To the Reverend

Dr. C L A R K E,

Rector of St. James's,

W E S T M I N S T E R.

Reverend SIR,

I SHOULD not have given you the Trouble of this Address, if my Worthy and Learned Friend, the Author of the following Treatise, concerning the Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, &c. could have been prevailed upon to have put his Name to it. If I mistake not, it is written with all those Qualifications, which you in your Introduction require, except that one which is also altogether extrinsic to its true
true Value, and is (if it be a Fault) the most easie of all to pardon, since no body but himself can be the Lofer by it. But his Modesty and Humility being of a Piece with his Learning and Piety, which are confined by no common Bounds, he contents himself with the Satisfaction of maintaining and defending a good Cause, without reaping that just Applause, which results from the Judicious Management of it. You will find the whole Composure governed by a Spirit of Christianity, and not by a Spirit of Popery or Persecution. And if any one be not favourable to the Argument, or satisfied with his and the Church's Reasons for the Common Faith, at least the Learning and Candor with which he treats it, may, I am per-
persuaded command no unfa-
vourable Reception.

There is nothing for certain more commendable in any Wri-
ter, than Candor and Sincerity, without perplexing the Questi-
on with a Multitude of Proofs, but little or nothing to the Pur-
pose, and drawing in Authors and Authorities, to speak that which we are certain enough they could never mean: And nothing undoubtedly is more necessary to guide our Judg-
ment, in distinguishing what is the Scripture Doctrine in any Point, whether it be an Article of Faith, or a less necessary Truth only, than a good Understand-
ing of the Original Revelation it self, and of the best and most Ancient Interpreters thereof. These our Learned Author pos-
tes in great Perfection; and
though he hath not the Honour and Happiness of waiting at the Altar; yet he truly respects your Order, and above all values the Sacred *Depositum* to you committed; neither doth he want Talents and Endowments to distinguish him, even if he were admitted into the Sacred Function; and therefore I hope you will not neglect to consider what he offers upon this Subject, though it comes from a Lay-Man, whose great Ambition is to lie concealed.

I must confess, I have had the following Papers by me above six Months, but I still deferred the Publication, in hopes the Author might have been persuaded to have owned them himself; but since no Intreaties can shake the Resolution he hath taken of continuing unknown,
known, I thought I ought not to detain them any longer from the Service of the Publick, for the sake of some uncommon Remarks in them. And the Reverend Dr. Wells, having considered your Introduction, and offered several things, in respect to the General Design and Plan of your Book, which will be thought by many not unworthy your Notice; it was not only my Opinion, but that of others also whom I consulted, That these Learned Remarks on the Book itself, would very properly follow what that Learned Doctor hath observed upon the Introduction. That so this whole Matter may be sifted into according as it deserveth, and the Evidence of Truth may determine it for the strongest Side; which is all the End that I here-
in propose to my self, that so God may be glorified in his Church by the Profession of a True Faith.

If you find the Observations and Remarks of my Learned Friend well grounded, you will do your Self and the Truth the greatest Honour, in receiving them according to the Intrinsic Weight they bear; and if they be not thus grounded, it will be a Piece of Justice due to the Publick, to undeceive those who may differ from you in their Opinion concerning his Manner of treating those Texts which have been alledged by you in favour of your Hypothesis, as distinguished from the received Doctrine of the Church of England, in Her Articles and Offices.

You will not, I believe, be able to fix upon him the Cha-
Character of a Despicable and Careless Writer, when you shall set about a Re-examination of that Original Revelation, both of the Old and New Testament, which is the true and undoubted Standard to go by in this Dispute. I have the Hopes, you will fully discharge the Promise with which you have bound yourself, and which the Church, which hath been so kind to you, hath a Right to expect. There are about Forty Texts, upon which the main Stress of your Theory depends, that are here examined; and being tried according to the Catholick Exposition, are vindicated for the Church by an able Scriptureist, who hath applied the Rules of Criticism, not against but for the
the Faith, of which the Catholic Church is in Possession.

When I had Occasion to mention your Name in the Life of Bishop Bull, and thereupon to take notice of your late Celebrated Performance, touching the Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, so far as the Honour of that Great Man did seem to be concerned; I did not think I should ever trouble the World or You again upon this Head. And though, as you know, I have with your self been publickly animadverted upon by a very Zealous and Learned Divine in our Church, for not coming up to his Measures of Orthodoxy; and censured for that very Part of this Good Bishop's Life, in which you are more particularly concerned, as if I there shewed my self too
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too favourable to you and your Doctrine, and made too near Approaches towards Arianism, though even by following that Great Defender of the Nicene Faith, of whose Writings I was there giving an Historical Account. However, I chose rather to bear the Censure passed upon me, without saying one Word for myself, but leaving my Readers to judge, as they should see Reason, either for or against me, than to enter beyond my Depth, or presume to intermeddle with the Discussion of so venerable a Mystery of our Religion as this, of which I can by no means think myself or any other obliged to have a full and adequate Idea: Notwithstanding I was thus invited by your and my Animadverter, or rather chal-
challenged to defend Bishop Bull and my self, and to adventure the losing my self in the τὰ βδων τῆς ἔρευς, when the Part of an Historian did only belong to me, and there wanted not able Divines enough in our Church, I was sure, to vindicate the Truth of the Scripture Doctrine, concerning the Object of our Worship, as it was understood and believed in the beginning, is now, and, I trust, ever shall be.

If I have discharged the Part of an Historian faithfully, in the Accounts which I have given, I have done my Duty, and what I undertook. And of this you were very sensible, when you were pleased to express your self to me with so much Candor and Ingenuity upon that Subject. It was not within
in my Province, as such, to debate those Scholaftical and Critical Points, in which some Great Masters of Controverfie have loft themselves. And I never thought that it would have been expected by any, that in an History, I should have entered into the Detail of the abftrufleft Questions, or have discussed the various Acceptations of fuch Terms, as I had occasion to ufe after Great Men, who had taken them in the fame Sense before me. Not engaging my felf therefore farther, I shall account it no small Satisfaction to find, that what I there advanced hath not been altogether without Fruit; if it may have given, at leaft an Hint to Men of more Learning and Leifure,
Leisure, either to correct what I have said, or to carry the Matter further, and very accurately to examine those Weights and Measures, which are to determine us in this Grand Question now before us.

To the Gospel and to the Testimony the Appeal is made, and there let it be determined. You have taken very much Pains in the Search; and others also have been at no less, who cannot yet be satisfied with yours. We must all, however, commend the Design of tracing the Originals of our most Holy Faith, with Candor and Impartiality; and of most strictly cleaving to the sincere Revelation of Divine Truth. And far be it from me, to derogate in
in the least from any Service you may have formerly done to the Cause of Religion, whether Natural or Revealed; or to lessen any Part of those Solid Merits, which are and must be confessed to be in you, even by those who are otherwise very different from you; I mean especially as touching this deep Article, which will for ever continue to puzzle all the Disputers of this World.

But I could heartily have now wished, That we of the Laity had no such Handle ever given us, as this your last Book hath afforded, as it is to be feared, but to too many, who think themselves able to overturn any Foundations whatsoever, if such a Method as
as you there propose be allow-able, with respect to the most Solemn Acts and Deeds of that Church and Community where-of we are Members, and to substitute what they please in their Room. It cannot be de-nied, but that your Method hath a plausible Appearance at the first View, and that you have said as much as is possible for the Setting it off, and recommending it to your Reader. But it is no less undeniable, that a considerable Advantage hath been thence made by the Enemies of our Peace at this Time, whether with or without Reason I do not say, and that our Church, both as to Doctrine and Worship, hath by this Means been very much traduced, and even triumphed over
over by our Adversaries of several Sorts and Denominations.

Now if your System, which you have drawn out in many more Propositions than we have Articles, be indeed the true Scripture System; it will be doubtless our Duty to renounce so far the Doctrine and Worship of our Church, as it is inconsistent with your said Propositions, and immediately to set about a new and thorough Reformation; left while we tax the Church of Rome with Idolatry, we our selves should at the same time be found guilty of it in our common Devotions, and in our most Solemn Acts of Communion; and that so much the more unpardonably, as that no heavier Charge can
can be laid against that corrupt Church for a Ground of our Separation, than that of Idolatry, as it hath been managed by the late most Learned Bishop Stillingfleet. But if otherwise, and this your System, after a most strict and elaborate Examination of it, be found no more consistent with the Scripture, than it is with the received Doctrine and Worship of our Church; then it will be doubtless our Duty, to continue steadfastly our Adherence to such Doctrine and Worship, according as the same is delivered to us from the Scriptures, by our first Reformers; That is, in the Sense which the Catholick Fathers and Primitive Bishops have thence collected. And I am willing to hope, that in the Learned
to Dr. Clarke there will be found so much of Christian Sincerity and Candor, as may oblige him by his own Example to approve of this Procedure; to justify the Rule which they have given us, and he hath commended, to prevent the Overturning of Foundations both Sacred and Civil, with which we are threatened from a Method of this Nature; and to endeavour to heal again those Wounds of his Mother the Church, which this Book of his may have given Her, and which so many of his Brethren loudly complain of, as if She had received them, not from an Enemy, but from a Friend.
But whatever may be said, either for or against this System of yours, and with whatever Mind it was by you published, thus much is certain and fixed; That according to the best of our Capacity, we are obliged, if we would avoid running into Heresy and Error, to have Recourse to the Rule it self, and also to take in the best Helps for the understanding this Rule. And it is no less certain, that either by not having Recourse to the Original Revelation it self, which is the Rule, or by neglecting the best Helps for the Interpretation of it which we are capable of using, there is the greatest Danger of falling into some Mistake; and generally so much the more, as the Enquirer is a Person of brighter Parts than
than ordinary, yea if he be never so little above the common Level. And if the Judges, and others Learned in the Law, shall follow the same Method of interpreting the Laws of the Land, and accommodating the Civil Oaths and Engagements, as you have taken in interpreting and accommodating the Sense of the Church, in her most Authentick Forms and Declarations before God and Man, and of the Venerable Fathers of the Catholick Church; There are many of the Opinion, That every Thing might easily be leaped over, and that no Establishment could be so strong as to last long.

Which being considered it is presumed that you cannot take it amiss, if this be a little far...
ther enquired into, for the sake of what is so dear to your self; for who knows where-abouts his Religion, Liberty or Property may be, if such a Latitude of Interpretation be defensible, as is avouched in your Third Part openly, and is therefore suspected in your First and Second. This will deserve to be set to rights.

It is very justly by you observed, That this Matter, which is of the greatest Importance, ought not to be treated of slightly and carelessly; for I fully agree with you, that it ought to be examined thoroughly on all Sides, by a serious Study of the whole Scripture, and by taking Care that the Explication be consistent with it self in every Part. And certainly the Design of digesting
getting with Care and Pains under proper Heads the Texts of Scripture which relate to this Doctrine, is very commendable; and then drawing up a Scheme of the whole, and reducing and explaining it, in a great Number of particular and distinct Propositions. And if indeed, according to the Weight and Dignity of the Subject, you have considered it throughout as carefully and distinctly as you was able; there is no sufficient Reason in my Opinion, for any Learned Person, who may think you mistaken, to treat You angrily, and in the Spirit of Popery, as if we were not to use our own Understandings in Matters of Religion as well as in other Matters; but must always plead for what Notions happen at any time to pre-
vail, as if they were therefore true, because they prevail.

However, Sir, You know there is an Apostolical Injunction, that we should earnestly contend for the Faith; and if the Divine Economy of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the Unity of the Divine Essence, which is taught us by our Excellent Church, in her most Publick and Authentick Acts, and is the Common Faith both of Protestants and Papists, or the Common Salvation as delivered in all the Churches Reformed and Unreformed, should be that Faith which was once delivered unto (or by) the Saints; you must not be disturbed if some, who have pursued Truth by the same Methods you have done,
done, do earnestly contend against you in a Matter of so high a Nature, where they apprehend you to be mistaken after all the painful Search you have made; and not to have represented the true Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, but to have substituted in its room another of your own; against the true Apostolical Tradition of that Doctrine, and the common Interpretation of the Scriptures throughout All the Ages of the Church of Christ.

If it should be thus, I say, as some, whose Learning and Piety are unquestionable, and who also have spared no Pains in the Research, do apprehend and assert; in this Case an Earnest Contention for the Catholick Faith, and for the Revelation of
of God as generally understood in the Church, where there is opposed to it no more than a private Interpretation of Scripture, should (if not commendedit at least) not be presently and altogether condemned, though it may not seem to you written with all that Spirit of Meekness, which you have laid in your Claim for, in whomsoever shall appear against your Explication. Indeed it is much to be wished that the Spirit of Meekness and Christianity did more universally influence the Management of all our Disputes both Religious and Civil; which I conceive may be very consistent with an Holy and Humble Zeal for God's Glory and the Defence of the Christian Revelation; and with an earnest Contention for all the Great
Great Truths thereof, by the Word of God, and the Testimony of his Saints, even such as were the Greatest Lights of the Church in the earliest and purest Ages of it. To a fuller Discovery of these important Points if the following Papers may any ways contribute, you will not be displeased, I am confident, with the Application which is made to you by,

Reverend SIR,

Your most Faithful

Novem. 16. 1713.

Humble Servant,

ROB. NELSON.
Perhaps the Reader may wonder, since Jesus Christ is the End of the Law, and Moses and the Prophets are everywhere full of his Sacred Person; that there is little cited out of the Old Testament for a Proof of his Divinity in the following Observations; especially since it is reasonable to believe, That in so frequent a Mention of Him as there occurs, something must be dropped in several Places in relation to his Godhead, as a proper Preparative for the greater Light of the Gospel-Dispensation. But the Truth is, The Learned Dr. having confined his Enquiries to the New Testament, gave little Occasion of making Excursions into the Writings of the Old; tho' I am well satisfied, from those Writings themselves, from the Citations of the Apostles, and from the Interpretations of the Antients, that there is a rich Treasure of Divine Authorities contained in them, which giving and receiving Light from the New, are an able Witness of
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of the great Mystery of the Son of God, in the hand of a Scribe that is well instructed to the Kingdom of Heaven, and knows, like the Householder, the Time and Manner of bringing into View both the New and the Old, for the Profit and Pleasure of those that are entertained by Him.

As for the Citations out of the Fathers, there would have been little need of them, had there been any Certainty that the Doctor's Preface would have been always read with the Performance following it, or always remember'd: But for fear, lest the Contradiction charged on these good old Men might not haply occur to the Reader's Mind, in weighing the Passages which the Dr. alleged, and their whole Writings might suffer Damage, and be judged of a Piece with the Sense impos'd on these few Passages: I have made it my Endeavour to shew, in some Instances, the little Ground which the Dr. had for placing those Authors on the side of his Opinion; being verily persau'ed, that such as are cited in these following Papers, give great Light to the Doctrine of our Church, and confirm its Antiquity, as deduced from Scripture.
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CHAP. I.

Of God the Father.

MAT. xix. 17. There is none good but One, (as, one * Being) that is, God.

*There is no necessity for rendering the Word as by One Person, as the learned Dr. supposes; since it may be as well
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well or better done by One Being. For One (εἷς) is Masculine, by reason of its Relation to God, (Θεός;) and is no less fitted to represent Being, than it is Person; since they are neither of them Masculine. After the like manner is εἷς used for One Thing, Galat. iii. 28. for ye are all one (εἷς) in Christ Jesus; not one Person, for that is impossible; but one Thing, as the vulg. Latin reads it, Omnes enim vos Unum estis in Christo Jesu; which Jerom explains thus.

You are all one Body of Christ; Omnes unum Corpus estis Christi. Theodoret says, The Term One, is τὸ εἷς ἀντὶ τῆς τοῦ σώματος, used for One Body.

Theophr. explains it, as we are ἡμεῖς ἐν σώματί ἐσμέν, all One Body.

And doubtless the Greeks were proper Judges of their own Language. If then One (εἷς) signifies one Thing or Body, in the Galatians, Why may it not signify One Being in St. Matthew? But after all, the Words might have been better rendered in our English Translation, There is none good but God alone; as they are in the vulg. Latin, Nemo bonus nisi solus Deus, Luke xviii. 19. for so we render the very same Terms, εἷς μην εἷς Θεός, in Mark ii. 7. Who
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Who can forgive Sins but God only? Which the vulg. Latin confirms, nisi solus Deus; and is justified by the Parallel place, Luke v. 21. which puts μόνος in the place of εἰς, Who can forgive Sins but God alone? ἐ ὤτι μόνος ὢς Θεός; Which puts an end to the Criticism of Personality founded upon the Term εἰς.

II. Mark xii. 29. The first of all the Commandments is; Hear O Israel, the Lord (Jehovah) our God, the Lord (Jehovah) is One, (or the * only one, that is, the only God.)

† So the Hebrew and Greek read it.

* The Term One is used in this exclusive Sense in the Old Testament, out of which the Passage is cited; as for instance, what we render, and that Man perished not alone in his Iniquity, Josh. xxii. 20. is in the Hebrew, and that (a) one Man perished not in his Iniquity; and is paraphrased thus in the Alexandria Manuscript, (b) and tho' this one Man was alone, yet He perished not alone in his Sin; and in the following Sentence, I called Him alone, Isaiah li. 2. the Term alone is the rendering of

B 2 the
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the Hebrew Word one. (See No I.) now in this very Sense is the Lord our God said to be One, that is, exclusive of the Gods of the Nations, among whom the Jews were then Strangers, as the Text is explained Zech. xiv. 9. _in that Day shall the Lord (or Jehovah) be One, (or the only God;) and his Name One, (or be only invoked) in opposition to Idols, and their Names that were to be cut off from the Land, c. xiii. 2. which is confirmed by comparing Deut. vi. 4. whence the Text is taken, with v. 12, 14. for Moses having inculcated Love and Fidelity to the One and only God, and enjoined them the Methods of preserving themselves and their Children after them, in this Faith and Practice from v. 4. to v. 10. he proceeds to caution them from falling away from the One God to the Gods of the Nations that were round about them, when they should come into the Land of those Idolatrous People; which is done from v. 10. to v. 15. and shews, That the Unity of the Godhead and their adherence to him, is taught and commanded in Opposition to the Multitude of false Gods, and the Worship paid them; and it is very probable that this Unity is generally, if not always, affirmed.
firmed in the Sacred Writings in this exclusive Sense, as opposed to the Multitude of false Gods.

As for the first Citation out of Athanasius contr. Gent. p. 6. it is plain from the Context, that the Unity of the Godhead affirmed in this Place, is not in Contradistinction to the Son; but to another unbegotten God or Principle, besides the true One, conceived by some Hereticks to be the Author of Evil.

In the second Citation out of his Orat. 3. contr. Arian. the Unity is asserted in like manner in Opposition, not to the Son, but to pretended Deities. For thus Athanasius explains himself, § 6. These sort of exclusive Terms are used not upon the account of the Son; but to deny the Existence of any other Being, like the Father and his Word.

And he affirms the Son in this very Place to be Co-essential with the Father.

Irenæus was of the same Mind with Athanasius, concerning the exclusive Terms,
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Terms, that they did not affect the Son, when he says,

*Ita ut is quidem,*

*qui omnia fecerit,* That He, who made

cum verbo suo justè all things, is justly called
dicatur Deus & with his Word, the Only


3. c. 8.

Including the Son in the Only Lord God, and not excluding him by the Term Only. See N° v. and Tertull. adv. Prax. c. 18, 19.

III. Mark xii. 32. There is † one God, and there is none other but He.

† This referring to the foregoing Citation out of Deut. vi. 4. The Lord our God, the Lord is one, shews it must be understood in the same exclusive Sense here, that is, in Opposition to false Gods; as appears from the following explicatory Sentence, *And there is none other but He,* which is spoken of the true God in Opposition to false Ones, Deut. xxxii. 37, 38, 39. Isai. xlv. 20, 21. and therefore is not to be opposed to the Son. In which Sense it is taken by Tertullian, who says, *There-
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Therefore there is one God the Father, and there is none other but He. By which Inference He does not deny the Son, but another God.

Again, that He says, there is no other God besides himself, Isai. xlv. 5. is spoken in respect of the Idolatry of the Gentiles and of the Jews.

Again, I am God, and there is none other besides me; Isai. xlv. 21. Sept. He shews himself to be the only one, but in Union with the Son.

Novatian follows him in the like Interpretation, and says of God the Father; who says by the Prophet Isai. xlv. 21. Sept. I am God, and there is none beside me; who says by the same Prophet, Isai. xlviii. 11. I will not give my Glory unto another; that He may exclude all Heathens and

---Igitur unus Deus Pater, & absque eo alius non est. Quod ipse inferens, non filium negat, sed alium Deum.

Itaque praeter semetipsum non esse alium Deum, hoc propter Idololatriam tam nationum quam Israelis.

Ego Deus, & absq; me alius non est, qui se unicum, sed cum Filio ostendit. adv. Prax. c. 18.

Qui dicit per Prophetam, Ego Deus, & non est praeter me. Qui per eundem Prophetam referet; Quoniam majestatem meam non dabo alteri, ut omnes cum suis fragmentis Ethnicos excudat.
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eludat & Hare- Hereticks with their false
ticos, cap. 3. Gods, or their own Inven-
tions.

Tho' then God Father be ο̄ν τοθθ, or such who derives his Being and God-
head from no Cause; yet since the Terms One God are used in no such
Meaning in this Place, but in oppo-
position only to false Gods; they ought not
to be confined to the Father alone, as
exclusive of the Son: Neither, indeed,
does Athanasius so confine them in the
Passage cited from him, under this Ar-
ticle, but includes the Son in the One
God, saying,

"Εἰς θ' θ' Ο̄ν τοθθ, &c. The Son also is in that
τοθθ μην, &c.

Εἰς θ' Θεός καὶ μην, &c. And He tells us just before, that tho'
τοθθ μην, &c.

We worship one God, who is both Father and Son. Orig. cont.

Cell. lib. 8. p. 386.
And again, § 8, of the same Oration.

These and such like exclusive Terms are not used on the Son's account to exclude Him, but false Gods only.

V. John xvii. 3. That they might know Thee the Only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.

† The Term Only does not always exclude every thing else but the Subject to which it is united; as Ecclus. xxiv. 5. Wisdom says of her self, I alone (μόνον) compassed the Circuit of Heaven; which surely does not exclude the Father, since Job says of El shaddai, or the Almighty God, a Name appropriated by the Modern Arians to the Father, That He walketh in the Circuit of Heaven: If then the Term Only does not exclude the Father, we cannot necessarily infer that it does the Son. And indeed it is not understood to do so, as will appear from the following Authorities, that may be added to the foregoing No. II, III.
Novatian says, for if Christ would not have been thought God, why did He add, *And Jesu Christ whom thou hast sent,* except he had a Mind to be accounted God? But He joyned himself with God, that by this Union, He might be known to be God, as really He is; we must therefore believe, according to the foregoing Rule, in the Lord, the only true God, and by consequence in Jesus Christ whom He sent: Who would never, as we have said, have joyned himself with the Father, except He had been willing they should have believed him to have been God.

I cannot conceive, says St. Hilary, how it is necessary to a right Faith, to separate the Son from the true God, who cannot be separated
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And again, The Faith of the Church, which confesses the Father to be the only true God, confesses the Son also.

He probably refers to the Nicene Creed, where He is called very God of very God.

St. Ambrose says,

The Evangelist in Writing those Words of our Lord, That they may know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent, has so united the Father and Son together by the Conjunction, that no one can separate Christ the True God from the Majesty of the Father; for a Conjunction never separates.

Scribendo verba Domini, ut cognoscant te solum verum Deum, & quem misisti Jesum Christum, conjunctione illa Patrem utique copulavit & Filium, ut Christum verum Deum a Majestate Patris nemo seceret; nam quem unum non conjunctio separat.

This
This Doctrine is evidently founded upon Scripture, in which the Son is called, the true God and Eternal Life, 1 Joh. v. 20. for that this relates to the Son and not to the Father, is clear, not only from the Construction itself, but from Eternal Life joined with the true God, which is spoken of no Person in the preceding Part of the Epistle, but of the Son only; vid. inf. N° 410.

To what purpose then was the exclusive Term Only added, if the Son be true God? It was in opposition to Idols and false Gods.

So says St. Basil, He is called true in Opposition false Gods.

And Gregor. Nazianz. I conceive the Words, that they may know Thee the only true God, are spoken to exclude those who are no Gods, tho' they are so called; for it would not have been added, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.
Chap. I. of the Trinity, &c. if the Terms the only True had been used in opposition to the Son, and the whole Expression had not been meant of the Divine Nature in common to them both.

This Observation upon the exclusive Term Only, is justified out of Deut. xxxii. 12. where it is used in opposition to false Gods, and not otherwise. The Lord alone did lead Him, and there was no strange God with Him.

The Citations out of Athanasius are to be explained by the Passages in Numb. 2. 3. adding only one Observation, that the Context shews, that in the last of those Citations, the only true God, is affirmed of the Father in opposition to false Gods.

Origen indeed makes the only true God to signify the Father as he is ὁ ἄλλος ὁ Θεός, God underived from any Cause; but perhaps it may be as difficult to prove this Sense of the Words out of Scripture, which the Dr. professed to be his Rule in these Matters, as it is to make
make good the critical Remark of the same Father, that the Article prefixed to Θεος appropriates the Name to God the Father; when it is evident, that the Son is called God with the same Article by his Disciple Thomas, Joh. xxii. 28. Θεος μου. And by St. Paul also in his Epistle to the Hebrews, c. i. v. 8. which is taken from Psal. xlv. 6. to say nothing of Writers older than Origen; and even of Origen himself, who destroys his Criticism in his own Writings, as will appear from one Instance that may serve for others, μελετηθειται τινη του Θεος ιματων, which he uses of the Son, Lib. 4. cont. Cels. p. 170.

VIII. 1. Cor. viii. 4. We know that an Idol is nothing in the World, and that there is none other God but One.

Here it is plain, that the Unity of the Godhead is affirmed in opposition to Idols.

Ver. 5, 6. For though there be that are called Gods — as there be Gods many, and Lords many. — To us there is but one God the Father.

Here again the Unity of the Godhead is opposed to the Multitude of pretended Deities; and though the Father
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ther be said to be the one God; yet is not this spoken to the Exclusion of the Son, who has been proved to be comprehended in the one God. No. 2, 3.

Irenæus expresses himself after this manner,

And thus it is proved, Et sic unus Deus that there is one God the Pater ostenditur, Father, who is above all, qui est super omnia, and thro' all, and in all; & per omnia, & above all (as) Father. — in omnibus. Super
and in all of us (as) Word. — For there is one thron all (as) Father. — and in all of us (as) Spirit. — For there is one Father, who is above all, qui est super omnia autem Verbum — in omnibus autem
and thro' all, and in us all, nobis Spiritus — Ephes. iv. 6. 
quia unus Pater, qui
lib. 5. c. 18.

In these Words it is plain, that under one God; the Father, is contained the Word, who is thro' all; and the Spirit, which is in all; in which respect He is said to be thro' all, and in all.

Ver. 6. And in one Lord Jesus Christ. This
This is not added as if the Son were not comprehended in the one God the Father, as He is the Word; but forasmuch as the Son is not only God, but God and Man consisting of two Natures; and by reason of that Union cannot be comprehended, as to his whole Person, under any one of them; therefore does He seem to be mentioned after God the Father, as a Being distinct from pure Deity, such as the Father is; though his superior Nature, or God the Word, is comprehended in it. See No. 501.

The Passage out of Mr. Mede, which says, that we have but One in each sort of superior and inferior Deities, supposes indeed, that the Father is the superior, and the Son the inferior Deity. But since He opposes the Son to the Baalim, or Daemon Mediators of the Heathen, who were the inferior Deities, and nothing more than the Souls of Men deified after Death, as he affirms, Lib. 3. c. 4. it appears to be plain, that when he names Christ the inferior Deity, he means it in no other respect, than in that of his deify'd Soul, or deify'd Humanity. And therefore
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fore tells us, Chap. 6. That when the Athenian Philosophers had heard Paul preach Jesus risen from the Dead, they encountered him on that account, as a Setter forth of strange Daemon Gods, 

*Acts xvi. 18.* and that Celsus in Orig. Lib. 8. calls Jesus Christ the Christian's Daemon, because he was honoured by them with Divine Worship after Death, as their Lord and Saviour:

LXVI. *Acts* v. 3, 4. To lie to the Holy Ghost. — thou hast not lied unto Men, but unto God.

If the Term God can be applied to the Holy Ghost, (see No 1056, 1075, 1132, 1211, 1248.) Why should there be so much Pains taken to prove it to belong to the Father, who is not mentioned in the Context? But if the Term God, cannot be applied to the Holy Ghost, how comes it about that when the Object of the Lie is said by the Apostle to be not himself, but God, the Author of his Power and Mission, it is yet affirmed to be the Holy Ghost? Since if the Holy Ghost be not God, but act by an Authority derived from C him,
him, the Person of the Spirit would be as little affected with the Lie spoken, in comparison of the Authority affronted in him, as the Persons of the Apostles were affected by it in comparison of the Authority affronted in them. Or if the Person of the Spirit were the Object of the Lie, by reason of the Authority delegated to him, the Apostles themselves would have been the Objects of it also, from the same Authority committed to them. Which is a Difficulty that is not removed by the large Citations alleged by the Dr., because, though it be granted, that God is present in an especial manner, wheresoever his Spirit is, and that He is affronted in those, in whom his Spirit is, as being present with them through the same Spirit, when the Affront is offered, yet does it not follow, neither can it be granted, that what is a Lye against the Holy Ghost, should be comparatively none against the Sons of Men, except it be true, That the Spirit is God.

As for the Explication of Athanasius, it is certain, that in the very Section out of which it is taken, He teaches the Essential Unity of the Spirit with God, and
and therefore looked upon the Sin against the Holy Ghost to be done against God, as being both subjectively One, tho' Personally two.

The Spirit of God (says He) is no stranger to, or is not separated from, the Divinity and Essence of God.

To Πνεῦμα τῷ Θεῷ Θεοτόκῳ αὐτῷ ἢ διὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ ἀληθείαν. De Incarn. & cont. Ar. §. 13. See also §. 9.

CLXXX. Galat. iv. 8. Τὸ δὲ δείγμα τοῦ λόγου τοῦ παρουσίας τοῦ θεοτόκου ἀπὸ τὴν καθ' ὁμοιότητα τῆς θεότητος.

The Comment on these Words is, Unto Gods which have no Being in Nature; or to Gods, which in Nature (or in reality) have no Being.

First, then, this rendering is contrary to the two most antient Versions: The Vulgar reads it according to our Translation.

Which by Nature are no Gods.

Qui naturā non sunt Dii.
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Qui naturâ sūd non sunt Dij. The Syriac is more plain. Which by their own Nature are no Gods. Which is followed by the Arabic.

Secondly, The rendering in the Comment, is not agreeable to the Apostle's Style of Writing.

For First, He no where uses φύσις for Nature in general, or the System of Natural Beings, as the Dr. seems to do; for I conceive his Meaning is, That they are Gods, which have no Existence among natural or real Beings.

Secondly, Had φύσις, or Nature been used by him in that general Notion, yet would he have expressed himself by ἐν φύσιν, and not φύσις alone, after the Participle of the Verb substantive; if in Nature, and not by Nature, had been his true Meaning, as will appear from the following Instances;

Rom. viii. 8. οὐ ὃς ἐν σὺμα ὅντες. They that are in the Flesh.
Chap. i. 7. τοὶς ἐστὶν ἐν φάσιν. That be in Rome.

neither
neither am I conscious of any one Instance to the contrary, in all the Apostles Writings.

Thirdly, If φύσα be granted to signify what the Comment would have it, yet is it not probable that the Apostle would have join'd it with τῶν μὴ ἐστί, to signify Things which have no real Being; because this latter Expression would have done it of itself, according to his Style in the like Cases; as Rom. iv. 17. 1 Cor. i. 28. τῶν μὴ ἐστί, signifies Things which are not, or, have no Existence; which is agreeable to the Septuagint, Isai. xli. 11, 12. where ἐστὶν ὡς οὐκ ὅρισι, has this Meaning, They shall be as if they were not, or, had not been; or, as those who have no Existence at all. So in like manner may it be supposed, that the Apostle would have used τῶν Θεῶν τῶν μὴ ἐστί, to have expressed Gods who have no Existence at all, or no real Existence, had that been his Mind.

But, Fourthly, φύσα is used in this very Epistle to the Galatians, and in all other Writings of this Apostle for by Nature, and not for in Nature; as the few Particulars will evince.
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Galat. ii. 15. We who are Jews by Nature.
Eph. ii. 3. And were by Nature the Children of Wrath.

Gregory Nyssen argues thus upon the Text:

If therefore the Son be God without being God by Nature, let him look to that, who affirms it. But if He is no God, who is not God by Nature, let them learn from the great Apostle, that they, who serve those who are not Gods by Nature, do not serve God.
For this Person (viz. Christ) was counted worthy of more Glory than Moses, inasmuch as He who hath builded the House, hath more Honour than the House.

For every House is builded by some one; but He that built all Things is GOD.

In these Words, v. 3. Christ is the Builder of the House; and the Church is the House, v. 6. whose House are we: And Moses, having been a chief Servant in it, was a Part of the House, and was as much exceeded by Christ in Glory, as the House is by the Builder. And to prove that Christ was the Builder, he shews, First, that the House was not Self-existent, but had a Cause, for every House is builded by some One. Secondly, that God was the Builder, because he built all things, of which the House is a Part. Now if this God is not Christ, but a distinct Being from Him; how does the asserting one Being to be a Builder prove another to be so? Except it be upon the following Supposition, That the One never acts without the Other, or the Father without the Son; which tho' it be indeed true,
true, and so the Creation of the Father infers that of the Son; yet since that Reason is not assigned in this place for the Inference, and the Inference may appear too remote, or not sufficiently clear, if it be drawn from the Premise, by means of a Supposition concealed in the Mind, and not expressed; it is natural to conclude that Christ is meant by the Term God; especially if we look back upon the beginning of this Epistle, where the Creation of the World, or of all Things, is attributed to the Son, Ch. i. 10. and consider, that the building of the House is given to Wisdom, or the Divine Word and Son of God, Prov. ix. 1.

Wisdom hath builded her House.

CCLXXXIX. 2 Pet. i. 1. The Righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.

If we determine the Sense of these Words by the other like Expressions in Scripture, they will appear rather to belong to the Son than to the Father. The Words in the Original are thus, το Θεον, και αυτην την Χριστον· The like to which are
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Το Κυρίος ἡμῶν ὑιοὶ καὶ σωτήρ, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
Of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

v. ii. and Ch. iii. 18.

Now these latter are evidently understood of one Person, as appears from the Doxology immediately following, that is directed to one, and not more; to Him be glory, &c, c. iii. 18.

Of the like Construction are,

Το Κυρίος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
Of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,
c. ii. 20.

Το Κυρίος ἡμῶν.
Of the Lord and Saviour, c. iii. 2.

Which I think both belong to the Son alone; neither do I know any one Place of the same Construction and Terms that may seem to contradict this Remark, except it be the following,

Τὸ μεγάλον Θεὸν ὑιοὶ καὶ σωτήρ, ἐμοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
The great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, Tit. ii. 13.

Which
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Which yet is understood by Clemens Alexandr. (a) of God the Son alone, and by Greg. Nyss. also in his Book against Eunom. p. 265. and their Interpretation may be confirmed from the Word ὁμοίως, used in the Context, which relates to the Appearing of no other Person in the remaining Part of the New Testament, but of the Son only.

CCCXL. Mat. xix. 17. Why callest thou me Good? There is none Good, but One (ος, one Being) that is God. Or, There is none Good but God alone. See No 1.

That Clemens Alexandr. included the Son in the one Good God, is evident from the following Words, that are in the very next Page to the Passage cited by the Learned Dr. under this Number.

Ως ὁ τοις ἀληθείς ἁλαφαρές τὸ πρὸς υποτάσσον Θεόν ὃν ὁμοίως ἀρχαῖον, ὅλον ἐν Παλαιῷ ὁ δὲ καὶ οὐ τῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν οὐνόματος, Ἀρν. Παραγ. lib. 1. p. 119.

So that it is truly evident, that the God of all is the one only Good, and just Creator, namely, the Son in the Father; to whom be Glory for ever and ever, Amen. See also No 535.
The Citation out of Athanasius has been already explain'd No. 2. and excludes not the Son from the one good God.

And when Novatian uses these Words,

*Whom alone the Lord justly pronounces to be good.*

He cannot be supposed to shut out the Son from the essential Goodness of the Father, because he makes him to be of one Substance with the Father, c. xxiii. 31. As for Self-originated, and begotten, they do not appear to be essential, but personal Characters, inferring not a Difference of Substance, but a different manner of having their Substance; the Son receiving it by Generation from the Father, which denominates him begotten, the Father having it without receiving it from any other, which names him Self-originated. See No. 591.

CCCLXXII. Rom. xi. 36. Of him, and through him, and to him are all things.
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Of him, as he is Father; through him, as he is Son; to (or rather in, for the Particle as is frequently used) him, as he is the Holy Ghost.

Nam & imperio ejus omnia, ut ex ipso sint & Verbo ejus digesta, ut per ipsum sint. c. 3. de Trin.

All things exist by his Command, so that they are of him; and are ordered by his Word, so that they are through him, says Novatian upon the Place. See No 8. and 382.

CCCLXXXII. Eph. iv. 6. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

This is understood of the Trinity, by Iren. Lib. 5. c. 18. No 8. and 372.

CCCXCV. Tit. ii. 13. The appearing of the Glory of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

See this Text explained, No 289.

CCCCX. 1 John v. 20, 21. This is the true God and Eternal Life.

Keep your selves from Idols.

The Comment upon this Text is something strained and extraordinary.
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This (this Knowledge of God in his Son Jesus Christ) is the true Religion, and the way to eternal Life. I with some Instances had been given, in which the true God is used for the true Religion: But I shall endeavour to shew, That the Person of Jesus Christ is understood by these Words.

First, From the general Design of the Epistle; which is not to teach the Truth and Existence of the One only God, in Opposition to Idols, but according to c. v. v. 13. to encourage the Believers to continue in the Faith of the Son of God, by assuring them that they had Eternal Life by virtue of that Faith, but not without it, v. 12. And therefore the Apostle begins his Epistle with the Word of Life, or Son, c. i. v. 1. and proceeds to speak of Him, and of our Salvation by Him, throughout the whole Discourse; and concludes it with the following Truth, as the Result of all he had been saying, namely, that the Son of God, Jesus Christ is himself the true God, and the only way to Eternal Life, or rather, Eternal Life itself; and that therefore they ought to keep themselves from Idols, or from all Means of
of approaching God beside this Divine Person, ending his Epistle, as he began his Gospel, with the Divinity of the Word.

Secondly, From the Context, and that first, in respect of the Term ἀληθινὸς, True, which is rarely apply'd to the Father, but frequently to the Son in St. John's Writings. As for Instance, in an Emphatick Sense, with the Article ὁ, it does not seem to have been once us'd of the Father, whereas it is spoken of the Son after this manner, not only in the Context, as shall be made to appear by and by; but in Rev. iii. 7. where it is written, These things faith He that is holy, He that is true, ἀληθινὸς, that is, Christ, who is the Person speaking to all the Churches. I cite not Chap. vi. 10. because it does not so evidently appear to belong to Christ, tho' the greater Probability is on that Side, if it be compared with Rev. xix. 11. which certainly belongs to him.

Again, The same Term without an Article, is but twice used of the Father in the Writings of the same Apostle, and that in his Gospel c. vii. 28. and xvii. 8. whereas it is frequently affirmed
of the Son, partly without an Article, and partly with one, as He is consider'd under certain metaphorical Characters, according to the following Citations, John i. 9. vi. 32. I John ii. 8. Rev. iii. 14. xix. 11. In the last of which it is said, that He that sat upon him (the white Horse) was called Faithful and True, as if True were a Name, or Attribute more particularly the Son's.

These general Remarks are a strong Prejudice in favor of the common Interpretation, that the true God is the Son of God; but the whole Verse will more particularly shew it, which runs thus, And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true (αληθεουν) and we are in him that is true (ἐν τῷ αληθείᾳ) even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal Life. In which it is plain, that the Terms in him that is true are explain'd by in his Son; so that no Doubt can be made, but that the Word True belongs to Christ; the Difficulty is, whether the first Expression, that we may know him that is True, belongs to the Son also. And here I think
think it is certain, that the Application of the same Phrase to Christ in the same Verse, is a strong Probability that this is spoken of Him also, since there is nothing in the Context, that appears to contradict it, and the Sense of the Expression will evidently allow it: For most certainly Jesus Christ came into the World to bear Testimony to himself, that he was the true Messiah, and to give Men an understanding to receive his Testimony, as is evident from John xviii. 37, 38. Pilate said unto him, art thou a King? (the King of the Jews, v. 33.) Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a King, (the King of the Jews.) To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the World, that I should bear witness to the Truth, (to his being the King of the Jews.) Every one that is of the Truth, beareth my Voice, (hath an understanding to receive his Testimony, or know him to be the King of the Jews, or the True Messiah.) It is probable then from this Evidence, that the Understanding, which the Son of God gave Men, to know him that is true, was to know himself as the true Messiah, and King of the Jews, and expected
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pected Saviour; and under this Character of the true Messiah, King, and Saviour, who bears witness to the Truth of his own Person, is He well opposed to the ὁ ὁμερός, the Wicked One, the Devil, v. 19. 20. Who is a Liar, and the Father of a Lye, Joh. viii. 44. Who will pretend himself to be that which he is not, and whose greatest and most notorious Lye will consist in denying the Truth, that was attested to by Christ, namely, That Jesus Christ is the true Messiah, the King of the Jews; or that Jesus Christ came in the flesh, or as Origen expresses it,

That God came in a human
Soul and Body.

And in substituting another in the Place of Christ, 2 Thess. ii. If then the Term true be rarely used of the Father in the Writings of St. John, but frequently of the Son; if never of the Father in the first Epistle; if it belongs to the Son in the Context, as He is the true Messiah, King and Saviour; and as He is the Amen, the faithful and true Witness ** Revel. in iii. 14.
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in Opposition to the Wicked one, the Liar, and false Witness; and if the Term this, in Grammatical Construction, generally refers to the last Noun, what, but apparent Prejudice, can determine any one to understand the Expression, This is the True God, of any other but the Son? Especially since it was given to the Son in the earliest Times, as appears from Irenæus, who says,

Neque Prophetae, neque Apostoli, alium Deum nominaverunt—præter verum & solum Deum. Lib. 3. c. 8.

That neither the Prophets nor Apostles have named any other, God, besides the True and Only God.

But then he grants the Son to be called God in an absolute Sense, c. vi. and says,

Ab omnibus accipiens testimonium quoniam verè Deus, à Patre, à Spiritu, & ab Angelis, &c. Lib. 4. c. 14.

That He receives Testimony from all Things—that He is truely God, from the Father, from the Holy Ghost, and from Angels, &c.

There—
Therefore did he look upon the Son to be true God.

Melito gives Him the same Title of true God, Θεὸς αὐνήθις, in his Fragment, in Cave's Hist. Lit.

The Church of Jerusalem confessed Him to be such in their Creed, calling Him Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν.

And the Universal Church, or Generality of Christians, had the same Faith, and publickly declar'd it in a general Council about the beginning of the fourth Century, as appears from the Nicene Creed, which styles him also, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν. See No. 534.

Secondly, The following Part of the Context, Eternal Life, is another Argument that the Person of Jesus Christ is understood by the true God: For it does not appear that those Terms are spoken of any other Person in the whole Epistle, but of the Son only; as c. i. 2. v. 11, 12, 13. if then the Son be the eternal Life; the true God, who is this eternal Life, must be the Son also.

D 2 CCCCXI.
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CCCCXI. Jude v. the 4th. Denying the † only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

† See No. 2, 3.

We must not understand the Citation out of Pearson, as if that learned Author meant that the Son, as well as other Beings, received his Power from the Father, either by Donation or Permission; for he says, p. 141. Edit. 7. That God was always Father, as always God; which seems to import, that the Character of Father depends upon the Godhead, and not upon the Will; that he is as necessarily Father as God; and consequently that the Son is as necessarily Son, as the Father is Father; and that therefore his Power founded upon his Nature, is no more by bare Donation from the Father, than his very Being.

CCCCXLIV. Matt. vi. 9. Our † Father, which art in Heaven, &c.

† Tertullian in his Comment on the Lord's Prayer, written before he was a Montanist.
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Montanist, comprehends the Son under the Name Father, saying,

The Son also is invoked in the Father.

And he says of Christ, who taught the Prayer,

God only could teach how He would have Himself be pray’d to.

DI. 1 Tim. ii. 5. For there is* One God, and † one Mediator between God and Men.

* In Opposition to false Gods. See No. 2, 3, 8.
† The mentioning the Son here after the One God, is not an Argument that He is excluded out of the One God, but that He is something more than pure Deity, a Mediator made up of God and Man; and therefore was to be spoken of distinctly by Himself. See No. 8.

That the Notion of very God and very Man was comprehended in the meaning of the Word Mediator; or, that the Person so named was believed to be true God.
Irenæus says, He (Christ) united Man to God; for except Man had overcome the Adversary of Man, the Enemy could not have been conquer'd fairly. And again, except God had given Salvation, we could not have enjoyed it securely; and except Man had been united to God, He could not have been Partaker of Incorruption. For it became the Mediator of God and Men, by his proper Relation to each (of the Parties,) to bring them to an Agreement, and make them both Friends; and to present or unite Man to God, and make God known to Men.

In which Words it is plain, that the great Design of the Son's Incarnation was according to this Author, to unite Man imme-
immediately to the *true God*; and that this was to be performed in his own Person, by uniting his own Divine Nature, or Himself, as † God, to the human Nature, as Irenæus explains himself a little after: For if his own Divine Nature was not *true God*, and no human Nature can arise to a sublimer Union with *God* than that of the Son; it will follow, That no human Nature can be immediately united to the *true God*; which is contrary to the Intent of the Father's Reasoning, which is to shew the immediate Union of *Man* with the *true God*; by the immediate Union of *Man* with *God* in the Person of Christ.

† The *Word* was that which it appeared to be; namely, *God* restoring in himself the old created Nature of *Man*.

Tertullian says, He is called the Mediatour of *God* and *Men* from that which is committed to him by both Parties, (or, from the Nature of both Parties communicated to him.)

Hippolytus has these Words,


Cyprian says thus,

Deus cum homine miscetur.hic Deus noster, hic Christus est. Qui Mediator. God is united to Man. This is our God, this is Christ. Who being the Mediator between two, assumed
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fumed Man, that he might bring him to the Fa-
ther.

Novatian says, For if he came to Man, that he might be the Mediator between God and Men, it was necessary that he should be with Man, and that the Word should become Flesh, that he might unite in Himself both the things in Earth, and the things in Heaven, in perfect Concord; while he joined God to Man, and Man to God, by the Union of the Pledges (or Natures) of both Parties in his own Person.

Quoniam si ad hominem veniebat, ut Mediator Dei & Hominum esse debe-
ret, opportunum illum cum eo esse, & Ver-
bum carnem fieri, ut in semetipsa con-
cordiam confibula-
ret terrenorum pa-
riter atque cælesti-
um, dum utriusque partis in se connec-
tens † pignora, & Deum homini, & bo-
minem Deo copula-
ret. de Trin. c. 18.

† Note, That which he calls here utriusque partis pignora, is in Irenæus, & idem idem in Tertullian, utriusque partis deposito; and in Hippolytus, ab utriusque arrobabo-
rem;
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nem; which is explained by, utramq; Substantiam, scil. Dei & Hominum.

DXXXII. Revel. xxii. 9. Worship God.

Cyprian reads or explains it thus.

Jesus Dominum adora. De bono Jesus,
CHAP. II.

Of the Son of God.

DXXXIV. Luke i. 16, 17. 

—shall He (John the Baptist) turn to the Lord their God; and He shall go before Him, &c.

The Dr's Remark is very good, that the Words "(the Lord their God) are " in strictness of Construction immediately connected with the following " Word, Him "; which must necessarily be understood of Christ, did He not endeavour to spoil the Consequence of it, by his References to No 538, and 293.

The great Difficulty, which that learned Gentleman makes of understanding the Words of Christ, is a Supposition, that
that according to the whole Analogy of Scripture (I suppose He means the Old Testament as well as the New) they cannot but signify the Father; which if I shew to be a Mistake, then the Strictness of Contraction ought to take place, and determine them for the Son.

I will begin first with the New Testament; in which Thomas calls the Son, my Lord and my God, Joh. xx. 28. and if He was the Lord God of Thomas, He was, without doubt, as much the Lord God of every believing Israelite; in Rev. xxii. 6. He is called the Lord God of the Holy Prophets, as will appear from the Context, the Lord God of the Holy Prophets sent his Angel to shew unto his Servants the Things which must shortly be done: Now the Person who sent the Angel for this purpose, is Jesus Christ, v. 16. I Jesus have sent mine Angel to testify unto you these Things in the Churches; Which is confirmed c. i. v. 1. The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew (that He, Jesus, might shew) unto his Servants things which must shortly come to pass; and He (Jesus) sent and signified it by his Angel unto his Servant John. If then God the Father did not immediately
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Immediately send the Angel himself, but revealed the Secret to Jesus Christ, that He (as Mediator) might have the Honour of sending it by his Angel to his Servant John; it will follow, that the Lord God of the Holy Prophets, who sent his Angel, is Jesus Christ, and if He be the Lord God of the Prophets, He is questionless of the Church also.

But if He had not been so called in the New Testament, which treats of the Son in respect of his Humiliation or Incarnation chiefly, and of the Benefits resulting from it; yet secondly if he be so called in the Old Testament, as interpreted by the New, this is sufficient to shew, that Lord God is not appropriated to the Father, according to the whole Analogy of Scripture. As for Instance, Isai. xl. 3. is cited Luke iii. 4. thus, The Voice of one crying in the Wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his Paths straight. But in Isai, it is thus, Make straight in the Desert a Highway for our God. In which Application of the Text by St. Luke it is evident, that by the Voice is understood John the Baptist; and by the Person, whose Way he was sent to prepare,
prepare, Jesus Christ; but this Person is called Lord (Jehovah,) and God (Elohim) or, our God, that is, the God of the Jews. Therefore Jesus Christ is the Lord God, or, Jehovah Elohim, the God of the Jews, no less than of the believing Gentiles; and may well be the Lord God, to whom many were to be converted. But to proceed; In Isai. xl. v. 9. it is said of him, Say unto the Cities of Judah, Behold your God: And v. 10. Behold, the Lord God will come with strong Hand, and his Arm shall rule for him. Ver, 11. He shall feed his Flock like a Shepherd: For the Son is the good Shepherd, John x. 11. and the chief Shepherd, 1 Pet. v. 4. The same Person in the Process of this Chapter, for there are no Tokens of a Change of Person, is called also the Everlasting God, the Creator of the Ends of the Earth, and the Workmanship of the Heavens is attributed to Him.

Again, when the Apostle faith, Let the Angels of God worship Him (the Son,) Heb. i. 6. the Context out of which it is taken, Deut. xxxii. 43. both in the Sept. and Hebrew, shew the Person spoken of to be the Lord God.
Chap. II. of the Trinity, &c.

I will add but one Instance more out of the same Epistle and Chapter, v. 10, &c., in which, Part of the 102 Psalm is applied to Christ; now in the Epistle he is only called Lord, but in the Psalm, v. 24, immediately preceding the Citation, he is called God. O my God, take me not away, &c.

I will proceed from Scripture to Authority, and here we shall find the most Celebrated of the Antients calling Christ in his own Person, Lord God.

Justin says, That Christ who is Lord and God, &c.

And God the Father is the Cause of his (the Son's) being — both Lord and God.

Irenæus says, No other — is named God, or called Lord, but He who is the God and Lord of all — and his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

Nemo — alius — Deus nominatur, aut Dominus appellatur, nisi qui est omnium Deus & Dominus —— Ec hujus Filius Jesus Christus Dominus noftr. Lib. 5. c. 6. Clem.
Therefore Him, on whom they did not believe as Man, they will acknowledge to be the Merciful and Just Lord God.

Tertullian. We know that the Name of God and Lord, belongs to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Novatian. From what has been already allledged, to prove the Divinity of Christ, it is demonstrated, that Jesus Christ is Lord and God, which the Hereticks deny.

The Synod of Antioch says,

The Messenger of the Father is the Son, who himself is Lord and God.

And
And to conclude all, tho' more might have been cited on this occasion, Eusebius calls the Son,

The Lord and God of all created Things.

And absolutely Lord God;

If the many Citations of these Authors out of Scripture should be produced, in which the Person, spoken of as Lord God, is interpreted by them to be the Son of God, it would tire the Reader as well as the Writer: What has been already urged does sufficiently shew their Opinion of the Son: And if we would know more, their large Writings will teach us the Scriptures, on which it was founded, and their Interpretation of the Scriptures will teach and instruct us what Doctrines and Expositions of the Sacred Writings, were handed down to them by Tradition from their Fathers.
Of the Importance of the Title Lord God, Irenæus shall be Witness, who affirms,

That neither the Lord himself, nor the Holy Ghost, nor the Apostles, would at any time have called him, who was not God, expressly and absolutely God, if He had not been truly God; nor have named any one Lord in his own Person, but He who rules over all, namely, God the Father; and his Son, who has received from Him the Dominion over all Creatures.

And then affirms Father and Son to be called God and Lord by the Holy Ghost, which is an Evidence, that He looked upon the Son to be true God and Lord, like the Father.
And left any notwithstanding, should conceive the Son to be such a God to the inferior Creation, as Moses was to Pharaoh, He distinguishes, saying,

Moses indeed — was said to be a God to Pharaoh, Exod. vii. 1. But He was not called truly Lord, nor God by the Prophets, but Moses the Faithful Minister and Servant of God, by the Spirit, Numb. xii. 7. Heb. iii. 5. as indeed He was.

If then the Writings of the Old and New Testament; if the Doctrine of the Antient Fathers, founded upon Scripture, and their Scripture Interpretations justly conceived to be founded upon Tradition, and the Analogy of Faith have evinced and delivered to us, that Christ is Lord God; and if the Strictness of Construction, as the Dr. confesses, connects these Terms with the Son of God, Luke i. 16, 17. then is Jesus Christ the Lord God of the Jews, to whom
whom many were to be turned, by the Preaching of the Baptist; and thus is the Text explained by Irenæus:

For whom did He (the Baptist) prepare a People? And in the Sight of what Lord was He made great? Truly in the Sight of Him (Christ) who said, That John was more than a Prophet.—— And therefore turning them to their Lord, (Christ) He prepared for the Lord (Christ) a perfect People, &c.

DXXXV. John i. 1. And the Word was \( \uparrow \) God.

The third Interpretation of the Word God in the Comment, and which is delivered as the true one, is the following; "A Person deriving from the "Father (with whom he existed before the World was) both his Being "it self, and incomprehensible Power "and Knowledge, and other Divine "Attributes..."
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"Attributes and Authority." If now by the Being derived from the Father be meant that which is consubstantial with the Father; and by incomprehensible and divine Attributes, such as are essentially inherent in the consubstantial Being, the Explication is Good. But if any thing less be meant by them, such as that the derived Being is substantially different from the Father, and the incomprehensible and divine Attributes not essentially inherent, but adventitious to the Subject, or derived Being; it will be hard to make out how a Person so conceived can be properly comprehended under the Name God. It is added, "In a manner not revealed." But the manner is revealed so far as it is expressed and conveyed to the Understanding by the general Term Generation, tho' the particular manner of Generation is not discovered; for the Prophet Isaiah doth not say in general, who shall declare the manner of his deriving his Being? That is, whether it be by Generation, Procreation, Manifestation, or otherwise: But who shall declare his Generation? Allowing the manner to be by Generation, but denying
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denying the Manner of Generation to be known.

Et in quo distabit Dei Verbum, imò magis ipse Deus cum sit Verbum, ò verbo hominum? &c.
Lib. 2. c. 18.

† Irenæus says, Wherein will the Word of God, nay, rather God himself, since He is the Word, differ from the Word of Men? &c.

Clem. Alexandrinus says, Nothing therefore is hated of God or his Word, for they are both One, namely God. For he hath said, In the beginning was the Word in God, and the Word was God. See No. 594, 340.

DXXXVIII. Ads xx. 28. To feed the Church of God; which He hath purchased with his own Blood.

In the Note on this Place there is a Citation of John iii. 5. Ye know that He was manifested to take away our Sins; and in Him is no Sin. On which Words is this Remark, "He and Him " must of Necessity be referred to Christ, " though
"though without any antecedent mention of Him," It is readily granted that He and Him refer to Christ, but not that there is no antecedent mention made of Him. For if we look back upon the Context, and well consider it, the Son will appear to be comprehended under the Name God. But before this be done, it will be necessary to remark, that St. John comprehends the Father and Son under the Name God, as will appear from Joh. i. 1. The Word was with God, and the Word was God: And therefore may be supposed to use the same Name sometimes for the Father, and sometimes for the Son, or for both together; which is always to be determined by the Circumstances of the Context. Now this seems to be the very Case in this Chapter, v. i. it is said, Behold, what manner of Love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the Sons of God. In this place the Term God may very well be judged to stand for the Father and Son, or for the one God, as comprehending the Father and Son; for the washing of Regeneration, Tit. iii. 5, through the Virtue of their Names invoked in Baptism, begets us into Children;
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Ver. 2. He says, Beloved, now are we the Sons of God, (of the one God, Father and Son) and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: But we know, that when he shall appear, ὅτι ἐὰν φανερωθῇ, when the one God shall appear in the Person of the Son; for so the Word appear, or manifested, φανερωθῇ, is spoken of the Son in v. 5, 8. and in other places of this Epistle; neither does it evidently appear to be once used of the Person of the Father in the Writings of St. John; nor perhaps in the whole New Testament; We shall be like him; for we shall see him, as he is. This may be very well explained by Colos. iii. 4. When Christ, who is our Life, shall appear, φανερωθῇ, then shall ye also appear with him in Glory.

Ver. 3. And every Man that hath this Hope in him, purifith himself, even as He (God the Son) is pure. For so is it said of Him, v. 7. Even as He (God the Son) is righteous: Which is the same with, And in Him is no Sin, v. 5. which is undoubtedly spoken of the Son; for the former part of the Verse
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Verse runs thus, *And ye know that He (God the Son spoken of v. 2, 3.) was manifested, to take away our Sins; for none other but the Son was manifested to do it. If then God be the common Name of the Father and the Son, and if it be so used of the Father and the Son in the first and second Verses of this Chapter, as the Style of speaking there, and in the Context shews; how can it be said that the Pronouns He and Him refer to Christ, without any antecedent mention of Him? There is indeed no antecedent mention of Him in this Chapter under the Name Christ, but He is plainly spoken of under the Name God.

DXLVI. John i. 3. *All Things were made by † Him.

† Not as by a Person substantially distinct from the divine Power dwelling in him, and using him as an Instrument; but as by the Son of a Father, who is himself like his Father essentially God, essentially Free, All-wise, All-powerful, and All-good; who though he works every thing in Obedience to his Father; yet works * freely,
*freely, being moved thereto by an Excellency of Nature, that is the same in both; and that equally moves them, the Father primarily, and the Son subordinately, to the same Acts of Power and Goodness.

*As the Father raiseth up the Dead, and quickeneth them: even so the Son quickeneth whom He will, John v. 21.

DLXXX. John v. 18. But said also that God was his Father (his own proper Father) making himself equal with God.

The Premise from whence the Jews made this Inference, that Christ called God his proper Father, and in so doing made himself equal with God, is his saying in the preceding Verse, my Father worketh hitherto, and I work; which, if it meant no more, than that the Power of God wrought in Christ, as in a great Prophet, could have given as little occasion for such an Inference to be made by the Jews, in Relation to Christ, as it would have done in respect of Moses, or of any other Prophet that wrought Wonders by a divine Power. The Jews therefore,
therefore, who drew the Inference, must have looked upon the Premise, as spoken in a Sense, which attributed more to the Person speaking, than ever any Prophet or Man could claim; and which could bear the Conclusion, they readily drew from it and charged him with, of making himself equal with God the Father: They must have had some Reason also for understanding the Premise in so exalted a Sense, as would infer their Conclusion; that is, they must have had a Notion that there was a certain Person so closely united to the great God in all his Operations, as that He never acted without that Person, nor that Person ever without God; and that the Person, so co-operating with the great God, was his proper Son, and the great God his proper Father, and that on this account He was equal with the Father; and that Jesus Christ using the Expression, my Father worketh hitherto, and I work; that properly belonged to the divine Person working with the Father, made himself the Son equal with the Father: For except all this be supposed to have been known to them, it is difficult to account, how so extraordinary a Conclusion could be drawn from a Premise, that
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that was otherwise capable of a lower Interpretation: Now it is certain, that the Jews, if they understood the meaning of their own Scriptures, must have known, that there was a divine Person subsisting with the Father, and operating with Him from the Beginning of the World, which is called Wisdom, as is evident from Prov. ix. 22, 27, 30. The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his Ways, before his Works of old.— When he prepared the Heavens I was there — then I was by Him as one brought up with him, &c. The Lord by Wisdom hath founded the Earth. Prov. iii. 19. and made the Heavens: Ps. cxxxvi. 5. and, That this Divine Person was brought forth, or begotten; when there were no depths, I was brought forth. — Before the Hills was I brought forth, יבּוּדָאָה, Sept. Prov. viii. 24, 25, and by Consequence that this Divine Person must be the Only begotten before the World, forasmuch as the Divine Scriptures mention no other begotten of the Father before the World, but this Divine Person; which has this Title given it, Wisd. vii. 22. for Wisdom, which is the Worker of all Things, taught me: for in her is an understanding Spiri-
They must also have known that God had a Son; what is his (God's) Name, and what is his Son's Name? Prov. xxx. 4. and that this Son is the same with Wisdom, or the Only begotten; otherwise Wisdom could not be the Only begotten, if there be a Son begotten different from Wisdom; and according to this Doctrine, John calls the Son, the Only begotten Son, ο μονογενής υιός, ch. i. v. 18. If then, I say, the Jews could not have been ignorant of these great Truths, upon the Supposition of their Knowledge of the Scriptures, and this Knowledge ought to be supposed, till the contrary be made to appear; that is, if they knew that there was a divine Person operating with the Father from the beginning of the World; and that this Divine Person was the Only begotten Son; it is no wonder that they understood these Words, my Father worketh hitherto, and I work, spoken by our Saviour, to be a taking to himself the Character of Son of God, who wrought with the Father in the Creation of the World, and operates with him in preserving and governing it; and by Consequence to be an asserting God to be his
his proper Father, as Only begotten; and himself Equal to him, as the proper Son of a proper Father.

† Tertullian says of the Father,

Exinde eum parrem sibi faciens, de quo procedendo Filius fatus est. adv. Prax. c. 7.

Cujus sic Divinitas traditur, ut non aut dissonantiae aut inaequalitatis Divinitatis duos Deos reddidisse videatur. de Trin. c. 31.

Novatian says, Whose (the Son's) Godhead is taught us in such manner, as that none may think that two Gods are introduc'd either by a Difference or Inequality in the Godhead.

That is, the Divinity of the Son was taught to be like to, and equal to that of the Father; because otherwise, if it were unlike, and unequal, their Natures must be different, and Father and Son be distinct Gods.

DXCI. John viii. 58. Before Abraham was, I Am.

"The Comment grants, that possibly our Saviour might hereby intend"
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"to insinuate——that he was that Person, in whom the Name of God was, viz. Jehovah, or, I Am."

Which seems to import, as if the Author thought, that the Name of God was a distinct Thing from the Person in whom it was; the Consequence of which is, that not the Person of the Son, but the Name of God in Him, is Jehovah, or I Am. Now if this be the Case, the Words would not have proved what our Saviour intended by them, namely, his Existence in the Days of Abraham. For the Meaning of them must have been this, Before Abraham was, the Name I Am existed; and how could the Existence of the Name of God prove the Existence of the Son of God, if the Son and Name were two different Things? Or would it not be strange Reasoning for a modern Christian to prove his Existence in the Days of Christ, from the Name of Christ, which He bears in Him? Nay, if Christ could call himself I Am, as certainly He does, not because He substantially or essentially is so, but because that divine Name is in Him; might not any Christian call himself Jesus, because He bears that Name,
The Scripture Doctrine  Chap. II.
or is baptiz'd into it? If then the Son
calls himself I Am, He must really be
so in his own Nature.

Again, it is suppos'd that the Term
ὁ ὅνι signifies the self-existent Being.
If the Meaning be that Self-existence
is an essential Part of the Idea of Being,
the Person affirming it is oblig'd to
prove it; since others are of Opinion,
and with good Reason, that it rather
relates to the manner of existing of the
first Person in the Divine Being, than
to the Nature or Essence of Being itself:
And indeed if it be throughly
consider'd, it is a positive Term for a
negative Idea, and imports no more
than that the Person or Subject, of which
it is affirm'd, derives not its Existence
from another Person. So that the Son
in respect of his Divine Nature may
receive the Names expressing him
as Being; and yet they, who give them
him, not incur the Blame of falling
into Sabellianism, or making him Self-
existent. See No 340.

As for the Comparison between Exodus and Acts, which is made to shew
that the Name of God was in the Angel
spoken of in both those Places, which
Angel is Christ; if it be meant to prove
that
that the Angel or Christ, in respect of his Divine Nature, is a distinct Subject or substantially different from the Name of God in Him; such a Construction of the places compared cannot be approved of; for the Name of the Father is not in the Son, by pure indwelling, but after such a manner, as the real Communication of the Divine Nature from the Father to the Son by Generation requires. But if it be intended to shew, that the Angel or Christ is a distinct Subject, or Substantially different from the Name of God in Him, not in respect of his Divine Nature, but of a created Nature assumed by the Word at the beginning of all Things, as the First-Fruits of the Creation, and in respect of which, He may be more properly and accurately denominated an Angel, it may be readily assented to as a strong Probability, not a little favoured by the Sacred Writings.

DXCIV. John x. 30. I and my Father are † One.

† One, not by a bare Unity in Power, but by an Unity of Nature, the Foundation of the Unity in Power.
That the Son is One in Nature with the Father, appears from the Divine Names attributed to him; such as Jehovah, and Hu; which express Him as He is Being, I Am, and, Who was, and is, and is to come; which Jehovah or Being, is but One; Jehovah our God, Jehovah is One, Deut. vi. 4. If then these Divine Names are alike affirmed of the Father and the Son; if the Name Jehovah be given to none but the one true God, Exod. iii. 15, Psal. lxxxiii. 18, and the Name Hu, be of the same Importance with the Name Jehovah, and on that account alike incommunicable; it will follow, that the Father and Son is the one true God, the one Divine Being, or the One Jehovah.

This Unity of Nature and Godhead in Father and Son is confirmed by the Fathers;

Et in quo distaabit Dei Verbum, Irenæus says, Wherein will the Word of God, nay, magis Ipse Deus, rather God himself, since cum sit Verbum, He is the Word, differ from à verbo Hominum? the Word of Men? &c.

Clem.
Clem. Alexandrinus, Nothing therefore is hated of God, nor indeed of his Word; for they are both One, namely, God.

Again, He who places some, Matt. xxv. 31, &c. at his Right Hand, and others at his Left, being Good, as He is consider'd in the Character of Father, is denominated that only which he is, namely Good; but as He exists in the Father in the Character of the Son, his Word is denominated Just.

In which Words it is evident, that the same God judging the World according to Matt. xxv. 31, &c. is consider'd under a twofold Subsistence of Father and Son; and that in respect of the former He is called Good, and of the latter Just.

Tertullian
Quomodo dicitum est, Ego & Pater unum sumus, ad substantiae unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem. Adv. Prax. c. 25.

Tertullian says; As it is said, I and my Father are One; to express not the Singularity of Person, but the Unity of Substance.

Cum nullius hominis bac vox esse possit, Ego & Pater unum sumus, hanc vocem de conscientiâ divinitatis Christi solum edicit, c. 13.

Novatian; Since this can be the Voice of no meer Man, I and my Father are One; Christ utter'd it alone from a Sense of his Godhead.

Which Godhead is founded upon a Communion of Substance between the Father and the Son; For, says He,

Unus Deus est et Pater, a quo solo bac vis Divinitatis emissa, etiam in filium tradita et directa, rursum per substantiae communionem ad Patrem revolvitur. c. 31.

It has been shewn that there is One true and eternal God the Father, from whom alone this Virtue of the Godhead being emitted, nay, delivered to, and directed towards the Son, returns again to the Father by a Communion of Substance.

And
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And that this substantial Virtue of the Godhead, emitted from the Father, is the very Nature of the Son, appears from the same Chapter, where He says of the Word:

That He is acknowledged to be a substantial Virtue brought forth from God.

Where Note the Agreement between substantial prolatæ à Deo Virtutis, and Vis Divinitatis emissa — per substantiam communionem.

DXCV. John x. 33. That thou being a Man, makest thyself "God."

† God, in respect of the Unity of Nature affirmed of himself with the Father, in the Words, I and my Father are One, v. 30. No (594) and not in respect of a bare Unity in Power: For it does not appear from the Writings of the Old Testament, that the Jews ever called any one God, absolutely, from the Divine Power communicated to him, except He were true God, or God by Nature; (see No 534) and there-
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fore when they charge Christ with calling himself God, absolutely, because He affirmed himself to be one with the Father, they must understand it of an Unity of Nature, that would infer him to be true God, or God by Nature, and not of a bare Unity in Power.

Eusebius founds the Godhead of the Son, upon his being Son of God by Nature, which supposes such an Unity of Nature between them, as is between a Natural Father and his Son; his Words are these.

And all this may be the Reason, why He (Christ) also is God, because He only is Son of God by Nature, and called Only Begotten.

Novatian reasons upon the place just as the Jews did, for says He,

How can that saying be true, I and my Father are one, if He is not both God and Son? (that is, Son, as He calls Him Father; and God,

Quomodo enim Ego & Pater unum simus, si non est Deus & Filius? Qui idcirco unum

God, as he affirms himself to be one with Him) who therefore may be said to be one (with the Father,) because He is of Him, is his Son, is born of Him, and is found to have come forth from Him (which is opposed to being made in this Chapter) on which account He is God also: And because the Jews were offended at this Saying, and held him as a Blasphemer, because He had shewn by these Words, that He was Christ the God, and were ready to stone him; He strenuously confutes his Adversaries with the Authority of Scripture, saying, if He called them Gods, unto whom the Word came, and the Scripture cannot be broken: Say ye of Him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the World, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God? In which

potest dici, dum ex ipso est, & dum Filius ejus est, & dum ex ipso nascitur, dum ex ipso processisse reperitur, per quod Deus est. Quod cum invidiae invidiosum putaret, judaei, & blasphemum credidissent, eo quod se offenderat his sermonibus Christiano esse Deum, ac propterea ad lapes des concursissent, & saxorum iactus injicere geslasissent, exemplo & testimonio Scripturarum adversarios suos fortiter refutavit: si illos, inquit, dixit Deos, ad quos verba facta sunt, & non potest solvi scriptura, quem Patrem sanctificavit & misit in hunc mundum, vos dicitis, quia
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Words He did not deny himself to be God, but rather affirmed that He was such.

Dei sum ego? Quibus vocibus neque se negavit Deum, quin imo Deum se esse firmavit. c. 23.

DXCVII. John xii. 41. These things said Isaias, when He saw his Glory, and spake of Him.

That Christ comes in the Glory of the Father, is true, and that He comes in his own Glory, is true also; for St. Luke says, ch. ix. 26. Of Him shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when He shall come in his own Glory, and in his Father's. Which supposes a personal, tho' not a real difference of the Glory of the Son from that of the Father. He came also in the Name or Power of the Father; and He had also a Name or Power of his own, which He preach'd to the Jews, as the Object of their Faith, in order to Salvation, John iii. 18. He that believeth not, is condemned already, because He bath not believed in the Name of the only begotten Son of God. Which Name, tho' derived from the Father with his Person, was yet as distinct from the Name of the Father, as

...
as his Person was from the Person of the Father, as appears from the baptismal Precept and Form given by our Saviour, Matt. xxviii. 19. Go ye—and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. It is true also that the Person of the Father was manifested in the Son his substantial Likeness; but then the Son had his own Divine Person the substantial Likeness, which He manifested to the World. So that the Glory, Name, and Person of the Father are manifested in, and united with, the Glory, Name, and Person of the Son, and that with a substantial Unity, as has been above proved. As then from the Unity of Essence is inferred the Unity of Glory, where the Glory is essential; so from the Unity of Glory is inferred the Unity of Essence: Or if no part of the Glory be essential, but only representative, yet forasmuch as such Representations are intended to instruct us about the Things of which they are Representations; if two Persons are represented by one Glory or Appearance, it is natural to conclude it is with this Design, that we should believe the two Persons to be one Being, represented by the one Glory or Appearance; other-

wife
wise it might be expected that two Persons distinct in Natures should constantly be represented by distinct Appearances, especially since it is as easy for God, and apparently more convenient for our Instruction, to represent distinct Beings by distinct Appearances, as by One only.

But the most remarkable thing in the learned Doctor's Note upon the Text, and which I take to be the Key of his whole Book, is his confounding individual Being and Person, as if they were Terms of the same Importance; and then ranking those among the Followers of Sabellius, who hold the Father and Son to be one and the same individual Being. But if God be Being, διά, and God be individually One, and Being individually One; and the Son no less than the Father be true God, as has been already proved, No. 594, 501, 410, then must the Father and Son be one and the same individual Being, that is, there must be two Persons in one and the same individual Being; and therefore individual Being and Person cannot be Terms of the same Importance, Otherwise if they were, and the Son be a distinct Person from the Father,
as doubtless He is, he must be a distinct individual Being. And since the One true God is but one individual Being; and the Father is this one true God, the Son, who is a distinct individual Being from the Father, must be distinct from the one true God, that is, be no true God himself at all; which is contrary to John v. 20. See No. 410.

As for the Authorities, they shew indeed that the Father never manifested himself otherwise than through the Son, and that the Son appeared and acted in the Person and Name of the Father; yet do not deny, that He appeared and acted in his own Person also as God, and in the Power and Virtue of his own Name, unitedly with the Person and Name of the Father.


And the Voice of the Lord came unto him saying, I am the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.
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Christ having a Divine Person of his own, did not so speak in the Person of the Father, as to exclude himself from being the God of the Patriarchs; but gave himself that Name, as being really such, in Union with the Father: Neither do the Testimonies shew, that He was so excluded. See No. 597.

Ipse igitur Christ Chriftus cum Patre, vit Chrifi with the Father, is vivorum est Deus, qui the God of the Living, who locutus est Mofe. spake to Mofes.

Lib. 4. c. ii.

Now Christ himself teaches us, that the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob is the God of the Living; Matt. xxii. 32. Christ therefore with the Father, is the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.

Justin Martyr, says,

Τὸ ὁ ἐγὼ ἐστὶν Θεός ὁ πάντων Ιακώβ, ὁ ἐγὼ ἐστὶν Θεός ἀληθινός, ὁ ἐγὼ ἐστὶν Θεός Ἀβραάμ, ὁ ἐγὼ ἐστὶν Ἑβραίον Θεός ὁ παλαιός ἐστὶν ὁ πάντων Ἰσαὰκ, ὁ ἐγὼ ἐστὶν Ἑβραίον Θεός ὁ παλαιός ἐστὶν ὁ πάντων Ιακώβ, ὁ ἐγὼ ἐστὶν Θεός ὁ παλαιός ἐστὶν ὁ πάντων Ἰσαὰκ, ὁ ἐγὼ ἐστὶν Θεός ὁ παλαιός ἐστὶν ὁ πάντων Ἰακώβ. That which was spoken to Moses out of the Bush, I Am that I am. The God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.
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Jacob, and the God of thy Fathers, signifies that those dead (Fathers) continue to be, and are the Men of Christ.

That is, As the Son proves the Patriarchs to live to God, Luke xx. 37, 38, because God calls himself the God of the Patriarchs; which supposes them to be the Object of his Love and Providence: So Justin Martyr proves them (a) to live to Christ; because the Person, who spake to Moses out of the Bush, calls himself the God of the Patriarchs; which would be no direct and immediate Consequence, but upon the Supposition that Christ is the Person who spake to Moses, and called himself the God of the Patriarchs, or of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; so that it is evident from Justin, no less than from Irenæus, that Christ, to whom the Patriarchs live, is with the Father the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; and Indeed He affirms Christ to be the Person, who spake those Words out of the Bush to Moses.

It
It is to be observed also, that he who calls himself the God of the Patriarchs, who has been proved to be Christ, is said also to call himself (ἐγώ ἐμέ ὁ ὄν) I Am that I Am, or I Am He who is: Whence it is evident, that the Son with the Father is Being itself, and by Consequence, Necessary and Eternal. See Chapt. II, 591.

† If it be objected that Christ gave himself the Name of Jehovah the God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, &c. Exod. iii. 15. in respect of the Father present with him, and not in respect of his own Person, it must be observed, that the Name Jehovah is given to Christ, in Distinction from the Person of the Father in the following Text; The Lord (Jehovah) rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah, Brimstone and Fire from the Lord (Jehovah) out of Heaven, Gen. xix. 24. where Jehovah, who rains down the Fire and Brimstone, is the Son; and Jehovah, from whom it is rained, is the Father, as is known to those, who are acquainted with the Interpretations of the *Antients: And if the Supream Name Jehovah, doubtless any other Name belonging to God, may be given to the Son; If it be further

* Not to mention any others, see Apost. Conf.Lib. 5. c. 20.
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ther objected, that the Name Jehovah, is spoken of the Son in an improper Sense; that must be repeated, which has been observed before, that the Name is * incommunicable to any Being but * N°594. the true God, and therefore belongs to the Son in the most proper Sense.

Philo says of the Word, or Second Principle, as cited by Eusebius,

That He is called the Beginning, and the Name of God.

Now the Name of God, emphatically so called, is the Name Jehovah, which is absolutely called the Name, Lev. xxiv. 11, 16, as being the Chief and Supream Name of God; if then Philo spoke the Sense of the learned Jews in this Matter, as is highly probable; the Name Jehovah, or the Divine Virtue of the Name, did not lodge in the Word, as in a distinct Subject, but was the very Word itself, according to the Wisdom and Tradition of the Jews; the Consequence of which is, that since the Name, or Thing signified by the Name, was
was feared, † called upon, and praised by the Jews, the Word; which is the thing signified, was the Object of Jewish Worship; and because the Object of Jewish Worship is but One, who is called the Lord God, or Jehovah Elohim, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve, Matt. iv. 10. Deut. vi. 13. Sept. And it is certain the Father was worshipped as well as his Word; the Father and the Word are the one Object of Jewish Worship, or the Lord God, who is but One, Deut. vi. 4. These, I say, are the Consequences of Philo's Position, without a strict Enquiry, how far He carried them in his own Writings; tho' it seems to appear with very great Evidence from the Gospel of St. John, and from the Nature of the Reasoning in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that the Jews had a Notion in the times of our Saviour, that the Word was God, and One † with the Father, and the Object of Worship.

* John x. 33. † Ch. x. 30. See N. 594.
From the Jews proceed we to the Christians, among whom Clem. Alexanderinus speaks of the Son after much the same manner, as Philo does of the Word. For
for having cited *Malachi* i. 11, 14. where the Name of the Lord of Hosts is declared to be great and dreadful among the Heathen, and the Object of Worship, He asks,

What Name? Among the Faithful, it is the Son revealing the Father, Matt. xi. 27. But among the Gentiles, it is God the Creator.

In which Words we may observe,

1st, That the Son revealing the Father, or, containing and manifesting the Father in Himself, is the very Name, and not the bare Subject in which it dwells. 2dly, That this Name is the Object of Worship, for it is said, *Malachi* i. 11. In every place incense shall be offered unto my Name, (that is, to the Son manifesting the Father) and a pure offering. 3dly, That the Son manifesting the Father is the same Object of Divine Worship to the Christians, as God the Creator was to the Gentiles; that is, as God was known to, and worshipped by, the wiser Heathens in...
The Unity of his Nature, and as Creator of the World: So is He known to, and worshipped by, the Christians in a Distinction of Persons, and more especially in the Person of the Son the Redeemer of the World. 4thly, That the Name manifested to the Christians and worshipped by them is as divine, as the Name manifested to the Gentiles, and worshipped by them; that is, the Son manifesting the Father is as true God, as God the Creator; otherwise the Christians in their new Dispensation, which is a plain Improvement of the State of Nature, would have a Name to trust in of lesser Efficacy than the very Gentiles. 5thly, That therefore the Son manifesting the Father is One with God the Creator, since the true God is but One.

Note, The Apostle tells us, Acts iv. 12. that there is none other Name under heaven (but the Name of Jesus Christ) given among Men whereby we must be saved. Now it is certain that the Name, by which the Church is to be saved according to the Prophecies of the Old Testament, is the Name Jehovah. For Joel says of the Christian Dispensation, as it is apply'd by St. Pe-
That whosoever shall call on the Name of the Lord (or, on the Name Jehovah) shall be delivered, or, saved, according to the Greek, Joel ii. 32. it follows then that the Name Jesus, and the Name Jehovah are One; for so is the Name Jehovah as cited out of Joel applied to Jesus Christ by St. Paul, Rom. x. 12, 13. If then Jehovah be incommunicable to any but the true God, and the true God is but One, and Jesus Christ is Jehovah, Jesus Christ is the true God.

DCXXII. Rom. xiv. 9, 10, 11, 12.

DCXXIII. For to this End Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that He might be Lord (ο ζωοιον) both of the Dead and Living, &c.

These and the following words seem to import something more than that God shall judge the World by Jesus Christ; namely, that Jesus Christ is himself both Lord and God, as may appear by looking back, and considering that these words are the Proof of a Truth asserted, v. 7, 8. That no Believer
believer lives or dies to himself but to the Lord, (μετα τον Κυρια) and the whole Reasoning runs thus: Christ died, rose again, and lived, that He might be the Lord (μετα τον Κυρια) both of the Dead and Living; the Faithful therefore, who live in, or, depart out of this World, ought so to live in, or depart out of it, as that, if they continue in it, they may live to the Lord (μετα τον Κυρια) or to the Person who rose again that He might be Lord of the Living; or, if they depart out of it, may die to the Lord, who himself died that He might be Lord of the Dead. Thus far then it is clear that Christ is Lord. But let us go a little more backward, and we shall find that the general Assertion, none of us liveth and dieth to himself, but to Christ the Lord of the Dead and Living, is laid down to prove a particular Truth, v. 6. that the Observation or Non-observation of Days by the Faithful, and their Eating or not Eating are Acts of Worship to the Lord. And the Reasoning is thus; No Believer lives to himself, but to Christ the Lord of the Living: All Acts therefore done by them in this Life, or Cessation from Acts, are to the Glory of the Lord;
Lord; observing of Days, or not observing, Eating or not Eating, are Acts of this Life, or a Cessation from Acts; therefore they are done by the Faithful to the Glory of Christ the Lord of the Living. Which is the Reason why none of the Faithful, whether weak or strong, should on these Accounts be condemn'd by their Brethren. So that it is still evident that Christ is the Lord understood in the Context. If then Eating or not Eating be to the Glory of Christ, it is reasonable to suppose that the Thanksgivings offered on either Occasion, v. 6. are to his Glory also; and that He is the God, or comprehended in the God to whom they are offered; for thus are the words, He that eateth eateth to the Lord (Christ) for He giveth God thanks. And He that eateth not, to the Lord (Christ) He eateth not, and giveth God thanks, v. 6. But it is yet more probable that Christ is comprehended in the Name God, if we retire to v. 1, 2, 3. where the Apostle exhorts the Romans to receive a weak Brother, and Him that eateth not, as well as Him that eateth, because God hath received them both. Which He repeats c. xv. v. 7. Wherefore receive ye one another,
as Christ also received us, to the glory of God, putting Christ in the place of God, as if He were comprehended in that Name. But let us take a View forwards, as we have done backwards; it is written v. 10. we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. And to prove this, the following words are cited out of Isaiah, † As I live faith the Lord (Jehovah) every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God; that is, to Jehovah, which the Septuagint take from the beginning of the next Verse, where it is placed according to the modern way of Pointing. And then from this Proof and Argument the Apostle repeats the Proposition to be proved, which was that we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, with some Variation in the following Terms, So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God, making these two Expressions, standing before the judgment seat of Christ, and giving an account to God, to be equivalent. Now if it did not appear from Scripture, that the Son in his own Person as well as the Father was called Jehovah, which is rendered here by the Name God; and that Jehovah was the
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the special and distinguishing Name of God, Exod. iii. 15. and that the Being meant by it was One only, Deut. vi. 4. it might be conceived that, standing before the Judgment Seat of Christ was no otherwhise giving an account to God, than in the Person of his Vicegerent, who bare his Authority, but was not God in his own Person: But since the contrary appears, and the Person swearing, that every knee shall bow to Him, and every tongue shall confess to God, is Jehovah; and Christ is acknowledged to have been the Person that generally manifested himself to the Jewish Nation; it will be a strong Presumption that Jehovah speaking by the Prophet Isaiah was the Son of God; and that the Apostle knowing this, cited the place as a direct Proof that we were all to stand before the judgment seat of Christ, and called him the God to whom all are accountable.

And thus Irenæus understood it as it is cited Philip, ii. 10, 11. for says He,
That every Knee of things in Heaven, and in Earth, and under the Earth, might according to the good Pleasure of the invisible Father bow to Christ Jesus our Lord and God, and Saviour, and King, and every Tongue might confess to him.

And Novatian says,

Neque enim, sinit Deus esset Christus, omne se in nomine ejus genu, sere teret caelestium, et infernorum. c. 17.

DCLXII. Heb. xiii. 8. Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever. Or rather, yesterday, and to day, and for ever. See ch. i. v. 12.

The Comment tells us the meaning is, "That the Doctrine of Christ once taught..."
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"taught by the Apostles ought to be " preferred unchanged." So that Jesus Christ here is the Doctrine of Christ; as the true God, No. 410. is the true Religion. But I believe it will appear both from the Words, and the Context, that the Person of Christ, and his eternal Existence, in respect of past and future Duration are understood by them. Chapter xii. the Apostle had been exhorting the Hebrews not to apostatize from the Faith of Christ, on account of any Troubles and Discouragements they might meet with from their Adversaries. And here Chap. xiii. v. 7. He proposes their own Pastors for an Example, whom he encourages them to imitate in the Constancy of their Faith; the Object of which was Jesus Christ, who was no Person of a modern Date, unable to sustain the Weight of so great a Confidence repose in Him; but was God Eternal, or a Divine Being without Beginning, and without End; on whom the Church was at first founded, does at present rest, and will be fix'd and establish'd to all Eternity, so that they might safely trust in Him, without Fear and Danger of Disappointment.

† That
That the Name *He* attributed to Christ is Divine, and argues Him to be God, Justin is Witness, who says,

That the Pronoun *He* signifies Him, who is truly God.

Ipse vero Idem est quod est, veluti Moysis famulo suo dixit, Ego sum Qui Sum. in Epist. ad Heb. c. I. v. 12.

Ambrose says, *He,* is the fame with *that which is,* as He said to his Servant Moses, *I Am that I Am.*

The Cabalistick Jews placed among the Divine Names.

Origen understands it as expressing the Immutability of God.

*But the Doctrine* (says He) *of the Jews and Christians,* which afferts the Immutability and Unchangeableness of God, is accounted impious, because it falls not in with the Impiety
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Impiety of those, who think

of the

of

of

of

Impiously of God, but

teaches us to say in our

Prayers to God, Thou art

He.

Again; We say that the

Divine Scriptures affirm

God to be immutable in

this Expression, But Thou

art He.

I think it is plain that Origen, in ci-
ting the words, But thou art He, refers
to Psal. cii. 27. Heb. i, 12. where
they are only written, so far as I know,
in the same Order and Number as they
are here cited. Now since the Apostle
Paul explains them of the Person of
Christ, and the Learned Origen skillful
in Scripture could not be ignorant of it,
He must be supposed to use them in the
same Sense that the Apostle explained
them in, and to comprehend Christ in
the Notion of the immutable and un-
changeable God, Which He seems to
do from the Context of the latter Ci-
tation. For Celsus having objected to
the Christians that it was impossible for
God
God to descend, and take upon him a mortal Body, without suffering an essential Change in his divine Nature, p. 169, 171. Origen answers him by explaining the true Meaning of God's descending, p. 169, which He had done before p. 168, and to which He refers him, and tells Him that notwithstanding this Descent, God remained immutable in his own Nature. That what descended to Men was in the Form of God, p. 169. or, was the immortal * God the Word, p. 170, who suffered no essential Change, tho' He emptied himself to be comprehended of Men. Which He proceeds to prove after the same manner as He had proved God to be immutable, p. 169, that is, as He had proved that by his descending to Men God was not chang'd, as Celsus supposed, from Good to Evil, from Beautiful to Deformed, from Happy to Miserable, and from the Best to the Worst; because He remained unchangeable in his nature, and did no more than condescend or accommodate himself by the Economy of his Providence to human Affairs: So does He prove of God the Word, that He suffered by his Descent no such Change
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Change from Good to Evil, &c. running through all the Particulars: And adds, that if Celsus thinks He must be changed on the account of his taking upon him a mortal Body and an human Soul. He ought to be instructed that the Word, remaining in, * its nature* ὁ Λόγος τῆς λογίας μεταβαίνει. the Word, suffers none of those Changes τίνος μεταβαίνει in which the Body and Soul do; but becomes Flesh by way of ἐν κοσμοποιήσει, &c. Condescension, &c. Since then the Word is God according to Origen, and his Immutability is proved by the same Arguments as that of God is, I think it is plain that the Son was comprehended under the immutable God by this Learned Father. Nay, his calling the Word the immortal God, seems to be done with an Intent to shew Celsus, that the Word was ever || the same; which is Celsus's Definition of immortal, p. 169. and that He ἡ αἰώνιος ἡμῶν was guilty of an Absurdity in affirming ἡ αἰώνιος the immortal God to be changed by his Descent into a mortal Body, p. 170, 171.

As for Yesterday, to Day, and for Ever, it falls in with, *Who is, and* Rev. is was, and is to come, a Name that expressthe eternal Existence of God.

Ambrose
Heri, propter aternitatem. Lib. 5. because of his Eternity.

dc Fide. c. 2.

Ambrose says, Yesterday, Chrysostom ; Yesterday signifies all the past time. To Day, the present. And for Ever, that which has no End.

DCCLXXIII. Mark xiii. 32. But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.

It may be supposed, that, when these words were spoken, the Humanity of the Son had no Knowledge of the Time of his coming to Judgment, because it was illuminated by degrees, Luk. ii. 52. and probably received the Knowledge of it with other Revelations after his Ascension into Heaven and Glorification there, Rev. i. 1. and v. 4, 5. Irenæus indeed seems to have understood the Passage of the Divinity of Christ, but may be very well explain'd by
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by the Citation out of Basil; who means nothing more by the Son’s Ignorance, than that the Father is the Fountain of all Knowledge, which is derived to the Son with his Essence from the Father: For that Irenæus believ’d that the Son knew all things is evident from the following Words:

How could therefore that which is produced by Ignorance and Defect contain Him (the Word) who has the knowledge of all things, and is true and perfect?

Quomodo igitur ignorantiae & Labis emisso eum qui continet universorum agnitionem, & sit verus & perfectus, portare potuit? Lib. 5. c. 18.

Clem. Alexand. was of the same Mind, for says he,

Ignorance does not approach God, who was the Father’s Counsellor before the Foundation of the World. For this is the Wisdom which God Almighty delighted in.

"Αγνοια γὰς εὰν αὐτέλθῃ τῷ Θεῷ, τῷ ὕποκεισθαι κόσμῳ συμβελή γενομένε τῷ Πατρίς ἀντὶ γὰς σοφία ἡ ἄρεσσάμεν ὁ Παντοκράτωρ Θεός. Strom. 7. p. 703.

DCCCXXX.
DCCCXXX. My Father is † greater than I.

† Greater as He is Father; not in respect of the Divine Nature, which is the same in both.

DCCCCXXXIV. Phil. ii. 6, 7. Who being in the Form of God (as He is God the Word) thought it not robbery to be equal with God († Did not take upon him at his first appearance in the World an Equality with God, or appear in the Glory and Power of his Divine Nature.) But made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the Form of a Servant; and was made in the likeness of Man, (or emptied himself, by taking upon him the Form of a Servant, being made in the Likeness of Men.)

† It must be observed that Christ the (a) 1 Cor. second Man, the Lord (a) from Heaven, coming into the World to redeem Mankind, took contrary Steps to bring it about, to those that were made by the first Man, who ruined himself and the.
the Creation with him. As for Instance, the first Adam had an ambitious Desire of becoming as God, ἑαυτὸν ὁμοιόμενον, that is, equal with, or like to God; of the same meaning with, ἵππος Θεός, Phil. ii. 6. as the Particle (ἐ) is render'd, Job xxix. 14. where ἱππός as a Robe is in the Sept. ἵππος στεφανός, equal or like to a Robe; and to compass his Desire violated the Laws, and trampled on the Authority of God his Creator: But the second Adam, the Son of God, tho' himself God, was so far from attempting to shew himself as God, or equal with God by violent Methods, that He would not appear to be that which He is, or come into the World in, the proper Splendor of his Divine Nature, but concealed his Glory under the Form of a Servant, or the human Nature.

† The Divine Nature of the Son did not empty itself of its Glory, which was Essential, nor of the Form of God, which was the Divine Nature itself, being entirely (a) immutable. But conceal-ed its Majesty under the Form of a Servant: That is, the Son relatively, and in regard of Men, was as it were, emptied of his Glory, because the Jews could
could not discern it through the Vail of his Flesh; but absolutely He was not. And in this Sense is the Text understood by the following Writers.


Tertullian says, He emptied himself, by taking on Him the Form of a Servant.

Si Christus exinanit tur in eo quod nascitur, formam servi accipiendo, &c. c. 17.

Novatian: If Christ was emptied in being born, and taking on him the Form of a Servant, &c.

Chrysostom: How did He empty himself? By taking upon him the Form of a Servant.

If it be further enquired, how the taking upon him the Form of a Servant was understood to be an emptying; it is explained thus by Theodoret,

Tho' He was God, He was not discerned to be God, by reason of his being cloathed with the Human Nature.

That
That is, The Glory of the Godhead was so vailed and concealed under the Man, as if it were not there; and this Concealment was the emptying.

Again, He hid his Majesty.

Which is Jerome’s Sense upon the Place,

He hid what He was, by Humility.

Novatian is more particular, and says,

It would have been more truly said of Christ, That He was enriched when He was born, than emptied; except it had been on this Account, that the Authority of the Divine Word, resting from the Exercise of its own Strength, in order to take upon it the Nature of Man, humbled and depressed it self for a cer-

De quo verius

dictum fussset locu-
pletatum illum esse
tunc, quum nasce-
retur, non exina-
nitum; nisi quoni-
am autoritas Divini
Verbi ad suscipien-
dum hominem in-
terim conquiescens,

dum, nec se suis viribus
exercens, dejectit se

ad
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Ad tempus atq; deposit, dum hominem fert, quem susceptit. c. 17.

Exinanivit se dum ad injurias contumeliasq; descendit; dum audit infamia, experitur indigna. Ibid.

And again, He emptied himself while he condescended to the bearing of Injuries and Reproaches; while He heard Words that ought not to have been spoken to him, and experienced things that ought not to have been done.

The Sense of the former of which Passages is expressed thus by St. Ambrose,

Sed semetipsum exinanivit. Potestate suam ab operere retraxit, ut humilis otiosâ virtute infirmior videatur. In loc.

But He emptied himself. He with-held his Power from acting; that being humbled by the Inactivity of his Power, He might seem weak.

The Sum of the Doctrine is this; That the Son of God emptied himself, or concealed his Glory and Power by taking
taking upon him human Nature, and bearing the Indignities offered him in it, thro' the Suspension of the Acts of his Divine Power; so that He seemed to Men to be void of that Power, which was essential to him and inseparable from him. For if He were really, and absolutely emptied of his Glory, or separated from it, it is impossible it should ever have been essential to him, or He himself have been true God; nor could the Glory of the Divinity have been mentally discerned by the Apostles themselves thro' the Vail of the Flesh, if it had not been there; as St. John tells us it was, c. i. 14. And we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father, in which Sense it is understood by Euseb. de Eccles. Theol. Lib. i. p. 85. and it is not improbable but that the Brightness of his Person, when transfigured upon the Mount, was the Effect of the Eruption of this concealed Glory.

The Comment indeed supposes, That Christ Jesus emptied himself of that Form of God which He before possessed; which seems to import, That He did not possess it in his State of Emptiness. Now if He was God, as being in the

Form
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Form of God, his losing the Possession of the Form was losing his Godhead; and since his State of Emptiness, was one and the same with his State of Humiliation in a Body of Flesh, and the Loss of the Possession was in his State of Emptiness, it will follow that He was not God, or possessed of the Godhead in his State of Humiliation in a Body of Flesh, which is contrary to Scripture, that tells us, God was manifested in the Flesh, 1 Tim. iii. 16, calling him God while He was yet in the Flesh, or in his State of Humiliation. But further, If He was not possessed of the Form of God, or of the Godhead in his State of Emptiness, and Manifestation in the Flesh, as He could never have been real God, because otherwise, the Form of God, or the Godhead, would have been essential to him and inseparable from him; so could He never have been the Mediator between God and Men, and have reconciled us to God; that Character and Office, requiring a Person who equally consisted of both Natures, according to the reasoning of the Antients, No. 501. So that the Consequence of the Supposition, overturns the Foundation of our Christian Hope. If then the Learned Author
Author believes that the Son is true God; He must mean something less than is here imagined, and the Words seem to import, when He says, That Christ Jesus emptied himself of that Form of God which he before possessed. But if He looked upon Christ Jesus to have been a mixt Being before his Incarnation, consisting of God the Word, and an intellectual Nature made and assumed by him, as the First-fruits of his Creatures holy to the Lord; it may be well conceived, how the created Nature in a qualified Sense might be said to empty itself, of something it possessed from the immediate Union, and glorious Irradiation of the Divine Nature, when it came into Flesh.

**Origen** was of this Mind, when He said, that

*The Word suffered no Change in it self, when out of its great Love to Mankind it caused a Saviour (meaning its own pre-exisling Human Soul) to come down to them.*

---

*Commentary Citations*

- *Origen* *Cont. Cels. Lib. 4* p. 172.

---
And then having affirmed, That the Scripture talks much of this Humiliation and Condescension of the Soul of the Word to Sorrow and Suffering, chooses out of all the rest, Phil. ii. 5, &c. to prove and confirm it, thereby shewing, That He understood all that was said there of Christ's emptying and humbling himself, to belong to his Soul and not to the Word, which he makes to be immutable. p. 170.

Now whether the Learned Dr. were of this Mind or not, it would have been more instructing and satisfactory to the Reader, if he had proposed his Sentiment with a little more Clearness.

Coloss. i. 15. Who is the Image of the invisible God, the First-born of every Creature.
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Creature, in respect of his Eternal Generation, or of his coming forth in order to Creation; it may be worth our observing, That the coming forth of the Son from the Father, is differently expressed in Scripture, and, as it is probable, according to the different Views, in which the Sacred Writers spake of him: As for Instance, The Ancients thought, that the Prophet David spoke of the Production of the Son, in the following Words, † My heart is enditing [Ps. xlvi. 1.]
as a good Matter, or, a good Word, [Heb. אֲדֹנָי אֲדֹנָי, Sept. which if it be true, it must be concluded, That David considered the Son as Light of Light, or as the Word and Truth conceived in the Mind or Heart of the Father; for so the Heart is used for the Principle of Thought by the Jewish Writers; and then it is no wonder that the Word סְדֹר rendered אֱנַדִּית, was used by the Prophet, as probably expressing the rising up of a Thought in the Mind or Understanding hot with Contemplation. But again, when the Scriptures speak of him as the proper Son of God (a) who is his proper Father, it may reasonably be concluded, That the Sacred Writers consider'd him (b) as the proper Son of God.

(a) Rom. viii. 32. (b) 1 John. iii. 13.
as the Fruit of the whole Person and Nature of the Father, or as the Offspring of his Love; and therefore expressed his coming forth by the Term Generation, as signifying the Production of a Being in the Power of Love, of the same Nature and Perfections with the Parent.

† The Apostle calls the Son, The Son of God's Love, τὰ ὑπὲρ ἀγάπης ἀυτῆς, Coloss. i. 13. That is, not only the Object of his Love, or the Person in whom He is well pleased, Matt. iii. 17. but also the substantial Fruit and Product of his Love, or of his * whole Nature, thro' Love.

Clem. Alexand. calls him

Ὁ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγάπης ἰδεῖται, Love, as being the Fruit of his Love, προκειμένου, ἀγαπη. brought forth by Love.

Quis Dives, &c.

P. 97. §. 37.

Which if it be true of his Relative Existence, is much more so of his Absolute and Eternal.
I cannot but take notice of a Saying of Origen, which in its plain and natural Consequence shews us, That He held the Son to proceed from the whole Perfection of the Father. His Saying is this,

I think that the Son is the Effulgency of the whole Glory of God.

Now the Son is not a Being of one Perfection, but of many. He is the Holy One, the True One, (a) the just (a) Rev. One (b) the Image of God's goodness, (c) or, the Son of his Love, (d) the mighty God, (e) or, the Breath of the Power of God Eternal Life, (f) and (g) absolutely God, or the true God (h) Which includes all Perfections. If then the Son as Light proceeds from the whole Glory of the Father: Is there any Reason, why as Holy, True, Just (f) i John Good, Mighty, Life it self, and true God, He should not proceed from the whole Holiness, Truth, Justice, Good-

*Sec. 2. p. 172. θεος ζωής. Truly Life. C. Alexand. Str. 7. p. 708. (g) John i. 1. (h) i John, v. 20.
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ness, Might, Life, and Godhead of the Father, and be the Fruit and Offspring of his whole Nature?

In Page 185. it is affirmed, "That the Antients from certain Expressions of Scripture, took occasion to speak as if the Son of God was produced by the Father just before the Creation of the World; but that the Words of Scripture gave no Ground for such Speculations.

Whatever the Opinion of this learned Gentleman may be concerning the meaning of the Scripture Expressions, it seems to be certain, that the Antients, who took occasion from them to assert the Generation of the Son, in order to Creation, thought they were a sufficient Ground for such their Assertion. And since these Antients are in great Numbers, and some of them in the most early Times, let the Reader judge which of the two may be presumed to be the best Witnesses, or Interpreters of Scripture.

As for the Λύγς, it was usually taken by Heathen, Jewish, and Christian
Christian Authors for the Thoughts of the Mind. And the Christian Writers considering the Father under the Character of Mind, or as an intellectual Nature, spoke of the Son as the Conception of the Mind, calling Him \( \Delta \gamma \theta \) and \( \nu \), as it stands for the Thoughts, and not for the Faculty. But then as they did not look upon the Father to be a bare intellectual Power, when they called him Mind, but a Divine Person, naturally and necessarily furnished and completed with all Perfection: So must they not be supposed to have conceived the Son, when they called Him Thought, as the bare Effect of the simple Faculty of Conceiving and Understanding, but as a Divine Person, the adequate Fruit of so compleat a Mind and intellectual Nature, as the Person of the Father. Thus Athenagoras * calls God the Father, an (a) Eternal Mind; and agreeably to this first Notion, That which is brought forth by him, (b) Thought or Word. And because an Eternal Mind, can never be supposed to be void of Thought, He makes it (c) eternally thoughtful, or the Thought to be co-existent with the Mind. This Eternal Thought
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Thought came forth and manifested itself in order to create, and is the Son of God. If then Athenagoras understood the whole Person of God the Father, by the Eternal Mind, as it is evident He did; the Thought of such a Mind, must be the Offspring of the whole Person of God the Father: and therefore the Thought or Word coming forth to create, must have been as Real and Personal a Subsistence before, as it was after the coming forth. For otherwise it is inconceivable, how the bare coming forth without Creation, and it is mentioned as a bare coming forth, should make, or be thought to make, a pre-existing Thing become a Person, which was none before.

Theophilus speaks of the Son after the same manner, * first as a Thought Eternally existing in the Mind of God, which was also his Counsellor. Secondly, as a Voice, or as the same ETERNAL Thought, uttered and spoken forth, in order to create: Which shews, That He believed the Son to be a distinct Person from the Father from all Eternity, partly by his calling him Counsellor before his coming forth, which is a Personal Character, partly by
by his affirming him after his coming forth, when He was doubtless a Person, to be the very same Thought that eternally existed in the Mind of God; which evidently infers him to have been a Person before. Nay, his Reasoning argues him to be Son, while He was yet concealed in the Heart of God, which is as Personal a Name as any that can be given.

Tatian seems to have been of the same Mind with the two preceding Writers. For the *Power of the Word, or rational Power, which is spoken of §. xi. as a Person, is mentioned as existing before his coming forth, §. vii. So that the Word according to all these Writers, was a Real Person present with the Father, and distinct from him, before his coming forth in order to create.
CHAP. III.

Of the Holy Spirit of GOD.

DCCCCXCVIII. MAT. iv. 1. Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the Wilderness.

Concerning the Son's emptying himself, No. 934.

* It is not to be supposed, That the Word so far emptied himself, and concealed his Glory under the Vail of Flesh, and suspended his Acts, as to leave the Humanity to the sole Conduct of the Holy Spirit. For if this were true, then was our Salvation wrought out, not by the Word made Flesh, or by the Second Person of the Trinity united to Man, but by
by the Holy Ghost. The Truth then appears to be this; That as the Father works through the Son in the Holy Ghost; so the Word works from the Father through the Spirit, and that this Economy was observed in the Human Nature; the Father working with and through the Son, John v. 17, 19. and the Word in the Flesh, working with and through the Spirit; so that the whole Trinity, or the Father, and the Word in the Spirit, wrought in and through the Man assumed by the Word. For that the Word was not Idle in the Human Nature, in relation to Acts of Mercy and Goodness, is evident from hence, that it was a Light that instructed, and a Life that quickned, John i. 4, 9, 12, 18: and xi. 25, &c. Nay, all his Acts of Patience and Goodness; his Victory over the World, and his Resurrection from the Dead, and Ascension into Heaven, are attributed by Irenæus, to the Influence of the Word. His Words are these,
For as He was Man, that He might be tempted: So was He the Word, that He might be glorified. The Word indeed \( \uparrow \) resting (here is its emptying itself) in regard of the Temptation, Crucifixion, and dying of the Man; but being present with, or assisting him, in regard of his Conquest, Patience, Goodness, Resurrection and Ascension. \( \uparrow \) See No. 934.

MV. Luke iv. 18. The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the Poor.

Irenæus's Comment upon this Place is very proper,

Nam secundum id quod Verbum Dei Homo erat, ex ra-
dice Jesse, & Fil-
lus Abraham, se-

As the Word of God was Man, of the Root of Jesse, and the Son of Abraham, in this respect did the Spirit of God rest upon him.
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him (Eum, the Man, not the Word) and He was anointed to preach the Gospel to the Meek.

candum hoc requirere scebat Spiritus Dei super Eum, & ungebatur ad evangelizandum humilibus. Lib. 3. c. 10.

MLVI. Acts xxviii. 25, 26, 27. Well spake the Holy Ghost by Isaiah the Prophet unto our Fathers, saying, Go unto this People, and say, &c. ——— and I should heal them.

The Glory which appeared to Isaiah chap. vi. is the Glory of the Father, Revelat. iv. 8. and of the Son, Joh. xii. 41. and in this Place, of the Holy Ghost. For the Glory, or Lord, which spake to the Prophet, is called here the Holy Ghost. Now since Three Persons are manifested in one Glory, and Manifestations are intended to bring us into the Knowledge of the Things manifested, it is a great Probability, that the one Glory teaches us the Unity or Identity of Nature, of the Persons manifested in it. See No 597.
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It is worth observing, That it is no strange thing with the Jews, to put Holy Ghost in the place of God, as if they were one and the same Being.

Rab. Ob. De Bartinora, says, At the time of Destruction, God was sad for the Misfortunes of his People; and then the Angels would have comforted him; but the Holy Ghost answered, Hasten not to comfort Me. In Notis in Tract. de Patr. Capit. Pars 4. Leg. Misch. p. 460.


The Holy Ghost (The Lord of Hosts, Hag. i. 9.) answered them, because of mine House that is waste. Tractat. de Patr. c. 4. which will explain those Expressions, in which the Church is called the Temple of the Holy Ghost.

The Prophets do the same Thing. Isaiah says of the Jews, c. lxiii. 10. That they rebelled and vexed his (God's) Holy Spirit. Which Holy Spi-
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It is the same with the Angel of his Presence, that conducted and saved them, v. 9. For this was the Being that was provoked by them in the Wilderness, and in the succeeding Generations. But this Angel of his Presence is God himself according to the Septuag. and according to their Notion of the Word Presence, Exod. xxxiii. that is, it is God himself as manifested in the Glory. It appears then that the Prophet looked upon God as manifested in the Glory, and the Holy Ghost to be One.

Ver. 11. He says, where is He that put his Holy Spirit in the midst of Him? Now that which was in the midst of them was the Glory of the Lord, sometimes resting on his Tabernacle in the midst of the Camp; and sometimes marching before them in the Cloud, Exod. xl. 34, &c. Numb. ii. 17. Which Glory is called by the Name of God; and is said to be Jehovah himself, Zech. ii. 5. I, saith Jehovah, will be the Glory in the midst of Her.
Ver. 14. He says, the Spirit of the Lord caused Him to rest. But it was the Glory, or his Presence, that led, conducted them, and caused them to rest in the Land of Canaan. It is plain then that the Glory and Spirit were considered as one in the Eye of the Prophet. But the Glory is called Jehovah; the Spirit therefore, who is one with it, is comprehended in Jehovah; which being but One, Deut. vi. 4. and the Name incomunicable, Exod. iii. 15. Psal. lxxxiii. 18. God and the Spirit, who are Jehovah, are One; that is, as the Divine Nature, or Jehovah, is but one; so is the Glory, which is a Manifestation of it, and called by the same Name, but One also; but this One Glory is that of God and the Spirit, therefore it may reasonably be inferred, That God and the Spirit are united in the One Divine Nature, as they are in the Glory or Manifestation of it.

Ezekiel seems to be of the same Mind with Isaiah; for says He, c. viii. v. 2, 3. I beheld, and lo, a likeness as the appearance of fire: ——And He put forth the form of an hand, and took
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took me by a lock of mine head; and the Spirit lift me up. It is no wonder that the Spirit lift up the Prophet, when the Hand of the Glory, or of the Lord (for so it is called c. ix. v. 3, 4.) took him by a Lock of the Head, for indeed the Spirit is called the Hand of the Lord, v. i. and c. iii. v. 14. The Spirit lifted me up, and took me away. The hand of the Lord was strong upon me. That is, the Spirit, which took him up, was strong upon Him; (or the Spirit of Prophecy, as the Hand is called, Paraph. Chald.) As then the Hand is one with the visible Glory of the Lord, so may it reasonably be concluded that the Spirit is One with Jehovah, or the Lord manifested in it.

Note, the Spirit and the Son are called the Hands of God the Father by Irenaeus, Lib. 5. c. 6. and Lib. 1. in praëf. and are said to be God himself. Lib. 2. c. 55. p. 185.
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Chap. iii. v. 24. The Spirit entered into me, and set me upon my Feet, and spake with me. No Subject intervenes between Spirit and Spake; so that the Spirit, which set him upon his Feet, seems to have spoken to him. If then this be true, the Spirit calls himself, Lord Jehovah, v. 27. When I speak with thee, I will open thy mouth, and thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord Jehovah. And doubtless the Testimony of the Spirit concerning himself, is to be believed by us. It is true, indeed, That the Verbs entered and set are Feminine, relating to Spirit; but Spake a Masculine; and therefore may belong to Glory, and not Spirit. But since Verbs of both Genders are joined with Spirit, see Gen. vi. 3. 1 Kings viii. 12. I think it is most agreeable to the Construction, to refer them all to Spirit.

Chap. xi. v. 1, 2. Moreover the Spirit lifted me up, and brought me unto the East gate of the Lord's House, _Then said He unto me._ Here the Spirit is the common Subject of the Verbs according to the foregoing Observation.
The Septuagint and Syriack indeed, put in Lord before the Verb said, And the Lord said unto me. But whether they refer it to the Glory at the East-gate, c. x. 19. whither the Prophet was carried, c. xi. 1. or to the Spirit carrying him, as being one with the Glory, is uncertain; though the latter is more probable according to the Hebrew, which has no Subject beside Spirit only.

Ver. 5. And the Spirit of the Lord fell upon me, and said unto me. The Spirit again is the common Subject of both these Verbs, which have the same Distinction of Masculine and Feminine with the former. If then the Spirit is the Person speaking, and calls himself Lord or Jehovah, as he does, v. 10, 12. Ye shall know that I am the Lord, He is truly such. And if it be objected that the Spirit speaks in the Name of the Lord only, and not in his own Name, because He says to the Prophet, v. 5. Speak, thus saith the Lord; it may be answered, That where the Lord himself undoubtedly speaks, the like Form of Words is used, as Isai. vii. 3, 4, 7. Then said the Lord unto Isaiiah, Go
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Go forth now to meet Abaz, — and say unto him, — thus saith the Lord God.

After the same manner, because the One Glory of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, was manifested in the Human Nature of Christ, though the Word Only was Personally united to it, are the Words of Christ attributed to the Spirit. *Revel.* ii. and iii.

It is no wonder then from all these Considerations, that some Antient Writers understood, *Isai.* vi. 9, &c. as cited by St. John and St. Paul, to be expressive of the Trinity in Unity of Essence and Glory.

Chrysostom says upon the Words of St. John, c. xii. 41.

These things said Isaiah when He saw His Glory, Whose Glory? The Father's. How then does John apply them to the Son, and Paul to the Spirit? Not as confounding the Persons, but declaring
Jerome says, who that Lord was, who was seen, may be fully learnt from John the Evangelist, and the Acts of the Apostles. John—evidently means Christ. Paul in the Acts—says, well spake the Holy Ghost by Isaias—But the Son was seen in the Dress of a King. And the Holy Ghost spake as being a Partner in the Glory, and one with Him in Substance.

And indeed the Glory speaks of itself as Plural as well as Singular, when it says, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Isai. vi.

MLXXV. John
MLXXV. John iii. 5. Except a Man be born —— * of the Spirit, He cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.

* To be born of the Spirit, is according to this Evangelist, Ch. i. 23. to be born of God; it is probable then that God and the Spirit or Holy Ghost, were believed by Him to be One.

Nemesianus à Thubunis was of this Opinion, who reasons thus:

That which is born of the Flesh, is Flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit. For God is the Spirit, and it is born of God.

That is, That which is born of the Spirit, is therefore Spirit, because it is born of God, who is the Spirit.
The Dr. argues, That the Blasphemy is not against the Person, but the Works of the Holy Ghost, for this Reason, because otherwise Blasphemy against the Persons of God the Father, and the Son of God, would be as unpardonable as that against the Holy Ghost. Which is plainly supposing, That Blasphemy against God the Father, and the Son of God are pardonable. But where this Doctrine is to be found is hard to tell; the Text does not seem to infer it, nor the Parallel places in the rest of the Evangelists. Nay, the Scripture rather contradicts it. For First,

Blasphemy
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Blasphemy against the Father is unpardonable according to Levit. xxiv. 11, 13, 16. as interpreted by the Jews. The Words are these, an Israelitish Woman's Son blasphemed, or profanely uttered the Name. —— And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying — He that blasphemeth the Name of the Lord, or the Name Jehovah, He shall surely be put to Death, and all the Congregation shall certainly stone him. Now doubtless, Blasphemy against the Name of God the Father, is Blasphemy against God the Father himself; if then Blasphemy against the Name, is not to be pardoned, but punished with Death, Blasphemy against the Person is equally unpardonable. And because it may be objected, that this only proves it unpardonable in this World, but not in the World to come: That the Temporal Punishment was to be inflicted, but not that the Sin was irremissible; I shall observe that the Jewish Doctors were of another Mind. They had a Tradition among them, that there were certain Crimes, that excluded the Sinners from having any Portion in *the World to come. Among which was
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was pronouncing the Name Jehovah, according to its Letters (a); now (a) Tract. they looked upon the Egyptian to have cursed God, by such a Pronunciation of the Sacred Name (b). The Consequence of which is, That his Blasphemy was irremissible in the World to come. Whether then the Reason assigned by them be good or no for their judging it unpardonable; this is certain, they had such a Doctrine, that there were some Crimes, that were not to be pardon'd in the World to come; and if any Crime, Blasphemy doubtless against the God of Heaven, or the Person of the Father, as being an Act of open Defiance, and most provoking Insolence. And to this Jews'h Doctrine, it is probable our Saviour has respect in speaking of the Sin against the Holy Ghost; and St. Paul also in pronouncing Apostacy from Christ, to be beyond Repentance (a), to have no (a) Heb. Sacrifice that is capable of expiating it (b), to be reserved for the Judgment, and Fire of the Great Day (c), and by Consequence to be unpardonable in the World to come. And St. John also in affirming, That there is
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is *a Sin unto Death*, that is, not to be pray’d for in order to be par-

(d) *1 Joh.* v. 16.

St. Cyprian seems to be of the mind, that there were Sins against God, that were alike unpardonable with that against the Spirit; for when he had cited Matthew and Mark for the unpardonable Sin against the Holy Ghost, He adds,

De hoc ipso in Basileion primo: Si delinquendo peccet Vir adversus Vi-

rum, orabunt pro eo Dominum: Si au-

tem in Deum peccet homo, Quis orabit pro eo? Testim. Lib. 3. c. 28.

Concerning this very thing (or Sin) it is written in the First of Kings (or *1 Sam. ii. 25.*) If one man sin against another, they shall intreat the Lord for him: But if a man sin a-

gainst God, (or Jehovah) who shall intreat for him?

Now God or Jehovah is He, whose Service and Tabernacle were pollu-
ted and prophaned by the Sons of Eli: If then Cyprian by God understood the Spirit, then He believed the Spirit to be God. But if He meant the Father, then the Sin against the Holy Ghost
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Ghost was not the only One, which He believed unpardonable.

Secondly, Blasphemy against the Son, as He is Son of God, and God himself, is unpardonable also. For if the Son as Son of God, and God is Jehovah, as Scripture and Antiquity affirms; and if Blasphemy against the Name Jehovah is unpardonable; Blasphemy against the Son of God is unpardonable also. Neither does this contradict the Text, which says, Whosoever speaks a Word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him. For Jesus Christ as He is Son of Man, is not Son of God or Jehovah; and therefore Blasphemy against Him as Son of Man, is not Blasphemy against the Name Jehovah, or the Son of God; and therefore is it remissible, as being done, not against the Godhead, but the Humanity of the Son, which is a meer Creature. For in this respect, it is of the Order of Crimes, which one Man is said to commit against another, and admits of Intercession in order to be pardoned.
Since then Blasphemy against the Father, and the Son, as God, is unpardonable, it can be no Argument, That the unpardonable Sin of Blasphemy was not against the Person of the Holy Ghost, because there is no such unpardonable Sin against the Person of the Father and of the Son of God; but on the contrary, because there is such an unpardonable Sin against the Person of the Father, and of the Son of God, as God, both comprehended in the Name of Jehovah; it may be inferred, that the unpardonable Sin against the Holy Ghost was not Blasphemy against his Works only, but his Person also. For when they said, He (Christ) had Beelzebub, or an unclean Spirit, they resolved the Works into a Diabolical Principle, or took occasion from the Works to traduce the Person and Authority that wrought them, making him unclean who was truly Holy; and of a devilish Nature, who was really Divine; which appears to be as Personal an Injury, as any that cou'd be offered.
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It is further observed in the Comment as a remarkable thing, "That neither here in St. Matthew, nor other in any other Place of Scripture, is there any mention made of any Sin against the Holy Ghost, but only of a Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost." What does the Remarker think of the lying to, and tempting the Holy Ghost, Acts v. 3. 9. Was not that a Sin against the Holy Ghost? And a Sin of a different Sort from that of Blasphemy? And a Sin, not against the Works: For as Ananias and Sapphira did not blaspheme them, so how cou'd they lie to, and tempt Works? But a Sin against the Authority and Person of the Holy Ghost, that was present with the Apostles and acted thro' them; as it might well do, being present every where, (a) and filling the World, and containing all things, 8. Wis. i. 7.

MCXXXII. 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18. The Lord is that Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty.

K 2 But
But we all with open Face, beholding as in a Glass the Glory of the Lord, are changed into the same Image, from Glory to Glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.

The Comment explains these words, The Lord is that Spirit, thus "Christ (or the Gospel of Christ) is the true Intent and Spirit (in opposition to the dead Letter and burdensome Rites) of the Law." But I shall endeavour to shew, that there is something more literal contained in them, and expressive of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. In order to which two Things shall be considered, 1st, who the Lord is; 2dly, who the Spirit. Who the Lord is, will appear by comparing v. 16. with Exod. xxxiv. 34. The Words of both places are these. Nevertheless when it (the Heart) shall turn to the Lord, the Vail shall be taken away, v. 16.

When Moses went in before the Lord (Jehovah)——— He took the Vail off. Exod. xxxiv. 34.

Here is a plain Allusion of the former Words to the latter, importing that
that as the Vail was taken from the Face of Moses, when He went into the Tabernacle to talk with the Lord (Jehovah ;), so the Vail should be removed from the Heart of the unbelieving Jews, when it should turn or move towards the Lord (or Jehovah ;) for so the Term Lord seems to mean; it being difficult to suppose that the Being, before whom the real Vail is removed, should not be Jehovah, when He, before whom the typical one was taken away, is really such. Now this very Lord or Jehovah, before whom the inward Vail is taken away, is said to be the Spirit, v. 17. The Lord is the Spirit. The Lord then is Jehovah.

The second Consideration is, who the Spirit is; which will appear to be the Holy Ghost by looking back upon the Context. For the Apostle makes an Opposition between the Law and the Gospel, shewing that the first was a Dispensation of Condemnation, as having no Sacrifice for Sin, nor quickening Spirit; the latter a Dispensation of Justification, as having both; and tells the Corinthians v. 3. that the Gospel was...
was written in their Hearts by the Spirit of the Living God, or, the Holy Ghost, in Opposition to the Law written upon Tables of Stone; That the Apostles were Ministers of the Spirit, v. 6. which was the peculiar Gift of the new Covenant, administered to the Faithful by the Imposition of their Hands; And that Divine Life was given to the Church by the quickening Spirit, and that the Spirit thus administered, was the Spirit of Glory, v. 8. as Peter calls it, c. iv. 14. that is, such a Spirit, as will adorn Believers in the Life to come with a brighter and more lasting Glory, than that which discovered it self in the Face of Moses. The Spirit then being used for the Holy Ghost, or the Spirit of the Living God, in the preceding part of the Chapter, it is no wonder that the Apostle repeats it in the same Sense, v. 17. saying, now the Lord, or Jehovah, is that Spirit, that is, is the Spirit of which He had been speaking; for nothing occurs in the whole Context to determine it to another Sense; nay the remaining part of the Verse rather confirms it, where the Spirit of the Lord is,
is, (that is, the Holy Ghost, which seems ever to be understood by the Spirit of the Lord) there is Liberty. Whence it may be observed, that as the Spirit it self is Lord or Jehovah, so is it said to be the Spirit of the Lord or of Jehovah; that is, as it is the Spirit of the Father, it is the Spirit of Jehovah; and as it is substantially one with the Father, it is it self Jehovah. For Jehovah is but One, Deut. vi. 4. in the last Verse it is called again, the Lord (or Jehovah) the Spirit (even as by the Lord the Spirit, v. 18.) which is the more agreeable rendering, on the following Considerations: 1st, Because the Positions of the Words are the same with, the Lord is that Spirit, v. 17. 2dly, Because according to the Apostles way of writing, He would probably have put ἠλπίμα before Κυρία in this oblique Construction of the Nouns, had his Meaning been, the Spirit of the Lord. These two Verses then are a strong Testimony for the Divinity of the Spirit, or that the Holy Ghost is God.

K 4 MCCXI, Matt.
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A Testimony of Tertullian for the Divinity of the Holy Ghost must not be omitted in this place.

Spiritus Dei super aquas factus est, etc. De Bapt. c. 3. p. 159. Edit. De la Cerda.

The Spirit of God, says He, moved upon the Waters—That liquid Element only—afforded a Chariot worthy of God, (that is, of the Spirit moving upon it.)

Note, This was written before he was a Montanist.

Clemens Alexandrinus is more plain:

Non hic Hominis sed Columba similitudinem Dei assumptit, quia volebat novam quaedam apparitionem Spiritus, God did not take upon Him the Likeness of a Man, but of a Dove. Because the Spirit would, by a new sort of Appearance in the Likeness of a Dove, declare
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declare his Simplicity and Meekness.

per Columba similitudinem, simplicitatem et manuenta
dem declarare. Ex Cat. in S. Luc. ad fin. Lib. Quis Dives, &c.

MCCXLVIII. 1 John v. 7. For there are three that bear Record in Heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are One.

Since it ought not to be concealed, That this Passage does not certainly appear to have been found in the Text of any Greek Manuscript: It ought also to be told, That it appears to have been found in the old Latin Version, that was used in the African Church. Else how could St. Cyprian have cited it in his Treatise, De. Unit. Eccles.? And again, it is written Et iterum De of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: And these three are One.

Now
Now where is this written, but in the above-cited Passage of St. John?

Again in his Epistle to Judæanus, He says,

*Si peccatorum remissam consecutus est, & sanctificatus est, & Templum Dei factus est? Quero cuius Dei? Si Creatoris, non potuit Qui in eum non creditit: Si Christi, nec hujus fieri potest Templum, qui negat Deum Christum: Si Spiritus Sancti, cunctres unum sint, &c.*

If a Man can obtain Remission of Sins, (among Heretics,) then is He sanctified, and made the Temple of God. But of what God, I beseech you? If of the Creator, that is impossible, because He has not believed in him: If of Christ, neither can He be his Temple, because He denies Christ to be God. If of the Holy Ghost, forasmuch as these three are One, &c.

Here is a plain Allusion to the same Passage of St. John’s Epistle; besides a Testimony of the Author’s Opinion of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost; since under the Term God He comprehends the Creator, Christ, and the Holy Ghost.
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As for the Unity of these Three, it is not a bare Unity of Testimony, but of Substance. (See No 594.) Tertullian says of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Which Three are One (Being,) not one (single Person;) as it is said, I and my Father are One (Being,) to express the Unity of Substance, not the Singularity of Person.

Qui tres unum sunt, non unus: Quomodo dictum est, Ego & Pater unum sumus, ad substantia unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem. Cont. Prax. c. 25.

In which Words, as Tertullian seems plainly to have read the same Passage with St. Cyprian in St. John's Epistle, These Three are One; so have we no Reason to believe, but that his Disciple Cyprian followed his Master in understanding One of a Substantial Unity.
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Dr. John Arias
THE Publisher of these Papers is very sensible, that they would have appeared in the World with greater Advantage, if Mr. Nelson's Letter to the Reverend Dr. Clarke, which he had drawn a Sketch of, and communicated to a Friend, had been finished by him, and prefixed to this Answer. But his much lamented Death, which is attended with the Loss of many Attempts for the Public Good, has deprived the Reader of this useful Entertainment, which, it may well be supposed, would have been every way worthy of those excellent Talents, which so much distinguished him. However, there is sufficient Reason for the Reader to believe from his intended Answer, that, not the Weight
Weight of the Objections, but the declining Health of this most valuable Gentleman, was the only Cause that prevented a Reply to the Letter he received from the Learned Doctor.
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It is necessary before I proceed to the Consideration of the Texts, to premise something in relation to the Two General Observations made by the Doctor. I say then in Answer to the First of them, That if the Texts I have selected be represented to the Reader in their true Meaning, there is sufficient ground, notwithstanding the Numbers which remain untouched, for rejecting the Notions advanced by the Dr. For should such of those Texts be separated from the rest, which either both Sides agree in, or may be taken in the Sense, they are explained in by the Dr.
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without any Damage or Advantage to either; or have been already set in their proper Light, as importing no more than what is contained in the select Passages; I conceive none would remain of such Moment and Consequence, as to infer the Doctrines contended for by the Dr. The Life and Strength of his whole Scheme, seem to be contracted into these few Passages, I have taken from the rest; and it must stand or fall, as the Explications given of them, either by the Dr. or my self, shall appear to be agreeable to the Analogy of Faith delivered to us in Scripture.

In Answer to the Second General Observation, I say, If I have shewn that the learned Dr's Explications are either not agreeable to Scripture and Antiquity; or do not come up to the Mind of them: And that his Citations from the Fathers are many of them produced in a Sense different from, or short of the Meaning of those ancient Writers. His Doctrines built upon such Explications and Citations, cannot be the Doctrine of Scripture and Antiquity. The Dr. says, "That I do not so much as attempt to prove "my Notion to be true;——And that it is "very hard to guess what that Notion or "Supposition is, which I intend to esta-"blish." Now granting this to be true, which whether it be so or no I refer to the Reader, Does it therefore follow that the Dr.
Dr. is in the right? Or because I cannot set a sacred Truth in so clear a Light, as lesser Matters, that are adequate to our Understandings, are capable of being placed in: Must therefore the Dr's Scheme, which attempts to bring it down to the Level of our Understandings, be so well contrived, as none can refuse to give their assent to it, but Men of confused and obscure Notions? And must I be said not to know distinctly what I intend to prove, when I undertake to prove the Dr. mistaken, because I do not say so much on the other Side, as he may be pleased to expect, or perhaps the Nature of the Thing cannot admit of? As for the Contradictions and Inconsistency charged upon my Writings, I hope, the following Papers will clearly shew, that there is no Foundation for any such Censure.

I. Matt. xix. 17. There is none good but One, that is, God.

The Dr. in his Answer, pag. 40. says, "That one Being, when spoken of an intelligent Agent, is the very same as one Person." To which I Answer, That if the intelligent Agent has but one Subsistence, as a Man, or Angel, one Being spoken of it, is subjectively the same with one Person; but where the intelligent Agent has more Subsist-
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ences,
ences, there one Being spoken of it, is subjectively the same with the Plurality of Persons contained in it. But proceeds the Dr.
"There is no other Notion of a Person, "than as it signifies an intelligent Agent, "or intelligent Being." The Notion indeed of a Person, and an intelligent Being, in relation to the Creatures, is the same, because each such intelligent Being, is supposed to have but one Subsistence: So that the Notion of a single Subsistence enters into the Idea of a created intelligent Being; and Person, and intelligent Being, may be reciprocally spoken the one of the other. But the Notion of a Person, and an intelligent Being, in relation to God, is not the same, neither can they be reciprocally spoken the one of the other; for tho' each Divine Person by himself is an intelligent Being, yet the Divine intelligent Being is not one Person only; because God, who is that Divine intelligent Being, is represented to us in Scripture as having, not one Subsistence only, but a Plurality of Subsistences: So that the Notion of a Plurality of Subsistences enters into the Idea of God, or the Divine intelligent Being. If then the Term &c. may be rendered one intelligent Being, and there be a Plurality of Subsistences in that one intelligent Being, it will follow, that the good God, who is that one intelligent Being, is not one Person only, but a Plurality of Persons. See N. 597.

Now that there are a Plurality of Subsistences in
in the Divine intelligent Being, will appear from N. 3, 8, 66, 372, 382, 1056, 1075, 1248.

The Dr. goes on, pag. 41. "If there be "any one Passage, in any one Greek or "Latin Writer, wherein the Word (εἷς unus,) "or any other Masculine Adjective, placed "absolutely without any Antecedent Sub- "stantive, (as ἔλες and εἷς are placed in "this Text) can possibly signify either "Thing or Being, or any thing else besides "Person; I will acknowledge my Explica-"tion of this Text to be erroneous." First, It must be observed, that ἔλες may refer to a Consequent, as well as an Antecedent Sub-stantive, as it does in the Text, namely, to ὁ θεός: And in other Places of Scripture. Secondly, That ἔλες absolutely placed, does not refer to any Greek Word expressing Per-son, according to the Dr’s Concession, pag. 43. but to a Noun of the Masculine Gender generally known and made use of, to signify a created intelligent Being living upon Earth, that is, to ἄνθρωπος. Man, as Mark xi. 2. ἔλες ἄνθρωπων, no Man. So 1 Tim. vi. 16. ὦ ἔλες ἔλες ἄνθρωπων, whom no Man hath seen. The parallel Place to which, 1 John iv. 12. has ἔλες; only without ἄνθρωπων, as thus; Θεὸν ἔλες παρακατε προσέλθε, no Man hath seen God at any time. ἔλες also is joined with the same Noun in the New Testament; as, John xi. 50. ἔλες ἄνθρωπως, one Man. So Chap. xviii. 14. and in Rom. v. it is sometimes B 3 with
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with ἄνθρωπος, and sometimes without it; and both ἡλιξπ, and ἔκ, are joined with ἄνη, of the same Gender, in other Writings. And the Translators of the Bible seem to have been so very sensible of this Truth, as that they generally render ἡλιξπ, no Man; not, no Person. In like manner of ἡλιξπ, if it be spoken of Men, relates to ἄνθρωποσ, or ἄνδρες; and ἐὰν, emphatically taken, to Ἴδες. See N. 597.

Thirdly, As then ἡλιξπ, belongs to ἄνθρωπος, who is a created intelligent Being, of one Subsistence; in this respect it signifies, no Person. But as ἔκ belongs to Ἴδες, who is an uncreated intelligent Being, with a Plurality of Subsistences; in this respect, if it be rendered separately, it signifies, not one Person, but one uncreated intelligent Being; which is manifested to its Creatures in a threefold Subsistence.

Fourthly, "A Masculine Adjective placed absolutely, without any Antecedent Substantive, may signify either Thing, or "Being;" as 1 John v. 8. Καὶ τρεῖς ἐὰν οἱ μαρτυρίαις ἐν τῇ γῇ, τῷ Πνεύμα, ὑπὸ τὸ ὦμος, ὑπὸ τὸ ἀἷμα. And there are Three that bear Witness in Earth, the Spirit, and the Water, and the Blood. Where τρεῖς is a Masculine Adjective, has no Antecedent Substantive; and yet the Three signified, are not Three Persons. So that Gregory Nazian. observes upon the Place, That the Term Three, expressed
pressed in the Masculine Gender, is followed by Three Things of the Neuter Gender, (meaning, το παρασημα, το ὧδε, το εἰμι,) against the Rules and Laws of Grammar. Το τρεῖς ἀναφεύγω το θεός, το τρία ἐξελέρως ἑωθνείκε, παρά — ἐκ γεγομενισις ἔργας ἀν νομέω. Orat. de Spirit. p. 603. Which may probably be an Hebraism; that Language expressing the Neuter by the same Termination that expresses either the Masculine or Feminine Gender. When on the other Side, had they been Three Persons that had followed, the Language would have bore a Neuter Adjective; as Prov. xxx. 21. Διὰ τελῶν σελαγίν, ἢ γιν. το ἄρα τέταρθον (this shews that τελῶν is Neuter) ἐ σώματι φέρειν εάν εἰκετις βασιλέσση, ἢ ἀρρων πιθη σιλιων. Καὶ ἐκεῖνος εάν ἐκδαλίη, ἢ ἐκείνης κυριαν, ἢ μονὴ γυνὴ εάν τοις ἀνδρος ἀγαθῆ. For Three Things the Earth is disquieted; and the Fourth, it cannot bear: If a Servant Reign, and a Fool be filled with Meat; If a Handmaid cast out her Mistress, and an odious Woman get a good Husband.

In Answer to pag. 42. it may be said, That forasmuch as ἡ δεικνύσει relates to ἄνθρωπος, as has been before observed, and εἰς το ἁγιες, the genuine rendring of the Text is this: No Man is good, but the One God; or, God only. Or if εἰς be separately rendred, as it is by the Dr. then it runs thus: No Man is good, but the one uncreated intelligent Being, that is, God. And so Chrysostom, and Theophylact,
interpret ἐδέλεξ; ταῦταν, ἐδέλεξ ἀνθρωπον: Which is confirmed by like Expressions of Scripture, as 1 Cor. ii. 11. Τὰ τὰς ἑαυτά ἐδέλεξ, (ἀνθρώπων, as the Beginning of the Verse thews,) ἐδέλεξ. ἐπὶ μὴ τῷ Πνεύμα τὰς ἑαυτάς, that is, in the English Translation thus: The Things of God knoweth NO MAN, but the Spirit of God. The Particles, εἰμὶ, not excepting God in St. Matthew, and the Spirit of God here, from any general Idea, common to God, and the Creature, and referred to by ἐδέλεξ, such as Person is supposed to be by the Dr. but opposing God and the Spirit to Men, in regard of their Essential, Eternal, and all Perfect Goodness and Knowledge: The want of which is charged upon Men in the Term ἐδέλεξ. Whence it appears, that as there is no ground for the Construction, which the Dr. draws from my affirming εἰς to belong to ὁ ἑαυτάς, which Construction is this: There is no God good, but One God; that is, God. So is there none for what he calls the plain Construction: There is no Person good, but one Person; which is, God. The Term ἐδέλεξ relating to ἀνθρωπός, and the Term εἰς to ὁ ἑαυτάς, God, who is more than one Person; and therefore εἰς is not to be rendred by one Person, but the whole thus; No Man is good, but the One God, or God only.

Pag. 43. the Dr. affirms, "That the "Word Person, is always expressed, both "in
"in Greek and Latin, by the Masculine Adjective, and by it only." To which my Answer is, That the Masculine Adjective always respects either ἄνθρωπος, or ἄνδρα, or some other Word of the same Meaning and Gender; the Language requiring, according to Grammar, that the Gender of Adjectives be determined by some known Substantive, to which they refer: And there is no such known Substantive of the Masculine Gender, as Person, in the Greek Tongue, according to the Dr. So that the Masculine Adjective, must necessarily be determined in its Gender by ἄνθρωπος, or ἄνδρα, &c.

Pag. 44, 45, 46. shews, That the Term εἷς, in the following Expression, ye are all one (εἷς) in Christ Jesus, Gal. iii. 8. may signify, in a figurative Sense, one Person, or rather one Man, as it is said, Ephes. ii. 15. To make in himself of Twain, one new Man; which is undoubtedly true. Yet this does not prove, that it could not be written, and might not be taken in a neutral Sense, as well as τρεῖς, for the Reason above given, pag. 6. or that the Translator into the Vulgar Latin understood not the Meaning, or Use of the Word; or that those Greek Commentators, who explain it by ἐν σῶμα, rather than by εἷς ἄνθρωπος, did not understand it in a neutral Sense; especially, since if ἡς had been uncapable of a neutral Meaning, it may
may reasonably be supposed, that those learned Writers would have been as careful to have found out a Substantive, with which it might have agreed, according to the Genius of their own Language, as the learned Dr. himself; and have taken άνθρωπος, which was ready at hand, rather than have explained it by a neutral Expression.

Pag. 47. the learned Dr. is of Opinion, That the Words εἰμὴ εἰς Θεός, Mark ii. 7. are paraphrastically rendered, but God only. Whereas, it is the true rendering; as will appear, First, From the parallel Place, Luke v. 21. which puts μόνος in the Place of εἰς: Who can forgive Sins but God alone? εἰ μόνος εἰς Θεός; which I had observed before, and the Dr. took no Notice of. Secondly, From the Use of the Hebrew Word יָאָשׁ One, which I had shewn, N. 2. p. 3. to be often exclusive, and signify alone. Thirdly, From the Testimony of Basil, who upon the Words άδελφες αραβαδός εἰ μόνος εἰς Θεός, makes this Remark: Το εἰς εναυθα τα μόνος ταυτάν διαλέγονται. The Term One, in this Place, has the same Signification with alone. Epist. 141. Fourthly, From the Reading of Justin Martyr, who cites the foregoing Passage with μόνος, instead of εἰς; άδελφες αραβαδός εἰ μόνος Θεός δη ποισας τα πάντα: None is good but God only, who made all Things, p. 141. Edit. Steph. So that upon the whole, I am of Opinion, that my Conclusion did not outrun my
Premises, when I said, That an end was put to the Criticism of Personality, founded upon the Term εἰς.

The Dr. proceeds to Authorities, and tells us, "That Clem. Alexandrinus interprets this Text, Matt. xix. 17. exactly, as he does, " when he paraphraseth One, that is, God, " by the Words, δ Πατρὸς μου δ' ε' τοις θεαότοις; " My Father, which is in Heaven." Now if the Expression, my Father, which is in Heaven, so appropriated the Term Good, to the Person of the Father, as to exclude the Son, it would argue, that this Author understood the Words, εἰς δ' θεός, of one Person only, as the Dr. does. But I conceive it will appear from the Design of the * Chapter, whence the Citation is taken, that the contrary was intended. Now the Design is to prove, that that which is Just, is Good; for some Persons had advanced a Notion, that the Lord (the Word the Pedagogue) was not † Good, because he was Just. Against whom this learned Father proceeds to shew, that God, and his Word, notwithstanding their Justice, were Good, because such Acts of Justice were intended for the Reformation of the Creature; and lays the Foundation of his Reasoning in their being both One, as a Key to the Chapter;

* Lib. i. cap. 8. Pedag. † Ἁγαθόν.
affirming, that God hates nothing, which he supports: And, by Consequence, that the Word hates nothing, because * they are both One, that is, God. That what does not hate, loves: That therefore God loves, and his Word loves. That he who loves a Thing, desires to profit it: And then, a little after adds, that God profits, because he is Good. If then the Word does not hate, but love, and desire to profit the Creature, because he is one with that God, who does not hate, but love, and desire to profit the Creature: And if these Acts are the Effects of Divine Goodness in the Father, it will follow, that they are the Effects of the same Principle in the Word; and that the Word, who is one with God the Father in his Godhead, is also † one with him in his || Goodness; and is no more to be excluded from his Goodness, in the Sense of this Writer, than he is from his Godhead. And therefore he concludes his Reasoning answerably to his Beginning, by asserting the Unity of both in Godhead and Goodness after the following Manner.

* Ὑμιᾶς καὶ κατὰ τὸν Τῷ τῆς τῆς τινὸς αὐτῆς τὸ τὸ τὸ καὶ τὸ τألوان is the one only Good
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Good and Just Creator, θεὸς Ἰσχαρων, Διαβοι, namely, the Son in the δευτερον, οὐν καὶ Πατρι. Father. To whom be ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸς αἰώνας Glory for ever and ever. ἔσοντας. Amen. p. 119.

Which is so far from being a rhetorical Sentence, as the Dr. judges it to be, pag. 89. that it is the proper Result of the whole Chapter.

The next Citation is out of Origen, who recites the Words thus: There is none good, but one God the Father, or, God the Father only; οὐκ ἐκ οὗτος ὁ Θεὸς ᾧς Πατρός. Comment. in Johan. p. 38, 60. But this Origen tells us, That * in like manner, as the Saviour is the Image of the invisible God, so is he the Image of his Goodness. When therefore it shall be once well settled how far the Image of God entitled the Son to Divinity, in the Opinion of this Writer, it will then appear how far the Image of his Goodness entitled him to the Appellation of Good. In the mean time I refer the Reader to what I have said upon Origen, N. 3.

As for Novatian, I had shewn, pag. 68, & 27. that he held the Son to be of one Substance with the Father; or that the Substance of the Father was communicated to the Son; and that therefore he could never intend to exclude him from the Good-

ness of the Father, a substantial Attribute. The Dr. calls this a remote, metaphysical, and scholastic Consequence, pag. 90. Let the Reader judge of the Remoteness of it; or whether it be the worse for being scholastic and metaphysical. However, I have a further Reason for believing the Son not to be excluded by the Term, alone, when Novatian says, * Whom alone the Lord justly pronounces to be good; because he is not excluded by the like Expressions of the same Author. As for Instance; He does not think the Son excluded from the Godhead by that Saying, That they might know thee the only True God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent, John xvii. 3. For, says he, † He (the Son) joined himself with God (the True God,) that by this Conjunction he might be known to be God also, (true God) as really He is, cap. 24. For if the Conjunction proves him to be God, because it joyns him with the God, who is True God, it must prove him to be God, in as True a Sense, as the God is with whom He is joined, that is, to be True God: For the Conjunction is to shew, that He is united in Godhead with the Father; and since the Godhead is but one, He is a God like the Father, that is, True God. Again: The exclusive Expression, I am God,

* Quem solum merito bonum pronunciat Dominus, c. 4.
† Deo junxit, ut & Deum per hanc conjunctionem, sic ut eft, intelligi vellet.
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and there is none other beside me, Is. xlv. 21.,
which he understands of the Father, cap. 3.
is explained afterwards to extend no farther
than to false Gods. If then He never de-
gigned to exclude the Son by the latter Ex-
pressions, why should He be imagined to do
it in the former? I am persuaded the Con-
text does not shew it. The Truth indeed
appears to be this; The Father is called the
One God in this Author, to exclude any
other co-ordinate God, who might be falsly
imagined to receive his Being and Attributes
from himself, that is, to exclude any other
first Person: But not to exclude the Son
from the Godhead, who has his Being and
Attributes from the Father; as will appear
from the 30th, and 31st Chapters. In the
latter of which it is shewn, That the Unity
spoken of, is of such a sort, as could only
suffer Damage by another innate or co-
ordinate God, or first Person: For, says
this Writer, If * Christ had been unoriginated
like the Father, there must have been Two Gods;
because there would have been two indepen-
dent Divine Substances. But the Son being
begotten, or receiving his Being and Per-
fections from the Father, † by a Communion
of Substance, does not destroy the Unity, tho*

* Duos Christus reddidisset Deos, si sine origine esset, ut Pater, inventus.
† Per substantiae communionem.
He is God; because he is not innate, or another first and co-ordinate Person, and therefore is comprehended, by Virtue of his Birth, in the One God: For the Divine Substance being communicated to the Son without Division, remains one; and the Godhead one. As therefore the Unity excludes no other but an unbegotten God, or another first Person; so does it exclude no other than an unbegotten Good: And as the Son is one God with the Father, by being begotten of him; so is He one Good also. As for unbegotten, it shall be shewn hereafter to be no positive, or substantial Attribute of the Godhead; and therefore it can infer no substantial Difference between the Father, and the Son. See N. 340.

That Athanasius understood the Text of the Father, is true; but not of the Father to the Exclusion of the Son. For, says he, a little before, *When therefore the Father is called the only God,—He is not so called to the Exclusion of the Son. And again, † The Son also is in that One, and First, and Only God. When Christ therefore said, There is none Good, but the One or Only God; He did not exclude himself according to the Mind of

* Ὡς γὰρ μόνος ἡμῖν ἑστήκει ὁ Παλαιός θεός ὑμῖν, εἰς ἐναίδειν ὑμᾶς ἡμῖν ἑστήκει. Orat. 3. cont. Ar. §. 3.
† Ἐστι γὰρ ὁ Θεός ἐν τῷ ἐνῷ, ὁ Ποιητῷ ὁ μόνῳ. Orat. 3. cont. Ar.
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this Author, out of the One or Only God, but was comprehended in him, and that with a substantial Unity, the known Doctrine of this eminent Writer.

The Citation out of Irenæus; tho' it be much the same with that, which the Dr. produces out of Justin Martyr, yet is it the Reading of Hereticks; some of whom placed the Word at too great a Distance from God the Father: And therefore nothing can be inferred from it concerning the Mind of Irenæus. Rather it appears from the Writings of this Father, that had he cited the Passage after the same manner, he could not have understood it in a Sense exclusive of the Person of the Son; for he look'd upon such exclusive Terms to be used in Opposition to false Gods throughout the whole Scripture.

Since therefore, says he, the whole Scripture, both prophetic and evangelic, teaches, That the God, who is one and only, by way of Exclusion of others, (that is, false Gods) made all Things by his Word.

Cum itaq; universa Scripturae, & Propheticae, & Evangelicae, unum & solum Deum, ad excludendos alios, prædictos omnia fecit per verbum suum, Lib. 2. c. 46.

For otherwise he includes the Word in God, notwithstanding the Addition of the Term, Father: As for Instance, Lib. 2. c. 55. he says,
There is only one God the Creator. This is the Father who made them (all things) by himself, that is, by his Word and Wisdom.

And Lib. 2. c. 24. * For if (the Word) existing in the Father knows him (the Father) in whom He is, that is, Himself; He is not ignorant of the Father. Which is not arguing upon the Principles of the Heretics, whom he labours to confute, but upon his own; who affirms a little before, † That the Mind is the Father, and the Father the Mind—and the Mind the Word, in Opposition to the different Æons of the Hereticks, called by those Names. If then he calls the Word, and the Spirit, || the Self of the Father, in the second Citation; and the Father, ** the Self of the Son, in the Third (as He is called the invisibile Filii, that of the Son which is invisible, Lib. 4. c. 14.) in an Orthodox, not a Sabellian Sense, that is, as substantially, not personally one; How can it be thought, that this Author would have excluded the Son from being Good, by the additional Term, Father?

* Si enim existens in Patre (Logos) cognoscit hunc in quo est, hoc est, semetipsum, non ignorant.
† Nus Pater, & Pater nus,—ipsum num, cum fit Logos. Ibid.
|| Semetipsum, Lib. 2. c. 55.
** Semetipsum, Lib. 2. c. 24.
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Solus unus Deus Fabricator—Hic Pater—qui fecit ea per semetipsum, hoc est, per Verbum & Sapientiam.
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The second Citation, out of *Clem. Alexandrinus, gives occasion for no new Remark. Neither do I know any thing in the Writings of Justin, that determines the Passage cited by the Dr. to any other Sense, than what I have been proving.

It appears then, from what has been said, that εἰς and παλιγ, in the foregoing Authors, were never intended to exclude the Son. What other Writers have either expressly denied, that the Son is excluded by such like Expressions, or have comprehended him in the one God, I have already shewn in my first Answer; where they will appear to be no less Persons than Tertullian, Hilary, Ambrose, Basil; to which others may be added hereafter.

II. Mark xii. 29. The first of all the Commandments is: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord; (or, the Lord our God, the Lord is one; that is, the only one, or only God.)

The Dr. upon my affirming God to be one in Opposition to Idols, puts a Question, who that God is, of whom this is spoken. I Answer, The Eternal God, having Three Persons in Unity of Substance. But the Jews did not understand these Words in such

* Strom. Lib. 7. p. 733.
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a Sense, when they were spoken by Moses. Probably they did not as to the Generality of the People, the Nature of their OEconomy leading them from Polytheism to the Unity of the Godhead. But this does not infer, that no more was meant, than what they understood: Or, that the Evangelical Mystery of Three Persons in Unity of Substance was not comprehended in the one Lord God, to be discovered at a time, when their Minds should be prepared for so sublime a Doctrine; and the Knowledge of the Unity, by a long Habit, had put them out of danger of running into Tritheism. It is not to be doubted, but that the Gospel was contained and published to the Jews, under the Vail of the Law: And that the Bulk of that People saw not through the Vail, but rested in the Letter and Ceremonies of the Law; yet, notwithstanding this Blindness, the Gospel was there, and consequently the Fundamental Doctrine of the Gospel Dispensation, the Trinity in Unity. Read, I pray, Psal. cii. 25, &c. St. Paul cites it in such a manner, as shews, that it belongs to the Person of the Son, Heb. i. 10, &c. And yet it may reasonably be supposed, that the major Part at least of the Jewish Nation understood it of none but of the Father only. The imperfect Notions of the Jews then, are by no means the Measure of the Extent and Meaning of the Law, and the Prophets: So that Christ might
might very well cite the Words before us in the Sense they were delivered in, and yet not in that, in which they were received by the Grofs of the Jews. As for the Meaning of John xvii. 3. it is explained, under the first Article. See also N. 5. The other two Texts shall be considered in their proper Places. It may be sufficient to make this general Remark, That one God, or God simply, tho' spoken of the Person of the Father, are not so limited to him, as to exclude the Son from being really God, and substantially one with the Father. And I have shewn already, that Irenæus extends the exclusive Terms in the Old and New Testament no further, than to the shutting out of false Gods. The Son may be really and truly God, by subsisting in the same Nature or Substance with the Father, notwithstanding the Term God be absolutely used of the Father: As the Father is really and truly God, notwithstanding the Term God be absolutely used of the Son. And therefore the large Collection of Scripture Passages made by the Dr. Part i. Chap. 1. Sect. 2. of his Scripture Doctrine, proving no more than that the Word, God, is absolutely used of the Father, is no Argument against the Godhead of the Son in the forementioned Sense, or that He is not One God with the Father. For tho' the Term Father, expressed or understood (as it is understood in several of the forementioned Passages,)
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pages,) excludes the Son from being the same Person with the Father; yet the Term God, or One God, does not exclude him from an Union in the Godhead. Which will answer Part of the 50th Page, where the learned Dr. supposes the One God to exclude the Son from being the Person who is supreme, independent, &c. when it is indeed the Term Father, implicitly, or explicitly united with it, that so excludes him; the One God excluding nothing, according to Irenæus, and others, but false Gods. The Citation out of Athanasius has been considered before.

I have revised also the numerous Passages taken out of the Fathers, Part 2. Sect. 9. and find none that prove the Thing for which they are cited, namely, " That the Words " One and Only, are used, by way of Eminence, " to signify him who is absolutely, supreme, " self-existent, and independent," that is, as the Dr. expresses it just before, the supreme Person of the Father. For the better Understanding of which, we must enquire into the Meaning of, by way of Eminence; for if the Dr. means, that the Person of the Father, who is first in the Trinity, and is self-existent, and independent, is first in the Conception of the One God, it is undoubtedly true; for the One God comprehending in its Notion the Persons of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the Father who is the first in Order, and the Root of the rest, is first in the
the Coception of the One God. But if his Meaning be, that One and Only are so attributed and appropriated to the Father, as that the Ideas of Self-existence and Independency enter into the Idea of One and Only, when they are united with God, so that the Son, who is not self-existent and independent, cannot be comprehended under the One and Only God, which appears to me to be the Dr's true Meaning: This is what I think my self oblig'd to deny; neither, as I observ'd before, do I find that the Authorities alleged by the Dr. Part. 2. Sect. 9. prove it. As for Instance; The Term One united with God, in Clem. Romanus, and Ignatius, does not appear to be any thing more than exclusive of false Gods. Irenæus calls the Creator of the World, or God the Father, One and Only, in Opposition to the Valentinian Æons, that were suppos'd to be above Him. * Clem. Alexandrinus, and † Tertullian, have been proved to comprehend the Word in the One God. Novatian shuts out all pretended, unoriginated, and co-ordinate Gods, or any other First Person, or Father, but not a Second Person, or Son, from the Godhead; as appears from the Citation out of Chap. 31. where he joyns the Term Father with God, and Only God: Shewing by this Addition, that the Term Only is

* See N. 1. † See the 1st Answer, N. 3.
applied to the Father, not as He is God, but as he is Father, as He is innate, or unoriginated, as the Context shews. So that the * One, or Only God the Father, imports no more, than the God who is alone Father, exclusive of any other Fathers. The like Judgment is to be made of the Passage out of Justin, and Eusebius; the latter of whom says, † Tho' the Son is by us acknowledged to be God, yet there is but One God only. But if you would know in what respect he applies to him the Term Only, he explains himself thus, || He who is alone without beginning (or a Cause of his Being) and unbegotten; fixing the exclusive Term upon his being underived, and unbegotten, not upon his being God; that is, excluding any other from being underived, and unbegotten, but not from being God. So again, he calls him, ** The One and Only God, as He is the Original, the Fountain, and Root of all Good; that is, he denies any other first, underived, and innate Cause besides the Father; but does not deny any other Person to be God, that is second, derived, and begotten: See the Passages in the above-cited Place of the Scripture Doctrine.

* Unus Deus Pater, Deus solus Pater.
† Τε γας ηδυ ήμοιοσαμεν ης, εις αν ζησεια ημων Σαραν.
|| Ενην ο μοις αναρχον αε αενην. ** Παναν η αυτος ου αισθα, αυτος η ζησα εις αε σαραν, οικος ος, εις μοις αναπαραρτο ου αεδας.

Hilary
Hilary makes the Father to be the One and Only God, because He is unbegotten, that is, the God who is alone unbegotten, there being but one unbegotten for were there any other unbegotten, intellectual Principle besides the Father of Jesus Christ, the Father's being unbegotten would not prove Him to be the Only God. So that the Term One, or Only, is exclusive of any other pretended innate Principle, that is, it does not exclude any other Person from being God, but from being innate, which is a negative Character of the first Divine Person; it does not exclude any other from the Nature or Substance of the first Divine Person, but from being the first Divine Person; for otherwise he * includes the Son in † the Only True God. De Trin. Lib. 9. Epiphanius makes the One God, to be One Original; but the Context shews it is in Opposition to many Originals, or Polytheism. Greg. Nazianzen comprehends the Son in the Only True God ‖. Orat. 2. de Fil. I omit Origën, referring the Reader for my Opinion, to N. 3. and the Sentiments of Athanasius and Austin, are generally known. It appears then, that One and Only, in the fore-mentioned Authors, as cited by the Dr. in his Scripture Doctrine, are

*† Ecclesis fide solum verum Deum Patrem confessa, confitetur & Christum.
 ‖ See the 1st Answer, P. 12.
used in a sense exclusive, not of the Son from the Unity of the Godhead, but of false Gods, and of any other Person from the Title of First, Unbegotten, and Father. Well then what is it, that shews God the Father to be absolutely Supreme, Self-existent, and Independent? Not the Term One, or Only; but the Term Father. If then God the Father be absolutely Supreme, Self-existent, and Independent, is not the Son, who is not absolutely Supreme, Self-existent, and Independent, substantially different from the Father? No; because absolute supremacy, Self-existence, and Independency, are not substantial Characters of the Godhead of the Father. For absolute supremacy relates to Order, not to Substance, and signifies no more than that He is the First Person; and Self-existence, and Independency, no more than that his Being and Attributes are underived: Which being negative Characters, can by no means relate to the Substance of the Godhead; which is real and positive. So that the Son may be substantially one with the Father, tho' the Title of Order, or the negative Characters, cannot be applied to him.

III. Mark xii. 32. There is One God, and there is none other but He.

This is to be explained by what has been said under the foregoing Number, where it
is shewn, That the Notions of the Jews are not the Measure of the Meaning of their Law; That the Words One God, are of the same Import in the New Testament, that they were in the Old, tho' the Bulk of the Jews did not fully comprehend the Meaning of them; That they do not so signify the Father in the best and most ancient Christian Writers, as to exclude the Son from the Unity of the Godhead by a Communion of Substance: Neither, do I think, that He is so excluded here in the Text before us. The learned Dr. indeed talks very orthodoxly, pag. 52. "And would not be thought to exclude the Son from being God in any other respect, than from being He, who alone derives his Being and Godhead from no Cause." But this does not remove the Matter of Dispute between him, and the Orthodox; which is, whether the Son may not be excluded from the Person of the Father, without being separated from his Substance. The Church holds the affirmative, that the Son is a different Person from the Father, but of the same Divine Substance with him. If the Dr. holds the same, I am very glad of it; only wish, that some Passages and Explications, found in his Writings, had pointed more directly upon this Article. For if the Son be not con-substantial with the Father, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to give a reasonable Account of the
the Divinity of the Son; but if the Son be con-
substantial with the Father, and the Divine
Substance, or Nature be indivisibly One, the
Son is of the same individual or undivided
Substance with the Father. The Dr. indeed
seems to endeavour to give an Account of the
Divinity of the Son without touching upon his
Substance, when he says, "That the Son " is really and truly God—by deriving " real and true Divinity from the ineffable " Power of Him, who alone has an unori-
ginated Being and Godhead." But what
this Divinity is, which is said, not to be derived from the Substance of the Father by a
Communion of Substance, but from his ineffable Power, is hard to conceive; neither
does the Dr. tells us.

Pag. 53. The learned Dr. thinks, that my few Citations under this Article are over-balanced by ten times the Number of Places cited out of the fame, and many more Fathers, Part 2. Sect. 9. of his Scripture Doctrine; which would indeed be true, were these Passages against me, as I have shewn they are not, N. 2. or were those the only ones I cited in my Book; but I have brought several Authorities under several Texts, to shew, that the Son was comprehended in the One God. The Dr's Remarks upon those of this Place, are the following; That when Tertullian says, " Deus se unicum, " sed cum Filio ostendit, God declares himself to " be
"be One only, but yet together with his Son." He did not mean that God, and the Son of God, were One individual. If by One individual the Dr. means one Person, I readily agree to it; and the Dr. is unkind in charging me with understanding it after that manner. But if he means one individual Substance, I cannot but affirm it was Tertullian’s Opinion, That the Father and the Son were the One God, by subsisting in one individual or indivisible Substance. For he says in the same Chapter,

That the Son, tho’ he is not expressly mentioned, yet is so far to be reckoned in the Father, as he is undivided, and unseparated from the Father.

And he makes the Father and the Son to be * of One undivided Substance, like the Sun and its Ray. And it is notorious, that in other Places of this Book, he speaks of them as substantially One, as Chap. 2, 12, 25. Tertullian therefore did not barely mean, "That God was so One, as nevertheless he’s to have a Son, to whom He had communicated true Divine Dominion over the whole Creation;" but that this Son was comprehended in the Father as He

* Unius & indivisæ substantiae, c. 13.
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is God, and of One undivided Substance with him. As for Tertullian's Notion of the Monarchy of God, which the Sabellians thought was consistent only with One Divine Person, it is founded upon the Unity of Substance communicated by the Father, to the Word and Spirit: And his arguing from the Monarchy of a Prince administered by his Son and Servants: And from the Monarchy of God administered by his Angels, is arguing from a lesser to a greater Union; and imports, That if the Government be One, where the Persons are separate and different Substances, the Government and Godhead are much more One, where the Son and the Spirit are of One Substance with the Father. For says he,

Quale est ut Deus divisionem & dispersionem pati videatur in Filio & in Spiritu Sancto, secundum & tertium locum, tam conse-fibus substantiæ Patris, quas non patitur in tot. Angelorum numero & quidem tam alienorum a substantiâ Patris?

How comes it about, that God should seem to be divided and parted in the Son and Holy Ghost, who are in the second and third Place, and of the Substance of the Father; when He is not parted and divided (in relation to the Monarchy) in such a Number of Angels, who are of a different Substance from that of the Father? Adv. Prax. c. 3.

Which
Which is not expressly asserting, as the Dr. affirms, pag. 54. "That God is One, in the same Sense, that the Monarch of a Country is the One and Only King, notwithstanding that He has an Only Son administering under him:" But it is inferring in a super-eminent Manner the Unity of God, and his Government, from the Unity of the Substance of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and from an Unity of Power arising from it. Novatian and Athanasius, who held the substantial Unity of both Persons, as well as Tertullian, have been shewn not to exclude the Son from the One God; as indeed, how could they do it, when the Substance is One? I am now to justify my self for a Citation * out of Origen, which I had put into the Margin, and not into the Text. My Reasons for doing it I conceive to have been these, or some such like Con- siderations: First, That his comprehending the Father and the Son under the One God, tho' he may be supposed to have looked upon them as different Substances, is a probable Argument, that they were generally comprehended under that One Name by the Christians of his Age, and before his Time; and that therefore he could not depart from the usual Form and Manner of speaking,

* See also the Dr's Answer to the learned Author of some Considerations, p. 269.
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thò' he might differ from others of greater Antiquity as to the Ground and Reason of it, by affirming, that the Father and the Son were different Substances. And this general way of including the Son in the One God, may be the Reason why the Compilers of the Sirmian Form of Faith, which is recorded in Socrates's Ecclesiastical History, Lib. 2. c. 30. p. 123. and in Athanasius's Treatise, De Synod, p. 742. * Anathematize those, who say, That the Son is excluded from the Godhead by the following Expression, I am the First, and I am the Last, and besides me there is no God, Isa. xliv. 6. which they declare to be spoken to the Exclusion of Idols, and false Gods, and not of the Son; for otherwise this Assembly seems to have receded from the Nicene Standard, in leaving out the Term διαδοχον in the Account which they give of the Person of the Son. Secondly, That the Context of the cited Passage is not sufficient to determine fully, what the Mind of Origen was in this Matter; because other Writers, who explain the Unity of the Godhead of the Father and the Son, by an Unity of Consent in one Place, as Origen does here, do yet notwithstanding hold an Unity of Sub-

* εστὶς τὸ ἐσό Θεὸς πρῶτος, καὶ ἐσό μὴ πτυε, καὶ πλὴν ἐσό
ἐστὶς τὸ ἐσό τὸ ἑνεχθέν καὶ ἑνεχθέν
ἡμέρας, επὶ ἑνεχθέν οὐ μορφωθήτω τῷ τῶν κοινῶν Θεῷ ἱερανοῖς
ἐκλαμβάνειν; αναθέμα ἐσό.

France
stance in others: Which may be the Case of Origen, since an Unity of Consent does not exclude an Unity of Substance. Thus Laëntantius, who resolves the Unity of the Godhead in the Father and the Son into an Unity of * Consent in the † latter Part of the 29th Chapter of the Fourth Book, does yet, at the || Beginning of the same Chapter, affirm an * Unity of Substance in both Persons. Novatian does the same; who says,

When (Christ) says One, it relates to Agreement, to the same Mind, to an Union of Love; so that the Father and Son are justly One, by Agreement, and by Love, and by Affection.

Which is making them One by an Unity of Consent, and no more. And he illustrates it after the Manner of Origen with the following Instance.

I have planted, A- Ego plantavi, Apol- pollos watered;—but lo rigavit——qui au-
He who Plants, and He who Waters, are One.

And yet notwithstanding this, in the very next Chapter, he founds the Unity upon a higher Principle than bare Consent, upon an Unity of Nature, when he says of the Son,

Unum potest dici, He may be said to be One with the Father, because He is of him, and is born of him, and is found to have proceeded out of him.

And asserts, Chap. 31. A Communion of Substance between the Father and the Son: The Father communicating it, and the Son receiving it; as I have already shewn in my first Answer, pag. 68, 69.

Thirdly, That this is probably the Case of Origen, if we consider his Notions concerning the Son of God. He held him to be * Eternal, to be Wisdom itself, and Truth itself, to be || Righteousness, to be Great, to be the adequate, or commensurate (συμμετρήτω) Image of the invisible God **, to be the

Immortal God, the Word, ever the same ††, to be Immortal, as He is the Resurrection, and the Life *, that is, essentially such, and not of meer Grace, to be not made †, and to be the Son of God by Nature ||. Now can it be imagined, that any one could have such sublime Notions of the Son of God, and yet look upon him to be no more One with the Father, than by a bare Unity of Consent? It must be confessed indeed, that there are some apparent Inconsistencies in the Writings of this Author. He acknowledges the Son to be Eternal, and yet affirms him to be created before the World. But these contrary Positions may readily be reconciled by that known Doctrine of some of the Antients, that the Son subsisted in the Father from all Eternity, and came forth and was manifested before the Worlds, as the productive Power, and original Pattern of all Things to be created. And some low Expressions used of the Son in certain Places of this Father's Writings, may probably refer to him in no other respect, than as He thus came forth to be the Cause and Pattern of the whole Creation. However this, I think, is a sufficient Apology for flinging a Passage into the Margin only.

V. John xvii. 3. That they might know thee the only True God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.

The first Reason which the Dr. gives for his Interpretation is, that the other (given in my Book) is forced and unnatural. To which my Answer is, First, That it can hardly appear unnatural to those Persons, who from other Passages of Scripture believe Jesus Christ to be True God: Nay, on the contrary, it would be an unnatural Interpretation of the Term Only to exclude him by it from the True God, who is himself True God.

Secondly, It does not appear in Fact to have been judged unnatural by those Fathers, who believing the Son to be True God, declare him not excluded by the Term Only; for had they thought it unnatural, such honest Men could never have used it in the Manner they have done, such as Novatian, Hilary, Ambrose, Basil, and Nazianzen, cited in my first Answer, p. 10, &c. To which may be added Epiphan, who says,

'Εν τῷ ἐν εἰπεῖν διά τινα When therefore, he says, the Only True God, he leads us to the Unity,—that we may be no longer Worshippers of many Gods. (And when he adds,) And Jesus
of the Trinity Continued.

Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent; What Jesus Christ? The True God.

And Athanasius, who says,

If therefore the Father be called the Only True God, He is not so called to the Exclusion of him, who says, I am the Truth; but to the casting out of Gods, who are not true by Nature.— But now when He joyns himself with the Father, He shews that He is of the Nature of the Father.

Epiphanius indeed seems a little after to apply μόνος. to the Father, as He is Father; but then this does not exclude the Son from being One with the Father, as He is true God, but from being One with him as He is Father: Which must ever be done.

The Dr's second Reason for his Interpretation is, "That in each of the other Places of the New Testament, where the True God is mentioned, it signifies, by way of Emi-
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nence, the Person of the Father." Well, but because the True God is affirmed primarily of the Father, as the Root of the Tri-
nity, must therefore the Son be denied to be True God by a Communion of Substance? As I conceive it, the Dispute is not, whether the Appellation of the True God primarily belong to the Father; but whether it so belong to him as to exclude the Son from being True God, by a real Communion of the Divine Nature. The Dr. indeed, acknowledges, p. 52. "That the Son is really and truly God, by deriving real and true Divinity from the Power of the Father." But what this Divinity is, or whether it be founded upon a Communication of the Substance of the Father to the Son, the Dr. tells us not: Here he leaves us in the Dark; and till this be cleared up, no Apology he can make, can prove satisfactory. It is granted therefore, that the Father is the Living and True God in Opposition to Idols, who have no Life, nor true Divinity, as the Text teaches us, 1 Thess. i. 9. and that the Word is the Son of the Living and True God the Father: And yet it cannot be granted, that the Father is contradistinguished from the Son, as Living and True God, but as Father; which is implied, tho' not expressed. For if He be contradistinguished as the Living and True God, the Son cannot be the Living and True God; otherwise there will be a Coincidence of Characters: And where there is a Coincidence, there is no Distinction, which is contrary to the Thing supposed;
posed; but the Son is * the Living and True God. The Dr. therefore cannot be supposed to distinguish the Father from the Son, by his being the Living and True God, but by his being primarily and originally the Living and True God; that is, the Distinction lies in his being the First, and the Origin, or in his being the Father, as I reasoned before: So that the Son is distinguished from the Father, who is the Living and True God, not as He is considered in the Character of Living and True God, which Titles have been already shewn to be given to the Son, but as He is considered in the Character of Father. But, adds the Dr. " In like Manner, the other " Places of Scripture, where the One or Only " God is mentioned, do all of them— mean " thereby the Person of the Father singly." If they mean the Father singly, then One and Only are a Personal Character, as the Dr. seems to understand them in his Scripture Doctrine, Part 2. §. 9. And the Son must necessarily be excluded from the One and Only God; but I have shewn, N. 2. That One and Only joined with God, is no Personal Character of the Father, and therefore does

† See N. 410.
not exclude the Son. One and Only joined with Father, is indeed a personal Character, and excludes any other Father, and by Consequence the Son from being the Father; but this is a different Expression from the One and Only God, which excludes from the Divinity, and cannot affect the Son who is God, but those only, who are no Gods. And thus Tertullian understands these exclusive Terms.

Deniq; inspice sequentia hujusmodi pronuntiationum, & inventies fere ad Idolorum Factitores atq; Cultores definitionem earum pertinere, ut multitudinem falsorum Deorum unio Divinitatis expellat. Adv. Prax. c. 18.

Consider, says he, the Context, or what follows this sort of Expressions, (meaning, the exclusive Expressions) and you will find that they are generally confined and directed to the Makers and Worshippers of Idols, that the Unity of the Godhead might exclude the Multitude of false Gods.

Irenæus, as I have observed before, makes the One and Only God, wheresoever used throughout the whole Bible, to shut out false Gods, and mentions no other.

* N. I. p. 16.
And Basil says,

*The Terms One and Only are spoken of God in the Scripture, not in Opposition to the Son, or Holy Ghost; but to those, who are not Gods, but falsely so called.*

What other Authors have been of this Opinion, will appear by considering my first Answer, pag. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. As for the Texts cited to support the Dr's Assertion, they will be explained by the Remark on, 1 Thess. i. 9.

The learned Dr's third Reason is, pag. 58. "That all the Writers in the three first Centuries understand the Text as he does." When he shall be pleased to produce these Writers, it will then be time to consider them. As for the Meaning of Novatian, I have considered it before, N. i. p. 13. I shall only add one Passage out of an Author, who would not easily be suspected to have called Christ the Only True God, I mean Eusebius of Caesarea; who in his Panegyric upon Constantine, pag. 654, 655, chap. 15. having given this as a second Reason why Christ rose from the Dead, namely, that He might manifest his Godhead, adds, for since Men had deified Men, who were detained of Death,
Death, calling them Gods and Heroes: The Word, out of Compassion to Men, would discover to them who He was, raising up his Body after Death to a new Life.

Calling the Word, who quickened his Body, the only True God, in Opposition to Men, who were deified after Death, but detained of it: As the Father is called the only True God, who was crowned with the Rewards of Victory over Death.

The fourth Reason is, "That many even of the latter Fathers also understand this Text, as He does." Of whom he cites two only, Athanasius and Hilary. That Athanasius, tho' he understood the only True God to be the Father, yet never intended to exclude the Son, is evident from his own expres Explication of this Text, which I have produced, pag. 34. And that Hilary does not exclude the Son from being True God, has been shewn in my first Answer, pag. 10, 11. from Words as clear, as well can be expected. Neither does the Passage brought by the Dr. prove the contrary, as has been observed before, N. 2. p. 23.
The fifth and last Reason is, "That the learned Bishop Pearson, and the learned Bishop Ball, expressly acknowledge these Words, the Only True God, to be meant—of the Father only, by way of supream Emi-
nence, in Contradistinction to the Son."
That the True God is a Title primarily attributed to the Father, as the first Person and Root of the Trinity, has been already granted. And that the Term Father contradistinguishes the Person, of whom the Words are spoken, from the Person of the Son, is equally true. But that the Only True God is used in Contradi-
 distinction to the Son, is what the Sentiments of the Antients concerning the Term Only, which I have plentifully alleged in the foregoing Pages, suffer me not to be-
lieve. It appears, indeed, to have been the Opinion of these learned Prelates, that it was used in Contradistinction to the Son; but the Authorities they produce for the Confir-
mation of their Opinion are very few, and argue no more than that the Son is excluded from the Person of the Father, but not from a Communion of Substance and Godhead: These very Fathers cited by them, as well as the learned Prelates themselves, holding the Unity of Nature in both Persons. As for the Texts they allege, in Favour of their Opin-
ion, and as the Foundation of it, they are the Text at present under Consideration, and 1 Cor, viii. 6. and Ephes. iv. 6. The Text out
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out of the Epistle to the Corinthians, has been considered in my first Answer, pag. 14, 15. where I have observed, That the Father is the One God in Opposition to the many Gods so called, whom the Context speaks of; and not in Opposition to the Son, who is comprehended in the One God: For the Proof of which I refer to N. 2, 3. And now further refer the Reader to what I shall say upon this Article afterward. To which may be added, N. 5. of my first Answer; and what I have now said, by way of Confirmation, under the same Number. To which I will subjoin two or three Authorities more in relation to the Text out of the Epistle to the Corinthians. Irenaeus having cited it, Lib. 3. c. 6. p. 209, 210. makes this Reflection upon it,

Distinxit enim & seperavit eos, qui dicuntur quidem, non sunt autem Dii, ab uno Deo Patre, ex quo omnia.

But not a Word of the Exclusion of the Son from the Unity of the Godhead. Theophylact says,

That the Apostle said One God the Father, in Opposition to Gods falsely so named, and not in Opposition to the Son.

Chry-
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Chrysostom says,

The Additional Term Father, would have been superfluous, when the Apostle intended to express him who was Unbegotten. Because the Term God would have sufficiently done it, if that Term were expressive of him only, who is Unbegotten.

And upon the like Expression, i Tim. ii. 5. He says, * How comes it that he says One? (God.) His Answer is, In Opposition to Idols, not to the Son. Whence it appears, that the Terms One God, are in Opposition to Idols, or False Gods; and the Term Father, either expressed or implied, is in Opposition to the Son. The other Text referred to Eph. iv. 6. is near the same with 1 Cor. viii. 6. and has the same Meaning. What I have said in Answer to the Dr's Fifth and Last Reason, will give a clear Account of the Passages cited out of the Learned Bishop Bull by the Dr. in his Reply to the Learned and Ingenious Mr. Nelson, pag. 8, 9. and help us to make a right Judgment of the Mind of the Catholic Fathers,

* Πῶς ἐν φανῷ, Εἷς; ἄλλος αὐτοπροσώπῳ τῶν εἰδῶν, καὶ οὗτος τῷ ὑιῷ.
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Fathers, whom the Dr. believes generally to be on his Side; there is one particularly, whose Opinion he largely examines into, from pag. the 11th, to pag. 14th, which I think my self obliged to take Notice of, because I have taken Passages out of the fame Chapter of the fame Author, pag. 47, and 50. of my First Answer. The Author is Irenæus, whose Reasoning He sums up after the following manner, pag. 12. "The Gods of the Heathen are false Gods, " or, no Gods at all: God the Father is " true God, or Lord, because he originally " ruleth over all: The Son also is true " God, or Lord, because he has truly and " really received from his Father Divine " Power and Dominion over the whole " Creation." That this is not a just Representation of the Reasoning of Irenæus, I think will appear from the following Remarks; first, the Dr. puts in, Originally, which Irenæus mentions not; his Words are, Neque Dominum appellassent aliquem ex sua Personā, nisi qui dominatūr omnium, Deum Patrem. They would not have called any One Personally Lord, but God the Father, who rules over all. Again, Nemo igitur alius Deus nominatūr, aut Dominus appellatur, nisi qui est omnium Deus & Dominus. No other therefore is named God, or called Lord, but he who is the God and Lord of all. Where the Fa-
ther is not called true God, and true Lord, because he originally ruleth over all; but simply because he ruleth over all, and is the God of all. Originally, belonging to God the Father, not as an Essential Part of the Idea of the true God, and Lord, or of the Father, as true God and Lord: But of the Father, as First, unbegotten, or deriving his Being and Power from no other. So that as He is the God and Lord of all, He is the true God and Lord: And as He is originally the God and Lord of all, He is the true God and Lord the Father, who is First and unbegotten. Secondly, the Son is not called true God, because he receives Dominion from the Father; but only true Lord. For having said, That neither the Lord, nor the Spirit, nor the Apostles, — would have called any one Lord — except God the Father, who rules over all; he adds, and except his Son, who hath received Dominion from his Father over all the Creation. Et Filium ejus, qui dominium accept a Patre suo omnis conditionis. Where there is nothing said of the Son as God, but as Lord; and that in such a Sense of the Word, as it signifies one who has Dominion; and not in the Hebrew Sense of Jehovah, which signifies him who emphatically is, or is Being it self; which causes a great Difference: For the Term Lord, as it signifies one who has Dominion, is inferior to
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to the Term * God, as it signifies Him, who has a Divine Nature † or Substance, the Ground of Dominion; when on the other Side, the Term God, (Elohim,) as it signifies Power, and consequently Dominion, is inferior to Lord, (Jehovah,) as it signifies a necessarily existing Substance, which is the root of all Power. Dominion then, as Irenæus uses it, proves the Son to be Lord; and his receiving it from the Father, proves his Dependency upon the Father. But as for his Godhead, He gives no other Proof of that, than that He is absolutely called God; I mean in this Chapter: For in other places He resolves his Godhead into the Divine Substance, or Nature communicated to him by Generation; as Lib. 3. c. 26. He has the following Words upon Isaiah vii. 10, 17.

Diligenter igitur significavit Spiritus Sanctus per ea quaæ dicta sunt, generatio-nem ejus quæ est ex Virgine, & Substan-tiam quoniam Deus.

Which is called, his illustrious || Birth of the most high Father. The Divine Substance shewing him to be God; his Birth, or re-

---

|| Proclaram — eam quæ est ab Altissimo Patre geni-turam. Lib. 3. c. 21.
ceiving it by Generation, shewing him to be Son.

The learned Dr. proceeds, pag. 12, 13. "But still the Father alone is strictly and "properly the One God." Which he en-
deavours to prove from Two follow-
ing Expressions in the same Chapter of Ireneus, whereof the one declares, * that
the Father is the Only and true God. And
the other, † that He is the only God. But
I must reply, that the Father is called the
Only God, in Opposition to false Gods, and
not in Opposition to the Son, as if he
were not properly contained in the Only
God. And this appears from the very Ci-
tation of the Dr. For when Ireneus says,
who art the only and the true God, he adds,
|| above whom there is no other God, Shew-
ing, that all pretended Superior Deities,
not the Son, who is subordinate to the
Father, were excluded from the Only God.
For the preceding Chapter will shew,
that he affirms and proves the Demiurgos,
or Creator of all Things, to be the Only
God, in Opposition to them who denied

* Qui eft Solus & vetus Deus. † Quia Solus Deus es.
|| Super quem alius Deus non eft. For these Hereits hold
ἀλλα Σαυτα εἰς τὴν διευρέσσα, Lib. 1. c. 4. To which ἀλλὰς
Sed, Ireneus opprobes τὸν μονόν ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου: Lib 1. c. 13. § 2. which may shew in what
sense this Father thought the first Article of the Creed to be
exclusive.

E

him
him to be the Only God, and made him to be the Offspring of Defect, who was out of the Pleroma, beneath all the Æons; that is, the God of the Creation only, but not the Supreme God. And this Opposition I believe will generally be found throughout his whole Book. And to make this more plain, that none but pretended Deities are excluded from the Only God, He tells us in express Terms.

Ita ut is quidem, That He, who made qui omnia fecerit, all Things, is justly cum (which is not called with his Word, said to be wanting in The Only God and more than one MS.) Lord.

Verbo suo justè dicitur Deus & Dominus Solus, Lib. 3. c. 8.

Comprehending the Word in the Only God and Lord. Which is agreeable to his Sentiments in other places, in which he makes them really, not personally One, as Lib. 2. c. 18. and 24. and opposes them jointly, as being each true God and true Lord, to the pretended Deities of the Heretics, against whom he disputes; as Lib. 3. c. 6. Lib. 4. c. 1. Lib. 3. c. 9. The Citation out of 1 Cor. viii. I have spoken to before. pag. 44. So that I am surprized at what the learned

* Libis esse fructum Lib. 3. c. 5. † Παντοκράτωρ, — τῶν ὑποκείμενων. Lib. 1. c. 5. § 1. Dr.
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Dr. says at the Conclusion of this Paragraph, to the learned Mr. Nelson, "That he could not have picked a Chapter out of the whole Works of Irenæus, or indeed out of all Antiquity, more contrary to his own Purpose, or more pertinent to his." Concerning which round Assertion, let the Reader judge.

Having thus passed through the Dr's Reasons for his Opinion, I come now to consider his Objections to mine. I had said, Page the 9th, that the Term Only, does not always exclude every thing else but the Subject to which it is united. This the learned Dr. denies, and I had supported my Opinion with a Sentence out of Ecclesiasticus, c. xxiv. 5. I alone (μόνον) compassed the Circuit of Heaven; which being spoken of Wisdom a Divine Person, did not exclude the Father, of whom the like Expression was used, Job xxii. 14. The Dr. denies, that Wisdom in this Place is a Divine Person. I Answer, in Relation to the first, that it is evident from the Use of the Word Only, (and the Import of Words is to be taken from Use, and not from Speculation,) that it does not always exclude every thing else, but the Subject to which it is united. As for Instance, Origen calls Christ *the Only Lord.

And
And says in his Com-ment on Psal. cxlvi. v. 10. not yet pub-
lished, concerning Christ, if therefore, O Sion, He, who is esteemed
thy only God, reigns always, and remains
for ever, &c.

Cyprian says,

Solus Dominus mi-
fererit potest, veniam
Peccatis, quae in ip-
sum commissa sunt,
Solus potest Ille lar-
giri, Qui Peccata no-

Now no one will say, that these Authors
intended to exclude the Father from be-
ing Lord and God, and from the Power of
forgiving Sins. Clemens Alexand. calls the
Son, † the only Judge. And yet God the
Father is called the Judge of all, κεχηριον παντων, Heb. xii. 23. So on the other Side,
God the Father is called the One and Only
God, and yet not to exclude the Son from
being comprehended in the One and Only,
as has been abundantly proved. Tertullian
says, ‖ Before all Things God was alone. But
then adds, ‖● He was alone: Because there

† Mονοθεος. Padag. Lib. 1. c. 2. p. 80. ‖ Ante
omnia enim Deus erat Solus. ●● Solus autem, quia nihil
aliud extrinsecus praeter illum.
was nothing Foreign to him besides himself, excluding only that which was Foreign to his Nature, but not the Word; for, says he, But even then He was not alone; for He had his Reason with him: Caterum ne tune quidem Solus: Habebat enim secum—ratio-nem suam. Adv. Prax. c. v. in which Reason He affirms, that the Word was before its Prolation. Theophilus ad Autol. says, * in the Beginning God was alone, but subjoyns immediately, † and the Word was in Him. So when Tatian says, || The Lord of all things was alone; it is with this Distinction, In respect of his Works, which were not yet made. For he says notwithstanding, ** that the Word subsisted with him. And where the Son is not expressly excepted out of the Exclusion, there, either the Context, or the like generally exclusive Expressions limited in other places, or the known Doctrine of the Author, will generally shew that the Son is excepted. In Relation to the Second, I say, that Wisdom mentioned Eccles. xxiv. is a Divine Person, as is evident from the Context, compared with the following Words out of Prov. viii. 22, 23.  
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which Wisdom speaks of her self, and are generally attributed by the Antient Writers, both Orthodox and Arian, to the Person of the Son. Now this very Stile of speaking, is appropriated to Wisdom in this very Chapter of Ecclesiasticus; for v. 9. She is represented as speaking thus of her self, περὶ τῆς ἀλήθειας, ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς (ἀπαρχῆ, MS. Alex.) ἐκτισέ με, and v. 8. ἐκείναι με κατέστατο τὴν σκινήν με, ἢ. Which, compared with v. 4. shews, that the Schechinah was hers. If then there was but one Wisdom created before the World: And that Wisdom is the Word, according to the general Sentiments of the Antient Orthodox and Arian Writers: The Wisdom in Ecclesiasticus, affirmed to be created before the World, must be the Word, that is, a Divine Person.

The Dr's Second Reply is referred to its proper Place.

The Third Reply is, "That the Word " Only appropriates somewhat to the Subject, not only exclusive of what the " Subject is opposed to, but also of what " it is contradistinguishing from. My Answer is, That if Only relate to the Term Father, the Term Father is so appropriated thereby to the First Person, as to exclude the Son, as well as every thing else, from being the Father. But if it relate to the Term
Term God, or true God, it is attributed to the Subject in such manner, as not to exclude the Son from the One true God, but Idols only. Again, The Father is not contradistinguished from the Son, by the Character of the Living and True God, but by that of Father; for this is the full Meaning of the Citation out of the First Epistle of the Thessalonians, c. i. v. 9. Ye turned to God from Idols, to serve the Living and True God the Father, and to wait for his Son from Heaven. Where the Living and True God, is used in Opposition to Idols only, who have no Essential Life and Truth; and not in Contradistinction to the Son, who is the Life and the Truth, John xiv. vi. And the Term Father implied, is in Opposition to, and exclusive of the Son. But I have spoken of this already, p. 38, 39.

The Fourth Reply is in Relation to the Authorities cited in my Answer. I have said enough before, concerning * Novatian, † Hilary, and ‖ Athanasius, observing only, that Novatian does not barely mean, that Christ is God, by having received true Divine Dominion over the whole Creation, from and in Subordination to the Father, as the Dr. says; but that He is God by a Communication of the Substance of the Fa-

---

* Page 13, 14, 15. † Page 10, 11. of my First Answer; and p. 25. of this Answer. ‖ Page 37. ther
to him, or by a Communion * of Substance. Nazianzen's Reasoning is not his own; it was a Traditional Manner of arguing upon the Text. He says, † That these following Words would not have been added, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent, if the Terms the Only True, had been used in Contradistinction to the Son. Which I think is much the same Reasoning with that of Novatian, who says of Christ, || Who would never — have joined himself with the Father, except He had been willing they should have believed Him to have been God. And again, ** But He joined himself with God, that by this Conjunction, He might be known to be God, as really He is. Which is as much as to say, That He would not have joined himself with God the Father, if He had not been God, that is, if He had been excluded from the Godhead, or from being comprehended under the One True God, by the Words, the Only True God; † † for that He is excluded from the Person of the Father, by the Term Father, v. 1. is already acknowledged. Athanasius talks after the like manner, || But now, by joining himself with the Father, He shewed that He was of the Nature of the Father, which

* Per Substantiae Communionem, c. 31. † See First Answer, p. 12, 13. || See my First Answer, p. 10. ** Ibid. † † See above, p. 13, 14, 15. ||| Above, p. 47.
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argues, that He would not have joined himself with the Father, had He shut himself out from the Nature of the Father by the exclusive Expression, that is, from the Nature of the Father as He is God. Ambrose was of the same Mind, when He said, 

*That the Evangelist joined the Father and the Son together by the Conjunction, that none might separate Christ the True God from the Majesty of the Father.* Which he seems to have taken from Novatian, who says, in the like Style, 

†But He joined himself with God, that by this Conjunction, He might be known to be God. Ambrose indeed adds, *For a Conjunction never separates,* which the Dr. reflects upon with some keeness: But be this Reason never so weak, it cannot take off from the Authority of an Explication, which has so much Appearance of being traditional.

We come now to Origen, whom this learned Gentleman thinks to have described the Sense of the Primitive Church in explaining the Only True God by ἡ ἁγιασμένη; but, I conceive, I have sufficiently shewn the contrary in this Article. The Dr. proceeds, and affirms, pag. 67. "That he could never find "the Title ὁ ἅγιος, given absolutely to any "other Person, than to God the Father." Which he grounds, I suppose, as well on

* First Answer, p. 11. † Above, p. 56. Origen's
Origen's Remark, as on his own Observation; who had said, * That "God unoriginated, is " (God with the Article δ.) And that whatever is God besides God unoriginated, being so by a Communication of his Godhead, cannot be called " (God, with the Article δ) but more properly " (God, without the Article.) To which Remark I had replied after the following Manner, pag. 14. of my first Answer, That if this Observation were true, neither Scripture, nor Antiquity, would have named Christ God, " with the Article δ; for which I cite Thomas's Words, " μ. The Dr. says, It is quite a different Thing from " absolutely. To which I Answer, That in Irenæus's Sense of the Word absolutely, whatsoever the Dr's may be, " is an Argument that the Son is " God absolutely. This Father lays down this as a Principle,

Neq; igitur Dominus, neq; Spiritus Sanctus, neq; Apostoli qui non esset Deus—absolute Deus—nisi esset verè Deus. Lib. 3. c. 6. That neither the Lord, nor the Holy Ghost, nor the Apostles, would at any time have named him—absolutely God, who was not God, except He had been truly God.

* In Johan. p. 46. Huet.
† See this Authority urged against the learned Author of Some Considerations, &c. p. 281.
Where the Truth of the Godhead is the Foundation of his being named absolutely God. And among the Instances, which he brings to shew that the Son is named absolutely God, are the two following, Deus Deorum Dominus loquatus est, in the Septuagint, θεὸς θεὸν μὴ έλαλητε; and, Deus manifestè veniet, Deus noster, in the Septuagint, ὁ θεὸς ομοπαθὴς θεῷ, ὁ θεὸς θεῖον, θεόν, Psal. I. 1, 2, 3. If then θεὸς without an Article, notwithstanding it relates to θεόν, or the Church, as he explains himself afterward: And θεὸς with an Article, notwithstanding it relates to θεόν, are Arguments that the Son is named absolutely God, and consequently that He is absolutely and truly God: Shall not θεὸς with an Article, notwithstanding it relates to μοῖ, be an Argument also that the Son is absolutely God, or called so in Scripture? The Ground of this Father's Reasoning I take to be this, that none could be the God of the Church, but who was absolutely God, that is, truly God, νερὲ Deus, or God by Nature; (for truly God, and naturally God, are the same with this Author, Lib. 4. c. i.) And that therefore the Son being the God of the Church, is thereby proved to be absolutely God, truly God, or God by Nature. And in this Sense of being absolutely God, or truly and naturally God, he opposes him to those who are not truly and naturally Gods, but only so reputed. For, says he, in the same Chapter, Cum
Cum autem eos, qui non sunt Dii, non nominat, non in totam illos Deos. Sed cum additamento & significacione, per quam ostenduntur non esse Dii.

When the Scripture names them, who are not Gods, it does not shew them to be absolutely Gods. That is, does not use any such Expressions about them, as are made use of to shew either immediately, or by Inference, that the Father and the Son are absolutely God; but makes mention of them with some additional Term and Token, that shew them to be no Gods.

Whence it appears, that according to this Author, absolutely is used in such a Meaning as comprehends both Father and Son, and excludes false Gods, and is not applied to the Person of the Father, in Contradistinction to the Son: In which latter Sense the Dr. understands it, when, he says, ἐκ σωμάτων abso-

lutely, is the same as ἐκ πάντων ἐκστάσεως, or ἐκ Θεοῦ πάνω Θεοῦ; which he holds to be a Personal Character of the Father. But to give two or three Proofs more out of Scripture, as interpreted by the Antients. Ἀρκέται ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἄλαλοισ, &c. Psal. xlvii. 6, &c. is attributed to Christ by Justin Martyr, in Dial. cum Tryph. Ο Θεὸς ἐν Θεομαν ὑμῖν, Hab. iii. 3. by Ireneaus, Lib. 3. c. 23. Καὶ εἶδον ὁ ἄγγελον ἐξ θυσίας ἔγειρεν ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσραήλ, Exod. xxiv. 10. by Eusebius, Lib. 5. c. 18. Dem. Ev. Indeed
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deed it would be endless to shew how Θεός, with the Article ὁ, is given absolutely to Christ in the Holy Scriptures, as cited by the Antients. They use also themselves, ὁ Θεός, of the Person of the Son. Justin says, in Dial. cum Tryph. p. 54. Edit. Steph.' That He is ὁ Θεός ἀλλ' ὁ Παλιγκ ἐλαυν γεννησίς, ἦ λόγος, ὁ θεός, &c. Irenæus, ὁ Θεός ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ ἐγενέτο, Lib. 3. c. 23. Clem. Alexandrinus, ἦ Ἰσωτίλ. ἐκωνύμασα, ἢν εἰς ὁ Θεός ἐκεῖνον ὁ Θεός ὁ λόγος, Paedag. Lib. I. p. 110. Eusebius, ἐν ὁ ἐν ὁ Θεός λόγος ἤ ταύτα φάσκων, Demon. Evang. Lib. 5. c. 6. The Dr. may probably think that these latter Citations, tho' they prove the Son to be Θεός, with the Article ὁ, yet don't prove him to be absolutely God like the former; because ὁ Θεός, is not used absolutely by it self, but with the Term λόγος. But I must say that according to Irenæus's Notion of absolutely, which I have already explained, they are absolute Expressions, because there is no additional Term or Token that shews the Person spoken of under the Character of ὁ Θεός to be no True God; which is the Mark of Distinction he gives us, to know God absolutely so called, from those who are not absolutely called by that Title. Now that these Authors had a different Notion of the Word absolutely, from that of Irenæus, is what I am not apprized of; tho' if they had, yet the Apo-
Apology is certainly good for Irenaeus’s own Expression, δ ἰερός καὶ ἀνθρώπος ἐγένετο, which is absolutely in his sense, notwithstanding what Dr. Clarke says, in his Letter dated July 22. 1714. " That in the Passage of Irenaeus, cited again by poor Dr. Grabe, δ ἰερός καὶ ἀνθρώπος ἐγένετο, the Words δ ἰερός are "not put absolutely;" And why so? Because they refer to Christ. And so do those Expressions which Irenaeus brings to prove him absolutely God. And yet they are absolute in his sense, because there is nothing joined to them that argues the Son to be no True God. Nay, I may say, that δ ἰερός καὶ ἀνθρώπος ἐγένετο, is as absolute as δ ἰερός καὶ θαυμάζῃ ἦς, Hab. iii. 3. to which it plainly refers, as ἰερός does in the same Fragment to the Term Lord, in the Citations out of Isaiah and Joel, in which it is used absolutely. So that I am persuaded it was not a Poverty or Weakness of Judgment, but a right Understanding of the Mind of his Author, that made the good and learned Dr. Grabe cite that Passage in the Manner he does.

The learned Dr. tells us in the Margin, that the same Remark (namely, that δ ἰερός is appropriated to God the Father) is largely insisted on by *Eusebius. But I am of Opinion, that there is a Difference between him and Origen. For Origen appropriates it to the

* See this Authority urged against the learned Author of Some Considerations, &c. p. 281.
Person of the Father; but Eusebius does not deny it generally to the Son, but says, in Opposition to Marcellus, a reputed Sabellian, That if Father and Son were Personally One, the Apostle would in this Place have said thus; *The Word was with God (the Father,) and the Word was that God (δ Θεός) the very Person of God the Father.* Which, I think, does not deny the Use of the Article in other Places, but only shew the Impropriety of it here in such a Personal Sense; for otherwise this learned Author applies δ Θεός to the Son, both in his Scripture Interpretations, and in his own Expressions. Nay, *Philo the Jew,* whom I take to be the Author of this Criticism, and whose imperfect Notions of the Word, no less than his allegorical Genius, might lead him sometimes to Remarks which it may not be safe for Christians to follow, does not make it a general Rule, that the Article δ is to be omitted, when the Term δ Θεός is spoken of the Word; but only says it is so in that particular Place of Scripture, *ἐν τῷ παθὴν Θεόν,* which he is there speaking of, pag. 599. For otherwise in that very Page, and in pag. 74. he calls him δ Θεός. As for the Citation out of Clem. Alexandrinus, brought against the learned Author of *Some Considerations,* &c. pag. 282. tho' it shews that Father to have allowed the Distinction in some Cases, yet it does not prove, that he admitted it in relation to the Son, whom,
as I have shewn a little before, he calls God, יְהוָה, with the Article ð.

There is one Criticism still behind of the learned Dr's, and that is, that ð יְהוָה, Heb. i. 8. is the Vocative Case from יְהוָה, without an Article: But, I humbly conceive, that the Vocative Case of יְהוָה is יְהוָה, as Matt. xxvii. 46. And that ð יְהוָה is the Nominative Case, used in a Vocative Sense; and that the Articles have no Vocative Case, but that the Adverb ð is used with the Vocative, as Grammarians observe. And therefore if ð יְהוָה be appropriated to the Father, it can be used in a Vocative Sense for him only, and not for the Son; who, according to the Dr. has no right to the Article ð before the Term יְהוָה in the Nominative Case.

VIII. 1 Cor. viii. 4, 5, 6. We know that an Idol is nothing in the World, and that there is none other God but One, &c.

I have considered this Text before under N. 5. and shall proceed a little further in this Place. The learned Dr. says, pag. 69. "But to say that the One God the Father is " the Son also, and not the Father only." I do not know the Person who in this present Controversy says, That the One God the Father, as He is the Person of the Father, is the Son. But to say, That the One God,
who is the Father in the first Subsistence of the Godhead, is the Son in the second Subsistence; is, I think, not contrary to Scripture nor Tradition. But adds the Dr. " Or " (to say) that the Son is not excluded from being that One God, which is the Person of the Father; this is directly affirming, that Two Persons are one and the same Person." The Answer is plain, That tho' the Son is not excluded from being substantially comprehended in that One God, who in the first Subsistence of the Godhead is the Person of the Father, yet he who so includes the Son, does not affirm, that two Persons are one and the same Person; because he considers the Son, who is so substantially included, to be God, not in the first Subsistence of the Godhead, but in the second. Pag. 70. The Dr. says, " If the Apostle had here mentioned Jesus Christ in the second Place— only upon Account of his being (as God Man) a Being distinct from pure Deity; he must have said, not One God the Father; but One God the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost; and One Lord, (or God Man) Jesus Christ. First, I nowhere say, that it is the only Reason, tho' I conceive it to be a sufficient one. Secondly, It may be worthy to be considered, whether the Word Son simply used, does not generally represent the second Person under both Characters of God and Man; and if so, whether it would not have
have been unnecessary to have mentioned him with the Father, since He was to be distinctly spoken of afterward as Mediator, or as God and Man. Tho' had the Dr. put Word instead of Son, yet it is hard to tell in this Case what the Apostle should have said more, than he has said. Chrysostom says, That the Holy Ghost is omitted, and the Son not mentioned by the Name God, that the Apostle might not be thought to teach a Plurality of Gods. The Words are these.

If therefore he (the Apostle) did not dare to call the Son God, together with the Father, that He might not be thought to speak of two Gods; why dost thou wonder that He did not make mention of the Spirit? For He was then labouring to convince them, (the Corinthians,) that we were not Polytheists.

So also Theophyl. in Loc. I will add also the following Citation out of Chrysost.

As the Father is not excluded from being Lord— because the Son is called the One
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Lord: So neither is the Son excluded from being God,—because the Father is called in Loc. the One God.

See also Theodorite and Theophylact upon the Place, and Jerom upon Ephes. iv. 5. Irenæus certainly held a substantial Union, or Unity of Substance in the Father, and the Word, as has been shewn before in Article the First. To which may be added what he says, Lib. 2. cap. 18.

But in that God, who is over All, forasmuch as He is all Mind, and all Word, and there is nothing sooner or later;

That is, the Word, who is comprehended in the One God over All, is of the same Duration with the One God. And in the same Chapter, under the Term God, is understood and contained * Mind, and Word, and Life, and Incorruption, and Truth, and Wisdom, and Goodness, and all such Appellations. Where by the Term Word is not meant, as is evident from the Context, an Attribute of the Father, but the Person of the Son in relation to his Godhead, being opposed under

* Appellationi enim Dei coobaudientur Sensus, & Verbum, & Vita, & Incorruptela, & Veritas, & Sapientia, & Bonitas, & omnia talia. Lib. 2, c. 18.
the Titles of Word, Life, and Truth, to the \textit{Aeons} of the Valentinians, called by those Names: And by the Term Wisdom, is meant the Holy Ghost, as will appear from Chap. 55. Lib. 2. and elsewhere; which also may be meant by the Term Goodness. If then the God over All, be \textit{all} Word; if the Word, and Wisdom, or the Holy Ghost, be comprehended under the Term God, and that with an Unity of Substance; what other Interpretation can be put upon Ephes. iv. 6. as cited by Irenæus, than that which I have given. For He who is \textit{all} * Word, if He is \textit{tho}' All by his Word, as the Dr. explains it, is \textit{tho}' All things, as He is the Word. And the God, who is Wisdom, or the Spirit, if He is \textit{in} All by his Spirit, is \textit{in} All as He is the Spirit. See more of this, N. 382. Bishop Pearson, and Bishop Bull, have been considered, N. 5. And Hilary, N. 2. As for Athanasius, see N. 382.

VI. Acts v. 3, 4. To Lye to the Holy Ghost

\textit{Thou hast not lyed unto Men, but unto God.}

That attempting to deceive the Holy Ghost, was in effect an attempt to deceive God himself, or God the Father, as this learned Gentleman understands it, is not to

* In quo dissabit Dei Verbum, imo magis ipse Deus, cum sit Verbum, \textit{Gc.} Lib. 2. c. 13.
be doubted. But this is not all; the attempting to deceive the Holy Ghost was an attempting to deceive God himself, as He is the Holy Ghost. But the Dr. says, *That I cannot alledge any Author— till after Athanasius's Days, that understood this Text in any other Sense, than he there gives.* My Answer is, *That I have not met with one Antinicene Writer, that has denied the Holy Ghost to be the God mentioned in the Text. For those early Authors cite many Passages of the New Testament, of which this is one, in such a Manner, as that nothing can be inferred from them concerning their Opinions, that can decide the Controversies of after-Ages.* However, St. Cyprian, in his Third Book of Testimonies, Chap. 30. in which he treats of paying our Vows to God, allements this Instance as a Breach of that Duty; which if it be compared with his Epistle to Jubaianus, where he comprehends the Holy Ghost under the Term God, will render it probable, that he believed the Holy Ghost to be the God, whom Ananias and Saphira attempted to deceive. The Post-nicene Writers, when there was occasion given to speak of this Text with greater Accuracy, explain it in Favour of the Divinity of the Spirit. *Athanasius, in his Treatise de Trin. & Spirit. Sancto, § 12. says,*

They will perhaps say, *Dicent forte, qui that they, who lye to Spiritui mentiuntur,*


As therefore he who uses this Expression, he who injures a reasonable Creature, injures a Man, does not refer the Injury to two Persons, but to one Person, known by different names; the Spirit of God, lye to God: As they who affront the Minister, dishonour the King. To whom we Answer, Did not they therefore, when they lied to the Apostle, lye also to God? Peter therefore should either have said, How comes it that Satan hath tempted thine Heart to lye to the Holy Ghost? Thou hast not liedy to the Holy Ghost, but to God. Or he should have said, How comes it that Satan tempted thee to lye to us? Thou hast not liedy to Men, but to God; that the Consequence might be reasonable.

Greg. Nyss. in his Oration de Deit. Fil. & Spiritus Sancti, says,

As therefore he who uses this Expression, he who injures a reasonable Creature, injures a Man, does not refer the Injury to two Persons, but to one Person, known by different
different Properties: So Peter also in saying, that Ananias lyed to the Spirit, and to God, shews them, who are of pious Sentiments, that these two Words mean the same thing, p. 910.

But says the learned Dr. p. 74, 75. "If the "Word God," placed absolutely as in this "Text, signified not the Father, but either "the Holy Spirit, or the whole Three Persons, "it would follow, that the "Holy Spirit of "God, was the Holy Spirit of himself." Surely this learned Gentleman may easily see, that tho' God absolutely placed may relate to the Person of the Holy Ghost, where the Circumstances of the Text so determine it: Yet it is not necessary it should so relate, where there are no Circumstances to determine it to the Person of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit may be God, as being the Third in the Godhead, and yet may be the Holy Spirit of God, that is, of God the Father who is First, or of God the Son who is Second, or of both together, without being the Holy Spirit of himself. But, Secondly, put the Case it were granted, that in this Expression, the
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Holy Spirit of God, the Word God stands for the Trinity, yet there would be no more Absurdity in saying, the Holy Spirit of the Trinity, tho' the Spirit be a Part of the Trinity, than in saying, the Spirit of a Man, which is yet a Part of the Man; and this latter Expression is the Style of * Scripture, or of the Holy Ghost. The Dr. concludes this Article, p. 75, 76. with the following Reflection upon my Reasoning for the Divinity of the Spirit in this Place, “The Strength of it indeed is no more than this: If the Holy Ghost be at all subordinate to the Father (as the Scripture every where declares He is sent and given by him) then He is nothing at all superior to Men.” Any one would imagine from this Representation, that I, who hold the Holy Ghost to be superior to Men, do therefore not think him to be subordinate to the Father, to be sent and given by him. Whereas I hold him to be subordinate to the Father as proceeding from him, to be sent and given by him, and yet to be God the Holy Ghost; and therefore to be as much superior to Men, as God is to Man: So that a Crime committed against Men, is comparatively nothing in respect of a Crime committed against him. But how the Dr. who does not seem to make that Difference between Men and the Holy Ghost as I do,
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but rather to place him beneath the Dignity of a God, by not confessing him to be God the Holy Ghost, can make such a difference between Two Beings acting alike by a commissioned Power, neither of which is God, that what is a Crime against one, should be mentioned as of no Consideration in respect of the other, is what he does not yet explain, tho' I conceive there are many Readers, who stand in need of Help to reconcile this Matter. The Process of my Remarks will shew, whether God, in no other Text, ever signifies the Holy Ghost, pag. 74. I will conclude with a Saying out of Jerom, in his Notes on Isa.lxiii.

If any one shall provoke and grieve the Holy Ghost— He provokes God; for the Holy Ghost is of the same Nature with Father and Son.

And then he gives an Instance of this Provocation in the Story of Ananias and Saphira.

CLXXX. Galat. iv. 8. Ye did Service unto them, which by Nature are no Gods.

My Reasons why the Term Nature signifies Essence or Substance, are the following:

First,
First, Because the Confidence and Honour due to God, are required to be given him principally on account of his being δ θεόν, Jehovah, or Jah, that is, He who is, or whose Essence and Existence is necessary, Exod. iii. 14, 15. Psal. lxviii. 4. that is, on Account of his being essentially and substantially God. And therefore it is reasonable to suppose, that Service paid to any other Being would be principally condemned in this respect, that it was paid to one who was not δ θεόν, Jehovah, or Jah, or who was not essentially and substantially God. Secondly, Scripture is used to argue, that the Gods of the Heathen, or the Beings called Gods, are no Gods; and by Consequence, that Honour is not due to them, because their Essence or Substance is not Divine. Thus Psal. cxv. in Opposition to Jehovah, or δ θεόν, the God of Israel, Idols are said to be Silver and Gold, v. 4. that is, Beings of a Substance incapable of Deity, and therefore were so far from being Gods, that they could neither speak, nor see, nor hear, &c. and that whoever trusted in them, were like unto them, or in a manner as senseless as they. Again: When the Heart of the Prince of Tyre was lifted up, and he said, I am God; The Divine Answer is, Thou art a Man, and not God. Shewing from the Difference of Essence, or from his being a Creature of a rational and immaterial, and a mortal and material Substance, that
that his Pretensions to Divinity were groundless and foolish, Ezek. xxviii. for adds the Prophet, ver. 9. Wilt thou yet say before him that slayeth thee, I am God? But thou shalt be a Man, and no God in the Hand of him that slayeth thee.

Thirdly, Divine Worship is not commanded to be paid to any Being that is not substantiably and essentially God, but to such * only. And therefore the Essence or Substance of the Godhead being the principal Ground of such Worship, the want of that Essence or Substance, as I have observed before, is the principal Reason why no such Worship should be paid to any, who for want of that Essence or Substance are no Gods. And therefore, since the Apostle pronounces them no Gods, who are not Gods by Nature, he may be justly supposed to give the principal Reason for his Assertion, namely, their want of the Essence or Substance of the Godhead: And to use the Term Nature for Essence or Substance; in which Sense, as Phavorinus tells us, It is generally used by the Christian Doctors. I take therefore the true Notion of Idolatry, in the proper Sense of the Word, to be paying Worship to a Being as God, or as having the Substance and Perfections of God, which indeed has no such Substance and Perfections.

* Deut. vi. 13. Mat. iv. 10.  
† θέου γὰρ πάλιν ὁσ πάντας, ἤ υἱὸς καὶ λίτας συνεδρίας, καὶ Μάλια τὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπιστολεῖν ἔδωκεν.
The Dr's Notion of Idolatry is this, " The " ascribing to any Being, real or imaginary, " such invisible Dominion, or Power, and " consequently such Worship and Honour " as does not belong to it." Which I take to be a loose Definition; for should I ascribe to an inferior Angel the Power and Honour of an Arch-Angel, I do not conceive it to be Idolatry, because I do not put him up in the Place of God, but of a Fellow Creature; I do not ascribe to him the Divine Substance and Attributes: Neither does it take off any thing from my Faith in, and Dependance upon God, to whom, notwithstanding this Mistake, I immediately apply my self for his Favour and Protection, leaving it to his Providence either to bless me by himself, or by these Second Causes, as He shall think fit. The Dr. proceeds; " For Worship being " nothing else but the Acknowledgment or " Payment of due Honour, correspondent to " the true Dominion and Dignity of the Per- " son to whom it is paid." The Power and Perfections of God, are founded in his Sub- stance or Essence, and are inseparable from it; whence it follows, that Divine Worship, or the Worship of God, which is founded upon them, is a Payment of due Honour, ac- cording as the Substance or Essence of God, to whom it is paid, is powerful and per- fect; which Substance being the most pow- erful, and most perfect, the Worship that is
is paid to God, is the highest Worship. The Dr. goes on in a Parenthesis; (“For all ‘Worship or Honour is Personal, paid not “to a Metaphysical Substance, but to an “intelligent Agent.””). Tho’ Honour be not paid to the Divine Substance abstracted from its Perfections, which are really and inseparably one with it, yet is it paid to the Divine Substance and Perfections together, which are no other than God himself. And the Honour thus paid is a Personal Honour, because it is paid to the Divine Substance and Attributes, as Personalized in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But further, The Dr’s Notion of Person, pag.40. is an intelligent Being; now Being is the Subject or Substance, and intelligent the Attribute: So that an intelligent Being, is the same with an intelligent Substance; if then Worship be Personal, and Person an intelligent Substance, the Idea of Substance is not excluded out of the Object of our Worship. The Dr. concludes, “It “follows manifestly, that so far as Dominion, and Power, and Authority, is ascribed to any Being, more than it really has; so far that Being is meerly [ FileNotFoundError] an Idol, a Nothing in the World, 1 Cor. viii. “4. a meer Fiction of the Imagination.” I Answer, That so far as the Power and Perfections of God are ascribed to any Being as God, which is not God, and has not such Power and Perfections; so far is the Divine Sub-
Substance the inseparable Ground of all such Perfections falsely ascribed to it; and so far is that Being an Idol, a Nothing in the World, as having nothing of the Divine Substance and Attributes that are ascribed to it. And this I have observed to be properly and strictly the Notion of Idolatry according to Scripture, namely, when a Being, that is not God, or has no Divine Substance and Attributes, is honoured as if it were God, or had such Divine Substance and Attributes. And in this Sense does Clem. Alexandrinus understand it, who says,

"Idolatry is the dividing of the One God among many," Strom. 3. p. 464.

That is, attributing Divinity, or Divine Substance and Perfections to many Beings, which have nothing at all of them. There is indeed a Secondary, and less proper Notion given to the Word, Ephe. v. 5. where a covetous Man is called an Idolater; but this is not spoken, as if every, or perhaps any covetous Man professedly and intentionally Attributes the Substance and Perfections of God to Gold and Silver, and gives them the Worship due to that Substance and its Perfections, but because he confides in them in such a Manner, as God only should be confided in; which is in effect to give them a Divine Substance, Nature, and Perfections, and
and to make them an Idol. The same may applied to any other thing delighted and confided in, in Prejudice to our Delight and Confidence in God. Besides these two Meanings, I know no other Notion of Idolatry: So that the learned Dr's Words seem too lax, when he says, pag. 80. "That so " far as Dominion, and Power, and Authori-" rity is ascribed to any Being, more than " it really has; so far that Being is meerly " an Idol." For an ignorant Person may ascribe more Power to a subordinate Ma-" gistrate than really he has, and yet that sub-" ordinate Magistrate is not therefore an Idol in the religious Sense of the Word: Because that Power is not ascribed to him in Pre-" judice to the Honour and Glory of God. He may, indeed, be a political Idol, if they rank him in Power and Authority with his Prince; but not an Idol, as the Scripture un-" derstands it, that is, such as receives the Honour and Worship of a God. It is my Opinion therefore, that St. Paul charges the Galatians in the Text, now under Considera-" tion, with serving Gods that neither were " Supreme, Self-existent, nor Independent, like the Father; nor had received from him the Divine Substance, and its inseperable Attrib-" utes, like the Son and Holy Ghost; which he might well do, tho' it be supposed that the Heathens did not look upon their Gods to be Gods in Substance, or Nature, but in Power
Power only; because it was informing them that none could be Gods in Power, who were not such in Substance: And that therefore the Gods they worshipped being not Gods in Substance, could not be such in Power. Tho' I think it appears from the Genealogy of their Gods, and the Saying of Emilius the Roman Governour, That the Gods they worshipped were reputed to be Gods in Nature or Substance, as well as in Power; for he addresses himself thus to Dionysius of Alexandria, when he endeavoured to persuade him to Worship his Gods with the One God and Creator of all Things,


That is, together with the Roman Gods, shewing by this Expression, that in his Opinion, a Godhead founded on Nature or Substance, was the Ground of the Worship paid to their Gods; as the Apostle supposes it, and in effect requires it in the Text before us, to be the real Ground of the Christian Worship. And it may be observed, that when he said of the Christians God, εἰς τὸν θεὸν, if he be a God, he meant at least such a God as theirs, that is, καλὰ φῶς, a God by Nature.

CCLXIV.
CCLXIV. Heb. iii. 3, 4. For this Person (viz. Christ) was counted worthy of more Glory than Moses, inasmuch as He, who hath builded the House, hath more Honour than the House.

For every House is builded by some One; but He that built all Things, is God, &c.

The Dr. thinks, that my Interpretation spoils the Elegancy of the Comparison which the Apostle makes between Moses's Faithfulness as a Servant, and Christ's as a Son; as if affirming him to be the God, who built the House, was inconsistent with his Faithfulness as a Son over his own House: When, indeed, my Interpretation proves him to be God the Son; which I will confirm with the following Authorities. Philo the Jew says,

That this visible World is nothing else but the House of God, (meaning the Word) one of the Powers of the True God, by which He is Good.

That this Power, called God, is that which made, and orders all Things.

And that there are Two Divine Temples, of which this World is One,
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One, in which the Divine Word, the First-begotten of God, is High-Priest.

Where he affirms, That the Power, which created all Things, is God (the Word;) That the World, and consequent-
ly the Church, a Part of it, is the House of God (the Word;) And that the Divine Word, the First-begotten of God, is the High-Priest of the World, House, or Temple: Which, I think, is so like the Apostle's Style in this Epistle, that it may very well be used as a Comment on the Place, making some Allowance for their different Notions of the Dignity of the Word, whom yet they both call θεός, God. Theodorit says, on ver. 4.

καὶ μὲν ομορρυγηθεὶς That he (the Apo-

στατικας εσθειες φύ-

στες.

Understanding the Term God, of the Per-

son of Christ.

And Chrysostom, on ver. 2. says,

Ἀρχηγός μὲν ἐν κυρίῳ ἐξουσιος, ἄμετρα γεῖσ τε γείσ τε begins with the Flesh,

χειρὶς ἐν γυναικί and ascends to the God-

head (of Christ, v. 4.)

where there could be no more Comparison between Him and Moses. See also Theophyl. upon the Place.

CCLXXXIX.
CCLXXXIX. 2 Pet. i. i. The Righteousness of our God, and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The learned Dr. pag. 83. Blames me for setting down my own Translation only; which, he says, "Determines the " Sense according to my Explication." The Translation in the English Bible is this; Of God and our Saviour. My Reason for differing from it, is the Position of Θεός immediately after Ἰησοῦς, which requires it should be rendered our God: Whereas, it should have been put after σωμάτως, as it is Tit. ii. 13. if it had answered our English Translation. In which latter Position Dr. Mills is of Opinion, the Syriac and Arabic Translators found it in their Greek Copies. For otherwise, to make Θεός, as it stands before Ἰησοῦς, to refer to σωμάτως, will, I believe, be found upon Examination to be very different from the Apostle's Manner of placing his Words on the like Occasions.

The Dr's Reasons for understanding the Term God of the Person of the Father, I leave to the Reader; and shall only make two or three Remarks upon what he has said in Opposition to mine. First then, Tho' it should be granted that God our Saviour, be always spoken of the Father, yet is there a great Difference between God our Saviour,
and the Lord Jesus Christ, and our God and Saviour Jesus Christ: The former belongs to
two Persons, but the latter not so evidently. Secondly, The Great God is not a Character
appropriated to the Father exclusive of the Son. In the Old Testament it is spoken of the
One God, who was known to the Bulk of the Jews in one Subsistence only, but was really
in more: See N. 2, 3. Now the Son is not excluded out of the One God, as has been al-
ready proved, N. 1, 2, 3, &c. The Son therefore is not excluded out of the Great
God; but as the Father and He are the One God, so are they the Great God. The Truth,
indeed, appears to be this: As the Term One is not used in Opposition to the Son when
it is joined with God, but to false Gods; so neither are the Appellations, True, Living,
Great. Thus Psal. xcv. 3. God is called the
Great God—above all Gods; that is, above
all false and pretended Deities, Psal. xcvi. 4, 5.
And Psal. cxxxv. 5. I know that the Lord is
Great, and that our Lord is above all Gods;
that is, above the Idols of the Heathens,
ver. 15. and other Gods in Title only. And
therefore some of the Antients never scrupled
to apply the Name to the Son of God. I
have observed in my first Answer, that this
was done by Clem. Alexandrinus, and Greg.
Nyssen. Origen does the same, who says,
That to foretell, that God the Word, as such,
should die; is the same as to foretell that the Great
God
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The former of whom says,

*Where are they, who* Πάντες οἱ Προφήται Παύσαν, διώκοντες, *say, that the Father is οὗτος ελάττων ὑπὸ τοῦ Σώματος Σωτήρου* ἀλλά ἐγώ less than the Son? Αὐτών εἰμι.

And the latter,

*He* (the Apostle) Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, οἱ ἐπόνομοι τοῦ Μεγαλούχου τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ Σωτῆρος, ἀλλ' ἐγώ ἀλήθειαν βλασφημίαν ἀναστίλλωσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ Σωτῆρος τοῦ Μεγαλούχου τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ Σωτῆρος.

Jerom is of the same Mind. And Cyril of Alexandria, de recta fid. p. 75. And if any regard may be paid to the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, we find the following Words in that of Symeon, §. 6. p. 156. Spicil. Patr. Tom. 1.

*That the Great ὁ ὅσιος Θεός Lord God of Israel μεγάς ὁ Θεὸς άληθείας proved appeared*

---

*The learned Dr. in his Letter, dated July 22. 1714. is of Opinion, That this Book was written by a Sabellian Author; and that the Passage is to be understood of God the Father in Christ. But I conceive it is a plain Allusion to the following Words, ἐστι δὲ ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ Υἱὸς τῆς θείας ἁφήν. εἰ ἐν τοῖς ἐνθρωπίσασις συναναθηκῃς. This our God— did cleave himself upon Earth, and conversed with Men, Baruc. 3. 35, 37. Which are applied by Anti-nicene Writers, to the Person of the Word, and not to God the Father in Christ: In which Sense they may be referred to by this Author: And I am the more confirmed in this Opinion from the Testa-
appeared upon the Earth as Man, and saved Adam thereby.

Nay, a reputed Arian, in his Comment upon Psal. 96. is not afraid to explain these Words, The Lord (Jehovah) is Great, ver. 4. which are Terms of as great Importance as God is Great, after the following Manner.

Mνασ, ὡς Θεός ἔστις is the Word of God, and Creator of all Things.


As for the single Instance produced by the Dr. out of Rev. xix. 17. "To prove that the "Great God is never used of Christ in the "New Testament, but of the Father only." It appears from Dr. Mills, that some of the

ment of Dan. Seft. 5. where the first Sentence of the Passage out of Baruch is cited, of the same Divine Person, after the following manner, ὃς κυρίος ἐστις τερμάτως αὐτοῦ, τοῖς ἄνθρωποις συναναστρεφόμενος; for the Lord shall be in the midst of Jerusalem, conversing with Men. And from the Testament of Nephthaliim, § 3. where the whole is applied with some Variation, ἑφόνται πάντες ἐν ἄνθρωποις ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς, God shall be seen dwelling with Men upon Earth. In the Testament of Levi, § 7. it is said, Ἀναστὰς ὡς κυρίος ἐστὶν τὸ Ἁρχόν τῆς οἰκουμένης, ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰσραήλ βασιλεύς, κεῖν ὃς ἄνθρωπον; The Lord shall raise up out of Levi an High-Priest, and out of Juda a King, both God and Man. Where it is reasonable to suppose, that the Person raised up, who is God and Man, is distinct from the Lord raising him up; that is, that the God and Man raised up, is God the Son incarnate; and the Lord raising up, is God the Father: Which, I think, is enough to remove the Suspicion of Sabellianism from this Author.
best Copies, and the best Versions read it, the Great Supper of God; which he judges to be the true Reading. And I am confirmed in that Opinion from the parallel Place, Ezek. xxxix. 17. where it is called, not the Sacrifice of the Great God, but the Great Sacrifice of the Lord God; or which the Lord God sacrificed for the Fowls, and for the Beasts. Thirdly, Tho' the Father be manifested in the Son, yet the Term ἐξπομπή seems to be appropriated in Scripture either to the Appearance of the Son in Flesh at his first coming, or to his Appearance in a Body of Glory at his second coming. And it is probably in this respect that Basil says, 

We wait for the Appearance and coming αὐτοῦ παρεξελέχον of the Son, not of the μακάριος, αὐτοῦ Παλαιός. Father;

Which he speaks in relation to Tit. ii. 13. As for the Dr's Marginal Remarks on some contested Places, as he judges them, of the New Testament, let the Reader compare them with the learned Notes of that judicious Critic Dr. Mills. I shall add, however, one Passage to those which are collected by that learned Critic, as a further Proof that Rom. ix. 5. belongs to the Son. Eusebius tells us, that in the Dioclesian Persecution, the Soldiers surrounding a populous City of Phrygia, and setting it on Fire,
Burnt the Men, Women, and Children calling upon Christ the God over all.

Which if they be really the Terms of Invocation used by those distressed People, and not the bare Expression of Eusebius, or of the Author from whom he had the Account, are an ample Testimony of the Opinion of the Christians concerning the Person of the Son in that Age, and in what Sense they understood Rom. ix. 5. However, Eusebius thought not that Title inconsistent with the Personal Subordination of the Son of God. In relation to the second Text taken out of 1 Tim. iii. 16. I shall observe, That the Context of Greg. Nyssen, and of Theodorite, evidently shews, that they read ἃς God. Greg. Nyssen says, * That St. Paul calls the Lord (Christ) not only God, but Great God, and God over All. And he proves these three Assertions by three Instances; the last Assertion by Rom. ix. 5. the second by Tit. ii. 3. and the first by 1 Tim. iii. 16. Which argues, that the Term God, was as much read in this last Text, as the Great God, and God over All, in the former; otherwise, how could it prove, that the Apostle called the Son God, for which it was cited by this Fa-

ther? See also his Treatise de Fide. Theodorus's Comment is this,

For being God—
He was manifested to all in Human Nature.
And the Apostle has evidently taught us two Natures; for he says, The Divine Nature was manifested in Flesh.

Which, I think, as plainly supposes the Term God in the Text, as Words possibly can.

Chrysostom says of the Mystery of Godliness,

It is indeed Great; for God became Man, and Man God,

An evident Variation of, God was manifested in the Flesh.

Whence it appears, that these Fathers read the Text, as we now find it, with the Term Ἰησοῦς; and that this Reading was both known and used before the Beginning of the Sixth Century.

CCCXL. Matt. xix. 17. There is none Good but One, (εἷς, One Being,) that is, God; or, There is none Good but God alone.

This Text has been considered, N. r. with the Passages out of Clem. Alexandrinus, Athanasius,
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...and Novatian; I shall add two or three Words more by way of Confirmation. Philo the Jew, whom the Arians have probably followed in some of their Opinions, had such a Notion of the Word, that sometimes he speaks of him as Goodness in the Abstract, or Eternal Goodness, that created all Things, and is it self God, that is, God the Word; for he supposes, οὐ χρηστός ἦν οὐ κρατός ἦν, that is, Good the Word.

While the Jews, whom the Arians have probably followed in some of their Opinions, had such a Notion of the Word, that sometimes he speaks of him as Goodness in the Abstract, or Eternal Goodness, that created all Things, and is it self God, that is, God the Word; for he supposes, οὐ χρηστός ἦν, οὐ κρατός ἦν, that is, Good the Word.

...by way of Confirmation. Philo the Jew, whom the Arians have probably followed in some of their Opinions, had such a Notion of the Word, that sometimes he speaks of him as Goodness in the Abstract, or Eternal Goodness, that created all Things, and is it self God, that is, God the Word; for he supposes, οὐ χρηστός ἦν, οὐ κρατός ἦν, that is, Good the Word.

...by way of Confirmation. Philo the Jew, whom the Arians have probably followed in some of their Opinions, had such a Notion of the Word, that sometimes he speaks of him as Goodness in the Abstract, or Eternal Goodness, that created all Things, and is it self God, that is, God the Word; for he supposes, οὐ χρηστός ἦν, οὐ κρατός ἦν, that is, Good the Word.

...by way of Confirmation. Philo the Jew, whom the Arians have probably followed in some of their Opinions, had such a Notion of the Word, that sometimes he speaks of him as Goodness in the Abstract, or Eternal Goodness, that created all Things, and is it self God, that is, God the Word; for he supposes, οὐ χρηστός ἦν, οὐ κρατός ἦν, that is, Good the Word.
I cannot pass by the Reasoning of Gregory Nyssen, which is very proper on this Occasion.


The Dr. says, p. 92. "For what is a Personal Character, but a Character which di-"stinguishes that particular Person from all "other Persons? And what is this, but the " Essence of that Person?" To which my Answer is, That if a Person be characterized by that which expresses his Substance or substantial Attributes, such a Character is essential: As for Instance, If God the Father be distinguished from Idols, or false Gods, by the Character of an Eternal, Immortal, All-wise, and All-powerful Spirit, this is an essential Character, but it does not distinguish him from all other Persons; it does not distinguish him from the Son, and the Spirit. But if He be characterized by that which does not express his Substance or substantial Attributes, such a Character, tho' it may distinguish him from the Son, and Spirit, and all other Persons, is yet no essential Character. Thus underived and unbegotten, is a Character of the First Person in the
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the Godhead; it is not * essential, because it is negative, and does not express either his Substance, or any of his substantial Attributes; but yet it distinguishes the Person of the Father from the Son, and Holy Ghost, and all other Persons, those two Terms being unitedly affirmed of no other Person but of the Father only; it is therefore a Personal Character, shewing not what the Father is, but that He is not derived nor begotten, or has not his Subsistence after the manner of any other Person or Being. Self-originated is of the same Importance with underived, being a Term in its meaning Negative, and shewing that the Person, to whom it is applied, does not owe his Subsistence to any other Person, himself being the First. In Opposition to unbegotten in the First Person, is begotten of the Father in the Second Person; a Character not essential to him as He is God, because it expresses neither the Substance of the Person, nor any substantial Attribute, but yet it distinguishes

* Οτι ης ῥηματος τον τητοιατον δεν αυτοσ ειναι τη εαυτη του. He is a Lyar who affirms that the Term (unbegotten) signifies the Substance it self. Bas. cont. Eunom. Lib. i. p. 19 D.


the
the Person of the Son from the rest of the Divine Persons, and from any other Persons whatsoever, He being the only begotten Son of the Father; which makes it a Personal Character, signifying the Manner after which the Son has his Subsistence. Thus begotten is no essential Character of Seth the Son of Adam, as he is Man, that is, no Character expressing his Substance, or any substantial Attribute; for otherwise the Human Substance and Attributes being specifically the same in both, Adam must have been begotten as well as Seth: But it is the Ground of the Relation of Seth as Son, to Adam as Father. But says the Dr. "If we " know any thing of the Essence of God, " the first, and of all others the most essen- " tial Character of Him, is his being Self- " existent, or Un-originated:" Which is what he affirms in Anfwer to the learned and ingenious Author of Some Considerations, p. 229. In Anfwer to which I observe, That the Dr. ues Self-existent and Un-originated as syno- nymous Terms, explaining the former by the latter, as he ues Self-originated and Un- originated in the same Page, laying, pag. 92. Self-originated, or (to speak more properly) Un-originated. Now essential Terms, by which the essential Character of a Thing is known, are such as express the Substance and substantial Attributes of a Thing; but Un-originated is Negative, shewing not what the
the Subject is according to its Substance or substantial Attributes, but what it is not according to the Manner of having its Subsistence; it shews not what does belong to the Subject, but what does not, that is, that it cannot be said of it, that it has an Original Cause, or Beginning; and therefore is no essential Character. For as Basil observes, and common Sense teaches us,

"Εστίν ὑπὸ τοῦ πρωτοῦ καινοῦ τοῦ πρώτου καινοῦ τοῦ πρώτο
racter, expressing God as He is, He, who is, ὢν. In which Sense the Son is existent, as having the same existent Substance with the Father; but with this difference, that the Negative Character self, or undervived, cannot be joined with the Existence of the Son, because the Son exists from the Father, whereas it may be joined with the Existence of the Father, who exists from none. Whence it appears, that the same existent Substance with its substantial Attributes, as it is considered in the First Person, or Person of the Father, is called undervived; as it is considered in the Second Person, or Person of the Son, to whom it is communicated from the Father, is called derived: The Terms undervived, or derived, arguing no Difference of Substance, or substantial Attributes, but the different Manner only, after which each Person has his Subsistence.

CCCLXXII. Rom. xi. 36. Of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all Things.

The Term Him, refers to God, v. 33. and Lord, v. 34. which Lord God I conceive to be the One God in a Trinity of Persons; as will probably appear from the Consideration of the Context. V. 33. it is said, How * unsearchable are his judgments, and his Ways.

* * *
If these Words do not belong to God, as standing for the Trinity, they must belong to the Father alone: And it will be universally true, that his judgments are unsearchable, &c. that is, to any but himself; for the Proposition is absolute, without Limitation and Exception, and therefore excludes not only Men from searching into and finding out God's judgments and Ways, but Angels also, who are desirous to look into the Mysteries of the Gospel, 1 Pet. i. 12. and know by the Church the manifold Wisdom of God, Ephes. iii. 10. or the unsearchable Riches of Christ, v. 8. and all created and made Beings whatsoever; who being of a different Nature from the Father, inferior to Him, and separate in Substance, can never be conscious of his Thoughts and Purposes, or search out the Reasons of his wonderful Works without a Revelation. But it is certain from Scripture, that the Spirit searcheth the Depths of God, and by Consequence the Depth of his Riches, and Wisdom, and Knowledge; if then they are unsearchable to created Beings, if searchable to God only, and yet searchable to the Spirit, the Spirit can be no created Being, it must be One with God, and comprehended under that Name, and consequently the judgments of God are not unsearchable to any, but the Father only. For

* Ἐπίπτω ἐκ ταυτάτην τις ἑαυτῷ, 1 Cor. ii. 10. † Rom. xi. 33.
Should it be objected that they are searchable to the Spirit, because they are revealed to it, it will follow, that they are no otherwise unsearchable than because they are not revealed; and therefore when the Scripture says, The Things of God knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of God, i Cor. ii. 11. no more is meant, than that it is the Prerogative of the Spirit to know those Mysteries by Revelation from God, that are not revealed, or communicated to others: Or, that the Spirit has the Knowledge of them before all others. Which should it be true, how can it be said of the Divine Spirit, That it knows the Things of God, as the Spirit of Man the Things of Man? v. 11. Which imports an essentiaal or natural Knowledge arising from it self, not a barely communicated Knowledge; and that the Spirit is as essentiaally one with God, as the Spirit of a Man is one with the Man: And that therefore he is excepted from those, to whom God's Judgments are unsearchable, as essentiaally knowing them, or by Virtue of his Nature, and as being himself contained under the Name God. The Judgments then, Ways and Depths of God, are searchable to the Spirit, as being one with God, and comprehended under the Name God. Which is farther confirmed in the next Verse; For who hath known the Mind of the Lord? This being put interrogatively, is equivalent to a Negative, and excludes all others but the Lord.
Lord himself from knowing his Mind; but the Spirit having an essential Knowledge of the Things of God, who is also Lord, cannot be excluded from knowing his Mind: The Spirit therefore is comprehended under the Name Lord. And if the Spirit be comprehended under the Names God and Lord, much more is the Son, who, in order of subsisting, is superior to the Spirit; as will appear from the following Part of this Verse, Or who hath been his Counsellor? This is negative and exclusive as the former, and shews, that God had no Counsellor besides himself: But it is certain, that the Father has a Counsellor, his only Son, who is called * Counsellor, the Mighty God; with whom he consulted about creating Man, and punishing him when he || was fallen. The Lord God therefore, that had no Counsellor, is not the Father solely, but the Father and the Son: So that the Father and the Son are both comprehended under the Lord God, mentioned in the Context. Which will give a clear Light to v. 36. For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all Things. For if the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are comprehended under the Titles Lord and God, and if the Being meant by Lord and God is the same, of whom the 36th Verse is spoken, then does it follow, that the 36th Verse re-

* Ht. ix. 6.  † Gen. i. 26.  || Gen. iii. 22.
lates to the whole Trinity, that is, of Him, to the Father; through Him, to the Son; and to Him, or in Him, to the Holy Ghost. Of Him, to the Father; for so it is written, 1 Cor. vii. 6. To us there is but One God the Father, of whom are all Things. Through Him, to the Son; as it is written in the same Place, And one Lord Jesus Christ, by or through whom are all Things. And to Him, or in Him, to the Holy Ghost; for as the whole Church is taken into one Spirit, or made to drink into one Spirit, 1 Cor. xii. 13. so does that one Spirit fill the World, and contain all Things, Wisd. i. 7. To whom be Glory for ever, Amen. This shews the Unity, as the preceding Part of the Verse does the Trinity.

The Authorities for interpreting this Text of the Trinity, are the following.

Basil says, Lib. 5. adv. Eunom. p. 128.

This Expression of Him, and through Him, and in Him, reduces the Property of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Spirit to one Name, (I suppose he means, Lord God, v. 34, 33, 32. to which ἐν is, or Him refers;) for there is one of whom are all Things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom
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whom are all Things, and one Holy Ghost, in whom are all Things.


Quoniam ex ipso, & per ipsum, & in ipso omnia. Ex ipso, ut dicitur de Patre; per ipsum ut de Christo; in ipso, ut de Spiritu Sancto.

Ambrose says,

Quia enim omnium Creator est Deus — ideo ex ipso sunt omnia. Et quoniam ab ipso sunt, per Filium ejus, qui ejusdem utiq; Substantiae est, esse cceperant.— Quia ergo ipse operatur per Filium, per ipsum sunt omnia. Et quoniam quae sunt ex Deo, per Deum sunt, post renata in Spiritu Sancto sunt, in ipso sunt omnia; quia & Spiritus Sanctus de Deo Patre est.— Ergo & in Spiritu Sancto

For of Him, and through Him, and in Him, are all Things. Of Him, as it is spoken of the Father; through Him, as of Christ; in Him, as of the Holy Ghost.

For because God is the Creator of all Things — therefore are all Things of Him. And because they are of Him, they began to be by his Son, who is indeed of the same Substance. — Because therefore He operates by his Son, all things are through Him. And because what are of God, and through God, are afterwards renewed in the Holy Ghost, therefore are all Things in Him; for the Holy Ghost also
also is from God the Father. — Therefore the Father is in the Holy Ghost also, because that, which is from God the Father, cannot be of a different Nature from God the Father.

Austin says, If of Him be of the Father; if through him be through the Son; if in Him be in the Holy Ghost;

It is manifest that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are One God:


Where tho' he does not directly affirm that this is the Sense of the Words, yet he plainly supposes it may be so. See also Hil. de Trinit. Lib. 8.

The Dr. p. 93. objects, that the Passage cited out of Novatian is directly against me. But if the Reader considers that Novatian makes the Son to be substantially One with the Father, c. 31. he will be inclined to understand the Passage as I apply it. For therefore are all Things done by the Word, said to be done by God the Father, because the Word, and the Father, are substantially and indivisibly One.
So that the Power of the Father is derived to the Word, with the Substance of the Father. I desire it may be observed also, that I understand no Part of this Passage in the following Sense, *by Him* (the Father) *as He is the Word*, which the Dr. affirms: Neither did my Interpretation of it infer any such Meaning. For tho’ all Things are through the Lord God, as He is the Son and Word; because the Lord God is a common Name to Father and Son, yet all Things are not through the Father as He is the Word; because *Father* is not a common Name to the Father and the Word; the Term *Father* expressing a single and individual Person; the Terms *Lord God*, a common Nature. See N. 382.

I had said concerning the Particle *εἰς* before *δια*, that it should be rendred rather by, *in*, (than to;) *for so the Particle εἰς is frequently used*. To this the Dr. replies, p. 94. “That there is no such Thing in the World, “as putting one Word, in this manner, for another.” Now I had no where said, That *one Word is put for another*. The learned Dr. owns, pag. 95. That sometimes indeed one and the same Word has indifferently two or more Significations; and then it may (according as the Sense requires) be understood in any of those Significations. And he gives the following Instance, *Thus the Word (ἐφ) in the New Testament, according to the Genius of the Hebrew and*
and Hellenistical Style, signifies indifferently in, or by. And in like manner I affirm, that the Word εἰς, in the New Testament, signifies indifferently to, or in; and the Expression I used imported no more: Tho' had I said, that εἰς was put for ἐν, I think the Meaning is much the same. But not to contend about Forms of Expression, the Dr. says, That the Word εἰς has but one Signification. Every one knows that one Signification is, to. But Phavorinus tells us it has another; that it signifies in also.

The Attics, says he, ἐν, ἀντὶ ἐν χρώμ-

uσε εἰς for ἐν. ταῦτα ἐνθεοί! (Which, I think, is near that Form of Expression which the Dr. condemns.) The Evangelists do the same; thus ἐν ἐν κοσμημα, Matt. iii. 17. is, εἰς ἐν κοσμημα, c. xii. 18. and ἐν τῷ ἄνωθεν, Matt. xxiv. 18. is, ἐκ τοίς ἐν ἐν, in the parallel Place, Mark xiii. 16. And it is certain, that εἰς was so understood by the Translators into the Vulgar Latin, who render the disputed Passage thus, in ipso sunt omnia; except their Copy had ἐν instead of εἰς, as Basil reads it. Which yet shews, that εἰς has the Signification of in.

CCCLXXXII. Ephes. iv. 6. One God and Father of All, who is above All, and through All, and in you All.

Above All, in his own Person, or in the Person of Father. Through All, and in All,
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as his Substance and Attributes communicated to, and personalied in the Son and Holy Ghost, are through and in All. Concerning which Passage, as cited by Irenæus, see N. 8. As for the Authorities of Bishop Pearson, and Bishop Bull, I have spoken to them already, N. 5. I shall add a Citation or two more upon this Article. Athanasius, in his first Epistle to Serapion, §. 28. Comments thus upon the Text.

'To πάντων μὲν ὡς Πατὴς, ὡς Ἄρχων, ὡς Πρῶτον ὑπὸ πάντων ὡς, διὰ τὸ Λόγον ἐν Πάσιν δὲ, ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι ἄγιον.

But then, he says, of the Trinity.

Ομολογήσοντες ὡς τῇ θυσίᾳ, ὡς εἰς ἀλήθειαν τῇ φύσει, ὡς μὰ τὰ τῶν ἐνεργεῖα.

And, §. 29. he says,

'Ει μὲν ἐν δύος ὡς, συναφθαις παρ' ὑμῖν τοῖς κόσμοις τὸ πνεύμα, ἐν ἐν μὲν τὸ τρίτον ὑμῶν φιλανθρακίας ἐναὶ δὲν, τὸ ὑπὸ πάντων, ὑπὸ διὰ πάντων, ἐν ἐν πάσιν, ὑπὸ ἡγεῖται, διαιρήθη σὺ αὐτοτελεῖς

If there are but two Persons, let the Holy Ghost be reckoned by you among the Creatures; but then this fort of Faith of yours is not in the One God who is over All, and through All, and in All; for you
you want in All, (that is God, as He is in Πνεῦμα. All,) if you divide and alienate the Spirit from the Godhead.

Jerom says upon the Place,

For God the Father is above All, because He is the Author of all Things. The Son is thro' All, because he runs thro' all Things, and passes thro' all Things. And the Holy Ghost is in All, because nothing is without Him.

Which is much like Irenæus's Manner of speaking upon the Text, and probably taken from it. Now all learned Persons know, that Jerom no less than Irenæus, held an Unity of Substance or Nature in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Whence it appears, that the substantial Union of the Spirit, and Word, with the Father, seems to be taught by who is above All, and through All, and in you All; as the Difference of Persons is by the distinct mention of One Spirit,—One Lord,—One God and Father of All, v. 4, 5, 6.

CCCXCV. Tit. ii. 13. The appearing of the Glory of the Great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ. See N. 289.

* See 1st Answer, p. 123. And 2d Answer, N. 1056.

CCCCX.
In Answer to pag. 98, 99. it may be said, That tho' the Person of the Father is the ultimate End of all Worship, as being the First in the Godhead, yet this does not hinder, but that the main Design of St. John's Epistle may be, as it appears to be, to shew the Reader, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, that He is the only Means of approaching the Father, that He is Eternal Life himself, and True God, (that is, as He is substantially One with the Father;) and all this, without exalting him into the Person of the Father, to whom the Title or Character of True God primarily belongs. For the greatest Difficulty lay in persuading Men of the Being, Nature, and Offices of the Person of the Son, not in bringing them to a right Notion of, and Faith in, the First Person. Which will Answer also the latter Part of pag. 103. where the Dr. plainly mistakes me.

Pag. 101. the Dr. says, in Opposition to my Observations on the Use of the Term ἀληθινός, "That there is an Error in the "Reading of the Original; and that had I "consulted Dr. Mills, I should have found "that the most and best Manuscripts have," "v. 20.
"v. 20. thus, ἂν ἔγνωκήμεν ἃνείπερον, that we may know the True God." But I must observe, that out of thirty Manuscripts cited in the various Readings of this Epistle, there are but ten produced with the Term ἁνείπερον; which is an Argument that it was not found in the other twenty: So that the most are not on the learned Dr's side; but double the Number will appear, upon Examination, to be found on mine. As for the Authority of the Manuscripts which omit ἁνείπερον, there is not one of them, whose Credit is questioned by that judicious Critic Dr. Mills, and which does not appear to be either of good Antiquity, or from approved Copies: Whereas one * of the ten, which the Dr. refers to, is judged by Estius (and not denied by Dr. Mills) to be of no great Authority; so that it is not to be wondered at, that this learned Critic, in his Prolegomena, pag. 88. col. 2. is of Opinion, that ἁνείπερον is not genuine, but borrowed from the latter Part of the Verse, this is the True God. But further, If Dr. Clarke's Reading be true, it may be asked, What Occasion is there for this Repetition, this is the True God? When it is said twice before, in the same Verse, that He is the True God, according to the Dr's rendering, which runs thus: † The Son of God is come, and hath given us an Understanding, that

* Steph. 1a. † Pag. 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107.
we may know the True God, and we are in that True God by his Son Jesus Christ. This is the True God, &c. But the Dr. says, That Basil confirms his Reading. And fo do * Hilary, † Augustin, and || Jerom mine. But there is another Error I am guilty of, in being misled by the English Translation in the following Words, We are in him that is True, even in his Son Jesus Christ; which he would have to be thus, And we are in that True God by his Son Jesus Christ. And to support this Translation, he asks a Question, “If the Words, “ says he, in him that is True, were meant “ of Christ; whom then would the Word “ His refer to, in the following Period, even “ in his Son Jesus?” My Answer is, That His, ὁ αὐτός, refers to God, ἐγώ, at the Beginning of the same Verse; for there He is called, the Son of God; and here He is called, His Son; which, I think, is no very remote Antecedent: Tho’ had it been more remote than it is, it would not have been disagreeable to the Style of this Apostle, who, c. 16. of his Gospel, refers ἐγώ, v. 13. to ἐγώ ἀλήτος, v. 7. As for the Dr’s Translation, by his Son Jesus Christ, I believe he cannot produce one ancient Writer of the Church on his Side; Athanasius, Basil, Ambrose, Hilary, Jerom, and Cyril, give us no Occasion

to think, that they understood it otherwise than Explicatory of the preceeding Sentence, in Him that is true. But Secondly, This manner of Style seems never to be used in the New Testament, when it speaks of our being in, or united to, the Father by the Son. St. Paul says, Col. iii. 3. Your Life is hid with Christ in God, σω τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ. And, 1 Thess. i. 2 Thess. i. 1. The Church of the Thessalonians in God (ἐν Θεῷ) the Father, or our Father, and (in) the Lord (κυρίῳ Θεῷ) Jesus Christ. And John says, c. ii. 24. Ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father; ἐν τῷ υἱῷ ἐν τῷ Πατρί. For it must be observed, that St. John, speaking in his own Person, never uses this sort of Phrase, with or in the Father by the Son, but with or in the Father and the Son, joyning them both together by the Copulative And. Thus, besides the foregoing Instance, it is said, * Our Fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ, not with the Father through his Son: And thus, in all Probability, would it have been expressed in the disputed Text, And we are in the True One, and in his Son Jesus Christ, were it true, that the Apostle intended to speak of two Persons, and not of one only. As for the Instances given by the Dr. they none of them relate to the Father and Son unitedly together; and there-

* 1 Epift. i. 3.
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Therefore do not appear to come up to the Case. Pag. 106. the Dr. says, Irenaeus very justly Styles, "Christ True God, and truly God; meaning thereby—not Self-existent, Independent, Underived Divinity." And, I pray, in what Part of my Writings does the Dr. find, that Self-existence, &c. are Parts of the Notion of the True God, as applied to the Son? Nay, I have rather shewn, N. 340. that they are Negative and not Essential, or Substantial Characters; and therefore the Son may be True God, by a Communication of the Substance and Attributes of the Father to Himself, without being Self-existent, &c. But he refers to pag. 11. of his Reply to Mr. Nelson. For an Answer to which, I refer him to N. 5. p. 43. &c. where I have considered what he has said in that Reply in relation to Irenaeus. The rest of the Authorities, cited in my first Answer, pag. 35. for the Son's being True God, are passed over by the Dr. without any distinct Reflection. Pag. 107. he says, "Had St. John intended "to affirm what your Friend supposes; he "would not have said, ἔτοι ἔτνυ, but ἔτι ἔτος or ἔτι ἔτος, &c." But the contrary is true. The Dr's Form with the Pronoun ἕτος is never used by this Apostle, but mine is in parallel Cases: Thus, John xxiv. 24. after the Apostle had been speaking of himself for the Four preceding Verses, he adds, ἔτοι ἔτνυ σὰ μαθηταῖς σὰ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τῆς τῆς.
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tετω, This is the Disciple, &c. And, Rev. xx.
14. when he had said, That Death and Hell
were cast into the Lake of Fire; he subjoyns, in
relation to the latter, Ετός ἐστιν ὁ δεύτερος
Ανατολής, This is the Second Death. So when
he says, We are in him that is true, even in
His Son Jesus Christ; he adds, Ετός ἐστιν ὁ
ἄναπαύος Σωτήρ, This is the True God. But
proceeds the Dr. “Neither would he have
said, ὁ ἄναπαύος Σωτήρ, but ἄναπαύος Σωτήρ; for
“ὁ Σωτήρ, is never by any Writer put for
“Σωτήρ.” First, It is the Dr’s Opinion, that
the Son is no other than Σωτήρ without an Ar-
ticle; but I have shewn, N. 5. that the
Son both in Scripture, as interpreted by
the Antients, and also by the Antients them-
selves, is called ὁ Σωτήρ. Secondly, The placing
of the Article ὁ after Ετός ἐστιν, is so constantly
the Style of this Apostle, that I know not
one Instance to the contrary. The Dr. adds,
“It ought also to weigh somewhat with
your Friend, that none of the Writers of
the Three First Centuries alledge these
Words, This is the True God, as spoken of
Christ.” It would indeed have had some
Weight with me, if the Dr. could have
produced any one of those Writers, who had
alledged the Words, as spoken of the Fa-
ther. Nay, it has not been my Fortune to
meet with one Writer of Antiquity who
explains the Text, who has not understood
it of the Son, notwithstanding the Article ὁ
be
be joyned with Σεβ. Pag. 108. The Dr. says, "St. John does not say, That the True "God is Eternal Life." This is indeed very strange. The Dr. affirms, and labours to prove it, pag. 106, 108. that the Words, this is the True God, are meant of the Father: Now Eternal Life is a joynt Predicate with the True God, of the Pronoun This, which is said to refer to the Father; for, says the Apostle, This is the True God, and Eternal Life. If then the Father be the True God, as the Dr. affirms; and He, who is the True God, is also Eternal Life, as the Apostle affirms; then does the Apostle, by plain Consequence, affirm, That the True God is Eternal Life. Indeed the Perplexity that the Dr. is in to make his Sense out against the plain Letter of Scripture, and Mind of Antiquity, is a sufficient Argument of the Violence of the Interpretation. The learned Dr. had explained the True God, by the True Religion, Scripture Doctrine, pag. 61. and endeavours to justify it, by saying, that Idols, or false Gods, in the next Verse, Keep your selves from Idols, signify the Worship of false Gods; which is, false Religion. I shall not at present examine how this Interpretation, that the True God is the True Religion, is consistant with the other I have mentioned before, that makes the True God to be spoken of the Father; but shall rather give my Reasons why I cannot agree with the Dr. that Idols,
in the next Verse, signify the Worship of Idols. In order to which, I desire the Reader would consider the Import of the first Part of the Sentence, namely, *Keep your selves from, γυλαζατε εαυτας και;* which admits of different Meanings, according to the different Terms, or Matter of the Context it is joined with: As for Instance, Josh. vi. 18. it is said, *Keep your selves from the accursed Thing, γυλαζατε—και θυματος,* that is, as it is explained in the same Verse, *Take not of the accursed Thing;* for adds Joshua, *Let ye make your selves accursed when ye take of the accursed Thing, μακαριτε—λαθετε και θυματος,* Sept. Again, Jer. ix. 4. it is said, *Take ye heed every one of, or keep your selves every one from, his Neighbour, και πλησιον αυτας γυλαζατε,* that is, *Trust ye not in him;* for so the Phrase is varied or explained in the very next Sentence, *And trust ye not in any Brother,* which is more exactly done in Mic. vii. 5. *Trust ye not in a Friend or Neighbour;* the Term Friend, in Micah, being the same in the Original, with the Term Neighbour, in Jeremiah. And thus in like manner is, *Keep your selves from Idols;* the same with, *Worship not Idols.* As then the accursed Thing, does not signify the taking of the accursed Thing; nor Neighbour, signify the trusting in a Neighbour: So neither does the Term *Idols,* signify *the Worship of Idols.* For

*Non jam ab Idololatria quasi ab officio. Ter. de Cor. Mil. c. 19.*
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the taking, the trusting in, and the worshipping, are no Part of the Idea of the following Nouns, but are implied in the Prohibition, Keep your selves from; as if it were said, Do not take, do not trust in, do not worship.

To the Authorities already cited in my first Answer, and to what I have said before upon this Subject, N. 5. I subjoyn the following. Arnobius says of Christ, That


And again,

Hoc enim est Proprium Dei veri, Potentiæ; Regalis, Benignitatem suam negare nulli, p. 144.

It is the Property of the true God (meaning Christ,) and of Royal Power, to deny his Bounty to none.

In Answer to pag. 113. it may be said, First, That allowing the Generation of the Son from the Father to be by Necessity of Nature,
Nature, yet this does not exclude the Concurrency or Approbation of the Will of the Father; because Necessity is not inconsistent with the Approbation of the Will. The Nature and Perfections of God are necessary, yet are they not therefore without the Approbation of the Divine Will; for the Will of God rests and acquiesces with the utmost Contentment in the Attributes or Perfections which He is necessarily conscious of in his own Nature. Let then actual Fruitfulness be one of the Perfections of the Paternal Nature; this being supposed to be necessary, like other Perfections, is not the Effect of the Will of the Father, or of an Act of his Will, any more than they; yet is it doubtless an Object and Occasion of Delight; it is what his Will approves of, and fully acquiesces in: So that tho' the Son is not from his Will, or the Act of it, yet can it not be said, that He is without the Will, or Approbation of the Father. But the learned Dr. is of Opinion, "That if the Son " be not caused by the Will of the Father, " He is not caused by the Father at all, but " by some superior Cause." Which is also what he afferts by way of Answer to the Reasoning of the learned Author of Some Considerations, &c. p. 227. To which I reply, That the Nature, or Substance of the Father, is not superior to the Father; but as it is his own Substance, with its substantial Attributes,
or as it is personalized in Him, is the very Father: Now the Son considered as necessarily begotten, is the Effect of an essential Act of the Nature of the Father; the Son therefore as necessarily begotten, or not caused by an Act of the Will of the Father, is not produced by a Cause superior to the Father, or not by the Father, because the Nature or Substance of the Father essentially acting in the Generation of the Son, is the very Father. And such an essential Act of begetting, tho' it is independent on the Will of the Father, yet being considered as a Perfection of his Nature, no more infers the Subjection of the Father to a superior Cause, than any other essential Perfection independent on his Will, and founded in his Nature. And to conceive the Father to be an Instrument only in this way of begetting, as the Dr's Reasoning infers, is the same thing, as to conceive him to be an Instrument to himself; which, whether it be a proper way of thinking, let the Reader judge. However, it infers a Subjection to none but to himself, or to his own Nature; which, I think, is Independency in the highest Degree.

Athanasmus says, That as the Father is good, neither by his * Will, nor against, or without his Will, or by Necessity (I suppose, as it stands,

* 'τετευγανέεινα οτ δ' Ἐκλύσατο το παρελκευνα οτ δ' ἐναὶ  

Oration. 2, cont. Ar. § 2.
for a superior Cause, or Fate) but by Nature: So is He * by Nature Father, and not by Will; (for the Arians had objected, that if the Son did not subsist by the Will of the Father, the Father must have the Son necessarily and unwillingly, or without his Will.) But in Opposition to this the Dr. cites Justin Martyr, Origen, Novatian, Eusebius, the Council of Sirmium, Marius Victorinus, Basil, Gregory Nyssen; who, he says, professedly argue, "That the Son was generated by the Father, "not by an absolute Necessity of Nature, but "by an Act of his Eternal Power and Will." And refers to his Scripture Doctrine, Part 2. §.17. I conceive, that if the learned Reader will be at the Pains to examine the Passages cited out of Justin Martyr and Novatian, and compare them with the like Style in Athenagoras, and Theophilus Antiochenus, he will have Reason to believe that they relate, not to the Eternal Generation of the Son, of which Athanasius speaks; but to his Manifestation, or Coming forth, in order to create. As for Origen, it is certain from what has been observed, N.3. That he held the Eternal Existence of the Son; and yet he speaks of the Creation of Wisdom, or the Son, as if it were done just before the Creation of all Things, and in order to it.
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For, says he, God having created, as I may to say, a living 
Wisdome, committed it to her Care to give 
Subsistence and Form 
to Beings and Mat-
ter, according to the 
Figures which she 
had in her self.

Which is affirmed with some Variation, 
pag. 36. E. Now if the Son be Eternal, and 
the Son be Wisdom, and the Creation of Wis-
dom be spokon of by Origen in the like Terms, 
which others have used to express her com-
ing forth by the Will of the Father in order 
to create, I think it is reasonable to con-
clude, that this Creation only, in the Sense 
of this Author, is the Effect of the Will and 
Power of the Father; for there is no other 
voluntary Generation, that I know of, men-
tion'd in his Writings. With this Doctrine 
of Origen, in his Greek Remains, agrees that 
of the Book Peri Archon, which makes the 
Creation of Wisdom, or the Son, to be no other 
than his forming and comprehending in him-
selb the Ideas and Principles of all Things.

Quali autem modo 
intelleximus sapien-
tiam initium viarum 
Dei eft, & quomodo 
creata eft dicitur,
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manner, as she is said to be created; namely, by forming and containing in herself the Ideas and Principles of the whole Creation, after the like manner, &c.

As for the Passage out of the Sirmium Creed, it was to condemn those, who said, that the Father was necessitated against or without his Will to beget a Son; and therefore their main Aim, as it appears to me, was to shew, that the Generation of the Son was not in such a Sense necessary as to exclude the Will of the Father; or to shew, that Nature and Will did both concur in the Production of the Son: Whereas the Creature was formed by the Will of God, without his Nature. And, I think, it is evident from the following Passages, that Hilary could mean no more in his Comment on the Place: For, says he, *it is impossible that that, which was (meaning the Word, John i. 1.) should not have been. And again, he says, That God the Father, according to Moses,

Is He who is;  
Is qui est.

That that, which Id quod est, non is, cannot be conceived, potest intelligi diciq; and said not to be, non esse.

Quod igitur & per Moyse de Deo significatum—id iplum unigenito Deo esse proprium Evangelista testatur, &c. p. 107. col. 1. C.

That what is spoken of God (the Father) by Moses, the Evangelist (St. John) testifies to be proper to (the Son, or) the only begotten God, when he says, In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God.

Which are Expressions that imply the necessary Existence of the Son; and that his necessary Existence is founded upon his Nature, or upon his Being, He who is, like the Father.

Basil says of God the Father, that He is, Τὸ καὶ ἐστὶν Θεὸς Θεὸς, p. 926. God and Father by Essence; Founding his Paternity, as well as his Godhead, upon his Essence. And Lib. 2. Adv. Eunom. p. 48. he supposes, That it is, Καὶ σὺ πρεσεν τῇ Θεῷ καὶ συγκεκαθημένος τῇ Θεῷ, Good and becoming the Blessedness of God to be a Father.

And pag. 56, 57. he calls the Son * ὁ Θεός, as Hilary does, Is qui est; which, I conceive,

---

* Athenagoras says, Τὸ ὤν ἐστὶν θεῖον, ἐκκλησία τὸ μυθὸν, Legat. p. 18. But he says of the Son, ὃς καὶ ἐστὶς παρεισευόμενος, p. 23. The Son therefore is not, Τὸ μυθὸν ὄν. But there is no Medium between τὸ μυθὸν ὄν, and τὸ ὄν; the Son therefore is comprehended in τὸ ὄν, and consequently must necessarily subsist from the Father, according to this Author's Principle; for τὸ ὄν is necessary.
is not so consistent with the Notion of a Generation purely arbitrary. And, pag. 57- he says, That the Heretics
Blasphemously say,  Μὴ ἐν ποτὲ τῷ θεῷ that the Son of God 
was not once, as if He did not exist by his own Nature, but was 
brought into being by the Grace of God.

A Passage which shews, that He did not believe the Existence of the Son to be of 
 meer Grace, but by Virtue of his Nature, that is, necessary.

Greg. Nyss. says of the Son, 
St. Paul calls him the Αἴτιμον, the Brightness of (God’s) Αἴτιμον, the Glory.

And then to shew the Eternal Existence of the Son with the Father, he adds, 
For it is impossible 'Ον χιαρι ὑπὸ αὐτῆς λαμματὶ ἐν τῷ δόξαν, οἷς ἐν ἐγκυρίᾳ ἀνευ ἀπαν-
without its Brightness; as it is impossible for a Lamp to be without its Brightness.— For it is impossible for the Glory to be without its Brightness.

If then the Glory cannot possibly be without its Brightness, and the Son is the Brightness of the Paternal Glory, the Person of the Father
Father could never possibly have been without the Son. And that, which it is as impossible not to be, as the Person of the Father, is necessary. As for the two Citations taken out of this Author, pag. 286. of the Scripture Doctrine, the First of them seems plainly to import no more, than that the Generation of the Son was not in such a Sense necessary, as to exclude the Will of the Father; or, that the Will of the Father was not so unconcerned, as that

He had the Son by a certain Necessity of Nature without his Will,

Which is not absolutely to deny a Necessity of Nature, but a Necessity of Nature alone, without the Concurrence or Approbation of the Will. The Second Passage is rather Argumentum ad hominem, a confuting Eunomius upon his own Principles. Marius Victorinus, after the like manner, denies such a necessary Generation as excludes the Will of the Father; for otherwise he allows a Necessity, when he says,

The Father therefore is necessarily Father, or necessarily begets; and the Son also has necessarily every thing that the Father has.
As for Eusebius, it is doubted among learned Men, whether he held the Eternal Generation of the Son, or not. Vid. Prælim. in Comment. Euseb. in Psalm. And a Passage in his Letter, as publish'd by Theodorit, in his Ecclesiast. Hist. L. I. c. 12. And Dem. Evang. * L. 4. c. 3. However, since there is Reason to believe he was once † of that Opinion, if not always, it may be worthy Consideration, First, Whether he did not believe the double Subsistence of the Son after the Manner of Theophilus, Athenagoras, &c. Whether this may not be inferred from his Epistle to the Church of Caesarea, as it is found in Theodorit. And whether the voluntary Generation of the Son may not be meant of his Second Subsistence. Secondly, If it be not so, whether he might not by Mistake apply to the First and Eternal Generation of the Son those Expressions, which were appropriated by Writers before him, to the Manifestation of the Son, or what they called his Coming forth in order to create. Or, whether he may not mean, with the foregoing Writers, that the Birth of the Son is not in such a Sense necessary, as to exclude the concurrent Approbation of the Will of the Father.

* Oδέ Πατρε τεσσαραυξ. Το ιει, κι η γενεσαι αυτο τεσσαραυξ, και μονο αεβωνινου πν. † See N. 1248.

These
These, I think, are the only clear Authorities relating to this Point, in that Part of the Scripture Doctrine referred to by the Dr. I shall add one Observation, that the Anti-nicene Writers generally, if not always, mean no other Generation by that which is voluntary, than the Coming forth, or Manifestation of the Son before the Worlds, in order to create them: Whence it is probable, some following Writers transferred the Style in a different Sense to the Eternal Generation.

As for the Citation out of John v. in pag. 114. of the Dr's Answer, I think it very probable, that the Father hath given to the Son to have Life in himself, v. 26. in the same respect, as He hath given Him Authority to execute Judgment also, v. 27. that is, as He is the Son of Man, or, because He is the Son of Man, v. 27. for the Word is the Life, John xiv. 6. This Life the Father has in himself, c. 5. v. 26. or, this Life was with the Father, i John i. 1, 2. and was manifested unto us, v. 2. in the human Nature of the Son, or, was given to the Man born of the Virgin, that He might overcome Death, and give Proof of his Victory in raising the Dead. For He was the Seed of the Woman, who by the Word of Life given to Him by the Father, and operating thro' his Body hanging upon the Cross, was to bruise the Serpent's Head, or destroy the Devil, who had the Power of Death, and
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and had subjected Adam, and his Posterity to it.

Cyril says,

The Son being Life by Nature, says that he receives it from the Father, not as He is the Word,—but as He is made Man, to whom all things are given of God.

CCCCXLIV.

As I do not see that Tertullian’s Words are attended with the Consequences which the Dr. draws from them; for he did not hold the Father and the Son to be one Person: So do they evidently shew what they were alledged for, that it was his Opinion before he was a Montanist, that the Father and the Son were so much One, (for which he cites John x. 30.) that they were the common and inseperable Object of the Christian Worship.

DI. 1 Tim. ii. 5. For there is One God, and One Mediator between God and Men.

I have shewn before, under N. 8. that One, as joyned with God, is not used in Opo-
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ition to the Son, to exclude him from being comprehended in the One God, but in Opposition to false Gods. And so I understand it here, where the Term Father is implied, as if the Apostle had said, There is One God the Father; So that the Meaning is this, There is One Mediator between God the Father and Men; which God the Father is called the One God, to exclude Idols from the Godhead, and not the Son. In which Sense it is taken by Chrysostom.

Τι ἐν; δ ὁσκεὶ ἄριστος; What then? (says he) Is not the Son ἐνος, εἰς; ἡ θεότης ἀνιδιαζολίων ἢ εἰδωλίων, How then does he ἢ ἡ θεότης ἢ ὁσκεῖ. In say One? In Opposition to Idols, not to the Son.

But says the learned Dr. "Not so in this Place; for there is no mention of false "Gods in the Context, pag. 116." But, I conceive, the Apostle had them in his Mind, as will appear from the preceding Verse, which runs thus; Who will have all Men to be saved, and to come to the Knowledge of the Truth. In which he plainly has respect to Persons in Error, and not yet admitted into a State of Salvation by the Knowledge of the Truth; for they were to come to the Truth, in order to be saved. Now the major Part of all Men were at that time Idolaters, particularly the Ephesians, among whom Timothy dwelt,
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dwelt, who were Worshippers of Diana, and
of the Image pretended to have fallen down
from Jupiter; whence it follows, that Idol-
latry was the chief Part of the Ignorance
and Error in which those Persons were, whom,
the Apostle tells us, God would have come to
the Knowledge of the Truth, in order to be saved.
If then the Error was principally Idolatry, and
the Truth opposed to it, as immediately fol-
lows, is, That there is One God the Father,
and One Mediator between God and Men; the
Consequence is, That this God the Father is
called the One God, in * Opposition to the
many Gods of the Idolatrous Heathens.
The learned Dr. proceeds; " But One God
" is put directly as the Person mediated to,
" (which all Men allow to be the Father
" only) in Contradistinction to the Person
" mediating to Him, which is the whole Person
" of the Son incarnate." It is granted, That
God the Father is the Person mediated to: That
God the Son, or, the whole Person of the Son in-
carnate, is the Person mediating to Him: That
God the Father mediated to, is distinguished
from God the Son mediating to Him: And yet
it cannot be granted, That the Term One
was ever united with the Term God, in Op-
position to the Son; because the Son being

* Chrysostom says upon the Place, That the Apostle's Dis-
course was concerning Truth and Error. Πετι γὰς αληθείας
καὶ πλάνας ἵν αὕτη ὁ Λόγος.

God
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God the Son, as the Father is God the Father, and the Godhead being but One, the Son cannot be excluded from the One God, tho' He is excluded from God the Father, who is sometimes called One, in Opposition to Idols. So that the Truth appears to be this, there is a mixt Opposition in the Terms, One God the Father; the Term Father implied, is opposed to the Term Son, and the One God to false Gods only.

The Authorities, which I had cited under this Article, as they shew the Son not to be excluded from the One True God, by affirming, or supposing Him in the Character of Mediator, to have the Natures both of God and Man: So are they passed over by the Dr. with a general Reflection only. It must also further be observed, That Hippolytus argues from this very Text, that the Son has the Substance both of God and Man by his being a Mediator between both of them, as is evident from the Passage out of him in my first Answer, pag. 40. and indeed most of the Authorities there cited point at this very Text, to which may be added the following one out of Tertullian.


Thus the Apostle also calling Him the Mediator between God and Men, confirmed his being of both Substances.

And
And Laclantius says, Ut (Filius) medium inter Deum & Hominem substantiam gerens, nostram hanc fragilem imbecillemque naturam quasi manu ad immortalitatem posset educere: Factus est & Dei Filius per Spiritum, & Hominis per carmem, id est, & Deus & Homo.— Interim & Deum fuisse, & Hominem ex utroq; generem permissetum. L. 4. c. 13. & vid. c. 25.

So that I am of Opinion, they are not so entirely besides the Purpose, as the Dr. imagines.

* Note, Hence it appears, that the middle Substance, is a middle of Participation, not of Negation.
The Substance of the Doctrine of the foregoing Chapter may be reduced to the following Articles.

That One, or Only, when united with God, is not exclusive of the Person of the Son, but of false Gods only, N. 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 501.

That therefore the Son with the Father is the One God.

That the Son was comprehended in the One God of the Jews, N. 2, 3, 340.

That the Son is God with the Article $\delta$, and absolutely God, N. 5.

That He is the Great God, N. 289. The Living God, N. 5. The True God, N. 410.

That Self-existence, and Independency, are no substantial Characters of the Godhead of the Father, N. 2, 340.

That therefore the Son is not excluded, for want of those Characters, from the Substance of the Father.

That the Son is of the Substance of the Father; which Substance is indivisibly, or individually One, N. 3, 501.

That $\delta \, \&$, does not relate to Person, but to God, $\delta \, \&$, N. 1.

That $\delta \, \&$, is the God who is, or whose Essence and Existence is necessary, N. 180.
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that is, the One Divine, Intelligent, and necessarily Existing Being.

That the Son is δ ἄν, N. 411.

That therefore the Son with the Father is the One Divine, Intelligent, and necessarily Existing Being.

That therefore Intelligent Being, and Person, are not convertible Terms, or of the same Importance, N. 1.

That the necessary Existence of the Son does not exclude the Will of the Father, N. 411.

That God is the Object of Worship, as He is δ ἄν, Jehovah, or Jah, or in respect of his necessarily Existing Substance, N. 180.

That the Son therefore, who is δ ἄν, is the Object of Worship in the same respect.

That the Holy Ghost is God, N. 8, 66, 382. and Lord God, N. 372.
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C H A P. II.

Of the SON of G O D.

DXXXIV. UKE i. 16, 17. Many shall He (John the Baptist) turn to the Lord their God, and He shall go before Him.

The Original State of the Controversie under this Article, which was about the Use or Application of the Name Lord God, whether it signify the Father * only according to the Analogy of Scripture, is now changed by the Dr. to a Dispute concerning the Meaning of that Name, when applied to the Son. To follow then the Dr. in this Enquiry, I must observe to the Reader, that, he says, pag. 119. "That the Title "Lord God,"—is a Personal Character; "expressing—Personal, and Relative Per-

* See Scripture Doctrine, pag. 84. where the Dr. affirms it.
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"sections, namely, Dominion and Government " over the World." If I understand the Dr. right, he makes Personal and Relative Perfections to be the same; and therefore a Personal Character expressing them, must be a Relative Character: And Lord God being a Personal Character, must be a Relative Character. In Answer to which, I say, that tho' Lord God be sometimes the rendering of other Terms, yet is it generally of Jehovah Elohim; that the Term Jehovah is not of a Relative, but Absolute Signification; and that therefore Part of the Character Lord God, is, at least Absolute. Now that Jehovah is of an Absolute Signification, appears from hence, that it expresses God as He is, or as He is He who is Being; for, First, It is put in the Place of Ehjeh, or, ὅ λου, as of the same Signification: For when God had said, Thus shalt thou say to the Children of Israel, I am hath sent me unto you, Exod. iii. 14. He adds a second Time, in the like Style, v. 15.* Thus shalt thou say to the Children of Israel, Jehovah, the God of your Fathers— hath sent me unto you; as if He had said, I am, or Jehovah, who is the God of your Fathers, hath sent me unto you. Secondly, Both * Jew-


K 3 ish,
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If, and Christian Critics agree, that this is the Meaning of it. If then Jehovah signifies God as He is, or, as He is He who is Being, and Being be an Absolute Appellation, as the Dr. says in this Page; Jehovah is a Name of Absolute Signification. And indeed it does not admit of Relative Terms as other Words do; for we no where find in Scripture, my Jehovah, our Jehovah, or the Jehovah of Israel, but Jehovah, the God of Israel; concerning which, and its Construction with Tzebaoth, see Buxt. de Nom. Dei, §. 12, 56. And tho', my Lord, be frequently used in the English Translation of the Old Testament, yet in such Cases it is never the rendring of the Term Jehovah. This Absolute Name Jehovah is sometimes rendred by τὸν, or God; and then † God is a Name of || Being or Essence; and it might be partly in this respect that Greg. Nyffen says,

Εἴ δὲ τὸν ὄνομα Ισίας σμανθίων ήτο, μίαν ἵναν ὄμολογησες ἢ ἵνας ἐρείδέ. το, ἢν ἔσεν ἐν κτιστος δεσδόμην,
ἐστι μίας ισίας ἐν ὅνο-

If God be a Name that signifies Essence or Substance, we, who confess One Substance of the Holy Trinity, do rightly glorifie One


†|| Compare this with what the Dr. says in Opposition to the learned Author of Some Considerations, &c. p. 290.
God; because God is a Name of One Substance.

Basil says,

That according to the Opinion of many, the Name of God (or expressing the Godhead) demonstrates his Nature.

And Greg. Nazianzen says,

He who is, and God, are Names of Substance.  

Let the Reader consider the Passages of the Scripture Doctrine referred to pag. 120. and what I have said already in my first Answer, and shall say hereafter under the same Numbers in this present Answer, and judge of the Reasonableness of the Dr's Interpretation. Pag. 121. He conceives, that my Words infer, "That the Son is so styled "Lord God, as not to be distinguished from "the Father." I do distinguish Him from the Person of the Father; but not separate Him from his Substance. For Jehovah is a Name expressing the Divine Substance, as has been already shewn; which Name being in common to the Son with the Father, and expressive of One God only, Deut. vi. 4. the Son with the Father is One God, and One Substance, the Divine Substance being One only.
I had supposed pag. 49, 51. that there was a traditional Explication of Scripture handed down from one Person to another in the first Ages of the Church; and that by Virtue of this Tradition, many of those Passages, in which the Lord God is mentioned, were applied to Christ: For this was the Original State of the Controversie, whether that Name signified the Father only, or did not belong to Christ also according to the Analogy of Scripture. In Opposition to this the Dr. says, "What and where this Tradition is, it does not appear, pag. 121." In Answer to which, First, I will shew, that there was a traditional Explication of Scripture; Secondly, I will give some Instances of it in relation to the Name Lord God. That there was a traditional Explication of Scripture, will appear from Irenæus, L. 4. c. 69. p. 368. col. 2. where he says of the Heretics,

De iisdem Scripturis varias habentes sententias.

De iisdem verbis non consentientes.

That they had different Sentiments of one and the same Scripture, or of the same Passages of Scripture.

That they did not agree about the same Words,

That is, about the Meaning of them; to which he opposes the uniform Agreement of the Church in the same Interpretations from the very Beginning; saying,
But we following the Rule of Truth, say all of us alway the same Things of the same Words.

That is, interpret the same Words in the same Sense. Now can it be supposed that the same Meaning should be put alway, or from the very Beginning, by all the Drs of the Christian Church upon the same Words of Scripture, and yet they not transmit that Meaning from one to another either in their public Discourses and Writings, or private Instructions? Or, was it possible that they could teach their People the Words of Scripture, and yet not give them the uniform Sense of the Church about them? Secondly, That I may give an Instance or two of such traditional Interpretations in relation to the Name Lord God, or Jehovah Elohim, I will premise, that where Fathers of different Ages agree in interpreting Places of Scripture concerning the Son, which might otherwise be understood of the Person of the Father, there, next to the Illumination of the Holy Ghost, it may reasonably be supposed, that they were induced to do it by receiving those Interpretations from the Drs before them, and by finding them agreeable to the Analogy of Faith.
Faith. Thus Psalm xxiv. from ver. 7. to the End, seems to be literally and prophetically meant of the Entrance of the Ark, and of the Shechinah, or Glory, that rested upon it, into the Holy of Holys in the Days of Solomon, when the Temple was finished. And Jehovah Tzebaoth, or the Lord of Hosts, was doubtless understood by the Bulk of the Jews of the Person of the Father; And yet, notwithstanding this, this very Psalm is alleged as a Proof by Justin Martyr, that Jesus Christ is Lord God, Dial. cum Tryph. And he is followed in this Interpretation by Irenaeus, p. 364. Edit. Grab. Tertull. Adv. Marc. p. 958. Edit. Pamel. Cyprian. Adv. Jud. Lib. 2. c. 29. Orig. in Matt. p. 438. Edit. Huet. Euseb. in Loc. and others. Again, Psal. lxxxii. 1. God (Elohijm) standeth in the Congregation of the Mighty, He judgeth among the Gods, is understood by Justin Martyr of the Son, Dial. cum Tryph. p. 117. Edit. Steph. by Iren. of the Father and the Son together, L. 3. c. 6. p. 208. and by Novat. de Trin. c. 15. Cyprian. Adv. Jud. Lib. 1. c. 6. Euseb. in Loc. Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 2. de Fil. sive Orat. 36. p. 579. and others, of the Person of the Son; and yet we need not doubt but the Jews understood it of God the Father. I conceive then it appears from these two Instances, for more are not needful, both where, or in what Authors a traditional Explication of Scripture may be traced: And also
also what that traditional Explication is, namely, that the Son is Jehovah Elohim, or Lord God: The first Instance shewing him to be Jehovah, or Lord, the Second to be Elohim, or God, and both together to be Lord God. Pag. 122. the Dr. says, "That this Title, the Lord God, when used absolutely, and without any antecedent mention of the Person it refers to, does in Scripture Language, by way of Eminence, always signify the Father." This Rule laid down by the Dr. was unknown to the ancient Writers. They frequently interpret the Title Lord God, of the Son, in many Passages of the Old Testament, where it is used absolutely, and without any antecedent mention of his Person. I have shewn this already in Psalm xxiv, and lxxxii. and will observe further, that Irenæus, among other Texts, alledged, to prove the Son absolutely Lord God, Lib. 3. c. 6. cites Psalm l. i. The Mighty God, even the Lord hath spoken, or rather according to the Hebrew, the God of Gods, the Lord (גête גאף וינא גאף, Sept.) hath spoken, or Jehovah, the God of Gods hath spoken; which is, I think, as high a Title as possibly can be given. And Justin, that he may prove Him to be God and Lord of Hosts, besides Psalm xxiv. cites Psalm xlvii. 5, &c. God is gone up with a Shout, the Lord (Jehovah) with the Sound of a Trumpet, &c. and Psalm
Psalm xcix. the Lord * (Jehovah) reigneth, &c. And the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews gives us to understand, c. i. v. 10, &c. that the Person called Lord and God, Psal. cii. is the Son; tho' there are no certain Tokens, no antecedent mention of him in that Character, either in this, or any of the foregoing Psalms, to determine an unenlightened Reader to that Meaning. Thus was the Son comprehended in the One † Lord God, while the Church was trained up in the Economy of the Unity, and the Memory of Polytheism was wearing out of their Minds. But when the Season was come, that the Church could be entrusted with the Great Mystery of the Divine Nature, the Doctrine of the Trinity: And was capable of receiving it, and being founded upon it, without incurring the Danger of dividing the Unity: The Son, who was now incarnate, or become Man, was generally spoken of in relation to the Nature which he had newly assumed; and the Father, whose Supremacy in Order, and whose Paternal Dignity, by no means submitted him to any such Alliance, was spoken of in Terms relating to his Godhead. Whence it is, that the Title, Lord God, is generally given

* Note, Moses and Aaron were the Priests of this Lord Christ, v. 6.
† Laetantius says, Lib. 4. c. 14. (Judaei) nefandas manus Deo suo intulerunt, c. 16. propter hanc humiliatem Deum suum non agnoscentes, &c. c. 18. ut Deum suum condemnarent— in qua (cruce) Deus a cultoribus Dei suspensus est, vid. Lib. 5. c. 9.
him in the New Testament, but without any Design of excluding the Son, whose Right to that Name was sufficiently secured in the Economy of Unity; the Gospel Dispensation being principally careful to distinguish the Persons, and build up its Professors upon a distinct Faith in the ever Blessed Trinity. But notwithstanding, that the Father is most generally meant by the Name Lord God in the New Testament, yet are there other Instances, besides those which I have produced in my first Answer, by which it will appear, that the Son had a Right to the same Name. In Matt. xxvii. 9, 10. there is a Citation out of Zech. xi. which is as follows, And they took the thirty Pieces of Silver, the Price of him that was valued, whom they of the Children of Israel did Value: And gave them for the Potter's Field, as the Lord appointed me. Now, according to Zachary, the Person so valued is Jehovah, or the Lord; for says the Prophet, v. 13. And the Lord (Jehovah) said unto me, cast it unto the Potter; a goodly Price that I was prized at of them. But according to the Evangelist, He is Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ therefore is the Jehovah, or Lord, who was valued. Again, Peter says of Christ, 1 Epist. c. ii. v. 8. That unto them which be disobedient—He is a Stone of Stumbling, and a Rock of Offence Which is cited by St. Paul in the same Sense, Rom. ix. 33. But the Prophet, out of whom it is taken, speaks it of
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of the Lord of Hosts, saying, Sanctifie the Lord of Hosts (Jehovah Tzebaoth) himself— and He shall be for a Sanctuary; but for a Stone of Stumbling, and a Rock of Offence to both Houses of Israel, Isa. viii. 13, 14. If then the Apostles cited these Words according to the Mind of the Prophet, (which cannot be doubted since they were enlightened by the same Spirit) Jesus Christ, to whom the Apostles apply them, is Lord of Hosts. Again, it is written, Rom. x. 13. For whosoever shall Call upon the Name of the Lord, shall be saved. The Lord, whose Name is to be called upon, is Christ: As appears from ver. 11. Whosoever believeth on Him, shall not be ashamed; which Expression is attributed to Christ, c. ix. 33. and 1 Pet. ii. 6. and as appears from the Words, Lord over All, κυριός πάντων, ver. 12. which is the Title of Christ, Acts x. 36. for there is no Appearance of a Change of Person from v. 11. to v. 13. but the Passage in Rom. x. 13. is taken out of Joel ii. 32. where the Lord, whose Name is to be called upon, is Jehovah; the Son therefore is Jehovah; and if He be Jehovah, or Lord, we cannot doubt but He is Elohim, or God. But the Dr. thinks, pag. 123. "That Passages of this sort, out of the Old Testament, if they be understood literally, (in the Manner I cite and apply them,) prove too much "for me," viz. That Christ is God the Father Himself. But this proceeds from the Dr's
Dr's Mistake, who supposes Lord God absolutely used to signify the Father only; whereas it is a common Name to Father and Son, and sometimes signifies the Father, sometimes the Son, as the Matter of the Context determines the Meaning. But he appeals to Acts vii. 30. which he is of Opinion is with other-like Passages of the Old Testament to be understood, " Of the Angel of God's " Presence, speaking in the Name, and " Person, and Authority of the Father; " which, he says, is Stephen's Explication." I suppose the Dr. means, that He spake in the Name, and Person, and Authority of the Father only; for otherwise, if Jehovah Elohim, or Lord God, in which Name the Son speaks of himself, and is spoken of by others, express the Nature, Person, and Authority of the Son, no less than the Nature, Person, and Authority of the Father, the Name Lord God absolutely used is not appropriated to the Father, as the Dr. supposes. It appears then to be this learned Gentleman's Mind, that the Son, or Angel of God's Presence, spake in the Name, and Person, and Authority of the Father only. I shall observe, in Opposition to this, that Stephen delivers himself in such a Manner, as that it cannot be inferred, that the Angel spake in the Name, and Person, and Authority of the Father only. His Words are these, Acts vii. 30. That the Angel of the Lord appeared; and,
That the Voice of the Lord came to him (to Moses) saying, I am the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Which will admit of different Interpretations; for First, If the Angel be the visible Glory manifested to Moses, then the Lord may be the Word actuating that Glory: And the Voice of the Lord, the Voice of the Word, who calls himself, * the God of Abraham, &c. and consequently speaks in his own Name. For Angel, as it signifies one that is sent, in which Sense יְהַלְכָּה is rendered by יְהַלְכוּ in the Targum, Prov. xiii. 17. can never signify the Word, but the visible Glory; because sending, in the proper Sense of the Word, imports a Motion of the Thing sent, from the Person sending, to the Person sent to: But the Word, which is omnipresent, ever with the Father, and ever with the Creature, as supporting it by his Power, can never either be withdrawn from the one, or make nearer Approaches, than He does, to the other; can never move from Place to Place, from one Part of the Creation to another Part of it, without deferting his Work, and suffering it to relapse into its first Nothing. But the visible Glory being finite and circumscribed, may pass like an Angel from Place to Place, and perform the Office of a limited Being. And

* See N. 616. of my first Answer.
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therefore Clem. Alexandrinus says of the Son, in respect of his Divinity, That

He does not pass from Place to Place, but is always every where, and contained no where. Stromat. L. 7. p. 702.

Secondly, If the Angel be the Word it self, as he is the operating Power of the Father in a Personal Subsistence; (for Malach signifies an active operating Being, as appears from Melachah, a Word of the same Radicals signifying Work.) I say, if the Angel be the Word in this Sense, then indeed Jehovah, or the Lord, is the Father; and the Voice of the Lord may be the Voice of the Father speaking thro' the Son in his own Name, yet so as not to exclude the Son (who speaks in the Name of the Father) from speaking at the same time in his own Name, Perfon, and Authority derived from the Father; into which Name, no less than into that of the Father, the Faithful are baptized; that is, when the Angel, or Son, said, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, he spake it of his own Divine Nature, as well as of the Person of the Father, who being both substantially One, tho' personally distinct, are in respect of that

* Πατερὴν ἐν τῷ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, p. 703. Ἰερουσαλὴμ παλαιώ, p. 704. Strom. C. Alex.  † Thus created Angels are called, αἰτιοπάροικοι ἐκδηλησθαυ, Heb. i. 14. as Melachah is rendered by λεγομένα, 1 Chron. xxvi. 30.
substantial Unity, the One God of the Patri-
archs, or of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; con-
cerning which, see N.616. p.76. of my
first Answer. Thirdly, Tho' it be granted,
that Lord signifies the Father in the first Ex-
pression, the Angel of the Lord, ver.30. yet does
it not certainly follow, that it signifies the Fa-
ther in the Second, the Voice of the Lord, v.31.
because the Term Lord signifies the Son as
well as the Father, and is sometimes spoken
of him in so singular a Manner, as to be
by no means applicable to the Person of the
Father. As for Instance, he, who speaks
in the first Person, Zech. xi. is Jehovah, or
the Lord; but this Person says, ver.10. They
shall look upon me, whom they have pierced:
Which belongs to none but to the Son, to
whom it is applied, John xix.34,37. Again,
The Lord, or Jehovah says, Zeck. xi. 13. Cast
it unto the Potter; a goodly Price that I was
prized at of them: But the Son only could be
prized and sold, in respect of his Humanity,
to whom it is applied, Matt. xxvii. 9, 10.
It appears then, from what has been said,
that the Son, when He speaks in the Name
Jehovah, or Lord, does not always speak in
the Name, Person, and Authority of the Father
only; (nay, that sometimes He speaks
entirely in his own Name.) For, if He al-
ways spake in the Name, &c. of the Father,
no Texts could be brought to prove him
Lord God, because Lord God would always
express the Person and Authority of the Father; but it is evident, that Justin, Irenæus, and others, do professedly cite Passages of Scripture to prove the Son to be Lord God: That Title, or Name, then no less expresses, * the Person and Authority of the Son, than of the Father; and, by Consequence, He speaks no less in his own Name, Person, and Authority, when He speaks in the Character of Lord God, than He does in the Name, Person, and Authority of the Father.

Since then the learned Dr. has declared, pag. 124. That the Title Lord God, if it be understood of the Son, as He is the Angel of God’s Presence, speaking in the Name, and Person, and Authority of the Father, proves nothing against him: So, I hope, he will acknowledge, that if Lord God has been proved to belong to the Son, in regard of his own Person and Authority, as well as in regard of the Name, Person, and Authority of the Father, in which he also speaks, it is an Argument against him; except the Dr. be of Opinion, that Jehovah contains in it the Notion of Being according to Scripture, and according to the Sentiments of Jewish and Christian Writers, and that it belongs to the Son in this very Sense, as being himself ὁ ἄρ, He who is Being, or, as He is Consubstantial with the Father, in like Manner as a Son

* Neg; Dominum appellaffent aliquem ex sua Personâ nili Deum Patrem, & Filium eju, Iren. Lib. 3. c. 6.
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is of the Nature and Substance of the Father who begat Him.

As for my Citations out of Justin, Irenæus, and the Synod of Antioch, which the Dr. thinks express his Sense, and not mine, I wish he would have been so just to the Reader, and my self, as to have shewn, wherein they are directly contrary to what I cited them for; which was to shew, that the Son was Lord God, not by being the Person of the Father, for that is a Contradiction; but by being his Son, or by receiving from him his Nature, which is Being it self; and by which He, who receives it, is He who is.

In the Passage which I cited out of Novatian, the Heretics are those, who denied the Divinity of Christ; and, by Consequence, denied him to be Lord and God. The Heretics, in the Passage cited by the Dr. out of the next Chapter, are of a contrary Sort, such, indeed, who acknowledged his Divinity, and therefore confessed him to be Lord and God, but thought * and affirmed Him to be God the Father Himself, or, the very Person of the Father. Now the Dr's Mistake in confounding these two Sorts of Heretics together, might have been avoided if he had considered, that the Beginning of the Eighteenth Chapter, out of which his Citation is taken, is a Transition of the Author from

2 Sed ipsum Deum Patrem promere & putare, c. 18.

Scrip-
Scripture to Authority, in order to convince the first Sort of Heretics, that the Son is God; which he does by arguing from the extravagant Notion, which the second had conceived of Him, in making Him the Father.

DXXXV.

The Dr. under this Number, makes only a short and general Reflection, which does not require an Answer.

DXXXVIII. Acts xx. 28. To Feed the Church of * God, which he hath † purchased with his own Blood.

I had taken no Notice of the Text at all, nor meddled with the various Readings, which the Dr. thinks I should have done; however, I desire the learned Reader to consider Dr. Mill's Note upon the Place, and his Prolegomana, p. 146. col. 2. and to weigh the Number and Importance of the Manuscripts on both Sides, and judge whether that learned Critic had Reason or not to adhere, as he does, to the Modern Reading, and reject that which the Dr. contends for.

*† Non tam parum sanguine suo redemit Deus, nec tam pauper eft Christus, says Pacian, Epift. 3. ad Sempron.
The remaining Difference between us, is about the Explication of the First Part of the Third Chapter of the First Epistle of St. John. And here such strange Consequences are drawn from my Premises, that I cannot but be surprized at them. The Principles which I had laid down for explaining the Place, are, First, That the Father, and the Son, are comprehended under the Name God by St. John; for the Proof of which I bring, John i. 1. The Word was with God, and the Word was God, meaning, that the Term God, in the First Sentence, signifies the Father; in the Second, the Son. Secondly, That therefore this same Apostle may be supposed to use the same Name in other Places, sometimes for the Father, as in the First Sentence; sometimes for the Son, as in the Second Sentence; and sometimes for both together: Which is always to be determined by the Circumstances of the Context. What then does the Dr. gather from these Principles? Why, that according to my Criticism, John i. 1. must be paraphrased thus, The Word was with the Father and Son, and the Word was Father and Son, p. 129. that is, because God sometimes signifies Father and Son together where the Context requires it, according to my Principle; therefore the Dr. will have it signify Father and Son together, where the Context does not require it, contrary to my Principle. Had the Dr. when he cited my Words,
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Words, not omitted this last Sentence, which is always to be determined by the Circumstances of the Context, he could not have fallen into to unfair a Representation. Which yet, he says, with great Assurance, "Is no Misre-" presentation of my Sense, but is my true, "real, and professed Meaning." And why so? Because, says he, "His Design is to "shew, not that the Word God means in "one Part of the Sentence the Son, and in "the other the Father; but that the same "individual Word singly, in one Part of the "Sentence alone, signifies both Father and "Son." But I affirm, with the same Af-"furance, that it was not my Design. My Meaning is plain, that as the Name God re-"peated signifies the Father in one Place, and the Son in the other: So it may be suppos"ed, that the same Name does sometimes signify both Father and Son together without a Re-"petition, which may each of them be sepe"rately referred to in the Context following.

Pag. 130. The Dr. endeavours to bring me to an Absurdity by a Reasoning that is ex-"traordinary: It is this, "Christ is the Na-"tural Son of God, we are Adoptive Sons "of God; if then the Adoptive Sons of God, "are Sons of the Father and Son; Christ, "the Natural Son of God, must be the Son "of the Father, and the Son also." I think I have done no more than barely abridged it, without altering the Reasoning, which,
in a parallel Case is this, Joseph is the Natural Son of Jacob, Ephraim and Manasseh are the Adoptive * Sons of Jacob; if then Ephraim and Manasseh, the Adoptive Sons of Jacob, are the Sons of Jacob and Joseph: Joseph, the Natural Son of Jacob, must be the Son of Jacob and Joseph also. Now is not this a strange Inference to be drawn from so clear Premises? May not Christians be the Sons of Christ, and yet be the Adopted Sons of God the Father, as Ephraim and Manasseh were the Sons of Joseph, and yet the Adopted Sons of Jacob? And must it follow that because they are the Adopted Sons of the Father thro' Christ begetting them, Christ also must be the Natural Son of the Father thro' himself begetting himself, any more, than that because Ephraim and Manasseh are the Adopted Sons of Jacob thro' Joseph begetting them, Joseph also must be the Natural Son of Jacob thro' himself begetting himself? For the Term God, in the Dr's Reasoning, should be understood, according to my Principle, of the Father only, not of the Father and Son together; otherwise it cannot be Sense. Tho' then we are the Adopted Sons of God the Father, yet we are such by being begotten of Christ, who is also our Father; as will appear, First, From the Parallel drawn between the First and Second.

† Genef. xlvii. 5, 6.

Adam,
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Adam, which supposes the Son to be the Head of Mankind in a Spiritual way, as Adam in a Natural. As for Instance, St. Paul says thus, 1 Cor. xv. 47, &c. The First Man is of the Earth, Earthy: The Second Man is the Lord from Heaven. As is the Earthy, such are they also that are Earthy; that is, that are begotten of Adam by Natural Generation. And as is the Heavenly, such are they also that are Heavenly; that is, that are begotten of the Son by Divine Generation. And as we have born the Image of the Earthy, by receiving our Natural Being from Adam; we shall also bear the Image of the Heavenly, by receiving a Spiritual Nature from the Son. And in this respect He is called, The Everlasting Father, or, * The Father of the World to come, Isa. ix. 6. because He Peoples that New State with a Spiritual Progeny, as Adam did the Old One with his Natural Issue. For Procopius says upon the Place,

St. Paul teaches us, * Παρὼνι ο ΠαύλτΩ. how He is also the Father of Eternity; when he says, For as in Adam we all die, even so in Christ shall we all be made alive.

* Παλδς η μίλλονε η αίνων. MS. Alex.

Secondly,
Secondly, It will appear that Christ is our Father from the following Words used of the Son, Heb. ii. 13. *I, and the Children which God hath given me.* Upon which Chrysostom has this Remark.

"Αμεσάντων ὁ Θεός ἤλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα τὰς ἐναντίον, ἀνερρέειν.

That is, as He is our Brother in respect of his Flesh, and our being the Adopted Sons of God the Father; so is He our Father in respect of his regenerating us into Children.

Thirdly, From the following Authorities; Irenæus says,


Clem. Alexandrinus says,


The Word of God is the Father of Man-kind: As Moses hath shown, saying, Is not He thy Father that hath bought thee, and hath made thee, and created thee?

The Word is all things to the Infant, He is Father, and Mother, and Instructor, and Nourisher.
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And Origen says,

I have said, ye are Gods: And all of you are Children of the most High (Psal. Ixxxii. 6.)
or of his Christ.

Philo speaks of the Word after the same Manner,

Professing one and the same Father, not a Mortal one; but the Immortal Man of God, who being the Word of the Eternal one, is himself also necessarily incorruptible—honouring one Father, right Reason, or the Word;

Which is opposed to the Worship of many Gods, or Authors of the Soul. For, indeed, if Adam was at first made by the *Father and the †Son together, in their Image and Likeness, as it is said, Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness, Gen. i. 26. Shall we not say that He is regenerated also by the same Father and Son, into the same Image and Likeness? But the learned Dr. has one Absurdity more, as he thinks, to charge me with.

I had used this Expression, pag. 56. When the One God shall appear in the Person of the Son; which the Dr. Paraphrases thus, p. 130. "When the Father and the Son shall appear " in the Person of the Son." As I suppose, because the Term God is understood of both Persons at the Beginning of the Verse. But he should have considered, as I have observed before, that where a Name signifies sometimes a Plurality of Persons together, and sometimes One of them singly by himself, as the Term God does, it may be applied either to One Person singly, or to more, or to all of them together, according to the different Circumstances of the Matter discoursed of. Which is the Case before us; for in the Words, now are we the Sons of God, the Term God signifies the Father and the Son, who are unitedly called God, and each of them singly: But in the following Sentence, when He shall appear, the Pronoun He refers to God, not as it stands for the Father and the Son together, but as it stands for the Son, who is comprehended in the Name God, and is himself God; so that the Meaning is, when God the Son shall appear, (who is comprehended in the General Name God, and is singly called God,) we shall be like Him. But let the Dr.'s Paraphrase stand, when the Father and the Son shall appear in the Person of the Son; I must own I can see no Absurdity in it. For it is certain, that the Father is seen (which means
means the same with appear, or manifested, in the Person of the Son, according to Christ's own Words, If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: And from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him—He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, John xiv. 7. 9.

And Irenæus says,

By the Son therefore, who has the Father in himself, He who is, is manifested, or appears to be God: Or He, who is God, is manifested, or appears.

And it is as certain that the Son appears, or is manifested in his own Person; which it is no less proper to say, than that Absalom went to Battle in his own Person, 2 Sam. xvii. 11. And therefore there can be no Absurdity in saying, That the Father and Son are manifested, or appear in the Person of the Son; because as the Father does appear in the Person of the Son, and the Son appears in his own Person, so may neither of them appear in his own Person, but in the Person of the Holy Ghost. Thus far in Answer to the Dr's Objections. I proceed now to establish my Comment. Origen refers the Words, ver. 2. when He shall appear, to God (ἴδιος) in the same Verse, as I do; but understands it of the Father: Whereas, I understand it of the
The Son comprehended in the Word (Θεὸς) God; for to Him ὅπειρα more strictly and properly belongs, according to ver. 5, 8.

Didymus Alexand. reads the latter Part of the Second Verse thus:

For when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, who begat.

Upon which Words he has the following Comment.

We shall be like the Father and the Son by partaking of the Trinity.

Where He, who begat, is explained by Father and Son: But He, who begat, is God; for we are called the Children of God, ver. 1, 2. God therefore who begat, and to whom we shall be like, is, according to this Author, both Father and Son; which he founds upon their being One. Austin explains the following Words, 1 John ii. 29. is Born of Him, thus, of God, of Christ; meaning either that every righteous Person is Born of the Father, and of the Son: Or, of God the Son. If he means the Father and the Son together, then the God, in the Two next Verses at the Beginning of the Third Chapter, whose Sons we are called and are, is Father and Son. If he means God the Son, then is the God, whose Sons we are, God the Son. And the Term God, is the Noun
Noun referred to in either of these Senses by the Pronouns following. And accordingly St Austin explains Him, whom the World knew not, ver. 1. And Him, whom we shall be like, when He shall appear, ver. 2. to be the Son; as the Reader may find by consulting his Comment on the Place, Tom. 9. Tract. 4. And this Manner of interpreting, is agreeable to other Drs of the Christian Church, who comprehend both Father and Son, under the same individual Word, God. Thus Irenæus makes the God of the Living, to be Father and Son together; for, says he,

"Christ therefore with the Father is the God of the Living, who spake to Moses, and was manifested to the Fathers."

Again, Lib. 3. c. 6. he affirms the God, who standeth in the Congregation of the Mighty, Psal. lxxxii. 1. to be the Father and the Son.

The Holy Ghost, says De Patre & Filio he, means it of the Father, and the Son.

And yet he applies the Term God to the Son only in the next Sentence, saying,

"Which (Congregation) God, that is, the Son, hath gathered by himself."
So the One, and the same Jehovah, who speaks Exod. iii. is affirmed, now to be the Father, now to be the Son, by this same Dr. in this very Chapter; which depends upon the Father's being in the Son, and the Son in the Father, and the Father's being manifested in the Son, as he speaks. So that it is strange, that the learned Dr. Grabe, who was so well acquainted with this Father's Style, should be surprized at it, as he seems to be, pag. 208. not 7. In like manner Clem. Alexandrinus and Tertullian, include the Father and the Son in the One God, and the Only God, pag. 7. and 26. of my first Answer, with others cited, N. 3, 5. From all which Considerations, I trust, I have no Reason to be ashamed of my Scripture Interpretation under this Article.

DXLVI.

No Objection is made by the Dr. to any thing I have said under this Text; in which if we both agree, it is strange we should so much differ in other Places.

DLXXX. John v. 18. But said also, that God was his Father (his own proper * Father) making himself equal with God.

* Nāšeq ʻAšer.
The first Objection the Dr. makes to my Reasoning upon this Text, is by way of Interrogation and Surprize, p. 34. "Is not this, " says he, now a wonderful Flight of Imagination, to conceive that the Affirmative " ought always to be supposed, till the Negative appears?" Whether the Affirmative ought always to be supposed, is not the Matter of Dispute between us; but whether it ought not to be supposed in the Case before us. It appears from Scripture, that the Persons who generally troubled our Saviour, and opposed his Ministry, were the Chief Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees, and others of the Learned in the Sacred Writings, according to the Customary Interpretations of those Times. The Bulk of the People were generally his Friends, and screened him with their Numbers. Of this learned Sort were the Jews in the Text, whom our Saviour talked with, as may reasonably be supposed from the following Observations: They were Men in Authority, who reproved the Man, who was made whole, for carrying his Bed on the Sabbath-day, ver. 10. who examined him about the Person who made him whole, ver. 12. who took his Information, when he had discovered it was Jesus, who wrought the Cure, ver. 15. who fought in Consequence of that Information to put him to Death, ver. 16. who were of the Number of those who sent to John, ver. 33. that is, who
who sent Priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask John, Who art thou? And why doest thou baptize? c. i. v. 19, 25. And who were therefore probably of the Great Sanhedrin. To whom our Saviour recommended the Searching of the Scriptures, ver. 39. as being those who were principally entrusted with the Oracles of God; not that they were unacquainted with the Scriptures, for they held them to be the Rule conducting them to Life: But that they might correct their Notions, and have just Sentiments of the first Appearance of their expected Messiah, and believe Moses according to the Meaning he delivered his Writings in, and not in the Sense imposed upon them by the Rabbins, or the later Drs, ver. 46, 47. Now is it any more strange that Persons of this Condition and Order should be supposed to understand the Scriptures committed to their Care, in its true Meaning, in certain Particulars, where there is no Evidence they made a Mistake: than that any learned Dr. of the Christian Church, whose Business and Duty it is to study and understand, so far as he is able, the Sacred Writings, and to instruct others, should be supposed to understand them in their true Meaning in Articles of Importance, till the contrary appears by his Doctrines and Writings? The Learned among the Jews were certainly divided into different Sects in the Time of our Saviour;
viour: Yet it does not appear that they had wrong Notions of the Person of the Word considered abstractedly from the Son of David; or, if some of them had, that the Mistake was general among all the Learned, as is evident from the Targums of Jonathan and Onkelos, which are supposed to be, the former a little older, the latter a little later, than the Time of Christ. And as appears from Philo the Jew, and from the Style of St. John, in his Gospel and First Epistle: And of St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews; where they do not labour to prove, that there is such a Person as the Word, or Son of God existing from the Beginning, for that they rather suppose, or affirm, as a Thing already known to the Persons they wrote to, but shew that this Divine Person became Man in Jesus Christ, who was the Son of David. The Dr. proceeds, "That every Man ought to be supposed to know every thing, till the contrary appears." That is, because the learned Drs. among the Jews, whose Business it was to study and know the Scriptures, are supposed to have understood them in certain Passages, where it is not recorded that they erred: Therefore every Man ought to be supposed to know every thing, which he is under no Obligation of knowing by his Business, or Profession. The Dr. further supposes, "That according to my Reasoning, the
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"Jews must be conceived to have understood clearly every thing that was hinted in the Old Testament, even in the obscurest Prophecies, concerning the Greatness and Dignity of the Person of our Saviour." That is, because the Jews, the Learned at least among them, are supposed to have understood the plain Letter of Scripture according to its easy, obvious, and literal Sense, (for the Passages I cited in my first Answer relating to Wisdom, or the Son, or a Second Person, are sufficiently plain; and it is evident from the above cited Authorities, and from Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and Baruch, that the Learned Jews had a Notion of the Word, or Wisdom, as a Person:) Therefore the Dr. will have it follow, that the Jews must have understood also the obscurest Prophecies concerning the Greatness and Dignity of the Messiah; which yet might have been believed in some Degree of the Learned Part of them, if the History of their Behaviour in relation to the Messiah recorded in the Gospels, if the Testimony of the Apostles in other Places, and the present Circumstances of that unhappy People, argued not the contrary: So that in this Case the contrary is made to appear, which is my Exception to any such supposed Knowledge, p. 61. Since then, according to this Exception, the Jews cannot be supposed to have had a perfect Knowledge of Christ's Spiritual Kingdom, because
of the Trinity Continued. 165

cause the contrary appears from History and Observation: To what Purpose is an Argument drawn from the Ignorance of the Apostles to the Ignorance of the Jews, when the Ignorance of the Jews is so clearly supposed, as to the Kingdom of Christ, in that which I have written? I hope then nothing yet appears to determine the Reader to believe that my Reasonings on this Text are the Effects of an indulged, or extraordinary Imagination, but the Words of Truth and Soberness. And in order to prove this further, I will shew, First, That the learned Jews about, or near our Saviour's Time, had a Notion that there was a Divine Person subsisting with the Father, and operating with him from the Beginning of the World. Philo says,

That the Word of God is the Instrument, by which (the World) was made.

That God made the Universe by his Word.

That the Divine Word is the Pilot and Governour of the Universe.

* John i. 3. Coloss. i. 16. Heb. i. 2.  † The Son upholds all things by the Word of his Power. Heb. i. 3.
Secondly, That this Divine Person, or the Word, was the First begotten Son of God; for so he is called by Philo.

The right Word of God his First begotten Son.

And again, The Eldest Son of God, whom he names elsewhere his First begotten.

Thirdly, That He was the Son of God after a particular Manner, that distinguished Him from all others; for says Philo,

"Oute ἄγεννθες ἢς (The Word) is neither unbegotten as God ἢς ἡμεῖς. Quis rer. is, nor made as we divin. Haer. p. 509. are.

And this Notion of the Præ-existence of the Word before the World, He tells us is Moses's; Moses's γάς ὤν τὸ For this is Moses's Doctrine, and not DeMundiOpific. p.5. mine.

Which if it be true, (and the ancient Christians were of the same Mind, that it was Moses his Sentiment) can it be thought that Philo was the only few among the learned that had a right Understanding of the
Mind of Moses? Or, that retained the Tradition, about our Saviour's Time, that the World was created by the Word of God? It must indeed be owned, that Philo says nothing of the Equality of the Son; but then he considers him generally either as the Archetypal World, or in some lower Characters expressing his relation to the Creature He made. In which Views, it is no wonder that He speaks of the Word as inferior to the Father. That the Targumists also had a Notion of the Subsistence of the Word with God as a distinct Person from him, will appear from several Passages, that agree with Philo and Christian Writers. The Targum of Jonathan says, That God stretched out the Heavens by His Word, Isa. xliv. 24, and made the Earth by His Word, c. xlv. 12. Which is Philo's Notion, Lib. de Cherub. p. 129. de Sacrif. p. 131. And is the Christian Doctrine, John i. 3. Col. i. 16. Heb. i. 2, ut sup. The Targum of Onkelos Paraphrases Jacob's Vow thus, If the Word of the Lord will be my Help, &c. Then shall the Word of the Lord be my God, Gen. xxviii. 20, 21. which agrees with Wisd. x. 10. which says, When the Righteous (meaning Jacob) fled from his Brother's Wrath, she (Wisdom the only begotten Spirit, c. vii. v. 22. or the Word) guided him in right Paths, &c. And with Philo, who makes God to appear to Jacob at Bethel in his Word; which Word he calls God,
The True Scripture Doctrine

* God, p. 599, 600. de Som. and † Lord, p. 101. Lib. 2. Leg. Allæg. and with St. John, who says, *The Word was God,* c. i. 1. See also Irenæus, Lib. iv. c. 23. The Targum of Jonathan says, in the Person of God, *I redeemed them* (the Israelites) *by my Word,* on the 15th Day of the Month Nifan, Hos. iii. 2. which agrees withWisd. xviii. 15, 16. Thine Almighty Word leapt down from Heaven out of thy Royal Throne—and—filled all things with Death. Onkelos Paraphrases, Exod. xxx. 6. thus, *Before the Mercy-Seat,* that is over the Testimony, where *I will cause my Word to meet with Thee.* Which falls in with the Style of Philo, who Places the *Word as || Charioteer above the ** two Cherubims,* or God’s creating and governing Powers; And of Irenæus, who says,

"Ο Φ' απεκλείαν τεχ- The Word the Cre-

νικαν λόγα, δ καθα- ator of all things,

μετ' Ελλι ή τ' χερεμί μ. who sitteth above the

Lib. 3. c. 11. p. 221. Cherubim.

Lastly, The latter Part of v. 23. of the 29th Chapter of Jeremiah, is expressed thus in the Targum of Jonathan, *It is manifest before me,* and *my Word is a Witness,* saith the Lord: *Where there are two Persons, the Lord before whom it is manifest; and his Word, that is a

---


Witness.
Witness. With which agrees the Style of St. John, who calls the Word, or Son, The faithful and true Witness, Rev. iii. 14. If then the learned Jews about, or near our Saviour's Time, had a Notion, as appears, of a Divine Person subsisting and operating with the Father from the Beginning of the World, and Jesus Christ speaks in a Style becoming this Divine Person, when he says, v. 17. My Father worketh hitherto, and I work; I think it is reasonable to conclude, that the Jews understood him to take upon him the Character of this Divine Person. Which they might the more readily do, because there was an Opinion among them, that their Messiah was to be more than a bare Man, or the Son of David; for say they, John vii. 27. When Christ cometh, no Man knoweth whence He is: Which must relate to a * superior Nature born from † above; because otherwise it is certain they knew whence He was, or of what Family He was to be born according to the Flesh, as appears from v. 42. Now as there is nothing in all this that tends to confound the Son with the Father, or is inconsistent with the Context following that refers all to the Father; so let the Reader compare it with the Dr's Explanation, and see which of the two comes up nearest to the Letter of Scripture, and the Sense of Antiquity.

* Vide. Theoph. in Loc. † See c. 3. 8.
As for Novatian, it will be necessary to consider in what respects he accounts the Father and Son unequal, that we may the better Judge in what respect he held them to be equal. Now it is certain, that he denies an Equality between the Father and the Son in the following Respects; that is, the Son is not equal to the Father on Account of his being Innate: For if He were, there would be two independent Principles, and, by Consequence, two Gods. That He is not equal to the Father, on Account of his being the Father; for then there would be two Fathers, and, by Consequence, two Gods. That He is not invisible, or incomprehensible as the Father, or any thing of that which is proper to the Father, for then there must have been two Invisibles and Incomprehensibles, and two Gods; that is, He is not the first.

Note, The Son is Invisible and Incomprehensible Person manifested by his Word as the Father is; for then He must have
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had a Word, or Second Person also to have manifested him to the World: Which would have made him a First Person, and have introduced two First Persons, or Fathers, and consequently two independent Principles, or Gods; but, says this Author, whatsoever He is, He is not of Himself, because He is not Innate, c. 31. Where it is evident, that the Inequality lies in the Son's not being unbegotten, not being the First Divine Person, not being the Father. Which is the Purport also of the Passage taken out of c. 17. But this does not infer, that He may not be equal to the Father in the Divine Nature so far as it is communicable to the Son; or, that this Author, who held him unequal in the foregoing Respects, might not believe and affirm him to be equal in others. I say then, that both the Dr's Citations and mine may be equally true without a Contradiction: As for Instance, the Passage I cited, p. 62. is this;

Whose
Cujus sic Divinitas traditur, ut non aut dissonantia aut inaequalitate Divinitatis duos Deos reddidisse videatur. *De Trin.* c. 31.

The true Meaning of which will be best found out by considering the Importance of dissonantia and inaequalitate. The Terms *dissonantia Divinitatis*, relate to that Difference, or Disagreement of Godhead that arises from the Supposition of the Father and the Son's being two *Innate*, *Independent*, and *Co-ordinate* Gods. Which Novatian explains before by *discordiam Divinitatis* thus;

*Dum non aliunde* *While He* (the Son) *eft quam ex Patre,* *has no other Origin than patri suo originem suam debens,* *from the Father,* *Discordiam Divinitatis de numero duorum Deorum facerenon potuit.* *He could not make a Difference or Disagreement of Godhead by introducing the Number of two Gods,*

c. 31.

That is, of two *Innate and Independent* Gods. And therefore opposes this Branch of the Sentence to those, who, by exalting the Son into the State of the Father, do, in effect, make of two Persons, *two Fathers*, *or unoriginated Beings*. The other Part of the Sentence *inaequalitate Divinitatis*, is spoken probably
bably in Opposition to a contrary Sort of People, who, by depressing the Son into a
meer Man, make him a God in no other respect than in Title and Authority. So that
Novatian's Meaning seems to be this, that
the Divinity of the Son is taught in such
Terms, as that neither two distinct, inde-
pendent, and jarring Deities are introduced
by making the Son, in all respects, equal to
the Father: Nor yet, on the other Side, are
two distinct and unequal Gods introduced
by holding an Inequality of Nature and God-
head among them; that is, they are as
equal in Nature, as the Communication of
the Substance of the Father to the Son can
possibibly make them, but are not equal in
Person, or in what is properly Personal.
Which is well expressed by Hilary, as if he
had commented upon the Text of Novatian,
saying of the Son,

That He is not equal
to Him, who is unbe-
gotten, by being him-
self unbegotten: But
that He is by means of
his Birth the only be-
gotten (Son,) who is
not unequal.

In which Words, as the Context shews,
he denies his Equality in relation to the Man-
ner of his having his Subsistence, or in re-
lation to that which is properly Personal:

But
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But owns his Equality, or denies his Inequality in relation to his Nature. And he says again, to the same Purpose,

Patri ingenito nihil That nothing is to be compared with the unbegotten Father: That compared with the unbegotten Father: That not withstanding that, the only begotten (Son) is not to be distinguished from him either in Duration, or Power.

Which will explain the following Expression of Novatian, *Numquam se Deo Patri aut comparavit aut contulit*, He never compared himself with God the Father, that is, He never compared himself with the Father by pretending to be unbegotten; for it follows, *Memor se esse ex suo Patre*, Remembrance He was from his Father, that is, that He was begotten, and not unbegotten, c. 17.

DXCI.

The learned Dr. says, p. 142. "That I seem some way or other to have misunderstood his Words." And he professes, p. 143. to understand not mine at all: So that this Article must continue in the State it is in, for such as can understand us.

DXCIV. John x. 30. I and my Father are One.

DCXV.
DXCV. John x. 33. That thou being a Man, makest thyself God.

I understand these Texts of an Unity of Nature: The learned Dr. says, I do not declare what I mean by Unity of Nature. I think the Context shews I meant Unity of Substance: For Phavorinus tells us,

It is a very usual thing to express Substance by Nature, especially among the Christian Doctors.

If he asks me further, what Sort of Unity it is? The Blessed Persons, who subsist in it, only know that. All, that we can say, is in a Negative way; that the Divine Substance is capable of no Division; that being communicated to the Son by Generation, and to the Holy Ghost by Procession, it remains undivided, notwithstanding it is communicated; that what is incapable of Division, is an individual; that the Divine Substance, incapable of Division, is an individual Substance; that therefore the Divine Substance communicated from the Father to the Son, and thro' the Son to the Spirit, is an individual Substance, and consequently One. When therefore, I say, Je-
hovah our God, Jehovah is One, I mean, One God, or, an individual Divine Substance; not One Person, which the Dr. thinks to be the Mind of Scripture; concerning which, see N. 1, 2. As for what I mean, when I include Father and Son under the One True God, see N. 5. and that I do not reduce Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to One Person only, when I understand Rom. xi. 36. to belong to them, see N. 372. and that I do not hold such an Equality between the Father and the Son, as to make them two unoriginated, independent Beings; but that, I confess, the Father to be First, unoriginated, and Father; and the Son to be Second, originated, and Son; and notwithstanding this, that they are equal in Nature, that is, so far equal as it is possible for them to be by a Communication of the Substance of the Father to the Son, is evident from the whole Design of my Writings. The Arguments used from Scripture and Authority were plainly to shew, that the Father and the Son are substantially One; which if those Arguments proved them to be, it follows that there is no reason to exclude such an Unity of Substance out of the Meaning of the Words, I and my Father are One, &c. especially since such a Sense is not contradictory to the Context, but rather confirmed by it. The first Argument is taken as from other Divine Names, so especially from Jehovah, which expresses
expresses God as He is Being, or He who is, according to both Jewish and Christian Writers; see N. 534. which * is appropriated to the True God, Exod. iii. 15. Psal. lxxxiii. 18. and represents One God, or One Divine Intelligent Being only, Deut. vi. 4. and yet is given to the Son; the Consequence of which is, that He is One with that One and True God, who is Being. In Answer to this, the Dr. refers to N. 24. of his Reply; which, if the Reader pleases, he may compare with what I say here, and have said in my first Answer, N. 591. and in this present Answer, N. 534. The second Argument to prove the Unity of Father and Son in Substance and Godhead, is taken from Authority; whether the Dr’s general Remarks upon the Passages I cited prove them insufficient for this End, let the Reader judge. Since they speak so plain, and nothing in particular is alleged against them, a further Explanation of them would prove needless. In Consequence of these Arguments from Scripture and Authority, the Passages in dispute are to be interpreted thus, I and my Father are One, that is, One in Substance, and consequently, One in Power: So that none can pluck my Sheep out of my Hands. Upon

* Our
our Saviour's using these Words, the Jews took up Stones to stone him; and give this Reason for so doing, Because thou being a Man makest thy self God, that is, because He, by affirming himself to be the Son of God in a proper Sense, (see John v. 18. compared with Rom. viii. 32.) declared himself to be of the same Substance with the Father, and therefore of the same Power with him, and by Consequence God: As the Son of a Man is of the same Substance with his Father, and is therefore Man. To this Accusation our Saviour Answers, not by denying that He is God; which was the Consequence they drew from his affirming himself to be the Son who was One with the Father: But by justifying the Premise, or his being the Son, and consequently by confirming the Conclusion they drew from it, that He made himself God, or God the Son. For, says he, if He called them Gods (in an improper Sense, as being the Images, or Representations of God the Word,) unto whom the Word of God came, (who were invested with Divine Authority, and were renewed by receiving the Light, Truth, and quickening Power of God the Word thro' Moses and the Prophets) and the Scripture cannot be broken: Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, (whose Humanity the Father hath sanctified by uniting it to the very Word it self, John i. 14. whence others derive their Divine Virtue, and which
which is it self God, John i. 1.) and sent into the World, (abroad into the World, or to all the Jews in the Land of Promise, c. xii. 19. to preach to them Repentance and Remission of Sins,) Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God? That is, the Word, which is the proper Son of God; One with him in Substance, and himself God. By which He confirmed the Inference drawn by the Jews, that He made himself God, or professed himself indirectly to be God the Word. This I take to be the genuine and most natural Meaning of the Words, and agreeable to the Sentiments, so far as appears, of the learned Jews of that Age; who, as I have shewn N. 580. had the Knowledge, at least some of them, of a Second Divine Person besides the Father, and believed that their Messiah was to be more than a mere Man.

As for the learned Dr's Interpretation, it infers no more from the following Words, I and my Father are One, than an Unity in Power, p. 146. which might probably be true, did it not appear from Scripture, that the Son was God the Word, consubstantial with the Father: And that the Unity in Power is founded upon an Unity in Nature. He says, that when the Jews charged Christ with making himself God, they meant no more than that He assumed to himself the Power and Authority of God, p. 147, 136. And the like is replied to the learned Author.
of Some Considerations, &c. p. 254. Which also might probably be true, were it not already proved, N. 580. that the Jews had a Notion of a Divine Person, whom they called the Word, and God, subsisting with the Father before the World; whose Person and Character they probably conceived was assumed by our Saviour, when He said, I and my Father are One: And did it not appear they were of Opinion, that their expected Messiah was to be more than Man, or to enjoy a Nature superior to that which was to be derived to him from David. As for the other Instances in which they accused our Saviour of Blasphemy, and which are cited by the Dr. p. 149, 150. it is not necessary they should all be parallel to the Case before us. Sometimes He might barely affirm himself to be the Christ, or King of the Jews: And leave it to such of them to infer his Godhead, who knew that the Messiah was to be more than Man, as Matt. xxvii. 11. Sometimes He might represent himself as the Son of the Father, co-operating with him from the Beginning of the World, and one with him in Nature and Power, as He does in the Text before us, and c. v. 17. At other times He might shew his * Godhead by for-

---

* * * | Si enim nemo potest remittere peccata, nisi Solus Deus; remitteret autem hic Dominus, & curabat homines; manifestum est quoniam ipse erat verbum Dei—ut—tangam

---

Dr. p. 254.
f forgiving Sins, and strengthen that Evidence with an Act of Healing, as Mark ii. 5,10,11,12. And on other Occasions He might declare himself that Person, or the Lord of David, who was to sit at the right Hand of God, Psal. cx. 1. the Dew of whose Birth is of the Womb of the Morning, v. 3. and who is the Son of Man who should come with ** the Clouds of Heaven, Dan. vii. 13. as he does, Matt. xxvi. 64. & xxii. 43, 44, 45. All which different Representations, or Manners of discovering himself to the Jewish Nation, might be the Ground of different Accusations; some, that He made himself God, or God the Word; others, that He assumed to himself a Power, that He had no claim to. So that nothing can be inferred from the Matter of one Accusation to that of another, which must needs vary, as the Degrees of Evidence were greater or less, that He was pleased to give them of the Dignity of his Person.

Pag. 152. The Dr. gives us a large Collection of Scripture Passages; which, so far as they relate to the Union of the Father and the Word, are of the same Import with, I and my Father are One, or express an Unity in Substance. So far as they relate to the

Presence of the Father with the Humanity of the Son thro' the Word, are of less Import; it being impossible that the Humanity should be One with the Father like the Word, or of one Substance with Him. And so far as they relate to the Presence of the Father, and of the Word with the Church, are still of less Importance than the two foregoing; since the Father is manifested primarily, and most eminently in the Humanity of the Son, and secondarily in the Church: And the Union of the Word, with the human Nature in the Person of Christ, is more strict and close, than with any Member of the Mystical Body.

Had the learned Dr. told us for what End he brought the two Passages out of Tertullian and Novatian under these Articles, something might have been said to them: However, this is certain, they held a greater Union between Father and Son than of bare Likeness, Agreement, and Love, namely, an Unity of Substance, or a Communion of Substance, as appears from the Citations in my first Answer, p. 68, 69. but without a Confusion of Persons.

Dxcvii. John xii. 41. These things said Isaiah, when he saw his Glory, and spake of Him.

The first Objection the Dr. makes to my Reasoning, besides that of Remoteness and
and Obscurity, is in relation to our Baptism into the Name of the Son. " As if, says he, " being baptized into the Name of Christ, " was not being baptized into the Profes-
" sion of his Religion, but into the Name " it self taken (as they speak) technically, " materially, or cabbalistically." I think a Name technically, or materially taken, is nothing else, if it be pronounced, but an articulate Sound: Or, if it be written, but a Set of Letters; and none can be supposed to be so absurd as to imagine, that when we are baptized into the Name of Father and Son, we are baptized into a Sound, or into a Set of Letters. Secondly, Name in Scripture signifies * Power: As Acts iv. 7. where the Sanhedrin ask the Apostles, By what Power, or by what Name have ye done this? To which Peter Answers, v. 10. That by the Name of Jesus Christ—doth this Man stand here before you whole. And adds, v. 12. For there is none other Name under Heaven given among Men, whereby we must be saved: Making it a Principle of Salvation both to Body and Soul in them who believe. And, c. 3. v. 16. he says, And his Name, thro' Faith in his Name, hath made this Man strong, that is, his Power hath done it; for a bare Sound, or bare Letters, could not effect this Cure. Now in this Sense do I conceive, that we are bap-

* See the Dr's Answer, p. 161.
tized into the Name of the Father, and of the Son; That is, into the healing and regenerating * Power of the Father and the Son, as well as into the Profession of the Gospel. Which Power of the Son is as distinct from the Power of the Father in the Regeneration of Baptism, as the Name of the Son is distinct from the Name of the Father in the Form made use of on that Occasion; and consequently, the Son does not act in the Name, or Power of the Father only, but in his own distinct and proper Name, or Power, derived from the Father. And therefore, the Power of the Son is represented as a joynt Principle of Salvation to us with the Power of the Father. I had said, p. 73. That two Persons are represented by one † Glory, or Appearance: The Dr. says, "This is not the Case; but, on the contrary, one Person is the Glory, or Representation of another, the Visible representing the Invisible, p. 157." It is true indeed, that the Son is the Brightness of the Glory, Heb. i. 3, and the Image of the Invisible God, Col. i. 15, and yet it is certain, that the Glory upon the Throne was a visible Representation of

* Thus, Gal. iii. 27, it is said, As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ; that is, have received thro' Baptism the Grace and Virtue of Christ. And Rom. vi. 3. To be baptized into Christ's Death, is to receive thro' Baptism the Benefits of his Death, by which we die to Sin, as He died upon the Cross. † See Chrysof. upon the Place; and p. 122. of my first Answer.
both Persons, of the Father, and of the Son; sometimes of the Father distinct from the Representation given of the Son, as Rev. iv. 3, 5, 1. where the Glory upon the Throne represents the Father as distinguished from the Lamb, or Representation of the Son upon the same Throne, v. 6. which Lamb took the Book out of the right Hand of him that sat upon the Throne, or, out of the right Hand of the Father, v. 7. as a Person representatively distinguished from him. To both which Persons, Honour and Glory are unitedly offered under their distinct Representations by the whole Creation, as v. 13. Blessing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. The like may be said of Dan. vii. 9, 13. Acts vii. 55. Sometimes the Glory was a Representation of the Son, or of God the Word, who is allowed by all Antiquity to be manifested in the Glory sitting upon the Throne. And in the Text before us, or in Isa. vi. it is a Representation of the Father, as appears by comparing v. 3. with Rev. iv. 8, which belongs to the Father; and of the Son, John xii. 41. that is, when there is no other Appearance of a Divine Person besides the Glory sitting upon the Throne, this is a Representation of Father and Son together, tho' with a special Relation to the Son on Account of his future Incarnation; but if there be a distinct Appearance
pearance of the Son, then is it a Representation of the Father exclusive of the Person of the Son, as in the Texts before cited; the united Representation expressing the Unity of Nature: The different Appearances, or Representations, the Difference of Persons. Pag. 157. the Dr. says, "If a Person be not " an intelligent Agent, and an intelligent " Agent an individual intelligent Being— " will your Friend tell us what a Person, in " his Sense, is." The Dr's Definition of a Person, in relation to the Creatures, is good, if it be extended no further. Among these every Person is an individual intelligent Being, and every individual intelligent Being is a Person. But the great Mistake is in arguing from the Creature to the Creator: In comprehending things Divine and Human under the same Conceptions; whereas their Natures are different, and the Persons subsisting in those different Natures, are to be spoken of, and represented after different Manners. The Notion of Person, in relation to the Creature, is taken from Observation, and sensible Experience; the Notion of Person, in relation to God, is taken from Revelation; the Excellency of his Nature being otherwise too great to be subject to the Discoveries of the largest Understandings. As then Observation, and the general Sense of Mankind founded thereupon, is appealed to for the Meaning of the Word Person when spoken
spoken of the *Creature*: So Divine Revelation, and the general Sense of the Church founded thereupon from the very Beginning, is to be appealed to for the Meaning of the Word *Person*, when spoken of *God*. I say then, that according to Scripture, and the general Sense of the Church founded thereupon from the very Beginning, there is *one God*, or, *one *Divine Substance manifested to the World in *three Subsistences*: So that, *First*, every Divine Person is an *individual intelligent Being*, but the Divine intelligent Being, which is individually, or undividedly one, is not one Person only; which is the first Difference between Human and Divine Persons. As for Instance, the Father and the Son are each of them an individual intelligent Being, as subsisting in the Divine Nature or Substance; the Father originally, the Son derivatively. But this Divine Substance being in Father and Son without Division, and being separate and distinct in Existence and Perfections from all other Substances, and compleatly perfect, is an individual intelligent Being; but more than one Person, as comprehending in it more. *Secondly*, Tho' each Divine Person is an individual intelligent Being, yet are they not three Beings separate and divided from each other; but

**See N. 1. where some Places proving this Doctrine are referred to.**
one undivided, or individual Being: Which is the Second Difference between Human and Divine Persons. Three Persons among Men, are three Beings separate and divided from each other: But the Divine Substance being communicated by the Father after different Manners to the Son and Holy Ghost without Division, remains one undivided, or individual Substance, or Being. So that each Person by himself, is in one respect an individual intelligent Being, and in another respect all three together are but one individual intelligent Being. The Father as not divided, or divisible, into two Fathers: The Son, into two Sons: The Holy Ghost, into two Holy Ghosts, remain each of them an individual intelligent Being; but as subsisting in one indivisible Substance, or individual Being, in this respect, they are all together but one individual, or undivided intelligent Being: Which is no Contradiction, because the Respects are different. Thirdly, Hence it appears, that a Divine Person is an individual intelligent Being, inseparably and substantially united with other Divine Persons, in one indivisible Substance, or Being: So that a Human and Divine Person cannot be comprehended under the same Notion. But the Dr. says, in his Answer to the learned Author of Some Considerations, &c. p. 237. "That if the Word "God, which always signifies an intelligent and "powerful
"powerful Agent, signified the Divine Nature, or the whole three Persons, who are each of them intelligent Agents; it would follow unavoidably, that the Divine Nature was a fourth intelligent Agent, distinct from, and constituted of, those three intelligent Agents." In An-
swer to which, I observe, First, That the Divine Nature, or Substance, being in three Persons without Division, remains in that respect one. Secondly, That this one, or un-
divided Divine Substance being Intelligent and Agent in the three Divine Persons, is therefore one intelligent Agent, or, one intelli-
gent and active Substance, or Being. Thirdly, That this one Divine Substance, which ex-
ists in, and is Intelligent and Agent in those three Divine Persons, is not a fourth intelli-
gent Agent distinct from those three Persons; be-
cause it does not exist out of those three Persons, but in them only.

The Meaning of the Passage cited by the Dr. out of Justin Martyr, and put in the Margin, p. 158. is this, that the Son is not a meer Power of the Father, without any Personal Subsistence of his own, which ope-
rates, or rests as the Father pleases, (which was the Sentiment of those whom he there finds Fault with;) but that He is a real Person distinct from the Father. For, says he, in the very next Passage to that, which is first cited by the Dr.
But this interferes with nothing that I say, who own him to be a distinct Person from the Father, and to subsist for ever in a distinct Person: And not to be a mere Power of the Father, or a temporary and transitory Manifestation of his Power. Pag. 159. the learned Dr. says, in Opposition to one of my Premises, "That God is " not only (τὸ ζῷον) individually one Being, but " also (δὴ ζῷον) individually one intelligent Agent, "or Person." For which he refers the Reader to N. i. and whither I refer him also in this second Answer, having shewn, that this sort of Masculine Terms refers to some known Noun among the Greeks of the Masculine Gender, which Person is not. As for Instance, ὁ ἰδίος relates to ἀνθρώπινος, ἄνδρας, or some other-like Noun of the same Gender: As τὰ ἔντα does to a Noun of the Neuter Gender. Thus Esth. xiv. 11. Μὴ παρέχωσι κύριο τὸ σκάβει τὸν σα* τοῖς μὴ ζώνι that is,

** So τοῖς ζοίν, and τοῖς μὴ ζοί, and μὴ ζῷα, relate to ζοίν and ζοί. Just. ad Græc. Cohort. p. 20, 21. Edit. Steph. either
either ἐγὼ εἰμί, v. 6. if it be meant of Men; or ἐγὼ ἐσμέν, v. 8. if it be meant of *false Gods. And thus δὲν relates not to Person, but to Ἐδ[ος]; and signifies the God, who is, in an emphatical Sense; or, the God who is Being, or eternally † exists; and is explained by δὲν ἔσται, δὲν ἔσται, δὲν ἔσται ἔσται Ἐδ[ος], and δὲν ἔσται τοιοῦτος, Just. ad Græc. Cohort. p. 20, 21. and is attributed to the Word, or Son, no less than to the Fathers by ancient Writers, as will appear from the following Authorities. Justin says, That the Son spake these Words to Moses, ἐγὼ εἰμί δὲν ἔσται. Apol. 2. p. 160, 161. Edit. Steph.

Athanagius says,

God is He who is, — therefore his Word also is He who is.

Basil says,

So that He, who named himself to Mo- ses, I am, or, He who is, can be conceived to be no other but God the Word, who was in the Beginning with God.


Where
Where he also makes it a very great Fault to say, that the Son is not \( \delta \alpha \nu \), *He who is*. See also Greg. Nyssen. cont. Eunom. p. 204. But if then \( \delta \alpha \nu \) does not relate to Person, but to God, who has been proved to be more than one Person; then is not my Premise faulty in not explaining \( \delta \alpha \nu \) by one individual intelligent Person. And if \( \delta \alpha \nu \) be attributed to the Word, no less than to the Father, the Son's being \( \delta \alpha \nu \) does not prove him to be the same individual Person, but to be one individual Being, or one God with the Father; for \( \delta \alpha \nu \) is individually one. And if \( \delta \alpha \nu \) be individually one and no more, and \( \delta \alpha \nu \) be the true God, and the true God be individually one and no more, then is the Son, who is \( \delta \alpha \nu \), the true God: And being the true God is \( \delta \alpha \nu \); these Terms being convertible, notwithstanding what the learned Dr. says, p. 160. where he would have the Son's being true God, to signify not that He is \( \delta \alpha \nu \), but "That He has true Divinity " (which false Gods have not) communicated to him from Him who is alone \( \delta \alpha \nu \)."

But what this true Divinity is, if it be not the true Divine Nature, or Substance, is hard to tell. But if it be the true Divine Nature, which is Being, and without which none can appear to be true God, see N. 180. Why should the Son, who receives the true Divine Nature, or that which is emphatically Being, be denied to be \( \delta \alpha \nu \)? In Opposition
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position to the remaining Part of my Reasoning, which the Dr. repeats in the same Page; he says, That the Passage, this is the true God, 1 John v. 20. is not spoken of the Son. For an Answer to which, I refer the Reader to N. 410. But proceeds the Dr. "If it was "spoken of the Son, still it would follow, "that the Son was true God, not by being "himself the Father, the self-existent Being." And who is it that affirms this? The Son may partake of the same Substance with the Father, without being self-existent; that is, The Divine Substance, as it is personalized in the Father without Derivation, is called self-existent: But as it is personalized in the Son by Derivation from the Father, or, as it passes from the Father into a second Substance, is called begotten; it receiving different Denominations in different Respects. In like manner, as the Substance of Adam personalized in himself, the first Man, without Generation, is called unbegotten: But as personalized in Seth by Communication from Adam, is called begotten. The Dr. adds, "But by having true Divinity and Domi-

nation communicated to him from him." But, as I have observed before, what this true Divinity is, distinct from the Divine Substance, that can make a true God, is hard to conceive, if not altogether impossible: Neither does the Dr. explain it.

Concerning the Angel here spoken of I have already discoursed N. 534. The Dr. says, p. 162. "That, Rev. xi. 1, 3. even an "inferior Angel is introduced speaking in "the Name or Person of God; the Angel "stood, saying—I will give Power unto my "two Witnesses." But it must be observed, that the Words, ἤ ἐσχήν δ ἅγγελον, and the Angel stood, are not in Arethas, nor in the vulg. Lat. and are contrary to the general Reading of the Manuscripts, as Dr. Mill tells us; who therefore leaves it out of his Edition of the Testament. It is probable then, that the Person who gave the Reed, said, I will give Power to my two Witnesses, (tho' it might be the Voice from Heaven, c. io. v. 8, 4.) But it does not appear that this Person was no more than a mere Angel. If it was the mighty Angel in the foregoing Chapter, whose Face was as the Sun, and a Rainbow upon his Head, and who was the last Person who spake to St. John in that Chapter, he is believed by many to be the Son of God; which I easily assent to, because the Rainbow, which appeared about his Head, is a * Token of the Covenant between God, and Noah,

* Gen. ix. 12.
and every living Creature: And therefore is a proper Emblem to point out him, who is *the Angel of the Covenant*, even the Son of God. Neither do I remember any one Instance in the whole Scripture besides, by which it appears, that the Rainbow was on the Head of any other, but of the Divine Glory sitting upon the Throne; which is generally allowed to be the Manifestation of the Son. In this same Page, p. 162. the Dr. grants, that the Premises I lay down, and which he there enumerates, are in no wise contrary to any thing he has asserted: But then denies my Inference, namely, that the Son with the Father is the necessary Being itself. For which he assigns three Reasons; First, Because it is an express Contradiction; that is, the Dr. conceives Being and Person, in relation to God, to be the same: Whence it is a Contradiction to affirm two Persons to be one Being, or Person. But I have shewn in the foregoing Number, and N. i. that Being and Person, in relation to God, are not the same; which removes the pretended Contradiction. Secondly, Because it is contrary to the Text; but this I have considered, N. 534. Thirdly, Because it is contrary to the Opinion of all the antient Fathers; for which he refers to N. 597, 616. in his Scripture Doctrine. As to the First of

* Mal. iii. 1. thes
these Numbers I had made a general Remark in my first Answer, p. 75. that the Authorities cited under that Number shewed, indeed, that the Son appeared and acted in the Person and Name of the Father; but did not deny that he acted in his own Name and Person also. I add further now, that they shewed indeed, that the Son was not the same Person with the Father: But do not deny, nay, rather the Writings of the same Authors suppose, that He was one Being with him; as will appear from a short View of Particulars. Theoph. ad Autol. affirmis, Lib. 2. p. 129. that the Word appeared in the Person of God the Father; which argues a Difference of Person: But yet, in the same Page, he calls him the Eternal Word, Mind, and Wisdom of the Father; which are Terms, that, I think, cannot import less than a *Consubstantiality, or that He is of one undivided Substance with the Father. Irenæus says, It is the Word, or Son of God, that appeared to the Patriarchs and ancient Saints, according to the Dr.'s Citations; and yet he speaks of the Father, and the Word, as one Being:

Et in quo distabit Wherein, says he, Dei Verbum, imo will the Word of God, magis ipse Deus cum nay, rather God him- fit Verbum a verbo self, since He is the hominum? Lib. 2. Word, differ from the 18. Word of Men?

* See N. 937.
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See also c. 48. Justin Martyr says, It was not God the Father of all Things, but the Son, who appeared and spake to the Fathers; yet, notwithstanding this Distinction of Persons, the Dr. does not shew, that he held the Son to be of a different and separete Substance from the Father: Nay, the following Words rather shew, that he believed him to be of one Substance with the Father, or one Being with him; for, says he,

That which was spoken to Moses out of the Bush, I am that I am (or, I am He who is,) the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, and the God of thy Fathers, signifies that those dead (Fathers) continue to be, and are the Men of Christ.

That is, the Patriarchs lived to Christ, because He was their God; and He was their God, because He was δ' ἄν, * the God who is, or, who is Being it self; by Virtue of

* Note, Athanasius, in his Orat. cont. Gentes, p. 40. and in his Treatise de Incar. p. 51. shews, that the Word, as He is ἄν, supports the Creatures that are made ἔξ ἐκ ὑμῶν; and that Man might have been immortalized by Him, if He would have adhered to the Word.
which, notwithstanding they were dead, He both could, and did continue them in Being. Which shews, that He believed the Son to be \( \delta \alpha \nu \), in his own Person. Now it being certain, that \( \delta \alpha \nu \), the God who is, or, who is Being it self, is but one, because Being is but one: And the Son being affirmed by this Writer to be \( \delta \alpha \nu \), the God who is, or, who is Being it self, that is, in Union with the Father: It will follow, that, according to this Writer, the Son with the Father must be the one necessary Being. St. Cyprian may reasonably be supposed to have believed them to have been one Being, from his * Epistle to Jubaianus, and his Treatise * de unit. Eccles. And || Tertullian, ** Athanasius, and †† Cyril of Jerusalem, make the whole Three Persons to sublifit in one undivided Substance, or Being. These are the Authors cited under N. 597. to whom the learned Dr. refers; and who rather confirm than contradict my Inference, that the Son with the Father is the necessary Being it self. The remaining Citations under N. 616, relate to his being called an Angel. The Dr. produces one of them in his Answer, p. 163. which may stand for the rest.

* See first Answer, p 138, 137. || Adv. Prax. c. 18, 13, 12, 24, 25. ** See N. 1056. †† Catech. 17. §. 15, 16. he tells the \( \delta \mu \alpha \mu \nu \). And Catech. 16. §. 2. the Indivisibility, saying, ἰττ ἴντι καταχώρια \( \varepsilon \) ἒλευρ τεσσαρα. The
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The Son (says the Synod of Antioch) is spoken of sometimes as an Angel, sometimes as Lord, sometimes as God. For it is impious to imagine that the God of the Universe is called an Angel. But the Angel of the Father is the Son, who himself is Lord and God. For it is written, the Angel of great Counsel.

I have observed, N. 534. that the Son was called an Angel (Malac) in two respects; either as He was sent, or, as He is the operating Power of the Father in a Personal Subsistence. The First relates to that visible Glory, or limited Figure, which the Word assumed, and appeared in to the Fathers, as preparative to his appearing and living in the Flesh; and which was capable of moving from one Place to another. The Second is the Word himself considered, as creating, upholding, and performing all things, and discovering to Men the Will of the Father. To say then that the Father assumed, and appeared in, the visible Glory under the Character of an Angel, was, according to the Doctrine of the Antients, the same thing, as to say, that

O 4  He
He appeared afterwards in Flesh, or was incarnate; for, according to their Reasonings, the same Person, who conversed as an Angel with the Patriarchs and Saints in a visible Manner, became Man, and was manifested in the Flesh to their Children after them: It was also the same thing as to say, that the Father was sent, which was to make him, not the Father, or a First Person, but a different and subordinate Person, that could be sent by him. Secondly, To say that the Father was an Angel in the Second Sense, as it stands for the operating Power of the Father in a Personal Subsistence, is the same thing as to affirm, that He is the Son, and to deny that He is the Father; which is doubtless impious. But how this affects my Inference, that the Son with the Father is the necessary Being in itself, I cannot tell. It is certain, that the following Fathers, who affirm the Son to be an Angel, and are cited for this purpose in the Scripture Doctrine, N. 616. such as Athanasius, Hilary, Basil, did not think their asserting him an Angel to be inconsistent with their holding him to be of one * undivided Substance with the Father; for the Son might act thro' a visible Form, and declare the whole Counsel of the Father, and yet be substantially one with the Father. The Dr. grants in this same Page,

* See 1056.
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that the Name Jehovah is given to the Father and the Son; but the Scripture tells us, Deut. vi. 4. that Jehovah, or the Being meant by Jehovah, is the one and only God. The Father then, and the Son together, who are meant by the Name Jehovah, are the one and only God. And if Father and Son be the one and only God, why should the Dr. contrary to Scripture, call the Father, in this Page, the one and only true God, in Contradistinction to the Son, whom he calls barely the true God? For as for Self-existence, and Supremacy, or Priority in Order, which he makes to be the Ground of that Title, they are no substantial Characters that make a Difference in the Godhead, as has been already shewn, N. 2, 340. Neither does it appear from Scripture, nor from the general Use of the best Antiquity, that the Terms one God have any such regard to Self-existence and Supremacy; but are used in Opposition to false Gods, and exclude them only from the Unity of the Godhead. See N. 1, 2, 3, 5, 8. If the Dr. is of Opinion, that the * Father only is meant by Jehovah, the God of the Jews, who is said to be one, Deut. vi. 4. let it be supposed also that the Father only is meant by Jehovah, the God of the Fathers, who says, This is my Name for ever; and this is my Memorial unto all Genera-

* See his Reply, N. 2.
rations, Exod. iii. 15. that is, a Name, and Memorial, that distinguishes him from all others. But Jehovah is the Name and Memorial of the Son, no less than of the Father, N. 534. Jehovah then is not the distinguishing Name of the Father. But it is certainly the distinguishing Name of the God meant by Jehovah. Jehovah therefore, the God of the Fathers, whose Name and Memorial, the Term Jehovah is, cannot be the Father only, but is the Father and Son together. And if Jehovah, the God of the Fathers, be the Father and Son together, in Exod. iii. Why should not Jehovah, the God of the Jews, be the Father and Son together, in Deut. 6? The Father then, and Son together, are the one and only true God, and, by Consequence, one Being; the one true God being but one Being. But the learned Dr. says, p. 163, 164. "That in the New Testament, where Christ appears in his own Person, that Name, meaning Jehovah—is never given to Him." For an Answer to which, consider N. 534. both in this, and in my first Answer. As for the Dr's Remark, that אֱלֹהִים is the rendering of Adonai, which with Elohim is always read and translated by the Septuagint instead of Jehovah, I refer the Reader to Pearson on the Creed, p. 146. of the Ninth Edition: Where he will find both the Remark it self, and a learned and full Answer to it. Part of my Reasoning, which
the Dr. repeats, p. 164. is unintelligible to him as he declares, and therefore I can expect no Reply to be made to it. That the Consequence of Philo's Position is, that the Father, and the Word, were the one Object of Jewish Worship, will, I think, clearly appear to any one, who revises my Reasoning, p. 79, 80. of my first Answer. The Dr. confesses, p. 165. towards the End, as he did before, that the Son is, "True God, by having true Divinity and Dominion communicated to him from the Father." But will not tell us, whether this true Divinity be founded upon a Communication of the Substance of the Father, or not; or, how it can be true Divinity without it.

DCXXII, DCXXIII. Rom. xiv. 9, 10, 11, 12, &c. For to this End Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that He might be Lord (κυριός) both of the Dead and Living.

The Dr. cannot deny, but must confess, That every Knee shall bow to Jesus; and every Tongue confess, that He is *Lord, Phil. ii. 10, 11. It is plain also from Isa. xlv. 23. that to the same Being, to whom the Knee shall bow, the Tongue also shall confess. But the Being, to whom the Knee shall bow, is Christ

* Probably Jehovah. See the following Note.
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Phil. ii. 10. and to whom the Tongue shall confess, is * God, Rom. xiv. 11. Why then should I be blamed for making the Inference, which the plain Letter of Scripture leads me to, that Christ is the God to whom every Knee shall bow, every Tongue confess? How does this make the Son and the Father one Person? Does not Irenaeus make him the Lord God, to whom every Knee shall bow? And does the Dr. charge him with confounding Persons? No, certainly. But what appears very strange, he says the Passage out of him is directly against me, without telling me wherein the Contrariety consists, excepting, that he interprets the Passage in such a Manner, as if Irenaeus had said, That the Son was Lord God according to the † good Pleasure of the invisible Father: Whereas I interpret it so as if he had said, That every Knee might bow, according to the good Pleasure of the invisible Father, to Christ Jesus our Lord and God; which, I think, agrees better with the Doctrine of Irenaeus, who makes the Son to be || substantially, and co-eternally one with the Father, and consequently God by Nature, or Substance. I grant then with the Dr. that giving Account to Christ, is the same thing as giving Account

* Jehovah, Isa. xlv. 24. from the Beginning of which Verse it is taken by the Septuagint, and translated טור, M. Alex.
† See what I have said on this Point, N. 411. || Lib. 2. c. 18, 43. N. 1, 8. ||| Lib. 2. c. 18, 43; N. 8.
to God the Father. But I further affirm, that giving Account to Christ, is giving Account to God the Son; and believe also, according to the foregoing Reasoning, that God the Son, in Union with the Father, is the * God, to whom every Knee shall bow, and every Tongue confess, v. 11. Rom. xiv. if then God absolutely used, v. 11. be the Son in Union with the Father, which is agreeable to my Observations, N. 538. Why may not † God, v. 3. comprehend them both after the same Manner? And why may not the two Persons implied here, be explicitly mentioned, c. 15. v. 7? The Term God signifying the Father and the Son in the former Passage, and the Father only in the latter, according to my Observations, N. 538. As for v. 6. if my Remark on that Text does not render it probable, that the Son is comprehended in the Name God, the Reader is at liberty to understand it as he pleases; it being sufficiently evident from what has been said, that the Son is called God, or Jehovah, in this Chapter.

**DCLXII.** Heb. xiii. 8. *Jesus Christ, the same Yesterday, and to Day, and for ever;*
The learned Dr. p. 169. supposes, that this is my Reasoning: "Imitate your own "Pastors, because the Person of Christ is "always the same." And asks me, "Where "now is the Force of this Argument?" But if the Dr. pleases to review my Words, he will find the Force of my Reasoning to be this, which I wonder could be mistaken, since it is so plain, namely, Jesus Christ, who is He, or a Divine Being without Beginning, and without End, or God Eternal, is the Object of the Faith of your Pastors, which they constantly do, and have adhered to; it is your Duty to imitate your Pastors in all things necessary to your Salvation; it is your Duty therefore to follow them in believing in, and constantly adhering to, Jesus Christ; who is not a created and mutable Being, capable of failing in his own Person, and of disappointing your Expectations: But is He, or God, eternally and immutably the same, who can never disappoint you. Which I desire may be once more compared with the Dr's Interpretation, who makes Jesus Christ, the same Yesterday, and to Day, and for ever, to mean no more, than that the * Doctrine of Christ is always one and the same, and

* Note, The following Authors understand the Text of the Person of Christ, and not of his Doctrine. Chrysost. Theodor. Athanas.
and cannot be changed by Men. To their Faith in Christ, and Perseverance in the same, by which alone they are justified, the Apostle opposes the Works of the Law, warning them not to be drawn aside by the Doctrines, that enforce them, as if doing those Works, and not Faith in Christ, was the proper Means of making them righteous. Be not carried about, says he, with divers and strange Doctrines: For it is a good thing that the Heart be established with Grace, not with Meats, which have not profited them that have been occupied therein, v. 9. which compare with c. 9. v. 9, 10. The Dr. p. 170. makes his Remarks upon my rendering the Words thus, Jesus Christ, Yesterday, and to Day, and forever He; and allows not the Authority of the Cabalistic Jews, who placed ὧν Ἰησοῦς among the Divines Names. Now tho' they may be good Witnesses of the Meaning of a Word, notwithstanding their Mystical and Cabalistic Genius, yet I will produce at present more sober Authority to justify that Observation, I mean, the Mifchna; which none will condemn for containing the Phrenzies of a Mystical Imagination, being that, which the Jews receive as the Body of their

Law. In this Work the following Words; O Lord, (Jehovah) save now, Psalm cxviii. 25. are paraphrased thus, יְהֹוָה יִנְאָ, I and He save now. Vol. 2. p. 274. §. 5. Ed. Surenhaus; where I and He are put in the Place of Jehovah, and probably respect Deut. xxxii. 39. See now that I, even I am He. See the Note of Maimon. on the Place. But the Dr. says, "That the Words of the Original cannot "bear my Translation: For the Word is "not, אָלַךְ, He, but, אָלַךְ, the same."

I must observe, that it is not certain, that the Greek is the Original Language of this Epistle. Clem. Alexand. and other learned Antients say, It was written in Hebrew. And if so, we need not doubt but the Original Word rendered אָלַךְ, was נָהְ, as it is, c. i. v. 12. which signifies He; and is applied, in an emphatical Sense, to the God of the Jews, as being He who is God, or, the true God. In which Sense it is taken by the Chal. Paraphrast, who renders נָהְ and He, Psalm lxxvii. 5. by נָהְ נָלְלָמִ', and God He, &c. And in Isa. xlii. 10. I am He, is explained, v. 11. by I am Jehovah; and v. 12. by, I am God, El; as if Hu, Jehovah, and El, were Terms of the same Importance. Our Translators generally render it He in the emphatic Sense, as Deut. xxxii. 39. Isa. xli. 4. xliii. 10, 13. xlvi. 12. Jer. xiv. 22. The Septuagint render it simply אָלַךְ without the Article in Jer. xiv. 22. אָלַךְ וּלָּאָלַךְ; and
and the Translator into the Vulgar Latin, renders it, *Heb.* xiii. 8. *ipse*, as I do. If then we consider the Greek only, the Dr's Remark is good, and, δ ἴδιός, ought to be rendered the same; but if we consider the Original Hebrew, which is הוהי, the Meaning is, as the Vulgar has it, and I render it, *He*, in an emphatical Sense, or, Jehovah, the true God. This will justify my rendering ἰδιός in the two Passages taken out of Origen, by, but thou art *He*, according to the Original Hebrew, נון יהוהי, *Psal.* cii. 27. which Arias Montanus, and Pagninus render, the first, ἵδιός *ipse*: The latter, *tui autem ipse*. The Reason why the Septuagint render נון by δ ἴδιός here, is, because God is spoken of principally in relation to his Eternity and Immutability, being opposed to the Things that perish, wax old, and are changed. However, it is not their Custom in other Places to translate the Name, or Pronoun הוהי, by a Term expressing the Attribute, which is particularly treated of in that Place, or in relation to which God is particularly considered and spoken of in the Context: As for Instance, God calls himself *He*, in respect of the Truth of his Godhead, and his Almighty Power, *Deut.* xxxii. 39. and in respect of his Knowledge, Power, and Eternity, *Isa.* xliii. 10. and of his Power alone, *Jer.* xiv. 22. and of his Power and Eternity together, *Isa.* xli. 4. yet the Septuagint do not
not render, *I am He*, by any other Terms, than by \(\epsilon \gamma \nu \epsilon \iota \mu \) only. And, *thou art* \(\text{He}^*\) by any other Terms, than by \(\sigma \upsilon \epsilon \varsigma \) simply, without an Article, as *Jerem. xiv. 22.* And thus here, in *Psal. cii. 27.* instead of, \(\Sigma \upsilon \delta \alpha \theta \nu \upsilon \varsigma \epsilon \iota \), *but thou art the same;* they might have rendered the \(\text{† Original, } \Sigma \upsilon \delta \alpha \theta \nu \upsilon \varsigma \epsilon \iota \alpha \delta \varsigma \) \(\text{but thou art } \text{He, as a more comprehensive Translation, expressing, not his Eternity and Immutability only, but himself as } \text{God, or, his very Godhead: And consequently all the Divine Attributes contained in it. So that, I hope, from all these Considerations, it will appear, that not a bare Defect of Skill, in the Greek Language; but a due Regard also to the Hebrew Original, was the Cause of my translating } \Sigma \upsilon \delta \alpha \theta \nu \upsilon \varsigma \epsilon \iota \text{, by, but thou art } \text{He.}*

**DCCLXXIII.**

The learned Dr. occasionally mentions under this Number, *Matt. xix. 17. There is none good but One, that is, God. For the true Meaning of which, I refer the Reader to N. 1.*

**DCCCXXX.** *John xiv. 28. My Father is greater than I.*
I had said, That the Father is greater, as He is Father: But that the Divine Nature (or Substance) is the same in both. The Dr's Remark is, "That if I speak consistently, I must be understood to mean so the same, as that which is derived can be the same with that which is undervived; and that which is begotten can be the same with that which is unbegotten." Which I readily agree to. But then, as undervived and unbegotten are Negative Characters, and derived and begotten are positive Characters, neither of them affecting the Substance of the Persons; but relating to the Manner of their having their Subsistence, the Substance of the Son, derived from the Father without Separation, may be inseparably the same with the Substance of the Father.

DCCCXXXIV.

The Dr. here accuses me again of great Darkness and Obscurity; which I am sorry for, designing to be understood when I wrote those Pages: And intending to go no farther in explaining the Manner of Christ's divesting himself of his former Glory, than was consistent with the Scriptures, the Analogy of Faith, and the sober Sentiments of the ancient Christians; which, I hope, I have observed, especially, since the Dr. makes no particular Objection to me.
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DCCCXXXVII. Coloss. i. 15. Who is the Image of the Invisible God, the First born of every Creature.

Here again my Notions are unintelligible to the Dr. and, as he says, out of certain Mystical Authors. But who these are I cannot tell: Except some of the most celebrated Drs. of the Church come under that Name. This learned Gentleman is so kind as to give two or three Instances of them; which, as he transcribed, I shall consider, for the Reader's Satisfaction. The first Passage he brings, is out of p. 105, 106. of my first Answer: Where I affirm, "That some of the Antients thought, that David spoke of the Production of the Son in the following Words, Psal. xlv. 1. My Heart is inditing a good Matter, or a good Word." Now these Antients are Tertull. adv. Hermeg. c. 18. Novat. de Trin. c. 23. Cyprian. adv. Jud. Lib. 2. §. 3. Many Christians in Origen's Time, Comment. in Ioan. p. 43. Euseb. Dem. Evang. Lib. 4. c. 15. tho' he is of a different Opinion in his Comment upon the Psalm. Athanas. de Decret. Nic. Syn. §. 21. with other noted Writers. From this Premise I infer, "That if their Interpretation be true, David considered the Son as Light of Light, or, as the Word and Truth conceived in the Mind, or Heart, of the Father; for"
"So the Heart is used for the Principle of Thought by the Jewish Writers, &c."

Where I do not affirm the Truth of this Interpretation, but shew, what Sentiments these ancient Fathers had themselves, and what Notions their Interpretation supposes the Holy Ghost to have conveyed, and David to have received in Writing this Psalm, (if he understood the full Import of that which he wrote,) concerning the Generation of the Son, when they conceived him to have represented it by the Conception of a Thought in the Mind of the Speaker. That is, it appears to me, that they looked upon the Son to be as nearly related to the Father, as a *Thought is to the Mind of the Speaker. Again, I say, "That when the Scriptures speak of him as the proper Son of God (Rom. viii. 32.) who is his proper Father, (John v. 18.) it may reasonably be concluded, that the Sacred Writers considered him as the Fruit of the whole Person and Nature of the Father," so far as it is communicable. For to what Purpose are the Terms proper Son used, but to instruct us, that there is at least as near a relation between God and his Word, as there is between a Father and his Son? Especially, since nothing can be clearly

brought out of the Sacred Writings, and no
certain and infallible Evidence can be given
concerning his Divinity, that sets this Rela-
tion at a greater Distance, or shews it to be
impossible. And if the Sacred Writers in-
tended to teach us this Relation, and such
Relation always supposes, that the Son is
the Fruit of the whole Person of the Father:
Can it be unreasonable to infer, " That the
Sacred Writers considered him as proceed-
ing from the whole * Person of the Father,
" when they call him the proper Son of God;
" or, as receiving from him his † Nature
" and Attributes, so far as they are com-
municable?" The Dr. makes a Marginal
Note upon my calling the Son a Being;
" Yet generally our Author, says he, does
" not allow the Son to be a Being." Con-
cerning which, see N. 597. Upon my ar-
guing, p. 107. " That as the Son proceeds
" from the || whole Glory of the Father in

Antioch. ad Encœn. vocat. apud Athanas. de Synod. Arim. &
Seleuc. p. 735,736. apud Sozom. Lib. 2. c. 10. Sozom. Lib. 3.
c. 5. & Hil. de Synod. Ex toto Patre, totus Filius natus est.
εύς σφρεγίλι τιν ποιλος φίλων ο Παλαις επαπασμανάνενς
† Quicquid est in Patre, ad Filium transfuit. Laftant. Lib. 4.
c. 29.

|| Διάπες έγ τον εν εαυτω διεικυος θα Pathez, έη θανω
Nay, Origen himself speaks of the Son, as γόμήθην επίον ἡ

" the
"the Character of Light: So He proceeds " from the whole Holiness of the Father, in " the Character of Holy, &c. and is the " Fruit of his whole Nature," so far, as it is communicable; the Dr. makes the following Remark: " Here he talks as if every one " of the Attributes of God were real Beings, " or Parts of the Divine Subsistence." The learned Dr. very well knows, that our Un- standings are so limited, that it is necessary, that things, which are simple in themselves, be considered under different Views to be comprehended by us. Thus God, who is one simple Essence and Being, has different Denominations according to the different Regards, which He is considered in by us. As He performs his Word, and is really the Being, which He declares himself to be, we denominate him True. As He rewards Vertue, and punishes Vice, He is named Just. As He does what He pleases in creating, supporting, and governing the World, He is called Mighty, &c. The Meaning then of my Words is plainly this; That the Son receives the Subsance of the Father in such Fulness, that He is known to his Creatures after the same Manner, so far as is possible, as the Father is known; the Father being manifested in the Son. And, consequently, that He receives the same Denominations of Just, Holy, True, &c. p. 177. The Dr. calls Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Tatian.
Tatian, the ancient Founders of Sabellianism. Eusebius was of a different Mind in relation to Theophilus; for in speaking of Him, Irenaeus, and others, He gives this summery Testimony of the Soundness of their Writings:

Whose Orthodoxy, and found Faith, according to Apostolic Tradition, is transmitted to us in their Writings.

An Argument, that the Notions of Theophilus, concerning the Son, had another Appearance with that learned Father, than they have with the Dr. Eusebius, indeed, finds Fault with * Marcellus for the same Expressions, that were used by Theophilus; but he did it, probably, because Marcellus had fashioned and adapted them to his own Hypothesis: Which is further credible, because the like Style, which is condemned in † Marcellus, passeth uncensured, or, is rather approved of by this learned Writer, in the Account which he gives of Constantine's Reasoning in the Nicene Council; which shews, that he understood the Words in an Orthodox
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Sense, or what he thought to be so, when they were used by the Emperor. After the like Manner, the Council of Sirmium condemns the following Terms, ἡ ὑπεροκομμάδα ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ θεοῦ; which, nevertheless, came under the general Character of Orthodoxy given to Theophilus in the forementioned Passage of Eusebius. And the Reason is plain; Theophilus meant a Divine Person distinct from the Father, whose Existence he considered in a twofold Respect, as He is Λόγος ἐν Θεῷ, the Eternal Personal Word of the Father: And as He is Λόγος ἐν Θεῷ, the creating Principle, or Cause of all Things. Whereas those, who are condemned by the Synod, are understood to have taught, that the Word was no more a distinct Person from the Father, than the Thought of a Man, expressed by his Word, is a different Person from the Man expressing it; for that this was the Notion condemned by the Council, we are told by Hilary, in his Comment upon the Clause. The Sentiments of Athenagoras, in this particular, are the same with Theophilus's; and therefore could no more have been condemned by Eusebius, had he spoken of his Writings, than those of Theophilus, whose Books to Autolycus he particularly mentions, without any Censure passed upon the Doctrines contained in them, Lib. 4. c. 24. The same Eusebius makes Tatian a joint Witness of the Divinity of Christ with Justin,
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Justin, Miltiades, and Clement; and therefore may be supposed to have judged him as Orthodox in this Article, as any of the rest.

Δέω δέ Ἔλλας, ἵνα Miltiades, ἵνα Τατίας, ἵνα Ἡρωδιάν, ἵνα Ἐτῆς 
κληρονόμους, ἵνα οὐς ἀδικοὶ θεολογεῖται οὐτε 
Χριστός. λ. 5. c. 28.

Ecclef. Hist.

Nay, he makes mention of his Discourse against the Greeks as a celebrated Piece, without giving us the least Hint that it was any ways heterodox in relation to the Point of the Divinity of the Son; which, probably, he would have done, had he judged it faulty in so momentous an Article.

Among whose Writings (says he) that, which is most taken Notice of, is his celebrated Discourse against the Greeks—which seems to be the best and most useful of all his Writings.

We may therefore fairly conclude, that these Fathers neither were, nor would ever have been, censured, as the Founders of Sabellianism, by the learned Eusebius; and, I think,
think, if they could escape him, they may very well be spared by any Orthodox Writer among the Moderns. The learned Dr. having put down, p. 177. the Doctrine I collected out of Athenagoras, and Theophilus, makes the two following Remarks, "Either the Term \( \Lambda \delta \rho \alpha \gamma \), the Word, signifies, in Scripture, that \( \Lambda \delta \rho \alpha \gamma \), which is first \( \epsilon \delta \iota \) \( \varepsilon \eta \delta \), and then \( \pi \rho \rho \rho \omega \) \( \mu \nu \sigma \), the internal Reason of God, (I suppose the Dr. means the Attribute, or, what we call the Faculty of Reason,) and his external Word spoken forth, represented only figuratively as a Person."

(Which Meaning, as the Dr. justly condemns; so can it not be charged upon the Writings of these Fathers.) "Or else, on the other Side, the Term \( \Lambda \delta \rho \alpha \gamma \), the Word, signifies, in Scripture, a real Divine Person—represented only figuratively, as the Word, or Wisdom of the Father." That the Word signifies, in Scripture, a real Divine Person, is undoubtedly true: In which Sense it is used by the forementioned Writers, and cannot stand for the internal Reason of the Father, or, the Attribute of Reason: Nor for his external Word spoken forth, considered as a Sound. In neither of which Senses, these learned Antients used the Terms \( \Lambda \delta \rho \alpha \gamma \) \( \epsilon \delta \iota \) \( \varepsilon \eta \delta \) and \( \pi \rho \rho \rho \omega \) \( \mu \nu \sigma \), as I have observed before, notwithstanding what the learned Dr. affirms, p. 179. Secondly, It is undoubtedly true also, that
that the Term *Word*, or *Wisdom*, is attributed to the Son in a figurative Sense, if it be compared with the Use of the same Term in relation to the *Thoughts* and *Words* of a created Agent. Thirdly, Notwithstanding all this, it appears to have been the Opinion of these Fathers, that the Term *Word* was given to the *Son* in the Holy Scriptures to instruct the Readers, that the Relation of the *Son* to the *Father* was, so far as possible, like that of the *Thoughts* to the *Mind*; for they express the former by the latter Relation. They speak of the *Father*, as a *Mind*: Of the *Son*, as the *Thoughts* of that *Mind* in a Personal Subsistence. And therefore may fairly be judged to have looked upon the *Son*, tho' a distinct Person from the *Father*, to be no more divided from him, than the *Thoughts* from the *Mind*; to be no more a distinct and separate Substance from the *Father*, than the *Thoughts* are a Substance separated from the *Mind*. And to be as truly † *begotten* of the *Father*, as the *Thoughts* are *produced* and *formed* in the *Mind*. Whether this be a proper Explication of the Doctrine of St. John concerning the *Word*, is not the Matter at present in Dispute: But whether this Explication does not infer, that the Persons using

* Cogitatio enim ejus Logos. Iren. Lib 2. c. 48.
it were of Opinion, that the Son was consubstantial with the Father; and if it does, whether it can be supposed they would have given an Explication so clearly inferring the Consubstantiality of the Son, if the Doctrine of the Consubstantiality were contrary to the Belief and Sentiments of the Church in the Age they wrote in; or, if it were contrary, whether their Writings would not have been censured by the learned Drs. of their own Times; whether such a Censure could have escaped the Knowledge of the learned Eusebius; and whether Eusebius himself would not have condemned them in this particular. As for confounding that which is literal with the figurative, and the figurative with the literal: If it should prove true, it does not affect me, who gave only a short Extract out of the Writings of those Fathers, to shew, that they held the Personal Existence of the Son with the Father from all Eternity. But says the learned Dr. p. 179. "Christ is called the Power and Righteousness (or Mercy) of God——And the same Authors might have argued——that the Son of God is literally that Attribute which is called the Power, and that Attribute which is called the Mercy of God." In like manner, as they argue, that He is literally the Reason, or Wisdom of the Father. But I have already observed, that they do not hold the Son to be the Attribute, or Faculty of Reason; neither
ther do they hold him to be the Wisdom begotten, or the Father: But the Wisdom begotten, or the Son; that is, Light of Light. In like manner may the Son be said to be the Power of God, and the Righteousness of God: That is, not the Attributes of the Father so called; but the begotten Power, and the begotten Righteousness. For the Divine Substance communicated to the Son admits of the same Appellations of Wise, Powerful, and Righteous: Or, in the Abstract, of Wisdom, Power, and Righteousness, as it does in the Person of the Father. So that some of the Antients never scrupled to speak of the Son in that Abstract manner. Cyprian calls him, Innocentia ipsa, & ipsa Justitia—* Veritas, de bono patient. p. 213. Ed. Oxon. And, Virtus Dei, ratio, sapientia ejus & Gloria de Idol. Van. p. 15. Edit. Oxon. Irenæus, Incorruptela, & Immortalitas, Lib. 3. c. 21. Origen, 'O autológos, & ἡ ἀλογισσία, ἠ ἡ ἀποκαλοθεα, cont. Cels. Lib. 3. p. 135. & Lib. 6. p. 319. And, 'Αυτοδιακροσύνη, p. 309. He says also, 'Ὁ Σωτήρ ἡμῶν ἦ That our Saviour does not partake of Righteousness, but being himself Righteous, is partaken of by the Righteous.

* See the like Abstract Terms attributed to God the Father, Epift. 35. p. 111.

Lactantius
Lactantius says, *Ipse Virtus, et ipse Justitia est*, Lib. 4. c. 16. And Clem. Alexandrinus calls him, Αὐτός τὸ πατέρων, Lib. 7. p. 704. that is, He is called, Innocency it self, Righteousness it self, Truth it self, the Power of God, or the Paternal Power, Reason, or the *Word* it self, Wisdom it self, the Glory of God. All which Appellations, I conceive, do not barely shew, that He is that Divine Person, by whom all these Attributes are manifested to the Creature, but that also He subsists in that very Substance, which is really one with all these Attributes; and, by reason of which, He may be abstractedly named by any one of them. As for what is meant, when it is said, that the Father, considered distinctly without the Son, would be ἄλογος, it is not that the Attribute of Reason, or rational Power, would be separated from the Father: But the begotten *Logos*, or *Wisdom* only.
The Doctrine of the foregoing Chapter may be summed up in the following Articles.

That the Son is Lord God in his own Person, N. 534, 623.

That Lord, or Jehovah, is a Name expressing the Divine Substance; which is one, N. 534, or individually one, N. 595, and is appropriated to the God of the Jews, N. 595.

That the Son therefore with the Father subsists in the Divine Substance, which is individually one, N. 595, 597, and is on with the God of the Jews, N. 595.

That the Son was comprehended in the one Lord God of the Jews, N. 534, 580.

That the Father, and Son, are understood under the same individual Term God, N. 538.

That the Name of the Father, and the Son, into which the Church is baptized, is the healing and regenerating Power of the Father, and the Son, N. 597.

That 

Does not relate to Person, but to God, Θεός, N. 597.

That is the God who is Being, who is individually one, N. 597.
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That the Son is δυνα, N. 597.
That therefore the Son with the Father is the God, who is individually one Being, N. 597, 616.
That therefore individual intelligent Being and Person, are not Terms of the same Meaning, N. 597.
That the Son is the Angel of the Father, and in what respect, N. 534, 616.
That the Name Jehovah is appropriated to the one and only God; and, consequently, the Father and the Son, who are Jehovah, are the one and only God, N. 595, 616.
That the Son with the Father is He, or God eternally and immutably the same, N. 662.
That the Λόγος Ἐνδιάθετος, and Περσονικός, is the one Eternally, Existing, and Personal Word of the Father, considered in a two-fold Respect, N. 937.
CHAP. III.

Of the HOLY GHOST.

M V. L U K E iv. 18. The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the Poor.

The Stress which I lay upon eum, does not certainly relate to the Greek, as the Dr. justly observes: But may serve to shew in what Sense the Translator, of almost as great Antiquity as the Author himself, understood the Passage; who may be supposed to refer eum rather to ἄνθρωπος, which he renders by a Masculine, than to λῃστής, which he renders by a Neuter.

MLVI. Acts xxviii. 25, 26, 27. Well spake the Holy Ghost by Isaiah the Prophet unto our Fathers, saying, Go unto this People, and say, &c.—and I should heal them.
The learned Dr. p. 182. says, "That "Isaias, by the Revelation of the Holy Ghost, "saw God sitting upon the Throne of his "Glory, and heard him saying, Go, &c. "Isa. vi. 1, 9." I should be glad to be in- 
formed, whether the God sitting upon the 
Throne, and speaking, be judged by the Dr. 
to be the Father exclusive of the Spirit, or in-
clusive. If He be the Father exclusive of the 
Spirit, how could the Apostle, who refers to 
this Place, say, That the Holy Ghost spake, 
when it appears from the Place it self, that 
none is said to have spoken, but the God sit-
ting upon the Throne, who is supposed to be 
the Father exclusive of the Spirit. If it be 
the Father inclusive of the Spirit, as it must 
needs be to make good the Words of the 
Apostle, who affirms, that the Spirit spake; 
then must the Spirit be included in the Term 
God, and in the visible Glory, which is deno-
minated God. Which is the Thing I con-
tend for; having shewn, that the visible 
* Glory, is called by the Name of the † Holy 

Q 2

* † I will add a Remark or two to those in my first Answer. 
Aben Ezra upon the following Words, They vexed his Holy Spi-
rit, Isa. lxiii. 10. Says, There be some who say, that his Holy 
Spirit is the Angel of Glory. And upon the Words, Where is 
He that put his Holy Spirit in the midst of Him, v. 11. He 
says, There be some who understand it of the Glory, which 
was in the midst of Israel. D. Kimchi upon the following Words, 
When the Lord shall bring again Sion, Isa. lii. 8. says, When 
the Glory shall return to Sion, which is the Spirit of Prophecy, 
putting these two Terms, Glory and Spirit in the Place of Je-

hovah,
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Ghoft, in my Remarks upon this Text, in my first Answer. And because the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, manifested themselves in this visible Glory, which was as the Appearance of a Man, Ezek. i. 26. and a prelude to the Incarnation of the Son of God; it is no wonder that the Son, and Holy Ghost should be said to speak in the Humanity of Christ, Rev. c. ii. and c. iii. which succeeds in the Place of the visible Glory, or Appearance of a Man. The Dr. says, in the same Page, "That whatever God speaks, may very "properly be said to be spoken by the Holy "Ghost; because God always speaks to his "Prophets by the Inspiration of his Holy "Spirit." But does the Dr. mean, that the Holy Ghost himself speaks the Words: Or only, that by his Inspiration, he puts the Prophet into a fit Disposition to hear the Words that are spoken by God? If he puts the Prophet into a fit Disposition only, then the Holy Ghost himself does not speak the Words; which is contrary to the express Assertion of the Apostle, who says, Well spake the Holy Ghost. But if the Holy Ghost himself speaks the Words, and none is said to speak in Isaiah but the God sitting upon the Throne, then is the Holy Ghost included in the

hovah, or Lord, as expressing all of them the same Thing. In like manner Peter calls the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Glory, 1 Pet. iv. 14.

God
God sitting upon the Throne. As for the inferior Angel, whom the Dr. conceives, p. 183. to have spoken in the Person of God, Rev. xi. 1. 3. I refer the Reader to what I have said upon that matter, N. 616. In the same Page the Dr. charges me with saying, "That the Glory mentioned, Isa. 6. is "said, Acts xxviii. 25, &c. to be the Glory "of the Holy Ghost;" and then tells me with Wonder and Surprize, "That there is not "one Syllable about Glory, either in the "Text or Context." If every Mistake, indeed, is the Matter of Wonder, I have reason to wonder at the Dr's in this particular. My Words are plainly these; "The Glory "which appeared to Isa. vi. is the Glory "in this Place, of the Holy Ghost." Where I do not say, it is said in this Place, or, that the Words of Scripture say, it is the Glory of the Holy Ghost: But I infer from the Apostles attributing the Words to the Holy Ghost, that the Glory, which spake them, was the Glory of the Holy Ghost. The Dr. replies, "It cannot be; because neither in the Old "Testament, nor in the New, is the Holy "Ghost, at any time, sith Lord." And the Glory in Isa. vi. is sith Lord. I think I have given Instances to the contrary out of the Old Testament under this Number. Nay, Origen * himself is on my Side in

* See also Orig. cont. Cell. p. 324.

Q 3
his Comment on Psal. xvi. 9. not yet published.

He (the Psalmist,) says he, calls the Gift of the Holy Spirit the Tongue; (that is, the Glory, Heb.) For he says unto the Lord (Psal. iii. 3.) Thou art—my Glory, and the Lifter up of mine Head. But the Lord

is the Spirit according to the Apostle, 2 Cor. iii. 17.

And as for the New Testament, see N. 1132. "But, on the contrary, adds the Dr. the "Prophets are always represented as fee- "ing those Visions by the Inspiration of the "Holy Ghost: In which Visions they hear God, or the Lord speaking." Here the Dr, seems plainly to make the Holy Ghost do no more, than put the Prophet into a Dis- position to hear God speaking, but not to speak himself, contrary to the Apostle's Assertion in the Text now under Consideration: And contrary to the Doctrine of the Jews, as I have shewn in my first Answer, p. 116. and will further shew, by a Passage out of Targ. Jonath. Numb. vii. 89. which runs thus; And when Moses went into the Tabernacle of the Congregation to speak with Him, He heard the Voice
Voice of the * Spirit, which spake with him (when it came down from the Heaven of Heavens upon the Mercy-Seat, which is upon the Ark of the Testimony) from between the two Cherubims. The Original Hebrew does not mention who it was, that spake from off the Mercy-Seat between the two Cherubims; but the Paraphrast calls him the Spirit: And the Septuagint, † Lord, xvpLo; which compare with Exod. xxv. 22. 1. But the learned Dr. p. 184. objects to these Authorities after the following Manner, "That (if they prove any thing) they "prove either that those Rabbies took the "Holy Ghost to be only another Title for "God the Father himself: Or else, that they "understood him to be a Person speaking in "the Name of God the Father." That they looked upon the Holy Ghost to be a Person of a different Nature from God the Father, who was not himself God, but yet spoke in the Name of God the Father, I think cannot be proved from the foregoing Citations, except it be from the first of those out of Aben Ezra, which yet may admit of some doubt. But that such of them, who knew not the God-

* The Word also is said to speak from, and sit between, the Cherubims. See Onkelos, Philo, and Irenæus, N. s80.
head but in one Subsistence only, or in one Person, (which may be supposed to be the Case of the later Rabbins) should take the Holy Ghost to be another Title for that One Divine Person, is what I think much more agreeable to the foresaid Passages. The Consequence of which is, that except the Scripture had represented the Holy Ghost in such Characters as inferred his Godhead, the Rabbins, who held but one Person in the Divine Nature, could never have taken him to be God the Father in another Title. If then the Holy Ghost be God in the Old Testament; if He be confounded with the Father by the Ignorance of the Rabbins, and not from a Personal Identity with the Father: If He be declared in the New Testament to be a distinct Person from God the Father: And if God be but One; it follows that the Holy Ghost, tho' a distinct Person from the Father, is yet one God with him. Other Jews there were, who, as they held the Spirit to be God; so acknowledged him to be a distinct Person from the Father, as Eusebius tells us, who has these Words:

All the Jewish Doctors, after the God over all, and after Wisdom his first begotten, deify, or hold for God, a Third and Holy Power, which they

Agreeable to which Assertion, concerning a Third Power, ἡ τρίτην δύναμιν, is Philo's Notion, which he expresses after the following Manner:

The enlightened Soul, says he, receives a threefold Appearance, or Manifestation of one Subject——The Father of all is manifested in the Middle, who is called in the Holy Scriptures by a proper Name, Ἡ ὁ Ἐπικράτειος, who is, and the nearest to Him.

Whereof the One is called, the creating Power; the other, the Royal Power. And the creating Power, is God—but the Royal Power, is Lord.

And, p. 503, 504. he tells us, That Ἡ ὁ Ἐπικράτειος, is called in respect of his creating Power Lord, and of his Royal Power God. And, p. 368. he says,

That there is a threefold Appearance
And proceeds to shew, that the Three which appeared to Abraham, were no more than One. See p. 370. B. \\nc. In which Words we may observe, that the Divine Subject, Substance, or Being, manifested to the Understanding of an enlightened Person, is One. That there are Three Manifestations of this one Subject, or Substance. That one of these Manifestations is of God, as He is He who is, or \( \delta \ \varepsilon \); and the other Two, of his creating and Royal Powers. That therefore God, as He is \( \delta \ \varepsilon \), and his creating and Royal Powers are one Subject, or Substance; that is, God, as He is \( \delta \ \varepsilon \), as He is Creator, and as He is King, is the one Subject, known by Three Appearances. And that both those Powers, and \( \delta \ \varepsilon \) in respect of those Powers, are called Lord God. Now that the first of these Powers is the Word, is evident from what I have said, N. 340. See also Philo, p. 416. C. And if the First be the Word, a Divine Person, it need not be doubted but the Second is the Spirit, or Holy Ghost, a Divine Person also; the nearest Power to the Word being the Holy Ghost. And if the Two Powers, and \( \delta \ \varepsilon \), are one Subject; the Word, and Spirit, and God the Father, are one Subject also; which is the Doctrine of the Church at present contended for. And if the two Powers be Lord God; the Word and Holy
Holy Ghost, who are these two Powers, are Lord God: So that it is evident, that not all the learned Jews, who held the Holy Ghost to be God, did look upon him to be God the Father in another Title; much less to be a separate Subject, tho' a distinct Person, from God the Father; and that those, who did confound him with the Father, tho' they were mistaken in so doing, were yet in the right in holding him to be God, according to the Light they received from Scripture. As for the Citations out of the Old Testament, I do not conceive that the Holy Ghost in these, or any other Passages, "is figuratively put " for God himself, or the Person of the Fa-" ther, in like manner as the Spirit of a Man signifies the Man himself: " Because then the Spirit of the Father must be considered as a Part of the Person of the Father; as the Spirit of a Man, is a Part of the Person of a Man; which is contrary to Scripture, that represents the Spirit as a distinct Person from the Person of the Father.

Pag. 184. the Dr. says, " Two Persons " cannot be (ταυτοκοσμί, or μονοκοσμί) of the " same individual, or identical Nature; be-" cause then one of those two Persons would " be the same Person, which the other of " them is," It is evident to Reason with-" out Revelation, that the Divine Nature, or Substance, is individually, or indivisibly One. It has been also proved from Revelation, that
that the *Substance*, or Nature of the Father, is communicated to the Son, N. 534, 594, 595, 597, 616. And it appears from N. 1056, 1132. of my first Answer, that the Holy Ghost, and Jehovah are One. And from N. 66. that the Holy Ghost is God. Which is confirmed by Authorities cited p. 119, 124, 136, 138, 139. To which may be added the Reasoning of Athenagoras, who argues, that the Christians are no Atheists, because they acknowledge

Ωδ ἐπιλέγει, ή γίνεν God the Father, God Ωδ, ἢ πνεύμα ἡνον, the Son, and the Holy §. 10. Ghost.

Which, I think, infers the Divinity of the Holy Ghost; because if He were not God, the acknowledging of the Spirit would be no joint Argument that the Christians were not Atheists. If then Lord God Expresses him, who is essentially, or substantially God, according to N. 534. the Holy Ghost, who is Lord God, is essentially, or substantially God: And consequently of one *Substance* with the Father. And if the one Divine Substance be communicated without Division, as appears from the Premises, it remains after Communication one undivided, or individual Substance: And the Three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are

of one and the same individual Nature, or Substance. Neither does this confound the Persons; because the Divine Substance is in the Father after one Manner, and in the Son, and Holy Ghost, after another. Indeed if by ταυτότητι, or μονοσύνε, be meant that the Son, and Holy Ghost, are of the Essence of the Father, as He is Father; this would be to make the Son, and Holy Ghost, one Person with the Father, or different Names of the Person of the Father. But I affirm no more, than that the Son, and Holy Ghost, are of the same undivided Substance with the Father; or, of the same Essence with him as He is God. In which Sense they may be called ταυτότητι, as appears from Expressions of the like Import: The Author of the Questions and Answers to the Orthodox, says,

One God, namely, Τῇ ταυτότητι Σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ Πατρὶ τῷ Χριστῷ τῷ Θεῷ, as it appears from Expressions of the same Substance of Persons. In Respond. ad Quæst. 139.

See the Confession of Faith sent by Damascus to Paulinus, Theodorit. Eccles. Hist. Lib. 5. c. 11.

Epiphanius says,

That the Trinity always existing, is of the same Essence, or Substance.
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Of the same Meaning is the Term διόσκορα, a Word not only fitted to represent Persons of the same Kind of Substance, but of the same undivided Substance or Essence, according to the Analogy of the Tongue. For if διοσκόρα, and διοσκόρα signify them, who are born of the same individual Mother, and begotten of the same individual Father: May not διοσκόρα be equally fit to represent them, who subsist in the same individual or undivided Substance? And indeed it is explained by Terms equivalent to ταυτόσωσι.

Phavorinus says,

"Ομοσώσις, το ἀντίς εὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργείας.

Hesychius says,

"Ομοσώσις, ταυτόσωσιν καὶ το ἀντίς εὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργείας.

And Epiphanius says,

"Οταν ἂ το διοσκόρον ἄγγελ, ἐκ ἀλλότριον ἂ δινής ἡσύνης σομαίνα. Vol. 2. p. 11. That Homoeousiōn, is that which is of the same Essence, or Substance, and Energy.

Homœousiotes, is an Identity of Subject.

And Epiphanius says,

"Ουδὲ ἐτέθη ἡ τοῖς παρὰ ἡ ἑσύνη, ἐδὲ οὐκ ἡ θεσύνη, ἐδὲ Substance, or Essence, is nothing else but
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but the Godhead; and the Godhead nothing else but Substance, or Essence.

And to put the Matter quite out of doubt, I will shew, that the most eminent Christian Writers, after the Arian Controversie, understood it in this Sense, that is, as signifying a Plurality of Divine Persons, not in the same specific or common Nature, but in the same undivided Substance; which may serve for an Answer to the 35th Page of the Reply to Mr. Nelson.

Athanasmus says,

God is He who is— therefore his Word, also is He who is. Orat. cont. Gent. p. 40.

But the God who is, or, who is Being it self, is indivisibly, or individually One; because Being is indivisibly, or individually One: The Son therefore, who with the Father, is He who is, or, who is Being it self, is with the Father indivisibly, or individually One Being, or Substance.

Again, he says,

Homoousion, is that whic h has an Identity of Nature, (or Substance, N. 595.) Lib. i. §. 9.

Which is spoken in relation to the Three Divine Persons, and is, I conceive, directly con-
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contrary to the learned Dr's Assertion, "That two Individuals cannot, without an express 'Contradiction, have an Identity of Nature.' See his Reply, p. 184.

This Doctrine is confirmed by the following Words,

The Trinity is One, and Indivisible — And the Monad, or Unit, is distinguished into Persons without being divided.

In which Words, First, He calls the One Divine Nature by the Name of * Monad, or Unit, which is known to be altogether indivisible. Secondly, He affirms this Monad to be indivisibly distinguished into Three Persons. Which argues, that the Monad is not a specific Nature, a Kind, or general Idea, but one really existing Substance; because a specific Nature, which is not real, but ideal, cannot be distinguished into real Persons, tho' it may be the common Standard, or Exemplar, with which they agree. Thirdly, He affirms, that the Trinity is indivisibly One. Which is the necessary Consequence of the indivisible Monad's being indivisibly distinguished into Three Persons. And this being like the Style of Dionysius of Alexandria,

*†† See N. 1248.
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cited by *Athanasius, is probably used by
him in the same Sense.

And to add no more, he illustrates the
substantial Unity of the Father and the Son,
(which may be extended also to the whole
Trinity, which he holds to be con-substan-
tial) after the following Manner;

For as the Fountain is not the River,
neither the River the Fountain, but both
are one and the same
Water flowing from
the Fountain into the
River: So the Godhead
comes from the Fa-
ther to the Son with-
out flowing, and with-
out Division.

Where as the Fountain and the Stream
have the same undivided Water; so the Fa-
ther and the Son are affirmed to have the
same indivisible Godhead, or Divine Sub-
stance. But let the Reader consult the
learned Cudworth, p. 616, 617, 618, 619, 620
where he proves, that Athanasius held more
than a specific Unity of Substance, or Es-
fence in the Three Persons.

Basil, after the same Manner, calls the
Son δ ὄν, Lib. 2. contr. Eunom. p. 57. See

* See N. 1243.
The Consequence of which is, according to the foregoing Reasoning, that the Son is One undivided Being, or Substance with the Father.

Again, he says,

That the Trinity is to be worshipped in One, Eternal Glory: Forasmuch as it has every where one and the same only Head, being indissoluble, inseparable, indivisible.

And in his Treatise de differ. Effent. & Hypost. he gives us the following Illustration.

As the Essence, or Substance of a Rainbow, which shines with different Colours, is one, but its Colours many—So in one common Essence, or Substance, do shine forth the distinguishing Properties of every Person.

In which he represents the Divine Substance to be One, as the Substance of a Rainbow is One, that is, individually One. It is true, indeed, he sometimes illustrates the Unity in the Divine Nature by that which is specific in created Beings; but then he can
can not mean, that the Divine Unity is no more than specific, as will appear from the following Considerations: First, That such an Unity is ideal only, and not real; for a Species being a common Idea representing the Nature of all its Individuals, a specific Unity must be an ideal Unity only: And if the Unity be ideal only, then is it not real, that is, there is no real, substantial Union between the Three Persons, but the Three Persons are Three distinct Substances, or Three Gods.

Secondly, Since δ ᾿αὐ, the God, who is Being, is but One, and individually One, N. 597, and this Writer holds the Son to be δ ᾿αὐ, he evidently holds him to be One undivided Substance with the God who is Being itself; which is more than a specific Union. Now δ ᾿αὐ, or I am, is no more communicable to any other Being, besides the One True God, than Jehovah, which is put in the Place of I am, or δ ᾿αὐ, and is itself incommunicable. See N. 534, 595.

Thirdly, His illustrating the Union of the Three Persons in one Substance, by the Union of the Colours of the Rainbow in one Subject, which is a really existing and undivided Subject, shews, that he looked upon the one Substance of the Three Divine Persons to be a really existing and undivided Substance; And that he meant no more by comparing the Divine Union with the specific Union of

Three
Three created Individuals of the same Order, than, that as Three created Individuals agree in the same common Idea: So the Three Divine Persons are united in the same Divine Substance inseparably existing in each of the Three. For it cannot be supposed that a real Subjective Unity, such as that of the Colours in the Substance of the Rainbow, should be made use of to represent a specific or ideal Unity; when, indeed, general Notions and their Affections, are founded upon, and are representative of, really existing Subjects and their Affections. But the forementioned Treatise will discover more of this Author’s Mind concerning the real and substantial Unity of the Three Divine Persons.

Greg. Nyssen. holds the Son to be ἕν, or, One undivided Being with the Father, contr. Eunom. p. 204. B. And says,

Εἷς δὲ Θεὸς ἐστὶν ἕν ἄν. There is One and the same God by reason of an Identity of Substance; of which Substance the Term God is Significative. See N. 534.

And in his Catechetic Discourse, cap. 3. he says,

Ἐξ ᾧ ἑιδαμαι τὸν Θεὸν τὴν φύσιν ἐν τῷ παρεμεῖτω. Let the Unity of Nature remain according to the Jewish Notion.

Now
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Now the Unity of the Divine Nature, according to the Jewish Notion, is not a specific Unity, but a real Unity, such as is the Affection of a really existing and undivided Substance: This Father then looked upon the One Divine Nature, to be one really existing and undivided Substance. But in this Unity of Nature, εν τῇ ἕνωσι τῷ φύσεως, or, in this one really existing and undivided Substance, he holds a Difference of Hypostases, or Persons, c. i. The Three Divine Persons then, according to this Father, subsist in one really existing and undivided Substance. And therefore, agreeably to this Notion, he says, it cannot be explained,

How the same Being may be numbered (as to Persons,) and cannot be numbered (as to Substance;) How it is seen dividedly, and yet is comprehended in a Monad: How it is distinguished in Subsistence, but undivided in Subject. But after you have considered their Distinction, (that is, the Distinction of Persons) the Unity of Nature (the Jewish Unity) admits of no Division.
Gregory Nazianzen says,

As we can conceive no Division and Seperation between the Mind, and Thought, and Soul: So can we not conceive any Seperation, or Division between the Holy Ghost, and the Saviour, and the Father; because, as we have said before, the Nature of Intelligible and Divine Beings is **Indivisible**.

Again,

As the Rays of a luminous Body, which have naturally an inseperable Relation one to another, are neither seperated from the luminous Body, nor divided from one another:—

So our Saviour, and the Holy Ghost, who are Twin Rays of the Father,— are united to the Father.—

For the Nature, (or Substance, N. 595.) of those excellent Persons,— is **Indivisible**.
If then the Mind, Thought, and Soul, are subjectively and inseparably One, so that the Thought cannot subsist out of the Mind: And if the Luminary, and its Rays, are One undivided Substance, according to this Author; Then are the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, subjectively and inseparably One, or one undivided Substance.

St. Chrysostom says of the Holy Ghost,

That it is of the \( \tau \varepsilon \alpha \nu \tau \nu \varepsilon \tau \nu \varepsilon \omega \lambda \varsigma \) same Essence, or Substance, with the Father, and the Son. De Sanct. Pentec. Ser. 37. p. 563. Tom. 5. Edit. Paris.

Here is a plain Identity of Substance, Essence, or Nature, affirmed in the Three Persons. This Trinity of the same Substance, or Essence, he calls,

The inseparable Trinity. The indivisible Trinity.

And says again upon Matt. xxviii. 19.

You see that the Trinity is indivisible. De Sanct. Pentec. Serm. 37. p. 562.

If then the Three Persons are of the same Substance, and indivisible; it follows, that they are of the same indivisible Substance. Which will further appear from the follow-
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He says, that the Nature (or Substance of the Father and Son) is not separated, \( \xi \chi \nu \iota \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \alpha \gamma \varepsilon \tau \nu \) De Serpente Mosis, p. 59. Tom. 6.

And again,
\( \theta \iota \nu \varphi \iota \omega \ \alpha \mu \acute{e} \zeta \iota \sigma \varphi \omega \naught \nu \varphi \alpha \lambda \mu \sigma \alpha \nu \nu \nu \alpha \nu - \eta \varphi \nu \tau \nu \), p. 65.

And again,
\( \tau \zeta \acute{o} \acute{a} \acute{i} \acute{a} \acute{e} \acute{e} \iota \varepsilon \alpha \tau \alpha \gamma \tau \nu \tau \nu \tau \tau \nu \tau \tau \nu \tau \nu \nu \alpha \mu \acute{e} \zeta \iota \sigma \nu \nu \nu \gamma \alpha \nu \), \( \varepsilon \mu e \acute{e} \iota \chi \varepsilon \acute{o} \acute{r} \gamma \varsigma \), \( \& \delta \mu \iota \acute{a} \sigma \iota \omega \alpha \nu \nu \nu \).

I conceive, and declare that the Nature (or Substance of the Trinity) is indivisible.

Reason does not divide, Time does not part, nor Ages separate the Nature of the Holy and Immortal Adorable Trinity.

But this Nature, or Substance, is the same in All, according to the first Citation. The Three Divine Persons then have the same undivided, or indivisible Nature, or Substance.

Hilary holds the Son to be He who is, Is qui eft, or \( \delta \ \acute{a} \nu \); see N. 411.

He says,

Igitur ex vivente Deo Patre vivens Dei Filius, \& ex Deo Deus, \& naturae in-

That the Nature of God (or the Divine Nature) is the same, and not unlike, in both (Father and Son.)

That the living Son of God from the living God the Father, and God of God, shewing, both.
both the Unity of Nature, which is inseperable and not unlike: And also the Mystery of his Nativity says, I and my Father are One.

And in relation to the following Words, Surely God is in thee, and there is none else, there is no God. Verily, thou art a God that hidest thy self, O God of Israel the Saviour, Isa. xlv. 14, 15. He speaks thus,

And Isaiah prophesied these Things after this Manner, giving Testimony to the Individual (or Indivisible) and Inseperable Divinity of Father and Son.

Note, By Divinity, he means the Divine Nature; as the Context in the preceding and following Pages shews. He also holds the Consubstantiality of the Three Divine Persons. It follows then it was this Father's Opinion, that the Three Divine Persons had One and the same individual, or indivisible and inseperable Divine Nature, or Substance.

Jerom says,

There is One only of God, which truly is.

Et hac quidem Esaies, individuum atq; inseperabilem Patris & Filii Divinitatem testatam, ita propheta tavit. Lib. 6. de Trin, p. 53.

Una est Dei & Sola Natura, quae verè est. Epist. ad Damas. adv. Arian. Hypost. This
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This Nature, or Substance, is not specific, or ideal, because it truly is, or truly exists. If then it truly exists, and is One and Only, it excludes Plurality, and consequently Division, otherwise it would not be only; and if there be no Division, it is one undivided, or individual Substance, or Nature.

Again,

Ille (Deus) Sola God is the Only perfect, Natura est perfecta, & in tribus Personis & in tribus Personis Deitas una subsistit, which (one Godhead) truly Natura est. Ibid.

That is, the One only perfect and truly existing Nature is God, or the One Godhead, which subsists in Three Persons. Which Nature being undivided, as it is One and Only, the Three Divine Persons are in One truly existing and undivided Nature, or Substance, according to this Author.

St. Austin says,

Omnes quos legere All the Catholic Writers, potui, qui ante me upon the Divine scripserunt de Trinitate qui ante me scripserunt de Trinitate qui eft Deus, divinorum librorum veterum & novorum Catholicici Tractatores hoc intenderunt secundum scripturas

which is God, have endeavoured to prove this by
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by the Scriptures, that docere quod Pater, Father, Son, and Holy & Filius, & Spiritus Ghost, by an inseperable and equal Frut Sanctus, unius ejus- tion of one and the demq; Substantiae inse- same Substance, do perabiliæqualitatiediv- give us to understand, inam insinuent Unit that there is a Divine tatetem. DeTrin. L.1. Unity.

These Words are very remarkable, and afford us the following Considerations; First, That the Divine Substance is one and the same. Secondly, That the Three Divine Persons do inseparably and equally subsist in, or enjoy, this one and the same Substance. Thirdly, That this is the Ground of the Divine Unity; which is therefore an Unity of Persons in one and the same Substance, without a Possibility of Separation, and without Inequality. Fourthly, That all the Catholic Commentators that wrote of the Trinity before St. Austin, and which he could possibly read, were of this Opinion. Fifthly, That they undertook to prove the Truth of this Doctrine from the Holy Scripture; which, I think, is a large and copious Testimony, that the True Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity is, that Three Persons subsist in one and the same undivided Substance.

Now I cannot conceive, that all these Fathers were mistaken in the Meaning of the Term ὁμοούσιον, considering how near the Time
Time of the Nicene Council they lived; and that the Tradition could not probably be lost in so short a Time of the Sense it was used in: And therefore I cannot but conclude, that as they understood it to import, that the Three Divine Persons had one and the same undivided Substance; so the Sense of the Council was expressed in their Sentiment.

What the learned Dr. means by the Citation out of Justin Martyr, p. 186. I cannot tell. It affirms, that the Divine Word, or Prophetic Spirit, sometimes foretells things to come, that is, in its own Person; sometimes speaks, as in the Person of the Lord, of All, and God the Father; and sometimes, as in the Person of Christ. But surely the Holy Ghost may do all this, and yet be comprehended in the Glory setting upon the Throne, and be the Third Person in the One Divine Substance; this near relation being no hindrance, why the First, and Second Person should not speak thro' the Third; or the Third speak in the Person of the First and Second.

MLXXV. John iii. 5. Except a Man be born—of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.

When I said that God and the Spirit were probably believed by St. John to be One, I introduced no Confusion of Persons; because my
my plain Meaning was, that since God, c. i. 13. Answers to Spirit a Divine Person, c. iii. 5,6. it is probable that St. John meant by God the same Person, that he did by Spirit, that is, God the Holy Ghost, not God the Father. The Dr's Citations out of Scripture, p. 187. shew, indeed, that the Holy Ghost is a distinct Person from God the Father; and that God the Father quickens us, leads us, adopt us into Sons, and dwells in us by his Spirit, which I heartily assent to as Divine Truth: But this does not prove that the Term God, c. i. 13. cannot be meant of the Person of the Spirit; or, that the Spirit is not of one Divine Substance with the Father. But says the Dr. "According to your " Friend's Argument, the * Spirit of God " will be the Spirit of himself." I have shewn, N. 538. that God sometimes signifies the Father, sometimes the Son; and, N. 66. sometimes the Holy Ghost. When therefore I say, that the Holy Ghost is God; I do not mean the Father, or the Son, but the Third Divine Person, by the Term God. When I say, that the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of God; I do not then mean, as I did before, the Third Divine Person by the Term God: But either the Father, or the Son; for the Son is supposed by Irenæus to be the Fountain of the Spirit also, in the following Words,

* See N. 66. p. 67.
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Moses (says he) did not give the Spirit (to Joshua) by breathing on him, as Christ, (gave it to his Disciples by breathing on them, John xx. 22.) because He was not the Fountain of the Spirit.

The Words of Nemessianus a Thubunis, were doubtless understood by the Council as a Citation out of the Gospel of St. John; which is an Argument, that they were generally found at that time in the African Copies of the New Testament: For otherwise, they would not have been registered, nor produced by St. Cyprian, as a Scripture Reason of the Suffrage of that Prelate. And if they were found in those Copies, they could not be contrary to the received Doctrines of the African Church; because otherwise, as may reasonably be supposed, such learned Bishops and Witnesses of the Truth would soon have discovered, and zealously have rejected, a Form of Words introduced into the Text, that tended to the Corruption of the Catholic Doctrine in so momentous an Article. It is evident then, that the Divinity of the Spirit was the common Doctrine of the *African Churches of that Age; and it may fairly be

** See a Noble Testimony of Eusebius concerning the Orthodoxy of the African and Gallican Churches. De Martyr. Palæst. c. 13.**
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concluded, that Tertullian's Notion of the Holy Ghost, whom he held to be God, and who cites this Passage no less than Nemescianus, was by no means the Effect of his private Spirit, but of the Doctrine of the Church of which he was a Member. Neither was Africa the only Place where the Godhead of the Spirit was believed and asserted in the Latin Church; for we find it acknowledged in the Second Century by a learned Father, and Bishop of Lyons, I mean, Irenaeus, who may be supposed in his public Writings to have taught nothing that was contrary to the Faith of the *Gallican Church, in which he was a Governour. This Father tells us, *Lib. 2. c. 55.*

That God made all things by himself, that is, by his Word, and by Wisdom,

Or the Holy Ghost; comprehending them both in the Name God, by affirming them to be One with God himself.

Again, he says, that

*The Word and Wisdom (or the Holy Ghost) are understood, or contained, under the Term God.*

Again,

*The Scriptures are perfect, because they are* perfectae sunt, quippe

Fecit ea per semetipsum, hoc est, per Verbum & per Sapi-entiam.

Appellationi enim Dei coobaudientur— Verbum— & Sapi-entia. *Lib. 2. c. 18.*
The True Scripture Doctrine

a Verbo Dei, & Spiritu ejusdems. Lib. 2. Word of God, and his Spirit.

Which supposes, that the *Word, and Spirit, are themselves perfect. For a perfect Effect cannot proceed but from a perfect Cause. But nothing is perfect that is made, according to this Author, who says,

Καθὼς δὲ μὴ ἐστιν. So far as any thing ἀγνωστα, καὶ ὅτα ἐστιν is not unmade; so far ἕι σεπελευθήσεται. it falls short of that Lib. 4. c. 73.

But † God only is unmade. God || only therefore is perfect; but the Word, and the Spirit, are perfect: The Word, and the Spirit, therefore are comprehended in the God, who is alone unmade. And to conclude with this Father, he has the following Words, Lib. 5: c. 12.

Καὶ πάλιν ὁ δεύτερος Ἱσαίας—φησίν, Πνεῦμα γὰρ παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐχεῖ λεύσεται, ἵπ τῶν πάντων πάντων ἐγὼ ἑκοίνσα, το τεύμα ἵπ χεὶ τὸ τεσσάρας—καὶ πνεῦμα κοινός ὁ πάντων κτισμάτων. And again, the fame Isaias says,— For the Spirit shall come forth from me, and I have made every Breath, or Soul, (c. lvii. 16. Septuag.) ranking the Spirit with

* Τίτικς ἐστιν τέλειος ἄν. Lib. 4. c. 75. † ὁ Θεὸς ὁ μόνος ἀγέννυτος, c. 75. || Τέλειος ἐστιν ἀγέννυτος. ἑτερός ἐστιν. Ibid.

God
God properly: But the σῶς ἐγείρετο τούτου ἀνατέσσα καὶ ψευμαί, Breath, or Soul, in ἐρεμαῖς ἦν καὶ ἔπεσεν ἀνάστησιν. common with the Creature, and calling it a Thing made.

Where ranking the Spirit with God, τὸ πνεῦμα ἄνω Θεῷ ἔκτενες, has the same Meaning with speaking of the Spirit, or representing it under the Character of God; as will appear from the Use of the like Phrase concerning the Holy Ghost, in the following Greek Writers. Chrysostom says, in his Comment on 2 Cor. iii. 18. You see again, how,

He places the Spirit ἔν τῇ Θεῷ τῷ in the Rank or Order of πνεῦμα ἂναπτ重要 God;

Referring, I suppose, to the following Words, ὥστε χαίρει τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς, which he understood thus; By the Lord the Spirit, or, who is the Spirit. Basil says, Let them consider, which is the more just, either to rank the Spirit with God, μετὰ Θεῷ συνάδεσθαι ὡς, or, to level Him with the Creature, πρὸς τὸν θεόν ἐξελθὼν. De Spirit. Sto. c. 16. p. 179.

MCXXI. Matt. xii. 31, 32. The Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto Men, &c.

The learned Dr. p. 190. brings these Words, All manner of Sin, and Blasphemy, shall be forgiven unto Men, Matt. xii. 31. and all Sins shall be forgiven unto the Sons of Men, and Blas-
Blasphemies, wherewith soever they shall blaspheme, Mark iii. 28. as a Proof, that Blasphemy against God the Father, and the Son of God, is pardonable. But, I conceive, that neither of these Passages, tho' universally delivered, are understood of Sins of Blasphemy against God the Father, or, the Son as He is God; but against Men only, or, the Son as He is Man. My Reasons are, First, Because Blasphemy is not appropriated to signify that sort of evil speaking, which is directed against God; but comprehends in its Notion, that against the Creature also: So that nothing can be inferred from the Use of that Term. Thus railing against the Devil, Jude ix. is βλασφημία in the Original; and, καθὼς βλασφημήσατε, Rom. iii. 8. relates to a slanderous Report, that was raised against the Apostles. Secondly, The Words, All manner of Sin, and Blasphemy, shall be forgiven unto Men, are explained and confirmed by the following; And whosoever speaketh a Word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven Him, v. 32. which limits the Blasphemy to that against the Son, as Son of Man. For that the 32d Verse is repeated as an Explanation and Confirmation of the 31st, is evident, partly from the remaining Parts of both these Verfes; whereof the One, v. 31. But the Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto Men, is explained and confirmed by the other, v. 32. But whosoever speaketh against
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against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this World, neither in the World to come. It being usual in Scripture to repeat a Matter, not only to render it more clear, and impress it deeper on the Mind of the Hearer, but also to shew the Certainty of the Thing spoken of. If then the remaining Parts of both these Verses are explicative, the one of the other; we need not doubt but the former Parts are so also. And partly from the parallel Places in St. Mark, and St. Luke; whereof St. Mark, c. iii. 28, 29. joyns the first Part of the 31st Verse in St. Matthew with the latter Part of the 32d Verse, omitting the rest between; and Luke, c. xii. 10. joyns the first Part of the 32d Verse with the latter Part of the 31st, omitting what follows and goes before, as if what each of them wrote seperately without a Repetition, imported by it self the same with the Matter repeated in St. Matthew's Gospel. Thirdly, The following Writers include the Father, and the Son, with the Spirit, in the Object of the unpardonable Blasphemy: The Divinity being equal, and the Energy alike in the Three Persons.

Athanafius says,

He who sees his (Christ's) Works, that are wrought by the Holy Ghost, and says, He who does

\[\text{O}\ \delta\rho\nu\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\alpha\ \varepsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\ \tau\alpha\ \tau\eta\theta\epsilon\mu\rho\alpha\\lambda\iota\ \alpha\gamma\nu\\mu\\mu\mu\varepsilon\alpha\tau\alpha, \ \xi\ \lambda\epsilon\gamma\alpha\nu\ \tau\alpha\ \tau\tau\iota\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \pi\omega\,\delta\nu\lambda\iota\ \mu\nu\ \varepsilon\iota\ \tau\eta\nu\ \delta\varepsilon\nu\ \nu\tau\alpha\ \nu\alpha\ \delta\lambda\nu\ \text{such}\]
Where it is evident, that the unpardonable Sin, in attributing the Works of Christ to an unclean Spirit, is declared to be committed not against the Holy Ghost alone, but the Divinity of the Son also. Now, according to this Author, he, who blasphemes the Godhead of the Son, not only blasphemes the Holy Ghost, but the Father also; for, he says,

It is necessary that he, who Sins against the Son, and blasphemes Him, Sin also against the Father; and the Holy Ghost.

Which he founds upon this, that the Trinity is indivisible; so that in the Opinion of this Writer, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were the joint Object of the unpardonable Blasphemy.

Ambrose says, upon Luke xii. 10.

Numquid ergo Spiritus Sanctus præferitur Christo, ut in Christum peccantes veniam consequantur, in Spiritum San-

such things is not God, and the Son of God, but attributes them to Beelzebub, he evidently blasphemes in denying his Divinity.
the Holy Ghost should be unworthy to obtain Forgiveness?

To which he replies,

If therefore, as we believe, there is an Unity of Trinity, the Greatness indeed is indivisible, as the Operation is indivisible.—And if the Operation be One, the Blasphemy is also One.

That is, the Father and Son operate thro' the Spirit, and are blasphemed in the Spirit; and therefore the Sin is unpardonable, no less on their Account, than on Account of the Spirit. St. Jerom, in his Comment on Matt. xii. 32. understands the Blasphemy against the Son of Man, which is capable of Forgiveness, to be no more, than a reproaching him as He is * Man. But, on the other side, he says, That that Person shall never be forgiven, who, against the clear Demonstration of Divine Power, affirms,

That Christ the Word is the Minister; and that the Works of the Holy Spirit, are the Works of Beelzebub.

* So Athan. Ep. 4, ad Serap. § 16. And Theophyl. in Loc. & in Luc. xii. 10.

S 3
And
And in his Comment on Mark iii. 29. he says,

Quia non meretur pænitentiam agere ut recipiatur, qui Christum intelligens, principem Daemoniorum esse dicebat.

For that Person is not worthy of Repentance in order to be restored, who knowing who Christ is, says he is the Prince of the Devils.

In all which Authorities we find, partly that the Word, partly that the Father, and the Word, were the joint Object with the Holy Ghost of the Blasphemy of the Jews; and that the Sin was unpardonable on Account of them all. For if the Father works thro' the Son in the Holy Ghost, the Demonstration of Power, as Ambrose has reasoned, is alike from them all; and all were affronted by the Blasphemy of the Jews, who resolved those Works, that were the genuine Fruits of the Holy Trinity, into an unclean Principle, or diabolical Agent. Tho' then the Blasphemy was in Opposition to the greatest and last Means of Conviction, to the most beneficial, as well as most powerful Works; (p. 191. of the Dr's Reply) yet, forasmuch, as those Works were not wrought by the Spirit alone, but by the Father, and the Son thro' the Spirit, as our Saviour says of the Works which He did by the Spirit, hitherto my Father worketh, and I work, John v. 17. And, forasmuch, as the Blasphemy consisted in saying, That it was
was an unclean Spirit, Beelzebub, or, the Prince of the Devils, which wrought in Christ, and cast out Devils, Mark iii. 22, 30. It follows, as has been observed before, that the Three Persons equally working the most beneficial, as well as most powerful Works, and equally affording the greatest and last Means of Conviction, were equally affected with the blasphemous Charge; and that the Sin was unpardonable, no less in respect of the Father and of the Son, than of the Holy Ghost. And here, on occasion of the Circumstances required by the Dr. to render Blasphemy unpardonable, namely, that it be directed against the greatest and last Means of Conviction and Amendment, p. 191. I shall observe, that the Blasphemy of the Israelitish Woman's Son, Lev. xxiv. 11. was of this fort; He had seen the Wonders of the Lord by the Hand of Moses, in the Land of Egypt, in the Red Sea, and in the Wilderness, till that time; He had heard God speaking from the Holy Mountain himself, and seen the Tokens of his Majesty and Power; and yet, notwithstanding these Evidences, this greatest Conviction of the Truth of his Godhead, which that Age was capable of receiving, he audaciously blasphemed Him; which was in effect to deny his Godhead, and resolve the Works, which he had hitherto seen, into another Principle than what was Divine; so that I cannot but continue
to believe, it was a Sin unto Death, or absolutely unpardonable, tho' done against the Father. The learned Dr. says, in the same Page, "That the Texts I allledge out of the "Epistle to the Hebrews, and out of St. John, "are by almost all Divines understood, not "of a Sin absolutely unpardonable." I conceive that they, who hold the Sin against the Holy Ghost, Matt. xii. 31, 32. to be absolutely unpardonable, as the learned Dr. seems to do in his Scripture Doctrine, and in his Reply, p. 191. at the End; must, in Consequence thereof, if they well consider it, hold the Sin mentioned, Heb. x. 26, &c. to be absolutely unpardonable also. For the Crime here spoken of being Apostacy, as appears from v. 25, 39. and from the parallel Place c. vi. 6. it will follow, that the Despite done to the Spirit of Grace, c. x. 29. if it were a thorough Apostacy proceeding from the Heart, was a rejecting of the Spirit, and condemning of its Works as delusive, or diabolical; which is the same Malignity that rendered the Blasphemy an unpardonable Sin, Mark iii. 29, 30. And if the Malignity be the same in both these Crimes, we have reason to believe that they are alike unpardonable. But further, it is highly probable, from Acts xxvi. 11. that the Jewish Apostates were obliged to * blaspheme the Son of God, and the Power He

* Hermas says, That the Apostates added this to the rest of their
He wrought by, in express Terms, as the greatest Evidence they could possibly give, that they had truly renounced him from the Bottom of their Hearts; which if they had done, and this Remark be true, there is a further Reason for understanding the Apostle in the strictest Sense, when he says, *It is impossible* (for Believers) *if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto Repentance*, c.vi. v. 4, 6. And, that *there remaineth no more Sacrifice for Sins, but a certain fearful looking for of Judgment*, c.x. 26, 27. But Secondly, The Sin of Apostacy is declared unpardonable, or a Sin unto Death, in the Old Testament; and therefore may be judged to be such in the New Testament, or, in the Epistle to the Hebrews. As for Instance; the Jews, who had disobeyed God, and retired into Egypt contrary to his Word, were reproved by Jeremiah for apostatizing from Him, and offering up Incense unto other Gods, c.xliv. But this unhappy People, notwithstanding this Reproof, and that the Events had justified the Prophet’s Mission, by answering his Predictions, instead of repenting, obstinate-

their Sins, that they blasphemed the Name of the Lord. Nomen Domini nefandis infectati sunt verbis. Sim 6. § 2. And Theoph. ad Autol. says of the Greeks, that they proposed Rewards and Honours to those (Christians) who blasphemed God, (Jesus Christ, or God in Christ) openly. Τοις ενεχώς υμείς Θεος; εἴθρα ν ἡ πμαὶς πνεύματι. Lib. 3. p. 286, 287. Edit. Οἰκιν.
ly refused to submit themselves to the Authority and Will of the Spirit, speaking to them by the Prophet. They tell him, v. 17. That they will certainly do whatsoever thing goeth forth out of their own Mouth, to burn Incense unto the Queen of Heaven, and to pour out Drink- Offerings to her. Upon which Declaration God answers them in the following Manner by his Prophet, v. 25. Ye will surely accomplish your Vows, and surely perform your Vows, importing, that their Resolution was unalterable, and their Apostacy confirmed; and then passes this severe Sentence upon them, v. 26. Behold, I have sworn by my Great Name, faith the Lord, that my Name shall no more be named in the Mouth of any Man of Judah, in all the Land of Egypt, saying, the Lord God liveth, like that Sentence in the Revelations, c. xxii. 11. He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: And he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; that is, since they were resolved to forget him, he was resolved they should not remember him: And since the Divine Resolution was immutable, as appears from the Oath, their Conversion was impossible, and their Sin unpardonable. Jonathan also, in his Paraphrase on Isa. lxv. 6. expresses the Certainty of the Punishment of such like Apostates in the following Words, I will not prolong their Life; but I will punish them for their Sins, and deliver their Bodies to the Second Death. See also, v. 15. Thirdly, Some of the
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the most ancient and eminent Writers either speak of Apostacy as absolutely unpardonable, I mean, a thorough Apostacy proceeding from the Heart: And therefore could have had no reason to have put a milder Construction on the Epistle to the Hebrews, had they happened to have cited it; or else, they cite this Epistle for the unpardonable Sin.

Hermas says,

They, who have apostatized from God for ever, — cannot return by Repentance unto Life; because they have added this to their other Crimes, that they have blasphemed the Name of the Lord. This sort of Men is allotted unto Death.

Clem. Alexandrinus alledges, Heb. x. 26, § 9c. as an Instance of Sinners to whom there is no Repentance, Strom. Lib. 2. p. 385. And in his Treatise, Quis Dives, &c. seems to allude to both the Sixth and the Tenth Chapters, when he says, that he who Sins to that Degree,

That He perfectly falls away, is entirely condemned of God,

Qui in perpetuum a Deo discesserunt—iis non est per pœnitentiam regres·sus ad vitam; quoniam quidem adiacerunt ad reliqua delicta sua, & nomen Domini ne·fands is infectati sunt


That He perfectly falls away, is entirely condemned of God,
Tertullian, Lib. de pudic. c. 19. acknowledges the Distinction of Sins into pardonable and unpardonable, or Sins unto Death which are not to be prayed for; and cites for this purpose the Epistle of St. John, and of St. Paul to the Hebrews. Origen also, and Theognostus, understood Chapter the Sixth, v. 4, &c. of the Epistle to the Hebrews, to be meant of a Sin altogether unpardonable; for which, see Athan. Epif. 4. ad Serap. § 9, 11. And thus much in relation to the Mind of St. Paul. As for St. John, I think no doubt can be made of the Meaning of his Words; for if Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and final Apostasy are unpardonable Sins, it is evident that there are Sins unto Death in the strictest Sense: And can it be thought, that the Apostle had no regard at all to these sorts of Crimes in his Sins unto Death? Tertullian, in the Place before cited, urges the Passage, we are now speaking of, as a Proof that there are Sins which cannot be pardoned. And Hermas seems plainly to allude to it, in saying of Apostates, * That they are corrupted—unto Death. † That they are allotted unto Death. And in calling the Sin of Apostacy by the Name of || Death. Simil. 6. § 2. Which Sin he judges unpardonable, as I have shewn a little before. And this is not at all dif-

* Corrumputurus quj ad Mortem. † Morti sunt defininati.

agreeable
agreeable to the Style of the Old Testament, which mentions also Sins unto Death, that is, such as are unpardonable; for Isaiah says, c.xxii. 14. Surely this Iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die; that is, as Jonathan paraphrases it, till ye die the Second Death. And Numb. xviii. 22. God tells the Children of Israel, That they must not come nigh the Tabernacle of the Congregation, lest they bear the Sin unto Death; as it may be rendered, that is, left they perish in their Presumption, as Korah did, c.xvi. 40, & xvii. 13. of whom it is said, That he shall have no Portion in the World to come. Tractat. de Syned. c. ii. §. 3. Vol. 4. Leg. Mish. Fourthly, The Church of England, in its Homily of Repentance, Part I. which may stand for the Opinion of many Divines, says, "That the Apostle St. Paul, in the Sixth and Tenth Chapters of his Epistle to the Hebrews, and St. Peter, in the Second Chapter of his Second Epistle, speak—of the final falling away from Christ and his Gospel; which is a Sin against the Holy Ghost that shall never be forgiven, because that they do utterly forfake the known Truth, do hate Christ and his Word, they do crucifie and mock him, (but to their utter Destruction,) and therefore fall into Desperation, and cannot repent." If then, according to the foregoing Reasonings and Authorities,
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authorities, the Sin mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews be absolutely unpardonable, and it be a Sin no less against the Son than the Holy Ghost, as appears from the following Expressions, it is impossible—if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto Repentance; seeing they crucifie to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open Shame, c.vi. 4, 6. And again, Of how much severer Punishment—shall be thought worthy, who hath troden under Foot the Son of God, and hath counted the Blood of the Covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, c.x. 29. It will follow, that it is * unpardonable on account of the Son as well as of the Spirit, being done in Opposition to the greatest and last Means of Conviction afforded equally by both.

MCXXXII. 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18. The Lord is that Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty, &c.

The learned Dr. begins with observing, p. 192. "That the Gospel, by way of Eminent, is styled the Ministration of the Spirit, upon account of the Holy Ghost that was poured forth upon the Apostles at Pentecost; and from that Consideration

* There remaineth no more Sacrifice for Sins; but a certain fearful looking for of Judgment, and fiery Indignation, which shall devour the Adversaries, c.x. 26, 27.

" (that
"(that is, as it is the Ministration of the Spirit,) he says, the Apostle, thro' the whole Chapter, magnifies the Doctrine of Christ, as being more clear and plain, more powerful and efficacious, more illustrious and glorious, than the Law of Moses." For if the Law be called the Ministration of Death, or Condemnation, because it * convinces Men of Sin, and condemns them for it, but affords no help to get rid of their Sin: The Gospel may be well called † the Ministration of the Spirit, because, at the Beginning of that Dispensation, the Spirit was † communicated by Christ to his Apostles on the Day of Pentecost, and is still communicated to such who believe, and are baptized into Him; and therefore they, who communicate it, are called the Ministers of the Spirit, v. 6. If then one of the Advantages of the Gospel above the Law be on account of the Holy Ghost, or quickening Spirit, communicated to the Faithful: And if the Gospel in this Chapter be opposed to the Law in respect of this Advantage more than any other, as is evident to the Reader: It will follow, that the Holy Ghost is the Advantage principally regarded in the Opposition between the Law and the Gospel; as I have

* "Οὐχὶ ὃ (νῦν ὃ) ἐκάθεν ἐπιστέψας, εἰς τὸ ἀμαρτίας δεικτός ἐστιν. Chrys.
† † Ἡ γὰρ διακονία — πρεσβυτία ἐκείνης — ἔπος ἂντι, ἡ διακονία τῆς πρεσβυτείας. Chrysost.

already
already shewn in my first Answer, and shall further shew in that which follows. Ver. 3. It is said, Ye are— the Epistle of Christ— written not with Ink, but with the Spirit of the Living God; not in Tables of Stone, but in fleshly Tables of the Heart. The Apostle in this Branch of the Opposition, gives us to understand, that the Holy Ghost, by influencing the Hearts of the Believers, enables them to perform the Duties of both the Tables; which is a Benefit peculiar to the Evangelical Dispensation, or New Covenant, in which God declares, He will put his Law in their inward Parts, and write it in their Hearts, Jer. xxxi. 33. that is, by his Spirit, as Ezekiel expresses it, I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my Statutes, and ye shall keep my Judgments, and do them, c. xxxvi. 27. Now if the learned Dr. means, p. 193, by the Power and Efficacy of the Gospel, in his Comment on this Place, the Power and Efficacy of the Holy Ghost communicated to us in the Gospel Dispensation, by which we discern, and assent to, the Truths of the Gospel, and perform its Obligations: And if he means, that that, which is imprinted inwardly in the very Heart and Soul it self, is imprinted by the Holy Ghost mentioned in the Text: His Comment comes up to the Mind of the Apostle, tho' he says nothing expressly concerning the Spirit; and we are agreed, that the Holy Ghost, or Third Person in the Trinity, is meant
meant in this Place. Which is also the Mind of Irenæus, who so understands it, Lib. 5. c. 13. p. 420.

The Apostle, v. 6. pursuing the same Opposition, says, God hath made us able Ministers of the New Testament, not of the * Letter, but of the † Spirit: For the Letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth Life. That is, they were not like Moses, who gave a Law written upon Stone, and upon Parchment, (which cursed the Transgressors) without giving them the Spirit as a Help to perform it; but they communicated the Spirit as well as the Rule, that what they spake, or wrote, the Hearers might comprehend, assent to, and practise by the Spirit in them. The Dr. in his Comment on the Place, says nothing of the Spirit as a Person, but seems to paraphrase it by Spiritual Precepts; and the Expression, the Spirit giveth Life, by the Gospel teaches us the way to Eternal Life, which, I conceive, is underinterpreting the Text. Tertullian understands the Spirit in this Place to be the Holy Ghost properly so called, Adv. Marcion. Lib. 5. c. 11. From v. 7. to v. 12. the Apostle proceeds to shew the different Effects of the Power of God upon the Subjects of both these Economies. In the First, the Law was external; and the Obedience paid to it was

* † Οὐ γὰρ πνεῦμα ἐν σαρκὶ Μαῦσος, ἀλλὰ γεννηθήναι, ἡμᾶς δὲ πνεῦμα ὑπερηφάνει πνεῦμα, ἄνθρωπῳ. Chrysost.
an external Obedience in Comparison of that, which was wrought in the Heart by the Holy Ghost, in the Gospel Dispensation; And therefore the Glory of the First, in the Face of Moses, was an external Glory, affecting the Body, and of a short Continuance like the Body itself, and not to be extended beyond that Economy. But in the Second, where the Spirit of God influences the Heart, and is always present with the faithful Christian to perfect his Obedience; where the Rule is inward, spiritual, and eternal, and the Person, regenerated by the Holy Ghost, is himself eternal; there the Glory wrought by the Spirit of God, which is *the Spirit of Glory, is an inward Glory rooted in the Soul, no less than an outward one illustrating the Body: It is of an eternal Duration like the Soul itself, and as much superior in Degree of Brightness to the First Glory, as the Dispensation of the Spirit is superior in Power to that of the Letter. *V. 13, 14, 15. He describes, as the Dr. observes, the Blindness of the Jews in not seeing thro' the Types and Figures of the Old Testament, which Vail of Blindness is done away in Christ; that is, by the Holy Ghost given by Christ: Which will entirely remove away the Blindness from their Hearts, and make them clearly see, that Jesus Christ is the End of their Law.


V. 16.
V. 16. Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the Vail shall be taken away, that is, when the Heart, or Understanding, and Will, shall submit to the Convictions and Impressions of God's Holy Spirit, so as to believe in Christ, be baptized into his Name, and receive, by Imposition of Hands, the Measure of the Spirit allotted to the Church in its present Circumstances: Then shall the Vail be taken away, and they shall discern that, according to the Types and Figures of the Law, the Glory of the Spirit, or the Spirit of Glory, was to rest upon Christ, or upon the human Nature of the Son of God, thro' the Sufferings of the Cross; and does rest upon him, and is manifested in him to all Eternity; and that the End of his coming and conversing in the World, was to obtain this Glory in his own Humanity, to purchase it for others, and to put them in Possession of it when their Obedience should be accomplished. The learned Dr. indeed, p. 194. understands the Lord, v. 16. to be Christ; but it appears from v. 17. that He is the Spirit: Tho' it is true, that he, who turns to the Lord the Spirit, turns unto Christ, the Spirit leading him to Christ. But then he must first come to the Spirit, or open his Heart to its first Impressions, that it may bring him unto Christ; who, in return, will pour upon him the Spirit in larger Measure, than he had it before: For the Father and
and the Son convert Sinners, and bring them to themselves, by the Means of the Spirit operating upon their Hearts.

V. 17. Now the Lord is that Spirit, that is, the Lord, to whom the Hearts of the Jews are to turn, or to whose Convictions and Impressions their Understandings and Wills are to submit themselves, is that Spirit, of whom the Apostle had been speaking from the Beginning of the Chapter; and who has been already shewn to be the Holy Ghost. And this is the joynt Sentiment of the following Writers, Athanas. Epist. 1. ad Serap §. 6. de Trinit. &c. Spiritu Sancto. §. 17. tho' he interprets it of the Son, Orat. 1. cont. Ar. §. 11. Basil. de Spirit. Sancto. c. 21. Greg. Nyssen. cont. Eunom. Orat. 6. p. 186. Chrysof. &c. Theodort. in Loc. The learned Dr. interprets it thus, p. 195. "This "Lord, even Christ, is that Spirit which the "Apostle had been speaking of thro' the "whole Chapter." But if the Dr. by "Lord and Christ, means a Divine Person, and if the Spirit be the Holy Ghost, as appears before; the Dr. in asserting Christ to be the "Spirit, does, in effect, fall into that Confu- "sion of Persons, which he endeavours to charge upon others: For I know no one Inst "stance in the Sacred Writings, in which the Son is called the Spirit of the Living God, as the Spirit is in this Chapter, v. 3. Christ, indeed, as He was the last Adam, or the Son of Man, born of a Virgin, was made a quicken-
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ing Spirit, 1 Cor. xv. 45. but it was by receiving the Fulness of the Spirit, Isa. xi. 2. John iii. 34. in Opposition to Adam, who wanted that Fulness. The Spirit also is said to speak in Christ, Rev. ii, & iii. because the Holy Ghost, who wrought by his Hands, Matt. xii. 28. spake by his Lips, Isa. lxii. i. Luke iv. 18. but in no Place is the Word said to be the Spirit, or the Holy Ghost. If the Dr. does not mean a Person by Lord, Christ, and the Spirit: But that they are the Gospel, or Doctrine of Christ, the End, Design, final Intent, or full Meaning and Signification of the Law, as he expresses himself in the same Page, I think there is but little need of Reasoning to shew, that this falls short of the Mind of the Apostle. For let us put any of these synonymous Terms in the Place of the Spirit, and see how it will run in the Context of the Epistle; as for Instance, let the following Words, Ye are— the Epistle of Christ— written not with Ink, but with the Spirit of the Living God; not in Tables of Stone, &c. Be read thus, Ye are the Epistle of Christ, written not with Ink, but with the Design of the Law of the Living God. Such a Style, I dare say, would appear harsh and uncommon to the Reader; but if we understand the Spirit to be the Holy Ghost, the Sense is easy, and the whole is an Allusion to an Epistle written with Pen and Ink, and to the first Covenant written upon Stone; that is, the Heart An-

T 3 nwers
flwers to the Parchment that is written upon, and to the Tables of Stone; and the Spirit of the Living God, writing upon the Heart, Answers to the Pen and Ink of the Person writing, and to the Finger of God writing upon the Stone, Exod. xxxi. 18. for the Spirit is called the Finger of God in Luke xi. 20. compared with Matt. xii. 28. whence it appears, that the End and Design of the Law, which is the Gospel of Christ, is the thing written on the Heart, not the Spirit writing: Now the Thing written, differs from the Spirit writing it; the Spirit therefore is not the End and Design of the Law, as it stands for the Gospel of Christ, or the Thing written: But is the Divine Agent, or Principle, that enlightens the Heart, and gives it the Knowledge of the Gospel of Christ, which is the End of the Law.

And where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty, that is, where the Spirit of the Lord, or of God the Father, enlightens the Understanding, and disposes the Will to comply with its Dictates; there the Person is free from Ignorance, Error, and Sin. For it is the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, a Divine Person distinct from the Father, and the Son, that guides us into all Truth, John xvi. 13, 1 John ii. 27. making us to confess, That Jesus is the Lord: Or, That Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh, 1 Cor. xii. 3. 1 John iv. 2, Which Truth manifested by the Spirit makes
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us free, John viii. 32. It is evident then, that where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is the Manifestation of the Truth; and where the Manifestation of the Truth is, there is Liberty. But then the Spirit is not the Manifestation of the Truth, as the Dr’s Comment supposes, p. 195. but is the Cause of it; so that Liberty argues a Manifestation of the Truth: And the Manifestation of the Truth, the Presence of the Spirit manifesting it, which is the Spirit of the Lord, a Divine Person.

V. 18. But we all with open Face beholding as in a Glass the Glory of the Lord. This is spoken in Opposition to the unbelieving Israelites, who, by Reason of the Vail of Ignorance upon their Hearts, could not discern Jesus Christ to be the End of their Law. But we Believers, says he, having the Vail of Ignorance and Error removed from our Hearts by the Holy Ghost enlightening them, do behold, in the * Glass of the † Law, or in the Types and Figures of it, that not only the Sufferings of Christ were represented in it, but also the End of those Sufferings, the Manifestation of the Glory of the Lord in the Face of Jesus Christ, or the Manifestation of the || Glory of the Spirit in the Humanity of Christ perfected thro’ Sufferings; the Know-

---

* Thus the Christian Law is compared to a Glass, Jamesi. 23, 25. † Ἀνακεκαλυμμένος πεσοτατος ἢς τις κακορμημένος νομισματι κτα γεύμαμα τα δέξαν ἢς Κυριω φυστρι ημαντειζαι. Orig. contr. Cel. Lib.5. p. 271. ‖ Θη (δέξαν) ἔν πνείματις. Chryloft.
ledge of which Glory in the Face of Christ, being founded upon the Scriptures, is improved into Vision, by our obtaining thro' the Spirit a Lot or Portion in the same Glory. The learned Dr. understands, by the Glory of the Lord, p. 197. "The clear and glorious Manifestation of the Will of God by the "Gospel." For the Proof of which he cites several Scripture Passages. But tho' the Will of God be clearly and gloriously manifested by the Gospel, yet does not this Interpretation seem to come up to the Mind of the Apostle; First, Because the Scripture Passages brought by the Dr. prove more than his Interpretation amounts to, and relate either to the Brightness and Glory of the Humanity of Christ: Or, to that Portion of Glory, which the Saints shall enjoy under Christ their Head, in the Kingdom of Heaven. Thus Rom. ix. 23. The * Riches of his Glory is, as the Context shews, that Fulness of Glory, unto which he had afore prepared the Vessels of Mercy, by Tryals and Afflictions; for God has determined, in bringing many Sons unto Glory, to make them perfect, like their Great Captain, thro' Sufferings, Heb. ii. 10. Rom. viii. 17. In like manner are we to interpret, The Riches * of the Glory of this Mystery among the

* Divini autem Gloriae sunt dignitas multiplex preparata credentibus Ambros. In Loc. Ἡ ὁμοιομοίως τε ἐχθρόνυμι ὑπὸ τῆς ἐπικοινωνίας τῶν ἔκκλησιῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Θεότητος. Theod. in Loc.
Gentiles, Col. i. 27. The Mystery is the Word of God, v. 25, 26. The Mystery among the Gentiles, is the Word of God relating to the Salvation of the Gentiles, that they should be co-heirs with the Jews, Ephes. iii. 3, 6. which was concealed from the World until that time, ibid. v. 5. Coloss. i. 26. The Riches of the Glory is Christ; for so the Verfe goes on, which is * Christ in you, the Hope of Glory. That is, God would have the Saints, or the Holy Apostles and Prophets among the Jews, Ephes. iii. 5. who were ignorant of the Salvation of the Gentiles, Acts x. 45. xi. 2, 3, 18. know, that the Gentiles had an Interett in the Gospel no less than they: That it was to be preached to the Gentiles, to the End that they also might believe in Christ, in whom the Riches of Glory, and the Fulness of the Godhead dwells, c. ii. v. 9. And from whom † the Spirit of Glory was to be derived to them, no less than to the Jews, according to John xvii. 20, 22, 24. And therefore He is called the || Hope of Glory, because that Glory, which Believers hope for, is to be derived from him as the Head of the Church, and as the Fountain of Honour and Glory to its Members. So that the Mystery, or the Gospel preached to the Gentiles, is not, as the

---

*† ὁ Ἀρχηγὸς Χριστὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ζωῆς ἡμῶν ἀποκάλυψις ἐστὶν. Theod. in Loc. || Ἐλπίδα τῆς δόξης ἐστὶν ἡ ἐνόρμωσις ἐν Χριστῷ. Ibid. Dr.
Dr. imagines, the Riches of the Glory, but the Means that lead or direct them to that Glory; and the Knowledge or Contemplation of the Glory of God, or of the Riches of God's Glory, in the Face of Jesus Christ, and the Enjoyment of it afterwards, when Knowledge shall be consummated, and end in Vision, is the End and Result of promulgating the Gospel, or the Means of Salvation to the Gentile Nations. The Citation out of John i. 14. The Glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of Grace and Truth, relates to the Glory of the Word in the Humanity of Christ, which the Apostles either spiritually discerned by the Operation of the Holy Ghost, as * Eusebius seems to understand it: Or saw at his Transfiguration upon the Mount: Or were convinced of by its † Effects, as St. John says, c. ii. 11. This beginning of Miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his Glory. And the Passage out of 2 Cor. iv. 4. should be rendered thus, Left the Light of the Gospel of the Glory of Christ, who is the Image of God, should shine unto them, that is, as it is explained, v. 6. Of the Glory of God in the Face of Jesus Christ; the Knowledge of which Glory is obtained by the Gospel. So that this belongs to the Glory of God the Father, manifested in the Humanity of the Son: Who, as

* De Eccls. Theol. Lib. i. p. 85.  † See Theophyl. in Loc.
He is the Word, is the Image of the Father; for the Glory of the Father thro' the Word in the Holy Ghost, is manifested in the Humanity of Christ. The Words of the 6th Verse I will paraphrase thus, God, who (at the Creation) commanded the Light (this visible Light) to shine out of Darkness, hath (in order to redeem us out of Spiritual Darkness) shined in our Hearts (by the Light of his Holy Spirit) to give us the Light of the Knowledge of the Glory of God in the Face of Jesus Christ, that is, that in the Light of the Spirit we might have an intellectual View of the Glory of God, which the Humanity of Christ is filled with thro' Sufferings: And be assured, that by the same Means, we our selves also may attain to a Portion of the same Glory.

The second Reason, why I believe that the Glory of the Lord imports more, than the clear and glorious Manifestation of the Will of God by the Gospel, is, that the beholding with the Face unvailed the Glory of the Lord, is made to answer Moses's beholding the Lord with the Face unvailed; and is opposed to the Israelites beholding the Glory of the Lord in the Face of Moses thro' a Vail. As then Moses beheld the real and true Glory of the Lord, or the visible Brightness that indicated his Presence: And as this real Glory and visible Brightness reflected from, or shining in the Face of Moses, was vailed from the Jews: So the Glory of the Lord, mentioned by the Apo-
file, can be nothing less than the real and true Glory of God, or than the visible Brightness indicating his Presence; for the Comparison is made between the Law and the Gospel, to shew the Advantages of the latter above those of the former: To instruct the Reader, that the Glory of the one is more excellent and durable than that of the other; and therefore, if the Glory of the Law be the visible Glory of the Divine Presence, or that which resulted from it, the Glory of the Gospel can be nothing less than a visible Glory, or bright Indication of the Divine Presence. So that the Meaning is, that by the Light of the Holy Ghost, we both see in the Types and Figures of the Law, and are convinced thro' the Gospel, that the Glory of the Lord was intended to rest, and does really rest in the Person of Christ thro' the Sufferings of the Cross; by means of which Conviction we contemplate thro' Faith this Divine Glory: And by the Power of the Spirit, and Perseverance in well doing, attain at last to such Purity of Heart, as to see him as He is, Matt. v. 8. John iii. 2. and shine our selves in the same Glory.

Are changed into the *same Image, are now, thro' the Contemplation of Faith accompanied with Obedience, gradually changed, and

* ου μόνον ὅμοιον εἰς καὶ θεαν οὐκέτι, αλλὰ καὶ έν καθαρεύεις θήκῃ πυρά χύνειν. Chrysoft. in Loc. See also Theodoris.
shall hereafter be fully changed, by the Power of the Holy Ghost, into the same Image, when He shall change the Body of our Humility, that it may be fashioned like to the Body of his Glory, Phil. iii. 21. This change, I say, is begun now after an invisible manner, the Spirit of Glory actually resting upon us, 1 Pet. iv. 14. but shall be fully compleated in a future State, when, according to our Saviour's Petition, John xvii. 24. We shall be with him where He is, that we may behold his Glory which God hath given Him. For the Glory, which God gave Him, He hath given us, ver. 22. And when, according to St. John, 1 Epist. iii. 2. We shall be like him at his Appearance, because we shall see him as He is.

From Glory to Glory, that is, gradually from lesser Degrees of Glory in the Flesh, to the last Degree of Glory at the Resurrection; from the lesser Communications of the Spirit of Glory now, to the full Communication of it at Christ's second coming.

Even as by the Lord the Spirit. This gradual, and finally compleat Change, is wrought in us by the Spirit of Glory, or by the Holy Ghost * the Lord, who rests originally in the Humanity of Christ, and is derived from Him to every Believer.

P. 201. The learned Dr. makes some Objections to the Interpretation I give in my

* Ο Ἠ χρυσός ἐνέκαλε τὸ πνεῦμα Κύριον καλεῖ. Chrysost. 
See also Theodor. in Loc.
The True Scripture Doctrine

first Answer, and says, "That the Word "Lord, v. 17. cannot possibly signify the "Holy Ghost," which, he thinks, is very evi-
dent from the following Considerations."

First, "The whole Scope and Connection
of the Apostle's Discourse from the Begin-
ing of the Chapter to the End, is very
"clear, natural, and elegant, according to
"the Explication he has given of it——
"Whereas, according to mine, the whole
"is made intricate and obscure." Which
I leave to the Judgment of the Readers;
some of whom perhaps may be of a differ-
ent Opinion, and think the Interpretation
I give to be more agreeable to the Mind of
the Apostle, and the Analogy of Scripture,
which is the Rule of interpreting, than that
of the Dr.

The Second Consideration, which must be
examined into, is, "That the Context im-
mediately going before, and following,
"necessarily determines the word, Lord,
"in the 17th Verse, to signify Christ."

His Reasons are, "That, v. 14. the Vail of
"Ignorance is done away in Christ. That,
"v. 16. to turn to the Lord that the Vail may
"be taken away, evidently means, being con-
verted to Christ. That therefore, v. 17.
"it is most manifest, that the word, Lord,
"must mean that very same Lord, who
"is spoken of in the 16th Verse; and
"who, in the 14th Verse, is expressly called
"Christ."
"Christ." Thus far the Dr. And I readily grant, that the Lord, v. 17. is the same with the Lord, v. 16. but deny him to be the Person, who, in the 14th Verse, is expressly called Christ. For the Meaning of the Words, which Vail is done away in Christ, v. 14. is this, That it is done away by the Spirit given us by Christ, and working in us the Faith of Christ. Which Spirit, as I have observed before, is sent for this purpose to guide us into all Truth, John xvi. 13. and bring us unto Christ, by working in us the Faith and Love of his Name; the Father and the Son converting us by the Spirit, and the Spirit leading us to the Father and the Son. And therefore, v. 3. we are called the Epistle of Christ, because our Hearts are written upon, that is, enlightened and influenced by the Spirit * of Christ, or, of the Living God, which is the Holy Ghost. Agreeable to which Doctrine are the following Words, v. 16. That when the Heart shall turn to the Lord, that is, when it shall submit to the Convictions and Impressions of God's Holy Spirit, the Vail of Ignorance shall be taken away, that is, done away by the Spirit of Christ, or Holy Ghost; so that Men shall believe and confess, in the Light of the Spirit, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God perfected, or glorified thro' Sufferings. For turning to the Lord in its immediate Sense, cannot be turning to Christ; because, in the

* 1 Pet. i, 11.
next Verse, the Lord is declared to be that Spirit, which the Apostle had been speaking of, and which appears from v. 3. to be the Holy Ghost: Tho’ secondarily and consequentially it is turning to Christ; because, in turning to the Spirit, we turn to Christ, to whom the Spirit leads us. And the Truth of this Explication will appear more evident, if we place the Words of the 16th and 17th Verses after the following Manner, Nevertheless, when the Heart shall turn to the Lord, which is that Spirit, (or, the Spirit of the Living God, v. 3. of which he had been speaking in the former Part of the Chapter) the Vail shall be taken away. Which shews, that the Term Lord relates to the Spirit, or Holy Ghost: And teaches us after what manner the Vail is done away in Christ, namely, by turning to the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of Christ. The Dr. adds one further Reason against my Interpretation, which is, if the Word Lord, in the foregoing Words, v. 16, 17. signifies the Holy Ghost, then the Spirit of the Lord would be much the same with the Spirit of the Holy Ghost; or, the Spirit of the Spirit itself. That is, because the Lord signifies the Holy Ghost in the Two preceding Sentences, it must signify the Holy Ghost in the Third also. But the Truth is this, the Term Lord, like the Term * God, is to be understood of dif-

* See N. 538.
different Persons according to the Circumstances of the Context; so that in the Two first Sentences, it signifies the Holy Ghost, and in the Third, God the Father.

The Third Consideration is, that the Holy Ghost is never called Lord in the Old and New Testament. But this is what I have been endeavouring to prove from the Old Testament, under N. 1056. in my First, and this Second Answer; and from the New Testament, under this present Article. With what Success let the Reader judge.


The learned Dr. p. 205. says, "That to "be baptized into the Name of the Father, and "of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is to be "baptized into the Profession of our Belief." But, I conceive, this Account to be too general, and that the Words rather mean, that the baptized Persons were taken thro' Baptism into a Communion with the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, (1 John i. 3.) in whom they had professed their Belief before; that is, they received thro' Baptism a real, quickening, and regenerating Power, from the joynt Influence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which is called their Name; by which Power, or Name, the Divine Image U
impaired thro' Sin was restored in them, and their Natural Powers perfected and assisted to conform the Man in all his Operations to the Divine Will, Phil. ii. 13. that the Father thro' the Son in the Holy Ghost might be all in all, 1 Cor. xv. 28. Ephes. i. 23. Col. iii. 11. or, as Christ himself expresses it, I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, John xvii. 23. For that Name signifies Power, I have already shewn N. 597. from Acts iv. 7. iii. 16. And this Name, or Power of the Trinity, I conceive, is the Cause of that, which is called by our Church, the inward and spiritual Grace of Baptism, namely, a Death unto Sin, and a new Birth unto Righteousness. As for the Latin Sentence of C. Alexandrinus, I think, it is of some Authority, till it can be proved to be spurious, or a bad Translation.

MCCXLVIII. 1 John v. 7. For there are Three that bear Record in Heaven: The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these Three are One.

The learned Dr. has these Words, p. 207. "How the Mistake arose concerning Stephen's Manuscripts, I have shewn at large in my Letter to Dr. Wells, p. 43. and Dr. Mills himself fully acknowledges it in his "Prolegomena, p. 117." What Dr. Mills acknowledges, by way of Mistake, in his Prolegomena,
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legomena, is no more than this: That whereas Robert Stephens had collated the Text of the New Testament with Fifteen Manuscripts, and had noted Seven of them in the Margin, in which the Terms, ἐν τοίς ἐγγράφοις, were wanting to the Seventh Verse of the 5th Chapter of the First Epistle of St. John: He thence inferred, that the other Eight Manuscripts had the Seventh Verse with those Words in it; when, indeed, those Seven, noted in the Margin, were the only Manuscripts that had the Epistle of St. John. In which Words there is no Acknowledgment of a Mistake made in relation to the Texts being found in the Seven Manuscripts: But in relation to his Opinion, that it was entire in the other Eight. The Dr. in his Letter to Dr. Wells, is of Opinion, that ἐν τοίς ἐγγράφοις stands for the remaining Part of the Seventh Verse, and the Beginning of the Eighth: So that the Reference to the Seven Manuscripts is to shew, that the Testimony of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, was wanting in them. But this Conjecture of the Dr. is contrary, First, to the printed Copy, which separates ἐν τοίς ἐγγράφοις from the rest of the Text by two Semicircles, as an Indication, that this Part of the Verse only, and no more, was wanting in the Manuscripts; whereas otherwise the Second Semicircle must have been placed near the Middle of the Eighth Verse. Secondly, It is contrary to a Marginal Note in a Latin
tin Edition of the Bible, by Robert Stephens, Anno 1545. in which the triple Testimony of the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, is left out, and the Reading is thus; Quoniam tres sunt qui Testimonium dant, Spiritus, & Aqua, & Sanguis, & hi tres unum sunt: Upon which Reading, after Quoniam, &c. (which stands for, Quoniam tres sunt qui Testimonium dant, found in the Text:) He adds in the Margin, Pater, Verbum, & Spiritus Sanctus, & hi tres unum sunt, & tres sunt qui Testimonium dant in terrâ, Spiritus, &c. sic legunt quaedam exemplaria Graeca. In which Words, as he affirms, that the threefold Testimony of Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, was found in some Greek Manuscripts: So does he give you the Reading in such a Manner, as shews, that &p c, &c. &c., and that only, was left out in the Seventh Verse; for we need not doubt but that these very Manuscripts were a Part of those, which he afterwards used in his Greek Editions, this Latin one being published but a Year before the First of the Greek ones. Whether, indeed, he had all the Seven Manuscripts at this time is uncertain; but, I think, no doubt can be made but he had the Four out of the French King's Library. Thirdly, It is contrary to the Remarks of Beza, in his Edition of the Testament, printed by Robert Stephens himself, Anno 1556. who says of the Seventh Verse in general, Legit Hieronymus,
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nymus, legit Ersinmus in Britannico Codice & in Complutensfi Editione, legitimus & nos in non-nulis Roberti nostri veteribus libris. Non convenit tamen in omnibus inter istos codices, nam Britannicos legit sine Articulis Папег, АпС, & πνεύμα, in nostris vero legebantur Articuli, & præterea etiam additum erat Sancti Epitheton Spiritui, ut ab eo distinguéretur, cujus fit mentio in sequenti versículo, quia; in terrâ collocatur. Where he affirms, that he read the Seventh Verse himself in some ancient Books of Robert Stephens, that is, Greek Books, because the Greek Articles were found in them before Папег, АпС, &c. Which ancient Greek Books could be no other than Manuscripts, because no Printed Copies, at that time, could be called ancient, the First of them, which was the Complutensian, being no more than about Forty-two Years old. And the same Beza, in his Note upon εν τῷ ἑγερᾷ, says, Hoc deerat in septem vetustis codicibus, the same without doubt with the ancient Books of Robert Stephens, in which he himself had read the Seventh Verse; so that it is evident, that not the Testimony of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, but this Part only, namely, εν τῷ ἑγερᾷ, was wanting in the Seven Manuscripts of Stephen's. And, indeed, had Beza been mistaken in this particular, Robert, who printed the Testament, and the Notes of Beza, would, doubtless, have set him right.
The learned Dr. says in the same Page, "That Erasmus himself, who is the only Person that mentions the British Manuscript, declares, at the same time, that he did not believe there was any such Thing." What Erasmus declares, in his Notes upon the Place, is this, That he suspected the British Manuscript was corrected by the Latin Copies, ad nostros esse correctum; but not a Word of his disbelieving there was any such Manuscript. In his Apology to Stunica he says much the same, That he suspected ad Latinorum Codicesuisse castigatum; but this was all. And in his Responsio de Trinit. he calls it, Codex Recentior; but says no more. Neither, indeed, can I believe, till I see it proved, that Erasmus could have been, either so unsincere as to insert a Passage upon the pretended Authority of a Manuscript, which he did not think was in being, that is, upon no Authority at all; or, so weak, as to own, at the same time, that there was no such Authority.

In Answer to p. 210. I must observe, that the Words cited by the Dr. out of my first Answer, p. 137. are not a Concession, that the Text was never found in any Greek Manuscripts; but a Repetition of the Dr's Words used, N. 1248. of the Scripture Doctrine. By which, and what follows, I gave the Reader to understand, that since the Dr. was pleased to declare, that this Passage
Passage does not certainly appear to have been found in the Text of any Greek Manuscript (in his Opinion,) it ought as freely to be declared, that it appears to have been found in the African Copies. For, as I verily believe that St. Cyprian referred to the foregoing Passage, when he said, *It was written of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and these Three are One:* So in Consequence of such a Persuasion, I must believe also that there were Greek Copies, that had the Passage in them; since, if St. Cyprian took it from the Greek, the Thing is granted; if from the Latin, it is hard to tell, how it should get into the Latin Copies, if it had never been in the Greek. For I have little Opinion of that Solution of the Difficulty, which refers the Words of St. Cyprian to the Eighth Verse, notwithstanding the Authority of Facundus: For the Understanding of which Matter, I desire the Reader to consult the learned Dissertation of the judicious Dr. Mills.

I had said, that the Testimony of the Three Divine Persons appears to have been found in the old Latin Version, that was used in the African Church. The learned Dr. tells me, p. 210. "That Dr. Mills shews, that "the old Latin Version had it not." This was, indeed, that Critic's Opinion; but

---

* De Patre, & Filio, & Spiritu Sancto S.riftum est: Et hi tres unum sunt. De Unit. Eccles.
might not some of the African Copies have this Amendment? The same Dr. Mills, who thinks, that the Italic Version had it not from the Beginning, is yet of Opinion, p. 743. col. 2. p. 746. col. 2. p. 748. col. 2. that those eminent Writers, Tertullian and Cyprian, corrected their Copies by Greek Originals; and that some few Transcripts of those corrected Copies were publickly used in that very Age in some of their Churches. And in his Prolegomena, p. 59, 60. he tells us from St. Austin, that the African Church had several Latin Versions besides the Italic, from the very Beginning; whereof some were made from compleat Originals, and had the Testimony of the Three Divine Persons: And that Tertullian made use of One of these Copies. But after all, it is not improbable, that the Italic Version was originally as perfect, as the Dr. supposes the Greek Text was; that the Passage in Dispute might as easily have been dropt out of most of the Copies after the same Manner, as it is supposed to have been dropt, by that learned Critic, out of the greater Part of the Greek Originals; and some of those Copies, which remained perfect, might have come to the Hands of these African Fathers. But I shall refer the Reader for further Information to the Notes and Remarks of the learned Dr. Mills, who has examined into this Matter with great Accuracy, and also
to the Writings of the learned Bishop Bull, for ancient Testimonies concerning the Trinity of Persons in Unity of Nature. What I shall do further, is to conclude this Article with Two or Three Authorities of great Weight for the Divinity of the Spirit, and the forementioned Unity. Origen, in his Comment * upon the Psalms not yet published, uses a Reasoning that infers the Divinity of the Spirit. I will put down his Words, and make my Observations afterwards.

On Psal. cxlvii. 13. he has the following Expression,

A right Faith in the Adorable and Holy Trinity.

And on Psalm lxxii. 5, 7. the following,

You may say, that Men also were at peace with God. For in the Days of Christ the Blessed Trinity was worthily and righteously worshipped.

And in his Comment on Psal. xcvi. 7. he supposes nothing is adorableness, that is not God. The Words are these;

---

* Vid. MS. Baroc.  
† Note, In his Commentary on St John, p. 124. Edit. Huet. he has the Terms, ἄθανατος βασιλεὺς.
The True Scripture Doctrine

A Graven Image is adorable, either because of its Nature, or its Form. If it be adorable because of its Nature, let them tell me, why all Stones are not adorable; if because of the Workmanship, then the Form, and not the Nature, is the Object of Worship. But every Form wants a Body to subsist, and God wants nothing to subsist. The Form therefore is not God. And if it be not God, it is not the Object of Worship.

If then the Holy Trinity be the Object of Worship (προσκύνησιν) and nothing is the Object of Worship (προσκύνησιν) that is not God, the Holy Trinity, which is the Object of Worship, is God: And consequently, the Holy Ghost, that is worshipped in the Trinity, is God also.

Athanasius, in his Epistle concerning the Sentiments of Dionysius of Alexandria, § 17, tells us, that he expressed himself concerning the Trinity after the following Manner,

"Οὐλο μὲν ἡμεῖς εἰς..." Thus we dilate the ἤμερα ἡ μονάδα indivisible Unity, or παλαισμοίν ἀδιάφελον, Unit, into a Trinity:

And
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And again recapitulate, or gather up the Trinity, which cannot be diminished, into the Unity, or Unit.

In which Words he plainly affirms, that the Unity is maintained in a Trinity of Persons without Division. It is true, indeed, this manner of speaking was used by Marcellus, and condemned partly by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastic Theology, Lib. 3. c. 4. who understood it in a Sense altogether Sabellian; and partly by the Synod of Sirmium for the same Reason. But it is certain, that Dionysius, who was so strenuous an Opposer of that Heresy, as to run into Extremes in asserting the Distinction of the Divine Persons, could never have used it in a Sabellian Sense. And if so profest and able an Adversary of the Sabellian Cause, could hold Three Persons in one undivided Substance, as the Words import he did, without falling into the Heresy which himself opposed: (For he knew it too well, to make use of Expressions that evidently inferred it;) why should the Churches in these latter times, whose Faith is the same with that of Dionysius, or who profess their Belief in One God, and Three Persons, or in Three Persons united in the same undivided Substance?

* See Athan. de Syn. Nic. † See Hilary's Comment on the 6th and 7th Anathema.
vided Substance, be thought to be Sabellian on account of that Profession, and to be less capable of opposing that Error, by holding this Faith, than the learned Dionysius was, who believed the same with these Christian Churches? Whatever Propriety, or Impropriety may be judged to have been in the word ἀνθρωπομετω, as applied to the Trinity; yet it is certain, that before the time of Dionysius, a Term of the like Meaning was made use of by Tertullian to illustrate the Generation of the Son out of the Sub stance of the Father: For, in his Apologetic, c. 21. he says,

*Cum Radius & Sole...*

> When a Ray is extended from the Sun, it is a Part out of the whole; but the Sun is extended from the Spirit, and God from God.

In which Comparison, First, He makes the Divine Substance to be indivisible, as Dionysius does the Monad. Secondly, The Son to be the Divine Substance, as it were, extended, or dilated into a Second Person, as Dionysius does the Trinity to be the Monad dilated into Three Persons. And after the Condemnation
demnation of this Form, or Manner of speaking, *Id. Pelaeus* thought he could use it in an Orthodox Sense, notwithstanding its Condemnation; for having mentioned the Doctrines of the Jews and Gentiles, that were opposite the one to the other, he adds,

But the most right and true Doctrine is this, that he who dilates (or multiplies) the Persons (or Sub sistences) into a Holy Triad (or the Number Three,) recollect or reduce them into one Substance.

Eusebius, in Orat. de Laudibus Constant. p. 618. speaks thus of the Unity and Trinity. First, He says,

That the Monad, or Unit, is an Image of the indivisible Substance, which is distinct from all others; that is, an Image of the Divine Substance. Secondly,

That the Triad is a-kin to the Monad, or Unit, being inseparable and indivisible after the same Manner.

That it teaches Equality, as having its
That is, he would have us understand, that the Divine Trinity is indivisible, like the Unity: And that the Three Divine Persons are equal. He adds, that the Trinity depends upon, or subsists by, a Nature that has no Beginning, nor is made.

Which being equally spoken of all the Three Persons, shews, that the Nature, or Substance of the Son, and Holy Ghost, is without Beginning of Duration, and not made, as the Substance, or Nature of the Father. For his design seems to have been to represent the whole Three Persons in a View, in which they were equal, according to the Equality affirmed of them before. How this agrees with what he says of the Spirit * elsewhere, let the Reader judge. And to conclude, he says,

* * Ev 3 n ἦν ὁ Θεὸς ἡγεμόνειν τούτων. Eccles. Theol. Lib. 3. c. 6.
That (the Trinity) has the Seeds, and Reasons, and Causes of the Essence, or Substance, of all created Things.

Which further excludes the Holy Ghost out of the Number of the Things that are made.

The Sum of the Doctrine of this Third Chapter, is as follows.

That the visible Glory is called Jehovah, and the Holy Spirit; and that the Holy Spirit is Jehovah, and Lord God, N. 1056, 1075, 1132, 1248.

That δυνατόν, as applied to the Divine Persons, signifies not a mere Specific Unity, but, an Unity of Persons in the same undivided Substance, or Essence, N. 1056.

That Blasphemy against the Father, and against the Son as God, is unpardonable, N. 1121.

That the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, into which the Church is baptized, is the quickening and rege-

That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, subsist in One undivided Substance; or, are One undivided Subject, N. 1248, 1056.

FINIS
An EXTRACT out of Mr. Nelson's Life of Bishop Bull, pag. 3. Speaking of Bishop Bull, he says,

"But besides, if he had been silent in his Life-time, yet being dead he still speaketh with so much Clearness and Strength of Reason, with so masterly a Knowledge in his own Profession, the best of Studies, with such an affecting Pathos, that impresseth it upon the Minds of others, and above all, with such an inward Sense of Piety and Devotion, the true Christian Unction, in those Sermons and Discourses which are now published, that the World would not have been at a Loss to have fram'd a just Idea of this consummate Divine, if these Remains had been the only Works of his, which were to have been conveyed down to Posterity.

And in another Place the same learned Author gives the Character of Bishop Beveridge's Sermons, pag. 75, 76.

"And now I have named this great and good Man, I cannot forbear acknowledging the favourable Dispenitation of Providence to the Age in which we live, in..."
"blessing it with so many of those Pious
"Discourses, which this truly Primitive
"Prelate delivered from the Pulpit; And I
"the rather take the Liberty to call it a fa-
"vourable Dispensation of Providence, be-
"cause he gave no Orders himself that they
"should be Printed; but humbly neglected
"them, as not being Composed for the
"Pres. But this Circumstance is so far
"from abating the Worth of the Sermons,
"or diminishing the Character of the Au-
"thor, that to me it seemeth to raise the
"Excellency of both; because it sheweth
"at once the true Nature of a Popular
"Discourse, and the great Talent this Pre-
"late had that way. For to improve
"the Generality of Hearers, they must be
"taught all the Mysteries of Christianity,
"and the Holy Institutions belonging to
"it; since it is upon this true Foundation
"that the Practice of Christian Vertues
"must be built, to make them acceptable
"in the Sight of God. And then all this
"must be delivered to the People in so plain
"and intelligible a Style, that they may
"easily comprehend it; and it must be ad-
"dressed to them in so affecting and moving
"a Manner, that their Passions may be
"winged to a vigorous Prosecution of what
"is Taught. If I mistake not, the Ser-
"mons of this Learned Bishop answer this
"Character; and I am confirmed in this
Opinion by the Judgment of those who are allowed to have the greatest Talents for the Pulpit, as well as for all other Parts of Learning. He had a way of gaining Peoples Hearts, and touching their Consciences, which bore some Remembrance to the Apostolical Age; and when it shall appear that those bright Preachers, who have been ready to throw Contempt upon his Lordship's Performances, can set forth as large a List of Persons whom they have Converted by their Preaching, as I could produce of those who owed the Change of their Lives, under God, to the Christian Instructions of this Pious Prelate, I shall readily own that they are superior to his Lordship in the Pulpit. Though, considering what Learned Works he Published in the Cause of Religion, and what an Eminent Pattern he was of true Primitive Piety, I am not inclined to think, that his Lordship will, upon the whole of his Character, be easily equalled by any one.
The English Works of the Two afore-mentioned Prelates, are as follows: Viz.

Bishop Bull's Important Points of Primitive Christianity maintained and defended, with the History of his Life; and an Abstract of those Fundamental Doctrines which he defended in the Latin Tongue. In 4 Vol. 8vo.

N.B. There is a few Printed upon Royal Paper, for those Gentlemen who are curious.

Bishop Beveridge's Sermons, in 12 Vol. with compleat Indexes.

— His Private Thoughts on Religion; and a Christian Life. In 2 Vol. 8vo.

— The great Necessity and Advantage of Publick Prayer and frequent Communion. In 8vo.


— An Exposition on the 39 Articles of the Church of England, in Folio.

— An Exposition on the Church-Catechism. In 12vo.

— A Defence of the Singing Psalms. In 12vo.