



AN  
**ESSAY**

ON THE

**REAL DEITY OF JESUS CHRIST.**

TO WHICH ARE ADDED

**STRICTURES ON EXTRACTS**

FROM

**MR. EMLYN'S HUMBLE INQUIRY**

CONCERNING

**THE DEITY OF JESUS CHRIST.**

---

BY **CALEB ALEXANDER, A. M.**

Pastor of a congregational Church in MENDON.

---

What think ye of Christ ?

Messiah.

Thou art the SON OF GOD, thou art the KING of Israel.

Nathanael.

This is the TRUE GOD and ETERNAL LIFE.

John.

---


**BOSTON.**

PRINTED BY JOSEPH BUMSTEAD, AT HIS  
PRINTING-OFFICE, No. 20, UNION-STREET.

MDCCXCI.

## ERRATA.

- P. 6. l. 10 from bottom, read Stockwell.
- P. 8. l. 2 from top, read Stockwell.
- P. 9. l. 6 from bottom, read *tetragrammaton*.
- P. 14. l. 18 from top, dele and.
- P. 47. l. 20 from top, read *Tyagathon*.
- P. 49. l. 15 from top, read expected.
- P. 51. l. 6 from top, read proemial.





# P R E F A C E.

---

“ **I**T certainly behoves every one, who has the cause of christianity at heart, and, who at the same time, is fully convinced that the doctrine of the Trinity has” a “solid foundation in scripture, to be *open* in his testimony” in favour of it. And I cannot but think “it is well known,” notwithstanding what is said to the contrary, “that nothing has so much contributed, as this doctrine, to “promote the propagating of the gospel among the inhabitants of the wide extended” world.

The doctrines of the *Trinity*, and of the real *Deity* and *Humanity* of Christ are, it is believed, plainly taught us in the bible, the standard of truth. These doctrines appear to be, not only divine, but of the highest moment and importance. They lie at the foundation of the christian religion. Against the polytheism of the gentile world, the apostles and first preachers in the church abundantly asserted, and strenuously vindicated them. The preaching of these doctrines overthrew heathen idolatry, and banished error from the minds of believers. But, unhappily, it had not this effect on the minds of the philosophers, who preferred “the wisdom of this world” to what they termed “the foolishness of God.”\*

“ That

---

\* Colof. ii. 8, 9. Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after CHRIST : FOR IN HIM DWELLETH ALL THE FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD BODILY.

The apostle foresaw that a thing calling itself *philosophy* would set all its engines at work to destroy the notion of Christ’s true and absolute divinity.—For in him, says he, dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. *Philosophy* will dispute this, and undertake to demonstrate the contrary. But if you listen to such *vain deceit*, it will overthrow your faith, and spoil you for a disciple of Jesus Christ. Therefore —*Beware.* Jones’s Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, p. 10,

“That the gospel of Jesus Christ has made so little progress in the world, has long been a matter of grief to all serious and thoughtful christians.” And, it ought to humble us in the dust that, nothing has so much obstructed this progress as the *amazing pride* of the *human heart*. This, it ought to be thought of and confessed, rises higher and stronger than every thing else, in opposition to the truth, and rejects, as gross absurdities, the plainest doctrines of the gospel.

Mr. EMLYN, a writer of eminence in the Arian cause, has, in his humble inquiry, boldly attacked the doctrine of Christ's proper Deity. He has herein attempted to subvert what is believed to be the faith which was once delivered to the saints. That Christ is, in one complex person, God and man united, is, it is imagined, a thread of gold running through the bible. This is of such glory, of such surpassing excellence, and has so conspicuous a place in christianity, that we ought always to behold it with wonder and delight.

To prove and confirm this precious faith has “occasioned the publication of the following pages. It is hoped that they will be received, by the public, with candour, and read with all the attention and impartiality their importance demands.”

The AUTHOR,



AN

# ESSAY

ON THE

## REAL DEITY of *Jesus Christ*.

---

**T**HE doctrine of the real deity of Christ, it is well known, is very offensive, not only to open infidels, but to many professing christians. Of these there are not a few of note and figure. Their talents and their learning are confessed by all. For their independence in thinking, and for their free inquiry, they have a just claim to esteem. They boast of superiority and conquest in Britain, and are spreading now their banners, with spirit, in America. They come on with professions of regard for Christ as a man, as a prophet, as a reformer, and with a show of zeal to turn from idolatry those who worship him as God.

The Arians speak highly of the person and character of Christ. They allow him to be the *first* and the *greatest* of all created beings. They hold that he existed before the heavens and the earth were made. But, then, he is, in their opinion, a *derived, dependent* being. All his power, authority, and glory, were, according to them, communicated to him; and that he is, consequently, not the supreme God.

The modern Socinians deny that Christ had existence before the days of Augustus Cæsar. They are pleased, without blushing, to call him a common, ordinary man. They have also the hardiness to say that he was subject to mistakes, was influenced by prejudice, and was really liable to sin. They do him the compliment, indeed, to acknowledge that he was the greatest of prophets and of reformers. He

is allowed too to be a god, but, then, it is in the same sense that Moses was a god. And, notwithstanding he is, in scripture, stiled a King, and he has ascribed to him the kingdom of heaven, they hold that he is no more than a metaphorical king, and his kingdom is only a metaphorical kingdom. Christ has, according to these gentlemen, no concern in the government of the natural or moral world.

As these sentiments are now spreading in our country, where they have been but little discussed, it highly becomes us to examine, with uprightnes, the evidence of Christ's real deity. If the bible shall be found to contain explicit and indubitable evidence that he is truly and properly God, independent in his being and character; then, we should be established in this doctrine, and render to him the homage which is due to the supreme God. If he be not a divine person, we need to know it, and refrain from worshipping him. For to worship, as God, any being, be his nature ever so exalted, or his character ever so glorious, who is not, properly and without metaphor, the supreme God, is idolatry.

The friends of Christ's divinity have been, lately, alarmed, from the press, by the publishing of extracts from Mr. Emlyn's humble inquiry. The anonymous Editors, for it is presumed a fraternity are concerned, interest themselves, in the dispute, very warmly. They have given, to the Trinitarians, a challenge to come forward, and appear openly. And, not content with argument alone, they have recourse to harangue and declamation. The reason, they say, that "the inhabitants of the wide extended empires of Turkey, Persia, and China do not embrace the gospel, is because the christian missionaries teach that there are three persons in the Godhead, each of them equally and of himself God, and yet that there is but one God. One of them, continue they, came upon earth, and, taking upon himself the form of a man, was scoffed at, scourged, and crucified." The influence of this doctrine, is, they say, "equally pernicious in the countries where christianity has been established, by its tendency to multiply the number of deists, who, finding such gross absurdities adopted into the christian creed, reject the whole, without farther examination."

I have read the extracts, according to desire, "with all the attention and impartiality their importance demands." And I do not find, after the most careful deliberation, that Mr. Emlyn has, with all his plausibility, invalidated the evidence

dence that Christ is truly the supreme God. The bible I have also, in consequence of his remarks, critically and candidly examined on this subject. The result of my examination is now laid before the public.

The subject is truly important, and demands particular attention and investigation. We ought, in our examination, to be exceedingly candid and impartial, and uninfluenced by the authority of splendid names. To believe in the divinity of Christ, merely because our parents have taught us this doctrine ; because it is in the confessions of faith and creeds of the church ; or because there are books written purposely by learned and pious men, in defence of it ; is folly, which a thinking man is careful to avoid. We should in this, as in all other articles of faith, appeal to the law and to the testimony. And, if we would be deemed disciples, we must be willing to be taught of God, and yield implicit faith to divine revelation. Let us, then, with the simplicity of children, and with the teachableness of inquirers, in a humble reliance on divine aid, examine the scripture testimony of Jesus Christ, *the second man, the Lord from heaven.*

The humanity of Christ, it is agreed, is plainly taught in God's word. That he was properly a man, his nativity, his education, his actions, his sufferings and death, bear testimony. As the truth of his humanity will, it is imagined, greatly assist in removing many difficulties with which the deniers of his divinity, seem to be embarrassed, it is necessary, in this work, to state the evidence of his humanity. "The supposed union of two natures in the Messiah" greatly offends the Unitarians. They consider it as "the continual refuge of the learned and unlearned among the Trinitarians." That actions properly human should be predicated of him in one capacity, and actions properly divine in another capacity, they cannot allow. But if, that he is properly man and properly God, be a doctrine of the bible, there will then be no absurdity in ascribing to him actions that are peculiar to each nature.

The incarnation of Christ holds a conspicuous place, on the theatre of the bible. It consisteth in his being united to a body, formed in the womb of the virgin Mary, and born of her. *When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman.* (Gal. iv. 4.) *The WORD was made flesh, and dwelt among us :* or, as it is in Greek, tabernacled in us. (John i. 14.) As Christ had agreed, in the covenant



of redemption, to save human sinners who are united to flesh, and blood, *wherefore, in all things, it behoved him, it is said, to be made like unto his brethren. Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.* (Heb. ii. 17, 14.) Had he not been united to a body, composed of flesh and blood, it is easily seen, he could not have died. "The incarnation consisteth," says Dr. Owen, "in Christ's assuming, not any singular person, but our human nature into a personal union with himself." The language of the bible confirms this truth. *Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith—a body hast thou prepared me.* (Heb. x. 5.) *He took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Jesus Christ our Lord was made of the seed of David according to the flesh.* (Heb. ii. 16. Rom. i. 13.) As Christ was united to a proper human body, formed in the womb of the virgin; so this union makes it proper that he be styled a man, of the seed of David, of Abraham, and one of the posterity of Adam.

It has been said, by some divines, that such is the personal union of two natures in Christ, that actions done in the divine nature may be predicated of the human nature; and those done in the human may be predicated of the divine. This is a distinction for which I can have no reverence. It belongs to the body of school-divinity. It nearly resembles the scheme of the Eutychians, that the two natures in Christ were so mixed and blended, that the human was changed into the divine, and the divine into the human. This was condemned, as an error, by the council of Chalcedon, which decreed, "although there was a union, yet there was not a mixture of natures."

We shall find, if we attend to the history of Christ's life, that the most of his actions, while incarnate, were properly human. Of this kind, may be reckoned his *increasing in wisdom and stature, and growing in favour with God and man.* To affirm that simple deity can increase in wisdom, or be the subject of any change, is impious. With God is *no variableness, neither shadow of turning.* But humanity may increase in wisdom, and be the subject of pain, hunger, and a variety of natural evils.

The humanity of Christ is established by the history of his life and sufferings. It begins with his infancy, and ends with his

his death. He appeared, lived, acted, suffered, and died, as a man. With this sentiment will be shocked no one who makes the bible the rule of his faith. That Christ may be properly called a man is agreed by Trinitarians, Arians, and Socinians. In the latitude of the term, however, they differ. Dr. Price allows that Christ was of Adam's posterity according to the flesh. Yet he calls him more than a mere man. He was, in the Doctor's opinion, the greatest of created beings, united to a human body. Dr. Priestley calls him a common ordinary man, assisted, in a peculiar manner, of God. The Trinitarians, who hold the doctrine of the two natures in Christ, deem it proper to call him a man. And this is the plain language of the bible. Peter calls him *a man approved of God*. (Acts ii. 22.) Paul calls him *the man whom God ordained*. (Acts xvii. 31.) And he says, in another place, *there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*. (1 Tim. ii. 5.) He is repeatedly, in the common language of the bible, called *the son of man*. To him are applied many actions, which prove, beyond doubt, that he is truly a man. Mr. Emlyn acknowledges the doctrine. And, notwithstanding he espouses the hypothesis that Christ was a *superangelic* being, yet, he contends that the actions he performed, in the world, were properly human, and that he was eminently assisted of God.

Having established Christ's humanity, it remains that we prove his divinity. This will be done by proving that he is a divine person, uncaused in his being, and independent in his authority and glory. If we can prove, from the bible, that Christ is as truly and properly God, as he is truly and properly man, the Arian and Socinian systems must, hence, fall to the ground. The union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, is, to our opponents, a stumbling block. They freely assent to the truth of his humanity; and as freely dissent from the truth of his divinity. But if we can prove that the human and divine natures are united in him, then, all their objections will vanish, and the truth of his proper deity will be established. The proof of Christ's real deity will demonstrate the fact, that in him are united the two natures. His humanity is acknowledged. The evidence, then, of his deity will prove the alledged union, and that he is properly a complex person, the God-Man.

To adduce the evidence that Christ is properly God, is now our business. The simple testimony of the bible we  
 B depend,

depend, is quite sufficient for this purpose. For it is much safer to depend on the evidence of the bible, than on any philosophical premises and deductions. Of Christ and his character, moral philosophy is ignorant. The bible is our only source of evidence. On this ground we are willing to meet our opponents. On this ground only will we rest the controversy, and engage to abide the decision of divine inspiration. Let us attend, then, with reverence, to the bible-evidence that Christ is God.

I. Jesus Christ is the Creator of all things.

That the heavens, and the earth, and all their numerous inhabitants, are the production of the supreme God, it is evident from scripture. If it shall appear, therefore, that Christ is, in the first and original sense, the Creator of all things, it will then follow that he is the supreme God. God, it is manifest, has created all things. To confirm this truth, it is not necessary to transcribe all the texts which apply to him the work of creation. A part only are sufficient. *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.* (Gen. i. 1.) With this agrees the testimony of Isaiah. *Thus saith God, the Lord, he that created the heavens and stretched them out, he that spread forth the earth and that which cometh out of it, he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein.*—The same prophet, in another place, adds: *Hast thou not known? Hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary?* (Isa. xlii. 5. xl. 28.)

As most of the deniers of Christ's divinity grant, that all creatures received their original being from the supreme God, we shall omit the rehearsal of more texts that confirm this doctrine. The evidence that God alone can create, demands our next attention.

Mr. Storkwell, in his dissertation on the creed, says, "it would be the highest presumption to say that the Almighty could not invest a creature with power to perform the works of creation."\* But if the bible ascribes the works of creation to the Almighty, exclusive of any other being, we may, then, fairly conclude, that to suppose he has invested any creature with power to create, is the highest presumption.

Let us hear what saith the scripture. *I am the LORD, there is none else, there is no God beside me.—That they may know,*

---

\* Extracts, p. 46.

*Know, from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me. I form the light and create darkness—I the LORD do all these things—let the earth open, I the LORD have created it. I have made the earth and created man upon it: I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded. For thus saith the LORD that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it. (Isa. xlv. 5—18.) Job, speaking of God, declares it is he, which alone spreadeth out the heavens. (Job ix. 5.) With this declaration agrees the Psalmist's ascription. Blessed be the LORD GOD, the GOD of Israel, who only doth wondrous things. (Psal. lxxii. 8.) To him alone does he ever ascribe the glory of creation. The LORD of lords—alone doth great wonders.—By his wisdom he made the heavens. He stretched out the earth above the waters. He made great lights, the sun to rule by day, the moon and stars to rule by night. (Psalm cxxxvi. 3—9.)*

Thus it is evident, from scripture, that God *alone* has created all things. The work of creation is, in the most exclusive sense, applied to him: it is to him *alone*. In it there is no hint of any under-worker, or delegated creator. To say, therefore, that God has invested a creature with power to create, is a flat contradiction of the bible, and an act of the highest presumption. As it is to God *alone* the work of creation is ascribed, there is not the least shadow of evidence, from the standard of truth, that power is delegated to any being sufficient to bring into existence even the smallest creature.

With the adversaries of Christ's divinity it is a fond sentiment, that a mere creature has been invested with power to create. Dr. Price, in his late sermons, says that simple creation belongs to God. When, therefore, he applies creation to Christ, it is to be understood, that he reduced to order the chaotic state of things, adjusted the several motions and revolutions of this system, and formed all the beauty and usefulness we behold. Jesus Christ did all this, according to the Doctor, by delegated power. He supports himself by a distinction between *formation* and *creation*. But it will be difficult to prove, notwithstanding this distinction, that a being who can *form* all things, cannot *create* all things.

This supposed *delegated* power of forming all things is not essentially different from *original* power to create. Mr. Emlyn has implicitly espoused the opinion, that the power which

which Christ exerted, in creating all things, was derived, and communicated to him by the Almighty. And Mr. Sterkwell says it would be the highest presumption to say, that the Almighty could not invest a creature with power to perform the works of creation. If we should allow, that the assertions of these gentlemen, carry more evidence than the assertions of inspired writers, we should then believe that power to create, is not evidential of divinity. Inspiration declares that God *alone* made the earth, and created man upon it. But these men say, that a *mere creature*, for Christ, in their apprehension, is no other, has created all things.

Now, as it is to GOD the bible ascribes the work of creation, and that exclusively of all other beings; so we may safely conclude, that he who hath created all things is truly and properly God. But, mark it, the bible ascribes, in the most explicit manner, the work of creation to Jesus Christ. Consequently, as it is *God alone* who can create; and as it is expressly said that *Christ* has created all things; so we may believe, from divine testimony, that *Christ* is *God*, truly and properly the everlasting *Jehovah*.

In support of the doctrine that creation is ascribed to Christ, we shall bring the following texts. *In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with GOD, and the WORD was GOD. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made. He was in the world, and the world was made by him.* (John i. 1—10.) John is, evidently, speaking of Christ. To him who was the *Light* of the world he ascribes creation: to him who came personally and visibly into the world: who came unto *his own*; who was made flesh and dwelt among us; of whom the baptist bare witness, and cried, saying, *he that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me.* (John i. 15.) The *WORD*, who created all things, is the complex person to whom Nathaniel said, *rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.* (John i. 49.) Inspired Paul, in all his epistles, especially in the one to the Colossians, informs us that *Christ* is the *Creator*. By him, says he, were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him and for him. (Col. i. 16.) This declaration of an inspired writer, in favour of Christ's original creative power must be deemed conclusive, For "here we are expressly told, that all things, visible and invisible,

visible, from the highest seraph to the lowest insect; from the largest globe to the smallest atom; were universally created, not only by Christ, but for him."† This is the current doctrine of the bible. This is so undeniably evident that all parties do, in some sense, concede to it. The Socinians say Christ is creator in a moral sense. He is, according to them, the grand instrument, under the supreme Deity, in managing and adjusting the affairs of the gospel kingdom. He is the creator of this new creation. And this is the only sense, with them, in which he is said, in the scriptures, to have created all things. Dr. Lardner, on the Logos, holds the same sentiment. Of Dr. Priestley and Mr. Lindley this is a well known sentiment. When Christ is said to have created all things in heaven and earth, it means only, these writers affirm, that he was, when in this world, the prime agent in the establishment of the gospel kingdom. The Arians, who believe that the Logos was the created, preexistent, soul of the Messiah, say he created all things by virtue of power communicated to him by the supreme Being. But, neither of these constrained senses amounts, in my mind, to the true sense of scripture. To say that Christ is creator only in a moral sense, is, plainly, to talk without book. That he had given to him, by delegation, all, or any degree of the power he exerted in creating the world, and adjusting its several parts, we see no evidence, nor shadow of evidence. The bible doth so plainly and particularly ascribe to Christ original power to create, that, to deny this power belongs to him, one may as well deny that he is the Messiah. It remains, therefore, that, in the prime signification of the word, Christ is *Creator*. He created all things by his own, inherent, underived, power. It is, hence, clearly evident, that *Christ is God*. For *he that built all things is GOD*. (Heb. iii. 4.)

## II. Jesus Christ is Jehovah.

This name is exclusively applied to God. For this name the Hebrews ever manifested a great veneration. They esteemed it so sacred, that they presumed not to pronounce it with their lips. They called it *tetragrammator*, the name of four letters, J-H-V-H. And, as they deemed it expressive, in a high degree, of his nature and character, they applied it, without exception, to the supreme God.

In the bible also, we shall find, on inquiry, the name  
Jehovah

---

† Mr. Emmons's sermon at the ordination of Mr. Harris. p. 9.

Jehovah is exclusively applied to the eternal, the independent God. *That men may know, that thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the Most High over all the earth.* (Psa. lxxxiii. 18.) That there is no being but the supreme God, whose name alone is Jehovah, is, by this text, made evident. To deny this, is to deny the text. If, then, we can find that this name is applied to Christ, it will afford incontestable and conclusive evidence that Christ is the Most High God.

*Sanctify the LORD, Hebrew, JEHOVAH, of hosts; and let him be your FEAR, and let him be your DREAD. And he shall be for a SANCTUARY; but for a STONE of stumbling and for a ROCK of offence to both houses of Israel.*—(Isa. viii. 13, 14.) Christ, it is evident from the new testament, is the person designated, in this text, by Jehovah of hosts: *Christ is the Shepherd, the Stone of Israel.* (Gen. xlix. 24.) *The Stone, says Peter, which the builders disallowed, the same is made the HEAD of the corner, and a Stone of stumbling, and a Rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the WORD.* (1 Pet. ii. 7, 8.) This metaphorical Stone was Christ. It was Christ who was despised, rejected, and disallowed, of the builders, the priesthood, the nobility, of both houses of Israel. It was *Christ* who became, to them, a Stone of stumbling, and Rock of offence. *We preach Christ, says Paul, crucified, unto the Jews, a stumbling block.* (1 Cor. i. 23.) Isaiah's prophecy hath been literally accomplished in Christ. Christ, therefore, is Jehovah of hosts. Christ, it appears also, is the Jehovah whom the prophet saw sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up. *Mine eyes, says he, have seen The KING, the Jehovah of hosts.* (Isa. vi. 5.) That this Jehovah, the King, whom Isaiah saw was really Jesus Christ, is evident from the testimony of John. *But though he had done many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him: that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? And to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, he hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them. These things said Esaias when he saw his GLORY, and spake of him.* (John xii. 37—41.) Christ was the person who did many miracles before the Jews, and on whom they believed not. This makes it evident that the very person, the Jehovah of hosts, whom Isaiah saw was  
Jesus

**Jesus Christ.** And as the name Jehovah is given exclusively to the true God, it follows that, Christ is the true God. *These things said Esaias when he saw his GLORY, and spake of him.*

To say that these words were spoken by way of *accommodation* will, we trust, avail our adversaries nothing, with thinking men. The idea of accommodation is absurd, and ought to be exploded where argument is concerned. It is invented, it seems, to serve at every turn, and to invalidate the evidence of Christ's real deity adduced from the old testament. If the prophets, in describing the character of the living God, predicate of him certain properties and actions, which, by the new testament writers, are ascribed expressly to Christ, it must be allowed, to say they are done by way of accommodation, is a miserable shift.

That Christ is Jehovah is confirmed by other passages. Isaiah frequently calls Jehovah the Husband of his people; and speaks of them as being married to him as his wife. To the church, after the accession of gentiles, it is declared, *thy Maker is thine Husband, (the Jehovah of hosts is his name) and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel, the God of the whole earth shall be called.* (Isai. liv. 5.) But it is plain from the new testament, that Christ is the Husband of the church. *I have espoused you to one Husband, says the apostle, that I may present you as a chaste virgin, to Christ.* (2 Cor. xi. 2.) *The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the Head of the church.* (Eph. v. 23.) *Come hither, saith an angel, I will show you the Bride, the Lamb's Wife.* (Rev. xxi. 9.) It is, hence, evident that Christ, the Husband of the church, is Jehovah. *Thus saith Jehovah, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, the Jehovah of hosts, I am the First, and I am the Last, and besides me there is no God.* (Isa. xlv. 6.) But this stile is expressly given to Christ. *I am Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last. These things saith the First and the Last, which was dead and is alive.* (Rev. i. 11. ii. 8.) Now, if Jehovah, the King, and Redeemer of Israel, besides whom there is no God, be the First and the Last; and it being certain that Christ, who was dead and is alive, is the First and the Last; then, it is certain that Christ is Jehovah, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, besides whom there is no God. This conclusion will stand, except it can be proved that there are two distinct and independent Jehovahs, two distinct and independent Kings of Israel, two distinct and independent



dependent Redeemers of Israel. But the God of Israel declares of himself expressly, *I, even I am Jehovah, and besides me there is no Saviour.* (Isa. xliii. 11.) And even the Arians acknowledge that Christ is the only Saviour. If he be so, then, he is Jehovah, the Jehovah of hosts.

The reader's attention to this argument will be relieved when we shall have considered one more text, from the old testament, to prove that Christ is Jehovah. *Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and Jehovah, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in.* (Mal. iii. 1.) The messenger sent to prepare the way, it is well known, was John the baptist. And the Messenger of the covenant was Jesus Christ, Jehovah, whom the faithful sought, who came suddenly to his temple, and in whom they delighted. This will appear if we attend to the new testament. Christ, speaking of John his harbinger, saith, *this is he of whom it is written, behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.* (Matt. xi. 10.) And Luke applies to John the words of *Esaias the prophet, saying, the voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.* (Luke iii. 4.) Expressly to our purpose, is the testimony of the angel Gabriel, concerning John. *Many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the LORD their God. And he shall go before him, in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the Just; to make ready a people prepared for the LORD.* (Luke i. 16, 17.) Let it here be noted, that the expression *prepare the way of the Lord*, is, in Hebrew, *prepare the way of JEHOVAH.* (Isa. xl. 3.) Now, as John was sent to prepare the way of Jehovah; and, in doing this, we find he actually prepared the way of Christ; it undeniably follows that Christ is the *Jehovah*, whose way he prepared, and for whom he made ready a people, prepared for the LORD. This conclusion receives strength from the prophecy of Zacharias. *And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the LORD to prepare his ways.* (Luke i. 76.) The HIGHEST is, confessedly, a title given alone to the supreme God. But it is here given to Christ: therefore, Christ is the supreme God, Jehovah.

Thus, I must think, it appears clearly, from the consent of both testaments, that Jesus Christ is the *Highest*, the *King*, the

**the Lord God of Israel, the First and the Last, the true, independent Jehovah.**

III. The name God, in a sense that does not imply derived authority, is given to Christ.

That the term god "is made the character of persons, who are invested with subordinate authority and power, from the supreme Being," we freely grant. But this militates not against the real Godhead of Christ. That he is called God, in a sense exceedingly different from that which implies subordinate authority and power, is plain from the lively oracles. And that he is God, as he is independent in his being, his power, and authority, is agreeable to the constant language of the bible. Recourse now shall be had to inspired men to decide our cause. Of these, the apostle John holds, it is thought, on this subject, a distinguished rank. Him we shall consult the first. He "composed his gospel, says the learned Bedford, at the earnest intreaty and solicitation of the *Asian bishops* and *ambassadors* from several churches. Two causes contributed especially to the writing of it. The one was that he might obviate the early heresies of those times, especially of *Ebion*, *Cerintus*, and the rest of that crew, who began openly to deny Christ's divinity, and that he had any existence before his incarnation." † Mr. Lowman, in his tracts, || says, "John wrote his gospel at the desire of the bishops of Asia, against the heresy of Cerintus and the Ebionites, who hold that our Lord Jesus Christ was a mere man, and that the world was not made by the supreme God, but by a separate and very distinct power." Our apostle appears to have thought this doctrine very dangerous, and even subversive of christianity. Against it, he asserts, in the strongest terms, the divinity of Christ. He calls him God and Creator. *In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with God, and the WORD was GOD. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.*

By the WORD, the Socinians say, is meant the *wisdom, power, and goodness* of God, which dwelt conspicuously in the man Christ Jesus !§ But this interpretation no ways comports

C

ports

---

† Bedford on the Trinity, p. 8. || p. 223. § See Crellius, Lardner on the Logos, p. 20—24. 2nd postscript, p. 155. Priestley's disquisitions, and Lindley's sequel to his apology.

ports with the *personal dignity* of the Word, who is made to sustain *every characteristic* of a person, and of a person too of the first dignity in the universe. The Word, we have already proved, is, unequivocally, the same person that was made flesh, and dwelt among us. He is the very Messiah, of whom the baptist bare witness, and whom he called the Lamb of God. He is the very person whom he calls Jesus Christ. We may, therefore, say, if it be proper to call the Word, God, and the Creator of the world; it is, then, proper to call Christ, God, and the Creator of the world: for he is the Word who made all things. If, then, the Creator of the world be a divine person, independent in his power and authority; it follows that Christ is a divine person, independent in his power and authority. And, indeed, if the Creator of the world be not truly and properly God; then, we have no evidence from either the light of nature, or the light of revelation, that there is any God. For, that there is any separate, superiour Being, who is distinct and above him who is called Creator, we are not taught by either the light of nature, or the light of revelation. Or, that there is any God beside the Maker of all things, we have no evidence. It remains, therefore, that as Christ, according to the bible, made all things, Christ is God.

This same apostle, after he had, in the name of believers, declared, *we know that the Son of God is come*, gives him the highest stile of divinity. *This is the TRUE GOD, and ETERNAL LIFE.* (1 John v. 20.) This text has greatly perplexed the minds both of Arians and Socinians. It is, in the way of their respective schemes, a grievous stumbling-block. And they have, accordingly, attempted to prove that the words, *this is the true God and eternal life*, are an interpolation. But, not content with this, they have thought it proper to alter the pointing and position of the verse. And, it must be confessed, if between assertion and proof there be no difference, they have gained their end. A cause, however, that depends on such uncertain evidence, may well be suspected of resting on a false foundation. Did not the Unitarians feel that the text, as it now stands, is an undeniable proof of Christ's divinity, they would never attempt to darken its forcible evidence. Christ is expressly called *the True God*. This term is given to God *alone*: never to dependent creatures. Moses and Rulers, stiled gods, were *types* of Christ. They were shadows, of which Christ was the substance: they

they were images, Christ was the life : they were pictures, Christ was the truth of all these, God manifest in the flesh in a word, the truth. God is, hence, called the *true* God, A greater than Moses, or David, or Solomon, is here. We behold him, as the original proprietor, sitting upon the throne of David, and answering, in the fullest manner, as the anti-type to the type. (Acts ii. 30, 36.) We are, hence, compelled to believe, that, Christ, who is called the true God, is God in the highest sense of the word. This we must believe, until the contrary shall appear by demonstration rather than by assertion.

Another passage, in the writings of this apostle, merits our attention. *Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us.* (1 John iii. 16.) Now, it was Christ who both died, and rose, and revived—(Rom. xiv. 9.) The construction of this text, invented by our opponents, to elude its evidence, is truly a trifling evasion. They would have us believe that the meaning of it is this, that “Christ, a person eminently assisted of God, more than Moses, or any other prophet, is here called God, simply because of this divine assistance.” But, how does it appear that Christ is, from this circumstance called God? Does the text, or any other scripture, exhibit evidence of this? Is it not, rather, a construction to which they are reduced, in order to ward off its evidence in favour of Christ’s divinity? Although mere Deity cannot suffer and die; yet there is no impropriety in saying that a nature to which Deity is intimately united, as spirit is united to a body, may suffer and die. The union of the divine and human natures, in Christ, is not an impossibility : it implies no absurdity : it may take place. And, we beg leave to say, it is clearly evident that, in him, it has taken place. For we have already proved, and our opponents acknowledge, that Christ may be properly called a man. We have also proved, that he is the Creator of all things, that he is the independent Jehovah, and the true God. What, then, is the consequence? That he is equally God and equally man : two distinct natures united, by an ineffable union, in one complex person, who is Immanuel, God with us. Gentlemen, in the opposite scheme, view this union, we are sensible, “as the continual refuge of the learned and unlearned among the Trinitarians. It was invented,” says Mr. Emlyn, “to serve at every turn.” Positive assertions, however, if we may say so much to great men,  
are

are, in our minds, even under the weight of all their authority, very different from solid arguments. To suggest that this union was invented to be a hiding-place, in which Trinitarians might screen themselves from the imputation of absurdity and contradiction, is utterly unworthy of divines. It may be presumed that Trinitarians are as capable as are Unitarians, of exercising judgment and discernment. And it may be supposed, even without any great effort of charity, they would never have espoused the doctrine of this union, had they not found it to be plainly a doctrine of revelation. They are willing to depend upon the testimony of God, and yield an implicit assent to all clearly revealed truths. When, therefore, they read, *hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us*, they suppose his death is predicated of his *humanity*, which only is capable of dying. And they feel able to support themselves in believing the divinity of Christ, from the consideration, that he who died for us is called the true God.

The evidence on which our belief is founded, is strengthened by the declaration of the apostle Paul on this subject. *Feed*, says he, *the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.* (Acts xx. 28.) Now, the church is the purchase of Jesus Christ: he purchased it *with his own blood*. To him it was promised, in the covenant of redemption, in consideration of his obedient sufferings. It is, hence, said of *Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.* (Philip. ii. 5—8.) Now, as the church was purchased by the blood of Christ, and by his blood only; and as it is said to have been purchased by the blood of God; it follows that Christ is properly God; who, in the form of a servant, and in the likeness of men, was united to human nature capable of suffering and dying.

To the truth of the doctrine, that Christ is God in the highest sense of the word, is another conclusive testimony of this inspired apostle. *Whose are the fathers, of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever.* (Rom. ix. 5.) At Christ, Dr. Clarke makes a full stop, in the reading. It ought to be read, says the Doctor, *God, who is over all, be blessed forevermore.* This transposition

tion of the words the Socinians adopt. The reason of their doing it, evidently, is because it favours their denial of the divinity of Christ. "*The texts,*" say our opponents, "*is wrongly pointed.*" That is, as it now reads it establishes his divinity. He is not a divine person. And, therefore, this text ought to be expunged from the sacred volume. It is left out by Wetstein, and others. At least, the words ought to be transposed, and the pointing altered. It is enough to make a combatant smile to behold the comfortable shift to which the Unitarians are driven to support the reputation of liberal, candid, independent inquirers. They are wonderfully supported, sometimes, by a metaphorical sense—by a literal meaning—by an interpolation—by an omission—by a transposition—by the pointing—by the want of inspiration in the scripture writers—or, by the common prejudices of the eastern philosophy.—Of this any man of candour may be convinced by the writings of Mr. Locke, Dr. Clarke, Dr. Lardner, Dr. Priestley, Mr. Emlin, and Mr. Lindsey, among the moderns; and Crellius and Grotius, among the ancients. They are pinched, and crowded, and forced to this necessity. And, indeed, it is easy to see they could not, with any colour of truth, maintain their opposition to Christ's divinity, if they permitted the texts to speak their own literal meaning. And it is a fact well-known, that the Arians and Socinians, by expunging and transposing the texts of scripture, have made them speak a language totally different from the original, plain, literal construction. The text under consideration, as it now stands, without the Unitarian distortion, both in the Greek and English bibles, is demonstration that Jesus Christ is the supreme God. *Christ came, who is OVER ALL, GOD BLESSED forever.* It is here forcibly expressed, and strongly asserted, that Christ has no Superiour. In this sense we shall rest until argument shall disturb us.

We shall content ourselves by adducing only one text more under this head that Christ is God in the highest sense. *And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: GOD was manifest in the flesh, justified in the SPIRIT, seen of angels, preached unto the gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.* (1 Tim. iii. 16.) This very memorable passage is an epitome of the gospel. It hath, it must be allowed, a direct reference to the incarnation of Christ—the miraculous and divine power displayed in the works he wrought on earth—the ministry of angels who attended at his

his birth, his temptation in the wilderness, and his agony and conflict in the garden—the reception of his gospel among the gentiles—and his ascension to glory. This comports with his history. Christ is the WORD that was made flesh, and dwelt among us. He is distinguished by the particular name EMMANUEL, which, *being interpreted, is, God with us.* Mat. i. 23.

The deniers of Christ's divinity do in this instance, as in all others of a similar meaning, take sanctuary in a *metaphorical* sense. As the term God, in its primitive signification, would, if applied to Christ, prove him to be, in the highest sense, a divine person, they cannot allow it here to apply to him. Of the term God in this text, they would have, therefore, the meaning to be this: the power and goodness of the true God were displayed in the man Christ Jesus: divine majesty and authority were delegated to him by the supreme Being. The *man*, as the Socinians say, or, the *superangelic* being, as the Arians say, is called God on account of this delegation. But who is so ignorant as not to know that this foreign sense is not on the face of the text? A person, unacquainted with the controversy, would naturally suppose that the God, of whom Paul here speaks, is the true and living God. Such a person, it may be presumed, would not even conjecture that God manifest in the flesh is god in a derived or delegated sense.

In perverting the original meaning of words, there is the greatest danger. A person who is governed by a metaphorical sense of plain scripture is liable to embrace the grossest errors and absurdities. The Phantastiaſtæ, among the ancient heretics, were surprisngly under the influence of mysticism. They, departing from the plain, literal meaning of words, embraced, what they called, a *spiritual* meaning. They were infected, it seems, with the dregs of the rabbinical cabala, which consisted in teaching the doctrines of splendors, abracadabra, and mysterious nonsense. They could not believe that Christ, by assuming a substantial form, had made a personal appearance. That he was called a man; that he appeared to have a body; and that he appeared to eat, to drink, to walk, to converse; they granted. "It is well known," says Dr. Lardner on the Logos,\* that, in the early days of christianity, particularly in Asia where St. John resided, there arose people, generally called Docetes, who denied the real

---

\* p. 7.

real humanity of Christ, and said he was a man in appearance only," To the passages which speak of his humanity they gave a spiritual meaning. They, hence, considered him as a walking *apparition only*, a mere visionary phantom. They fell into this absurdity, because they disavowed the literal meaning of scripture. Notwithstanding the bible contains the most express declarations of his humanity, they could not, with all their learning, believe he was a man. And, as long as they sheltered themselves under their spiritual meaning, it was impossible to convince them of their mistake. *The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.* And do not the Arians expose themselves to a similar infelicity? Notwithstanding the doctrine of Christ's real deity is, in the bible, taught plainly and literally, they reject it. When to them are objected texts of scripture, in which Christ is called expressly the CREATOR of all things, JEHOVAH, the ALMIGHTY, the TRUE GOD, EMMANUEL, the GOD of Israel, &c. they call instantly to their aid their metaphorical, mystical, sense, which, like a shield of brass, resists the arrows of conviction. They tell us that Christ is god only by delegation, who acted in the power and authority of God. Although he is repeatedly called God, yet we must not believe, say they, that he is the supreme God: for the word God, when applied to him, has a metaphorical meaning: it is not used in its highest sense. This is the mode of reasoning adopted by our opponents. This metaphorical sense of the term God is the corner-stone of Mr. Emlin's system.

To Christ are ascribed, plainly, the divine nature and character. And to him are ascribed, with equal plainness, the properties and character of a man. The real deity of Christ is so plainly taught, in the bible, that one may deny his humanity with no less absurdity than he may deny his divinity. Now, if the word *God*, when applied to Christ, be used in a *metaphorical* sense; pray, what conclusive evidence is there that the word *man*, when applied to Christ, is not used in a *metaphorical* or *spiritual* sense? And why is not the system of the Phantasiastæ as defensible, as the system of the Arians? If the plain texts, which speak of Christ's divine nature and character, do not establish his proper Deity; then, it may be said, with the greatest propriety, that the plain texts, which speak of his human nature and character, do not establish his proper humanity. If the term *God*, when applied to Christ, does mean that he was god in show,  
by



by delegation ; how, then, can you prove that the term man, when applied to him, means any more than that he was man in show, man in external appearance only ? If the first term, when applied to Christ, be metaphorical, why is not the second term metaphorical also ? If, in saying Christ is called god merely in consideration of his delegated authority, and eminent services in the cause of religion, the Arians be right and their system defensible ; then, we see not but that the Phantasiastæ be right, and their system defensible. The bottom principles of the two systems are very similar. The Phantasiastæ taught that Christ was a metaphorical man, and came metaphorically in the flesh ; but yet he was not really and truly a man : though he assumed the external appearance of a man, there was in him no substance : all was visionary. Now, if the Arians be disposed to reject, as grossly absurd, this phantastical doctrine, because the bible teaches that Christ possessed the real nature and properties of a man ; it may be replied, that he possessed the real nature and properties of God, the bible teaches as plainly as it does that he possessed, in this world, the nature and properties of a man. The former proposition is as defensible as is the latter. And there is, in the denial of Christ's proper humanity, as much reason and show of argument, as there is in the denial of his proper Deity. If we are to believe that Christ is really and properly man, because the bible calls him a man, and ascribes to him the actions and character of a man ; we are also to believe, upon the same authority, that he is really and properly God, because the bible calls him the true God, and ascribes to him plainly the nature and character of the true and living God. The Saviour is called the man Christ Jesus, the son of man, and the man whom God ordained. He is also called the Creator, the Almighty, the Highest, Most High, Most Mighty, Jehovah, the Everlasting Father, God manifest in the flesh. Now, if these appropriate names do not establish Christ's proper Deity, neither do the names, the man Christ Jesus, the son of man, the man approved of God, establish his proper humanity. And, to be consistent as men of sense, we must, according to the Arian way of reasoning, or rather of denying plain texts of revelation, conclude there never did exist such a person as Jesus Christ, and honourably yield up to deists and infidels the cause of christianity.

IV. Jesus Christ is the Judge of all.

This

This character given to Christ is a strong evidence that he is really God. If he be the Judge of all angels and men, he then has undoubtedly all the qualifications necessary for sustaining, with honour, this high office.

The God of Israel is frequently called the Judge of all, in a sense which is emphatical, and utterly excludes all ideas of any compeer with him, or superiour over him. The patriarch Abraham styles him the Judge of all the earth. *Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?* (Gen. xviii. 25.) And David says, *God is Judge himself.* (Psa. l. 6.) The preceding verses contain a sublime description of the Majesty of God exhibited in calling the earth from the rising, to the going down of the sun, and demanding the attention of heaven and earth, that he may judge his people. This description can belong only to the character of the supreme God. It is not necessary to quote the many texts which speak of God as the Judge of all moral creatures. It is evident, on the face of revelation, that there is but *One Being* who is the supreme Judge. A plurality of supreme Judges would infer a plurality of supreme Gods.

Allow it now to be said that Jesus Christ is the supreme Judge of angels and men. He is the God of Israel, and the God of Israel is Judge himself. If it be made appear that Christ is the supreme Judge, and have authority to judge, it will also appear clearly that he is God in the prime signification of the word. To this let us attend. *The son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.* (Matt. xvi. 27.) *When the son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats.*—(Matt. xxv. 31, 32—46.) These verses, which contain the process of the day of judgment, represent Christ as the sole Judge. Language similar to this Christ speaks of himself. *The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the son: that all men should honour the son, even as they honour the Father.* (John v. 22, 23.) The Father, in these verses, it should seem, means the first person in the Trinity. For the bible teacheth, that it is the office-work of the *Second Person* to pass a general judgment upon all moral created beings. *It is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead.*

D

( Acts

(Acts x. 42.) The *Second Person*, in union with humanity, is Christ, that complex being who is the Judge of all. Thus it is said, *the LORD cometh to execute judgment upon all. We must all stand before the judgment-seat of CHRIST. We must all appear before the judgment-seat of CHRIST. The revelation of the righteous judgment of GOD. For then, how shall GOD judge the world?* (Jude xiv. 15. Rom. xiv. 10. 2Cor. v. 10. Rom. ii. 5. iii. 6.) These texts, it is evident, speak of Christ, and give him the character of supreme Judge. We may hence infer, that as the God of Israel is the supreme God and Judge himself; so Christ is the true God of Israel; for he is Judge of all.

It is needless to mention all the texts that speak of Christ as supreme Judge. One more text, however, and the accomplishment of the prophecy it contains, demands particular attention. *They shall smite the Judge of Israel with a rod, upon the cheek.* (Micah v. 1.) The accomplishment of this prediction, in Christ, is very remarkable. *And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews. And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head. And, when they had blindfolded him, they struck him on the face.* (Matt. xxvii. 30. Luke xxii. 64.) This makes it as evident as possible that Christ is the God and the Judge of Israel.

Similar to this is the prophecy recorded in Zechariah. *I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon Me whom they have pierced.* (Zech. xii. 10.)

The person who speaks in this astonishing language is *the Lord who stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him.* (xii. 1.) These actions, surely, can be predicated of the true God alone. *Thus saith the LORD, thy REDEEMER, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the LORD, that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens alone.*—(Isa. xlv. 24.) If it shall appear, therefore, that Christ is the person who pronounced this prophecy, and that it was literally accomplished in him, it will amount to demonstration that he is truly and properly God. *One of the soldiers, with a spear, pierced his side.*—*Another scripture saith, they shall look on him whom they pierced.* (John xix. 34—37.) Now, that Christ is the person here spoken of, our opponents, I think, must acknowledge. And, if they will not acknowledge that Christ is the person.

person spoken of in Zechariah, and the very person in whom the prophecy was literally accomplished, they must, indeed, be under the power of great prejudice. This prophecy, and its accomplishment in the person of Christ, carry very strong conviction that he is the true God of Israel; the true Jehovah of hosts, the supreme Judge of all. This conclusion is strengthened by the testimony of John in the revelation, *Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him.* (Rev. i. 7.) Christ, it is plain, is the person described in this verse. And it is also plain that Christ is the person, who, in the eighth verse, takes to himself this solemn stile: *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.* And the same person, to prevent all uncertainty about the matter, declares, in the eighteenth verse, *I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold, I am alive forevermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death.* If these texts do not fully establish the doctrine that Christ is truly God, there is no meaning in words, and it would be vain to attempt to establish any doctrine by words. Christ calls himself the Alpha and Omega, the Lord, and the Almighty, and declares that he is the person that was *dead*, and is *alive*, and *liveth forevermore, Amen.*

V. Jesus Christ is the person, who, in the old testament, made the appearances of God.

Appearances of God were made *at sundry times, and in divers manners—unto the fathers.* Jehovah condescended to manifest himself to his ancient people, and to give them instruction in his own person. Of this kind of instruction instances are very numerous. For the present design it will be sufficient to mention only a few. This we shall do by arranging them in the order of time they were made. Then we shall close with some remarks.

*And they heard the VOICE of the LORD GOD walking in the garden in the cool of the day, and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the PRESENCE of the LORD GOD, amongst the trees of the garden.* (Gen. iii. 8.)

*And the LORD appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land.* (xii. 7.)

*And the LORD appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the ALMIGHTY GOD.* (xvii. 1.)

*And Jacob was left alone, and there wrestled a MAN with him, until the break of day.—As a prince hast thou power with God*

**GOD and with men, and hath prevailed.**—And Jacob called the name of the place **PENIEL** : for I have seen **GOD** face to face. —(xxxii. 24—30.) By his strength he had power with **GOD** : yea, he had power over the **ANGEL**, and prevailed. He wept, and made supplication unto him : he found him in **Bethel**, and there he spake with us ; even the **LORD GOD** of hosts ; the **LORD** is his memorial. (Hof. xii. 3—5.)

And the **ANGEL** of the **LORD** appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush.—And when the **LORD** saw that he turned aside to see, **GOD** called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said—I am the **God** of **Abraham**, and the **God** of **Isaac**, and the **God** of **Jacob** : And **Moses** hid his face : for he was afraid to look upon **GOD**. (Exo. iii. 2—6.)

And the **LORD** went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way ; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light to go by, day and night. (xiii. 20.)

Then went up **Moses** and **Aaron**, **Nadab** and **Abihu**, and seventy of the elders of **Israel**. And they **SAW** the **GOD** of **Israel** : and there was under his feet, as it were a paved work of a sapphire-stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness. And upon the nobles of the children of **Israel** he laid not his hand : also they **SAW** **GOD**, and did eat and drink. (xxiv. 9—11.)

And it came to pass, as **Moses** entered into the tabernacle, the cloudy pillar descended, and stood at the door of the tabernacle, and the **LORD** talked with **Moses**.—And the **LORD** spake unto **Moses** face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend. (xxxiii. 9—11.) Compare this with what is said in another place. My servant **Moses**—with him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches, and the SIMILITUDE of the **LORD** shall be beheld. (Numb. xii. 7, 8.)

And it came to pass, when **Joshua** was by **Jericho**, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and, behold, there stood a **MAN** over against him with his sword drawn in his hand : and **Joshua** went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries ? And he said, Nay ; but as **CAPTAIN** of the host of the **LORD** am I now come. And **Joshua** fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my Lord unto his servant ? And the **CAPTAIN** of the **LORD**'s host said unto **Joshua**, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot : for the place whereon thou standest is holy. And **Joshua** did so. (Joh. vi. 13—15.) Let this passage be compared with what the angel in the burning bush said to **Moses**. Draw not

*not near hither : put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.* (Exod. iii. 5.) N. B. This was an expression of the highest respect and reverence. It was such as was due to the tabernacle and temple, and the immediate service of God, before his most peculiar Presence. This was, indeed, a very ancient and known rite of religious respect. *Free from shoes,* says Pythagoras, *perform thy holy rites and adore,* And *naked feet,* says Grotius, *appertain to religion.* †

*In the year that king Uzziah died, I SAW also the LORD sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple.—Mine eyes have seen the KING, the LORD of hosts.* (Isa. vi. 1—5.)

These are some of the most remarkable appearances of the God of Israel in the old testament. They are predicated of that Being who calls himself **JEHOVAH, I AM THAT I AM,** the **POSSESSOR** of heaven and earth, and the **ALMIGHTY.** These are truly some of the highest titles that are, in the scriptures, given to the supreme God. And these carry full and indubitable evidence of real Divinity.

The Socinians, to invalidate this evidence, suppose that by the *Angel* of the Lord, frequently mentioned in these appearances, is meant simply the appearance itself, in distinction from the person who appeared and acted.\* But, we beg leave to say, this supposition has no bible-ground. That the *appearance, the voice spoken, the cloudy pillar, &c.* is the *Angel* of the Lord, is not, in scripture, so much as intimated. The sacred historian is ever careful to maintain a *distinction* between the *appearance* and the *divine person* who appeared.

The Arians, who are equally concerned with the Socinians to invalidate the evidence of Divinity in those appearances, suppose that this angel of the Lord was the Logos, who, they say, was the preexistent soul of the Messiah. They conceive of him as appearing in derived glory, assuming the character, and acting and speaking in the name of the supreme God. That the glory and authority he displayed were properly his, they will not allow. He manifested power and majesty ; but these, they say, were communicated to him by the supreme Being, on whom he was dependent, and in whose name he transacted the affairs of the Israelitish church. But we

---

† Lowman's tracts, p. 98. \* Dr. Priestley's disquisitions. Dr. Lardner's letter. And Mr. Lindsey's sequel to his apology.

we say, this doctrine doth not appear to be true, nor the representation just.

This majestic person, who made those singularly glorious appearances, has, in our opinion, a just claim to the divine nature and character. To him are ascribed the works of creation and providence. The divine stile in which he spake, and the majesty which attended him, declare him to be the supreme God. He is the God who gave law to Adam, who instructed Noah about building the ark, and made a covenant with him. He is the God who called Abraham from his native country, who promised to him the land of Canaan, and engaged to be his covenant-keeping God. He, it hath been shown, is the Most High God, the Possessor of heaven and earth, the Almighty, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. It was he who saved, from Egyptian tyranny, his people Israel, who conducted them through the wilderness, who gave them laws and ordinances, and caused them to inherit the land of promise. To him are ascribed infinite knowledge and infinite power. He is, without a figure, the Creator of all things, and the Governour of all beings. He is, truly, the omniscient God, whose Presence fills the immensity of space. And he is the proper object of adoration and prayer, even of supreme worship. This is the character the bible ascribes to the *Person* who made these appearances. Can any one, hence, dispute whether or not he be truly and properly God? That the gentlemen, in the Arian scheme, can seriously believe this majestic and glorious Being is a dependent creature, is truly surprising.

That those divine appearances, recorded in the old testament, are predicated of *Jesus Christ*, is now to be proved. We shall, in doing this, sum up the evidence with conciseness.

The new testament, it is clear, speaks of Christ as the very person who conducted Israel through the wilderness. Paul, speaking of the Israelites murmuring and rebelling against GOD, exhorts the Corinthians not to imitate their example. *Neither let us tempt CHRIST, says he, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.* (1 Cor. x. 9.) The apostle evidently refers, in this verse, to a remarkable occurrence, which happened when Israel was in the land of Edom. *And the people spake against God, and against Moses, Wherefore have ye brought us up out of Egypt, to die in this wilderness?—And the Lord sent fiery serpents among the people, and they bit the people; and much people of Israel died.* (Nutt.)

(Num. xxi. 5, 6.) Now, the *Person* whom Moses calls GOD and LORD, Paul calls CHRIST. Neither let us tempt CHRIST, as some of *them* tempted, and were destroyed of serpents. If, then, the Person whom, by murmuring, the Israelites tempted, in the wilderness, be the supreme God, it follows, clearly, that *Christ* is the supreme God : for Paul declares expressly that the God whom the Israelites tempted, and who sent the fiery serpents, was CHRIST. The Socinians, to invalidate the evidence of this text that Christ is the true God and King of Israel, have recourse to their wonderful invention, the doctrine of accommodation. And the Arians say, that the God and King of Israel was a derived and dependent being, and acted under the controlment of a Superior. Both of these sentiments appear to be bottomed on the air.

That Christ was the *supreme Agent*, under the former dispensations, our apostle was impressed with strong belief. We, hence, find he gives to Christ the very same character which other-inspired writers give to the true God of Israel. Paul calls him, expressly, *the Lord of glory*. Which none of the princes of this world knew : for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. (1 Cor. ii. 8.) James gives to Christ the same character. *My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons.* (James ii. 1.) This stile carries our minds back, necessarily, to the old testament, where we find the same character given to the God of Israel. How familiar, to the ear, is such language, *the glorious Lord, the God of glory, the King of glory* ? That this high character should be ascribed to a dependent creature, it is not conceivable. The criticism of our opponents, that this is only the idiom of the Hebrew language, will avail nothing. If it prove anything, it will prove too much. For, if the stile, *the Lord of glory*, when applied, in the new testament, to Christ, mean only a glorious person, one more exalted than other prophets, it will be hard to prove that the God of Israel is the true God : for the same stile, and, indeed, no higher stile, is frequently given to him. The high character, *the glorious Lord, the God of glory, the King of glory*, means only, according to our opponents' criticism, that he is greater than other prophets. What, then, becomes of the surpassing excellence of the real God of the Hebrews ? A candid mind, unengaged in controversy, must judge, one would think, that the divine person, whose



whose character is described, in the old testament; under the highest ascriptions of adoration and glory, is really the Most High God. And when he finds that the same character is, in the new testament, given to Christ, he must admit the evidence, that he is the very person of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, and to whom they gave the highest character, and the highest homage, supreme worship.

That it was CHRIST who influenced and actuated Noah in his preaching to the inhabitants of the old world, we have the express declaration of Peter. CHRIST also hath once suffered for sins, the JUST for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the SPIRIT: by which also HE went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient; when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah.—(1 Pet. iii. 18, 19.) Mr. Lindsey, to weaken this evidence of Christ's divinity, is pleased to say, in his sequel, that the meaning is this, "that the apostles preached, by the Spirit of Christ in them, to the descendants of those, whose ancestors were amazingly wicked in Noah's time." Pray, Mr. Lindsey, in what part of the universe were those descendants? For the bible declares expressly that all the inhabitants of the old world, excepting Noah and his family, were drowned in the flood. Is not your meaning, therefore, pointblank contrary to the best-known fact? And, notwithstanding geographers may tell us, that, in Africa, "we find a race of people quite black, supposed to be descendants of Cain, who, for his cruelty to his brother, had this mark set upon him," yet, we have no evidence that any descendants of the amazingly wicked antediluvians survived the flood. And that men have descendants, after they are drowned; as in the flood, we do not believe. The rational sense of the text, then, remains good, that Noah was influenced and actuated by CHRIST, in his preaching to the inhabitants of the old world.

We have, moreover, the testimony of this same apostle Peter, that all the former prophets, who prophesied of the grace that should come, were moved by the Spirit of CHRIST. The prophets—searching what, or what manner of time, the SPIRIT of CHRIST which was in them, did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. (1 Pet. i. 10, 11.) The Socinian sentiment, that Christ had no existence before the days of Augustus, is hereby flatly contradicted. And the Arian hypothesis, that Christ is

is a derived and dependent being, is, with equal force, contradicted and confuted. For; surely, that Being who influenced and inspired the former prophets, in their predictions of the grace and glory of the gospel, is the Almighty God, the Possessor of heaven and earth. And Christ being this God; our position, that Christ is the Person, who, in the old testament, made the appearances of God, would, without adding more, be established.

Proceed we now to observe, that we have, in the writings of John, plenary evidence, that Christ is; according to the divine appearances in the old testament, the true God and King of Israel. This witness, speaking of Christ, says, *He came unto HIS OWN, and HIS OWN received him not.* (John i. 11.) Dr. Lardner, in his letter on the Logos; says, "I pray, whose people were the Jews; but God's; his; who stiled himself *Jehovah*?" (p. 20.) That the Israelites were the peculiar property of God, none; I trust; will deny. And that this text is spoken of *Christ*, it cannot be denied. What follows from hence? That Christ is the King of Israel. This conclusion is supported by the testimony of Nathanael: *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the KING of Israel.* (John i. 49.) If, to invalidate this evidence, it be said, that Nathanael was not inspired, and there can, therefore, arise; from this declaration, no conclusive evidence of Christ's Divinity, let it be considered that there is in it as much weight, to say no more, as there is in the declaration of other uninspired men. Nathanael confesseth, to his *Master*; his conviction and belief. The more weight is to be allowed to this confession; in that it was made instantly upon its having been proved to him that Christ knew him otherwise than one mere man knows another. *Nathanael saith unto him, Whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him; Before that Phillip called thee, when thou wast under the figtree, I saw thee.* (v. 48.) It is the testimony of other uninspired men, that Christ is not the King of Israel. Whether this testimony, or the testimony of the Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile, hath the most weight, is left to the judgment of those, who are able, in an even balance to weigh evidence.

What shall we say of the testimony of Christ himself, in his address to the murmuring Jews? *Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad.* (John viii. 56.) But when did Abraham see the day of Christ? It was,

E

certainly,

certainly, when Christ *appeared* to him, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God. It was when he blessed him, and made a covenant with him. (Gen. xviii. 1—22.) At this declaration of the Saviour, as it exalted him to the dignity of the God of Abraham, the Jews were offended. *Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?* Jesus said unto them, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, BEFORE Abraham was, I AM.* Then took they up stones to cast at him. (v. 57, 58, 59.) They were unwilling to allow that *Jesus of Nazareth* was that *glorious Person* that *appeared* to their father Abraham. I AM, they knew, was **GOD'S MEMORIAL for ever.** And, when Christ assumed to himself this memorial, they saw, he claimed to be the **GOD of Abraham.** That *Christ existed only in the divine decree before Abraham existed*, is, one would think, too insignificant a sense to gain any credit. Did not the Socinians, many of whom are men of learning, feel themselves hemmed in, with insuperable difficulties, they never would stoop to this unmeaning construction. That Christ existed in the *divine decree* before Abraham existed, is, indeed, true. And that *all men* existed in the divine decree before this patriarch had birth, is equally true. This Socinian, suppositious sense, therefore, so takes away the sense of the text, as to make Christ say *nothing peculiar* of himself. Why, then, pray, did the Jews take up stones to cast at him?

That Christ is the very person who, in the old testament, made all the *appearances* of God, is farther demonstrated by the use and application made, in the new testament, of a passage in the prophet Isaiah. *In the year that king Uzziab died, says the prophet, I saw also the LORD sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple.* (Isa. vi. 1.) Some conversation, it is mentioned, passed in consequence of this appearance. And the apostle John referring to this conversation, says, *These things said Esaias when he saw his GLORY and spake of him.* *Him*, we have already seen, refers to *Christ*, who had wrought many miracles before the Jews, and on whom they believed not. And, it is said, *they could not believe, because that Esaias said, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their hearts.*—These things said Esaias when he saw *his GLORY*, that is, the glory of *Him Who* wrought many miracles, and on *Whom* they believed not. Now, as it was the Lord of hosts, the King of Israel who appeared to Isaiah, and as John applies this appearance to Christ, making him

him the person whose Glory the prophet saw ; it follows, that Christ is the Lord of hosts, and King of Israel, who then made the appearance of God, the appearance of what he is, in truth and reality, the living God. From these considerations, I think, it clearly and forcibly appears, that Christ is the God, the very God, whose character, in glowing colours, adorns the old testament, and who, ever, appeared to his people.

Thus we have endeavoured to establish, by scripture arguments, the real Deity of Christ. For this end we have attempted to prove that Christ is the Creator of all things—is Jehovah—the true God—the supreme Judge—and the very person, who, in the old testament, made all the appearances of God. Leaving, now, to the meditation of the inquisitive, the many other things, in holy writ, which might be employed, with advantage, in support of Christ's divinity, it is humbly submitted, to the judgment of the candid, whether or not we have proved that Christ is really the SUPREME GOD. That he is properly man, our opponents grant ; and that he is properly God we have employed arguments to prove. If, then, the reader shall judge these arguments are conclusive, he will find no difficulty in believing that Christ is truly God, and truly man ; or, that, in him, a complex person, are united the *divine* and *human natures*. This is the God, who, it is said, rideth upon the heavens by his Name JAH ; who, in the chariots of God, even thousands of angels, as in Sinai, ascended on high ; who led captivity captive ; and who received gifts for men ; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them. (Psa. lxxviii. 4, 17, 18.) *Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth ? He that descended, is the Same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things.* (Eph. iv. 9, 10.) This is the person who, in the form of a servant, descended from heaven into the lower parts of the earth, from whence he ascended in majesty and triumph to glory : this person was Christ. In him, JAH, the Divine Essence, and the MAN, human nature, being united so as to form one complex person, we are able to account for the different things, and the complex character, which, in scripture, are ascribed to Jesus Christ.

Against this doctrine, it will, perhaps, be objected, that the union of two natures in the person of Messiah is repugnant to *common sense*, and contradicts all our ideas of *natural religion*.

Our

Our appeal, for the truth of Christ's Deity, is not made to the favourite standard of common sense, or that of natural religion, but to the STANDARD of the BIBLE. By this standard only, is this doctrine to be examined. Whatever is contrary to revelation is foreign from this dispute, and is to be treated accordingly. But, what shall we say of common sense, in other cases which seem to contradict revelation? Suppose, for instance, common sense should object against the scripture doctrine of the resurrection: must we, therefore, reject the divine testimony, and believe that our bodies will not be raised at the last day? Dr. Priestley says that all the appearances in nature are against the doctrine of a future resurrection, yet believes it upon the simple testimony of the bible.\* But the union of the two natures in the person of Christ, we beg leave to say, is no more repugnant to common sense, than is a future resurrection. And yet our opponents believe in the resurrection, and reject the union, although both are founded on the same evidence. The Athenian philosophers once thought not so well of the resurrection. They, finding no arguments in natural philosophy that proved to them the resurrection of the bodies of men, deemed the doctrine an absurdity, and mocked Paul who preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection. (Acts xvii. 18.) And modern philosophers, finding, in nature, no arguments in favour of this alleged union of two natures in Christ, cry out against it as inconsistent with their ideas of natural religion. The weight of this objection must be ascertained by those who can, according to their system, make the light of nature weigh down revelation.

The Arians say, "that the doctrine of the Trinity, and the mystery of the hypostatical union, have not the least foundation in natural religion."† This they urge as a reason that these doctrines should be disbelieved. But, it ought to be considered, that if we exalt our *reason* above the word of God, we shall be exposed, thereby, to the most fatal errors, and in danger of renouncing, as incredible, all the distinguishing doctrines of christianity. Natural religion is unacquainted with Christ crucified—with repentance—with faith—and with pardon through his blood. To prove the truth of these doctrines, we are not obliged to have recourse to moral philosophy.

---

\* Dr. Priestley's disquisitions relating to matter and spirit.  
 † See a pamphlet against the Arians, printed at Boston, 1756.

philosophy. The testimony of God is alone sufficient; Our assent is demanded, and our implicit faith is to be given to any, and to every doctrine which carries conclusive evidence that it is taught in God's word. We are bound to receive it as divine truth, although it be not taught by natural religion, or, by the lucubrations of philosophers. "It is very observable," says a writer, "that the Spirit of God did not see fit to have the scriptures penned in a philosophical strain, but, with great plainness of stile and argument, as if done on purpose for the meanest capacity to understand; especially so far as related to the person, offices, and cross of the Redeemer." To pretend, therefore, to prove the meaning of the scriptures, as the opposers do, by the test of common sense or natural religion, is not to follow the method marked out, for this purpose, by the Holy Ghost. *New we have received, says the apostle, not the Spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we may know the things that are freely given to us of God: which things also we speak; not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth; but which the HOLY GHOST teacheth; comparing SPIRITUAL things with SPIRITUAL. (1 Cor. ii. 12, 13.) Christ sent me—to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect. For the preaching of the cross, is to them that perish, foolishness, but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God.—For after that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe. (1 Cor. i. 17—21.)* The wisdom of God has devised this method, "that no man should have cause to say, that the mysteries of the gospel were beholden to him for his philosophical deductions, distinctions, &c. And, if this be foolishness, he assures us, that it is so only to them that perish." †

## STRICTURES

---

† See the last named pamphlet.



# STRICTURES

ON

## EXTRACTS from Mr. EMLYN'S HUMBLE INQUIRY

CONCERNING

### THE DEITY OF JESUS CHRIST.

**M**R. Emlyn's Humble Inquiry, from which are taken the *extracts* lately published at Boston, has, it is freely acknowledged, a share of ingenuity. The style is clear and familiar; and the work is particularly adapted to lead the common people into the *Arian system*. But, the author, we beg leave to say, has, in his inquiry, made no real advance in his favourite scheme. Mr. Chubb's *Supremacy of the Father vindicated*, and Dr. Clarke's *Scripture doctrine of the Trinity*, have accurately stated this scheme. A pertinent reply to either of these tracts, would vindicate the Deity of Christ, and expose the fallacy of our opponents, as well as a reply to the inquiry in particular. But, inasmuch as *extracts* from the *inquiry* have lately been selected, as the ground, we suppose, of debate, we shall give them a particular hearing and examination. This we shall do, with the same good will to Mr. Emlyn's admirers, as to the public in general, who are desired to take in good part our upright endeavours, in these strictures, to make the light shine out of darkness. We write from conviction, not from ambition.

Mr.

Mr. Emlin, to annihilate the doctrine of Christ's real deity, founds his arguments on a few texts of scripture, which have an especial reference to his humanity, and avoids a consideration of those plain texts which assert, we say, his real deity. Of this we have an instance in page 9th, where he states, what is deemed, a strong objection against the Godhead of Christ. "Our Lord Jesus Christ," says Mr. Emlin, "expressly speaks of another God distinct from himself: several times we find him saying *my God of another*:—*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Surely he intended not to say, *myself, myself, why hast thou forsaken me?*"

The argument, in all these words, is simply this: *because Christ, in prayer, calls upon God, as his God, therefore, Christ is not God.* But, who cannot see, that, from the premises, this is no consequence? Our author, in using Christ's invocation on God as an argument against his proper deity, has, as logicians say, begged the question. That the doctrine of the *hypostatical union* is an absurdity, he, evidently, takes for granted. But this is the point in debate. Before this gentleman inferred, from the words, that Christ is not God, he ought, as a disputant, to have proved, by argument, that the alleged union is an absurdity. If this union holds, his consequence does not follow the premises. Suppose, because the apostle Paul declares that Christ is the Great God, and the True God, we should infer that Christ is not a man, a dependent creature, would the Arians abide the consequence? Would they not think that the many plain assertions, in scripture, of his humanity, merit consideration? And why may not we think, that the many plain assertions, in scripture, of his divinity, also merit consideration? That Christ is a complex person, is as truly God as he is truly man, has, we judge, been made evident from the lively oracles. The bible expressly calls him God, and ascribes to him omniscient power. Christ is said to be the God that made the world. In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with God, and the WORD was GOD. The same was in the beginning with GOD. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made—He was in the world, and the world was made by him. (John i. 1—10.) His current style is, *THE MIGHTY GOD, the EVERLASTING FATHER, GOD over all, blessed forever, the TRUE GOD and ETERNAL LIFE.* (Isa. ix. 6. Rom. ix. 5. 1 John v. 20.) His current style



style also is, THE SON OF MAN, the MAN whom GOD ORDAINED, the MAN CHRIST JESUS. Now, allow it here to be said, that if Christ's being called a *Man* is evidence of his proper *humanity*, then it as fairly follows, that, his being called *God*, the *God* that *made the world*, the *true God*, the *Everlasting Father*, is evidence of his proper deity. Consequently, his saying my *God*, my *God*; why hast thou forsaken me? does not prove "That in all just construction, he can not be supposed to be that *self-same God*, from whom he distinguishes, and to whom he opposes, himself." If the person of Christ be complex, and consist of proper deity and proper humanity united in him, then there is no impropriety in considering the humanity, or the man, as addressing himself to the Deity. This prayer of Christ Jesus, then, is no argument against his real deity, or Godhead.

Mr. Emlyn's second objection is founded on the same defective reasoning. "Our Lord Jesus owns," says our author, "not only another than himself to be God, but also that he is above or over himself; which is plainly intimated also by his apostles." We are then referred to "many instances" in which Christ "loudly proclaims his subjection to the Father. In general he declares his *Father* to be *greater* than he. He says, that he came not in his own, but in his Father's name, or authority. He owns his dependence upon his God and Father, even for those things, which, it is pretended, belong to him as God. In like manner, his apostles declare his subjection to another, not only as his Father, but as his God." (p. 10.)

That Christ is not God, in the *bighest* sense of the word, that is, he is *not independent* in his being and power, is the conclusion, which our author draws from this reasoning. But, that this mode of reasoning is defective, and will operate against our antagonists as much as against us, is easily seen. For, if, to prove that Christ is not truly and properly God, or, God in the *chief sense* it be conclusive; then, it will be equally conclusive to prove that he is not truly and properly man. Let this matter be tried. Christ is the Creator of all things: (John i. 1—3. Col. i. 16.) but the Creator of all things is not a man: therefore, Christ is not a man.—Christ is the True God: (1 John v. 20.) but the True God is not a man: therefore, Christ is not a man.—Christ is the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Most Mighty, the Highest: (Isa. ix. 6. Psa. xlv. 3. Luke i. 76.) but the Mighty

Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Most Mighty, the Highest is not a man : therefore, Christ is not a man. At this mode of reasoning, to overthrow the doctrine of Christ's humanity, the Arians, it is imagined, would both smile, and pronounce it inconclusive. It is, however, the very mode Mr. Emlyn has adopted to disprove Christ's divinity. Because Christ says, *My Father is greater than I—I can of mine ownself do nothing—I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me* : therefore, our author argues, Christ is not really God. If our opponents will abide Mr. Emlyn's conclusion, then, let them display their logic in denying this conclusion, viz : because the bible calls Christ the Creator, the Highest, the Mighty God, the Most Mighty, the True God, the Everlasting Father : therefore Christ is not properly a man. I appeal to the *candid* among the Arians, that this conclusion is not less logical, than is Mr. Emlyn's. And if they will grant this, then, they themselves will grant that his reasoning proves nothing against the true deity of Christ.

“Our adversaries,” says Mr. Emlyn, “will gain nothing by alledging texts to prove the title of God to be given to Christ, since that may be, and yet it will not prove him to be the supreme, independent God; but only one who is inhabited of, and commissioned and enabled by, him who is so.” (p. 16.)

We do not wish to gain any thing, “by alledging texts to prove the title of God to be given to Christ.” The title itself, we grant, is no certain evidence of his proper deity. Moses is called a god : (Exo. vii. 1.) and princes, magistrates, and judges are called gods : (xxii. 28.) But, notwithstanding Moses is called *a god*, it is to be noted, he is in no place called the true God, God over all, the Highest, the Almighty. Neither are these highest titles given either to princes, magistrates, judges, or angels. But to Christ they are given without any limitation, and without any intimation that they are used in a metaphorical sense. They, it must be allowed, are the highest titles of the supreme and independent God. If there be, in the bible, any expressions which prove there is a supreme Being, these, surely, are as proper as any. And if these do not prove that there is a supreme Being, it will be difficult to say what words, in our language, will prove it. There exists no being who is *higher* than the *Highest*, or, *more mighty* than the *Most*  
F Mighty,

*Mighty, or, more eternal than the Everlasting Father, or, more truly God than the True God.* These terms, being too sublime to imply subordinate power and authority, do clearly imply, and strongly assert, the most absolute and undervived power and glory. And, inasmuch as they are given to our blessed Redeemer, without the limitation of a metaphorical, or mystical sense, so we may fairly conclude, notwithstanding what is said to the contrary, that Christ is God "in the highest sense."

Had not Mr. Emlyn taken for granted, things which ought to have been proved, we should not find him building on assertion more than on demonstration. He was under obligations, certainly, as a fair disputant, to have brought into the view of this controversy some, at least, of those texts which ascribe to Christ the highest titles and character of God. If there were to be found any texts which expressly deny that Christ is the Creator of all things, that he is the Almighty, the true God, and God over all, our author, it is presumed, would gladly have alledged them in support of his denial of Christ's divinity. And pray, what reason is there, that we may not alledge the texts which declare his highest character? The Arians and Socinians, to weaken and elude the evidence of these texts, have employed various methods. They have attempted to prove, that some are an interpolation—that some are used metaphorically—that others are not applied to Christ—and that, in some instances, the sacred penmen were not under inspiration. But, as Mr. Emlyn has, in his inquiry, passed them over in silence, the better to support his cause; so we think that, in detecting the base ideas he has suggested of our glorious Saviour, we have full right to adduce them as arguments. We have, accordingly, endeavoured to make it appear, and, if we mistake not, it doth appear, in the foregoing Essay, that Jesus Christ is Jehovah, that glorious person who, in the old testament, made all the appearances of God—that he is the true and living God—that he is not simply the *preexistent soul* of the Messiah, as the Arians conceive the Logos to be—that he is not a *derived* and dependent being who spake and acted under the authority of the supreme God—but that he is himself the very supreme God, uncaused, undervived, and independent in his being and character. This, we think, is the true account the bible gives of Jesus Christ, Immanuel. And it is, consequently, proper, in our mind, to apply to him the highest titles and perfections that

that are applied to the Maker of heaven and earth. The reader may now judge whether or not we have gained any thing, "by alledging texts to prove" that Christ is the Highest, the true God, and God over all, blessed forever.

That Christ is inferiour to his Father, or to God, Mr. Emlyn considers that great text 1 Cor. xv. 24 to 28 as irresistible evidence. *Then cometh the end when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, 'till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him; that God may be all in all.* There are several things, which Mr. Emlyn says on this text, that demand an examination.

1. "All things are to be put under Christ's feet.—The apostle knew," says our author, "that Christ must needs triumph by a power derived from God, to whom it was most eminently to be ascribed; and then, to one who had such thoughts, it was manifest that there must be one excepted from the all things under him, because he must needs be above Christ, who enables him to subdue all things, or makes him a God over all." (p. 12.)

Reply. To say "the apostle knew that Christ must needs triumph by a power derived from God," is, we beg leave to say, a gross misconstruction of his invariable sentiments of him. That Christ is, in his whole nature and character, dependent on a being distinct from himself, and, in all respects, superiour to him, is not apostolical. And that the apostle Paul had of Christ no such idea as Mr. Emlyn has asserted he had, we shall adduce a few quotations from his writings in proof. *Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: (Philip. ii. 6.) And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: GOD was manifest in the flesh. (1 Tim. iii. 16.) By him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist. (Col. i. 16, 17.) Looking far—the glorious appearing of the GREAT GOD, and*  
OUT.

our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST,—GOD our SAVIOUR—  
 (Tit. ii. 13. i. 3.) *In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.* (Col. ii. 9.) *Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever.* (Heb. xiii. 8.) *Upholding all things by the word of his power—*(i. 3.) *According to the working whereby he is ABLE even to SUBDUER all things unto HIMSELF.* (Phil. iii. 21.) There is, in this account, nothing that has the complexion of *derived* power. Here is the highest appearance that words can give of original, and unlimited power and authority. Cannot the great God, who possesseth all the fulness of the Godhead, who is before all things, by whom all things consist, who is over all, and who is able even to subdue all things unto himself; cannot this Great God triumph by his own inherent, underived, and independent power? This infinite character need not, surely, depend on any one for power to triumph. As he hath created his enemies, hath imparted to them all the strength they have, and constantly upholds them, he can easily subdue them and triumph over them when he will. What right, therefore, had Mr. Emlyn to say that the apostle knew that Christ must needs triumph by a power derived from God?

2. This surrender of the kingdom and subjection to the Father, says our opponent, is spoken of the *Son*.

This is granted. But what follows from this? Nothing against the deity of Christ. Are we to argue in this way, because the term *Son* is applied to Christ, he is, therefore, not a divine person? This way of reasoning, which runs through the EXTRACTS, we have seen is extremely lame. It will prove, to a demonstration, that Christ is not a man. Christ is called the Almighty, the Highest, the Great God, the True God. Now, if it be conclusive reasoning, that Christ is not *properly* God, because the term *Son* is sometimes applied to him, it will also be conclusive reasoning, that he is *not a man*, because the highest titles and perfections of God are applied to him. This is plain. And that our author's premises do not afford his consequence is also plain. An argument that will prove both sides of the question, or that will operate as much against one side as against the other, is to be suspected of sophistry, or fallacious reasoning.

But, "as there is no intimation of any such distinction between the *pretended two natures* of the *Son* here," says Mr. Emlyn, "so there is enough in the words to show that they are spoken of him under his *highest* capacity and character." (p. 13.)  
 The

The union of the two natures, in the complex person of Christ, is, we say, no pretension. It is a gold thread which shines, with lustre, throughout the scriptures. That Christ is a man, is clearly taught in the bible. And that he is truly and properly God, is as plainly taught in the bible. The doctrine of the two natures in the complex person of Christ, is, consequently, taught in the bible. If Christ is properly man, and properly God, then, in him are united the divine and human natures. And, consequently, to hold a distinction between the two natures, is no impropriety. To say that simple Deity can be the subject of human infirmity, is impious. And to say, that a purely dependent, created being is able to create and govern the world, is antisciptural. But that there should be a *complex* person, who is able to create and govern the world, and who might suffer and die, is possible. If Christ, when in the world, was properly a man, he, then, was capable of suffering and dying. And if he is the true God, God over all, he, then, is able to have created, and to govern, the world. In drawing a line, therefore, between his two natures, there is very great propriety. And, because Paul speaks of the *Son* as giving up the kingdom to God, even the Father, it does not follow that there is no distinction between the two natures in Christ. The doctrines of religion, it is evident, are not arranged systematically in the bible. One doctrine is placed in one place, and another doctrine is placed in another place. This is granted by all. An inspired writer might, therefore, speak of Christ's humanity in one place, and of his deity in another place. And, because Paul does, in certain detached sentences, call Christ the Creator of all things, the true God, God over all, it does not follow that he is not properly a man: so, because the same apostle, in pursuing a certain argument, calls him the Son of man, and gives, in the time of it, no intimation of his divinity, it does not follow that he is not really God.

It is besides, far from the truth, that the apostle, in 1 Cor. xv, is speaking of Christ "under his *highest* capacity and character." Christ's highest capacity and character is, not the Son, but, the Everlasting Father, the Mighty God, the Almighty, the Creator of all things, the Possessor of heaven and earth. His lowest capacity and character is the *Son*, the *Righteous Servant*. The term *son*, whether *son of man*, or *Son of God*, is ever, when applied to Christ, expressive of his humanity. We know not that it is ever intended to

express

express his deity. Christ is very often called the son of man, and the son of God; and God is frequently called his Father. But this cannot mean that the *divine nature* of Christ is derived from the Father. A derivation of nature implies inferiority and subjection. But the *divine nature* of Christ is not inferior to the first person of the Trinity. His *divine nature* is as much uncaused, unoriginated, and as independent, as is the *divine nature* of the other two persons of the Trinity. The Trinitarians, it is probable, in asserting the Son's ETERNAL GENERATION, have yielded too much to the Arians. The bishop of Chester, in his exposition on the creed, has asserted that the *divine nature*, and *personality*, and *character*, of the Son were communicated to him by the Father. This communication he calls an *eternal generation*. The Holy Ghost proceeded, he says, from the Father and the Son, by their joint co-operation. This is generally called the *athanasian doctrine*. This doctrine the Arians have employed as an argument against the real deity of Christ.\* For a derived, or, originated, or, emanated, being, they easily see, is inferior to the Being from whom he received his existence. And if he is inferior, then, say they, by consequence, he is dependent on him for his power and authority. But, that the *divine nature*, the *divine personality*, the *divine character* of Christ were communicated to him by the Father, the bible does not even intimate. He is said, indeed, to have *proceeded forth* and *come from God*; and God is said to be his Father. But this *proceeding forth* of Christ, and the *fathership* of God, are spoken of him in especial reference to his *humanity*. *Sonship* implies, always, *derivation* and *dependence*. Seth is called the son of Adam, because he received his being from him. Adam is called *the son of God*, because God, by an *immediate act*, created his soul, and formed his body from the dust of the ground. And *Christ* also is called *the Son of God*, because his human nature was created by an *immediate act*. His *divine nature* is eternal, self-existent, independent, and uncaused. The term *Son*, consequently, when applied to him, has, always, an especial reference to his *human nature*. It is, hence, evident, that when the apostle speaks of Christ's delivering up the kingdom, and of his being subject to God, the Father, he speaks of him

---

\* See Emlyn's reply to Boyse, Waterland, Stillingfleet, Sherlock, Bennet.

him under his *lowest* capacity and character. That the apostle is discoursing, in this place, of the consummation of ALL THINGS, it is manifest. And, according to him, the *concluding scene* will be the SURRENDER of the MEDIATORIAL KINGDOM. This is the sense of our best expositors and divines. The *Mediator*, who is *not of ONE*, (Gal. iii. 20.) but of TWO natures, has been invested with *Royal Authority and Dignity*. A KINGDOM was *promised* to him, early, in the COVENANT of redemption. To this kingdom he has been exalted, in consideration of his obedience to the law of this covenant, which was in his heart. In consideration of his having *finished* the WORK which, in this covenant, the Father gave him to do, it is said, *Wherefore, God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name—*(Phil. ii. 9.) *and set him at his own right hand, in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in the world which is to come : and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be THE HEAD over all things to the CHURCH.* (Eph. i. 20, 21, 22.) The term of his holding the rule and dominion, is until he shall have gathered in all his elect, his chosen people, and subdued all his enemies. Then the mediatorial office will cease : the Mediator will then surrender up the government of all things ; and then God will be all in all.

To have this matter stand in a consistent light, we must, needs, preserve, carefully, the distinction of the two natures in the Mediator. Simple deity did not promise a kingdom to simple deity. Neither did simple deity reward simple deity with supreme authority. Deity cannot be rewarded ; and there is no one who can invest him with authority. The humanity of the Mediator, consequently, is the subject of the promise and of the reward. And it is the humanity which surrenders, to the deity, the kingdom and authority with which he had been invested. And as Christ comprehends within himself the two alledged natures, it is evident that the apostle is speaking of him under his *lowest* nature and capacity.

Let us examine, now, another objection against the real deity of Christ. " Our blessed Lord Jesus," says Mr. Emlyn, " disclaims those infinite perfections which belong only to the supreme *God of gods*. And it is most certain, that if he want one, or any, of these perfections, that are essential to the Deity, he is not God in the chief sense. One great and peculiar



peculiar perfection of the Deity is absolute, underived, omnipotence: he who cannot work all miracles, and do whatever he list of himself, without help from another, can never be the supreme Being, or God.—Now, it is most evident, that our Lord Jesus, whatever power he had, confesses again and again, that he had not infinite power of himself; *of myself I can do nothing.*" (p. 16.)

Reply. If this be the *bible-account* of Christ, then, we grant, "he is not God in the chief sense." But, that our author has not done justice to the high power and dignity of the Messiah, we have abundant evidence: for, to him, the bible abundantly ascribes, plainly, omnipotent power. What else is such language as this? In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with GOD, and the WORD was GOD.—*All things were made by him.*—He was in the world, and the world, was made by him. By him were *all things* created, that are *in heaven* and that are *in earth*, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; *all things* were created by him, and *for* him. And he is *before* all things, and *by him* all things *consist*. These are but a few of the many texts which ascribe to Christ omnipotent power. More, on this head, may be seen in the Essay. They do, evidently, without metaphor, ascribe to Christ the whole work of creation: he is, consequently, a being of omnipotent power. That creation is the *peculiar* work of the *supreme, omnipotent*, God, we have, already, proved: he *alone* created all things. But Jesus Christ, the bible says, created all things: he is, consequently, the omnipotent God; of whom the works of creation are predicated.

When our opponents shall make it appear, by argument, that a mere created, dependent being, has been invested with power to create; then, we will acknowledge that creation, when applied to Christ, is not evidence that he is the omnipotent Jehovah, the true God, who made heaven and earth. But, inasmuch as the bible does not, in our mind, afford the least presumptive, evidence, that the supreme Being has invested a *mere creature* with creative power, we are warranted to believe, from the testimony we have in scripture, that Jesus Christ is truly omnipotent. Is not the God and King of Israel, the supreme, omnipotent God? Is not he plainly called the Almighty? Is it not he who says of himself, *there is no God besides me, I know not any?* And is it not he who declares, *I am the Lord that maketh all things; that*

stretcheth

stretcheth forth the heavens *alone*?—But the bible is full of evidence that CHRIST is the GOD and KING of Israel. Why, then, should it be denied that “one great and peculiar perfection of the Deity, absolute, underived, omnipotence,” is fairly ascribed to Christ? To talk of any god besides him whose works and character are described in the bible, is vain. Neither the light of nature, nor divine revelation, give evidence that there is one superiour to him. The bible’s God says, expressly, *there is no God besides me, I know not any.* He is the God and King of Israel: and he, we have seen, is Christ. To him is ascribed the great and peculiar perfection of the Deity, absolute, and underived, omnipotence. He is, therefore, we maintain, to be received and worshipped as the omnipotent God; the God, and King, of Israel. The old testament calls him the *Almighty, the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth.*—The new testament holds the same language. He is the Creator of all things—the Upholder of all things—by him all things consist—he is able to subdue all things to himself—the *Almighty, Pantocrator, who has all power.* (Rev. i. 8.) Christ is, evidently, the person of whom these things are spoken. It is Christ who was pierced, who liveth, and was dead, and is alive forever more, and has the keys of hell and of death. (Rev. i.) It is this Being who upholds all things by the word of his power; and who is called THE WORD of God. This name the Jewish Rabbi and Philo gave to their expected Messiah; and it is a name which the inspired writers frequently give to him. The WORD was GOD—by the WORD of GOD the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water, and in the water—the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same WORD are kept in store—(2 Pet. iii. 5, 7.)

The power by which Christ raised the dead, healed the sick, walked on the sea, and by which he wrought his other miracles, was, according to the face of the history, his own, independent, underived, power. When Moses and the prophets wrought miracles, it was by a *delegated* power. They did as the Lord commanded them to do, and a miracle was wrought. *And the Lord spake unto Moses, and unto Aaron, saying, when Pharaoh shall speak unto you, saying, Show a miracle for you: then thou shalt say unto Aaron, Take thy rod, and cast it before Pharaoh, and it shall become a serpent. And Moses and Aaron went in unto Pharaoh, and they did so as the Lord had commanded: and Aaron cast down his rod before Pharaoh, and*

G

*before*

before his servants, and it became a serpent. (Exo. vii. 8, 9, 10.) It was a delegated power, also, by which the apostles wrought miracles. This was their stile: *In the Name of Jesus Christ, rise up and walk.* The reader takes, necessarily, the idea that Moses, the prophet, and the apostles, wrought miracles by a delegated power. But, the stile which Christ employs, when he works a miracle, bespeaks undivided power: it is the stile of the Almighty. *Peace!—Be still!—Arise!—Take up thy bed and walk!—Damsel, I say unto thee, arise!—I will, be thou clean!—Lazarus, come forth!—I am the Resurrection and the Life!*—When, therefore, Christ says, *The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do—I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge—I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me—I am come in my Father's name—the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works:* (John v. 19, 30, 43. xiv. 10.) his meaning, evidently, is, that his humanity was not able, of himself, independently of God, to whom he was united, to do any thing.

But, "I imagine," says Mr. Emlyn, "our opposers have but one shift left—and this is a distinction which serves them in all cases; for they say Jesus Christ speaks these things of himself as man *only*, while he had another nature as *God*, which he reserved and excepted out of the case: so that when he says, I cannot do, thus my self—according to them his meaning is, I have not these perfections in my human nature; but yet I can do all unassisted in my divine nature, which is also more properly myself—It is," says he, "the most popular and common evasion, and comes in at every turn, when all other relief fails." (p. 21, 22.)

Reply. *To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.* (Isa. viii. 20.) If, between the two natures, in the complex person, of Christ, the bible makes a distinction, we may, and we ought, to avail ourselves of it. We cannot preach Christ, clearly, understandingly, and faithfully, without it. The question to be resolved, therefore, in this controversy, is simply this: *Is Christ as truly and properly God, as he is truly and properly man?* That Christ is truly and properly man, it is mutually agreed. The labouring point is, that he is truly and properly God. If he be truly God, then, the distinction is of divine authority. To support the affirmative, we have produced arguments from the scriptures. The reader is desired

desired to weigh them, uprightly, and give them all the credit they deserve. He is to judge in this dispute. He will read, with candour, what has been offered, in the Essay, to prove that Christ is—the Creator of all things—that he is Jehovah—that he is the true God—that he is the Judge of all—and that he is the person who, in the old testament, made all the appearances of God. If these arguments are conclusive, they will support us in recurring to the distinction between his two natures. This distinction will help us to account for many of his expressions, and many things predicated of him. And if this distinction holds, it will reduce, to atoms, the Arian system. If, as, we trust, has been made appear, Christ is as truly God as he is truly man, we have, then, a clear right to plead this distinction in answer to the objections of our adversaries; Mr. Emlyn himself being judge. It is the hinge of Christ's divinity.

“Another infinite perfection, that must needs be in the Deity,” says Mr. Emlyn, “is supreme, absolute, goodness: all nations have consented to this by the light of nature, that *Fagathon*, and *Optimus Maximus*, are the prime characters of the Supreme.—Now, the Lord Jesus expressly disclaims this character: *Jesus said to him, why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God.* Here, it is most evident, that he distinguishes himself from God, as not the same with him, and denies of himself, what he affirms of God.” (p. 18, 19.)

Reply. That supreme, absolute, goodness is the peculiar character of the SUPREME, the independent GOD, we acknowledge. And this character, we say, the bible gives to Christ. Christ, we have proved, is that supreme Being who made all the appearances of God to the patriarchs, and transacted all the affairs of the ancient economy. His goodness is infinite. He is supremely, and absolutely, Good. Nothing, here, can be disputed, but simply this, whether or not *Christ* is the person who made those divine appearances?

The Socinians say that Christ was not this Being. The Arians hold he was the Logos, who, they think, was the pre-existent Soul of the Messiah, who appeared to Adam, and to the patriarchs, and who conducted Israel to Canaan. They say, however, that he was invested with power and authority from the supreme God. That Christ was the grand Agent, under the Mosaic dispensation, they agree with the generality of divines, ancient and modern. But, from these, they dissent,

by

by denying his proper deity. It appears, however, notwithstanding what they have urged to the contrary, that Christ is the true and living God. The arguments, brought from the old testament, in favour of Christ's divinity, ought to have been examined, by Mr. Emlyn, before he claimed the contested palm. For, if there be conclusive evidence, that Christ is the person who, under the old testament, made all the appearances, that were made, of God; and if he, there, be called the Creator, the Almighty, the Lord, to whom belongeth mercy, who is good, whose mercy is everlasting, who is plenteous in mercy—it is vain to argue that Christ, in his reply to the ruler, disclaimed the character of supreme, absolute, goodness. Any thing that could be construed as a denial of the most perfect character, which the old testament gives to him, Christ, in replying to the ruler's salutation, would not say. The God of Israel, according to the old testament, is supremely, and absolutely, Good. His benevolence, mercy, and goodness, are set forth in the most glowing colours, and truly exceed all description. This God, we have seen, is Christ. There can be nothing, therefore, in this speech to the ruler, that should lessen the lustre and glory of this supremely good character,

That Christ disclaimed this character, cannot be argued from his reply. The ruler who kneeled to Christ, with Good Master on his tongue, esteemed him, at best, but a great prophet and reformer. (Mark x. 17.) Acting under this apprehension, this young man, accordingly as was customary for a learner, in those days, to place himself at the feet of his preceptor, kneeled down to Christ, and address him with the title of Good Master; but, in the same interview, he calls him Master, only. It cannot be argued, from this Jewish posture, either, that "the man gave, or, that Christ received, worship, from him." Our opponents would have us believe, that the amount of Christ's reply is this, *I am not supremely and absolutely, good; this character belongs to God alone; and as I am only a dependent creature, you do wrong to call me Good.* Allow it here to be said, "there is not one word in the context looking this way." That the man looked upon Christ, in no higher light than that of a prophet, is evident, at first blush. His giving to Christ the title of Good Master proves no more than that he observed the manner of a polite scholar. "The Pharisees," say Pool's continuators, "would not own Christ to be God, nor to be come forth

*forth from God.*—Now, saith our Saviour, seeing you will not own me to be God, nor yet to have come from God, why callest thou me Good? There is none, originally, essentially, and absolutely, Good, but God.—How callest thou me good, whom thou wilt not own to be God?"

Mr. Emlyn, it appears, has *mistaken the meaning* of the text, and has *misconstrued the prudence*, by which Christ governed himself in all his conversation with the Jews. If the man had entertained wrong apprehensions of Christ, or, had "thought too meanly of him," Christ, he thinks, would have rectified his apprehensions, and told him, plainly, that he was the supreme God. This, we beg leave to say, is a great mistake. It arose, peradventure, from not understanding, at least, from not considering, the prudential principles of our Lord's conduct. The Jews, it should be noted, excepted a *temporal* Messiah, a *temporal* deliverance from the Roman yoke, and a *temporal* kingdom. They were [prepared, by their worldly views, to embrace a Messiah of this character, and to reject any one of a character different. Had Christ, therefore, declared plainly, openly, and without a parable, that he was the Messiah, and that their views of his kingdom were utterly wrong, the nation would, at once, have risen, and rejected him as an impostor. And it appears, from his history, to have been the object of WISDOM dwelling with prudence, to assert his Messiahship by deeds rather than by words, making it evident, in this way, that he answered, in every particular, exactly, to the prophecies of him. We, hence, find him using the greatest prudence, in teaching the *spirituality* of his kingdom, and in rectifying the mistaken apprehensions of the people. Of this system of prudence, we would remind the reader of a few instances. *And as they came down from the mountain*, on which had just been exhibited, by *transfiguration*, the most astonishing display of his *ancient glory and dignity*, *Jesus charged them*, his disciples, *saying, Tell the vision to no man, untill the Son of man be risen again from the dead.* (Matt. xvii. 9.) When a leper was, by a word, cured of his leprosy, *Jesus saith unto him see thou tell no man*—(Matt. viii. 4.) When Christ restored the sight of a blind man, *he sent him away to his house, saying, Neither go into the town, nor tell it to any in the town.* (Mark viii. 26.) When Peter, in behalf of the disciples, answered the question, *But whom say ye that I am?* by saying, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,* then *charged he his disciples that they should*

*should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.* (Mat. xvi. 20.) When he raised to life Jairus's daughter, and her parents were astonished, he charged them that they should tell no man what was done. (Luke viii. 56.) When John sent his disciples to Jesus with this close question, Art thou he that should come? or look we for another? he returned only this answer; *Go your way, and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor the gospel is preached.* (Luke vii. 22.) When Jesus, therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone. (John vi. 15.)

These few instances are sufficient to give the complexion of Christ's prudence, and demonstrate, that Mr. Emlyn, in supposing it necessary, or expedient, that he should have "rectified the wrong apprehensions of the man," misjudged. The necessity, in this case, was not greater, surely, than it was in, perhaps, thousands of other cases. Notwithstanding the cases were so many, the prudence of WISDOM and LOVE did not allow Christ to deviate from his general maxim, in his treatment of private, individual, cases. His preaching and miracles, which blazed all over Palestine, were done in public. These were to bear testimony of him, as, the most likely, by all odds, to carry conviction. The rulers denied his divinity—they alledged, *this fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils*—their prejudice was deep-rooted—they hated him without a cause—and to employ simple expressions, to convince, them would have been vain. If a perfectly innocent life—if speaking *as never man spake*—if the effects of divine power in miracles—if an exact fulfilling the types—and if a full, unequivocal, answer to the *voice* of the prophets—if these would not convince them of their error, it is highly improbable that a mere declaration of divinity would have had effect. Christ's reply to the ruler appears, therefore, to have been the dictate of great prudence, and calculated better to strike conviction, than if he had said, as Mr. Emlyn thinks, according to the doctrine of his divinity, he would have said, *I am not a man, as you judge, but the supreme God.*

We shall close these remarks by examining only one more objection, employed, by Mr. Emlyn, against the proper deity of Christ. "I will only add," says he, "one perfection more, viz. absolute omniscience, or unlimited knowledge of all

all things, *past, present, and to come*. Now, it is plain our Lord Jesus Christ had not this infinite knowledge, particularly of future things, such as the day of judgment." (p. 21.)

Reply. Before we answer *directly* to this objection, we beg leave to make one or two *preliminary* observations. Mr. Emlyn *implicitly* grants to us, that if *omniscience* be the *peculiar* property of *Christ*, then *Christ* is *God*, in the *highest* sense. The reason that *omniscience* is singled out in particular is, because Mr. Emlyn considers, that his opposers alledge the *most plausible testimonies* for its belonging to *Christ*. He then proceeds to a *formal proof*, that *omniscience* is *not* the *peculiar* property of *Christ*.—But, it being our intention not to follow him, closely, in all his windings, we shall pass over, with unconcernedness, what he says of the woman of Tekoa's crying out, "under a surprising wonder of David's sagacity, My lord knows all things on earth, and is as wise as an angel of God."—And it as little concerns us, that "the Jews seem to have thought their prophets knew, in a manner, *all things*; and spoke of *Christ* under this apprehension, *If this man were a prophet he would have known what manner of woman this is*."—Neither do we think it incumbent on us to reply to Mr. Emlyn's philosophy. "It can never be demonstrated," says he, "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. The reason is, because the object is finite; and I challenge any man to show how it can be impossible for a finite capacity to comprehend a finite object, as this world is, and would be, though it were ten thousand times greater than it is." We shall not accept the challenge. The proof, we grant, is impossible. What then? To maintain the truth of *Christ's* divinity, we appeal not to *philosophy*, but to *divine revelation*. *Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?*—Proceed we now to a direct answer to the objection. And if it shall appear, on examination, that *Christ* knows all things *past, present, and to come*, without limitation or exception, then, we shall make good our affirmation, that *Christ* is truly and properly *God*.

*Christ* has the most perfect knowledge of the heart, of its present and future emotions and passions. *But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man.*



man. (John ii. 24, 25.) *And Jesus knowing, (seeing, in the original) their thoughts, said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts? (Matt. ix. 4.) For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him. (John vi. 64.) Peter said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. (John xxi. 17.) And all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts. Re. ii. 23.*

This knowledge is too high for a dependent being; it is ascribed to God alone.—*Forgive, and do; and give to every man according to his ways, whose heart thou knowest: for thou even thou only, knowest the hearts of all the children of men (1 Kings viii. 39.) I the LORD search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings. (Jer. xvii. 10.) The LORD is in his holy temple—his eyes behold, his eye-lids try, the children of men. (Psa. xi. 4.)*

These texts ascribe to God *alone*, the character of searching and knowing the heart of man; and as expressly exclude all other beings from sharing with him this glory.—But, Jesus Christ, we have seen, searcheth the reins and hearts.—Consequently—as it is *God only* who knoweth the hearts of all the children of men—and as Christ is said, in scripture, to try and to search the reins and hearts—it follows, evidently, that omniscience is the peculiar character of Christ; and that he is the supreme God.

We cannot concede to Mr. Emlyn, that 1 Kings viii. 39. is “the strongest instance that can be produced from the sacred text, for proving any infinite, divine, perfections to belong to the Lord Jesus Christ.” There are many other “sacred texts” that do as strongly prove that infinite, divine, perfections belong to him. This one text, we believe, however, is a conclusive proof. For to say there is more than one being to whom it may be said, *thou, even thou only, knowest the hearts of all the children of men*, is not only absurd, but very impious. A plurality of such beings implies a plurality of gods. That omniscience, therefore, is the peculiar character of our Lord Jesus Christ is undeniable.

The objections brought against this consequence are really, in our mind, of no weight. “It is no wonder,” says our author, that “Solomon should not know of any other to whom that excellency was communicated.” Very good. There was, in Solomon’s day, no being besides the God of Israel that had ability to search the heart; neither has there since

since been any other. The God of Israel knew *all things, past, present, and to come.* *The eyes of the Lord,* said Hanani the seer, *run to and fro throughout the whole earth.* (2 Chro. xvi. 9.) *The eyes of the Lord,* says Solomon, *are in every place, beholding the evil and the good.* (Prov. xv. 3.) To the God of Israel; it was, he addressed himself, with the greatest solemnity, when he said, *But will God indeed dwell on earth? Behold, the heaven, and the heaven of heavens, cannot contain thee.* (1 Kings, viii. 27.) This address is proper to be made only to the omniscient Jehovah, whose Presence fills heaven and earth. The fervent and devout prayer Solomon made, at the dedication of the temple, plainly shows that the God of Israel is not a titular, circumscribed deity.† And, though he had, at times, made the cloudy pillar his *pavilion*, though he made Sinai his *throne*, though he marched, and fought, and conquered, and reduced to order the affairs of his kingdom, in *the tabernacle of testimony* erected by Moses, and rested in the temple built by Solomon, yet, his Presence was not confined: it was in all places. He pervaded immensity, and was acquainted with all the actions and all the volitions of moral beings, and, indeed, with every event, and the cause of every event, in the whole circle of existence. Moses and Solomon and the prophets give this character to the God of Israel. And we have already proved that Jesus Christ is the God and King of Israel. The reader will recollect our arguments in favour of this doctrine. That Jesus Christ made all the divine appearances recorded in the old testament, was the current opinion of the primitive fathers: and the same opinion has been advocated by the greatest divines in the last and present century.\* And, what is infinitely more, it appears to be a doctrine of the bible.

On this ground we choose to meet our opponents. If *Christ* be the Creator and Possessor of heaven and earth, the very God and King of Israel, then, certainly, he is *omnipotent*, and *omniscient*. From the premises this consequence is just. And Mr. Emlyn's arguments and objections against the infinite goodness, the omnipotence, and the omniscience of

H

Jesus

---

† Lowman on the Hebrew ritual.

\* Dr. T. Goodwin's works, Bp. Bull's works, Bp. Pearson on the creed, Dr. Watts on the Glory of Christ, Dr. Doddridge's lectures, Fleming's Christology, President Edwards's History of redemption.

Jesus are, hence, reduced to atoms. If Christ be the God of Israel, then, Solomon was acquainted with his true character. In vain, therefore, is our author's remark, that, "it is no wonder Solomon should not know of any other to whom that excellency was communicated." The divine essence, personality, and attributes of Israel's God and King were *not communicated* to him. This Solomon knew. And he knew that his dwelling in *the thick darkness*, his tenting in the tabernacle, and his resting in the temple, were a prefiguration of his being *made flesh and dwelling among us*.

Gentlemen in the Arian way stumble at the threshold. The celebrated Dr. Price advocates the *preexistence* of Christ. But it is difficult to say why it was necessary, on his plan, that Christ should preexist. For, the introduction of sin, and death, as a consequence, are, according to the Dr. *adventitious evils*; not an original part of God's plan.† For what purpose, then, did Christ preexist?—Not to be a Saviour. For this character, upon the Doctor's plan, is merely adventitious. He is, then, an adventitious Saviour to redeem men from the adventitious evils of sin and death. Mr. Emlyn held the Arian notion of Christ's preexistence. "It should seem," says he, "*that nature which did preexist, did not possess the supreme will, even before it was incarnate.*" For what purpose, it may again be asked *did he preexist?* What office did he sustain before his incarnation?—If it be replied, that the *Logos* was the *preexistent soul of Messiah*, was the Angel of the Lord, and was the prime agent, under the supreme God, in managing the affairs of the former dispensation—we answer, that the Angel of the Lord is, in his complex capacity, the very supreme God. That there was any God above him, on whom he could be dependent, or, from whom he could derive power and authority, there is not the least intimation. Solomon makes his prayer to the Angel of the Lord, as sustaining the character of the omniscient God. *Thou, even thou only, knowest the hearts of all the children of men.* If it should be said, that this is spoken of the supreme and independent God, and not of the angel of the Lord—it may be answered, that it is spoken of that Being who had taken up his peculiar residence in the cloud of glory, who dwelt in the tabernacle, and whose glory filled the house of the Lord on the day when the temple was dedicated. And this very Being, and no other,

was

---

† Price's late sermons.

was called the Angel of the Lord. This very Being was, afterwards, called Jesus Christ. He is the God that was **MANIFEST** in the flesh. In this manner, he came unto *his own*, and his own *received him not*. And this stile is retained in the new testament.—*The ANGEL of God, whose I am, and whom I serve.* (Acts xxvii. 23.) Paul was not the property of a mere, created, angel; nor did he serve a mere, created, angel; but the Angel of the covenant, Jesus Christ. In manifest allusion to the ancient stile, when he dwelt in the cloud of glory, he is called *The Lord of glory.* (1 Cor. ii. 8.) He occupied the cloud, he commanded it, and through it, displayed his glory. This is the Angel that God sent before Israel, to keep them in the way, and to bring them into the place which he had prepared. Of him they were to beware, his voice they were to obey, and him they were not to provoke: for he had the power of withholding pardon of their transgressions: for God's NAME was in him. (Exo. xxiii. 20, 21.) It was Christ whom the Israelites tempted in the wilderness, and who sent fiery serpents among them. (1 Cor. x. 9.)

Whether or not there is sufficient reason to say, that omniscience is the peculiar, underived, property of Christ, the reader will now judge. And he will judge also whether, "there is no absurdity in attributing *this* knowledge of the heart to *him*, though he be not the most high God." That omniscience is the peculiar prerogative of the supreme God, is declared in the bible. And it can no more be *communicated* to a dependent being, than can be communicated his own eternity of existence, and infinity of power and goodness. And, notwithstanding Elisha might have known the secret counsels of the king of Syria, and, notwithstanding there might have been, in the primitive church, a *spirit of discerning*, yet, it does not follow that the faculty of *knowing* and *searching* all the volitions and actions of the human heart, was communicated to the prophet, or to the church, or, can be, to any mere creature. This is the uniform and decisive language of the bible, THOU, even THOU *only*, knowest the hearts of all the children of men.—And all the churches shall know, that I am HE which *searcheth* the reins and hearts. This is the language of omniscience—it is decisive—it establishes the doctrine that Christ is truly and properly God, the omniscient Jehovah,

But, "Christ confesses," says Mr. Emlyn, "that he was ignorant of futurities: of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but

*But the Father.*" This, Christ speaks of himself, our author thinks, *in his highest nature and capacity.* But this, we beg leave to say, is a great mistake. For the term *Son*, when applied to Christ, is spoken of him in his *lowest* nature and capacity: it is expressive of his *humanity only*: it is *never*, in the bible, expressive of his *Deity*. "If it were granted that our Lord Jesus knows all things, i. e. which actually are; yet if he knows not all futurities too, which, says this writer, himself denies, he comes short of infinite omniscience. For aught I know," continues he, "a finite being may have a knowledge commensurate to this poor earth, which is but a dust of the balance, and yet not know all God's secret purposes, or the seasons which the Father keeps in his own hands." (Acts i. 7.)

Reply. How great a created being may be we shall not pretend to determine; nor shall we presume to define the extent of natural capacity that may be communicated to him. God, it must be allowed, can, if he please, create a rational being whose faculties shall be as much superiour to the highest angel, as the highest angel is superiour to the lowest of our race. And what, pray, is the amount of this supposition? It determines nothing about the character of Christ. For, in ascertaining the high nature and dignity of the LORD of GLORY, we are not to be governed by *suppositions*, and arguments, and deductions, of *philosophy*. In this scripture inquiry, *philosophy* has no voice.

But, granting the Son did not know when the day of judgment, or, the destruction of Jerusalem, would be: is it, therefore, improper to believe in the real deity of Christ? According to Mr. Emlyn, it is. "For," says he, "it would be no unreasonable demand to ask, what intimation of any such distinction of two natures they can point us to, in any of these discourses of Christ? Why should men devise, or imagine for him, such a strange, and seemingly deceitful way of speaking, from no ground, nor necessity, other than that of upholding their own precarious opinion?"

Reply. For this way of speaking there is both *ground* and *necessity*. The oracles of God have this way of speaking. The union of the two natures, in the complex person of Christ, is not of man's device. Mr. Emlyn grants that Christ is truly a *man*—and John the divine declares that *this is the TRUE GOD*—the just consequence is that the human and divine natures are united in Christ, *the second MAN, the LORD*

**LORD from heaven.** (1 Cor. xv. 47.) To him it is proper to apply the divine nature and the human nature—the divine character and the human character—divine actions and human actions. This propriety is founded on divine revelation. The doctrine of this union invalidates, wholly, the objection that the Son knoweth not when the day of judgment will be. His ignorance is to be predicated of his humanity *only*: as God, Christ could not be ignorant of any future event. But, his human nature might be ignorant of many futurities. His divine nature did not make his human nature know every thing. The union did not change the human into the divine, nor the divine into the human. There was, in Christ, no confusion, though a union, of natures. Christ is, properly, a *complex person*. He has a *distinct, human*, personality—and a *distinct, divine* personality—and, yet, so united as to make a *complex person*.

In the light of what has now been said, it may be seen that Mr. Emlyn, in *suggesting* that Trinitarians hold that the personality is *wholly divine*, is quite wrong. They, in general, hold no such thing. That Christ has a proper, *divine*, intelligence, and a proper, *human*, intelligence—and that there may be applied to him actions that are *properly human*, as well as actions *properly divine*, is their general sentiment. The ancient *Apollinarians*, indeed, held that the *personality* of Christ was predicable of his *divinity*, not of his *humanity*. But the Trinitarians, in general, disavow and reject this sentiment, as error. When there are predicated of Christ actions which imply *inferiority* and *subjection to God*, Trinitarians believe, they are predicated of his *humanity solely*—and when there are predicated of him actions which imply *absolute supremacy* over all things, they are predicated of his *divinity solely*. In favour of this belief, there is, it is imagined, the whole weight of revelation.

Should the Arians, because the union of two natures, in Christ is *indescribable* and *incomprehensible*, reject this doctrine, and demand a *description* of it, we shall beg leave to tell them that their rejection and their demand are *unreasonable*. If this demand is still urged, we, then, challenge them to *describe* the *essence* of matter—the *union* of souls and bodies—the *growth* of plants—or, the *secret agency* of God in upholding and governing the world. When they shall give a *just description* of these things, and reduce them to finite *comprehension*, we will then undertake to *describe* the union of two  
natures

natures in the complex person of Christ. Our adversaries, without being able to describe, or, account for, these things, believe them, upon the testimony of their senses. We, without being able to describe it, believe the alledged union, upon the testimony of the scriptures.

It is the *proud maxim* of many, *not to give their assent to things they cannot comprehend*. This is the boast of your men of sense and of independence.—But, it should be considered that this maxim is the foundation of skepticism, and of infidelity, and of deism, so prevalent at this day. And this, we fear, has caused many ingenuous men to embrace the *Arian system*. That two natures, differing infinitely from each other, should be united in one complex person, it seems to them is an absurdity. Their *philosophy* is not sufficient to account for this union: they can not comprehend it.—and they are not disposed to give their assent to things they cannot comprehend—therefore, they reject the doctrine that Christ is really God and really man. These gentlemen might as well, upon the same principle, reject the doctrine that they have souls and bodies. Can they comprehend the nature of their souls, or, the nature of their bodies? Can they comprehend the union of their souls and bodies? Can they comprehend how they move their limbs—how they think—how they will—how they choose—how they refuse? Now, if they cannot comprehend these things, then, they may not, on their own principle, give to them their assent. They must, in short, disbelieve their own existence, and disbelieve divine providence. They must, to be consistent, disbelieve all the leading doctrines of revelation. They cannot comprehend how God created the world—how he preserves the creatures in being—how he will raise the dead at the last day.—For “every proposition,” says Mr. Stockwell, “requires a force of evidence in proportion to its incredibility.” But the doctrine of creation, of preservation, and of a future resurrection, is, confessedly, revelation apart, in the highest degree, incredible, and, therefore, requires the most clear and undoubted evidence to support it. Should it here be said, the BIBLE informs us that God, by the exertion of almighty power created all things—by the same power, preserveth all things—and will, by the same power, raise the dead—it may also be said, the BIBLE does as clearly inform us, that the human and divine natures are united in the complex person of Christ.

Allow me, now, to ask every candid reader, has not this doctrine that clear, and undoubted, evidence in scripture, which the

the nature of it requires? It is well known, that great numbers of sensible, learned, serious, and pious, christians have, after the most diligent search into their bibles, believed it, as both *scriptural* and *consistent*.

But, "I see, with sorrow, that to this day, even among professed christians themselves," the real DEITY of CHRIST "is, to some, a stumbling-block, and, to others, foolishness." The Arians strip the blessed Redeemer of his highest crown and glory. They exhibit him in so maimed a light, that the scriptures cannot know him to be the Messiah. They come forward, with intrepidity, and blush not, more than did Herod's men of war, to reduce him to the condition of a mere, dependent, creature, though he be LORD of all. For, notwithstanding they give to him a seemingly glorious character, and ascribe to him a seemingly exalted nature—he is, nevertheless, in their estimation, a mere creature. For, on supposition, he existed *before* the heavens and the earth existed, and, on supposition, he is not only the *first* but the *greatest* of all finite beings—yet, he is, according to their sentiment, *infinitely below* the eternal God. If, indeed, Christ be only a *derived, dependant*, being—if all his power and authority were *delegated* to him—if he be no higher than the *prime minister* of God in directing the affairs of only the moral world—then, surely, he is not worthy of supreme love, and of supreme worship. To pay to him any divine worship is, on this principle, impious—to make any prayer or supplication to him, is idolatry.

This doctrine, it is believed, is opposed directly to the whole scheme of redemption, and is repugnant to the whole current of the bible. The bible teaches that Christ is worthy of supreme love and obedience, of the highest praise and adoration. Abraham obeyed and worshipped the ANGEL of the LORD. Moses, Joshua, and the pious Israelites obeyed and worshipped the LORD of GLORY. Solomon, and his people, at the dedication of the temple, adored him as the God whom the *heaven, and heaven of heavens, could not contain*. They gave to him the *highest* service and worship that is *due to him who only knoweth the hearts of all the children of men*. This very divine person, we have proved, is Jesus Christ, who *was made flesh and dwelt among us*. He is *God manifest in the flesh*. The sons of men worshipped him while he was incarnate. The wise men from the east worshipped him. The twelve disciples, and the pious among, the



the Jews, worshipped him. And he was worshipped after his resurrection, and after his ascension. The eleven prayed and said, *thou Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men—* Stephen prayed to Christ. *And they stoned Stephen, calling upon \* and saying, LORD JESUS, receive my Spirit. And he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, LORD, lay not this sin to their charge. The ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands of the blessed in heaven are represented as 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 they ascribe, in the sweetest harmony, blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, unto HIM that sitteth upon the THRONE, and to the LAMB, forever and ever !*

But, all this high obedience and homage is, upon the *Arian* principle, barefaced idolatry. There is, upon this principle, no propriety in making Christ the object of our supreme love and highest praise. And the *sensible, consistent, Arians* acknowledge it. Dr. Price, who labours to be consistent, says, in his late sermons, “that we must love Christ as a great benefactor. But our supreme love must terminate upon the one God.” The Dr. considers Christ as a derived, dependent, being—and, yet, the *first* and *highest* of all dependent beings—and, “to worship him is,” he expressly says, “an idolatry which the scriptures forbid.” This is coming out and talking consistently. For this *frankness*, the Dr. is to be admired. But this is coming out, and talking, in manifest contradiction to the language of inspired truth. The highest capacity and character of Christ is, not that of the first and highest of all dependent beings, but the *First* and *Highest* of all beings in the universe—the SUPREME, the INDEPENDENT, the OMNISCIENT, JEHOVAH. Is it not surprizing, therefore, that *worms* dare deny him his *highest* honor, and rob him of his *highest* nature and character? And may we not safely conclude, from a candid survey of this subject, that the ARIAN SYSTEM is a BASELESS FABRIC—is built on the SAND—and will FATALLY DELUDE those who CONFIDE in it?

## APPENDIX.

---

\* This is an exact translation : the word *God* is not in the Greek text.

---

# APPENDIX.

---

TO invalidate that contested text, *For there are Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these Three are One,* (1 John v. 7.) the *Arians* and *Socinians* are very solicitous. Mr. Emlyn, among the former, for his learning and ingenuity, holds a high rank. Against the original authority of this text, he, in a concise manner, sums up the *negative evidence*, from the *concessions* of Dr. Mill.\* “This text is wanting,” says Mr. Emlyn, “in our famous *Alexandrian copy*, which the Dr. calls *ingens thesaurus orientalis*. It is wanting in the famous *Vatican copy*, by which, according to *pope Leo’s order*, the *complutensian edition* was to be made. It is enough,” says Mr. Emlyn, “to shake the credit of this text, with all impartial men, that it is wanting in these *two*, the most valuable manuscripts, we know of, in the world. Besides this, the Dr. gives a long roll of other ancient manuscript *Greek copies*, in the most famous libraries of the learned which want this text. The fifteen copies of Robert Stephens have not this text. And it is wanting in the ancient versions of the new testament. The most ancient of these versions were the *Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Latin*, all which, with the *Russian*, have not this text. And Dr. Mill says that not one *Greek writer*, from the beginning of christianity to St. Jerome’s time (about 400 years) has ever cited this verse. And adds, it is certain it has been wanting in the *Greek copies* very near from the apostle’s writing this epistle. And the *Latin primitive fathers* never quoted these words. †

I

The

---

\* See Emlyn’s Inquiry into the original authority of 1 John v. 7. † Mr. Travis, who has access to the most faithful, and the most credible, documents, has proved, beyond all reasonable dispute, that Mr. Emlyn, in his inferences from the *complutensian manuscript*, the *Vatican copy*, Robert Stephens’s fifteen manuscripts, &c. has greatly mistaken.

The reader must note, that all these ancient writers are here produced, not merely for not mentioning these words, but because they treated professedly of such subjects as required the assistance of this text, and many of them of the context, and next verse. And they could never have omitted it on any other reason, but this, that they had it not in their Bibles, for above 700 years.

“It may reasonably be inquired, if there be any more evidence for this text since the reformation? Luther and Bullinger would not put this text in any editions of the Bible. Our old Bibles in Henry VIII’s and Edward VI’s time had had these words in small letters, and sometimes in a parenthesis. In Queen Elizabeth’s Bible I find the same.”

“Now, methinks, here is pretty large stock of evidence, and as much as one can well require, for a negative, to show, that this verse was not originally any part of the New-Testament, and one need have very *direct* and *peremptory* testimonies to the contrary, to make him so much as hesitate in the matter.”

Negative evidence has, in determining the judgment of a candid mind, we beg leave to say, but little weight. One *positive* fact, well supported, is of more importance than ten thousand negations. And we are very happy it is in our power to produce “very *direct* and *peremptory* testimonies” to establish the originality and authenticity of this disputed text. For these testimonies we are indebted to the judicious and learned works of the Rev. GEORGE TRAVIS, A. M. Prebendary of Chester, and Vicar of Eastham, who, in his Letters to EDWARD GIBBON, Esq. has rescued this text from the hands of its adversaries, and conferred on the CHURCH an obligation of the liveliest gratitude and love.

EXTRACTS from Mr. TRAVIS.

“First—From the writings of individuals.

1. *Laurentius Valla*, an Italian nobleman, of great erudition,

---

mistaken. He gives the most enlightened answers to the objections of those writers that have distinguished themselves most against this contested text. “Of these *Sandius*, *M. Simon*, and Mr. *Emlyn*, among the more early opponents; and Dr. *Benson*, Sir *Isaac Newton*, *M. Grisbach*, and Mr. *Bowyer*, among its more modern adversaries, seem to have been the most diffuse, in the variety of their remarks, and the most determined in their opposition.” (Letter iii. p. 60, 61.)

erudition, was the first person (as *M. Simon* confesses) who set himself to correct the *Greek M.S.S.* of the New Testament. He lived nearly a century before *Erasmus*.† By assiduous, and long continued, enquiries he got into his hands seven *Greek M.S.S.*—This passage of *St. John* was found in all these *M.S.S.* and is commented upon by *Valla*, in his Notes upon this Epistle.

2. In the Commentary upon the scriptures, written by *Nicholas de Lyra*, this verse of *St. John* is found, in the place which it now possesses, accompanied by the learned author's Annotations, without the smallest, expressed, suspicion of its authenticity. He held the professorship of Divinity, at *Paris*, with great reputation, in the *fourteenth* century.

3. About a century before this last mentioned time, appeared the Commentary of *St. Thomas*—on this epistle, in which this Verse is not only admitted, but commented upon, without any insinuations of interpolation.—

4. This Verse is found in the *Rationale of Divine Offices*, composed by the celebrated *Durandus* Bishop of *Mende*, in *Languedoc*, in the *thirteenth* century.

5. *Lombard*, who was Bishop of *Paris*, in the *twelfth* century, expressly cites this Verse in the first book of his *Sentences*.—

6. This Verse is quoted, in the same century, by *Rupert*, Abbot of *Duyts*, in Germany, in his Treatise on the "*Glorification of the Trinity*."

7. In the *eleventh* century lived *St. Bernard*, whose sermons are yet extant. This Verse is insisted upon, by him, in several of his discourses.—

8. In, or about this age, *Radulphus Ardens*, *Hugo Victorinus*, and *Scotus*, with other authors, whose works have survived to the present times, referred to the Verse in question.—

9. The *Glossa Ordinaria*, the work of *Walafrid Strabe*, was composed in the *ninth* century. Even *M. Simon* confesses, that "*no comment on the Scriptures is of equal authority with this exposition*." In this work, the text, in question, is not only found in the Epistle of *St. John*, but is commented upon, in the Notes, with admirable force, and perspicuity.—The *Greek M.S.S.* which directed him to insert this Verse in his Text, and Commentary, must,

---

† Erasmus lived in the fifteenth century.

in all probability, have been more ancient than any known to exist.—Some, at least, of the *Greek M.S.S.* which were used by him, cannot well be supposed to have been less than 300, or 400, years old; the latter of which dates carries them up to A.D. 440. But the MOST ANCIENT *Greek M.S.* which is now known to exist, is the *Alexandrian*; for which, however, Westein, who seems to have considered the question with great attention, claims no higher an antiquity than the close of the *fifth* century, or about A.D. 490. If this mode of reasoning, then, be not (and it seems that it is not) fallacious, the text, and commentary, of *Walafrid Strabo* stand upon the foundation of *Greek M.S.S.* which are more ancient, in point of time, and therefore, which ought to be more respected, in point of testimony, than any possessed by the present age.

10. In the middle of the *eighth* century *Ambrose Ansbert*, Abbot of *St. Vincents*, in *Italy*, wrote a comment upon the *Apokalypse*; wherein this verse of *St. John* is applied, in explanation of the *fifth* Verse of the first Chapter of the *Revelations*.

11. In the same century lived *Elipandus*, Archbishop of *Toledo*, in *Spain*, who maintained that *Jesus Christ* had no existence, antecedent to his coming into the world, and that he was the Son of God by *adoption*, only, and not by any *co-essentiality* in nature. These opinions of *Elipandus* were strenuously opposed by *Etherius*, Bishop of *Uxame*, a suffragan to *Elipandus*, and by *Beatus*, a Priest in the *Austrias*.—They quoted several passages of this Epistle of *St. John*; and this verse in particular.—

12. *Cassiodorus* lived in *Italy*, in the middle of the *sixth* century.—He wrote a Commentary on the Epistles, &c. of the New Testament.—In his Annotations on this chapter *Cassiodorus* uses these words:—*in Heaven, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one God.*

13. In the beginning of the *sixth* century flourished *Fulgentius*, Bishop of *Russe*, in *Africa*. In that age the tenets of *Arius* were espoused by, at least, two *African* kings, *Thrasmond*, and *Huneric*. *Fulgentius* opposed the *Arians* (although supported at that time by the former of these kings) with zeal and fortitude. And in his works we find this verse—expressly cited, and insisted upon, as being conclusive against the tenets of *Arius*.—

15. A few years before *Fulgentius*, lived *Vigilius*, who was Bishop of *Tafsum*, situated in the same province, and kingdom with

with *Russe*. He—urges the testimony of this Verse, in opposition to the errors of *Arius*.—

17. When the pious *Jerome* (who died A.D. 420) had completed that great work, of correcting the *Latin* version of the old, and settling the text of the New, Testament, which he undertook at the request of Pope *Damasus*, he closed the arduous task with a solemn protestation, that, in revising the New Testament, he had adhered entirely to the Greek M.S.S. And in *Jerome's* Testament this verse of *St. John* is read, without any doubt of its authenticity.

18. He has also quoted it in the solemn confessions of his Faith.—

19. *Augustine* was cotemporary with *Jerome*—In his Commentary upon the first Epistle of *St. John*, and upon this very chapter of that Epistle, *Augustine* uses these expressions—the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost are one.

20. In the exposition of the Faith, written to *Cyrellus*, by *Marcus Celedensis*, an *African*, the writer thus expresses himself: To us there is one Father, and one Son, who is truly God, and one Holy Spirit, who is also truly God; and these Three are One:—the precise words of the verse in question.

21. *Phæbadius* was Bishop of *Agen*, in *France*, in the fourth century. He, cites this verse, in his Book against the *Arians*.—

22. *Cyprian* was made Bishop of *Carthage*, A.D. 248. In his treatise *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, written against *Novatus*, he uses these words:—“it is written of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—*And these Three are One*.”

23. *Tertullian* was born about the time of *St. John's* death, if some Chronologists may be credited. But other computations, which indeed seem to be much more accurate, place his birth about A.D. 140. In either case, it will be no incredible thing to suppose, that *Tertullian* had conversed with Christians of his own times, who had actually sat under *St. John's* ministrations of the Gospel. In those days arose, in *Asia*, the heretic *Praxeas*, who maintained that there was no plurality of persons in the Godhead, but that the Father suffered on the cross. Against the opinions of this man *Tertullian* wrote a treatise—and alleges this passage of *St. John*—*which Three are One*—a literal quotation of the verse in question.

To

To the evidence thus furnished by *Individuals*, I now beg leave to subjoin—THE TESTIMONY OF COUNCILS, AND OTHER COLLECTIVE BODIES OF MEN—in support of the originality of the Verse in question.

1. The Council of *Lateran* was held at Rome, under *Innocent III*, A.D. 1215. Of all the assemblies, of this kind, which the christian world ever saw, this was the most numerous. It was composed of more than 400 bishops, of about 800 abbots, and priors, and of an equal number of deputies, from prelates, colleges, and chapters, who could not attend in person. Among others, the *Greek* patriarchs of *Constantinople*, and *Jerusalem*, were present; and the several patriarchs of *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*, sent, each, a bishop, and a deacon, as their representatives. The chief purpose of, convening this council, was, for the examination of certain opinions of the famous *Italian*, Father *Joachim*, founder of the congregation of *Flora*. These opinions were accused of *Arianism*, and were unanimously condemned by the council: in whose act, or decretal, containing the reasons of such condemnation, we find the verse now in question, among other passages of scripture, thus particularly set forth. It is read in the Canonical Epistle of *John*, that “*there are Three which bear Witness in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these Three are One.*”

2. About the close of the *eighth* century, the Emperor *Charlemagne* called together the learned of that age—instructing them to revise the M.S.S. of the Bible then in use.—To effect this great purpose, he furnished these commissioners with every M.S. that could be procured throughout his very extensive dominions. In their *Correctorium*, the result of their united labours, which was presented in public, to the Emperor, by *Alcuin* the testimony of the *Three* (heavenly) *Witnesses* is read, without the smallest impeachment of its authenticity.

3. In A.D. 484, an assembly of *African* Bishops was convened at *Carthage*, by King *Huneric*, the *Vandal*, and the *Arian*.—At the time appointed nearly *four hundred* bishops attended this council, from the various provinces of *Africa*, and from the isles of the *Mediterranean* sea; at the head of whom stood the venerable *Eugenius*, bishop of *Carthage*.—When *Eugenius*, with his *Anti-Arian* prelates, entered the room of consultation, they found *Cyrila*, their chief antagonist, seated on a kind of throne, surrounded by armed men; who quickly, instead of confuting the argu-  
ments

ments of their opponents, offered violence to their persons.—*Eugenius*, and his prelates, withdrew from the council-room, but not without leaving behind them a protest, in which—this Verse of *St. John* is thus especially insisted upon, in vindication of the belief to which they adhered.—“That it may appear more clear than the light, that the divinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is one, see it proved by the Evangelist *St. John*, who writes thus : *There are Three which bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these Three are One.*”

4. This verse of *St. John* was inserted in the ancient service-books of the *Latin Church*.

5. This verse of *St. John* is found in the *Confession of Faith* of the *Greek church*.

6. This verse is also found in the liturgy, or public service-books, of the *Greek church*.

If there can be, at this time, an *unerring* method of demonstrating, that any particular passage of scripture was considered, by the primitive Christian church, as authentic, as bearing upon it the seal of divine inspiration, it must be by shewing such passage placed in its public creeds, or confessions of faith, and appointed to be read in the solemnities of its religious worship.


7. The ancient version, or translation, of the New Testament into the *Armenian* language, hath always contained this verse.

8. The *most ancient* of all the Versions of the Books of the New Testament, from the languages in which they were originally written, is the *Old Italic*. This Version was made in the *first* century, and therefore **WHILST ST. JOHN WAS YET ALIVE** ; and was used by all the *Latin Churches* in *Europe, Asia, and Africa*, for many centuries after his death. And thus the origin of the Verse in question, is, at length, carried up, not by inferences, or implications, alone, however fair, and obvious, but by **PLAIN, AND POSITIVE, EVIDENCE**, to the age of *St. John* himself. For this *most valuable*, as well as *most ancient*, Version hath constantly exhibited the Verse 1 John v. 7. (p. 18--55.) Throughout the vast series of *one thousand four hundred* years, which intervened between the days of *Praxeas*, and the age of *Erasmus*, not a single author, whether *Patripassan, Cerinthian, Ebionite, ARIAN, Macedonian, or Sabellian*, whether of the *Greek, or Latin*, whether of the *Eastern, or Western, Church*—whether in *Asia, Africa*



*Africa* or *Europe*—hath ever taxed the various quotations of this verse—with interpolation, or forgery. Such silence *speaks*, most emphatically speaks, in favour of the verse. (p. 319, 320.)

THE RESULT, THEN, FROM THE WHOLE, is—that THE VERSE, in question, SEEMS, BEYOND ALL DEGREE OF SERIOUS DOUBT TO HAVE STOOD IN THIS EPISTLE, WHEN IT ORIGINALLY PROCEEDED FROM THE PEN OF ST. JOHN. In the *Latin*, or Western, Church, the suffrages of *Tertullian*, and *Cyprian*, of *Marcus Celedensis*, and *Phabadius*, in its favour, aided by the early, the solemn, the public, appeal to its authority, by the *African* Bishops under *Huneric*; the Preface, Bible, and *conscripta-fides*, of *Jerome*; the frequent, and direct, citations of the verse by *Eucherius*, *Augustine*, *Fulgentius*, *Vigilius*, and *Cassiodorus*:—these, supported, as to the *Greek*, or Eastern, Churches, by the Dialogue between *Arius* and *Athanasius*, as well as by the *Synopsis* of this Epistle—by the *Armenian* Version, which was framed from *Greek* M.S.S. by the very early, and constant, use of the *Apostolos* in the same *Greek* Church (an usage which seems to be deducible even from the Apostles themselves) and by its *public Confession of Faith*:—ALL THESE evidences, arising within the limit of the *sixth* century, (to pass over the immense accumulation of testimony which has been produced subsequent to that æra) offering themselves to the test of the judgment, combined in one point of view, unchecked by a single negation, unrebuked by any *positive* contradiction, unresisted by any the smallest, *direct*, impeachment of the authenticity of the verse, throughout all the annals of all antiquity:—ALL THESE CIRCUMSTANCES seize the mind, as it were, by violence, and compel it to acknowledge the verity, the original existence, of the verse in question.” (p. 344—346.)



N. B. The pages in the preceding work are much larger than it was at first expected they would be, which is the reason that they do not amount (agreeably to the proposals) to about 90 pages.