinctly*, at the same time, and *separately* at different times: — Which both evidence that these distinctions are real; or, that they actually subsist in the divine nature; and that they *equally* partake of all divine perfections and attributes: — The same perfections are attributed to, and the same worship and

homage

A LETTER to the DEDICATOR

homage paid, to each of these distinctions, or differences.——The Father is represented and worshipped as GOD *supreme*; and so is the Son, as hath been largely shewn; and the same might be made to appear of the Holy-Ghost. Ananias is charged with lying to the Holy-Ghost, Acts 5. 3. It follows in the next verse, *Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.*——So the Holy-Ghost is said to have dictated the scriptures, 2 Pet. 1. 21. But it is needless to multiply texts of this nature.——There is the same evidence in scripture, that there is a Son, and an Holy Ghost, as that there is a Father; and there is likewise the same evidence that the Son is GOD, and that the Holy Ghost is GOD, as that the Father is GOD:——The same perfections are attributed, the same worship is paid to each, distinctly and separately, as to them all, jointly considered, as one divine Essence, or nature.——And now, What shall we call these distinctions in the one divine nature or Godhead?——They are described as real, as plainly as words can express:——Nothing is more expressly or plainly taught in scripture, than that these three distinctions, the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost, do actually subsist in the one God-head, or divine nature.——That there is but one God, we are sure of, both from reason and scripture:——That there is a Father, a Son, and an Holy-Ghost, the scriptures likewise assure us:——That these distinctions are not imaginary, but real, is likewise certain:——They are represented as real as Peter, John and Paul; for the Father sends the Holy-Ghost in the name of the Son:——And it is moreover evident, that the same divine perfections and honours are given to each of these distinctions; and therefore, since there is but one God-head or Deity, they must all subsist in that.——And since we cannot convey our ideas without words, especially in speculative points; by what terms, word, or sound, can we convey our ideas of these distinctions better, than by calling them persons?——However, I shall not contend about this particular word, or sound:——If another can be found by which we can convey our ideas of these distinctions better, I shall readily embrace it:——And if not, I am content to call them, real distinctions, or differences; and to say, that in the Godhead of Deity, there are three real distinctions or differences; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and, to distinguish the Father from the other two, to call him the first difference in the Godhead, or Deity; the Son, the second difference, and the Holy Ghost the third; instead of saying, there are three persons in the Godhead, that the Father is the first person, the Son the second, and the Holy Ghost the third.——Words are arbitrary, and often change and lose their use and meaning:——Men may therefore call these distinctions by what names they please; but the nature and truth of things is not so variable; and therefore, by whatever names we call, or by whatever sounds we convey, our ideas of these distinctions; it does not, and cannot, destroy their truth and reality.——Peter and John will be two men, though we should call them Paul and Barnabas; or compound and confound their names together, in one single word.

Of terms :—And there is a *Father*, a *Son*, and an *Holy-Ghost* ; c^t *three* real distinctions or differences, in the *one* divine nature or Deity, which the scripture represents by these terms. — Nor will our giving *these* new names, or comprehending them all in one single word or term, destroy or alter the truth and reality of them : — There will still be a *Father*, a *Son*, and an *Holy Ghost* : — The *Father* will still be GOD ; the *Son* will be GOD ; and the *Holy-Ghost* will be GOD : — That is, these *three* will still subsist in the *one* Godhead, or Deity ; and *equally* partake of all divine and incommunicable perfections and attributes : — The *Father* will be infinitely wise, powerful, holy, just, &c. and so will the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost* : The *Father* will be the proper and ultimate object of our religious worship and homage ; and so will the *Son* and the *Holy Ghost* ; and yet there is but *one* Deity, or divine nature, in which these perfections dwell, and in whom this worship and homage must terminate.

If it be inquired, *How can these things be ?* — Or objected, That this is talking without ideas. — I answer, That the particular *nature* and *manner* of these distinctions or differences, subsisting in the Godhead or Deity, is a *secret* which infinite wisdom has not discovered to us : — But to disbelieve the *truth* and *reality* of these distinctions, when plainly asserted in the *scriptures of truth*, merely on *this* account, because the nature and manner of them is inscrutable, would be foolish and presumptuous. — When we speak of *these*, we indeed talk without ideas, so far as the subject is *above* our comprehension : i. e. We have no just ideas of the *nature* and *manner* of these distinctions or differences subsisting in the Godhead ; but we have very clear and distinct ideas of their *truth* and *reality*, which the scripture *plainly* asserts : — In like manner, When we speak of the GREAT GOD, we talk without any adequate ideas of his nature and perfections, or *manner* of existence ; the subject is vastly *above* the reach and comprehension of our reason : — But we may have very clear and distinct ideas, and a rational, firm belief of his being, power, wisdom, &c. and with the utmost propriety discourse of them. — So that our not being able to explain the *particular nature* and *manner* of *these* distinctions or differences subsisting in the divine nature, is no reasonable prejudice against their *truth* and *reality* : — And our not having clear and distinct ideas of their nature and manner of subsisting, is no argument that we have not clear and distinct ideas of their *truth* and *reality* ; or, that we cannot discourse of them with the utmost propriety, and believe them upon the principles of the strictest reason. — What I intend, is this — That the nature and manner of a thing's existing, being *above* our reason, is no argument that the thing does not *really* exist ; and our not being able to frame just and adequate ideas of its nature and manner of existence, is no obstacle to our having clear and distinct ideas, that it does exist ; and consequently, this

is no reasonable prejudice against the *truth* and *reality* of it; or, against our believing it, if there be *sufficient evidence* to ground our faith upon, such as the *word of God* is generally allowed to be, by professing christians.—And if it be allowed, as I think it must be, then it can be no unreasonable thing for us to believe what is commonly called, *The doctrine of the TRINITY in unity*, or that there are *three* real distinctions in the Godhead; since the scripture very plainly represents the Deity under this notion, or teaches us, that there is a *Father*, a *Son*, and an *Holy Ghost*, who separately, and jointly, have divine incommunicable perfections attributed to them, and religious worship and homage paid them; unless some *other* reason can be offered why we should not, besides *this*, that the nature and manner of these *three* distinctions subsisting in the *one* Godhead or Deity, is *above* our comprehension, and what we can frame no just and adequate ideas of.

BUT I proceed to say,

2dly—It is not pretended that the scriptures any where expressly assert, that the SON of GOD, or divine LOGOS, or the *second* distinction or difference in the Deity, assumed a *human* soul and body into a *personal union* with Him:—But thus much the scriptures plainly and expressly teach us, that JESUS CHRIST had a body, and a soul; and that He is *truly* GOD, or a *divine person*.—That Jesus Christ had a true and real body, is indisputable:—That He had a soul or spirit, such an intelligent, active principle as is common to all men, I think none can doubt, who read the *new testament*:—We find that His reason, understanding and judgment, were gradual, or progressive; as is the case with all men, however superior and extensive they might be:—Luke 2. 40, 52.—*And the Child grew, and waxed strong in spirit*, or, by the spirit, *filled with wisdom*:—*And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man*.—And the same passions and affections are found in Him, that are common to all men; and are the appendages of human nature in its original; such as love, joy, sorrow, compassion, &c.—*He wept over the city of Jerusalem*, at a view of their stupidity, hardness of heart, and approaching judgments, Luke 19. 41.—*He loved, and groaned and wept over Lazarus*, John 11. 33.—*And how exceeding sorrowful, grieved and dejected, was He at the prospect of His own sufferings*, Matth. 26. *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death*.—John 12. 27. *Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say?*—Thus it appears beyond all reasonable contradiction, that JESUS CHRIST had a *true body* and a *reasonable soul*; or, such an intelligent, active principle, as is common to all men:—And (as hath been largely shewn) the scripture no less plainly, expressly and distinctly represent Him as *true* GOD, or a *divine person*; as the *second* distinction or difference in the Deity, called by way of empha-

ence

Hence the SON of GOD :——It attributes such perfections and excellencies to Him, and commands, both by precept and example, such worship and homage to be paid to Him, as we are sure can belong to no creature, however dignified by office and station.——We must therefore conclude, that Jesus Christ has *something more* than true a body and a reasonable soul, or mere *humanity*; something more than common divine inspiration and influence, such as the prophets and apostles had; and something more than a dignified office and character in the universe; since none nor all of *these*, though possessed in the *highest* degree, could entitle him to these *divine* perfections and attributes; or this *religious* worship and homage :——In order to these, He must be *true* GOD; a *divine* person, eternally and essentially possessed of *these* perfections and excellencies :——And if so, JESUS CHRIST, has a *true human body*, and such an intelligent, active principle, or *soul*; as is common to all men; and is *true* GOD, possessed of infinite, divine perfections; and entitled to *religious* worship and homage :——How can we better express our notion or idea of this, than by saying, that the SON of GOD, the *second person* of the *Trinity*, or the *second distinction*, or *difference* in the *Deity*, is *personally united* to the *human nature*; or the *human nature* is *personally united* to that?——The same JESUS CHRIST, who is expressly described, and called *man*, is also represented as *true* GOD, the *mighty* GOD, the *omniscient* GOD, the *heart-searching* GOD, &c.——Nay, further, the GOD and the *man* are so far *one*, that, in some instances, the *act* of the GOD, or *Divinity*, is attributed to the *humanity*; and on the contrary, that of the *humanity* to the *Divinity*; and of *both*, to JESUS CHRIST :——See, 1 Tim. 2. 5, 6. *The man* Christ Jesus, *who gave Himself a ransom for all*.——Acts 20. 28, *Take heed, —to feed the church of God, which HE hath purchased with His own blood*.——Here we see, that the GOD and the *man* both claim the *same act*, that of ransoming or purchasing the church :——The *man* gave himself, or shed his blood, and GOD purchased it with his own blood.——And, Rev. 5. 9. we are told, that CHRIST, *hath redeemed us by His own blood*.——Now, it is difficult for us to express our notion or idea of the GOD and *man's* being *one* in JESUS CHRIST, so far as to lay a positive and *personal* claim to His act of shedding His blood, or giving Himself to suffer for the redemption of sinners, better, than by saying, that there is a *personal union* of the two natures, the *divine* and *human*, in JESUS CHRIST :——Nor will any reasonable man contend with *this manner* of expressing it, till he finds a better.——I know that our not being able to explain the *nature* and *manner* of this *union*, is frequently urged as an argument against the truth and reality of it :——But I have already shewn this to be absurd and foolish :——It may as well be urged against the being of a GOD; yea, and of any thing else, as against the truth and reality of *this* doctrine, or proposition,——“*The JESUS CHRIST is truly man, and truly GOD;*” or, that He has

true body, a reasonable soul, (such as is common to all men; as to the nature and essence, however it may differ in its extensive powers and capacities) and a divine nature or substance; since they are so clearly, distinctly and expressly revealed in the scriptures of truth.

— We are not more fully assured of any thing which the scripture reveals, and is discoverable no other way, than we are of this, viz. That JESUS CHRIST is true GOD and man; for, *In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*, Col. 2. 9.

GOD did not barely inspire, influence and direct Him, (which I suppose is what your author intends by His being *inhabited* by GOD;) but the Divinity dwelt in Him, *bodily*, i. e. *personally and substantially*; so as to make HIM true GOD, possessed of all infinite, divine perfections, and worthy of all religious homage and worship.

— And this is exactly agreeable to the apostle Paul's account of the Mediator, 1 Tim. 2; which your author pretends is in favour of his opinion, and seems desirous to build his faith upon it.

— Indeed, if we take only the single text, which your author mentions, ver. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*:— This seems to make our Mediator a mere man.

— But how unreasonable is it, to take single texts and scraps of scripture, and draw conclusions from them repugnant to the general tenor of scripture, the current of the discourse, from which they are taken, and the true design of the texts themselves.

— A conduct which your author cannot easily be acquitted of in this instance.

— If we take the apostle's whole discourse, or first epistle to Timothy, it will very plainly appear, that he did not design to represent our Mediator as a mere man:— He begins the epistle with this account of his apostleship, that it was *by the commandment of God, and our Lord Jesus Christ*:— He next prays to God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, for mercy and peace upon his son Timothy:—

In ver. 11, he styles the gospel of Christ, *The glorious gospel of the blessed God*; and thanks Christ Jesus, who had counted him faithful, putting him into the ministry; and who had enabled him to preach His gospel:—

Ver. 16, he tells us, That for this cause he obtained mercy, that in him first, Jesus Christ (not God the Father) might shew forth all long suffering, &c.—

And chap. 3d. 16, he tells us, That without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness, GOD was manifest in the flesh:—

He adds, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory:— Which shews, that he designed by this to describe our Lord Jesus Christ; and His first characteristic is, That HE was GOD manifest in the flesh;—

And chap. 6. 15, he styles Him, *The blessed and only Potentate; the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; who only hath immortality, &c.*—

And one would think, after all this, that neither Timothy, nor any other, who read this epistle, could be in the least danger of taking JESUS CHRIST for a mere man, or that St. Paul intended to represent Him as such,

MOREOVER,

MOREOVER,—If our *Mediator* be a mere man, or creature, as your author supposes, it will be difficult to shew what end His *mediation* answers; or, what hope or comfort we can possibly derive from it, however He be dignified and exalted by His natural endowments, and appointed character, or office.——**JESUS CHRIST** is represented, as our *atonement* before the injured **DEITY**; and as our *sacrifice*; as being made a curse for us; as bearing the chastisement of our peace:——**HE** hath appeared, to take away sin, by the sacrifice of Himself;—and hath by once offering up, himself, forever perfected those that believe:——**He** came to reconcile the world of sinners to the offended **DEITY**, by offering, himself without spot;—and as by the transgression of one, many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous:——But how can these things be effected, any more by the sufferings and obedience of **CHRIST** (if a mere man, or created being) than by those of any other man?——**HIS** great endowments, His dignified office, or any derived excellency cannot qualify Him for it:——These will not enable Him to do or suffer any thing on our account, by way of atonement; because, from him, to whom much is given, shall much be required:——**GOD** Almighty justly expects a return from every creature in proportion to the powers and abilities they are endowed with, and the office and character they sustain in the universe:——This is evident from natural reason, and the famous parable of the talents:——And, therefore, if **JESUS CHRIST** be a mere creature, He can do nothing for us, by way of atonement with the offended **DEITY**.——Again, **JESUS CHRIST** is represented, as our *Intercessor* and *Advocate* in heaven; as Him by whom only we can have access to **GOD**:——But if a mere man, of what service can He be to us there?——What has He to plead that can gain us audience and acceptance, to recommend our imperfect prayers and services to the **DEITY**, more than another man?——**HIS** knowing our cases, wants and desires, and pitying them, can be to no purpose, in point of our being heard, accepted, and answered by the divine Majesty; for He cannot be a means of, informing **HIM**, who knows all things:——And He has nothing to represent, or plead in our behalf, if a mere creature; **HE** hath done no more than was His duty, and is the duty of every created being, viz. To be submissive, resigned and obedient to the will and pleasure of the Creator, whether it be to do or suffer.——To conclude this head:——According to your author's account of the *Mediator*, we have no rational grounds to hope for the divine mercy and forgiveness, through His *mediation* or *intercession*;——**GOD**'s being reconcilable to us, by or through, **CHRIST JESUS**, is mere sound:——We may no longer, with any propriety, plead the merits, atonement, the obedience and sufferings of **CHRIST**, before Him, under a notion or hope of being heard and answered on their account:——And, in one word, we may no longer ask any thing of him, in **CHRIST**'s name, or for His sake, intending by it, that

He

A LETTER to the DEDICATOR

He would be graciously pleased, in consideration of what CHRIST hath done and suffered for sinners, to hear, forgive, and answer us; for Christ is a creature, as well as we; and at most has done no more than improve and employ the powers and faculties, gifts and accomplishments bestowed upon Him, agreeably to the will and pleasure of His Creator.——Thus entirely does your author subvert the doctrine and worth of CHRIST's mediation:——Thus does it overthrow the hope of christians; necessitating us to despair of the divine mercy and forgiveness; or seek it some other way, than by and through the merits and mediation, or obedience and sufferings of our Lord JESUS CHRIST.

Your author complains, that as there are two principal distinguishing doctrines of christianity, relating to the unity of the supreme GOD, and the one Mediator with him, so the Trinitarians have lost them both, among their several parties, &c.——They who leave room for a Mediator, destroy the unity of GOD:——On the other hand——They who hold true to the divine unity, or one infinite Being, under three modes, or properties, or relations, have no room for a Mediator, &c.——But surely, it cannot be thought, that because two different opinions of the one GOD and one Mediator, are repugnant to your author's account of this matter, therefore both of them are false:——Besides, What could be said, if I should rank the letter of the parties, your author mentions, with himself; or call them a party of Unitarians; and urge how they are divided in their sentiments of the one GOD and Mediator?——They certainly approach as near to your author's opinion, as to that of Trinitarians, properly so called; who, though they hold that there are three distinct persons, or real differences, in the God-head; yet they firmly believe with St. John, That those THREE are ONE; one DEITY, or divine nature; and therefore, they do not destroy the unity of GOD, while they leave room for an able Mediator:——And though this should be stiled, babbling without ideas; saying what we do not understand, or affirming nonsense and contradictions; yet the faith of a wise man will stand unshaken, while it has so rational and solid a basis as that of GOD's word.——And if the pride and vanity of some men carries them into such a wild extreme, as to make their own understanding the standard of all truth and possibility; and turn all into ridicule that soars above the reach and comprehension of their reason, we should be exceeding cautious how we follow them, least it be at the expence of truth; and least, by avoiding what their pride and ostentation, their imaginary wit and penetration, files nonsense and contradiction, we should fall into that which is truly such; as all doctrines that are repugnant to the word of GOD, are.

THE next thing your author flies to is, St. Peter's description of the Lord JESUS, Acts 2. 22, and 36. Ye men of Israel, hear these words.

words, *Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, &c.*—
 And let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made the
 same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.——It
 is true in these words the apostle is aiming at such a description of
 CHRIST, as might strike the murderers with horror, and bring
 them to a true repentance of their crime; and therefore he describes
 Him as to His *humanity*; which alone was capable of suffering and
 being murdered:——To have told his audience, that they had
 killed the *infinite GOD* himself, would have been to the last degree
 absurd and foolish; and instead of bringing them to a sense and re-
 pentance of their crime, would have exposed Him to their ridicule
 and scorn:——He therefore tells them, that the man they had cru-
 cified, was approved of God among them, by miracles, signs and wond-
 ers, which God did by Him; and that now God had made the same
 man both Lord and Christ; which is not denied:—But in this same
 speech he gives plain intimations, that JESUS CHRIST was not a
 mere man, when he refers to the words of David, concerning Him,
The Lord said unto my Lord, &c. ver. 34.——With these words our
 Saviour confounds the Pharisees, who answered, that Christ was the
 son of David, meaning that he was a mere man, Mat. 22. 42:——
 But, says our Saviour, *David called Him Lord in spirit, or by divine*
inspiration; and if David call Him Lord, how is He his son?——
 Our Saviour, no doubt intended, that this represented Christ, or the
 Messiah, to be something more than a mere son of David, or merely a
 man; or else it will be difficult to make sense of what he says, or
 apply his words to any wise and rational purpose:—And therefore
 since St. Peter applies these to CHRIST, in his description of Him,
 before His murderers, he might with the utmost safety direct those
 of them that were convinced, and inquired, *What they should do to*
be saved? to believe in this Christ, such as he had described Him,
 and be baptized in His name; which is both an evidence and an
 acknowledgment of His Divinity; it being a most solemn act of
 religious worship, paid to CHRIST personally and immediately, as hath
 been already shewn.

I SHALL take but a very brief and cursory view of your author's
 Sect. III. with which he concludes his argument; as it cannot pos-
 sibly be thought to have much weight in it to support his cause;
 and as I have already drawn out this letter vastly beyond what I at
 first intended.

1. FIRST then, It is acknowledged, That GOD and CHRIST,
 if we hold to the strict *etymology* of the word CHRIST, cannot be
 properly predicated one of the other; the name CHRIST, in its
 primary and most proper sense, “signifies one anointed, and raised
 by authority and honour conferred;” as we acknowledge the man
 Christ Jesus, or the humanity of our Saviour to be, Heb. 1. 9.—
God, even His God, hath anointed Him with the oil of gladness above
His

A LETTER to the DEDICATOR

His followers :—But we must remember His name is JESUS, as well as CHRIST ; the import of which we may see, Matt. i. 23. *It is Emmanuel, which being interpreted, is, GOD with us* :—So that if we may not with the strictest propriety, or agreeable to the etymology of the name, call Christ GOD, because it signifies one *united*, &c. yet we may thus stile JESUS CHRIST ; for His being called JESUS, imports Him to be Emmanuel, or God with us. —“ But if the business can be saved here, by supposing a personal union between GOD and CHRIST, or JESUS, and the *anointed* : —“ Why may not the *Papists* set up another union such between Christ’s body, and the bread, in the *Eucharist* ; and stoutly defend, that it is the *body of Christ* properly ?”

ANSWER. (1st.) Because there is no such foundation in scripture for supposing that the bread in the *Eucharist* is the body of Christ *substantially*, as that GOD and CHRIST, or the *divine* and *human* natures, are united to each other *personally*. — And, (2dly.) Because the *Romish* doctrine of *transubstantiation*, is of a very different nature from that in dispute :—It supposes a real *change of the substance*, contrary to the united judgment and testimony of our reason and senses ; but this cannot be objected in the present case :— There are therefore good reasons why the *Papists* cannot maintain or defend the doctrine of *transubstantiation* with the same justice and propriety, that we can the *Divinity* of our Saviour ; or the *union* of the *divine* and *human* natures in the person of JESUS CHRIST.

SECONDLY. — I shall not pretend to determine what use some may have made of the *bailed* arguments of *Papists*, when they wrote against the *Unitarians*, in vindication of the *Divinity* of Christ :— But this I am bold to affirm, that they have no need to do it in one single instance ; — and that they have not done it in the instances your author mentions. — 1. No one surely at this day pretends, that the novelty of *Arian* principles is much of an objection against them, (as the *Papists* hold that the novelty of *Protestantism* is against that :) Alas ! They are *antique* enough to claim our veneration, if *that* alone was sufficient, having been extant at times for almost 1500 years ; passed through various changes and fancied emendations ; been once and again suppressed and revived in *Europe*, *Asia* and *Africa* ; obtaining sometimes in a very surprising manner, through that love of novelty, which is rooted in our nature ; but have never obtained long at once, to any considerable degree, in either of those parts of the world :— Allow me to guess the reason, — That when they become common, and their novelty ceased to recommend them ; when men come to calm and serious consideration, they easily see their *fallacy* and *dangerous tendency*, and quickly rejected them. — This is the novelty objected perhaps by some against your author’s opinion ; which certainly is no commendation to it ; and I humbly trust, (if nothing else will do it) that this will prevent its obtaining long, and to any great degree, in

N^o 22

New-England.—2. It is judged, That our Saviour's being styled, the *image of God*, is no argument that He is not GOD; and yet it is thought at the same time a probable argument, That the Fathers did not look upon the elements to be *changed* into the real substance of Christ's body and blood, in the sense which *Papists* hold, because they oft call them the *images* thereof.——There is too manifest a difference between these propositions, to need any illustration.——It is not supposed, That CHRIST is called the *image of GOD*, with respect to His *humanity*; for that can bear but a faint resemblance to the DEITY, to which nothing may be likened or compared—but that He is the *image of GOD*, i. e. of the *Father*, in respect of His *Divinity*:——The *second* distinction or difference in the DEITY is the *express image* of the *first*. On the other hand,—The *Papists* suppose the elements to be transubstantiated, or changed into the real substance of CHRIST's body and blood; but had the *Fathers* thought so, they could, with no propriety, have called them the *images* thereof. CHRIST is called the *image of GOD*, in opposition to GOD the *Father*; but the *Papists* leave nothing to oppose the *image* to.

3. THIRDLY, In opposition to the *Papists*, it is thought evident, That St. *Peter* was *inferior* to the church, and the rest of the apostles (though not singly to each) because he was *sent* up and down by them:——And yet it is no argument that the *Son* is *inferior* to the *Father*, in opposition to *Trinitarians*, because He was *sent* by him.——Here again, is a manifest difference in the position and circumstances of the arguments:——It is not the *nature and essence*,—but the *office and authority* of St. *Peter*, that is in dispute:——It is argued, that in *office and authority* He was *inferior* to the church, and the rest of the apostles, because they *sent* him up and down *authoritatively*:——On the other hand, the *nature and essence* of the SON, is in dispute; and, it is humbly thought, that it can be urged, with no propriety, that the SON was *inferior* to the FATHER in *these*, merely because He was *sent* by him:—e. g. A *son* may be as truly a *man* as the *father*, and yet be *sent* by him; or *two*, that *equally* partake of human nature and all its properties, may *send each other* by mutual agreement.

4. FOURTHLY,—There can be no just grounds for your author's complaint, "That *Trinitarians* join with the *Papists* in hood-winking people in ignorance; forbidding them to enquire into and examine your author's principles."——I cannot think that any *Protestant* will inveigh against the closest examination and enquiry into any of the principles and doctrines of our holy religion; and especially the more *important and fundamental* points of it.——For my own part, I heartily wish your author's opinion may meet with this treatment wherever it goes;——as I humbly think it will prove a most effectual means of securing men against it.

I therefore, intreat all men, closely to examine, and seriously to consider it, in all its parts, before they embrace it.—

5. FIFTHLY,—How just your author's claim is to *primitive antiquity*, is what I cannot determine; nor what poor apologies have been made for those fathers who seem to have favoured his principles:—This can be no ways material; since our faith is not, and ought not, to be built upon the *opinion of the fathers*, or, *tradition of the elders*; but, upon that *sure word of prophecy*, and *inspiration*, the HOLY SCRIPTURES:—Upon the *foundation of the Prophets and Apostles*, JESUS CHRIST Himself being the *chief-corner-stone*.—However, it is generally allowed, that *Arius*, a *presbyter*, of the church of *Alexandria*, about *Anno Domini 320*, was the first who reduced your author's principles to a regular system; or set them up in opposition to those who hold to the *supreme DEITY* of JESUS CHRIST:—His principles were immediately condemned for *heresy*, by a council under *Alexander*, bishop of *Alexandria*; and, afterwards, *Anno 325*, by *three hundred and eighty fathers* in the general-council of *Nice*.—After which, the disciples of *Arius* divided into several parties:—Some held, That the Son was made *ex non entibus*; and that He was *all respects, unlike the Father*:—Others held, That the Son was *like the Father*, and begot of his substance; though not *co-eternal* with him, &c.—In the *sixth century* it was carried into *Africa*, under the *Vandals*; and into *Asia*, under the *Goths*; *Italy*, the *Gauls*, and *Spain*, were also deeply infected with it:—But having reigned *thirty years* with great splendor, it sunk almost all at once.—After which, it made no great noise in the world, till *Anno 1531*, *Servetus*, a *Spaniard*, wrote a small treatise against the *mystery of the Trinity*; which gave occasion, after his death, to the forming a new system of *Arianism* in *Geneva*; the admirers of which presently degenerated into *Socinians*, who are likewise divided into several parties; some leaving *Socinus*, as to what regards the worship to be offered to *Jesus Christ*; not being able with all their penetration, added to the subtle reasoning of their matter, and all that have since appeared to support his cause, to see how divine worship should be given a mere man. See *Chamb. Dic. Art. Arianism and Socinianism*.

FROM this general view, it appears, your author will not gain much by appealing to *antiquity*, the fathers, and the genuine history of his principles.

HE thinks,—“The fathers were more likely to attribute too much, than too little, to *Jesus Christ*, as He was, and is deservedly, a beloved object, &c.”

ANSWER.—They were at most but *fallible, imperfect* men:—Besides, we must consider them either as *wise and honest*, or *ignorant*

ant and deceitful :—If they were *ignorant* or *deceitful*, either not understanding the nature and truth of the cause they were engaged in ; or disposed to betray it, their testimony, one way or the other, is not to be regarded :—And if they were *wise* and *honest*, understanding the cause and truth of christianity, and were real, sincere friends to it ; they would have endeavoured to represent things in their true light ; to preach and recommend the naked, unadulterated truth, and have carefully guarded against error on every side ; and especially in *fundamental, important points* ; such as the *present* confessedly is :—When they come to describe our Lord JESUS, the author of our religion, one would think they should have studied for the exactest truth ; and have been as careful not to attribute too much, as too little, to Him ; and to be sure not to attribute *that* to Him, which belongs to GOD only ; if He is not GOD ; and it is no less dishonoring and affronting to Almighty GOD, to *make a mere creature to an equality* with Him, than it is to *debase* the Lord JESUS, by esteeming and representing Him as a *mere creature*, if He be GOD *supreme*.—The truth of the case (I am ready to think) is, That it was much with the fathers, as with our sons of the present day ; they generally professed to build their civil or religious principles upon divine revelation ; in order to which, some wisely examined the *whole current and tenor* of scriptures, before they drew up an absolute determinate conclusion ;—Others, of a more sudden resolution, and hasty genius, considered only *particular texts and phrases* ; such, perhaps, as favoured some *existing* prepossession, and formed their opinion with less thought and deliberation :—And though the *former* were by much the fairest candidates for truth, and to be depended upon with the most safety ; yet they were *all fallible* ; their writings are not the *standard* of truth, nor the *rule and measure* of our faith, while we have the *words of inspiration* ; which are *profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness* ; *that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works* :—And which we are, or ought to be, as capable of examining and understanding, as our fathers have been ; and have as good a right to judge and determine for ourselves, as they had.—

THUS I have gone through with my intended *Observations* upon your author's *Inquiry into the Scripture Account of JESUS CHRIST* ; and designedly omitted no part of his reasoning, that can possibly be thought material :—I am, however, far from thinking, that I have offered all the arguments which can be produced against his opinion ; or set off those I have offered to the best advantage :—But I humbly imagine, they carry so much of *truth* in them, as entirely to overthrow and confute whatever your author has opposed to them ; and effectually secure every honest, considerate, unprejudiced person, who reads them, even in their present dress, against his opinion. I cannot but hope, these hints, imperfect as they

they are, contain proper grounds of conviction; and that having these laid before you, agreeable to your promise in the *Dedication*, you will readily alter your opinion:—If this should be the case, I am far from desiring a publick confession, or declaration of gratitude:—The thought of having been the means of turning one from the error of his way, will be a sufficient reward to me.—— If you should answer this by a profound silence, judging it to be *superficial*, and to carry its own confutation with it; and to be utterly unworthy either of publick or private notice, one way or another,—I have the satisfaction of reflecting on my own good design; and of thinking, that such a sullen, ill-natured *silence*, but poorly supplies the place of *solid reason and argument*; and that, at least, some others are of the same opinion. If, on the other hand, you should think *this* deserving of an answer, and capable of a refutation, I shall endeavour, with the utmost candor and impartiality, to read and consider it;—lay myself open to conviction; and yield the point with joy and gratitude, whenever I see an over-balance of *fair reasoning*, against my present opinion.—— If you should not chuse to dispute the point, (as I pray may be the case, for disputes of this nature rarely tend much to promote the cause of religion) but should find some things *unfair* to you in point of argument, I shall endeavour, upon information, to remove your difficulties and objections, with the utmost pleasure and satisfaction.—— After all, I cannot but apprehend, that your procuring a new impression of your author's *Inquiry*, will fail of that good effect, which you profess to hope for from it; and declare to be the great inducement which moved you:—Granting that it should be universally embraced and believed:—Where is the great service done to the cause of christianity?—Will any person by this, be made a better subject to his king; a more useful member of society; or more pious and devout towards his GOD?—Indeed, if it be the *truth*, men ought to know it, and believe it; and *truth* can never injure that religion which is founded upon it; and which is, or ought to be, supported by it:—But we should be well assured, that we have *truth* on our side, before we attempt to bring about such revolutions and changes in religion, as this *tract* must make, if universally embraced in *New-England*.—— We should also be assured, that *this truth*, more or less, affects the essentials of religion; that the eternal salvation of mankind is affected by it, before we can be excused in such an attempt:—But surely true *Unitarian* charity, which extends to all men, at least to all denominations of christians, would not suffer you to judge thus of the point before us, that it is a *fine qua non*; or absolutely necessary to eternal life, that men believe with your author:—And therefore the importance of the subject, in the light which *Unitarians* commonly consider it in, will but poorly excuse you in so glaring and dangerous an attempt, as a revival of this *old controversy*, in this *new world*, evidently is.—— In short, if you closely adhere

adhere to the principles, which you have so generously taken under your patronage, I see no way that you can excuse yourself for diffusing them abroad, with such a profuse liberality, and air of challenge, any more than a serious *Atheist* could excuse himself for publicly calling in question the *being of a GOD*; and pleading with great zeal and earnestness, that there is no supreme, wise and intelligent Being, who made and governs the world, and to whom we are accountable for our behaviour:—Such an one might plead that he had *truth* of his side; but he could not justly plead the least prospect that *this truth* would be of any service to mankind, though vindicated by ever so specious an appearance of demonstration:—The same holds good with regard to true *Unitarians*:—They cannot, consistent with their own principles, pretend, that the denying, or not believing the *Divinity* of JESUS CHRIST, will be of any great service to mankind, or to the cause of christianity; because they hold that *all christians* are agreed in the *essential* points.——I cannot therefore but suspect, either that you are not well acquainted with the principles you espouse; or, that some *other motive*, than a true love to the cause of christianity, and a sincere desire to promote it, induced you to such an attempt:—Charity obliges me to hope, that the former of these is the case; and that when you come to a more calm and serious consideration of your principles, if you do not renounce them, yet, that you will think it of less importance to the cause of christianity, that all men embrace them.——Not that I, at present, fear that your utmost efforts to maintain and diffuse them, will be attended with a general success;—But, it is my sincere desire, that this controversy may stop here; as it is of such a nature as to admit of no determinate decision, beyond all possibility of contradiction on *either* side:—For in disputes of this kind, an ambiguous, subtle wit will never want nice distinctions to evade the *truth*, and cover over *falsehood* with the appearance of it.

It may, perhaps, be thought by some, that I have contributed to the revival of this dispute:—That a profound silence would have been the most prudent answer to your author, and your own challenge:—That the former hath been repeatedly answered already:—That the dispute is endless, &c.——But I humbly beg leave to dissent from such; (1.) Because silence would undoubtedly bring the cause I maintain, under suspicion, with many of the unlearned and unstable multitude.——(2.) Whatever answers may have been made to *this tract* already, they are not common as this now is among us; and therefore, though vastly superior to what I have offered, can be of no immediate service to this part of the world.——(3.) Though this dispute is in a sense endless, as it cannot at present be determined beyond all possibility of contradiction; yet when a point so important, as that of our blessed SAVIOUR'S **DIVINITY** is generally esteemed to be, comes to be called in question,

question, denied, and laughed it: I think it becomes those who sincerely believe it, to lend their reasonable assistance to support and maintain it, in proportion to their ability and sphere in life; and though it be not capable of *absolute* demonstration; yet a *rational* vindication of it, especially at such a time, cannot but be of service to the cause of religion, by the divine blessing:—The Lord JESUS, grant these imperfect hints may have this happy effect, though offered by one of the least of those who *adore* HIS DEITY.——In short, I humbly imagine, that, in consideration of the manner and circumstances of the *dedication*, and *tract itself*, should it pass unnoticed in this publick manner, the vulgar opinion will be, that it is *unanswerable*, at least as to our teachers and *spiritual guides*.——These considerations induced me to an attempt, which more properly belongs to my superiors in ability:—And an earnest desire, and secret hope, that some one, more equal to the task, would have engaged in it; has delayed this *epistle* for some weeks:——And should any one be engaged, or disposed to engage, I am far from desiring to monopolize the dispute; but shall be heartily glad of their kind assistance, whether it ceases here, or is carried on farther.

TO CONCLUDE—This is not wrote for *dispute* sake; but with a sincere love to, and honest desire of, promoting and vindicating *truth*, and the *cause of christianity*:——And should the dispute be prolonged; I heartily join with your author, in wishing,——That it may be carried on with *moderation* and *christian charity*:——That all wrath, malice, envying, and revilings, may be laid aside; and that *truth*, *sacred truth*, may be every man's aim.——I pray GOD to deliver both parties from that ostentatious *brife of words*, those ill-natured censures, bitter reflections, and uncharitable railings, which are truly a reproach to our nature, a scandal to our christian profession, an injury to pure and undefiled religion, and a grief and offence to all good men.——

9 JU 64

Should any one attempt a further vindication of your author's principles, in a fair and rational manner, I hope there are none among us, but will give it a candid and impartial consideration:——But should any one, in order to this, supply the place of solid argument, with barbarous criticisms, and pert, witty reflections upon his opposers; studying to turn their opinion and arguments into ridicule and banter, instead of giving them a fair confutation; insinuating, That there is as good a foundation for affirming, that there are *four*, as *three* persons in the God-head:—That we may, with as much propriety, call the Virgin *Mary*, *God*, or *Godde*; the *Mother*, as *Jesus Christ*, *God the Son*; reflecting upon all his opposers as *babblers of nonsense and contradiction*, and the like;——

—Suck

Such an one, I say, whether a *Layman*, or *D.* though he might shine and blaze a while like the *Son of the Morning*, and quickly draw upon himself the contempt of the *bad*, and the praise of the *good* :—All men of reason and sober thought, would despise him, for studying to render *that* ridiculous, which, however false, foolish and groundless some may think it to be, ought to be treated in the most serious manner, 'till it is shewn to be so :—

I hope, and pray, that nothing of this nature will ever appear. Good sense, and sound reason, I desire to attend to, wherever I see it ; and whoever it comes from :—But *controversy* should be *abhorred* by all men, especially in things of a *religious nature* and importance.——

Signe'd, Aaron B.

THE LORD prepare us all for that state and world, where *Paul* and *Barnabas* shall eternally agree :—Where all strife and controversy shall cease ; and, where we shall no more dispute *about* our glorious MEDIATOR is ;—but shall see HIM as HE is :—To HIM be glory now and evermore.——AMEN.