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THE PREFACE.

Thought, in a long Introduction, to have given some Account, of my Concern in this Controversy; how I came to undertake this Work; of a Conference I had, several Years ago, with the learned and worthy Author with whom I have now to do; why I have considered what the learned Roel, Dr. Ridgley and Dr. Anderson have advanced against the proper, and coessential Sonship of the second Person in the Trinity; and of the woful Tendency, and unavoidable Danger of Error: But the following Discourse is sworn to such a Bulk, that I can only, at present, give these few short Hints.

The very first Time I hear'd that these Useful and Important Questions were published, I presently said to the Ministers who told it me, That, if the Lord spared me my Life, I would, with his Assistance, answer them; which I the rather then did, that I might, if possible, prevent the other Discourse, concerning the Pre-existence of Christ's human Soul, &c. which, they told me, the Author had promised: And therefore, being, from the Conference I had with him, &c. not wholly unprepared, I set immediately about it.
PREFACE.

I had some Reason to think, that my Resolution soon came to his Ears; and that it hasten'd the Publication of the other: But, before it came from the Press, I had provided Materials, form'd my Plan, and digested my Method. And, resolving not to be moved from it, I have not, to this Day, seen that Discourse with my Eyes; nor have I, these Twenty Years, read so much as one Line of Mr. Fleming's Christology, from which, I hear and believe, our worthy Author has borrowed many of the principal Things in his second Book.

My Answers were almost ready, above three Years and a Half ago. — I had written them, as in a Letter to himself; and, from what had pass betwixt us, taken the Liberty to explain, and confute, several Things of Moment, of which he has given us, in the Book, I am now to answer, only some remote Hints, or some very dark, or general and ambiguous Expressions; not to say several others, of which I cannot here find one Syllable.

When I was ready for the Press, hearing of his ill State of Health, &c. the very great Esteem I had for him, and the sincere Love I bore to him, gave me a very sensible Pain, left my Answer should decompose or add any Uneasiness to him, in that Condition — In these Circumstances, being in a Strait, whether to publish my Answers then, or delay them, at least, till we might see whether he should recover, I advis'd with several Ministers and others, and with one of the Deacons of the Church of which he was the Pastor, a grave, solid, serious old Gentleman yet alive: But, while I was in this Suspence, I was called upon, and invited to other Work, even the Defence of the great Foundation of all our Hopes, the Satisfaction of Christ; and, much about the Time I had finish'd it, our worthy Author went, I have no Doubt, into Everlasting Rest.

His Death put me to many Inconveniences, more and greater
greater than every one will think. I was forced to alter a very great Part of what I had composed; to write almost the whole of it over again, and many Pages of it of ten then once; to drop altogether some of my principal Arguments, which I had level'd chiefly against some of the Things, which had past betwixt us: I say drop altogether, because I abhor such Base-ness, as to allege, or impute any Thing to one in his Grave, that is not known to all. I have been also obliged to be very reserved in opposing many Things, which, tho' often plainly enough hinted and implied, are no where literally, no nor clearly express'd. — Those who consider these well, will not think it strange to find a Thought which, now and then, may not seem so pertinent; or an Argument, which may not come fully up to the Purpose, or may, possibly, appear to prove too much, &c. But, if any Person shall point out any Fault, of any kind, instead of evading, excusing, or wriggling, I shall be one of the first who shall acknowledge it, shall heartily thank him, and be more careful to avoid the like for the future.

I write not for the learned, but for the young Student, and the plain, illiterate Christian. That, if it please God, I may be so happy, to confirm such as have kept the Truth, establish those who may be wavering or unsettled, and recover some who have been seduced into Error. — To Answer these Ends, I have, throughout, 1. Avoided Scholastic Terms, as much as possible, or explained them. 2. Have studied to express myself, in Scripture Language. The Doctrines of Christianity, found best, and are, commonly, most clearly and fully taught in Christ's own Words. 3. Have given the same Thought in a great Variety of Phrases, that every Thing may be made the more easy and perspicuous; and those for whose sakes I write, may be the more secured from Temptation.
If any shall be displeased, with my too frequent repeating the very same Answers, let them remember the Necessity of it. — Our worthy Author abounds with them: And I have seldom repeated the same Answer, but when he gives us the same Thought, and in the same, or nearly the same Words.

I have not offered Mr. Perrault's Opinion of the Generation of Animals, to explain the Doctrine of the Trinity, which is as clearly and fully revealed in the Scriptures, as infinite Wisdom thought fit and necessary for us, in our present State; but to remove the Difficulties, which the scholastic Notion of the Generation of the own, the only begotten, Son of God, has brought into Divinity, which seem'd so insuperable to these learned Men Roel, Dr. Ridgley, Dr. Anderlon, &c. that they denied, either "That the second Person, and purely as such, was, in any Sense, the Son of God;" or "that he was his Son, in a strict and proper Sense:" And this, I persuade myself, it will, with all judicious and impartial Readers, do effectually.

I hear from several Hands, I am to have "more Questions to answer," &c. — I hope they do not think, That sending me more Questions, will be a defending the Things, I have more than superabundantly confuted: And may therefore, I humbly conceive, expect, they will answer me first. — However, If they send me any, I hope they will be to our present Purpose: And if, through the Grace of God, I can answer them, I assure them that, with his Help, I will; but, if I cannot, I shall freely own, I cannot, which is more, I verily think, than they will do, when they cannot answer me.

Tho' I have not, at large and of Purpose, considered and answered all our learned Author's Notions, about Christ's pre-existent human Soul, I have not wholly past them all. — Some of them are of much greater Moment, and consequently, of much more dangerous
gerous Consequence; (such as, "That his human Soul is properly the Son of God, and therefore, That he is not as God, properly, the Son of God; &c.") and these, I hope, I have superabundantly confuted: The others, I have almost altogether waved. — If my Friends think, that a more full and particular Consideration of them is necessary, I shall, with the Help of God, be ready to gratify them; being well satisfied, that what Mr. Fleming has said, may, so far as I can understand him, be easily and fully answered. — And yet, I humbly conceive, That single Point, Whether Christ's human Soul existed before his Conception? or rather, ever since the Creation of Adam? (for, I cannot see any Reason for supposing, that it was created before the World was,) may remain a Problematical Question: And that serious Christians may be of different Minds about it, without much Danger. Should any think it worth their while to answer me, I desire no Quarter. Let them treat me with the same honest Freedom, they desire to be treated: — Let them produce Scripture Texts, instead of human Authorities; and good Reasons instead of Suppositions: — Let them not beg the Question which they should prove, shift any thing they should answer, fly off when they should come up to the Point, or wriggle and quibble when they have nothing to say: — And let them remember, That the Subject is not only Sacred, but very awful and of the last Importance; and therefore, treat it with all becoming Decency and Seriousness, and I am pleased; and so far from being uneasy, that I shall heartily thank them. — If they act this Part, the Question betwixt us, may be brought to a short Issue; and then the Danger of erring about it, may very easily be discerned.

USEFUL
USEFUL and IMPORTANT ANSWERS
Freely given, to
USEFUL and IMPORTANT QUESTIONS, &c.

Some Thoughts on the Introduction.

The Introduction having several Things in it New, and Strange, and which seem to have been advanced as a Sort of Foundation, for the following Super-structure; we shall not think it Labour lost, to give the Reader every Word of it, p. 1—5. with some very necessary, but short, Remarks upon the whole.

"'Tis of some Importance in the Doctrines of the Gospel, and especially in the great Article of the blessed Trinity, to know the Meaning of the Name Son of God, which is so often given to our Lord Jesus Christ in the New Testament:

"for hereby we shall be better able to understand the chief Import and Design of those Places of Scripture." — To all this, we heartily agree: And add, 'Tis not only of some, but of very great
Importance, in all the principal Doctrines of the Gospel; and especially that great, and most Fundamental Article of the most Holy and Undivided Trinity; to know the true, i.e. the whole Meaning of the Name Son of God, when given to the Lord Jesus Christ, in the Scriptures: Because, without it, we shall hardly, if at all, be able to understand the chief Import and Design, of any one, of all those Passages wherein he is so stiled.

"But here I desire my Reader to observe, that "I am not enquiring into the highest and most sublime Sense of which 'tis possible that our Lord himself might have the Idea when he used "that Word;" * He cannot, it seems, deny, That this Title may possibly have a higher and more sublime Sense, then he intends to take it in, nor that our Lord himself might possibly have that Idea, when he used it: And we shall see presently, That the Jews, as soon as they heard him use it, or Words of the same Signification, readily took them in the highest Sense they could possibly bear; whence, I conceive, 'tis undeniable that they well knew that Sense, that it was familiar to them, and common amongst them, and the Sense of that Title then generally received. — "but what is the Sense that Christ or the Apostles and Writers of the New Testament more directly designed to convey to those who heard them;" Ans. 1. Christ, undoubtedly, designed to convey the true Sense of it, to his Hearers: For, surely, he did not design, to amuse them, nor puzzle them, and much less to impose upon them. — Wherefore 2. When the Jews took it, in the highest and most sublime Sense, it could possibly bear, Jo. v. 17. 18. if it was not

* N. B. The worthy Author, almost every where, calls these three Words, Son of God, the Name, or the Word, neither of which are, I humbly conceive, proper. I therefore every where call them, the or this Title.
the true Sense, He would, most certainly have, one Way or another, told them so: And, if it was not the very Sense, "which he more directly designed to "convey to them." He would surely, yea he ought to, have rectified this Mistake, set them right in a Matter of such Moment, and told them plainly "the Sense he more directly designed." And — 3. The same we say of "the Apostles, and Writers of "the New Testament." They would, they should, have acquainted those, to whom they preached, or wrote, with the true Sense of this Title, which they "more directly designed to convey to them," whether it was the highest and most sublime Sense it could have or not: And, if they perceived (as they could not but perceive) them in Danger of taking it, in a higher Sense than they designed they should; they ought, plainly and freely, to have warned them of that Danger. "and in what Sense "the People generally did and could understand "this Name." Anf. The People, generally, so far as appears, both could, and did, understand it in a Sense far, if I may not say quite, different from that which this Author gives it: And neither did, nor could, upon his own Principles, understand it in his Sense, as we shall demonstrate by and by.

"'Tis evident from several Expressions of Christ," that he well knew that his own Words some-
times carried in them a much nobler and sublimer Signification, than barely that which he designed to "convey to the Jews, or even to his own Disciples "at that Time:" Anf. One would not have expected these strange, these unguarded Words, from our worthy Author; and much less, at the Beginning, and with so very much Assurance, as to say, "'Tis evident." — However, How does he support this evident Proposition, which has so very harsh a Sound? Or, since, 'tis plain, it is not self-evident,
How does he, How can he, prove it? Why, the only Two, I do not know what to call them, Proofs, or Instances, he gives of this, are both very unlucky for him: As, indeed, are most by far of all that follow. — “As when he says to the Jews, Before Abraham was I am, Jo. viii. 58.” And yet, whatever he designed, the Jews, to whom he spoke them, presently took them, as “carrying in them their most noble and sublime Signification,” and the Words themselves seem plainly, yea necessarily, to have led them to it. They are not, Before Abraham was, I was: (which, had he not “designed to have conveyed to them a much higher, if not “an infinitely more sublime Idea,” would have been a clear, and very sufficient Answer to their Objection, or Question, Ver. 57. Thou art not yet fifty Years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?) But, ἐγώ εἰμι, I am, i. e. Whether you believe or no, I am, as I told you before, Jo. 5. 17. 18, the Son of God, who does whatsoever he does, &c. and, as such, have a necessarily existing and unchangeable Being, as God; not the Father, but the Son, who was always in Him, of Him, and with Him. Verses 18. 29. 38. 42. 49, &c. That the Jews took them, in this Sense, or as implying it, is undeniable from the very next Words, Ver. 59. Then took they up Stones to cast at him, as a Blasphemer, for assuming to himself Eternity, Necessary-Existence, and Immutability: Or speaking of himself, in such Strains, as no one, who is not, indeed, the one true God, can, or should do. — “And so when he says to his “Disciples, Jo. xiv. 10. I am in the Father, and "the Father in me, they could not know that glo- "rious and sublime Relation of Christ to the Father, "and his intimate Oneness with the Father, which "he himself was perfectly acquainted with.” Ans. 1. Supposing this, What then? Will it, can it, follow, “that he did not design to convey to the Disciples,”
(the only Persons present when he said those Words,) the Knowledge of that glorious and sublime Relation, and his intimate Oneness with the Father; which was the Thing to be proved?—By no Means. — The direct contrary seems rather manifest. — What need was there to talk to them in such Strains; or, what good End could it have answer'd; if it was not to inform them of what, upon this Supposition, they were ignorant, and teach them what was most necessary for them to know? — But, 2. How does it appear, "That they could not know these." "The most glorious and sublime Relation of Christ to the Father," and as such, was, That he was his own, proper, begotten, only begotten, Son: And could they not know this, when they had heard their ever blessed Lord declare it, with the greatest Solemnity; and in the plainest and most significant Words, openly proclaim it, over and over? Jo. iii. 16. 18. ch. v. 17—26. And had themselves also publickly professed it, again and again; Mat. xvi. 15—18. Jo. vi. 69, &c. and that with the most gracious Acceptance, and kindest Approbation, of their truly Divine Master? — And could they not "know his intimate Oneness with the Father," when they had heard himself so strongly, so emphatically, assert, Jo. x. 30. I and the Father 7γεν, are one Thing; i. e. not one Person; for a Father and a Son are, most certainly, Two Persons; but, one Essence, Substance or Nature? Why, if they could not, It was not, because he did not "design to convey to them "the noblest "and sublimest Signification of the Words:" Because, 1. This "intimate Oneness" is not revealed any where in Scripture, more clearly, expressly, fully and strongly, than in this very Text; and in that, 1 Jo. v. 7. which seems, thus far, plainly parallel to it; And consequently, if he designed to reveal to them this "intimate Oneness,"
any where in Scripture, one would think, it must have been in these. — 2. This Proposition, I and the Father are one Thing, (ἐν ἰσόμετον) which must be farther explained and vindicated hereafter, if we more carefully consider the Context, and remember the Occasion and other Circumstances, and take a nearer View of the Words themselves, hath, I humbly conceive, but one Signification; and can admit no other, neither higher nor lower. — To confirm this, 3. The Senses which the various Sects of Antitrinitarians, would force upon it, seem, to me, ungrammatical, strained, and very contrary to all the Circumstances of the Passage, many other clear Texts, and to the emphatic Words themselves; not to add, would hardly leave them any tolerable Sense at all. And therefore, 4. The Jews, readily, and very naturally, took them in that, which seems really their true, yea their only Sense: And hence took up Stones again to stone him, Ver. 31.—They could not, it may be said, “be so perfectly acquainted with that Oneness, as himself was.” We acknowledge it: But, neither could, nor can, the highest Angels in Heaven, to all Eternity. — Be it therefore still remembred, 

N. B. 1. That, how intimate soever this Oneness is, it is neither destructive of, nor any way inconsistent with, the Distinction of Persons in the Godhead: Or, the blessed Three are, notwithstanding “this most intimate Oneness,” Three true distinct Persons.

2. That the Father, and He only, always and necessarily, was, is, and still will be, the Father; and the Son, and he only, always and necessarily, was, is, and ever will be, the Son. And,

3. That, tho’ they are the one God, and therefore each of them the true God; yet, as the Father is not the Son, so the Son is not the Father, or any mere Attribute, or Perfection, of the Father, as
our learned Author seems to have hinted he is, in many more Places than one.

What then shall we say to this odd, this strange Assertion, which is here laid down as a Postulatum, i. e. a Truth to which he may demand our Assent, and which we must grant to be true, without any the least Proof; or any Authority, but his own? — Does it not, to say the leaft, appear very injurious to our ever blessed Saviour; and a heavy Impeachment both of his Wisdom and Goodness: That He, who was anointed to preach the Gospel to the Poor, Mat. xi. 5. and to Babes, Ver. 25. Luke iv. 18. &c. i. e. the unlearned, the ignorant, and Persons of weak Capacities, &c. should so frequently, and familiarly, use Words and Expressions, of the highest Moment, which he well knew "carried in " them a much nobler and sublimier Signification, " than barely that which he designed to convey to " them;" and when he saw that many, if not all of them, took them, contrary to his Intention, as designed to convey to them the sublimest Signification they could possibly have, did not, plainly and expressly, inform them of their Error, and deliver them, from the great Risk they run, by continuing in it? — What Cause was there for such Expressions? What Good could they do? Would not other Phrases have done as well; and suited the Capacities of his Hearers, and answered his own Character, much better? — Those who teach Babes, or the Young, the Ignorant and weak, &c. are wont to speak to them in their own Way; chuse the eafieft, and plainest Words, such as they are best acquainted with, and can best understand; and are so far from being fond of Expressions which are above them, or like to be mistaken by them, that, if they must use any such, they are always careful, one Way or another, in less or more, to make them so plain,
plain, and bring them so low down to their capacities, that their Scholars may not mistake them, but receive them in that Sense, which they directly design to convey to them; and especially if their all is at Stake: And, as soon as they perceive they have mistaken them, they studiously endeavour to set them right; and cease not, upon all proper Occasions, to keep them so. — This was expected from the Messiah, as is clear from the second Article of the Woman of Samaria's Creed, When the Messiah is come, he will tell us all Things. Jo. iv. 25.—This, He who knew how to speak a Word in Season to him that is weary, Is. l. 4. could have done most sweetly, easily, and effectually. — But, upon this Supposition, it seems he did not, yea, would not; even in Points of such vast Importance! Suffer me then to ask. Were there no other Expressions, in which he could have conveyed the Sense he intended? Or, if there were not, Would he not have plainly told them, some way or other, by some Periphrasis, or Similitude, &c. the Sense in which he would have them to take them, and so prevented their taking them in another? — Or, if in his Wisdom, he did not then think it proper, "to convey to them the Signification which he barely "designed," in express and plain Terms, which they could not mistake: Would he not, (since he knew they took these and other his own Words, in a Sense which he did not design,) at least have kindly told them so; and that the Sense which they put upon his Words, was not the Sense he designed to convey to them? — Or, was there, is there, any Danger, in taking them in their "much nobler "and sublimier Signification? &c." But,—This Postulatum then, we cannot grant, because of the Fear of God. Neh. v. 15. 'Tis not only at best, a mere begging the Question, but absolutely false, as
is plain from both the Instances given. — Postulatum, did I say? Why, it is really the principal Basis, upon which a great Part of the following Discourse is built. For, if this Title, Son of God, ever "carries in it the highest Sense of which 'tis "possible that our Lord himself might have the "Idea when he used that Word," or, signifies a coessential Son; as we shall demonstrate it does; and as, in this very Text, it evidently does, if it ever can do: It will be very hard to prove, That the Idea of Coessentiality is ever, can ever, be quite dropt or excluded from it. But, if so, his whole Fabrick, which chiefly rests upon This, which is also the principal Thing he undertakes to prove, viz. "That it never signifies a coessential Son," must needs fall with it. — And indeed, That Building can never stand sure, or long, which stands on so weak and sandy a Foundation.

"My chief Business in this Discourse therefore is "only to shew what is the true Idea or Meaning of "the Word Son of God, which our Saviour or the "sacred Writers designed to convey to their Disci-"ples thro' all Ages and Nations by this Name." Surely, if they intended to give "the true Idea or "Meaning" of it, they would, once at least, give the whole of it: And therefore would, some where or other, give "the highest and most sublime Sense" of it. "And in which, 'tis possible, their Hearers "could understand them." Had our Author been alive, I should have used a little more Freedom with this. However, ab esse cd posse valet Consequentia. What actually has been, or now is, was, or is, most certainly, possible; yea, more than possible.—Well then, Whenever the Jews heard our Lord assume this most august Title, or call God his Father, in the Manner, and with all the Circumstances, which he did; or speak of God, or Himself, in Terms equiva-"lent; they took it in the highest Sense possible, as C imply-
implying, a making himself equal with God; Joh. v. 17, 18. yea, a making Himself God; Ch. x. 30, 33: And consequently, that, if he was indeed a Son, he was most certainly a Co-essential Son: Therefore, it was very possible, they could understand it in this Sense.—The Catholic Church, every where, and in all Ages, ever since, have actually taken this to be the true Meaning of this Title: And therefore it was very possible, yea more than possible, they could. —Very few, if any one, till very lately, even of those who concerning the Truth have erred, have been wholly of our Author’s Mind, as to the Signification of this Title: And we shall shew, by and by, from his own Words, that it was very hardly, if at all, possible, that any one, and much less that the Generality of Christians, should ever put his Sense upon it; yea, that he has, with his own Hands, wholly and for ever demolished his own Scheme.

“And in order to find this Sense of it, let us consider those Texts of Scripture wherein the Belief of Christ to be the Son of God, is made the great Requisite in order to Salvation, and a necessary Ingredient of Christianity.” Whether this was the most easy, natural, and sure Way “to find this Sense;” and whether those Texts have any Thing in them, which leads to his Sense, shall be considered afterwards: But the confessed Importance of knowing the true Sense, ought to make us all very serious indeed.—“For in those Places of Scripture, these two Considerations will offer themselves; (1) That the Sense of those Words must be plain, familiar, and easy to be understood; otherwise it could not be made a necessary Article, or a Fundamental of the Christian Faith.” This, and the next, require a much longer Reply, than I have here Room for; and much freer, than I am, at present, disposed to give. However, we answer, 1. The Words, Son, own Son, begotten Son, only begotten Son, are as plain, familiar, and
and easy to be understood, as most; yea, any Words, which convey the same Ideas; or, as any which can well be desired: And much more so, than any other which can now possibly be chosen by us, to signify the great Thing, or Things, meant by them. 2. The Sense of them is as plain, familiar, and easy to be understood, in our present imperfect State, as Infinite Wisdom thought fit it should be understood by us: Or, as it can be from so many plain, familiar, and easy Terms, so often repeated, and illustrated also from, or by, the Circumstances of the Places where they are found. And, 3. The Sense we put upon those Terms, is, as shall be proved, much more plain, familiar, and easy to be understood, than the Sense he puts upon them; and upon many other Words in this his Discourse. — “It must have also (2) some apparent Connection with, and Influence into our Salvation,” So the Meaning, which we give it, manifestly has. Yea, it has a much greater, nearer, and more apparent Connection, &c. than his own. — Because, (1) Had not the second Person in the Trinity, and as such, been coessential, and consequently as such, equal with God, He neither was, nor could have been, qualified, for the Offices he executes as our Redeemer. (2) We leave out no very “Important Part” of his Sense of this Title: But, he leaves out the most “important Part,” by far, of ours, which is the only true, Sense, as we shall see presently. “otherwise the Belief of it would not have been made “so grand a Requisite in order to be saved;” — I, for my Part, shall now freely, and fully, grant this. “for it is scarce to be imagined that the “blessed God would appoint any mere arbitrary “and unoperative Speculations to be the Terms of “enjoying his Favour.” What strange Language, is this; and from such a Man! However, we ans. 1. That the second Person, in the ever blessed Trinity, is the proper, the only begotten, and therefore
coessential, Son of the Father is not a "mere Speculation," but a Matter of Fact; and of so very great Importance to be believed, that they, who deny him, to be such a Son, deny the Father to be such a Father: And, consequently, have Reason to consider, whether they do not deny both the Father and the Son. 1 Jo. ii. 22.— 2. The Belief of his being a coessential Son, is so far from being an "arbitrary Speculation," that, upon the Supposition he really is so, it necessarily arises from the natural Relation, that is between the Two Divine Persons; and must be owned a fundamental Article of the Faith once delivered to the Saints. — And, 3. It is so far from being an "unoperative Speculation," that the firm, and practical, Belief, That God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten and therefore coessential Son, another Self, &c. Jo. iii. 16. and that this only begotten Son laid down his Life for us, &c. 1 Jo. 3. 16. Ch. 4, &c. will, powerfully and effectually, excite, and quicken, and enflame us, to the most humble and thankful Acknowledgments, the most sincere and universal Obedience, &c. if the practical Belief of any one Truth possibly can; and, indeed, more, by far, than any other. — "Now, both these Considerations will give us some Assistance toward our "finding out the true Sense of this Title." And we shall see, alas! before we have done, what good Use our learned Author has made of this Assistance.

"The Texts of Scripture, wherein a Belief "of Jesus to be the Son of God seems to be made "the great necessary Term of our Salvation, are "such as these. Jo. iii. 18. Jo. xx. 31. 1 Jo. v. "13. 1 Jo. iv. 15. 1 Jo. ii. 23. and Acts viii. 37. "38." I hope the Reader will consult these Passages himself, read them attentively, and excuse me from transcribing them, according to my Promise;
Promise: And I’ll give him several more, the more deeply to impress this most weighty Truth. See then, Jo. v. Verses 17, 18, 23, 25 and 34. Rom. viii. 32. Gal. iv. 4—7. and carefully ponder these following. He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting Life: And he that believeth not the Son, shall not see Life; but the Wrath of God abideth on him. Jo. iii. 36. This is his Commandment, that we should believe on the Name of his Son, &c. 1 Jo. iii. 23. — God sent his only Begotten Son into the World, that we might live through him. Ch. iv. 9. — Who is he that overcometh the World, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God. ch. v. 5. He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the Witness in himself, &c. Ver. 10. — And this is the Record, that God hath given to us eternal Life: And this Life is in his Son. Ver. 11. He that hath the Son, hath Life: And he that hath not the Son of God, hath not Life. Ver. 12. Even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and Eternal Life. Ver. 21. — And this is Life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. Jo. xvii. 3. This last Text, I have here quoted, only to prove, That the Knowledge of Jesus Christ, i. e. his Person and Offices; or what he was, became, did, suffered, purchased for, promises to and befows upon his People; is as necessary towards their obtaining Eternal Life, as the Knowledge of God the Father; i. e. of what He does for, or gives unto them. And this it does, if any Text well can: Because, if it is true, it is certainly, and as much, Eternal Life, to know the One as to know the other; i. e. to know Jesus Christ as to know the Father. Yea, we are sure, That that no Man can either know the Father, Matt. xi. 27. or come to the Father, but, by or through him, Jo. xiv. 6.—Our Author therefore, with very great Reason, goes on,
"Now if believing or not believing Christ to be the Son of God has Salvation and Damnation annexed to it by the sacred Writers," Then the Belief of it is so absolutely necessary to Salvation, that no one, who bears the Gospel, can have any Reason to expect Salvation without it. " then surely 'tis of considerable Importance to know what this Name means," Yes, it is so: Yea, it must needs be of the very greatest Importance. " that we may not include too little in it, and by leaving out some important Part, expose ourselves to that Anathema;" An awful Thought! Damnation is a terrible Anathema indeed! Lord teach us thy Truth, and help us to love, and keep, and do it; that we may not come into that State of Torment. " nor incl"ude too much in it, and so be tempted to lay "our weaker Neighbours under the like Condemnation for want of sufficient Knowledge." But, this Danger, when compared with the former, is really very little, or rather none at all; because, 1. With respect to ourselves, " should we include "too much in it," if that too much, is not false, does not overthrow, or leave out, " some important Part;" lead us aside from some other momentous and necessary Truth; occasion, involve us in, or draw us to, some considerable Omissions, or Commissions; we hope, we shall not be, thereby, ex"posed to that Anathema." —But, 2. " Our lay"ing our weak Neighbours under the like Condemnation," whether in our own secret Thoughts only, or in private Admonitions; or joyning with others, in any judicial Act, as in the lesser or greater Excommunication, as they are called, (provided there be good Reason for our so doing, and we proceed with Caution and Deliberation, that Concern for the Glory of God, and that Compassion and Love to our Brethren, which is required;) is our Duty, and may, probably, do them Good: Whereas, if we do these,
these, or either of them, ignorantly, rashly, maliciously, and much more if without just Cause; it is our Sin, but can do them little or no hurt, and does not, at all, make them obnoxious to the everlasting Judgment of God. But, — 3. They who "expose themselves to Damnation," as opposed to eternal salvation, do, by their own Act and Deed; expose themselves to an endless Anathema.—And, 4. If their "want of sufficient Knowledge" is owing to their Carelessness, Pride, Prejudice, or any Fault of their own, it will neither much extenuate their Guilt, nor lessen their Punishment.

"But blessed be God, since it is a Name of "such Importance, he has not confined this Name "precisely to one single, narrow, abstruse and difficult Idea," i. e. To signify precisely a coessential Son, and nothing more.—Granted: And what then? — Will it follow, That Coessentiality is no "important Part of its Signification; or, not one of "those several Ideas affixed to it in Scripture?"

By no Means.—Sometimes 'tis confined, precisely, as we shall see, to the single Idea of a coessential Son; and, at other Times, it signifies the complex Person of the Mediator, who is God-man.—But, I must further answer, a proper Name, when given to any one single Person, denotes that individual Person and him only: The Title of an Office, which is peculiar to, or can be executed by, one only, when ascribed to any particular Person, denotes that individual Officer, and no other: Tho' the Idea of an only begotten, and therefore, coessential Son, and as such, is confined precisely to one single Person, exclusively of all others, it is neither so very "abstruse, nor difficult an Idea:" And, in the Case before us, the Idea we affix to this Name, is neither so abstruse, nor difficult, as that which himself does, as we shall see. "but has affixed it to several Ideas "in
in Scripture," This I have freely granted; and only add, That, whatever Ideas 'tis affixed to, it always signifies one and the same Person only; and always includes his Divinity: Or, coessential Sonship is always the primary, and most important of them. "that so if we receive it in the most important "Senses, we may be secured from the Scriptural "Condemnation, tho' we should not happen to un-"derstand and receive it in all the sublime Senses "which may be applied to it." — This is very ge-
neral, and ambiguous. — However, If one of these sublime Senses, is the most important of all, and the Foundation also of most or all the rest; whoever are so far from receiving that into it, that they always and absolutely exclude it from it, have great Reason to look to themselves: Not to add, they can neither, as some wou'd say, understand the most im-
portant Sense of it; no, nor sufficiently know, nor consequently receive, and believe in, the ever blessed Person, who is frequently so called; for a Reason obvious enough of itself.

"Let it be noted also, that perhaps the various "Imaginations and Reasonings of Men may have "affixed more Senses to this Phrase than Scripture "has ever done:" A sad Truth! Many Ages, since Christ's Ascension, bear Witness to it! We need not go back to the antient Heresies condemned by the first four General Councils, &c. &c. since there are several such Senses now before us. — "Yet, "in order to give this Enquiry a fuller Considera-
tion," Hitherto, we have not, I think, had any one Consideration of it at all. — "we will survey the "several Senses which have been usually put upon "it;" And yet, the second of these, "which he "is very much inclined to believe, &c. p. 10." has very seldom, if ever, been heard of, till very lately. — "And this shall be the first Argument which I "shall
"shall use towards the Proof of the true Signification of this Name in the New Testament, i. e. by Way of a disjunctive Syllogism, proposing several and excluding some of them."—With respect to this, one would have thought, 1. That the Title, The Son of God, considered abstradedly; and especially when any of these Adnouns own, proper, begotten, only begotten, are affixed, could have no true Signification but one. 2. That there was hardly, if at all any Danger, of mistaking that Signification, when all Things should be duly considered. And, 3. That it had, and has, the same Signification in both Testaments. But much more of this last Sentence, by and by.

Having thus briefly, but plainly, examined the Introduction, proceed we now to the Discourse itself.
Useful and Important

**ANSWERS**

Freely Given, To

Useful and Important

**QUESTIONS**

Concerning

**JESUS** the **SON** of **GOD**, Freely proposed:

Or, the Co-Essential Son-Ship of the Second Person in the Trinity clearly proved, &c.

The Introduction thus animadverted on and dispatched, we hope, to the full Satisfaction of the impartial Reader, we now proceed to consider the Work itself. And, that he may, if possible, have a true, clear, and full Idea, of the worthy Author's Principles and Design, we shall first give him the Contents, whence he may, perhaps, at least in some good
Measure, learn what he would be at; and how far he has departed from the Faith of the Catholic Church, which is plainly, expressly, and fully revealed in the Word of God, and indeed runs quite through the New Testament.

These he has proposed, in eight Questions, p. 8, 9. immediately after his Preface: And, tho' several of them are so worded as to be very equivocal, and hard to be clearly understood, you shall here have every Syllable of them in order, with a direct and plain, but brief Answer to every one of them, so far as I can understand them; each of which Answers shall be afterwards explained, illustrated, and confirmed, so far as is necessary to our present Purpose.

The Contents.

"Quest. I. What is the true Meaning of the Name Son of God, as given to Christ in the New Testament; and especially where the Belief of it is made necessary to Salvation?"—To this, he replies, "He has made it appear, that it does not, "yea cannot, necessarily imply his divine Nature, &c. p. 6, 8, 63, &c. &c.

Ans. The true, the only Meaning of this Title, the Son of God, when given, any where in the Scriptures, to the second Person in the ever blessed Trinity, and purely as such, is, that he is the own, begotten, only begotten, and consequently, the coessential Son of the Father; or, in the Words of the Nicene Creed, which has been always, and every where, had in Reverence by the Catholic Church, "God of God, very God of very God, begotten not made:" But, the true Meaning of it, when given to Christ, (the Word made Flesh) in the New Testament; and "especially, where the Belief of it is made necessary to Salva-
"tion," is, That the blessed Person, so styled, was, and is, the co-essential Son of the Father, who, being anointed before the Foundation of the World to be the Saviour of his People, was now manifested in the Flesh, having assumed our Nature, that, in and by it, he might execute all those Offices, which were necessary to our Salvation. So that,

N. B. This Title does always, and everywhere, even in the New Testament, primarily, either presuppose, imply, or denote, his Divine Nature: Nor is, nor can, his co-essential Sonship be ever wholly dropped, or quite excluded from it.

"Quest. II. Did the Disciples of Christ certainly believe that Jesus was the true and eternal God during his Life-time, or not till after his Death and Resurrection?"---His Reply, if put into plain Words, is, "Not certainly till after his Resurrection," which he also labours, with all his Might, to prove.

Anf. His Disciples never did, nor could, believe, that he was the Father: But, they most firmly believed, and oftener than once readily, publickly, cordially, and most emphatically, professed, That he was the Son of God; and heard himself frequently, and solemnly declare, That he was his own, begotten, only begotten Son, and therefore, if these Words have any proper Meaning, his co-essential Son: And consequently, they certainly might, and I humbly conceive did, and could not but, firmly believe, even "during his Life-time," That he was equal with him, and, as such, true and eternal God, as well as he; or, with him the one true God.---But,

N. B. Since the Disciples believed this, after his Resurrection; Are not we also to believe it now?

"Quest. III. Could the Son of God properly enter into a Covenant with his Father before the Creation of the World, to do and suffer what was necessary to our Redemption, without having any human
human Soul, which was to suffer all?"—He would have us think, "He could not."

And, Why could he not? If the second Person in the ever blessed Trinity, who is called sometimes the Logos, but much more frequently the Son, or the Son of God, was, as such, from all Eternity, a true and proper Person, distinct from his Father, he might (and we believe did) properly enough, enter into a Covenant with him, before the Creation of any Thing; wherein he consented, and promised, to take upon him our Nature, and so become our near Kinsman, (Goel,) that he might have a Right, and be put into a Capacity, to do and suffer for us, i. e. in our Name and Stead, all that was necessary for our Redemption.—All this, I say, he might undertake, as well before the Creation, as after it; and before he had a human Soul, as well, as when he had one: Because, tho' he could not either actually do, or suffer, all that was necessary without one; yet, the to us incomprehensible Measure of the Gifts, and Graces, of the Holy Spirit, which the Father promised him to pour out upon his human Soul, when it should be created, would, as he could not but know, most sweetly and effectually prevail with it to give, and most certainly secure, and continue, its most free and cordial Consent, both to do, and suffer, all that should be required.—But before I leave this Question, I must observe upon it these four Things, out of many well worth the while.

(1) If it is properly proposed, his own Words evidently imply, That God had a Son without, and consequently before he had, a human Soul; which manifestly overthrows his own Cause, and establishes mine.----It should therefore have run thus, Could the Logos properly enter into such a Covenant, &c?----And then,

(2) I should have ask'd, if the Logos, as such, was a true and distinct Person, Why could he not? -- Should
Should it be said, he was not a true Person: I must have replied, This is pure Sabellianism, &c.

(3) Whence does it appear, that his human Soul was, (if I may not say, could be,) a Contractor in the Covenant of Redemption, as is necessarily insinuated in this Question, &c. — Permit me only to add,

(4) That, if we should, without all Reason, suppose that it did exist from Eternity, and that it did actually enter into this Covenant with the Father, it neither was, nor could be, the primary and principal Undertaker: Because, our learned Author often acknowledges, That it was absolutely necessary our Redeemer should be both God and Man; p. 44. 68, &c. and consequently, his Soul was not, of and by itself, equal to the most glorious Undertaking.

"Quell. IV. Is the Godhead of Christ and the Godhead of the Father one and the same Godhead?" — His whole Reply, from p. 130, to 141. to say the least, favours too much of Sabellianism.

Anf. Seeing there is, there can be, but one only the living and true God; there is, there can be, but one only Godhead, or Divine Nature: And consequently, the Godhead, or Divine Nature, of the co-equal Son and that of his Father is, and must needs be, one and the same Godhead, subsisting in the Father as a proper Father, and in the Son as a proper Son.

"Quell. V. Is there an intimate Union revealed between our Lord Jesus Christ and God the Father?" — His Mind is, That, "by the intimate Union of the Man Christ Jesus with this one God-head or Divine Nature which is in the Father, Christ is the Lord Jehovah, &c. p. 144," &c. ---- I shall leave it to those that can, to make Sense of this at their Leisure.

Anf. There is an intimate Union between them, the most intimate possible: And this most intimate Union, is very clearly, strongly, and most emphati-
phatically, revealed. — If we consider him purely as the Son of God, He and the Father, are, as we have heard, Jo. x. 30. ONE THING: If merely as Man, the Holy Spirit was given unto him, rests upon him, and abides in him, in a Manner and Measure inconceivable to us; and so as he never did, nor shall, in any other; If. xi. 2—5. Jo. iii. 34: And, if as GOD-man, In him dwelleth all the Fulness of the Godhead, Bodily. Col. ii. 9. Ch. i. 19.

"Queft. VI. Is Chrifi the express Image of God the "Father in his Human Nature, or in the Divine." — To which he replies directly, and roundly, "In the Human Nature. p. 153.

Ans. I do not know but I may say in both.— Or rather, to be more particular, thus, Christ is the Brightness of the Father's Glory, and the most express Image possible of his Person, only in his Divine Nature, i. e. as his only begotten Son: And, in his Human Nature, i. e. merely as Man, He is, I believe, more the express Image of God, than any other mere Creature, whether in Heaven or Earth, ever was or shall be.

"Queft. VII. Are the Worship of God the Father "and of his Son Jefus Chrifi consistent with one "another"—I cannot tell how to give his Reply? to this, in full, with any Freedom, without seeming to expose him.

Ans. What should render them inconsistent? We worship them both as the one God, tho' distinct Persons: And as the Worship we pay to the Father, as such, is the highest relative Worship, we can give him; so the Worship we give to the Son, as such, is the highest we can pay him. — In other Words, As it is the highest Glory to the Father, as such, that he has such a Son; so it is the highest Glory to the Son, that he had such a Father: And as the Glory we pay the Father, as such, redounds, in-
infinitely, to the Honour of the Son; so the Glory we ascribe to the Son, and as such, reflects infinite Glory to the Father. — When we worship any One of the blessed Three, by Name, tho' we consider him as a distinct Person, we do not as a Being distinct from the Deity; or a Person divided, or separated, from the other Two: But as having the same Divine Nature, with all its Essential Perfections, which they have. — In short, we believe the Unity of the Divine Nature is not so singular, strict, or close, as to exclude a Plurality of real Persons in it: And that the Distinction of the Persons in it, is not so wide, so great, or so large, as that a Distinction of that Nature is implied in, or can be inferred from it. — Thus, to be somewhat more particular, we worship the Father, as the Father; and the Son, as the Son: The Father, as the first in Order, and consequently in Operation, who also, in the Covenant of Redemption, sustains the Majesty and Glory of the Deity, demanding, and accepting, a Satisfaction, &c. But his own, proper Son, tho' coessential with him, as having condescended to become our near Kinsman, and act in a delegated Capacity, &c. &c. And then, we consider his Divinity, or co-essential Sonship, as the only Foundation of the religious Worship and Adoration we pay him; and his unparallel'd Condescension, with the glorious Fruits of it, as the most affecting, endearing, and constraining Motives, to trust in, fear, honour, obey, and love him, and delight ourselves in him.

“Queft. VIII. What is the Worship paid to our ‘blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, God's express Image?’” —I shall not here perplex the Reader with his strange Reply, what is necessary may come in hereafter.

Anf. This is an odd Question, very hard to be understood, if at all intelligible: And his Reply, or Explication, p. 165—170. is so very general, loose,
loose, and unguarded, not to say very offensive and dangerous, that I know not what to say to it.
—I cannot remember I ever heard any such a Question before, and am apt to think that not one in a Hundred, of all the Christians upon Earth, ever did, any more than I. Does he mean, is Christ to be worshipped as God's Image; which, from his Manner of proposing it, p. 165, seems to be the Sense? I then desire to have it explained.
—Is it, what kind or sort, of Worship do we, upon this Supposition, give him? viz. Is it supreme, or only inferior Worship? Is it directed to the Creator, or only to a Creature? Is it absolute, or relative? Is it intended to terminate upon himself, the Image, or to pass through him to the Father, whose Image he is? Is it, that we are to worship him purely as the Image of God, and not as his Son: And that it is not himself we worship, but the Father in him? Or, what does he mean?—Till we know, I am persuaded this clear and direct Answer to this Question, will satisfy every serious, impartial Christian. Our blessed Saviour being the own, begotten, only begotten, and consequently, the Natural and coessential, Son of God, He is, as such, the most express Image possible of his Father; and, when we worship this Son, and as such, we honour him, according to his own express Words, Jo. v. 23. even as we honour the Father: But, because He, who being in the Form of God, (as his Human Soul neither ever was, nor could be,) and thought it not Robbery to be equal with God, (as he must have thought it, had he not been really equal with him,) emptied himself, taking the Form of a Servant, — humbled himself and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross; for all which God also hath highly exalted him, (in his whole complex Person,) and given him a Name above every Name, &c. Seeing, I say, the Case is
so, we heartily and thankfully confess, "Ori Κυριώτερα Ἰμաωσεν Χριστός Ἰησοῦς Θεὸς τὰ ἀποκάλυψεν, That the Lord Jesus Christ is in the Glory of God the Father. Ph. ii. 6—11. And therefore, with the Angels round about the Throne, the living Creatures, and the Elders, we say, in as long a Doxology, as any we find in the Bible, (and which is almost the very same with that, which is ascribed unto our God, Rev. vii. 12.) Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing: And, with every Creature which is in Heaven, and on the Earth, and under the Earth, and in the Sea, we cheerfully say, with the very same Breath, and in the very same Words, Blessing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power, be unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. Rev. v. 12, 13. Whence it seems evident, that our dear Redeemer, in his whole complex Person, or, He who is the Lamb, even the Lamb of God, has the very same Worship with the Father. And this is strongly, and invincibly confirmed from, Ver. 6. where the Lamb, as it had been slain, was seen standing in the Midst of the Throne, as partaking of the same Glory, Dignity and Authority, with Him that sat on it: And his own most express, solemn, and emphatic Words, which put it out of all Doubt, Rev. iii. 21, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his Throne. See and compare, Jo. xiv. 9. Ch. xvii. ii. 5. Heb. i. 8—13. Rev. xix. 16, 17. Ch. xxii. Ver. 22, 23. Ch. xxii. 1, and 3, &c. — Thus we have, I would fain hope, fully satisfied all true Christians, as to this Point.

He then concludes the Contents, with these Words by themselves, "To which is added an Essay of the true Importance of any humane Schemes to explain the sacred Doctrine of the Trinity. — When the learned Author wrote "The Christian Doctrine of
"of the Trinity,"—it was to be, "without the Aid or Incumbrance of Human Schemes." p. 1. Happy had it been, had he kept to this his good Resolution. But, since then, we have a Scheme made up of a Medley of the worst human Schemes, oddly blended together!—However, this being very little, if at all, to our present Purpose, we shall only say,

Scripture is, itself, the best Explaner of Scripture. — Human Schemes seem not so proper for this End, viz. to explain any Doctrine of pure Revelation, except there be something in Nature, level to our Capacity, and well known to us, which some Way resembles, or may, in some Measure, illustrate, the Thing revealed. This can hardly be expected, or but very imperfectly, feintly, and confusedly, in the Case of the adorable Mystery of the Trinity, which, as Divines are wont to say, nec capitis Ratio, nec demonstrat Exemplum, i.e. which created Reason can neither fully comprehend, nor any Example or perfect Analogy in, or from, inferior Beings, clearly illustrate. — There are, I know, several figurative Expressions, both in the Old and New Testament, which have been commonly thought to cast some glimmering Light, on this great Doctrine: But, 1. Even these, are but general; and what Light they give, is but very feint, and imperfect, leaving it still an unsearchable Mystery. And, 2. Schemes founded on Scripture Phrases and Similitudes, are more than merely human. — In short, all Human Schemes hitherto invented, "to explain this sacred Doctrine," have, in my Opinion, been so far from answering the Design pretended, or desired, that they have but the more perplexed, and manifestly obscured, debased, or corrupted it: And, whatever Evil our Author's Scheme, (which is not only Human, but a very Modern one too,) has done, or may do; it never did, never will,
never can, do any Good. — The Doctrine itself runs through the Bible, from the very Beginning to the End of it: 'Tis sufficiently revealed, for the Faith, Hope, and Love, yea for the Direction, Peace, and Comfort, of all Penitent Believers: And may be as easily believed, as many other Matters of Fact recorded in Scripture. To the Law then, and to the Testimony, If. viii. 20. and let Human Schemes of all Sorts, be for ever cashiered, by all who have Wisdom, and Humility, enough to be contented with the Bible, our only Rule.

The Reader will now, readily and clearly, perceive, that the first, of the former Eight Questions, is the principal One: And that the Answer to it, whether true, or false, will naturally lead us to reply to all the rest, and indeed draw all the rest after it. — If this Title, the Son of God, ever belongs, or is ascribed, to the second Person in the Trinity, and purely as such; or, if the second Person, and as such, is indeed the proper, only begotten, and therefore coessential, Son of the Father; then it will, clearly, and undeniably, appear, That he is, as such, as truly, and properly, a Person, as the Father: — That he might therefore; very properly, enter into a Covenant with him: — That his Godhead, and the Godhead of the Father, is one and the same Godhead: — That there is the most intimate Union possible between them: — That, as a coessential Son, he is the most express Image possible, of his Father's Person, &c. &c. But, if this Title does never belong to the Second Person, and purely as such; or, if the Second Person, as such, is not, in Reality, a coessential Son; then, it will, as undeniably, appear, That Christ, purely as the Son, is not the true and eternal God: — That therefore, purely as such, he is a mere Creature: — That, how intimate soever the Union between the Father and the Son is, it is but the Union of the Father
Father, with a mere Creature: — That the Son, as such, cannot, possibly, be so express an Image of the Father's Person, as if he were a coessential Son: — That, as the Son, he is not to be honoured as the Father: — Yea, That, purely as such, he cannot be at all, the Object of religious Worship, &c. — This being really the Case, the great Question, which will determine all the rest, and upon which they all depend, will be, if put into plain English, as our worthy Author's is not, run thus,

Does this Title, the Son of God, ever denote or signify the second Person in the Trinity, and purely as such: Or, is the second Person in the Trinity, and purely as such, in Fact, the own, begotten, only begotten, and consequently, coessential Son of God the Father? — The Catholic Church, in all Ages, have most firmly, and steddily, believed he is: But our Author is of another Mind, and appears most zealous to draw others to his Opinion.

The Subject "if Salvation and Damnation are " annexed to it," &c. must be confess to be of the laft Importance: And therefore, since our all is at Stake, we cannot be too attentive, serious, and inquisitive about this Matter. He himself, "has "spent many Years of his Life in diligent Inquiries " into the sacred Doctrines of the Gospel, &c. Pref. p. 3. And now, "takes the Freedom to say, these Papers are the Product of that Part of Life, when his Powers of Mind and Body were in full Vigour." ibid. p. 4. And yet, a great many Things not only new and strange, uncouth and abstruse, but besides, and against the Word of God, &c. and which were little expected from such a Man, are found all over them.

"He has one Favour to beg of his Readers, and "that is, that they would not examine any of these "Papers, by the mere Dictates of their own reason-
"ing Powers, ibid. p. 4. 5. O that he had taken this wife, this necessary, Admonition in writing them. "for the Subject is a mere Matter of Divine " Revelation;" It is so: And consequently, we can know nothing more of it, than what we learn from thence. And the true, the sure, the only, Way to know the true and full Meaning of the Word of God, is, not to bring our own Dreams, Fancies, and Wishes, &c. to it; and then twist, and torture it, to vouch for, support, and establish them: But, to take Things, as we find them in Scripture; examine every Word; compare one Passage with another; cast down Imaginations (λογισμος Reasonings,) and every Thing that exalteth itself against the Knowledge of God, &c. 2 Cor. x. 5. &c. and then submit all our own Conclusions, to his Authority. "nor that they would take the " Sentiments or Schemes of elder or later Writers, " whether Schoolmen or Fathers, or Divines of " any Party," A shrewd Evidence, he well knew, they were all against himself! "for a perfect Test of " Truth and Orthodoxy in these sacred Subjects." I appeal to the impartial Reader, whether I have not complied with this good Counsel. — Tho' I have, and most justly, a very high Regard, for the concurring Testimony, Opinion, or Judgment, of the Fathers, and that of many of our modern reformed Divines; and particularly, those of the famous and most venerable Synod of Dort, and Assembly at Westminster; yet, I never did, and, by the Grace of God, never shall, take the Schemes of any mere Man, or Men, "for a perfect Test of " Orthodoxy," in these or any religious Subjects. — The Bible, The Bible, is the only Rule of Protestants. — And I can, for myself, call the most High to witness, whether, "in all mere " Matters of divine Revelation;" or any Matters which can be determined by it, my first, my chief,
my last Resort is not, What saith the Scripture? And had this Author spoken more according to this Word, If. viii. 20. and been less sway'd by the Scheme of a very modern Writer, (who, tho' an ingenious and learned Man, neither indeed was, nor was ever thought to be, the best of Guides,) I am inclined to think, the World had never seen "these his Papers." And hope, by that Time I have done, to convince my Readers, they had been at no great Loss, if they had not.

They are not to expect I should follow him, through almost every Page, not to say Sentence, as some tell me I have too much done with my last Antagonists; for this Reason, among several others: There are so many Things in these Papers, which were so little expected from this learned Author, That were I to take this Method, except I should transcribe every Word from the Beginning to the End, those who have not read them through-out, again and again, and very attentively too, would be tempted to think, either that I had not plainly quoted his Words, as they lye; or, had taken them by a wrong Handle; or concealed some Passages which would have qualified them, if not set them in another and in a better Light; or flyly palmed some Conclusions upon him, which are not really in his Premises; &c. All which mean, base Arts, I most heartily abhor; and, should scorn to use, did my Cause need them: But, blessed be God, it does not.—Withal, there are not a few Particulars, which I could not answer, with that necessary Freedom, the Importance of them requires, without being supposed to take Pleasure in insulting his Memory, which is the farthest of all Things from my Thoughts. — That I may therefore, as much as possible, without injuring the Cause of Truth, avoid all Suspicion of any such pitiful Shifts, I shall wholly pass by a great many
dubious, and offensive, Passages; and treat others, which must be animadverted on, with all faithful Tenderness: And, instead of a direct, and severe Confutation of many of his numerous Mistakes, and Errors; or dwelling too long, or frequently, upon them, as if I delighted in such ungrateful Work; I shall rather set myself to prove, illustrate, and vindicate, those Doctrines of the Gospel, which, tho’ very dear to the Church of Christ in all Ages, he has perverted, denied, or opposed. Return est Index sui & obliqui. — If Truth is clearly proposed, fairly proved, and fully vindicated; the contrary Errors, whoever patronises them, or however speciously advanced, or plausibly mainrained, will be easily discerned and for ever demolished. — This Way also, I shall have the desirable Opportunity of rescuing, explaining, and illustrating, a great many Scripture Texts; (to which he has given a Sabellian, or Arian Turn!) an Exercise, which I have, for many Years, look’d upon, as the chief Delight of my Life. — And, that this may be done to the best Advantage, and with the most convenient Brevity, we shall follow this Method, viz. Shall

1. State the principal Question, or Questions, between us, in the plainest and most candid Manner, that every one may, clearly, discern what we are disputing about, and may keep the true Points in Controversy still in his Eye.

2. Offer some just and weighty Prejudices against those novel Opinions, which this learned Author has espoused, and labours, so industriously and zealously, to maintain, recommend, and spread.

3. Propose several Preliminary Considerations, which may help us to some clearer Ideas of the principal Things in this Controversy; remove several Difficulties attending them; and lead us, the more easily and fully, to perceive, not only the
the Truths we are contending for, but the Importance of them.

4. Discuss some of his subordinate Questions, if they may be so called, and answer the most plausible Things, he has, any where, brought in support of his Notions, against the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

5. Produce, and vindicate, a great many Scripture Texts, which the Church of Christ, in all Ages, have pleaded, as so many convincing Proofs of the coessential Sonship of the Second Person in the ever blessed Trinity: Or Proofs, That this Title, the Son of God, so frequently ascribed in Scripture to our ever blessed Redeemer, does always, primarily and directly, either presuppose, or denote, his Divinity, or natural Relation to the Father, whose own, only begotten Son he is; and, That this Idea, is, every where, implied in all the Passages, wherein he is so styled.

C H A P. I.

The principal Question, or Questions, stated, in the plainest and most candid Manner, that the Reader may clearly see what we are disputing about, and have the true Points in Controversy still in his Eye.

WHEN one engages in any Work, wherein he, designedly and professedly, sets himself to oppose any commonly received Opinion, or Article of Faith; and especially, if it be, in his own Judgment, "an Article of such Importance as to have "Salvation or Damnation annexed to the believing, "or not believing it," he ought to be careful, in
the first Place, to propose "his Theme," in the clearest Manner he can, That his Readers may neither mistake his Notions, nor Intention in advancing and supporting them:—And the first Thing an honest Respondent should do, is to state the Questions, fairly and clearly; and then explain his Terms, declaring wherein, and how far, he and his Antagonist agrees, and in what Things, with what Views, and how far, they differ. If either, and much more if both, forget these, they may talk, or rather wrangle, without End, and to very little Purpose. And hence it is, as well as from other Causes, that Controversies of all Sorts, and particularly religious ones, have so little good Effect.—That this therefore may be, I hope, prevented at present, we shall give our learned Author's Mind, in his own Words, faithfully, without altering, adding, or abridging them; make some Observations on them; acquaint the Reader wherein we differ; and then, honestly and clearly, give the State of the Questions between us, and especially the principal One.

Having, in the last Sentence of his Introduction quoted above, promised "to survey the Senses which have been usually put upon the Name Son of God, — by Way of a disjunctive Syllogism, proposing several and excluding some of them;"

He begins his first Section, in the very next Words, p. 5. thus, "This Name, Son of God, hath been supposed to be given to our Lord Jesus Christ, upon some or all these five Accounts," which he there gives us, and must be particularly considered afterwards.—Anf. Upon One of them, it always has; upon some others, frequently; and upon one, very seldom, and but by very few. The fifth, which is that which he, in these Papers, pleads for, we have, p. 16. You shall have every Word of it.

"V. The last Sense in which Chrift is called, the Son of God, is to signify that glorious Person who
who was appointed to be the Messiah, the anointed Saviour who was derived from God, and did bear some very near and extraordinary Relation to God above all other Persons; and therefore he is called his Son, his own Son, his only begotten Son, his beloved Son. And since the several other Senfes cannot be admitted to be the precise Idea and common Meaning of the Name Son of God in the New Testament, I take this to be the true Idea of it, as it is generally used in the New Testament, and especially in those Scriptures where the Belief or Profession of it is made neccessary in Order to the Salvation of Men in the Writings of the Apostles.

How orthodox now does all this appear! Had he stopp here, we could hardly have desired more. Take this, in a Catholic Sense, and I, for my Part, can heartily subscribe almost every Word of it, but one. Thus, "Christ is called the Son of God," in numberless Passages; and we most stedfastly believe, He is what he is called; and that, in a most peculiar, even in the highest, and most, yea only, proper Sense:—This Son of God was, and could not but be, as such, a most "glorious Person;" Heb. i. ver. 2, 8, 10. and when he took on him our Nature, He was, and is, still one Person only, and a most glorious one:—He, and he only, "was appointed to be the Messiah, the anointed Saviour;" Prov. viii. 23. and he, and he only, i. e. as the Son of God made Flesh, could actually execute that most glorious Office; Rev. v. 3—6:—He "was derived from God," even the Father; for, he is his own, his only begotten, and therefore coessential Son: John iii. 16. and 18:—He bears a very "near and extraordinary Relation to God;" for, He and the Father, John. x. 30. are One:—"Above all other Persons;" Yes, (if we must not except
the Holy Ghost,) for, he is his only begotten, who always was, and is, of him, and yet with him, and in him. John i. ver. 1, 2, 14. and 18, &c.—And now, taking these Words as Christians, in all Ages, would have taken them, and one can hardly say any Thing more sound.—But alas! this is not his Sense, tho’ “he takes it to be the true Idea of this “Name!” as is clear from the very next Paragraph, which you shall also have verbatim.

“it includes some special and glorious Relation “to God;” p. 17. It does, it must do, so, if it includes any Thing in it at all: Nor can any one possibly doubt of it.—“but whether that Relation “belongs to his Flesh,” i. e. if it be Sense, to the Body he assumed. Strange Words indeed! The Son of God himself took Part of the same Flesh and Blood, of which the Children were Partakers; Heb. ii. 14. and thereby, became our near Kinsman: But, I never heard it surmized, till now, that, by taking our Flesh, he became more nearly related to God, than he was before he took it.—“or his human “Soul,” which, he tells us, had “a glorious and "peculiar Derivation from God the Father before the “Foundation of the World,” p. 10, &c. Of which peculiar Derivation of his human Soul, the Scriptures, so far as I can find, are entirely silent.—“or “his Divine Nature,” a Clause which our Author, above all Men, should have clearly explained, for a Reason which will come up by and by.—“or to “all these,” And yet, if “this Relation belongs "either to his Flesh, or to his Divine Nature, or “to all these three,” his darling Nostrum, “That "his Human Soul is properly the Son of God, p. 150, "&c.” is most evidently demolished thereby.— “is not so directly determined by those Texts,” Is it not? Why; If those Texts, where our Lord is so frequently stiled the own, the begotten, the only begotten Son; and such as that, I and the Father.
ARE ONE, &c. do not directly, I'll add fully, and strongly determine, That that Relation belongs to him, as the proper, natural, and therefore coessential Son, no Texts, no Words can. — If any think otherwise, I wish they would only tell me what Words, or Phrases, can determine it more plainly, strongly, and undeniably? "Because, says he, "the chief Design of them is but to point out the "Person and Character of the Messiah." Very well: And can the Person of the Messiah be, possibly, pointed out, without some Mention of both his Natures; his Divine as well as, if not much more than, his Human? — Yea, can it be pointed out without some Account, or Hint, of both his Sonships; or, that he is both the Son of God, and the Son of Man; and as properly God, as the Son of God, as he is Man, as the Son of Man? Or, can his Character be pointed out, without some Notice both of his Natures, and his Sonships? — Had he said, The chief Design of them is but to point out the Office, which the Logos, or the second Person in the Trinity, when made Flesh, sustained; he had said something to his Purpose, and we had understood him: But, as it is, it had been as well omitted. — However, This Reason, as he has given it, evidently destroys his own Cause, and confirms mine.

He proceeds to prove this to be "the true Sense "of the Name Son of God; and that it doth origi- "nally respect the Glory and Excellency of his Per- "son, and his near Relation and Resemblance to "God, as appears from the Use of the Word Son "and Son of God in other Places of Scripture." Still, every Catholic, one would think, must ac- quiesce in this; and add, That it is next to impos- sible, that a serious Reader of the Bible should doubt of it. All the World must own, that the Word, Son, as it is used among Men, always denotes a Per- son; that it never did, nor does, signify an Office; that
that he, who is indeed a proper Son, is so very nearly related to his Father, as to be of his own Flesh and Blood; and that, if a Father is himself a Person of Honour and Distinction, this cannot but add to the Glory of the Son, &c. — If then, we apply these Ideas to this Title, the Son of God, as the Christian Church have ever done, 'tis expressive of the highest possible "Glory and Excellency of his Person:" — Whereas, the Ideas he means by it, viz. "that it cannot necessarily imply his divine Nature," p. 63. and that the pre-existent Soul of Christ is properly the Son of God, p. 150, &c." 'tis certain, are not. For surely, The proper, i.e. coessential Son of God, and as such, is in his Person, infinitely more glorious and excellent; stands in an infinitely nearer Relation to God the Father; and resembles him infinitely more; than the highest possible mere Creature either does, or can do, were all the highest possible created Glory and Excellency in him alone. — And yet, says he, p. 20. in a Paragraph of which you shall have every Syllable.

"But let us raise this Idea of the Name as high as we can suppose any of the Disciples had attained "before the Death of Christ,"—Which, as we shall afterwards see, was much, yea inconceivably, higher than he thinks. — "or as high as could be "requisite in Order to Salvation in that Day," — How could our Author know this? — and I think "it must be granted that this Name Son of God "(so far as it denotes the Nature of Christ distinct "from his Offices) can necessarily be construed to "rise no higher than to denote some peculiar and "glorious Likeness to God," What is that; or what Conceptions can we have of it? "Some more "near and excellent Relation to God the Father," What Relation can "the Nature of Christ, distinct "from his Offices," have to God? — "or some spe- "cial Derivation from him," Could his Nature be any
any otherwise derived from God, but either by eternal Generation, or proper Creation? — "some divine Character more eminent than belongs to Men or Angels when they are called the Sons of God," He was speaking of the Nature of Christ, and not of any Character. — "without any precise Determination wherein this peculiar Relation to God consisted." This has been already answered. — But to be more particular.

What does, what cou'd, our learned Author mean, by "the Nature of Christ distinct from his Offices?" The Word Christ, is a Title of Office: He who is the Christ, is God-man, having two infinitely distinct Natures in his one Person; as himself often confesses, p. 34, 44. &c. — Which of them then could he mean? If he meant his Divine Nature, then the Idea of this Name Son of God, especially as it denotes the Nature of Christ, &c. must necessarily be construed to rise infinitely higher, than he here alludes it can: Because, he is very express, (the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity, Prop. 8. p. 37.) "Yet these very Names, Titles, Attributes, Works and Worship, which are peculiar to God, and incommunicable to another, are ascribed to Three by God himself in his Word; which Three are distinguished by the Names, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." and (Prop. 14. p. 149.) These Sacred Three "are evidently and plainly discovered in Scripture, to be one and the same God, and Three distinct personal Agents or Persons; &c." and below, "That there are three divine Persons," &c. — And now, Would one have thought that he should, after this, have so positively affirmed, "I have made it appear that the Name Son of God cannot necessarily imply his divine Nature?" p. 63. &c. — If he means his human Nature, I grant we need not, and I think, we cannot, raise his human Nature any higher.
higher than our Author has done: But then, I deny that this Title, *Son of God*, ever denotes, anywhere in Scripture, "the human Nature of Christ "only, and as distinct from his Offices."—But, to wave such disagreeable Work, I shall here leave only these few Thoughts with the Reader, and shall afterwards confirm every one of them.

This Title, *the Son of God*, must, in the Judgment of all Men, originally, and properly, denote a Person:—It never did, directly, if at all, signify his Offices; but, the Divine Person, as clothed with them:—When ever the Jews heard our Lord assume it to himself, they always took it, in its only proper, which is also its common, grammatical, natural Sense, as implying *Sameness of Nature* with the Father, or coessential Sonship; nor did he himself ever once deny it, or let either them, or his Disciples, or any other, know that it was not to be taken in that Sense:—We cannot think, that the Disciples, who heard this so often, either did, or could, put any lower, or indeed any other, Sense upon it:—Could any Thing be rationally suggested, against our taking it, when it comes alone, in the highest, which is indeed its only proper, Sense; yet, when these Adjectives, *own, proper, begotten, only begotten*, are joined to it, we cannot tell how to lessen the Idea, without questioning the *Veracity, Wisdom, or Goodness*, of him who affixed them:—And, to wave some others, this Title, especially with these Adjectives, gives, as we have said, "as precise a Determination where-" in this peculiar Relation to God consisted," as any Title, or any other Words can. If any are otherwise minded, let them instance in one or more of them, at their Leisure.—I cannot help adding the two next Paragraphs also, Word for Word.

"Now
Now to proceed: This Glory and Excellency of the Person of Christ, which is originally denoted by the Name Son of God," p. 20.—Well then, 1. This Name, originally, denotes the Glory and Excellency of his Person. And yet, 2. He will not have his Divine Nature, in which is the infinitely chiefest Glory and Excellency of his Person, so much as implied in it! "is part of his Qualification for the Office of the Messiah," No doubt, the peculiar Excellency of his human Nature is; but much more is the infinite Excellency of his Divine Nature, if it be proper to use such an Expression. "part of the Foundation of his Office, and what made him a proper Person to undertake, sustain and fulfil it." But, should we (as we need not, yea cannot,) grant him, that his pre-existent human Soul could undertake his Office, it could neither have sustained, nor fulfilled it: But, as the coessential Son of God could, from Eternity, undertake it, so could he, in the Fulness of Time, assume a true Body and a reasonable Soul, i.e. our Nature; and in, and by, that Nature, most gloriously and effectually sustain and fulfil it. And therefore, his Divine Nature ought not, upon any Account, to have been omitted, especially by one, (who acknowledges Christ to be God-Man, p. 34. & passim) when speaking of the Glory and Excellency of his Person. — What was all his other Glory and Excellency to this? — Might not every Arian in the Kingdom have said as much as all this, if not much more? —

"Yet this Excellency of his Person, this Likeness and Nearness to God," Still not a Syllable of his Godhead, or coessential Sonship! Still he speaks of his Human Nature as a Person! "is not the complete Sense and Meaning of the Word Son of God in those forecited Texts of the Gospel," Very true: Nor is it possible to give the complete Sense of it, if any true Sense of it at all, without some
Notice, or Mention, of his Divine Nature. "but it includes also a Designation to his Office, viz. "that glorious Person of extraordinary Nearness "and Likeness to God, who was ordained to be "the Saviour of Men:" p. 21. All who read, understand, and believe, the Bible, are agreed, That the Messiah, and as such, is indeed the Son of God, and often so called; or, that this is one of the Titles of the Messiah; which it may be, tho' it originally, and chiefly signifies, and always presupposes and implies the coessential Sonship. "And "tho' the Name Son of God signifies and includes "both these, yet sometimes the Scripture in using "this Name seems to have a more special Regard "to the Excellency of his Person, and sometimes to "his Office," This may be granted, without disputing. "and perhaps for this Reason, that a "Belief of his Sonship in one of those Senses, but "especially the latter, (i. e. his Office) in that Day "might be a sufficient Ground for the Faith or "Hope of Sinners." Anf. 1. Could any Jew, in that Day, believe him to be the Messiah, without believing him to be also the Son of God? 2. Whether they could or no, surely Sonship and Office are not, nor ever were, at least among Men, synonymous Terms. The two Ideas are quite different. Nor was ever a Son, as such, called an Officer; or an Officer, as such, a Son.—A Son indeed may have an Office, and be stiled by it too: But no one would call him a Son, as an Officer, or because he is an Officer; because he was a Son before he had, or could have that Office, and would have still been a Son, tho' he had never had it. 3. What was a "sufficient Ground in that Day," is not the Question, but what is so in ours. — 4. I may, I conceive, positively deny, That either the Disciples, the Scribes and Pharisees, or our Saviour's ordinary Hearers, ever took this Title, barely for a Title of
of Office; or, That when the Disciples publicly pro-

fessed, that he was the Christ the Son of the living

God, they meant nothing by it, but that he was

the Messiah; and shall give my Reasons for my De-
nial, hereafter. And, 5, I may safely defy the

whole World to prove, That any one of all these,
or any other, did or could, in that Day, take it

in our Author's Sense. — Yea, 5. He himself has

almost expressly own'd as much, as we shall see. —

But, to wave this unpleasant Work, I would only

ask every serious, impartial Christian these few

Questions.

1. Is not "a Belief of his Sonship, in this latter

" Sense especially," i. e. as having "a more spe-

" cial Regard to his Office," when put into plain

English, neither more nor less than, a Belief that these

two Titles, Son of God and the Messiah, are syno-

ymous, or signify the very same Thing? And if

so, would it not have been as well to have told us

this, expressly, as the other learned Gentlemen,

with whom I have now to do, have done? — But,

whether this be so, or not,

2. Can a serious Person think, That a Belief of

this; or even of this Proposition, That "Christ

" was the glorious Messiah, p. 63. was a sufficient

" Ground for the Faith and Hope of those Sinners,"

who had heard himself so frequently and solemnly

declare, that he was the own, only begotten Son, and

that He and the Father were One, &c. without a

firm Belief also of his Divine Nature?

3. Can an impartial Person, who has no pre-

conceived Opinion to bias him, if he really be-

lieves, " that the Messiah hath two distinct Natures

united in him, even the Nature of God and the

" Nature of Man: and that Christ is true God,"

p. 34. &c. ever be induced to think That this

Title, the only begotten Son of God, does not always
denote, or at least imply, his Divine Nature? Or,

G2 "that
"That his human Soul is properly the Son of "God?" &c.

4. When this Title, the Son of God, has, as he says it often has, "a more special Regard to the "Excellency of his Person, p. 21." &c. Can it be imagined, That "this his Sonship may, (even then) "be better referred to his inferior Nature, or to "his Offices?" p. 44. Or "cannot refer to his Di-
"vine Nature?" ibid. &c.

5. When it has a more special Regard to his Of-
"fices, Is not his Godhead pre-supposed to, or im-
"plied in, his being the Messiah? — The Title itself naturally, easily, and directly, leads to this; and the Nature of the Thing necessarily requires it: Be-
"cause, he confesses Christ is both God and Man, 
p. 44. &c. — However, If it does neither denote, nor imply, his divine Nature, it must of necessity either signify, or imply his human Nature only, or no Nature at all! But his human Nature neither is, nor ever was, nor ever will be, a Person: And, if so, it neither ever did, nor can, act of itself, or divided from, the second Person in the Trinity. — Yea, should we suppose it could, yet it never was, nor could be made, equal to the mighty Undertaking: 
&c. For Example, It could never, of itself, have assumed the Seed of Abraham; it could never have had Power to lay down its Life, and much less, of itself, to take it up again, whatever Commandment it might have received of the Father. John x. 18. &c. &c. — Should any allege, that this is not sufficiently proved; 'twill be enough at present, to say, That if he will consult "the Christian Doctrine," p. 28— 84. he will see it is, at least, an invincible Argu-
ment ad Hominem. Once more,

6. Would not one have thought, That "those "Articles he has borrowed from the Athanasian "Creed, which he freely and delightfully confesses, "viz. That Christ the Son of God, is both God and "Man;
"Man;—perfect God and perfect Man;—One;—by taking the Manhood into God, so as to become one personal Agent, or one Person; and as the reasonable Soul and Flesh is one Man, so God and Man are one Christ, who suffered for our salvation," &c. Pref. p. 5. 6. Would not, I say, one have thought, That these would have kept him, from several very unguarded Things, &c. &c.

I am very heartily sorry, he has given Occasion for such Questions: And, that I may have done with such ungrateful Work, since it is hardly possible to give his true and full Meaning of this Title, in any one or two Propositions, we shall give it the Reader, as much as may be, in his own Words, in several very short, and plain ones. And shall, as we go along, hint at some only of the necessary and inevitable Consequences: And observe also wherein, and how far, he agrees or disagrees from the other learned and worthy Persons mentioned above; some of whose Notions I am also to confute. —Well then,

1. 'Tis his avowed Design, throughout, to insinuate and prove, "That the second Person, in the Holy and Undivided Trinity, is not indeed, as such, at all, the Son of God; and is never so called, any where in Scripture:" And therefore he, every where, opposes "his Eternal Generation, and the coessential Sonship of Christ," p. 6. &c. &c.

In this, he differs from the Christian Church in all Ages, and the generally received Creeds, &c.—Withal, if this is so, The Son of God, is not, as such, one of the Three undivided Persons; is not God of God; yea, is not at all God, &c. &c.

2. He is positive, he "has made it appear, "That the Name Son of God cannot necessarily imply his divine Nature," &c. p. 63, and express, "That this is his present Theme, to prove "that this Name, in the New Testament, does not "gene-
"generally (if ever) signify his divine Nature," &c. p. 45, &c. &c.

In this, I conceive, he differs, from all the Tri-nitarians that ever were, or now are, in the World; and in particular from the other learned Gentlemen, with whom I am now to deal, and all others like minded, &c. — Withal, if this is the Case, 'tis then undeniable, That the Son of God is not, as such, in any Sense, God; has not the divine Perfections; is not the Object of religious Worship; &c.

3. He is express, "The pre-existent Soul of Christ," (which he frequently calls his human Soul!) "in whom the Divine Nature or Godhead always dwelt," (then it must have been Eternal!) is "properly the Son of God," (which it could not possibly be, even tho') "derived from the Father before all Worlds, as his only begotten Son," &c. p. 150, &c. And "is very much inclined to believe," that this Title "relates to his human Soul, and signifies the glorious peculiar Derivation of it from God the Father before the Creation of the World," &c. p. 10, &c.— What this "glorious and peculiar Derivation" is, he has no where pretended to tell us. — However, This Soul was either unmade, or made, tho' in a very peculiar Manner. — If unmade, it is necessarily Existant, Eternal, &c. — If made, it was not only "derived from the Father," but the second Person also, even the Logos; for, all Things were made by him, and without him was not any Thing made that was made. John i. 3. Col. i. 16, 17. &c.

All this now, to the best of my Knowledge, is a very modern Fancy, unknown to all Antiquity!— 'Tis not at all sufficiently proved, tho' it makes no small Alteration in the Christian Faith!—Yea, if it is not almost downright Arianism, it, in my Opinion, comes not only too near it, but is very like it!
And, tho' he doth not, in this Work, set himself, so directly, to maintain it, as in a following one; yet, he has it often up; frequently insinuates, and supposes it; and makes no little use of it, upon several occasions! &c.

4. That which he principally seems to plead is, as we have heard already, “The last sense in which “Chrift is called the Son of God, is to signify that “glorious person who was appointed to be the Messiah, “the anointed Saviour who was derived from God, “and did bear some very near and extraordinary Re-“lation to God above all other persons; and there-“fore he is called his Son, his own Son, his only be-“gotten Son, his beloved Son.” p. 16, &c. &c.

Upon this, besides what has been offered above, I would desire the Reader to observe, — 1. ’Tis Chrift or his human Soul, and not the second person, as such, who, according to him, is called the Son of God! — 2. This title, in his opinion, signifies a person, tho’ “not his Divine Nature!” — Then 3. His human nature must be that person, except he has some other nature, besides his Divine and his human nature! — 4. If his human nature is a person, since he acknowledges the second person in the Trinity, who assumed that nature, is also a person, and was so before he assumed it; then there are two persons, in the one person of Chrift the Messiah! &c. &c. — 5. This person was “appointed to be “the Messiah;” i.e. according to him, his human person was! — 6. He was derived from God; but not by generation! — 7. “He did bear some, “very near and extraordinary relation to God,” (but what that relation is, he has not told us;) “above “all other persons!” Not, surely, above the second and third persons in the ever bleffed Trinity. — And 8. “And therefore is called his own Son, his only “begotten!” But no relation, how near and ex-“traordinary soever, is, or can be, in the Language of
of Men, and of common Sense, a sufficient Foundation, or Reason, for calling any one an own Son, an only begotten, who has not, as such, the same Nature with his Father, of and from him also. And therefore, as no one, who is not as truly and properly Man as his Father, can be called his own, his only begotten Son: So no one, can be truly called the own, the only begotten, Son of God the Father, who is not, as such, coessential with him, and consequently, as truly God as he. —But, this must be very particularly considered, by and by.

5. He is plain, "This Title, Son of God, is given to Christ, sometimes upon the Account of his Incarnation and miraculous Birth, Luke i. 31, 32, 35. p. 11. —Tho' God be the Father of all Men by Creation, and of the Saints by a New "Creation or Regeneration," He is so called, but improperly only: And therefore, no one of them had ever the Honour to be called his Son, in the singular Number, on any such Account; and much less that transcendent, that singular Honour to be filled his own Son, or his only begotten. &c. "yet in "a more special Manner he is the Father of the "blessed Jesus; because his Body was so formed "or begotten by him, in so peculiar a Manner, as "no other Man ever was." p. 12. Why then, "his pre-existent Soul was properly the Son of "God," p. 150. and his "peculiarly formed Bo-"dy" seems also, in this Way of talking, to have been the Son of God! —— But,

It is not, nor ever was, nor ever will or can be, the Part of a Father, as such, to form a Body: — Nor was ever a Father, I believe, before now, said, or thought, to have formed the Body of his own Son: — Nor are the Words formed and begotten, of the same Signification: —No, nor were they ever, till now, supposed to be. —So far from it, that they cannot be predicated, either of the same Object, or Sub-
Ye,

They are evidently inconsistent; He who forms a Body does not, cannot possibly, beget it, any more than he who begets a Body, does, or can form it. But more of this hereafter.

These are the principal Things, wherein our worthy Author has departed, from the common Faith of the Christian Church: And these are a few only of the necessary, and unavoidable Consequences of them.—Every intelligent Reader must see, That as I have not strained them, so neither have I been fond of multiplying them.—Several more, alas! out of many, must be animadverted on, ere we have done.

The other learned Gentlemen agree with him, in some of these Notions, tho' not in all: Nor, be it spoken to their Praise, have they, even in the Things wherein they have erred from the Truth, gone his sad Lengths. Their Principles, which we are now to oppose, as well as some wherein we agree, are

1. They all solemnly declare, That they firmly believe the fundamental Doctrine of the Trinity, as well as he, viz. "That there are Three distinct "Divine Persons, of each of whom it may be affirmed, That he is the true and most high God, "and that these Three are one."*—Thus far, we most heartily agree with them.

2. Roel, very fully and freely, confesses, "That "the Son, the second Person of the most Holy Trini-
"ty, was from Eternity begotten of the Father." † In every Title of this, we agree with him, with all our Hearts: But our worthy Author, and his other

† His Tenth Thesis is, ibid. "Dicimus Filium, Secundam Per-
sonam S. S. Trinitatis, ab aeterno a Patre esse genitum."
Brethren, will by no Means allow, That the second Person, as such, was, in any Sense, begotten of the Father, or is ever called a, the, or his Son.

3. Roel, in the very next Words, Thefis eleventh, is plain and full, That his eternal Generation is the first and principal Reason, why the "second Person of the Trinity is called the Son": And because "he is the true and eternal Son,|| he is there-
fore said to have been begotten from Eternity." —
In this also, we most cordially agree with him, in Words at least. But, as our Author and his other Brethren vehemently oppose the Things meant by these Words, so they will not allow, that they are ever used of the second Person in the Trinity, and purely as such.

Should it then be asked, wherein Roel and we differ? We answer, Tho' he cannot deny, as his Brethren do, that the second Person, and purely as such, is often stiled the Son, the own, the begotten, the only begotten, Son of God; yet he will not grant that any of these Names or Titles are used of him properly, Thes. 17. p. 3. or as they are commonly used among Men. Thes. 16.—He thinks that the Words, Son and Generation, when used properly, necessarily imply "Production, Inferiority, Dependence, &c."
Thes. 14. p. 5. which cannot be affirmed of "a " Divine Person, who is the true, the supreme God," and consequently, "Eternal, independent, God of " himself, and of no other Person." &c. Thes. 15. And this is almost the only Thing, of any Moment, in which he has, thus far departed from the common Faith; and in these last his Brethren agree.

4. He thinks therefore, "That it is the most "simple, most agreeable to the Nature of the Thing,|| Hanc; esse primam & praeëpam Rationem, quod secunda illa Persona S. S. Trinitatis dicatur Filius: & viceïssim, quia verus & aëterns Dei Filius, hanc esse causam, cur ab aëterna genitus dicatur. most
most safe, and, in a Word, most Orthodox Sense, to say, That the Words, Son and Generation, in the present Case, do most emphatically signify, That the second Person has the same Essence and Nature with the First, and did co-exist with him from Eternity." Thes. 20. p. 5. *—Whence 'tis plain, he thinks, that this is a Title of Nature, and not of Office, tho' he seems afterwards to have somewhat changed his Mind upon this Head.

So that, N. B. 'Tis evident, he believes, that the second Person, and purely as such, is, and is called, the Son: — That he is, as such, as truly and properly, a Person, as the First: — That he is a co-essential Son: — That he is co-eternal with the First also: — That he is Δυτοθεός, God of himself, as well as He: — That therefore, he is, as such, in every Sense, and upon every Account, equal with him; and no Way derived from, or dependent upon him.

I do not remember, That the learned Dr. Ridgley, or Dr. Anderson have, any where, exprest themselves so clearly, and strongly: But, in some of those, they agree, or very nearly agree; and, in others, they differ from him. — They deny, That the second Person, and purely as such, either is, or is ever called, the Son of God; and consequentially, deny also, that he is either a co-essential, co-eternal, or co-equal Son: But they believe, That the second Person, and purely as such, is the true and supreme God; that he is co-essential, co-eternal and co-equal with the First Person, and no Way derived from, or dependent upon him. — Yea, neither they, nor the learned Roel, will hardly confess, that there is any natural Priority, no not of Order, among the blessed

Three; no, nor any Subordination, such as there is between a Father and a Son among Men, tho' supposed, in all other Respects, to be equal. — Whatever Priority or Subordination there is, they think it is purely Oeconomical, and not Natural; insomuch, that they seem backward to call them the first, second, or third Persons. And hence, they cannot bear to hear the first Person, the Father, called the Fountain of the Deity, or of the Trinity; or that any of the other two, were derived from, or produced by him: And, instead of calling them the first, second, and third Persons, while they consider them purely as God, they rather chuse to say, in Roel's Words, they are alijs, alijs, and alijs, one Person, another Person, and another Person. Differ. Theol. p. 39. &c. and not alius, alius, and alius, i. e. one Thing, another Thing, &c.

Our worthy Author agrees thus far, with the two Britifh Divines, only in these and their Consequences, "That the second Person, and purely as such, "neither is, nor is ever called, the Son of God, his "own, his begotten Son, &c; and therefore, is "neither a co-essential, co-eternal, or co-equal Son, "&c. That he is, purely as such, neither derived "from, nor dependent upon, any other." — But he differs from them in these following, They knew nothing of "Christ's pre-existent human Soul;" and never dreamt That "this human Soul was properly "the Son of God;" or, That the Father's peculiar Formation of his Body was a begetting it, or the Reason of his being called his own, his only begotten Son, &c. which are our learned Author's beloved Nostrums. — He differs yet farther from the learned Roel. This worthy Professor, as we have heard, freely grants, That the second Person was, from Eternity, begotten of the Father, and is therefore called his begotten Son, &c: That the Words, Son and Generation, imply Coessentiality and Coeternity
nity with the Father, and that this Title is a Title of Nature: That therefore the Son, as such, is the true God, the Object of Worship, &c.—But our worthy Author believes neither of these, nor any of their Consequences: Yea, he, with all his Might, opposes them!—But I must add,

5. Tho’ the Catholic Church have always believed, That this Title, the Son of God, is a Title of Nature, they seem all to be unanimous, That it is rather only, or at least chiefly, a Title of Office.—For,

Dr. Ridgley is express, That “Christ is called “ the Son of God, as Mediator.” vol. i. p. 128, &c. So is Dr. Anderson, “ All the Texts relating to the “Sonship of Christ, in the New Testament; all, none “excepted, are applied to him as the Mediator.”
p. 39.—And, tho’ Mr. Roel, has nothing like this in any of his Theses; and tho’ it can have no Place, in what he calls the most Orthodox Sense of this Title, as must be clear to every one that does but read it: Yet he seems afterward to have changed his Mind a little, and admit, p. 40. “That, “tho’ these Names, Father, and Son, chiefly signify “a Communion of the same Nature, yet they seem “also to respect the Oeconomy of our Redemption,”
&c. — Our Author’s Opinion we have had already. He thinks, That, this Title, the Son of God, is a Title of Office, yet some Way or other implying, that he, who is so stiled, “was derived from God, “and bears some very near and extraordinary Relation to him,” &c. i. e. that his “human Soul had a “glorious peculiar Derivation from him.”—

Upon the whole, if any learned Man shall think it worth his while to read this, he will easily see, That, whether Dr. Ridgley and Dr. Anderson were, in these Things, the Disciples of the learned Roel or no, they are, in most of them, pretty much of his Mind; and that, if they were, they have en-
deavoured to express themselves with more Caution, and Reserve: And That, tho' our worthy Author has followed the excellent Mr. Fleming, as he calls him, and laboured to improve upon him, yet he has not been so happy, as to have much mended Matters.

On the other Hand, tho' the Church of Christ, in all Ages, have most unanimously confessed, That this Title, the Son, the own Son, the only begotten Son, of God, is often ascribed to the Messiah, as such, and in his complex Person; yet, they believed it was not, strictly speaking, synonimous to, or of the same Signification with these, the Mediator, or the Messiah; or, in other Words, was not, in its first and principal Sense, a Title of Office, but of Nature: — But that it primarily, and strictly, signifies the second Person in the most holy Trinity: — That this ever-blessed Person was, from Eternity, the true, natural, and therefore co-essential Son of the Father: — That he was so, and might have been so called, in the Order of Nature, before the Scheme of Redemption was laid, and abstracting from all Consideration of it: — That, as such, he was, with the Father, the joint Creator of all Things, visible and invisible, &c. and that by him all Things consist: — That therefore, he is, as such, the Object of Religious Worship: — And, That his glorious human Soul is not properly the Son of God; nor is ever, nor can be, so called; and much less his own, his only begotten Son. So that,

N. B. 1. The Question is not, whether Christ indeed is, and is called, the Son of God, which is their unfair Way of proposing it, and which we heartily believe, as well as they: But, whether the second Person is; which they deny, and we affirm?

2. The Question is not, whether Christ indeed is not, and may be called, the Son of God, upon several Accounts; which many yield, and we may grant without disputing: But, whether he is not in-
1. Whether "Christ's human Soul is properly " the Son of God?" 2. Whether he has made it appear, "That the Name Son of God, cannot necessarily imply his Divine Nature?" 3. Whether this is a Name, or Title of Office? — Each of these, especially the two first, he boldly affirms, and pleads for with all his Might: And we positively deny.

So that the great Truths I am, through the Grace of God, to prove and defend, are these,

1. That the second Person, in the holy and undivided Trinity, and as such, is called, in Scripture, the Son of God; and therefore, is, in Fact, what he is called.

2. That the same ever blessed Person is titled his own, his begotten, his only begotten Son.

3. That therefore, this is a Title of Nature, and not of Office. And consequently,

4. That in all Places, where he is so called, it, necessarily, does either presuppose, imply, or denote, his Divine Nature. And therefore,

5. That, as the Son, he is God of God, very God of very God, Begotten, not made. And

6. That his pre-existent human Soul is not properly the Son of God.

I have been so very plain, and copious, in stating the Questions, (some of the Terms whereof must be hereafter explained, a little more particularly,) That the plain unlearned Reader may, the more clearly and easily, understand the true State of the Controversy, and the Importance of it: — That neither he, nor we, may mistake, or forget the true
true Points in Debate: — That we may wholly cut off, or at least abridge, what is either altogether foreign to, or comes not near, or at least not up to, our present Dispute: — That the Case may be brought to a short Issue: — And, that I might, even in stating the Questions, shew how an illiterate Person, of but an ordinary Capacity, may answer more than one Half of all that I ever heard urged, against the true and proper Sonship of the second Person in the Trinity. — This he may easily do, if he will only remember, That the Terms, the Christ, the Mediator, or Redeemer, respect not the second Person, merely as the Son of God; but as God-man, as is readily confessed; passim: And that, tho' the Title, Son of God strictly taken, signifies only the second Person, and as such; yet, we freely grant, it most frequently denotes in the New Testament (even when the Adnouns own, only begotten, &c. are affixed) the whole complex Person of the Messiah. — And one principal Reason why the Mediator, as such, is so often titled the Son of God, seems to be, because that glorious Title primarily implies the most transcendent Excellency of his Person; his coessential Sonship being that which chiefly qualified him for, or made him capable of, acting the Redeemer's Part. — It was not necessary, that all his Titles should be given him, on every Occasion, when he was mention'd: But, it was highly so, upon several Accounts, when one of them was thought sufficient, frequently to use the leading one, which would most conduce to his own Glory, and the Support of his People's Faith, &c. — These Thoughts, I say, will help even the weak Christian, to answer more than one Half of all that can be objected, against the coessential Sonship of the second Person. Of which, take now this one Proof, by Way of Sample.
The late learned Dr. Ridgley having, with more Modesty, Brevity, and Plainness, and not less Judgment, than some others, proposed his Opinion, "That Christ is called the Son of God, as Mediator," vol. i. p. 128, adds immediately, "we proceed to prove this from Scripture." Let us then now, very briefly consider the Texts.

"And here we are not under the Necessity of training the Sense of a few Scriptures, to make them speak agreeably to this Notion of Christ's Sonship; but, I think, we have the whole Scripture, whenever it speaks of Christ, as the Son of God, as giving Countenance to this plain Sense thereof;" Here, (1) 'tis insinuated. That we are under this sad "Necessity of training Scripture Texts, to make them speak our Mind;" whereas, we indeed are not: Yea, we are so far from training the Sense of any of these Words, the Son, the own, the proper, the begotten, the only begotten, Son, that, in the Case before us, we take every one of them, in the plain, common, natural, and therefore necessary Sense, in which all the World takes them, when they read, or hear them; and in which he himself, and all his Followers do, in every other Case but this; viz. as a Title, or Titles, signifying the natural Relation of the Son to his Father, and not an Office. (2) 'Tis also hinted, 'That there are but a "few Scriptures" which we have to strain, or which can be strained to our Purpose.—Whereas, every Text, where any of these Titles occur, is, we conceive, as plainly for us, as we need desire. (3) Can any one, who has no darling Nostrum to defend, indeed think, That the "plain Sense" of this Title, the Son of God, or his only begotten Son, is, That he is not in Reality, the Son, the only begotten Son of the Father at all; but a Servant, or one in Office under him? &c. Yea, (4) What hard straining must it cost, to make a great many Texts, which literally, and
most properly, and emphatically, affirm any one Thing, to signify nothing less; if I may not lay, to make them, point Blank, deny what they so positively do affirm? — "So that I cannot find one " Place, in the whole New Testament, in which " Christ is called the Son of God: but it is, with " sufficient Evidence, proved, from the Context, " that it is applied to him, as Mediator." ibid. And then goes on, as if the whole Difficulty was got over, " to refer to several Scriptures, in which " he is so considered." — In the very same Manner, the late learned Dr. Anderson, who has acted his Part, upon this Subject, as well as any of his Brethren, in his very learned Sermon, for so it is, The Word made Flesh, p. 39. " In the New Testament, all " the Texts relating to the Sonship of Christ; all, " none excepted, are applied to Christ as Mediator." — To all which we ans. 1. This Assertion seems not, to me, to be true, in Fact. There are more Places, I conceive, than one, (for Example, Heb. i. ver. 8. comp. with ver. 10.) in which Christ is called the Son, or the Son of God, where this Title denotes only his Divinity, or coessential Sonship, and not at all his Mediatorial Office; which we shall by and by produce, and explain. I desire the Reader would, in this, give me Credit, for a little; which he may the more safely do, because. — 2. Were it true, it comes not home to the Point. — None of the Scriptures, which any of them have alleged, prove any Thing which we ever denied. — What he should have proved was, That these Titles, the Mediator and the Son of God, signify not only the very same Person, but the very same Thing in that Person: — That this latter, is a Title of Office, and not of Nature: — That, if he, the second Person, had not been the Mediator, he had never been, or been called, the Son of God: — That his Deftination to his Office, was, if I may so say, the Foundation of this Title, &c.
Whereas, all that the Scriptures quoted prove, is, That this Title, the Son of God, is one of the Titles of the Mediator, as such; which was never doubted by any of us. — 'Tis one Thing to say, That the Messiah, and as such, is called, and is actually, the Son of God; because, he really is so, and could not have been the Mediator, if he had not: And quite a different Thing to say, That these Titles are indeed synonymous; or, That the second Person, and purely as such, was not indeed, in the Nature of Things, the Son of God, before his Designation to his Office, or abstracting from all Consideration of it. — The Scriptures quoted to support this Notion, tho' they must come up hereafter, may be very briefly considered here, That the Reader may, by having a Taste of them, perceive more clearly what we have been saying, and what little Service they do their Cause. We shall treat them very modestly.

The first is, "That Scripture where Peter confesses, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God; Matt. xvi. 16. in which, speaking of himself as Christ, or the Mediator, i.e. the Person who was invested in the Office, and came to perform the Work of a Mediator, he is, in this Respect, the Son of the living God." Here you have every Syllable he has offered upon this Text. — Ans. No doubt of it. — The Mediator is, in this Respect, i.e. as the Mediator, the Son of the living God: I add, and the Seed of the Woman, the Son of David, and the Son of Abraham also, Gen. iii. 15. Matt. i. 1. Gal. iv. 4. But it will by no Means follow, either that these Titles, the Mediator and the Son of God; or, the Mediator and the Seed of the Woman, are strictly synonymous, or signify the very same Thing precisely, in the complex Person of the Messiah.

The next is, the High Priest's Question, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of God?" Mat. xxvi. 63. Art thou the Christ, the Son of God? i. e.
"Art thou the Messiah, as thou art supposed to be by thy Followers?" Here also you have every Word that respects this Question, ibid. Ans. Since all acknowledge, that the Word Messiah, answers in Hebrew, to the Greek Word, Christ; and since he is pleading, that these two are synonymous with the Title, the Son of God; his Explication of this Question is, in plain English, neither more nor less than this, "Art thou the Christ, the Christ, i.e. the Christ, as thou art supposed to be by thy Followers?" A palpable Tautology, if any ever was, or can be! — But we shall by and by demonstrate, That the High Priest took these two Titles, the Christ and the Son of God, in two very different Senses; which will, for ever, confute and quite demolish this Fancy. — The next twelve Lines make no Mention, of the Title, the Son of God.

The third is, "And, doubtless, the Centurion and they that were with him, when they confessed that he was the Son of God, in Mat. xxvii. 54. understood by it, that he was the Messiah, or the Christ, which is a Character, by which he was most known," &c. p. 129. He should have added, to the Centurion, and those that were with him; and then, though I have some Reason to doubt this; yet, if I had granted it, it would do his Cause no Service. — However, the true Meaning of this glorious Confession, will be clearly determined hereafter.

The next is, "that in Luke iv. 41. When the Devils are represented as crying out, Thou art Christ, the Son of God, it follows, that they knew he was the Christ;" What then? Will it follow, that they knew that he had this Title, the Son of God given him, only because he was the Christ, or the Messiah: And that he would not, could not, have been so called, had he not been the Messiah; which is what he intends, if to his Purpose? By
no Means. No doubt, *they knew he was the Christ*; but this they might know, and yet know also, that he was *the Son of God*, before he was, or could be, *the Christ*. "So that the commonly received Notion of our Saviour's Sonship was, that he was "*the Christ."*" ibid. Was the commonly received Notion then, commonly express'd in such Tautologies, i.e. in those two Phrases, Names, or Titles, which he will have to be of the very same Import?—And, Did the Devils learn to tautologize, in the usual Mode, after the People? Or, are we indeed to believe, that this was the commonly received Notion, because the Devils so express'd themselves?—Or rather, Would not the so common Use of these Titles together, or by *Apposition*, as Grammarians speak, naturally lead all Men to think, That, tho' they were given to, or denoted, the very same Person, yet it was in different Respects; and because, they signified different Things in that individual Person?—However, this learned Gentleman's Conclusion, "that the commonly received Notion of our Saviour's Sonship, was, that he "*was the Christ,"* will by no Means follow, from the Evangelist's Remark on the Words of the Devils, "*they knew that he was the Christ;"* no, nor any Thing like it. All that does, or can, follow from them, supposing that our Translation is the best, is either one, or both of these. 1. That the Devils knew, that he, who was *the Eternal Son of God*, had undertaken to be our Redeemer; and was therefore, in *the Fulness of Time*, to be made Flesh: And consequently, since they well know, that *Jesus* was indeed the Messiah, they concluded, and therefore confess, that he was really also, *the Son of God.*—Or, 2. They knew, that these two Titles, *the Christ* and *the Son of God*, which primarily imply his two Natures, belonged both to the one Person of the Messiah, tho' in different Respects. Nei-
ther of these answer his End: Yea, they plainly de-
stroy his Notion, and strongly confirm the Truth
we contend for. — But, if we read the Words, as in
the Margin, He suffered them not to say, that they
knew him to be the Christ; since, He never forbade
them, nor any other, to say that he was, or they
knew that he was, the Son of God; we may therefore
much rather conclude, That these two Titles
are not, strictly taken, originally equivalent, but
convey to us Ideas very different. — And we shall
shew, by and by, That our Lord was so far from
being sly of proclaiming his being the Son, the
only begotten Son of God. &c., i. e. his being God of
God, and consequently his having the Divine Na-
ture, that he, many Times, avouched it openly,
and maintained it strenuously: Whereas, he never,
so far as we know, expressly and in so many Words,
avowed himself to be the Messiah, either in public
or private, but to the Woman of Samaria only,
John iv. 25, 26. till he was on his Trial: And, if
I remember right, did, all along and upon every
Occasion, forbid his Disciples to speak of him un-
der that Character, till after his Resurrection. The
Reason of which must be given, and enlarged upon,
hereafter.

The fifth is that Passage, "John xi. 4. when
" Jesus says concerning Lazarus, that his Sickness
" was not unto Death, but for the Glory of God,
" that the Son of God might be glorified thereby;
" the Meaning is, that he might give a Proof of
" his being the Christ, by his raising him from the
" Dead." ibid. What is this for his Purpose, or
against us? We never doubted, that this Title, the
Son of God, is one of the Titles of the Messiah, as such.
— This, surely it may be, tho' it originally, directly,
and chiefly, if strictly taken, signify his coessential
Sonship. Nor will Martha's Reply, "ver. 27. I
" believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God,
" which
which should come into the World" do him the least Service. — It was the Son of God, i. e. according to us, the second Person in the ever blessed Trinity, who was to come into the World, i. e. be manifested in the Flesh, take upon him the Seed of Abraham, be made of Woman, that he might execute the Mediatorial Office: And when he did come, and was made Flesh, he made it known, by his Divine Works, that he was indeed the Son of God, Immanuel, God in our Nature, the Christ.

The last is " Acts ix. 20. Saul when converted, preached Christ in the Synagogues, that he is the Son of God, i. e. he proved him to be the Messiah:" ibid. What then? If he proved that he, whom he so called, was indeed the Son of God, i. e. the Divine Person so styled by the Prophets, it could not be denied, that he was the Messiah: Because, no other Son was to be given, and be a Child born, whose Name was to be called the mighty God, &c. If. ix. 6. but the Messiah. " and accordingly, ver. " 22. when he was establishing the same Doctrine, " it is said, that he proved that he was the very Christ." ibid. 'Tis evident he took the plain, the ready, the only Way to prove this, by proving the other first: Because, if he had not preached Christ, that he is the Son of God, he could not possibly have proved, that he was the very Christ.

These are all the Scriptures here produced, which seem, to me, directly to his Purpose: If these do him no Service, those that follow, which must be afterward considered, will do him as little. — And these few Thoughts I have here offered upon them, only that I may, as I said, fully convince every Reader, That most, by far, of the Texts urged against us, come not at all up to the Point: And, That the Conclusions drawn from them, are, almost all, merely, what the Logicians file, Ignorations Elenchi, Proofs of what we never doubted,
Conclusions beside the Question. — One Thing I must observe before we proceed, which will appear, more and more, as we go on, quite throughout.

We have, from these Texts now quoted, pretty plain Evidence, That, tho' our Adversaries seem very ready to multiply Scripture Passages for themselves, yet they never much care to hear, see, quote, or meddle with, any of those Texts, where the Adnouns, own, proper, begotten, only begotten, which undoubtedly limit and necessarily fix the Sense, are annexed to the Word Son! — This learned Person, tho' he dwells upon this Subject, for more than ten Pages in Folio, Vol. i. p. 120—130, has not so much as once mentioned any one of them, but thrice. viz. P's ii. p. 124. and John i. 14. and 18. p. 125! every one of which shall be very particularly considered by and by. The like Observation, as every Reader must see, is true of every one of them. One Reason of this will be easily guessed, viz. 'Tis very natural to think, That should serious, unprejudiced, Christians frequently meet, in such a Dispute, with these Titles, his own, or his proper Son; his begotten, or the only begotten of the Father; &c. or of his Son, who was, and is, the Brightness of his Glory, and the express Image of his Person, Heb. i. ver. 2, 3. &c. they could not fail to wonder what those Disputants meant, who durst set themselves to shew, That the true Sense of these Titles is, That he is not at all his own Son, nor his only begotten; no nor, as such, the Brightness of his Glory, nor the express Image of his Person, &c.

Having thus clearly, and honestly, stated the Questions, go we on now to
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Some just and weighty Prejudices against these his Novel Opinions, which will go far quite to overthrow them.

When any Principle is well established, or the Truth of any Proposition is fully confirmed, no Prejudices against them, how plausible forever, are much to be regarded; because, no Truth is, or can be, inconsistent with, opposite to, or destructive of, any other Truth; and consequently, those Prejudices, how strong forever they may appear, must either be, at best, but ill grounded, or they do not, in Reality, come up to the Point, whatever those who entertain, or urge, them may think: But, when up-start and unproved Opinions, against the common Faith, even in Matters of the greatest Moment, are obtruded on us, with great Importunity, and mighty Efforts; then all Sorts of Arguments, and even just Prejudices amongst the rest, may be of very considerable Use; and well deserve, upon several Accounts, to be regarded. For this Reason, I offer these few, out of many, against this his new Scheme.

I. The first just Prejudice, we offer against these Notions, is, The Novelty of them.—Take them all together, and they are but of Yesterday: And therefore we conclude, They are not likely to be true; yea are pretty sure, they cannot be true.—

That the plain Reader may perceive the Weight of this Prejudice, and some others that follow, let it be remembered,
(1.) We do not plead for, no nor pretend to, Perfection of Knowledge, in this imperfect State, wherein we now are: Nor, in particular, That any Persons, even the most holy, sagacious, learned, and useful, that ever were in the World, ever had the full Knowledge of the Meaning of every Word and Phrase in Scripture; and much less, that they ever had, or could have, clear, distinct, and adequate, Ideas of the sublime Things themselves, which are signified by them,—The Royal Psalmist himself, who had more Understanding than all his Teachers; Ps. cxix. 99. yea, than the Ancients; ver. 100. did not pretend to any such Perfection; and therefore, fervently prays, ver. 18. Open thou mine Eyes, that I may behold wondrous Things out of thy Law:—The Prophets were obliged, by Reading, Meditation, and frequent, fervent Prayer, to enquire and search diligently, 1 Pet. i. 10—12. into the Scope and Meaning of their own Prophecies:—And the Apostle Paul, who had as profound and comprehensive a Knowledge of the Scriptures, and the great Things revealed in them, as any meer Man ever had, found Depths in them, which he could not fathom. Rom. xi. 33. — They all had the fullest Satisfaction, that they were under the infallible Inspiration of the Holy Ghost; or, were moved, φορεωτατω, born up, by him; 2 Pet. i. 21. so that they did not, could not, err, when thus instructed: And knew as much, of what they delivered, by Word or Writing, as was at that Time necessary, for themselves, and those to whom they were sent: But, a perfect Knowledge, of many of the Mysteries they revealed to others, they neither had, nor could have; because, the Things were revealed to them but in part, and they themselves could only know them but in part. 1 Cor. xiii. 9. Much less can we, or any others, not so inspired, now pretend to any such Attainments. —So that, we do not deny, That there are many Difficul-
Difficulties in Scripture, which we do not thoroughly understand; 2 Pet. iii. 16. many Expressions or Phrases, here and there, of the true Meaning of which we are not sure; many single Words, which cannot now be easily translated; many Allusions, which we hardly at all know; many different Readings of particular Texts; and several, yea contrary, Expositions of the same Passages; &c. — And therefore, we need not scruple to grant, That the true and full Sense, of some of these, has never been known, since the Death of the Apostles: — That Interpreters and Ministers may have, for some Ages, generally, if not universally, misunderstood several of them: — That some of these Mistakes, through the Devices of Satan, and the vile Designs of his Emissaries, may have prevailed, and been almost unanimously delivered to, and received by, the Churches of Christ, as so many undoubted Truths: — And, that they may, (especially, if we join with them the inexhaustible Fund of unwritten Traditions, from whence the Popes have had always some ready, whenever they thought they wanted them) have sadly affected the Christian Faith, and corrupted the Worship of God, &c. — But yet,

(2) These need not much disturb us, or be a stumbling Block to us; because, most of those Passages relate to the Histories, or Genealogies, &c. we find in the Bible; or to the proper Names of Men, Cities or Countries; or the Computations of Time; or the Names of Animals and Herbs; &c. or some Customs of the Eastern Nations, well known to the Israelites, in those Days; which very little concern plain Christians: — Or, they occur only in some more obscure Prophecies; in Places where a Word, or two, are found, which we nowhere else meet with, whence we might more surely learn their true Meaning; or in Passages, which seem to have no near Relation either to our Faith, or Practice, which
which serious Persons have not so carefully enquired into:—Or, what is obscure, and hard to be understood, in one Place, is made plain and clear in another; &c. — We need not, I say, then be troubled, because,

(3.) The Scriptures are, in all Things necessary to Salvation, in some or more Places, so clear and perspicuous, that he that runs may read them, and may assuredly know the true Sense of them also. One may not deny, no, nor doubt of this, without Blasphemy against their ever blessed Author. — If they are not so clear, it must be either, because God could not, or would not, make them so: A Suspicion, which highly reproaches, either his Wisdom, or his Goodness! — The Ends, for which they were given, even to be a Rule of Faith and Manners, Ps. xix. 7—10, &c. a Light and a Lamp, Ps. cxix. 105. 2 Pet. i. 19. &c. strongly confirms this. — A Rule, which cannot be perceived, is useless: And a Light, which can't be seen, is a Contradiction. — Hence it will follow,

(4.) That, when God was pleased to reveal his Mind and Will, to his People, immediately, he did it in Words that they understood; or by Visions, Emblems and Signs, the Meaning of which they knew; or if they did not, at first, clearly perceive the Sense of his Words, or Design of those Visions, &c. he was careful to make them understand them. This was, undoubtedly, the Case, when he gave them Laws, made Promises, or denounced Threatenings.—And, when he spoke of his own Being, Perfections, or Actions; or mention'd any of his Names; had he not, one Way or another, done this, He had as good have kept his Mind to himself: Because, what he had said to, or shown them, could answer no valuable End, or do them any Good. — Words not understood are, to him that hears them, mere Sounds: And Emblems, or even Visions,
Visions, of which we know not the true Meaning or Intention, are full as likely to lead us into Mistakes, as into Truth. — This was yet rather, I conceive, more necessary, when he employed Prophets to bring his Will to others: Because, If they had not known the Meaning of his Words, or of the Emblems they were to represent to them, &c. sufficiently to answer his End in sending them; I cannot see how they could have remembred them, or delivered them to those to whom they were sent, &c. — Withal, upon this Supposition, I cannot help thinking, That, if the People had but suspected so much, they would have alleged that they came to ridicule, expose, banter or insult over them, and have treated them accordingly. But, it seems, they had no such Thought. — Need I add, That, when the most High saw it necessary, he was often pleased to explain the Visions and Emblems to them, Am. vii. 1, 2, 3. Ch. viii. 1, 2. Zech. i. 18—21. and Ch. iv. 5, 6. &c. &c. and sometimes also the Predictions of future Events, Dan. Ch. ii. iv. Ch. vii. 16—23. Ch. viii. 19—29. Ch. ix. 22—27. and Ch. xi. throughout, &c. &c. so that, even under the Old Dispensation, which was but a Dispensation of Darkness, the Church had Light sufficient to teach them all that they were obliged to know, and believe; and shew them the right Way they were to take, to obtain everlasting Life. — Shall I offer one Thing farther,

(5.) That the true and full Import of Terms, and Expressions, which had been long used by the People of God, and familiar among them, and all Ranks of them, for many Ages, could not but be well known among them; at least to the most intelligent and learned, the Expounders of the Law, and the Priests, who were to have the Law of Truth in their Mouths, and whose Lips were to keep Knowledge. Mal. ii. 6, 7. — No reasonable Creature can well
well doubt of this: But, if any should, let them recollect, That they had Prophets with them, for several Ages, who were able, and would be very ready, to give them all the requisite Information they could; and the Urim and Thummim also, which would afford them, at all Times, infallible Information; and then, they cannot entertain the least Demur about this.

Having premised these Things, the Weight of this Prejudice will be very apparent, if we do but well consider these few Thoughts, every one of which will much confirm the rest.

1. The Christian Religion was not like the Arts and Sciences, which are capable of various and numberless Improvements, from Age to Age; but perfect, (and therefore, not to be altered,) as soon as the Canon of Scripture was complete.—Our Lord himself knew all Things; John xxi. 17, and all that he had heard of his Father he made known unto the Apostles; Ch. xv. 15. to whom he also gave the Spirit to teach them all Things. Ch. xiv. 26. So that they could not but know, the true, the complete Sense of a Title, they were so frequently to use.

2. This Title, the Son of God, was well known, as we shall see, in Old Testament Times: Yea was, as our Author confesses, "universally known," when our Lord himself was upon Earth. "The Scribes, the Pharisees, the Priests, and all the Jews, says he, talk'd with our Lord Jesus freely about the Messiah under this Name and Title, as being the common Name of the Messiah, and perfectly well known amongst them," &c. p. 73. But, if it was "perfectly well known," the true and complete Sense of it, must, I conceive, have been well known also: And, "if all the Jews knew it," the Disciples and the ordinary Hearers of our Lord, could not be Ignorant of it.—Whence I gather, That
That this true and full Sense would be continued, at least, among the Disciples; who would communicate it to others, wherefoever they went: That it would be well known among their immediate Successors, and frequent in their Sermons and Writings:—And consequently, That it was next to impossible, it should ever be quite forgot; and absolutely impossible, it should be soon forgotten, all over the World. And yet,

3. Antiquity, to the best of my Remembrance, never, any where, mentions his "compleat Idea of " Christ's glorious pre-existent human Soul," &c. p. 10. and very seldom his other Notions; nor are they found, in the Writings of any Age, ever since, till very lately. — His Caveat, against " taking the " Sentiments or Schemes of elder or later Writers, " whether Schoolmen or Fathers, or Divines of " any Party, for a perfect Test of Truth and Ortho- " doxy in those sacred Subjects," Pref. p. 5. seems a tacit Confession of this. But this, as we have hinted, was next to an absolute Impossibility, if his "compleat Idea of this Name" had ever been known in the first Ages. — Need I add, I cannot recollect, that it, (if any other of his Fancies) was ever once mention'd in the famous Council of Nice, or any of the other General Councils, whose Decisions are much set by, and very justly, among all the Protestant Churches: Whence 'tis plain, it was either not at all then known, or but very little regarded. — Yea,

4. So far were the Ancients, who were esteem'd Orthodox, from being of his Mind, in these Notions, that, as all the World know, they were unanimously, zealously, and steadfastly, for the true and proper Generation, and co-essential Sonship, of the second Person in the Trinity. This will hardly be denied: But, if it should, the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, so well known
known among us, put it out of all Doubt. — Be it considered further,

5. This Title, Son of God, does not occur once, or a few Times only; in one, or a few, obscure Places only; or without any Parallel, or equivalent Expressions to explain, and confirm it: But a great many Times, all over the New Testament; in a great Number of Passages, which are clear, and easily understood; and with many other Phrases, which ascertain the true, the full Sense. — Had we met with it only once, or twice; occasionally only, or by the by; in some dark Prophecy, or some figurative or ambiguous Expression; there might have been some Pretence for hesitating, demurring, disputing: But, when we meet with it, so very frequently, on so many Occasions, and with so many significant Adjectives also, which so certainly determine the Sense, if any Words can determine it; and have, in the Judgment of the Christian Church, actually determined it, at least, from the coming of the Holy Ghost to this Day; there was but very little Reason, for all this extraordinary Opposition to it.—Once more,

6. The Sense of this Title we plead for, has been not only the general Sense of the Church, in all Ages, but always accounted the Rock on which it is built.— And tho' the Gates of Hell, i. e. Satan and his Emisaries, have been, according to our Lord's Prediction, Mat. xvi. 16—19. by all manner of Means, incessantly, and ever since, endeavouring to batter, or undermine it, yet have they never, nor shall they ever prevail against it. Learning and Criticism, Quirk and Quibble, and Sophistry of all Sorts; Yea, Banishments, Imprisonments, Racks, Wheels, Gibbets, Axes, Fire, Faggots, and all Manner of Tortures, have been often used, for this End, and in many Places, but, blessed be God, all to no Purpose. The coessential Sonship of Christ, is still, and,
if he is the Truth, ever will be One of the Foundations of the Christian Faith! — Let those otherwise minded, consider these well, and they will easily see, there is more in them, than they were aware of.

II. These Notions were not only, so far as appears, wholly unknown, when our Saviour was upon Earth, but, by our Author's own Confession, could hardly be known, even to any of the Apostles themselves, but one only; which, in my Opinion, as I have hinted above, wholly and for ever, demolishes his own Cause and establishes mine.—One of the Reasons he gives, (even when he is telling us, "he is very much inclined to believe, that the "Name, Son of God, relates to his human Soul, and "signifies the glorious peculiar Derivation of it "from God the Father, &c. p. 10.) why he cannot "think this precise Idea is the very Thing designed "in those Texts,—wherein our Salvation is made "to depend on the Belief of Christ being the Son of "God;" is this: — You shall have every Syllable of the whole Paragraph.

"Tho' the Apostles Paul and John, and perhaps the rest of them, arrived at this compleat "Idea of his glorious pre-existent human Soul in due "Time, yet it doth not appear evident that the "Disciples had all attained such an Idea, so soon "as they believed that he was the Son of God, in "a sufficient Manner for their attaining the Favour "of God and a State of Salvation." p. 10, 11.

On which observe, He dare hardly say, That any one even of "the Apostles, arrived at this com-"pleat Idea," at least for some Time, but two at most: — He puts a "perhaps upon the rest of "them: — He mentions a "due Time;" but nei-"ther tells us when that due Time was, nor whether, the rest did then actually arrive at it, when the due Time came: — Is plain "it doth not evidently "appear
appear they had all attained such an Idea so soon as they believed he was the Son of God," &c. And talks of their "believing this, in a sufficient Manner for their attaining the Favour of God?" &c. But neither acquaints us what he understands by this sufficient Manner;" nor when they "attained the Favour of God, and a State of Salvation."

But, to answer all this more particularly, I must ask,

1. Why the Apostle Paul, in the very first Place, who was no Disciple, yea knew nothing of Christ, till long after his Ascension; if it was not, That he verily thought with himself, that he ought to do many Things contrary to his Name? Acts xxvi. 9—12. — Did he, could he, know the true Meaning of this Title, before any other of the Twelve?—2. Why the Apostle John, more than Peter and James; yea, and the other Evangelists also, who all mention this Title, with several Thoughts to establish the true Sense of it? — Did he so much excel even all these in Knowledge, or other Abilities? — Or, did our Lord reveal any Thing to him, in his Life-Time, which he did not to his other two Favourites? Yea, Is it not from the Apostle John, we have several of the clearest, fullest, and strongest Proofs, both of the Divinity, and coessential Sonship, of the second Person; and of his Unity, and Equality, with the Father? — 3. Why did he say, "and perhaps the rest of them arrived at this compleat Idea in due Time?" Can there be any Doubt, That every one of them arrived at it in due Time; if it was indeed the true Idea signified by this Title: Or "the Sense which Christ more directly designed to convey to those that heard him?" — Is not himself very express, All Things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you? John xv. 15. And could they then be ignorant of it? — If the Knowledge of it, or his other Notions, was nece-
fary, either for their own Instruction, Faith, Peace, Comfort, Joy, or Salvation: Or, for the faithful Execution of their Office; Would not the Spirit of Inspiration teach it them? — Or, Was there any Thing in “this complete Idea, or indeed in any of “ his other Notions,” so very hard to be conceiv-
ed, retained, or conveyed to their Hearers, which the Holy Ghost could not make clear and plain, to the weakest of them all? 4. When was “the due “Time,” he speaks of? — Was it to come soon, or not till several, yea many Ages after? — Is it now past, or not?—One would think, That, if it is already past, it arrived, if not before, yet when the Day of Pentecost was fully come; Acts ii. 1—4. Or very soon after it: But, if that was the Time, we may, I think, be sure, That every one of them knew the true, the full Sense of this Title; and “ that which Christ more directly designed to con-
“ vey to his Church,” long before the Apostle Paul did. — Yea, surely, every one of them knew all that was necessary to the faithful and successful Execution of their Office, soon after that remarkable Event, through the whole Course of their Lives. — 5. Did not Peter, in his own Name, and in the Name of his Brethren, over and over, confess that their blessed Master was the Christ, the Son of the living God? John vi. 69. Mat. xvi. 16—18. And did neither himself, nor any one of them, but John, know the true, the full Meaning of their own Confession! — 6. Did not our Lord kindly accept, and mosit highly approve of this their Confession; adding, Blessed art thou Simon Barjona: For Flesh and Blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven? Mat. xvi. 17. And, did not the Father then reveal to them “the Sense of this Title, “which he more directly designed to convey to “them?” Or, did neither of them, even then, know what they believed? Or, Could our worthy Author,
Author, had he reflected on this: Or, can any other now, soberly think they did not? — 7. Whence should any of them, at last, have "arrived at this complete Idea?" or any other of these Ideas? — The Old Testament, I humbly conceive, is wholly silent, as to these Matters: — There is not a Syllable, that dropt from the Mouth of any of their Contemporaries, which, so far as I can find, comes up to the Point: — And our blessed Lord, so far as we know, never spake one Word "of the glorious peculiar Derivation of his Soul from God " the Father before the Creation of the World." He never gave any Hint, That "his human " Soul was properly the Son of God:"
— Yea, so far was he from insinuating any such Thing, That when he assumes this Title, the Son of God, or speaks of himself in equivalent Terms, he does it as a co-
essential Son, attributing to himself such Things, as none but a con-substantial Son could, or durst have done; &c. as shall be fully proved by and by. See John v. 17—20. Ch. viii. 54—59. Ch. x. 29, 30, &c. — 8. Whence then does it appear, That any one of them ever arrived at "this complete Idea" of his, or ever entertained any other of his Nostrums? — 9. If any one of them ever did, It was either necessary, upon one Account or other, in less or more, that it should then be made known by them to the Churches of Christ, or it was not. If it was not, then, in any Degree, necessary; I cannot but believe, it was not, is not, now: And therefore, humbly conceive, That, however our learned Au-
thor came by the Knowledge of these Notions, he had as good have kept it to himself: Because, if it was no Way necessary, the World can never be the better for it, and had been full as wise, and as well, without it. — 10. If it was, in any Degree or on any Account, necessary, Is it not somewhat strange, That they never made any of these Notions, expressly known
known to the Church? Or, if they did, any where or any how, That we hear nothing of them in the Bible, or any of the ancient Creeds, or the Writings of the Fathers, or in some Tradition or other from the first Ages; and but very little of some of them, for many Ages after; yea, till very lately? — And, 

Since he was very senfible, he could not, up-on his own Principles, make it evidently clear, That they all ever " arrived at this complete Idea;" it was very modest, to express himself with so much Caution, " and perhaps the rest of them," (i.e. Peter, James, and eight or nine more of them!) " arrived at this complete Idea in due Time?" However, he is pretty plain, " That the due Time" came at laft; (no great Matter when!) that others arrived at his complete Idea besides the Apostles; that " the excellent Mr. Fleming" was one of them; and that some of his Followers are so very fond of it, as to employ all their Talents, to diffuse the Knowledge of it far and near, left it should ever be unhappily lost again! — But, we shall reserve half a Dozen Questions more relating to " this complete " Idea," till another Opportunity.— Upon the whole,

From these two just Prejudices, I conclude, with almost the Evidence of a Demonstration, That Sense of this Title, which he dare not positively say was known to any one of the Apostles themselves, but two; and consequently, could very hardly, if at all, be known to ordinary Christians, before the Conversion of Saul the Persecutor, at soonest; could not be " the Sense, which Christ himself or the " Apostles and Writers of the New Testament more " directly designed to convey to those that heard " them:" But he dare not say, " that this his com-

" plete Idea," was known to any of the Apostles themselves, except two, before that Event; &c. Er-go, It cannot be the Sense directly and designed, &c.

III. We
III. We cannot think it at all safe, needlessly to depart from the Common Faith of Christians, in all Ages; especially, when we find it so frequently, expressly, fully, and strongly, revealed in the Scriptures. Why should we? — How dare we? — Should it be said, These Words, coessential Sonship, nowhere occur in the Bible. We grant it. — But, (1.) These Words, own Son, begotten Son, only begotten Son, &c. are equivalent, and full as strong: Nor can any Words, more emphatic and clearly for our Purpose, be given or desired: Nor can they have any proper Sense at all, if they do not signify coessential Sonship. — (2.) We do not, at least need not, believe the coessential Sonship of Christ, merely because of these Titles, as express and significant as they are; but because we find, That this only begotten Son, and as such, is frequently mentioned as having the Names, Titles, Perfections, Works and Worship, proper to the One true God, clearly attributed to him; as must be shewn by and by: And this, absolutely and invincibly, confirms the Catholic Doctrine. — (3.) Are any of those Notions, he would court us to embrace, to be met with, any where expressly in the Word of God? Where do we find the Words, "Christ's human Soul?" — Where is it written, "That his pre-existent Soul is properly the Son of God; or that the divine Nature always dwelt in it?" p. 150. Or, "That Christ is the express Image of God, in the human Nature? p. 153." &c. &c. — Yea, How can any of these be, any how, proved from Scripture? Withal, (4.) Should we desert the Catholic Church and go over to his Opinions, We should gain nothing by our so doing: And he must be very fond of Change, who will change for Changing's Sake. — We should not, I say, gain any Thing by our forsaking our Principles; Because, if we indeed continued to believe the Scripture
true Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Personal Union of the Divine and Human Natures in Christ, the Difficulties attending those two fundamental Articles of Christianity, would be just the same they are, upon our Principles: And the like we may lay of most, if not every one, of his other Notions. — Or, if he may seem, here and there, to give us some Light to help to remove some inconsiderable Difficulty, we shall soon find ourselves plunged into another, and a greater! — This leads us naturally on to another Prejudice.—We conceive,

IV. Not only, That it is not safe to espouse his Scheme; but cannot help thinking, That it is dangerous, yea very dangerous to do it: And his Management of his Cause convinces us of this Danger. We find him, in many Places, talking too like, if not directly in the Strains of, the Arians, Sabellians, Nestorians, Eutychians; &c. expounding many Passages of the Scripture, as those Heretics did, and do; and obliged to wrest them, with all his Might, to support their Sense.—For Example, those remarkable Passages Prov. viii. 22—36. Josh v. 17. p. 39, 40. Mark xiii. 32. p. 42. 1 Cor. xv. 28. p. 43—44. Mat. xxviii. 19, &c. &c.—Yea, these Notions have led him, throughout, as every one must see who reads him attentively, to many unguarded and suspicious Expressions, as if our Lord were not now, or was not when he was upon the Earth, Mediator secundum utramque Naturam; or, to speak of him, as if there were two Persons in him; or sometimes, as if he was only Man, and not God-man; &c. &c.—Now we dare not, especially in an Age so prone to apostatise from the Truth, give Way to, and much less fall in with, such Fancies, or Ways of speaking, as may entangle us, 'ere we are aware, into the Paths of Error; yea, and draw us to a manifest Opposition to the great Doctrines
Doctrines of Christianity.—A more particular Prejudice is,

VI. The Denial, of the coessential Sonship of the second Person in the Trinity, robs us of a very good, and convincing, Argument for the two great and fundamental Doctrines of the Trinity, and the Divinity of Christ. This, I take it for granted, will be owned to be an insuperable Prejudice, if well proved; as shall be done presently, as soon as I have answered his fourth Section, p. 63—69. which is a Reply to this Question, "What Advantage is there in not applying the Name Son of God to the divine Nature of Christ?"—After all, says he, "many a pious Christian will be ready to enquire and say, since you acknowledge Jesus Christ to have a divine Nature," This, to say the least, is somewhat strangely express'd! "and to be truly and properly God, why have you taken so much Pains to shew that this Name the Son of God in Scripture, does not necessarily signify either his Godhead or his co-eternal Generation and Sonship?" p. 63. 64.—'Twas very natural indeed to think, That "many a pious Christian," would, with Wonder, make this Enquiry: And, I believe, every one, who has heard and considered it, hath been ready to ask this necessary Question, and to expect a plain, direct and pertinent Answer to it.—Well, "he hopes he can give some satisfactory Answers, and offer such Reasons as may justify and support this Attempt; &c." and accordingly he gives us four, not one of which is at all satisfactory, or indeed comes up to the Point.

"1. I was willing to search the true Sense of Scripture in this Point, and to understand the Meaning of God in his Word." p. 64.—So has, so may, and so will, every one say, who has a Mind to obtrude his own Dreams upon the World, be they ever so silly, or ridiculous.—However, no doubt,
'tis every one's Duty, to search the Scriptures, that he may understand the true Meaning of them: But, when we have proved all Things, we must hold fast that which is Good; 1 Th. v. 21. or else, every honest Man will say, we have either not indeed proved all Things, or that we have lost the happy Fruits of our Search. &c. "Where any Expression " is used so very frequently in the Bible, as this " Name the Son of God is, and that in Texts of " awful and solemn Importance,—'tis of great " Moment to know the Meaning of that Expres-
" sion," for the Reason given and weighed above, " viz. " that we may not include too little or too " much in it," &c. ibid. This is a great, and an acknowledged Truth: But, blessed be God, there is no great Need, if we will but believe his Word, of much searching, to know the true Meaning of it. —Not to add, That it is next to absolutely impos-
sible, the Catholic Church should have been mistaken, in this Point, till very lately.

" 2. I was afraid to build my Belief of the Deity " of Christ upon feeble and insufficient Foundations, " and therefore I thought it necessary to examine " this Argument which is drawn from his Sonship." Blessed be God, Our Belief of the Deity of Christ, is built upon such strong and firm Foundations, that all the Devils in Hell, with all their Emmissaries upon Earth, shall never be able to move them—He goes on, " The great Doctrine of the Godhead of our Lord " Jesus Christ, and Faith in him as the true God, " has been by many Persons built chietty upon " this Name which is given him, viz. the Son of " God; and that upon this bare Presumption, that " as a Son amongst Men has the same specific Na-
ture with his Father, so the Son of God must have " the same individual Nature with his Father; but " how weak this Argument is to support such a " Doctrine, appears in the foregoing Discourse." &c.
p. 65. Ans. 1. I must crave Leave to question the Truth of what is here alleged. I do not remember, I ever heard of one Man of Sense, if any one Man, who ever " built this great Doctrine chiefly on this " Name, and upon this bare Presumption;" And am pretty sure, I never any where read any such Thing. None of the Systems, I have by me, give any Countenance to such a Notion. I have carefully consulted two of the last, and best, systematic Writers in the World, the ever famous Turretine, and his learned Nephew Pietet, both Professors of Divinity in Geneva, who say nothing to this Purpose. The former, invincibly and at large, proves the Divinity of Christ; or, That the Son is true and eternal God, coessential and coeternal with the Father; from the common Topics, That the Names, Attributes, Works, and Worship, of the one true God, are so frequently ascribed to him in Scripture: And then adds three more particular Arguments, from the Equality of the Son with the Father, his Oneness with him, and his mediatorial Office;* but not a Syllable of building his Deity, chiefly on this Name. He adds, 'tis true, in one Line, That the true and proper Divinity of Christ might be invincibly also gathered from his Filiation, or Sonship, which no Man, who believes his coessential Sonship, will, I presume, be so ridiculous as to deny. — The latter has also a whole Chapter, of God the Son, wherein he uses the very same Topics, as our worthy Author himself has done since; but he doth not so much as mention his Sonship, as any Proof at all of his Deity †. So that what follows upon this Head, must pass for just nothing.— 2. Had he no other Way " to examine this Argu- " ment, drawn from the Sonship," of the second

Person, but by denying that he is a coessential Son; which some will think, will amount to a denying, That he, or, if you will, that Christ, is, in any Sense, the Son of the Father? — 'Tis plain, and indubitable, That, if he is not a coessential Son, He is not, at all, a proper Son; is not, at all, a Son who is co-equal with him; who doth what Thing forever he doth; or could say, I and the Father are one; as the Bible assures us He is, and could say. &c. &c. But,—3. Supposing the Fact, I want to know whence, and how, "the Weakness of this Argument appears?"

3. 'Tis necessary as far as possible to remove "all Cavils from every important Doctrine of Christianity, and such is that of the Deity of Christ." p. 66. Let us grant this, at present, tho' I shall freely retort it upon himself before I have done. "Now if the Doctrine of his Deity be built on "his Sonship," We do not build this Doctrine upon it alone, as we have said, and as every Body knows. "then he must be true God considered "as he is a Son;" What then? "but the Notion "of a Son in all Languages of Mankind import-"ing some Sort of Derivation and Dependence;"— The best Way to answer this, will be to turn the Question. Does ever, Did ever, "the Notion of a "Son, in any Language of Mankind, import, "That his Body was formed by his Father?" p. 12. Or, That Generation and Creation are the same? — Withal, these Words, Derivation and Dependence, are general and ambiguous: Nor is the Derivation and Dependence of a Son, in any Language of Men, inconsistent with his Coessentiality with his Father; or, with his enjoying all the Perfections of his Nature, as well as he. — "and the Notion of Godhead "importing Independence and Self-existence, seem to "carry a Sort of Contradiction in them." — Why, If it is but "a Sort of Contradiction," it may yet, be very consistent with the Coessentiality of the Fa-
ther and the Son: And, if they but seem to do this, since numberless Things seem, to us, to be what they are not; or to carry in them what they indeed do not; they may, in reality, notwithstanding this seeming, carry no sort of Contradiction in them at all. — "And this becomes a mighty Prejudice to "the Minds of Men," &c. ibid. — Why, if it does,
Who can help it? — Must we give up the Faith once delivered to the Saints, or any "important Part" of it, because some are mightily prejudiced against it? Did not the Apostles preach Christ crucified; tho' as such, to the Jews a Stumbling Block, and to the Greeks Foolishness? 1 Cor. i. 23. Is not He a Stone of Stumbling, and a Rock of Offence, &c.
1 Pet. ii. 8. Is He not set for the Fall, as well as rising again, of many in Israel, and for a Sign which shall be spoken against? Luke ii. 34. And, is not his Sonship, the Rock, against which the Gates of Hell have, from the Beginning, levelled all their Artillery? Mat. xvi. 18.

But, after all, who are they to whom this becomes so mighty a Prejudice? Not, surely, the Catholic Church; for they have always unanimously confessed, That the second Person is, as such, a Son, or God of God! — Who then? Why, "the Arians "and Socinians!" You shall have the whole Paragraph. "Now if by this Exposition of the Name "Son of God I remove any of the great Impedi-
ments out of the Way of the Arians or Socinians "from believing the true Deity of Christ, then "I shall account myself to have done Service and "Honour to that glorious Article of our Faith." p. 67. I do not know what to reply to these odd Words, and have too great an Esteem for the worthy Author, to treat them as they very well deserve. We have an Apostle's Words for it, If any of you do err from the Truth, and one convert him, he shall save a Soul from Death, &c. James v. 19, 20. and
is consequently, well employed. — It seems then, That, as innocent a Thing as Error is, now a Days, too commonly, said to be, it exposes the erroneous Person to Death! — However, Was there no other Way "to remove any of those great Impediments," but by talking too much in their Strains! &c. &c. — Was this the Way to convert them to the true, i. e. the Catholic Faith? — Why, if he did indeed, or could, think so, he has been very unlucky and unsuccessful; as every one, I really think, will be, who shall follow his Steps. Some, to my own Knowledge, in several Places, have been, or say they have been, tempted, or drawn, from the Truth of the Gospel, by his unhappy Dissertations, &c. to the Blasphemies of Arians and Socinus: But, I have never heard of any one Arian, or Socinian, Man or Woman, young or old, who has been, by any of his Writings, by trimming, or by such Means, brought from those Abominations, "to believe the "true Deity of Christ;" and am apt to think, I never shall.—Those that are gone so very far wrong, are not so soon, or so easily, recovered; and much less, by such Methods: And, to yield any Part of the Truth to them, complement them, or meet them as it were half Way, &c. is not the direct Course to bring them over to the Truth; but to harden them in their Errors, desert the Truth ourselves, and so, betwixt us, to lose it wholly. My own Eyes have seen some scene, — and my Ears have heard others make their Boasts of him, as if he was a coming over to them, &c. —

Two Paragraphs under this Head, p. 66, 67. I must almost wave. They are so very metaphysical, as to be far above the plain Christian's Reach. — If any one will but explain the first of them, and shew the Pertinence of it also, he will easily see what Use may be made of it, and how little it serves our Author. — In the other, "he dares not utterly re-
nounce all those Schemes of explaining the Trinity, which make the Divine Nature of Christ to be in any Way or Manner whatsoever derived or communicated from the Father," Even these very Words need Explanation! But, Why then all this Stir? Why so very much ado? And, Why "dares he not" do this? "for I must own myself "lost in these Unsearchables, &c." And no Wonder, That a finite Being should be lost, in searching out an Infinite one. How can it be otherwise? But, blessed be his Name, it is neither our Duty, Wisdom, nor Interest, to search what is unsearchable. Let us but read, and believe, the plain and familiar Language of our Bibles, and through the Grace of God, we shall know enough. "yet he would not make the "necessary Proof of the Divinity of Christ to depend "upon this," &c. No more did those great Men just named, and no more do we.

4. I would do something to take away the "Anathema and damning Sentence which some Parties of Christians who believe the Divinity of "Christ have thrown on others, who also believe "his Divinity, merely for not explaining some parti-"cular Scriptures in the same Way and Manner that "they do, or for not using the same Arguments to "prove his Divinity." Our worthy Author, seems to be much afraid of that Anathema, forgetting that the Curse causeless shall not come! And yet, "a dif-
ferent explaining of some particular Scriptures," may, in some Cases, make the Faith of Christians quite another Thing from what it was, and should be; so that we ought all to be very cautious, in such Matters. Those who are fond of new Explana-
ations, and new Ways of speaking, are, generally, found to be looking to new Doctrines and Princi-
pies: And those, who begin, pretending only to be displeased with Words or Modes of Speech, which have been long in Use and become familiar, are, com-
commonly soon observed, to be also displeased with the Things meant by them. — It is in the old Paths, the good Way, in which we shall find Rest for our Souls: Jer. vi. 16. And therefore, Those take the safest Course, who go forth by the Footsteps of the Flock; especially, where there is a plain and long beaten Track. — 'Tis next to an absolute Impossibility, the Catholic Church should have been so very long mistaken, and in such a Point: — But, nothing alas! is more Ordinary, than to see even very great and good Men err; and be pretty tenacious too, of their own Fancies. — I know no “Party of Christians, who believe the Divinity of Christ, that have pass’d a damning Sentence on any, who in- deed believe his true and proper Divinity,” merely, for these Reasons: And, if there are any, I for my Part, neither am, nor, through the Grace of God, ever will be, one of them. — “ He does not love to see everlasting Death thrown upon Persons who believe the same Scripture Doctrine of the Deity of Christ that we do, but chuse to ex- plain it another Way.” p. 68. No, nor I neither, if, in Fact, any do this. — ’Tis a Maxim in our Law, Apices juris non sunt jura. — However, were he now alive, I assure the World, I should not throw an Anathema on him; because, I really believe, he was not aware of the Consequences of the Things he has said; and seems not, to me, to have been either very clear, or fixed, or steady, in these his new Notions, as I gather from these very Pages I am now examining, among others: And, now that he is dead, I have no Doubt he is in Heaven; and am well satisfied, that, if ever I shall be so happy as to go there, he will never reprove me, for en- deavouring to prevent the bad Effects of his lately invented, and dangerous Notions.

And thus have I considered every Sentence of these Answers, that is worth any Notice, or can do
do him any Service; tho', perhaps, with too much
Regard to his Memory: And must now leave it,
to every impartial and serious Christian, to judge
between us; and say honestly, Whether " these An-
swers are satisfactory, and whether these Reasons
may justify and support his taking so much Pains
" to shew that this Name, the Son of God, cannot
" necessarily imply his Divine Nature, or co-eternal
" Sonship?" p. 63, 64. An Attempt, I think, never
undertaken before! To return then to this Prejudice,
which has led us to examine this Question.

Those Notions, which rob us of a good, and con-
vincing, Proof of the Divinity of Christ, can be nei-
ther safe, nor true; and therefore, are not to be espoused, or vindicated: But, so do these his No-
tions: Ergo.—The Proposition, or Major, as it
is called, cannot be doubted, in Reason, by any
One, who really believes his Divinity. The Ass-
sumption, or Minor, is evident. If the second Per-
son is indeed co-essential with the first, he is, most
certainly, God as well as he. For, if he is co-essen-
tial, he is co-eternal also; because, the whole Divine
Essence, if I may so express myself, is Eternal: —
And, if he is co-essential and co-eternal, he has all
the essential Perfections of the Divine Nature; be-
cause, the Essence cannot be divided from itself or the
Perfections, nor the Perfections from themselves or
the Essence; and therefore, he is co-equal with him
also: But He, who is co-essential, co-eternal, and co-
equal with him, is God as well as he.—This Prejudice
therefore, must needs appear weighty; and, 'tis evi-
dent, remains unremoved.—Should it be suggested,
That the Deity of Christ may be, and has been ma-
ny Times, invincibly proved, from many other
Arguments; We grant it heartily: But, the more
of them we have, I humbly conceive, the better.
—Should it be said, That the Argument from his
Sonship "may seem, to many, feeble or false."
p. 65. which may be thought to weaken the Evidence of the other, and give "Occasion to some " to insult the Faith of Christ, &c." ibid. I can perceive no just Cause, for any such Suspicion. Why, or How, should one feeble Argument, weaken many strong Ones?—However, The Catholic Church have never thought this Argument either feeble or false, inconclusive or dubitable. Yea, the eternal Generation and coessential Sonship of the second Person, if really, true and well supported, amounts to a Demonstration of his true and proper Divinity, as is evident to common Sense. The Thing tells itself: And, if well managed, like Jonathan's Bow, it will hardly turn back; yea, it never did, it never can, fail to do Execution.—The sober Appellant, with the shuffling and wriggling, which are the best Artillery of the Party, made a Shift, tho' some Times a very sorry one, to answer, or rather evade, most, or all, of our Author's Proofs of the Deity of Christ: But, had he heartily and closely urged his coessential Sonship, that Gentleman would have found, that denying it absolutely, would have been the best, the only Way, to get rid of it. But, this will come up by and by, when we shall illustrate, and confirm, it much farther, after we have demonstrated Christ's coessential Sonship.

I have yet two other Prejudices, which, tho' perhaps, not so considerable, in the Opinion of some, as these foregoing, are yet of too much Importance to be wholly omitted; viz. The Denial of the coessential Sonship of Christ, is not only a symbolizing with the Jews and Mahometans; but must therefore, be likely to harden them, in their malicious Oppositions to him, and Blasphemies against him.

1. The Denial of the coessential Sonship of Christ, is not only, a symbolizing with the Jews; but must therefore, be likely to harden them, in their inveterate Hatred of, rooted Opposition to, and odious Blas-
Blasphemies against him. — That they always, during his Life-time, denied his proper Sonship, and were filled with Rage and Madness, when he asserted it, either expressly, or in equivalent Terms, cannot be denied. — When, by Way of Apology for his healing the impotent Man, on the Sabbath Day, &c. he begun, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work; John v. 17. we are told, in the very next Words, Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, &c. ver. 18. — When he strongly asserted, I and the Father are One; John x. 30. in the very next Line, it follows, Then the Jews took up Stones again to stone him. — That they took him to have always spoke of a coessential Sonship, is evident from their continued charging him with Blasphemy, whenever he stiled himself by that Title, &c.—Now, To deny That he was, and is, a coessential Son; or That as a Son, he and the Father were, and are One, is a justifying the Charge the Jews, in his own Life-time, advanced against him, &c. &c. John xix. 7. — But, to justify their Ancestors, in what they said, or did, against him, is the ready and the sure Way to harden their Posterity, in their confirmed and resolute Enmity against him, &c. &c.—And is this then, a light Thing? — Surely, they had need to be very certain they are in the Right, who will continue to maintain such dangerous Novelties. See p. 83. — But more of these, in a more proper Place.

2. The Denial of the proper, or coessential, Sonship of Christ is likely to humour, and, thereby harden, the Mahometans also. — Every Body knows, That a Jew, who was, as such, an Enemy to the Name of Christ, and an heretical Christian, who was little better, assisted in composing that vile, that occurred, Hodge-podge, the Alcoran, &c. And that the Mahometans expressly, avowedly, and maliciously, blaspheme the Eternal Sonship of Christ, &c. This you shall have with the Reason of it, in the Words of
of the very learned and most judicious Bishop Pearson. "It was the chief Design of Mahomet to "deny this Truth, because he knew it was not "otherwise possible to prefer himself before our "Saviour.—Wherefore he frequently inculcates "that Blasphemy in his Alcoran, that God hath no "such Son, nor any equal with him: And his "Disciples have corrupted the Psalm of David, "reading, (instead of, Thou art my Son, this Day "have I begotten thee,) Thou art my Prophet, I "have educated thee." &c. &c.* We may also add, That crafty and wicked Impostor well knew, that the Generality of those who were called Christsians, in Arabia, and the neighbouring Countries, in those Days, were most miserably divided and disordered, by a great Variety of Heresies relating to the Person of Christ, even those of Sabellius, Arius, Eunomius, Nestorius, Eutyches, and I do not know how many more, which, tho' absolutely inconsistent with each other, did all agree in opposing the proper and coessential Sonship of the second Person, or the Unity or Distinction of the divine and human Natures in the one Person of Christ: And that the few, who remain'd thoroughly sound in the Faith, had been long sadly harrass'd, and persecuted, by those Heretics. He, I say, who knew this well, might, very naturally, conclude, That they would not unanimously concur in any one Thing, and much less, to oppose him, who, so far, agreed with them, in so material a Point: That one of the most likely Ways to gain them, would be, openly and zealously, to declare against the co-essential, and therefore co-eternal, and co-equal, Sonship of the second Person: And That, if he should prevail with them,

* Pearson's Exposition of the Creed, p. 136. and in the Margin of that Page, Est ipse Deus unus Deus Aeternus, qui nec genuit, nec genitus est, &c.
frankly and totally, to give up his proper Sonship, and consequently his Divinity; it would not be very hard, with some Care and Management, to bring them to part with his Satisfaction also, &c. &c. Accordingly he succeeded, and much more easily than can well be thought, God, in his just Judgment, giving up those, who did no longer hold the Head, &c. and therefore, could hardly be called Christians, not only to be subdued by the Sword of Mahomet, but to believe even those most stupid Lies wherewith his Alcoran is stuffed.—Now then, Is not the pleading, and with so much Vehemence too, against the coessential and coeternal Sonship of Christ, yielding them a great Point? &c. What will they be apt to think, when they shall hear, (not that idolatrous Papists, who are so clearly condemned by the Light and Law of Nature itself, which is yet written in the Hearts of all Men, whatever some Men may say to the contrary, Rom. ii. 15. and so evidently, so invincibly, accused, confuted, and judged, by the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, for the most gross and senseless Idolatries, which ever were committed under Heaven, even amongst the most ignorant, barbarous, and degenerate of Mankind, but) That even reformed Christians, who are under no external Force; yea, and Men, much, and deservedly, celebrated for Learning and Piety, shall not only give up, but zealously contend against, the coessential Sonship of Christ, &c. and by so doing, justify the Jews in charging him with Blasphemy, &c. if not themselves also, at least in some Measure, for denying his proper Sonship; and, in Consequence of that, his true and proper Divinity? &c. But, — I shall urge this, and several other Things relating to it, no farther.—I verily believe, our worthy Author would have been as far from laying a stumbling Block before them, or any.
any other, as any Man; had he thought that they, or any others, would have stumbled upon it.

Let not our Antitrinitarians of any, or all Sorts; or Unitarians, as those Men most ridiculously stile themselves, who dare not deny, yea, who confess, That there are, even to us Christians, at least two living and true Gods, for very Shame, object to us the Doctrine of the Trinity. — Does the Doctrine of the Trinity fall in, with any of the Doctrines of the Mahometans? Does it, any how, countenance any of their Blasphemies, against the Person, Natures, or Offices of our Emmanuel? &c. — Should we give it up, and go over to the Camp of the Socinians, who most furrilously and maliciously deride it, we should then harden them, with a Witness, in their Rebellion against Christ: But, instead of remaining Christians, we should be not only almost, but very near altogether, Mahometans. — The true Trinitarians, who have kept themselves from Creature-Worship, and Idol-Worship, and believe in fear, serve, and love, the one true God and him only, Mat. iv. 10. are, and always have been, the only Unitarians upon Earth. — But, a few Thoughts relating to these Things may, perhaps, come in hereafter.

Thus have we produced, and urged, these just Prejudices; and shall now leave it to all impartial and serious Christians, to say, Whether they are not, as I have stiled them, both just and weighty? — They are not, I acknowledge, equally weighty; but, if they take them altogether, and consider them well, &c. our worthy Author’s most zealous Admirers, will not find That, with all their Arts, they will be easily removed: Yea, I would hope, will perceive, That they will go far quite to overthrow those his novel Opinions. Several others might have been added, but they will come naturally in, under
under another Form, in a more proper Place. Advance we then to,

C H A P. III.

Several Preliminary Considerations, or Propositions, which may help us to some clearer Ideas of the principal Things in this Controversy; remove several Difficulties attending them; and lead us, the more easily and fully, to perceive not only the Truths we are contending for, but the Importance of them; &c.

The previous Propositions or Considerations, we shall now offer, with the necessary Explication and Confirmation of them, are only these seven.

1. The Doctrine of the Trinity, is the first and great Foundation, upon which, the Christian Religion, as such, is built.

2. There is a natural Order, both of working and subsisting, among the ever blessed Three.

3. The Terms, Father and Son, of whomsoever understood, are relative Terms.

4. These Terms are, in Scripture, and all other Books and Languages, used sometimes properly, and sometimes improperly or figuratively; and that, on divers civil, moral, and spiritual Occasions.

5. The first Person of the most holy and undivided Trinity is, in the truest, strictest, most proper, and sublime Sense, a Father; and the Father of the second, who is called his Son: And consequently, the second Person is, as such, in the truest,
truest, strictest, most proper, and sublime Sense, a Son, and his Son.

6. Whereas, in the one complex Person of the Redeemer, there are two distinct Natures, the Divine and the Human, He is a Son, and frequently so called, in respect of each of these Natures: i.e. As God, he is often called, as he indeed is, the Son of God; and as Man, he indeed is, and is frequently called, the Son of Man.

7. Tho' our ever blessed Saviour, when on Earth, did never, so far as we know, but once, in express Terms, acknowledge himself to be the Messiah, till he was upon his Trial: Yet, he was never, from his Entrance upon his public Work, to the Day of his Death, fly or backward, to declare and proclaim his true and proper Divinity, by publishing himself to be the Son, the only begotten Son of God; and to maintain, and prove, that he was, as such, equal with the Father, John v. 17—19, and that he and the Father are one. Ch. 10. 30, &c.

I. The Doctrine of the most holy and undivided Trinity, is the first and principal Foundation, upon which the Christian Religion, as such, is built.

This Doctrine is, That there are Three, clearly distinguished by Personal Names, Pronouns, Titles, Characters and Actions, (who have been therefore, called Three Persons,) viz. the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to whom the very same Essential Names, Titles, and Perfections, as well as the very same Works, and Worship also, which are proper to God most High, are, in a great Variety of the most plain and emphatic Phrases, ascribed in Scripture: Whence it is concluded, and most justly, That, since God is one, these Three are the one True God.

The Form of Baptism, Mat. xxviii. 19. which is a short, but full, Summary of the most essential Articles of our Faith, put this out of all sober Doubt:  

—The
— The Form of Blessing, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. which
is nothing but the Blessing, wherewith the High
Priest of Old was to bless the People, Numb. vi.
22—27. put into New Testament Language, makes
it more evident:— The Work of our Redemption
plainly supposes, and requires it:— The Creeds, which
were generally received, in the first Ages, and
contained little more than a Confession of this Doctrine,
as revealed in the Form of Baptism and Blessing:
—And indeed, in a Word, the whole Scriptures strongly
confirm it. — Here, because thus far we agree,
or seem to agree, in Words at least, let us only
observe these few Things.

1. This great Foundation Truth, runs quite
through the Word of God. — The Bible is full of it,
from the very Beginning to the End. — Whoever
reads that Holy Book, with Reverence and Diligence,
and in the Fear of God, must find it there, whether he will or no: Yea, he that runs may read it:
—In short, It is not revealed, only in a few Places,
or in obscure and dubious Words: But, almost all
over it; and, in some Passages, I verily believe, in
as easy, clear, and proper Expressions, as the infinite, and therefore unspeakable and incomprehensible,
Subject would well admit, or our present and imperfect State bear. — The three very first Verses in
the Old Testament, and three very first Verses of the New, (if we allow the three first Verses of the Gospel according to John, to be the first three) plainly enough reveal this Doctrine. There we find God,
I. e. the Father, (he being clearly distinguished from the other Two,) the Son, or Word, and
the Spirit of God, all three concurring in the Creation of all Things: And therefore, the Joint Creator, or, if you will, Creators or Makers of the World. I say Makers or Creators, because this Word is, several Times, found in the plural Number, when spoken of the ever blessed Three, as
Job
Job xxxv. 10. 

Ecc. xii. 1. 

Isaiah liv. 5. &c. &c. 

Here then, are Three Persons and One God: 

For, whoever made all things, is God. 

2. Tho' the Distinction of the Three ever blessed Persons; the Part, which each of them was to act, in the Work of our Redemption; the Obligations Believers are laid under to every one of them; the Glory and Honour, they are to give each of them; &c. &c. are much more frequently, clearly, and copiously, revealed in the New Testament, than in the Old: Yet, are all these to be found, in the Old Testament, in a Suitableness to the Dispensation the Church was then under. See Gen. i. 26, 27. Ch. iii. 9—22. Ch. vi. 3. Ch. xi. 7. Ch. xviii. 20, 21, 25, and 33. Ch. xix. 16. and 24. Ch. xlviii. 15. 16. — Exod. iii. 2—6. Ch. xxiv. 10, 11. Ch. xxxiv. 5—8. Lev. ix. 22, 23. compared with Numb. vi. 22—27. Ch. xii. 8. comp. with Ex. xxxiii. 11. — Job. v. 13—15. Ch. vi. 2— Judg. ii. 2—5. Ch. vi. 11—25; &c. — Job xix. 25—27. Job xxxiii. 24. Ps. ii. 7—12. Ps. xxii. throughout. Ps. xxxiii. 6. Ps. li. 11, 12. Ps. lxviii. 13—20. compared with Eph. iv. 8—10. Ps. xcv. 7—11. compared with Heb. iii. 7—11. Ps. xcvii. 1 and 7. comp. with Heb. i. 6. Prov. viii. 22—36. Ch. xxx. 4. — Isaiah vi. 1, and 3. compared with John xii. 41. and Acts xxviii. 25. Ch. ix. 6, 7. Ch. xxxv. 4—6. Ch. 40. 9—11. Ch. xlv. 3. Ch. l. 4—9. Ch. lii. 12—14. and Ch. liii. throughout. Ch. lxi. 20, 21. Ch. lx. 1—3. comp. Luke iv. 18—21. Ch. lxiii. 7—14. Jer. xxiii. 6. Ezek. xxxvi. 27. Dan. ix. 17. and 24. Hos. i. 7. Ch. xiii. 14. Joel ii. 28—32. Zeck xi. 11—13. compared with Matt. xxvii. 9, 10. Ch. xiii. 7. Mal. iii. 1. &c. &c. These are some of the many Proofs, which might have been adduced, and vindicated, for this Purpofe. If any serious Person will read them attentively, he will find they strongly confirm both
this, and the former Proposition; and, I dare assure him, he will have no Reason to repent his Care.

3. If a really honest, and diligent Inquirer were, or could be, in any Hesitation, about the Doctrine of the Trinity, he needed nothing more, to satisfy him fully, than to hear a judicious Sabellian and an Arian dispute upon the Point. — These taking the two opposite Extremes, the former believing That the Unity of the Divine Essence is so very strict and singular, as to exclude any Distinction of Persons; and, by Consequence, that the distinct Names and Titles, which are given to the blessed Three, signify or denote only three Characters, Relations, or I do not know what, of the same one individual Person: And the other, That the Distinction of the three Persons is so very wide, as that they are not Three distinct Persons, in the same one undivided Essence, but Three divided Beings, and infinitely distant from each other also: --- These, I say, if they acted their Parts well, would effectually, and irresistibly, destroy each his Antagonist's Opinion; and so, between them, illustrate, and invincibly confirm, this great Fundamental. — The Sabellian would irresistibly prove, That the essential Names and Titles of God most High, which are given to each of the Three, are peculiar to the one true God and him only; that the Attributes or Perfections, ascribed to each of them, are infinite, agreeably to their Names and Titles; and that the Works, which each of them do, require, and the Worship, which is paid to each of them, suppose the Divine Nature; which is all he could possibly prove: And the Arian would demonstrate from, the personal Names and Titles of each, which cannot be given to any of the other Two; the different Characters, or Offices, they sustain, which cannot, could not, be possibly executed, at least in the same Manner, by any but one of them; their various Properties pecu-
peculiar to each of them; and their different, yea seemingly contrary, Actions, resulting from those their Properties and Offices, &c. from these, I say, he would easily demonstrate, That they are in fact three distinct Persons; which is all he could possibly prove. — Here then, we have one Party demonstrating, That they are three distinct Persons; and the other, That they have every one of them the same one Divine Essence, or Nature: Whence, 'tis undeniable, That there are three Persons in the Godhead; or, three distinct Persons and one God. — Not one only Divine Person, or Personal Agent, but three: And not three Divine Natures, or Gods, but one only.

4. As fashionable as it is become, in this backsliding Age, to make a jest of the Doctrine of the Trinity; and to speak of it, in such a light and impious Manner, as to shew that the profane Sneerers have thrown away all Modesty and Shame, as well as Sense: Yet, it is unto the Belief of this Doctrine, we are baptized; and hence all Parties, from the Beginning, have thought themselves bound, by their Profession, to acknowledge, That there is a Trinity, in some Sense or other; and to believe some Parts, at least, of the true Doctrine; if they would bear the Christian Name.—Sabellius, the Paripassians, and several other Sects, who were much of their Mind; Arius, Eunomius, and I do not know how many more of them, with their Followers, were all forced to own some Sort of a Trinity; and found themselves very hard put to it, to believe the Bible, and yet reject the true Scripture Doctrine, which was indeed, all along, the Faith, of the Catholick Church. Those who took the two Extremes, invincibly proved, as we have heard, that Part of the Truth, which each of them held; but quite confounded their Antagonists, and easily baffled all the Arts which they used to support their Errors. Whence we may gather,
gather, 1. That all Parties have owned a Trinity: That the Scriptures are full of it: That the Christian Religion is founded upon it: And that he is not a Christian, who denies this.---I think, I may add, 2. That he neither is, nor ought to be called, a Christian, who, in his ordinary Conversation, can even pride himself, in jeering, or ridiculing, &c. either the Name or the Thing commonly meant by them.

N.B. As the Proofs, That the very same essential Names, Titles, and Attributes, and that the very same Works and Worship, which seem naturally and necessarily to suppose, denote, or require, Sameness of Essence, are ascribed, frequently in Scripture, to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, must have appeared to the Sabellians, very strong, and indeed irresistible; when, notwithstanding their personal Names, Titles, and Offices, &c. which seem undeniably, to suppose, denote, or require, different Persons, they thought they even forced them to believe, That those three personal Titles, denote but one individual Person, under three distinct Characters or Relations: So, the Proofs of the real Distinction of the three Persons, notwithstanding those essential Names, Titles, Perfections, &c. which necessarily suppose, and require, the same Essence or Nature, must have appeared to the Arians, full as strong, and undeniable, when they thought, they even compelled them to believe, That the three Persons have no Communion at all, in the same Essence, but are really three divided Beings, as separate as infinite is from finite.

I might also have observed, 1. That, when the Jews charged Christ, with making himself equal with God, John v. 18. they did not accuse him with Polytheism.---Yea, 2. That, when they charged him expressly, with making himself God, Ch. x. 33. they did not, durst not, allege, That he made himself another God; or was a setter forth of a
Strange God, as the Athenians did the Apostle, because he preached unto them Jesus. Acts xvii. 18. 3. Tho' the Apostle John, in the very first Verse of his Gospel, mentions one, who was with God, and therefore distinct from him who is so called, and was himself God, as well as he with whom he was; adding, ver. 3. as an undeniable Proof, that he was indeed God, as well as the other, All Things were made by him, and without him was not any Thing made that was made: And consequently, That He was not himself made: That he was before all Things, that were made, and therefore is, in Scripture Stile, Eternal: That he himself made all Things: see Col. i. 16, 17. and Heb. i. 10—12. And therefore, is God. Ch. iii. 4. — Notwithstanding all this, I say, the Jews in those Days, did not, durst not, charge either the Apostle, or the Christian Church, with Polytheism or Idolatry: Nor can I certainly say, that any of them, to this Day, have ventured to charge those who believe the true Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, with these horrible Crimes. — But these, and some others, will come up, in a more proper Place, when I shall urge them home to my Purpose; and offer some Consequences from them, which our Adversaries will never be able to evade.

II. There is a natural Order, both of Working and subsisting, among the most Holy, and undivided Three.—Here we shall prove, That there is such an Order, and that it is natural.

1. There is an Order of Working, or Operation, among them, according to which, they all, in their natural Order, concur to, or in, all their Works without themselves; not only of Redemption and Grace, but of Creation and common Providence. That there is an Order, and that they all act according to it, cannot, I think, be rationally doubted. — And hence, tho' the very same Works, of all Sorts, are attri-
attributed to each of them, in many Passages of Scripture, yet it is, with some Difference, in some Respect, or other: Whence we may gather, most evidently, both the Unity of Essence, and the Distinction and Order of the Persons in the Trinity.

—Several of the Fathers, in the first Ages, and many of the most serious and judicious Divines ever since, and none more so, than the very learned and famous Dr. John Owen, have observed; That, tho' they all jointly concur to the very same Work; (of Creation for Example,) yet each of them do it, according to his own Personal Property: And hence, the Contrivance, or the Designing Part, if I may so say, is, in a peculiar Manner, attributed to the first Person, the Father; the Production, making, or executive Part, to the second, the Son; and the polishing, finishing, and perfecting Part, to the third, the Holy Ghost. — And so it may be observed in, or of, all their Works, ad extra, as the Schools speak, i.e. without themselves.—And hence God, the Father, is said often to have created, or made all Things by Christ, or the Son; Eph. iii. 9. Col. i. 16. Heb. i. 2. &c. and by his Spirit, to have garnished the Heavens, Job xxvi. 13. and to send forth his Spirit to create, and renew the Face of the Earth, Ps. civ. 30. Ps. xxxiii. 6. &c.—And yet, to, or of the Son, it is expressly said, Thou Lord in the Beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth; and the Heavens are the Works of thine Hands; Heb. i. 8—12. see John i. 3. Col. i. 16, 17. and we are told, in so many Words, That the Spirit of God moved upon the Face of the Waters, i.e. communicated a cherishing, quickning Virtue to them, Gen. i. 2. and Elihu is full to the Point, The Spirit of God hath made me. Job xxxiii. 4. &c. — Whence these Things are plain and undeniable, (1.) That they all Three concur to the very same Works; and therefore are, as we have observed above,
above, the Join-Creator, or Creators, of all Things. 

(2.) That the second and third Persons, are not the instrumental Causes of all Things, as some most ridiculiously and impiously speak, but the Join-Efficient, or Efficient; with the first, each of them, immediately in his own Person, applying himself to the same Work: And therefore, each of them, without any diminishing Circumstance, or any Particle, or Word, to lessen, or sink the Idea, are expressly said to have made some of them at least, as if each had been the sole Efficient. (3.) That these different Phrases or Expressions, manifestly imply, or denote, some Difference or Peculiarity, in the Manner of their Operation. And hence, 'Tho' the first Person is said to have created, or made, all Things, by the second, or third: Yet neither of these is ever, or could ever have been, said to have done those Works, by the first. — (4.) That this Difference, or Peculiarity, in the Manner of their Operation, necessarily and manifestly supposes a Distinction of Persons. For, (5.) No imaginable Reason can be assigned, or indeed imagined, for this Peculiarity, except what results from their distinct Personal Subsistences and Properties. Because, (6.) Should we suppose all the Three to be indeed distinct Persons; and yet, absolutely and omnimodously, equal, without any Sort of Natural Order at all amongst them: Whence is it, that we so frequently hear of the first Person's doing all these, by the second, or third, or both; and not vice versa? Surely, the Phrazeology denotes some Sort of Pre-eminence in the first, and some Sort of Subordination in the other Two. But enough of these high and mysterious Things at present, tho' many pretty obvious Thoughts clearly to our Purpose, may possibly be hereafter deduced, and urged, from them.

(2.) From
(2.) From this Order of Working, among the ever blessed three, I cannot help thinking, we may safely, yea assuredly, conclude, That there is an Order of subsisting among them also, according to which, they may, they should, at least, be called the first, second, or third; and that this Order is natural; and consequently neither arose from, nor is founded upon, any Dispensation.—— Whence came, whence could come, the former Order without this? — What Cause, or Reafon can be conceived, for such Expressions, as making the Worlds by his Son; by the Word of the Lord were the Heavens made; who created all Things by Jesus Christ; &c. which not only seem clearly to hint to us, but strongly to imply some Sort of Priority, Pre-eminence, or Precedency, in the first Person, and some Sort of Subordination in the second and third? — In these, there is no Room to suggest the Oeconomy of Redemption, as the Reafon.—Because, here was no voluntary Humiliation, or Condescension in the Son, or Spirit; no, nor any Sort of Condescension at all.— Here was nothing, that seems beneath the Dignity of Perfons co-equal with the Father; or, any how, unworthy of, or derogatory to, the Divine Nature. —But, this is not all; The Manner in which each of these three applied themselves to thofe Works, and consequently, their Order in the Operation, seems manifestly natural, and therefore necessary: Which, I conceive, will almost force us to believe, That there is an Order of subsisting among them, that is also natural, and consequently necessary and unalterable. This I thought, which I offer chiefly against Roel, brings us near to the true Point in Debate: For, if there is such an Order of Working, and consequently of subsisting, then the first Person is naturally and necessarily, the first, and acts as the first; and never could, in any Dispensation what-
foever, or upon any possible Supposition, act as the second, or third; or by any Commission from either, or both of them. — Now, if this Order is natural, and consequently the Manner of their Operation is necessary, these Things will clearly follow, 1. That the blessed three, are really three distinct Persons. 2. That whatever is the foundation of it, there is a natural, and therefore necessary, Distinction between them, so that neither of them is any of the other; nor could, nor can, the first be, or act as, the second or third, or any of these be, or act as, the first. 3. That there is some Sort of Priority, or Pre-eminence, in the first Person, and purely as such, above the other two; and of the second, above the third: But, a Priority of Order only, and not of Existence; and a Pre-eminence fully consistent, with the true and proper Coessentiality of all the three. No Father, among Men, ever existed, as we shall see, before his Son: And whatever Pre-eminence a Father, as such, has above, or over his Son, as such; yet, when he, the Son, grows up, he is as properly a Man as his Father. Yea, and often proves, in all other Respects, by far the greatest and worthiest Person of the two. 4. If these Things are so, no other Account can be given of this Distinction, either the Nature or Foundation of it; yea, no other need be enquired after, or desired, than what the Scriptures give us, viz. That the first Person is, as such, a proper Father, who begot the second: That the second, and as such, is a proper Son, and was begotten of him; and therefore, has the same Nature and Perfections which he has, as all proper Sons have: And, That the third Person, who is sometimes called the Spirit; frequently stiled the Spirit of God; Rom. viii. 9. 1 Cor. iii. 16. &c. and elsewhere, the Spirit of his Son, Gal. iv. 6. and of Christ; Rom. viii. 2. Ph. i. 19, &c. proceeds from them both; John xiv. ver. 10,
17, and 23. Ch. xv. 26. Ch. xvi. 7, &c. and works with them also immediately, according to his own Personal Property. — But, because these Things do not lie so directly before us, at present, I wave them, and desire the Reader, carefully to weigh and remember, these following Thoughts.

N. B. These Observations will be thought, perhaps, to appear more plainly, in that most astonishing, and unparallel'd, of all the Works of God, even the Work of our Redemption. — The Source, Rise, or Original, of this stupendous Work, is, every where in Scripture, ascribed to the Father's Love; John iii. 16. Rom. v. 8. Ch. viii. 32. 1 John iii. 16. Ch. iv. 9, 10, &c. and the whole Contrivance or Design, is assigned to him. There is a manifest Dignity and Precedence, in the very Title and Idea of Father. — In this amazing Design he sustains the Majesty and Honour, of the Deity, requiring and accepting a Satisfaction, and from one in our Nature too, &c. — It therefore did not become him to take upon him the Seed of Abraham, and act the near Kinsman's Part: Nor would the Order we are speaking of, upon any Account, permit it.—The Execution then of this unparallel'd Work, belong'd to, or devolved of Course upon, the Son; and the Application of all the glorious Fruits or Effects of it, upon the third Person? — And yet, the Father is said to do all these, by the other two, &c. &c.

N. B. 2. If any are pressed with Objections, against the Doctrine of the Trinity, let them remember, That the Bible is full of it: That the Form of Baptism, and the Part each of them act in our Redemption, make it absolutely necessary to be believed: That the Catholic Church has been always unanimous and steady, in the Belief of it: And, That the chief Difficulties arise, from the Difficulty we find in conceiving the Manner of it. And, to give some Assistance, if not Satisfaction, in
n this Case, let them remember, That the Divine Essence is infinite, and therefore incomprehenible and unsearchable:—That, many Things therefore may, and must, be predicated of it, which cannot be predicated of any finite Essence whatsoever:—That therefore we cannot clearly conceive how, the one undivided Divine Nature can subsist, in three distinct Persons; because, we think, and judge, of it, as we do of other Essences; and perceive no such Thing in any finite Essence; and consequently, find nothing in Nature parallel to it, or which can tolerably illustrate it.—And, That it is from the Infinitude of the Divine Essence, That it may, it always did, it must, and could not but, subsist in three: As we are sure, from Scripture, it does, and ever did, and shall.

N. B. 3. Tho' the Idea, which Philosophers and others, have of God, as of a Being infinitely, and therefore, omnimodously perfect; Or, a Being, which has all Perfections in itself, and subsisting in the absolutely most perfect Manner: Tho', this Idea, I say, doth not, in this our present State of Imperfection, rise up to the Idea of the Trinity; or, of three Persons in the one Divine Nature; yet there is nothing in it, that is inconsistent with, or destructive of it, neither.—We can know nothing of God, but what we know from himself, or his Works, by Sensation, or Reflection: And therefore, it is Presumption, and rank and ridiculous Pride, to imagine, That our Reason is the Measure of Truth; That nothing is, or can be true, which we cannot have clear and distinct Ideas of; or, That we can find out the Almighty unto Perfection.—But, 'tis Impiety, and Rebellion against God, to dare to say, That what God has said, is not, or cannot be, true.—I have no Doubt, That, if we had the perfect, and adequate Idea, of the Divine Essence, of infinite Perfections, and the most perfect Manner of existing, we should have the fullest Satisfaction of the Truth: of
the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity. — But, enough of this, for those for whom I chiefly write, especially since a Passage of Scripture, which led me, long ago, to this Way of thinking, must be a little explained, by and by, which will give us some clearer Apprehensions of the several Things to this Purpose. And, whereas,

N. B. 4. The learned Roe reasons against the proper Sonship of the second Person, chiefly from his absolute and omnimodous Equality with the Father; and has carried Matters so far, as to deny any Order, either of Working or Subsisting, among the blessed Three, but what is purely Economical! — Yea, and to venture to say, That he who is called the Father, might have been called the Son, &c. because the Name Son, as well as the Name Father, signifies most perfect and true Deity! His own Words are thrown into the Margin. I shall not stay to shew, That his Conclusion out runs his Premisses; and, That, if it did not, it would not follow from them, for another Reason: And therefore shall only suggest, to the plain Reader, a very easy and full Reply. — Tho' the Name Son, among Men, especially, if the Son is grown up, equally signifies true Humanity, or Manhood, as well as the Name Father; and tho' the Son may be, in many Instances, upon every Account, a more worthy and considerable, or, if you will, a more perfect Man, than his Father: Yet, as long as they are both alive, the Relation between them remains. The Father, is still Father; and considered purely as such, there is

something in the very Name, more venerable, great
and honourable, as all Mankind, I think, agree.—
Advance we then to another Proposition, about
which there will be no Dispute.

III. The Terms, Father and Son, of whom-
soever understood, are both relative Terms; and
therefore, necessarily suppose each other.

This is undeniable, and self-evident. He who
is a Father, has a Son: And he who is a Son, has a
Father. No one ever could, or can be, truly call-
ed, a Father, but one who either had, or has a
Son: And he who is, or ever was called, a Son,
either had, or has, a Father.— This holds, whe-
ther we speak of God the Father and his only be-
gotten: Or, of God and his Creatures, whether Angels
or Men, who are sometimes called his Sons: Or,
of Fathers and Sons among Men. In short, where
there is no Father, there is no Son; and vice versa.

IV. These Terms, Father and Son, are, in Scrip-
ture and among all Nations, used sometimes pro-
perly, and sometimes improperly, or figuratively, and
that on divers, civil, moral, and spiritual Occasions.

1. They are sometimes used properly, as all do,
and must confess. — There would be no Room to
say they are ever used improperly, if they were not.
The first Sense of every Noun-Substantive, is the
proper Sense, including all the Essential Ideas chiefly,
together with those which we know do commonly
agree to, or are found in the Subject: And, when
we use it improperly, we drop several of those Ideas,
and especially the primary ones, retaining sometimes
more and sometimes fewer of the others, as the
Word is used more or less improperly.

Among Men, when they are used properly, they
are either taken more strictly, or largely.— When
taken more strictly, He is a Father, as both Phi-
losophers and Divines have been wont to speak, who
by natural Generation, communicates the same Na-
ture
ture which himself has, with all its essential Attributes, to another: And, He is a Son, to whom, the same Nature, with all that is essential to it, is, that Way, communicated *. This is not only the common, but has been thought to be the proper, Signification, or philosophical Definition, of the Terms, when taken strictly. Thus Cain and Abel were the Sons of Adam.—In a larger Sense, He is a Father, who does not immediately, but, by the Intervention of some proper Son, communicate the same Nature, &c. in the common Way, to another: And, He is a son, to whom the same Nature is thus communicated. — Thus Enoch was the Son of Adam. And, as we commonly say, when we stretch the Idea, Adam was the Father of all Mankind, or our first Parent; because we were all in his Loins, and all sprang of, or from him.—Thus Israel is, frequently, filed the Father of all his Posterity, as they are very frequently called the Children of Israel. — These, as all Men know, are the primary and chief Ideas annexed to these two Terms: And, in this Sense, they are always, without Exception, used among Men, when the Adnouns own, or proper, are added to the Word, Father; or the Adnouns own, proper, begotten, only begotten, are affixed to the Term Son. In this, all are agreed: Nor can any one Exception be given, I think, to the contrary. I desire the serious Reader always to keep this in Mind.

2. These two Relatives, Father and Son, are, in Scripture and among all Nations, often used improperly, or figuratively; and that both when spoken of God, with respect to the Creatures; or of Men with respect to other Men: And that, upon divers civil, moral and spiritual Occasions.

These Words are used improperly, when the first and principal Idea, or Ideas, denoted by them, when taken properly, are dropt; and they are used to signify Persons, who stand not in so near a Relation to each other, because of some secondary Ideas, which are supposed, naturally, to arise from, or accompany, the Relation of a Father to a Son, or vice versa. An Example or two will make this plainer. — Thus, because (besides the Idea of begetting, and thereby communicating the same Nature with all that is essential to it, to another, which is, or has been, thought the primary Idea signified by the Word Father among Men;) it has been, in all Ages, and every where, observed, by universal Experience; That there is in all proper Fathers, a natural, strong, and almost indelible, Instinct or Propension, powerfully inclining them tenderly to love those whom they have begotten, provide for them, protect them, hide their Infirmities, bear with them, instruct them, pity and relieve them in Distress, and the like: Because of these, I say, Other Persons, who are observed to be very fond of those, whom they have not begotten, to take them under their Protection, look after their Education, put them out to some Trade, set them up in the World, assist or direct them in their Affairs, and the like, have been thought, and said, to act the Part of Fathers to them: — And hence have been, every where, and in all Ages, very commonly stiled, their Fathers: And those, to whom they have shewed all this Kindness, have been as usually called their Sons.—On the other Hand, because own proper Sons have been generally observed to resemble their own Fathers, either in their Faces, Complexion, Air, Temper, &c. to speak or walk, like them; to reverence, fear and love them; to have the same Tempers, Passions, Foibles; &c. to imitate them, embrace their Notions or Opinions, and be very tenacious
cious of them, or zealous for them; to depend upon them, and run to them, upon all Occasions, for what they want; and the like: Those young Persons, who, tho' not akin, very much resemble other Men, either in their Faces, or Tempers, &c. who imitate them, study under them, are advised and managed by them, and put themselves under their Protection, depend upon their Favour, Assistance, or Interest, &c. — Those young Persons, I say, have been commonly called their Sons: And those, whom they have thus resembled, imitated, or studied under, &c. have been as usually stiled their Fathers.—This may suffice, for the various improper Uses of these two Terms, among Men.—For Example,

Holy Job speaking of himself could, in his Afflictions, remember with much Satisfaction, That he had been a Father to the Poor; Ch. xxix. 16. and that the Fatherless was brought up with him, as a Father. Ch. xxxi. 17, 18. — The pious Youths, who were bred in the Schools of the Prophets of Old, were commonly stiled, the Sons of the Prophets; 2 Kings ii. ver. 3. and 5. &c. and they, with Reverence, called the Prophets their Fathers. ver. 12. 15, &c. — This, or something very like it, was, and is still, also frequent, every where, among Divines, Philosophers, and Teachers of all Sorts of Arts and Sciences, and those who attend their Lectures, &c. — We read of some called Fathers and Sons, upon a civil or political Account. — Whence God is said to have made Joseph a Father to Pharaoh, Gen. xlv. 3. i. e. his chief Counsellor or prime Minister, whom the King respected as a Father, and who counselled him with the Wisdom and Prudence of a Father: And 'tis said of Eliakim, he shall be a Father to the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, &c. ii. xxii. 21. i. e. shall be very careful and tender of them, &c. as a Father.

— And
And hence it is, That wise and good Princes, who have really studied the Welfare of their Subjects, have ruled them justly, and in the Fear of God, and have been to them as the Light of the Morning when the Sun riseth, &c. 2 Sam. xxiii. 3, 4. have been deservedly honoured with the most glorious of all their Titles, The Fathers of their Country: And those Princes have reciprocally honoured their Subjects, with the endearing Compellation of, their Children.

—We read also of Fathers and Sons, so called upon a religious Account. —In something like this Sense, was the young Levite invited, first by Michab, Judg. xvii. 10. and then by the Children of Dan, Ch. xviii. 19. to be to them a Father and a Priest: But, much more truly, and emphatically, does the Apostle Paul speak of himself, 1 Cor. iv. 15. as the Father of those, whom he had begotten through the Gospel. see Gal. iv. 19. 1 Tim. i. 2. &c. &c.

Had our learned Author been as particular, and accurate, upon these Things, as he should have been, our Work had been much shorter, and much more pleasant: But, seeing he has not, as the Reader will see presently, we must observe in general. That

1. Tho' the Terms, Father and Son, when spoken of Men, are often used improperly as well as properly, the Scope of the Speaker, common Sense, or several Circumstances, &c. and the Adverbs own, begotten, &c. do so clearly determine the Meaning, That we can be in no Danger of mistaking.

2. That whenever these Terms, Father and Son, are used of God and his Creatures: Or, when God is called the Father of any of his Creatures, whether in Heaven or in Earth, or any of them are called, his Sons; both Terms are, every where, and without any Exception, used very improperly. And the Reason is, Because they are Creatures, created, made, or formed, by him, of an Essence infinitely inferior to,
and divided from his own: And not, in a proper Sense, begotten of him, or coessential with him, as all proper Sons are. So that, neither is He the proper Father of any one of them; nor is any one of them, in a strict and proper Sense, his own Son. — In how many near, and dear, Relations forever, any One of them may stand to him; or how much forever any one of them may resemble him, or be like him, in Dominion, or Holiness, or any other Qualities, the first and chief Idea denoted by those Terms, when taken properly, is wanting: And therefore, they are not, in those Cases, used properly, but improperly; as will appear, by a very particular Consideration of all those Places, where any Creatures are, any where in Scripture, filed the Sons of God, or to whom he is said to be a Father.

1. Whatever the whole Creation are, or have, the Creatures have all they have from him that made them; even their Beings, particular Natures, Forms, Powers, &c. And hence, their Almighty Creator has been often, and in all Places and Ages, (tho‘, to the best of my Remembrance, never in the Scriptures,) filed their Father, or the Parent of all Things. — But, ’tis self-evident, they have not, or he did not confer upon them, or give them, his own Essence: And therefore, He is not, in a proper Sense, their Father, nor is any One of them properly his Son. — 2. Because Angels are spiritual Beings, excelling in Strength, like God in Knowledge and Holiness, &c. they are, three or four Times in the Bible, called the Sons of God; Job 1. 6. Ch. 2. 1. Ch. 38. 7. and upon the same or the like Accounts, is the most high called, the Father of Spirits; Heb. 12. 9. but, improperly also, for the very same Reason. — In like Manner, 3. If that Passage, Luke 3. 38. which was the Son of Adam, which was the Son of God, be justly translated, as perhaps it is not, Adam was, and the only mere Man that ever was, in the Singular Num-
ber, dignified with this glorious Title; because he was made after the Image, and in the Likeness of the blessed Three; Gen. i. 26, 27. i. e. made a living Soul, endued with Knowledge, Righteousness, and true Holiness, 1 Cor. 15. 45. Col. 3. 10. Eph. 4. 24. having also Dominion over the Creatures: Gen. i. 26—28. But, tho' he did, upon these Accounts, more nearly resemble his most blessed Maker, or Father, than all the lower World besides; yet, God is said to have made and created, but never to have begotten him; and no Man now dreams, That the Divine Essence was communicated to him; for the Poet's, Divine Particula Aurea, is, to say the least, too bold, and cannot be justified. In short, the very Idea of Creation, as we have hinted above, is absolutely inconsistent with Generation or Filiation: And the Relation, between a proper Father and a proper Son, is as different from that between a Creator and the Work of his Hands, as any Relation can well be.—4. Because Magistracy is of God, and all Authority and Dominion is from him; and Magistrates represent him, and act in his Name and Place, &c. Deut. i. 17. 2 Chron. 19. 6. &c. hence Magistrates, especially the higher Powers, are once stiled Children, or Sons of the most High: Ps. lxxxii. 6. But, they have been so far from being, in a proper Sense, Sons of God, that many of them have been, in all Ages, as properly, as they well could be, Sons of Satan.—5. Because those great Men, who have been very instrumental, active, and successful, in founding, raising, enriching, establishing, and protecting, Families, Cities, Kingdoms, or Empires, giving them sound and wholesome Laws, or ruling them with paternal Care, Tenderness and Love, &c. &c. have been distinguished, and honoured, with the Title of Fathers; and have, with great Affection, called their Subjects, Sons: For these, or the like Reasons, The most High, who chose the Children of Israel for a peculiar
liar Treasure unto himself above all People, Ex. xix. 5. &c. brought them out of Egypt, bare them on Eagles Wings, bought them, made them and established them, &c. Deut. xxxii. 6—12. entred into a Covenant with them, Ex. xxiv. 6—12. gave them Laws and Ordinances, &c. Ex. Chs 20, 21, 22, &c. and at last, put them in Possession of the Inheritance promised. For these, or the like Reasons, I say, is He called their Father; and he himself, most singularly honours them, styling Israel his Son, his first-born: Ex. iv. 22. And they, in their Distress, many Ages after, encourage themselves in Prayer, looking unto him as, their Father. Is. lxiii. 16. Ch. lxiv. 8. But, notwithstanding all these, 'tis undeniable, That the Terms are here taken very improperly. — 6. Among the Ancients, 'twas very common for Persons of some Distinction, who had great Estates, but no Heirs of their own Bodies, to chuse some others, whom they loved, from any Families they pleased; and, in a public Manner, according to a Form then prescribed by Law, to adopt or chuse them for, and so make them, their Legal Children: Whence the Adopters, were, in Law, reputed, and always after called, their Fathers; and the Adopted were, by that Means, as it were, cut off from their old natural Families, and inoculated into another Family, and called by their new Fathers Names, or the Names of their Families, treated and educated as their own, and to them were their Possessions at last bequeathed. — In Allusion to this Custom, God is said to have predestinated his People to the Adoption of Children; Eph. i. 5. and Christ to give them Power, i.e. to have Right, or Privilege to become the Sons of God; John i. 12. and hence we read of their receiving the Adoption of Sons; Gal. iv. 5. and of the Spirit of Adoption; Rom. viii. 15, 17, &c. But the very Word, Adoption, presupposes, That God is neither their own proper Father, nor they
his own proper Sons. And consequently, when he is said to have begotten any of thoso adopted Children, or when they are said to have been born of him, 'tis self-evident, That the Words, begotten and born, must be used improperly: Because, if they had been, in a proper Sense, begotten, or born of God, they would have been his Sons by Nature; and then, there would have been neither any Reason, nor Room, for adopting them.—And 7. Those who are born from above, or born again; John iii. 3 and 5. are called the Sons of God by Regeneration. Ch. i. 13. Hence they are said, to be born of the Spirit; John iii. 5, 6, and 8. Born of Him, i. e. I humbly conceive, Christ; i John ii. 29. (for, it is of Him the Apostle is speaking; 'tis He, in whom Believers are to abide, ver. 28. comp. with John xv. 4, 6, &c. 'tis He only, who shall appear; ver. 28, and Ch. 3. 2. who was manifested; ver. 5, &c.) and in so many Words, Born of God. Ch. iii. 9.—Ch. iv. 7. Yea, the Apostle James is express, Of his own Will begat he us; Ch. i. 18. and another has it, God who hath begotten us again, &c. i Pet. i. 3. and the Apostle John is very clear, He that believeth, is born of God, i John v. 1. and whosoever is born of God sinneth not, but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, &c. ver. 18. These, I think, are all the Texts in the New Testament, where any such strong Expressions occur. And strong, and clear, and full, they are, and blessed be his Name, there are such in the Bible: But yet, 'tis plain, 'tis undeniable, that even in these, the Words, Born and begotten, &c. are improper.—1. From the Texts themselves. It the Father of Lights is said, to have begotten them again, 'tis evident they were begotten once before, viz. in the Likeness of their sinful Parents; Gen. v. 3. and that this begetting them again, was only a renewing them: Because, we cannot be properly begotten twice.—2. From the Nature of the Thing, the Divine
Divine Nature is indivisible, and a Finite Subject is not capable of receiving, or containing, what is Infinite.—And 3. From this, that Christ calls himself, and is often called, the only begotten Son; and he is confessedly, the true God, having the same Essence and Perfections with the Father; and therefore, the Terms are used of him, most properly; and consequently, He is, in the truest, most sublime, and most proper Sense, a Son, i.e. a coessential Son: But, if he is, in a proper Sense, the only begotten, 'tis Demonstration, That when the renewed are said to be born or begotten of God, both these Words, born and begotten, are used figuratively for the Renovation of their Natures; and not, properly, for communicating his own Essence unto them; and so making them coessential Sons.

'Twill be in vain, if these Things are well considered, to object to us those Words, wherein true Believers are said to be made θείας κοινωνίας φύσεως, Partakers of the Divine Nature, 2 Pet. 1. 4. which are the strongest to this Purpose, we find anywhere in the Bible: Because, that Expression is clearly explained by many others; such as, I will put a new Spirit within you, &c. Ezek. 11. 11. A new Heart also will I give you, &c. Ch. 36. 26—29. Put on the new Man, which after God is created in Righteousness and true Holiness, Eph. 4. 24. That we might be Partakers of his Holiness, Heb. 12. 10. and several others of much the same Importance. These all strongly imply, against our Pelagianizers of all Sorts, and especially our Socinians, That a supernatural Change is wrought in his People, wherein, or whereby, the Image of God, in which Man was made at first, Gen. i. 26, 27. and which was sadly defaced, and, in several Respects, absolutely lost, by the Fall: That this Image, I say, is, in some good Measure, restored in them, and an inward, vital, habitual, abiding Principle of spiritual Light, Life and Strength, is infused into
into, or, created in them, by the Holy Spirit who is
given unto them, and whereby they are made New
Creatures, and in some good Measure to resemble
their heavenly Father: But, except the wretched Ser-
vetus, and some half-crazed Creatures in the last
Age, not worthy any one's Regard, I do not re-
member any who ever dreamt, That, by the Pro-
mises, true Believers have the very Essence of God
communicated to them; and consequently, tho' they
are called, upon several Accounts, his Sons, 'tis
only in an improper Sense.

Our learned Author hath neither so accurately di-
istinguished upon this Head, nor so clearly, and fully,
explained his Terms, any where, as we could have
wished. And tho' he, in several Places, for several
Pages together, is explaining them, or effaying
somewhat like it, he never once, I think, tells us,
That they, as almost all other Terms, are some-
times used properly, and sometimes improperly or
figuratively; &c. nor acquainted us with the true,
or common Definition of them, when taken properly,
&c. — In short, all is general! & in Generalibus
latet Ambiguitas. — Thus, p. 17. having observ-
ed, "That the Name Son of God doth originally
"respect the Glory and Excellency of his Per-
"son," Would not one then have thought, That
it originally respects his Divinity? " appears from
"the Use of the Word Son and Son of God in other
"Places of Scripture." He goes on, in the very
next Paragraph, which you shall have verbatim.

"Son or Daughter or Child in the Hebrew
"Tongue implies eminently two Things. (1.) It
"notes some Derivation of one Thing from ano-
"ther." How general, and equivocal is this? Ho

However, perhaps it does so, in some very large,
improper, or figurative Sense: But, if taken pro-
perly, he should have said, The Derivation of the
same Nature, with all that is essential to it, from
the
the Father to the Son. " Men are frequently called " Sons of Men." Yes. All Men that ever were born, might and have been called Sons of Men; because they really were so: And none but such, could be, properly so called. " Israelites are called " the Sons or Children of Israel." They are so: And here, 'tis plain, the Word is used, properly, tho' with some Latitude: " So Sparks are called " Sons of the burning Coal, Job v. 7. to signify " the Derivation of one from the other." They are so, in the Margin of our Bibles: And here, every Man must fee, they are used figuratively, and very improperly; tho' the going forth of the Sparks from the Coal, and their having something of the same Nature, gave rise to this lively, strong and poetical Expression.

" (2.) It is also an Idiom of the Hebrew Language, and a peculiar Way of Speaking much in " use among the Jews, to call one Person the Son of " any other Thing or Person whose Quality and " Likeness he bears. So wicked Men are called the " Sons of Belial, &c. p. 17. 18." If this is so, in all those Cases, and the like, the Word is used very improperly: Because, otherwise, Sons are the Sons of Persons, and not of Things. He then takes Notice, " That Adam, Angels, Saints, Magistrates " are called the Sons of God;" p. 18. for the same, or the like Reasons, that we have given: But, it is undeniable, they are all so only, in an improper Sense.

He then adds, p. 19. " Now it is evident that " our Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of God, in a " Sense superior to Men or Angels, for he is called " ed God's own, Rom. viii. 32. his only begotten " Son, John i. 14. 18." Why then, surely, He is, as such, BEGOTTEN and NOT MADE: And therefore, a COESENTIAL Son; if these Words have any Sense. — He goes on, He is called his First-born,
"the Image of the invisible God, the first born of every
Creation: or that in all Things he must have the
Pre-eminence. Col. i. 15, 16, 18. p. 19." Here it
is insinuated, That the Son of God, as such, is him-
s elf, in reality, one of the Creatures, tho' created be-
fore them all, and the chief of them! Whereas, that
very Context, strongly, and invincibly proves,
That he is no Creature, but a coessential Son, if any
Words can prove any Thing. — Because, By him
were All Things created that are in Heaven, and
that are in Earth, visible and invisible, &c. All
Things were created by him, and for him: And he is
before All Things, and by him, or in him, in dust
all Things consist. ver. 16, 17. What more then
could be said? He is the First Cause, and Last End,
of all Things: And therefore, as such, absolutely
and in all Respects, yea infinitely, above the Rank
of Creatures. — "These scriptural Expressions plainly
imply both Derivation and Resemblance." What
then? A proper Son, as such, is derived from his Father:
And the nearer the Resemblance, the more likely he
is to be an own, a coessential Son.—Yet, in the very
very next Words,
"He craves Leave to insert one Caution," And
a strange one it is! "Tho' 'tis sufficiently manifest
from the New Testament, and especially from
Heb. i. that Christ is the Son of God in a Sense far
superior to Angels, yet I am in Doubt whether the
Disciples at first could have any such Idea of his
Superiority to all Angels: Perhaps their Idea of
the Son of God arose no higher at first then to sup-
pose him superior to all their Prophets and Kings,
who were called Sons of God, tho' afterwards
it grew up to an Idea superior to all the Angels of
God." p. 19, 20. When "Doubts," "and Per-
baps's," and that against all Probability, are brought
in to support a Cause; at the same Time, that the
Author shews us his extraordinary Zeal, he too evi-
dently
dently makes it appear, That Arguments are very scarce, and other Proofs no where at Hand!—More particularly, 1. The Proofs of the Sonship of Christ, *Heb. i.* are all from the *Old Testament*; *Ps. ii.* 7. *Ps. lxxxix.* 26, 27. *Ps. xcvi.* 7. *Ps. xlv.* 6, 7. *Ps. ciii.* 25—28. most, if not every one, of which were, by the ancient Jewish Church, interpreted of the Messiah.—2. Could the Disciples be ignorant, That the Second Psalm, (to take the first that offers) was a Prophecy of Christ; or, That He whose *universal Dominium* is there spoken of, and whom the Father calls *his begotten Son,* &c. was *superior to Angels?* — 3. Was it possible, That those, who had heard himself so solemnly declare, That he was the *Son,* the only begotten *Son of God;* *John iii.* 16, &c. who was equal with him, and, to prove it, could say, *What Things soever the Father doth, these also doth the Son likewise;* *Ch. v.* 17, 19, &c. &c. who had heard the *Baptist’s Discourses,* *Ch. i.* 29—34. and *Ch. iii.* 27—36. as several of them no doubt did, and soon after, made that glorious *Confession,* *Ch. vi.* 69. Could they, I say, have any Doubt “of his Superiority to all Angels?” Why really, if they had, I shall only say at present, They might, certainly, have known better.—4. How did they know “that the Prophets were ever called Sons of God?” 1 o the best of my Remembrance, they were never so called, till our Lord himself honoured them so far, &c.—But, to wave trifling, I must ask, What will follow from this, should I grant, That the Idea the Disciples had of him, at first, was so very low? That this was the true Idea: That it will suffice, if we have now the same Idea? &c. No, by no Means. The Idea, we now enquire after, is that which, at last, they arrived at. I shall therefore, once for all, desire the Reader to remember,

1. That *Doubts and Perhaps's,* against all Probability, deserve no Regard. — 2. That *Hints and In-
nuations unsupported, and without Reason, deserve very little.—3. That begging the Question, throughout, i.e. asserting, or supposing, what should have been proved, is not reasoning or disputing, but talking, at best, and to very little Purpose too. And

4. That I might have given twice twenty Instances of this Kind, more than I shall, as every judicious, attentive, and honest Reader must observe, whether he will or no.—But,

That you may be yet more convinced, That our Author has been, throughout, very general and ambiguous, yea perplexed, in proposing the Question, and explaining the Terms, we shall consider two or three Paragraphs more.

The Objection he puts into our Mouths, p. 36, is this, "The Word Son, among Men, properly signifies one of the same Nature with the Father; and therefore Son of God, when 'tis applied to Christ, must signify One of the same Nature with God the Father," &c. — Now, this is not only very general, but really defective, if not plainly false. Would he have given our Minds, it should have run thus, One of the same Nature with the Father, and of him, from him, or some Way or other communicated by him. But, his Answer to it, is yet much more so!

"Ans. 1. The Word Son taken in its common Senses and Uses; among Men, may be applied to several Ideas," p. 36. So may almost every Word. "viz. a Derivation from the Father," Had he said of the same Nature, with all that is essential to it, that had been the first, and chief Idea of the Word, when used properly: But, as it is, 'tis to say the least, very general and equivocal. The others are all applied to it very improperly, to say no worse—"a Likeness to, or Imitation of the Father, a Subordination, or some Sort of inferior Relation to the Father," — At this Rate, I do not know but some Sons may have Ten Thousand Fathers! " or a Being of the
"the same Species, Kind or Nature with the Father, and an individual Being distinct from the Father." — If so, there is not one Man upon the Face of the whole Earth, who is not the Son of every other Man in the World: Because, There is not one Man, this Day alive, who is not a Being of the same Species, Kind or Nature with, and an individual Being distinct from," every other Man! — Surely there must have been some Reasons, for this Way of talking! Let others guess them. — So much for this Paragraph, which you have had verbatim, as you shall have the three following; the two first of which come in as a Sort of Explanation, or Confirmation, of that which we have now considered.

"Now 'tis plain that when human Words and Similes" (and, I conceive, we have no other) "are used to represent Divine Things," (as they frequently are,) "there is no Necessity that those Words should include all their original Ideas, nor indeed is it possible:" Granted, at present. "'Tis enough to support the Analogy, if but one or two of the same Ideas are denoted by the Use of the same Word." p. 36. — If the Words are taken properly, the original and principal, or, if you will, the essential Ideas denoted by those Words, are never, can never, be quite dropt: But, if they are taken improperly, one or more of the secondary Ideas, according as the Scope and Circumstances of the Passage require, are, yea must be sufficient. "Why may we not then suppose that the Name Son of God, when applied to Christ, may signify his peculiar Derivation from the Father, as to his Soul, or as to his Body, or his subordinate Character in his Mission by the Father, or his being appointed by the Father to be his Vicegerent in the Kingdom, or his Likeness to the Father in his natural Qualifications and Powers, or in his kingly Office,
Office, together with his being another individual distinct from the Father? Why may not one or two of these Ideas, and much more all of them, be sufficient to account for the Use of this Name Son of God, without making it necessary that the Word Sonship in this Place must include a "Sameness of Nature?" p. 37. Here our Author will allow, That this Name signifies any Thing, or every Thing, that it can signify, but that which it originally, and primarily, signifies, when used properly. — But we shall here give a direct and short Answer, to every one of these Questions.

1. We cannot grant it signifies "the Peculiar Derivation of his Soul;" 1) Because, the Scripture gives no Hint of any such Derivation. 2) No Man can tell what he means, by this peculiar Derivation. And, (3.) All Things were made by the Logos, as well as the Father: And therefore, had he been the Son of God, on the Account of this Derivation, he had been the Son of the second Person as well as the first, &c.

2. It does not "signify the peculiar Derivation of his Body:" Because, had he had this Title, on any such Account, he should not have been called the Son of the Father, but of the Holy Ghost; as we shall see. — 3. With respect to "his Mission by the Father," Tho' an own Son, may accept of a Commission, from his Father; and the only begotten Son of God condescended to accept of one from him: Yet, no One was ever honoured with this Title, Son, own Son, &c. because of any such a Commission: And the same we may say with respect to his Vicegerency, or kingly Office. — 4. "The Likeness" of the coessential Son of God, to his Father, must needs be infinitely nearer, than the Likeness of any possible Creature: And "the natural Qualifications and Powers" of such a Son, infinitely greater, &c. — To pass several others, 5. Tho' "one or two of these his Ideas might be, in some Places, suf-
"sufficient for the Use of this Name Son of God;" yet, (1) They could not be sufficient for this Title, the own, the proper, the only begotten Son of God. (2) They could never have been a sufficient Foundation, for those glorious Things which our Lord spake of himself as a Son; I and the Father are one; What Things, ever the Father doth, these also doth the Son likewise, &c. And therefore, I must turn the Question upon him, when I have considered the next Paragraph.

"in a Sense superior to Angels and Men; p. 10." but in a quite different Sense; they, improperly only, being his Creatures, be properly, and in the sublimest Sense, being God equal with him. — 3. As to the Text, 1 John v. 1. where he will have it, "That the Term of begotten Son is applied to "Men," I ho' we are not so hard put to it, we shall only now give his own Answer to us, in another Case, p. 45. "Neither is the Name Son of God "there used, nor is God called his Father: And therefore "it is not to our present Purpose." ——

But, 4. Tho' true Believers are said to be begotten of him, Yet that Title, the only begotten Son, is so very restrictive, as to exclude all others, from being Sons, in the same Sense that he is. —— Christ alone is titled God's own, or proper Son; yea, his only begotten Son: And consequently, no other Person Divine, Angelical, or Human, is, or can be, so his Son as he. —— Others, as we have heard, are called his Sons, in a figurative and an improper Sense, by Creation, Election, Regeneration, or Adoption: But He only, in a proper, or if you will, natural Sense, by Generation. —— All others, so called, are Creatures, his Creatures, who were made by him, as well as by the Father: John i. 3. Col. i. 16, 17.

But He, as a Son, was begotten, and not made. —— If then his human Soul be a Creature, it cannot be, properly, said to be begotten: Because, creating is not begetting. "A peculiar Manner of "making or creating," be it ever so peculiar, does not alter its Nature; 'tis still a making, or creating. Majus & minus non variant Speciem. But, to be more particular,

Obf. 1. Tho' Angels are, in the plural Number, in a Parabolical Speech, Job i. 6. and Ch. ii. 1. and in a Poetical Description, Ch. xxxviii. 7. and no where else, called the Sons of God: Yet no one created Angel, no not the highest, is ever in the singular
gular Number, honoured with this Title; no, nor ought to be.—The Apostle lays a mighty Stress on this, and so should we. For unto which of the Angels, said he, at any Time, thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee? Heb. i. 5. Whence 'tis plain, That tho' Angels were filled the Sons of God, no particular Angel was ever called a, the, or his Son; and much less his own, his begotten Son. They are not therefore, begotten and not made, or properly Sons, as the only begotten Son is, but, improperly and figuratively only, so called, as some other Creatures also are.

2. Tho' some Men, and particularly the Regenerate, &c. have been, in a Body, if I may so say, called the Sons of God, &c. Yet no one particular Man, was ever, I think, in the Singular Number dignified with this Title, the Son of God, if we except Adam only, the first Man; Luke iii. 38. for which, two very particular Reasons may be assigned, which never could, nor can, be given in any other Case.—And, as to that Exception, since the Words, which was the Son, are not in the Original, in all that Genealogy, but once, when spoken of Christ himself, ver. 23. I do not know, whether they had not been better omitted, by our learned Translators, quite throughout, and the whole read, as in the Greek, thus, And Jesus himself began to be about thirty Years of Age, (being as was supposed) the Son of Joseph, of Heli, i.e. truly and properly, tho' with some Latitude, the Son of Heli, of Matthat, of Levi, and so on ascending all the Way to, of Enos, of Seth, of Adam, of God.—So that it was Christ, who is said to have been the Son of every one of those; and consequently, it was he himself, and not Adam, who is filled the Son of God. Or, to make it somewhat plainer, Christ was not only, in a proper Sense, tho' with some Latitude, the Son of every one of those from Heli to Adam, but over and above all these, and before them all, he was also, the Son of God,
God; and therefore, as truly and properly, *the Son of God*, as *God*, as *the Son of either, or all the others, as Man.*—If this be allowed, no one is ever called, in Scripture, in the Singular Number, *the Son of God*, but himself: And then, in these Verses, we have both his *Natures* in his *one Person*, and both his *Sonships* also; being, as *God, the Son of God*, and, as *Man, the Son of Man*. I need not contend about this, my Cause not needing it, tho' that Text, *Mat. i. 1. The Book of the Generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham*, I think, seems to confirm it. For there, 'tis *Christ*, and not *David*, who is said to be the Son of *Abraham*: *q. d.* of *Jesus Christ*, who is not only *the Son of David*, but also *the Son of Abraham*, in the same Sense; and in the same Manner so.

3. Tho' *Magistrates* are once, collectively, if I may use the Expression, said to be *Children of the most High*, *Ps. lxxxvi. 6.* as they are, in the very same Verse, stiled *Gods*; and in both of them very improperly: Yet no one Magistrate, Prince; or King, is ever, in the Singular Number, distinguished by the glorious Title, *Son of God*; and much less with that, *the Son of God*.

4. Tho' *Believers in Christ*, are not only called *the Sons of God*; but, as we have heard, said to be *born, or begotten of him*: Yet, no one of them, no not the most wise, holy, useful, or most peculiarly favoured, is ever dignified with this distinguishing Title, *Son of God*, in the Singular Number.—From all these.

5. I conceive there is in the Expression, "*Christ is the Son of God*, in a Sense superior to Men or Angels." *p. 19.* and in that, "*the glorious peculiar Derivation of his human Soul from God*," *p. 10 &c.* several *Ambiguities*, or *Fallacies*, which our Author ought to have guarded against, or removed; by explaining his Terms, or, more accurately stating the Questions;
Questions, &c. which would not only have shortened the Dispute, but made it easy and pleasant:—For, 1. Christ is a Term of Office, supposing, or implying both Natures; and his Condescension and Humiliation in them. 2. Tho' the Title, Son of God, is sometimes used, upon several Accounts, in a low and figurative Sense: Yet those Titles, his own, and his only begotten Son, &c. neither ever are, nor can be so used; because many other Things spoken of him, as such, do even compel us to believe he is a coextensional Son. 3. The Phrase, "in a Sense superior to Angels or Men," is very equivocal.—Plain, honest Christians, might think this enough; because, they hear of none superior to all the Angels, but God only; I mean the most blessed Three: Whereas, our Author means one, who, tho' superior to Angels, is but himself a Creature; and therefore, infinitely inferior to the Creator; and consequently, let him be ever so high, is, as such, as dependant, and as annihilable, &c. as you or I, or the meanest Insect.—4. That Expression, "the glorious peculiar Derivation of his Soul from God," is also very ambiguous, if it has any Sense at all!—It could not be derived from him, but either by a proper Generation, or Creation. If by proper Generation, then is it coextensional with the Father, as is evident to common Sense. If by proper Creation, then it was either made out of nothing, or out of something made before; unless there was, as the great Dr. Waterland has it, "an Eternal Substance not Divine," out of which, this Soul, which our Author says, "is properly the Son of God," was made.—An eternal Substance, not divine, is a monstrous Contradiction, implying many, yea numberless Absurdities: And, if this human Soul was made, either out of nothing, or of something made before, 'tis self-evident, it is, in every Sense, as much a Creature; and therefore, as dependant for all that it is, or has, or can do, and as annihilable too, &c. as either you or
or I. — 5. The Adnoun, "peculiar," tho' it may seem to signify something; yet, it really here does not: Or, if it does, it is something unconceivable, and unintelligible. For, it either respects the Thing derived, or the Manner of the Derivation, or both. Let any one chuse which he will, and then explain it, if he can.—But, to pass many such Things, I shall now, according to Promise, turn his Question, p. 37. upon himself, thus,—Supposing, but not granting, "That one or two of these Ideas, and much more all of them, were sufficient to account for "the Use of the Name, the Son of God," when it comes alone, and without any Adnoun, or other Phrase, to determine and heighten the Sense: Why is he so very zealous to make it not necessary, That these Titles, God's own, or proper Son, his only begotten Son, who is, as such, equal with the Father, does whatsoever Things he doth, and is one Thing, with him, &c. to make it not necessary, I say, That these Titles "must include a Sameness of Nature," or co-essential Sonship? — Is it possible, they should indeed include less? Let us then go on to his next Reply, which must be very particularly considered.

"Anf. 2. The Word Son in the Language of "Men," p. 37. He means, if to his Purpose, when applied to the Sons of Men. "wheresoever "it means a Sameness of Nature," As it most certainly does, in all Places, and on all Occasions, without Exception, when it is taken in its first, its usual, its only proper and natural Sense. "it always "means the same specific Nature, or a Nature of the "same Kind and Species;" And it could mean no other; because, the human Nature is a specific Na-
ture, i. e. a Nature that subsists in all the Indivi-
duals of the Species. "but it never means the "same individual Nature," No, nor cannot; be-
cause our Nature is not an individual, i. e. indivi-
sible Nature. "for it always denotes a distinct, in-
S 2  " divi-
And it always must do so; because every distinct Person, which partakes of, or in, a specific Nature, must needs be a distinct individual Being. — "Therefore, in order to keep up this Part of the Idea of Sonsbip," Which we never designed, never pretended to keep up. "and to maintain the Parallel in this Point," Which neither can be done, nor does our Cause require it. "if we will have the son of God to signify one of the same Nature with the Father," As it must do, when taken properly, especially if those Words own, proper, only begotten, are joined to it; if they signify any Thing at all, "it must mean one of the same specific Nature, that is, a distinct individual Being of the same Kind with the Father;" By no Means. The Divine Nature, in the common Language of Philosophers as well as Divines, is not a specific, but a most singular and therefore indivisible Nature: And therefore, the Son is not a distinct individual Being of the same Kind, but a distinct individual Person, in the same Nature, with the Father. "and thus we shall be in danger of making two Gods." — i. e. If we admit Premisses which we do not, some Conclusions would follow which we abhor.—However, the Enemies of the Doctrine of the Trinity have, in all Ages, pretended to terrify themselves, and their deluded Followers, with this Danger; tho', Would one think it! even the most subtle of those of them, with whom we are acquainted, are neither afraid, nor ashamed, to declare, That there are, to them, two living and true Gods! When, blessed be his Name, the Catholic Church have retained the antient Faith, That the three Persons, into whose Name we are baptized, are the one only, the living and true God. "But it is plain, that in order to support the Analogy of the Name Son, we can never make the Word Son of God
"to signify one of the same individual Nature or \"Essence,\" Why pray? \"because it never signifies to in the Language of Men;\" p. 38. Strange indeed! — Anf. 1. 'Tis enough to us, that it always signifies so in the Word of God.— But, 2. We reply in his own Words not two Pages before, "Now 'tis plain that when human Words and Similes are used to represent Divine Things, there is no Necessity that those Words should include all their original Ideas, nor indeed is it possible: "&c. p. 36." We never include all their original Ideas in neither of the Terms, Father or Son, when they denote the first and second Persons in the Trinity, which we do, when we use them, in common Conversation, to signify a Father, or a Son among Men. So far from it, that we know, That the Divine Essence is infinite, and indivisible: That the Son of God is still in the Father, and the Father in him: That they concur in all their Works ad extra, without themselves, &c. &c. not one of which could ever be said, of any one Father and Son, among Men: But, we cannot help being fully persuaded, that the first and principal, or, if you will, the leading Idea, viz. of Coessentiality, can never be excluded; yea, that it must be chiefly included, especially, when the Adverbs own, proper, only begotten, &c. (which he has never mentioned, in any of these Paragraphs!) force us to include them. — 3. I shall not tarry to tell you, That this, were it true, is a mere begging the Question; or, That it is very confusedly proposed, whether with Design, or no, I know not: But, must be so plain to say, It is absolutely false; and to declare, in Opposition to it, That "the Word Son of God, \"strictly and properly taken, never signifies, in Scripture, any Essence but the same individual Essence which the Father has; and to defy all the World to give one Instance to the contrary. — And 4. Had his
Argument been fairly proposed, it should have run thus, "The Word Son of God cannot signify one of the same individual Essence with his Father; because the Word Son of Man cannot signify one of the same individual Essence with his Father:"

And then every one would have seen, That it is no Argument. — The strange Conclusion, he draws from all these Metaphysics, is, "and therefore there is no Necessity that it should signify one of the same Nature in any Sense when applied to Christ." p. 38. The Words, "in any Sense," need to be explained; and, when they are, I shall make a proper Use of them. — Till then, let this suffice, 1. This is just such arguing, as if one should say, one Title cannot signify what it naturally, and necessarily signifies; because, another does not signify what it cannot. Or thus, more largely,— 2. Because the Title, Son of Man, never signifies one of the same individual Nature with his Father, who never had an individual Nature to communicate to him; therfore, this Title the Son of God, never signifies one of the same individual Nature with his Father, who had no other Nature, of his own, to communicate to his Son! Where is the Connection? Or, how can this follow from that? —— But, I have no Inclination to ——

There is a third Answer, p. 38. which will lead us on to more delightful Work, even to explain, and vindicate, several very remarkable Texts, to which he has given a Sabellian or Arian Turn: But, because they will come in, very naturally, hereafter, I shall now pass them, and go on, when I have observed,

That, if any learned Person shall think it worth his while to read this, he will readily see that I might have given another, and much fuller Reply, to our Author's Metaphysics, in this last Paragraph. But, I think he will also grant, that it is a sufficient An-
Answer \textit{ad Hominem}; and as such only, did I give it: What is deficient, will come up in another Place. Advance we then, to the next Preliminary.

V. The \textit{first Person} of the most holy and undivided \textit{Three}, is, in the truest, strictest, most sublime, and most \textit{proper Sense}, a \textit{Father}; and so called, with respect to the \textit{second Person}, who, as such, and abstracted from all Consideration of his \textit{human Nature} or Mediatorial Offices, is, in the truest, strictest, most sublime, and most \textit{proper Sense}, a \textit{Son}, and \textit{his Son}. In short, the \textit{first Person}, as such, is as far as possible, a \textit{proper Father}; and the \textit{second}, as such, as far as possible a \textit{proper Son}.

I need not tarry to prove, That the Terms, \textit{Father}, \textit{Son}, \textit{begotten}, \&c. when used of the \textit{first} and \textit{second Persons} in the \textit{Trinity}, are taken from their common Use among Men.—This is owned by one of our greatest Adversaries; of this Mind, I think, are they all; and \textit{common Sense} evidently confirms it fully *.

Nor, perhaps, is it worth while to spend Time in shewing, That, tho' the Terms, \textit{Father} and \textit{Son}, amongst Men, are often used \textit{properly}, and often \textit{improperly}, and that in all Nations, and in all Sorts of Writings, and in the Bible as well as in common Conversation: Yet, if the \textit{subject Matter}, the \textit{Scope} of the Discourse, or some \textit{Circumstances} hinted or expressed, do not so sufficiently determine the \textit{true Sense}, as to remove all \textit{Ambiguity} or \textit{Doubt}; the Addition of such Adverbs as \textit{these}, \textit{own}, \textit{proper}, \textit{begotten}, \textit{only begotten}, \&c. does so \textit{precisely} determine the Sense, that the Terms \textit{are to be taken properly}; That there can be no Room

left, for the least rational Delay, Demur, or Hesitation, in the Cafe. — For Example.

Were A and B, two Friends, talking of D; and A should ask B, Whence is this D? Of what Family is he? — And B should answer, Why, He is the Son of C. Don't you know that? Did you never hear it before? I thought every Body had known it. — And should they carry on the Conversation thus,

A. I confess I have heard it often, but can't think it true: Or, if he is, 'tis only in a low, or figurative Sense.

B. I assure you, he is his Son, his own Son.

A. Son! I know he is "a-kin" to C, a very near Relation, a great Favourite of his, highly esteemed and beloved by him, and very like him, &c. But I cannot believe that ever C had an own or proper Son.

B. Cannot! Why can you not? — Depend upon it, he is his own Son, as much as you are your own Father's Son.

A. What! his own Son, say you, as much as I am my own Father's Son? It cannot be.

B. Be satisfied he is his own, his proper Son, for he begat him.

A. I know there are many who, upon various Accounts, are called his Sons, to whom he acts the Part of a Father; for, he is a most generous Person, and has many Relations, &c. But, he can't be his own Son.

B. I protest he is his own Son; for he begat him: Yea, he has no other proper Son, D is the only begotten.

A. You may say what you will, I will not believe you. It cannot be. I say it cannot be.

B. It cannot be! — Why, the Thing tells itself. D is the very Picture of C, and as like him as he can look; he has his very Complexion, Features, Shape,
Shape, Temper, &c. If you but saw them together, you could not doubt of it.

A. I will not believe it; should C and D both tell me so. Say what you will, I will not believe it.

B. Say what I will! Why, C has published it often, and in the most open Manner. He calls him his Son, his own Son; declares he is his begotten, his only begotten; speaks of him as his Darling, his Soul's Delight, his Right Hand, &c. and, in short, has acknowledged him Heir of all.—Yea, D himself has publicly, avowedly, and expressly, proclaimed; ay, and proved all this, and more! Is it now possible to express any Thing more literally, clearly, fully, and strongly?

What would the World think of B, if he should assert all this, so emphatically, without good Reason? What must B think of A, if, after all this, he should make any Hesitation in the Case?—He must think, either that A took him to be the greatest Trifler, Deceiver, or Liar, &c. or, that he was the hardest to be persuaded of all the Men he had ever seen.—But, if B was a Man of Probity, and established Reputation and Honour, he could hardly forbear resenting his Carriage, as the greatest Affront which could be put upon him. —How highly must C, the Father, think himself injured? He that could say such Things to, or of, one whom he indeed did not believe to be his own Son, must be both Knave and Fool, if not something worse. —But, if D himself had, publickly and privately, on all proper Occasions, avowed, in express Words, that he was the own, the begotten, the only begotten Son of C, &c. I shall leave it to the Reader to say, how much his own Honour would be concerned: And what Thoughts he must have of A. —And yet, in the present Case, every Thing is more fully and strongly to our Purpose.

The Father, by the Prophets of old, proclaimed,
ed, Christ to be his Son, his begotten Son; Pf. ii. 7, and 12. Pf. lxxxix. 26—37. If. ix. 6, 7. Ch. xlii. 1—8, &c. and immediately, in his own Person, again and again, declared, by a Voice from Heaven, That he was his beloved Son, in whom he was pleased, Mat. iii. 17. Ch. xvii. 5. John xii. 23—30. and confirmed all, by the Works which he gave him to do, to which our Lord also often appealed. John v. 36, 37. Ch. x. 25.—The Baptist, who was a sort of a middle Person between both Testaments, witnessed the same Thing. John i. 34. comp. with Ch. iii. 31—36.—The Son himself, frequently published this great Truth; and that in the clearest Manner, it could be done. He often, with a mighty Emphasis, states himself the Son, the own, the begotten, the only begotten Son of God, &c. John ix. 35. Ch. iii. 16—18. Ch. v. 17, 19, &c. &c. He commonly speaks to, and of, the first Person as a Father, and his Father; and, in such Words, and with such Familiarity, as such a Son might be supposed to do to, and of, such a Father.—He in many Places declares, That he was with him before the World began; That he came from him, and yet was still in and with him, &c. John iii. 13. Ch. vi. 38, and 62. Ch. viii. 42, &c. and That the Father loved him, and would glorify him, as his Son, John xvii. ver. 1, 5, &c.—Yea, he avows, and proves too, That he was so his Son, as to be equal with him; John v. 17—26. That he, and the Father, are one; John x. 30. That he was in the Father, and the Father in him; Ch. xiv. 10, 11. and, in one Word, died to seal all these Truths with his Blood, as we shall see.—And the Apostles, especially the beloved Disciple, wherever they went, inculcated this great, this fundamental Truth, (which they could not but do, as often as they baptized any uncircumcised Converts to the Faith) proclaiming him to be the Son, the only begotten of the Father, &c. John i. 14, and 18.—the Son of his Love,
Love, by whom, and for whom, all Things were created, and by whom all Things consist; Col. i. 13—17. — the Son, who is owned by the Father, to be God, Heb. i. 3. and to have laid the Foundations of the Earth, &c. ver. 10. yea, and who is always the same, &c. ver. 12, &c. And that, before his Incarnation, he was in the Form of God, and thought it no Robbery to be equal with him, &c. Ph. ii. 6—11, &c. &c. — All which help to explain his own Words, he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father. John xiv. 8. Not, because he was the Father; (an Expression to which several of our Author's approach too near) for, 'tis certain, there is a personal Distinction between the Father and the Son: But, to use one of Milton's Phrases, q. d. He that hath seen me, hath seen a Son, "IN WHOM ALL HIS FATHER SHINES;" and therefore, moat certainly, a coessential Son.

And now, What more was necessary? What more could be said, to demonstrate this great Truth, that the Terms, Father and Son, when used of the first and second Person in the Trinity, are taken in the truest, strictest, most sublime, and most proper Sense possible? — If the Terms themselves, are not thought sufficient; yet, surely, the Adnouns, own, proper, begotten, only begotten, &c. joined to them, may well be thought more than sufficient, to put the Matter out of all Doubt: But, when we remember, That the Son is, as such, EQUAL WITH THE FATHER, ONE WITH HIM, GOD, who laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c. by, and FOR WHOM all Things were created, &c. these are more than enough, to put Unbelief itself to the Blush. And so they would, were not Pride, some strong, long contracted, Prejudices, &c. in the Way. — Can any Words prove any Thing, if these and the like, (so often repeated, and with so many concurring Circumstances to strengthen them) do not prove this? — Let me ask them again, What would they have had the Holy Ghost to have said,
said, "precisely to determine; wherein the peculiar "Relation of the Son, as such, to the Father, as "such, consists."—Let them tell us, if they can.—If they can, I am pretty sure they will; tho' they may keep their Countenances, say——, but pretend something or other as a Reason for their not doing it.—If they cannot, as I am sure they cannot, the least we can expect is, That, if they will not believe, they will be silent, and keep their Notions to themselves.—But, because the fuller Proof of this great Point, is to be the Subject of the last Chapter, we shall wave it, at present; and shall, while we are upon this Proposition, do these two Things at large, where they come so naturally in.

I. We shall consider all the Objections offered against the proper Use of these Terms, in this Controversy, i. e. in other Words, against the coessential Sonship of the second Person; and answer them fully. II. Shall, after our learned Author, carefully "survey all the five several Senses, which have been "put upon this Title, Son of God;" and more especially, when the foregoing Adnouns are joined to it.

I. We shall consider all the Objections, which are produced, and urged, against the coessential Sonship of the second Person: Or, against taking the Terms, Father and Son, in this Controversy, in their truest, strictest, and most proper Sense, as they are used to denote the Relation of an own Father to an own Son, or, vice versa, of an own Son to an own Father, among Men; as far as the Divine and Human Natures are analogous, or may be compared, and will permit us to carry the Ideas.

The plain, honest, serious Christian, after what has been offered from Scripture, in the most common, easy, and familiar Expressions, which are readily and well understood, may be, perhaps, disposed to ask, What need is there for this? — Can such

a Truth
a Truth be more plainly, directly, or emphatically, express'd? In what Words can it be done? — Those who will not be satisfied, with such a Number of Passages, and such a Variety of the clearest, easiest, and strongest Phrases, each mutually illustrating the other, and all directly to the Purpose, will hardly be satisfied with any Proofs: And the Men, who can think, by Quirk, or Quibble, &c. to evade these; or to wrest, and torture, them to mean what they never do, in any other Case, or to mean just nothing; may, full as easily, gloss away the Sense of any Words, or give them any Turn, how ridiculous soever, their Cause requires. — But, because the Sense, we put upon these Terms, is vehemently opposed; a great many Things are objected to it; flagrant Absurdities charged upon it; and our worthy Author is, so very positive in the Case; it may not be Labour lost, to consider, and answer, every One of them. — And, That this may be done, the more easily, clearly, and to the greatest Advantage; We shall first offer some Thoughts upon the true, strict, and proper Use of these Terms, among Men; and then propose, and remove, the Objections.

We have before observed, That, when these Terms, Father and Son, &c. are taken in their true, strict, and only proper Sense, He is a Father, as both Philosophers and Divines have been wont to speak, who, by Natural Generation, communicates the same Nature, which he himself has, with all that is essential to it, to another; who is, upon that Account, called his Son: And, He is a Son, to whom the same Nature, which the Father has, &c. is, that Way, communicated. — Whence 'tis evident, That, in the Relation between a proper Father, and a proper Son, Coessentiality is the first, the leading, the principal Idea: He being no proper Father, who has not the same Nature, &c. with his Son; nor he a proper Son, who has not the same Nature, &c.
with his Father, and vice versa. — In this Latitude, were the Terms of old used, when applied to the first and second Person in the Trinity: And happy had it been, if the Importunity and rash Boldness of the Enemies of the Divinity of the Son, had not, as they thought, obliged them, (the Fathers, I mean, and other Divines ever since,) to try to explain and illustrate, not only the Thing itself, but the Manner of it. But, since the Opposers of the coessential Sonship of the second Person in the Trinity, have, so vehemently urged many Conclusions drawn from the Nature and Manner of human Generation, against this Article of the Christian Faith, something must be said upon that Head, to remove all their Objections.

After the Revival of Learning, in the Western Parts of Europe, and the prodigious Progress it made, every where, in the two last Centuries, especially, since Natural Philosophy became the darling Study of many great, and noble Persons, of very distinguished Abilities, who, in that their favourite Study, had many extraordinary Advantages above the Antients; (chiefly from the amazing Discoveries of several famous Chymists, and the Providential Invention of the Microscope,) the Nature and Manner of the Generation of Animals, came, of Course, to be more narrowly enquired into. — This Enquiry they had hardly begun, when the palpable Absurdities, attending what was then called equivocal or spontaneous Generation, appeared so very evident, that most of the celebrated Inquirers soon resolved to expose that ridiculous Notion, which had too much prevailed for many Ages. And this they easily, and quickly, did; and with such Success, that it was, in a little while, every where, given up and run down; and is now, I think, universally exploded. — Having rid themselves of this, when the Nature and Manner, of regular and proper, or, as
as it was then called in the Schools, univocal Generation, fell under their closer and deeper Researches; they quickly perceived, that all the former Hypotheses, to account for, or illustrate, these Things, were either so precarious and ill-grounded; so dark and unconceivable, as well as inexplicable; so contrary to Experience, as well as common Sense; or, so evidently above, or contrary to, all the known, or imaginable Laws of Matter and Motion; that, after many, and various Essays to prop, or amend, they were even forced to abandon them absolutely.

— In this Case, several great Men were ready to propose each his own Fancy, few of which gained either very much, or long Credit, till that very ingenious and polite Philosopher, the famous Mr. Perrault, gave it as his Judgment, That "God "created all the Animals, at first; not only the first "of every Kind, or Sort, but all, and every one "of the Individuals." So that every Individual, that was to be afterward produced, by natural or ordinary Generation, i.e. the semina, or stamina, or Seeds of them, were actually all made, or formed, and inclosed in the first Male of the Species: And that they were afterward to be brought forth to view, in his own appointed Time, according to Laws of his own establishing, as we see they daily are.

— Of this Mind, with many others, was that great and learned Philosopher and Physician, my famous Country-Man, Dr. Pitcairn, who carried this Thought very high indeed, as is undeniable from those Words of his, when speaking of the Stone in the Kidney, which need not now be translated: * And this is now the prevailing Opinion, I may call it Doctrine, and generally entertained by the most

learned; tho', with some Difference, in explaining some Things in it.

That most excellent Philosopher, the Author of the Religion of Nature delineated, tho' he seems not to think, That the Animalcula of every Species were, from the Beginning, enclosed in the first of their respective Sorts, p. 89. is yet positive, "That the Body (of Man for Example) cannot be formed by the Parents,—For, says he, all the vital and essential Parts of it must be one co-eval System, and formed at once in the first Article of the nascent Animalcium; — And since an organized Body, which requires to be thus simultaneously made (fashion'd as it were at one Stroke) cannot be the Effect of any natural and gradual Process, I cannot but conclude, that there were Animalcula of every Tribe originally formed by the Almighty Parent, to be the Seed of all future Generations of Animals.—And it is certain, that the Analogy of Nature in other Instances, and microscopical Observations do abet what I have said strongly."

I might quote many Things, from the most learned Dr. Nieuwentyt, that religious Philosopher, who is express, "That our Parents are nothing else but unknowing, and consequently no true, but at the most, instrumental Causes only of our Existence.—That none of them all, were ever capable of knowing, or saying, whether it should be a Male or Female, a deformed or well-shaped Child, that was to be produced, &c. &c." I might, I say, quote many Things from this great Man, and many others, to the same Purpose: But, I have no Mind to make any needless Ohsentation of Learning; and therefore, shall only observe,

1. Tho' I dare not undertake, to account for all the Difficulties, in this Notion or Scheme; or, to answer all that may be objected against it: Yet, I am
am pretty sure, it can never be proved impossible; as, I humbly conceive, all the other Hypothefes, I have heard and can now remember, easily may be. — And therefore, 2. 'Tis, to say as little as can well be said, egregiously the most probable Account of these Matters; and attended with the least by far, and fewest Difficulties. — 3. The Scripture Phrafeology seems to favour it: Or, at least, there are several Expressions, or Hints, in Scripture, which seem to me to look directly this Way. — For Example, these Expressions, to name no more, in whom, $\exists\phi$ $\forall$, all have sinned, Rom. v. 12. As in Adam all die, 1 Cor. xv. 21. Levi paid Tythes in Abraham, for he was yet in the Loins of his Father, &c. Heb. vii. 9, 10. and many others, lose Nothing of their Beauty, or Emphafis, if this Opinion is admitted for Truth. Lose, did I say? No. According to this Hypothefis, the literal Sense of each of them is true, and proper, and strong: Whereas, according to any other, it may, perhaps, be questioned, by some, whether it be either? But; 4. Whether it be true or no, since it is, and must be, I think, allowed possible, 'tis sufficient for my Purpose at present. — If we cannot, from Scripture, prove, yea unanswerably prove, the coe{f}sential Son{ship} of the second Perfon in the Trinity, and as such; I, for my Part, fhall give it up; for I mortally hate all Shameful Evasion and pitiful Shuffling: — But, if we do, it will be in vain to talk of the Absurdity or Impoffibility of it, when we can fhew a possible Way, how all Difficulties may be removed. — For, tho' that Way fhould prove not to be indeed the right one, 'tis plain, there must be some other, sufficient in the Nature of Things, to remove them; tho', perhaps, it may remain still unknown to all Mankind.

This Opinion now wholly removes many Things, which are objected against the coe{f}sential Son{ship} of
the second Person, by our Author; or the proper Use of the Terms, Son and Generation, &c. by Roel, Thef. 17. and his Followers.—Remove them, did I say? Why, this Account of human Generation leaves no Room for most, if for any one, of the Objections. — If this is admitted, 'tis plain, No Father exists before his Son; No Father is the true and efficient Cause of his Son, i.e. forms or makes his Body; or his Soul, &c. &c. and consequently, many of the Difficulties pretended, and urged, against us, vanish without an Answer.—Yea, 'twill be ridiculous, hereafter so much as to mention them; as we shall shew, when I have put the Reader in Mind of what needs no Proof, That our Author's, and his Brethren's, principal Arguments are drawn from the Nature and Manner of human Generation; or, "the Meaning of the Word "Son in the Language of Men," &c. as is clear from the many Hints already given. — Suffer me only to repeat his principal Objection, or Reason against our Sense, p. 38. which I have given already verbatim; and shall now do again, with a clearer and fuller Answer, to shew how many Fallacies are in it, &c.--- The Reader will excuse me, Because, if this falls, all his Sophisms fall with it.

"But it is plain, that in order to support the "Analogy of the Name Son," which we never pretended, nor does our Cause require it. --- However, be it still remember'd, That the principal Idea denoted by the Word Son, when taken properly, is Coessentiality with his Father. "we can never make, "the Word Son of God to signify one of the same "Individual Nature or Essence," Why? If it does not signify one that has the very same Essence with the Father, it does not, it cannot, signify any Essence at all, as is evident to common Sense. --- But, why can we not make it to signify one of the same individual Nature? "because it never signifies so
"in the Language of Men." Anf. i. This Title, the Son of God, never, any where, signifies One of any other Nature, in any Language. — But, 2. Here are more Fallacies than one, or two. "(1) 'Tis the Name Son," in one Line, but " the " Word Son of God, in the next; which, 'tis " self-evident, are not the same. (2) Himself has given an Instance, where the Word Son, or Sons, when used improperly, do not signify a Person, no nor any living Thing! "Sparks are "called the Sons of the burning Coal; p. 17." but the Title, the Son of God, always and every where, without Exception, signifies a Person, and so does the Word, Son of Man, &c. — 3. This Expression, " in the Language of Men," seems to have been Studied, on Purpose, to ——. If it has any true, and pertinent Sense, in this Place, it must be this, "Wheresoever it signifies a Son of Man." And then, his Argument, in plain English, is this, The Title, the Son of God, cannot signify one of the same individual Nature with his Father, because, the Title, the Son of Man never signifies so! i. e. As I have given it above, there is no Necessity, that This Title, the Son of God, should signify what it cannot but signify; because this Title, the Son of Man never signifies what it cannot! Is not this now, a goodly Argument? " and therefore, there is no " Necessity that it should signify one of the same " Nature in any Sense when applied to Christ." ibid. Here are several more Fallacies. What does he mean by " in any Sense?" &c. — Where is the Connection? — Or, How does this follow from the other? I earnestly desire to know. Mean while I rather reason thus, and have no Fear of being con- fused. i. The Word, "Son of Man," whether taken properly and strictly, or more largely and figuratively, always signifies one of the same Nature with his Father: And therefore, the Title, Son of God,
God, especially when the Adverbs own, only begotten, &c. (which necessarily limit and determine the Signification, that it must be taken, in the most strict, and proper Sense) are adjoin'd, must always signify one of the same Nature with God the Father. — 2. This Title, The Son of God, is never applied to any but him, who could say, I and the Father are one, &c. &c. And therefore, there is an absolute Necessity, that it should alway signify a co-effential Son. — 3. Our Lord's Human Soul, how great soever, was never in the Form of God; &c. Phil. ii. 6. was never called God, by the Father; did never, could never, lay the Foundation of the Earth; &c. Heb. i. 3, 10. nor could it ever be said of it, That by it were all Things created that are in Heaven, &c. All Things were created by it and for it. And it is before all Things, and by it all Things consist, Col. i. 13---17: &c. &c. But, all these Things are clearly, and strongly, affirmed of the Son, God's only begotten Son; &c. Whence I draw these Conclusions among others, and shall, through his Grace, be bound to make them good. (1.) That it is not his human Soul, that is called the own, the only begotten Son of God. --- And (2.) That He, who is called the own, the only begotten, Son of God is, as such, most certainly a co-effential Son. — I shall add, 4. Every own, proper Son is co-effential with his Father, whether the Essence they have is individual or specific, or in "what Sense" foever that Word is used. —— But,

Because the learned Roel has, very clearly, given us all the Objections against this proper Sonship, together and in a very small Compass, Diff. i. p. 25. we shall here, for once, fairly propose them in his own Words, of which you shall have every Syllable; and answer every one of them, in Order, and, I hope, to the Reader's full Satisfaction.
"If, says he, we compare the Ideas of true Deity and Generation properly so called, it will appear that they cannot both agree to one and the same Thing or Person;" To pass the Fallacies here, What follows? "and therefore, That a Divine Person cannot be said to be properly begotten." How does he prove this? Or, What Reasons has he for it? "In Generation properly so called," i.e. In the Generation of all Animals, and particularly of Men. "we have observed, 1. Production, and consequently a Transition from Non-existence to Being." Anf. These Words are very general, and ambiguous: But, take them in what Sense he would, or could, they are manifestly, and absolutely false. Fathers among Men, were never said, or thought, to be Creators: Nor, in human or any proper Generation, is there "a Transitus a non esse ad esse." — Nor can a greater Absurdity be conceived, if these Words are taken strictly, than to say there is. — 2. "That the Begetter, among Men, is prior to, i.e. exists before, or, is older than the Begotten." Anf. (1.) Not at all: They were both created at the same Time. Yea, all the Individuals of every Species were created, when the first of the Species was. — (2.) The Terms, Begetter, and Begotten, being Relatives, neither of them could subsist without the other. There can be no Father without a Son: Nor before he has a Son. The Father, indeed, is first brought forth into View: But, the Son existed, in Animalculo vel Semine, as soon as he. — 3. In him that begets an active Power of begetting, and in him that is begotten a passive Power to be begotten." — If he means, by an active Power of begetting, a Power to produce out of Nothing; or, to give Existence to what does not exist, according to his first Observation; we anf. (1.) No Father, among Men, ever had, or possibly can have, any such Power. — And,
to apply this to the Point in Hand, (2.) In the Eternal Generation of the Son of God, the Father did not produce any Thing out of Nothing: But, to speak after our Fathers, "communicated his own Essence to him." — And, (3.) If we transfer the Ideas of human Generation, according to Mr. Perrot's Opinion, to the Generation of the second Person in the Trinity, then the active Power of the Father to beget the Son, was only a Power to send him forth, on any Occasion; to send forth, I say, his always coexistent Son: And the active Power of the Son, for there could be no proper Passion in the Case, was his Power to go, or actual going forth. And (4.) That Expression, often quoted to prove his Eternal Generation, whose Goings forth have been from Old, from the Days of Eternity, Mic. v. 2. seems to hint to us, (as several of the Fathers many Ages after, seem, to me, to have thought,) That there were several of these Goings forth, or Generations. — "4. In both of them, (viz. the Father and "Son among Men) some Change." No other Change but this, the Animalcule, which existed, as such, before Generation, is brought forth into another Bed, or Nest if you will, more convenient for Augmentation. — "5. In the Begetter, the voluntary "Act of begetting." And, What then? — 6. "Materi- "am & semen ex quo gignat." This, as it is here exprest, seems neither clear nor true. However, his Materia & Semen is, or are, no other than the little Foetus, or Embryo, perfectly formed already; and which was, in all Probability, actually formed, and, perhaps, enlivened with, and in, the first Man: Or, according to that Hypothesis of the most ingenious, and learned, Author of the Religion of Nature delineated, which, he says, "had been "long his," p. 90. viz. the little Animalcule, which "being already formed from the Beginning, and pre- "served in some opportune Place, is taken in by "the
the Father, some convenient Time before Procreation," — p. 89. which may be thought to remove, or take off much of the Force of, some Objections, which seem to bear very hard upon Mr. Perrault's Opinion. "7. In the Act of begetting the Beginning and End." And, What then? "8. In the Son Dependence upon the Father, as the Cause of his Existence." The Word, Dependence, is very ambiguous, and so is the Expression, "the Cause of his Existence." However, the Father is, as we have heard, at most, but an Instrument in the Hand of God, or of Providence, to bring forth the little Animalcule, into a Situation, where it may have more Room, and proper Nourishment also, for its Growth, &c. — True indeed it is, That when we are born, we are, for a great while, the most helpless and miserable of all Creatures, &c. (the humbling Effects of Original Sin) and under numberless Obligations to our Parents for the Care they take of us, &c. — But, when Children grow up, they are able to do for themselves; and sometimes, tho', alas! not so often as they should, requite their Parents; and their Parents come to depend upon them. — These now are all the Ideas of Generation he mentions! How just they are, and how little they help him, shall be left to others.

N. B. While his Hand was in, he would not, one would think, have forgotten the very Wise Reason which the most polite, learned, and pious Muhammad, or, as we commonly call him, Mahomet, (which was also greedily lick'd up by a Son, I mean a Disciple, of his, a Person of much the same Spirit, if not Size for Abilities, the unhappy antichristian Socinus!) gave to prove, That God had not, yea could not have, a proper Son, viz. Because he had not a Wife. And, I am apt to think he would not, had he not clearly perceived, That it was so ridiculous, as to have moved Laughter, or Pity, or Contempt,
Contempt, rather than done himself any Honour, or his Cause any Service. But, least it should be objected to us, we anf. — 1. The first Person is, in numberless Passages of Scripture, ftiled the Father of the second Person; yea, is called his own, or proper Father, and expressly said to have begotten him; And, which is more, in so many Words, Ps. ii. 7. tells himself, that he had begotten him: And the Son as often ftiled the Son; the own, or proper Son of God, and calls himself the begotten Son, yea, the only begotten of the Father, &c. Now, They must certainly know: And we cannot think, that either of them would tell us a Lie; or that they would conspire to do it, and so impose upon us, &c. — 2. Tho' the Father had no Wife, he might, to speak with the Ancients, communicate the Divine Essence and Perfections to another; who, upon that Account, would be his Son, his proper, his begotten Son. — Or, 3. According to the more probable, and now more current, Opinion of natural Generation, might send forth the second Person, who had been always, and necessarily, with him as a Son: And the second might go forth from him, upon any Occafion mutually agreed upon between them, and so be manifested to be indeed a distinct Person from him, and properly a Son. — Upon either, or both, of these Accounts, supposing either, or both of them to be true, might the Father, tho' he had no Wife, be, and be ftiled, his proper Father, and the Son, tho', as fuch, he had no Mother, be, and be called, a, the, or hit, proper Son. — Let us then go on to "his Ideas of " true Deity," which cannot, he says, confift with " the Ideas of Generation properly so called." You shall have every Word of them in Latin, in the Margin, tho' I shall not, for Perspicuity's fake, tie myself to a literal Translation. * "But, says he, in

* In Deitate vcto exilentiam necessarium & eternam, cum qua pugnat.
the Deity we have observed. Existence necessary and eternal." p. 25. So have all the World. But, if the Existence of the Deity is necessary and eternal, "it quite excludes the Idea of proper Generation."

Yes: his mistaken Ideas, but not the true Ideas of it. But how does he support this? " * i. If the "Deity is necessarily existent and eternal, it always "Was," True. "and could never begin to be."

Who says the Deity ever did, or could, begin to be. We abhor such stupid Blasphemy.—But, the Son, we say, was begotten. —We do so, and what then? Therefore, he began to be? I deny the Consequence. He was always, and necessarily, a proper, and therefore, a coessential Son; as the Father was always, and necessarily, a proper, and coessential Fa-

ther. † " 2. The Deity cannot be posterior to, or "younger than another?" The Reader will easily perceive the Fallacies, in this Way of talking, which I am ashamed to trouble him with. We shall therefore propose this, more plainly, thus, "In the "Deity, there can be no Person posterior to, or "younger than, another." Who says there is?—

As the Son never began to be, he could have none before him, or be posterior to any other. ‡ 3. The "Deity cannot produce its like or equal." Who says it does, or can? The Deity does not, cannot, in any Sense, produce another Deity. The Notion is pregnant with numberless odious, monstrous, Contradictions. The very Supposition is an abso-

lute Impossibility. But, from this Principle, " the "Deity cannot produce its like, i.e. another Deity, "or Divine Nature," to infer, That therefore, the Father could not have a coessential Son, or could not beget the Son, is not only a mere Shuffle founded upon his own Mistakes, and a poor begging the

Question also, but a plain, avowed Contradiction to numberless Passages of the Word of God. " "

4. The "Deity is immutable, but Generation supposes, or "implies, that it is changed." Wherein? The Father and Son both, are, necessarily, the same that they were from Eternity. — — — And, the go-
ings forth of the Son, were rather Manifestations of his Sonship, than the Foundation of it: Or, if there was any Thing in it, which might be called a Change, it was purely relative; at most, no Way inconsistent with the Unchangeableness of God. "

5. In proper Generation, there is a Production by "a voluntary Act: But, the Deity cannot be produced "by any such Act." No, nor by any Act. Whoever dreamt it could? — Here, and in the third, the ambiguous Words, produce and be produced, must do the Business? But, "the Communication of "the Divine Essence to the Son, as our Fathers used to speak, was not a Production of any new Thing, that did not exist before; i.e. was not a Creation: And, according to the new Opinion, the Generation of the Son was only the sending him forth, &c. as we have just now hinted. "

6. Proper Generation supposes Matter, both in the Begetter and "Begotten: But, the Deity is immaterial and spirit-
al. And what then? Because, in Human Generation, there must be Matter; and the Body of the Son must be corporeal, as well as his Father's: Must the Son of him, who is a most pure Spirit, be material also? — He is, in the most proper Sense, a Son, who has the same Essence or Nature his Father has, and of him, what Nature soever that be. 

7. "In proper Generation, as there is a voluntary Act, "so must there needs be a Beginning and Ending of it, "considered both actively and passively?" Anf. 1. We
observed already, that there was, there could be, no proper Passion in this Case. 2. Tho' the Son was always, and necessarily, a Son, we may easily conceive both the Beginning and the Ending of his Going forth from the Father; or of the Father's sending him forth, and of the Son's going forth. 3. Tho' of the Fathers, who speak of more of his Goings forth than one, must have given much the same Answer. *" 8. In proper Generation, the Son " receives his Essence and Existence from his Father, " and depends upon him: But, this cannot be said of " the second Person, if he is indeed the true God." Anf. 1. All the Sons of Men receive their Essence and Existence too from their Maker, and not from their Fathers; as their Parents also, did before them. — 2. Notwithstanding the Dependence of the Sons of Men, upon their Fathers, they are coessential with them; and, when grown up, are as truly, and as much, Men as they. 3. If the first Person communicated, from Eternity, his own Essence and Perfections to the second; 'tis undeniable, he is coessential, and coeternal, and, in every Thing but the relative Precedency of a Father, coequal with him also: And consequently, the true God, as well as he. N. B. When I say he is the true God, I do not say he is the Father, but the Son.—From all which, he says, 'tis easy to conclude,

† "Deum nec generare nec generari posse," p. 25. i.e. That God can neither beget, nor be begotten." In these Words, we see one of the Fallacies, which runs through every one of these Particulars. — It was Deitas, the Deity, or Divine Nature, and in Capitals too, in the Premisses; 'tis Deus, God,

* 8. Ab alio Essentiam & Existentiam accipere, acdependere. † Unde procli've est concludere, Deum nec generare, nec generari posse, atq; adeo de quo Generatio proprie dicta affirmatur, de eo negandam esse veram Deitatem; & de quo vera Deitas affirmatur de eo generationem proprie dictam esse negandam.
an equivocal Word, in the Conclusion! So that 'tis either another Ignoratio Eleucbi, a Conclusion beside the Question, or, it is plain, it does not follow from his Premisses.—If therefore, his Meaning be, The Deity, or Divine Nature, can neither beget, i.e. according to him, produce another Divine Essence, nor be begotten by another Divine Essence; Nothing can be more certain, nor more self-evident: But then, 'tis nothing against us.—If, That the first Person could not beget the second; 'tis a mere begging the Question, without any the least Proof. But, should all the World beg this of us, never so hard, we cannot, dare not, grant it, for our Souls. 'Tis a Contradiction to the whole Word of God, directly contrary to the Form of Baptism, and to our baptismal Covenant, &c. &c.—And yet, he is so sure of this, as to be positive, "That the of whom Generation properly so called is affirmed, of him true Deity must be denied," and vice versa. Anf. 1. His Ideas of Generation properly so called are, as we have heard, manifestly false. 2. All that will follow from his Premisses is this self-evident Truth, That he who is begotten is not, as such, a Father; and he who begets is not, as such, a Son! --- "Unlefs," says he, the Idea of another Sort of Generation properly so called shall be given, which may be consistent with the Idea "of Deity." ibid. — Whether this learned Man had heard of Mr. Perrault's Account, "of Generation properly so called," I cannot say: But, his Way of Reasoning upon this Head, invited and led me, many Years ago, to consider it; because, it furnishes us, with such an easy, ready, and clear Reply to almost all his Objections. — However, we ans. 1. We have given "another Idea of Generation properly so call-ed," which, when transferred to the Generation of the second Person in the Trinity, supposes, implies, and requires, his Coessentiality and Coeternity, with
with the Father; and consequently, his true Deity:

i. e. That, as the Father, is, properly, his Father,

so he is, properly, his Son; and that He and the Fa-

ther are \( \text{i. e.} \), unum, ONE THING. — But, I must add,

2. The old Idea, That the Father, from Eternity,

communicated his own Essence and Perfections to the

Son, has never yet been proved inconsistent with the

Idea of Deity, nor never will; no, nor never can. 
Yea, should it be supposed, That we are indeed

mistaken in this Case; yet, unless God himself should

reveal it to them, all Mankind can never prove that

we are. — Because, Since we are sure it can never be

proved from the Scriptures: Whoever shall, without

a new Divine Revelation, undertake to prove we are

in this mistaken, must reason upon a Subject infi-

nitely above him, and of which he can know very

little or nothing without Revelation; and conse-

quently, must reason without any Ideas at all; or with

Ideas very precarious if not ridiculous; which can ne-

ver do a good Cause any Hurt, nor a bad Cause any

Service.

This learned Man goes on, in the next Paragraph,

to acquaint us, "That Divines, to avoid " these Difficulties, have removed all Sort of Imper-

fection from the Generation of the Son of God," Sure-

ly, there could be no Manner of Imperfection in it.

and call it a Hyperphysical, or Supernatural Gene-

ration." Had he given us a more proper Word,

we should have used it. This, says he, "they say,

" is,—1. Eternal." It is so.—2. "It admits of no

Priority or Posteriority." Not of Existence. — "3.

" Nor any Power of begetting, whether active or " passive." Not of proper producing or being pro-

duced, viz. out of Nothing: Nor any other than

we have allowed. — — "4. No, or Change." No

Change of their Nature; nor any Change inconsistent

with the Immutability of the most High.— "5. 'Tis 

" a natural, but no voluntary Act in the Father."

Why
Why might not a Natural Act be Voluntary? — But, according to the Explication I have now given, I see no Inconvenience in allowing a voluntary Act. —

6. It admits "Nullam Materiam ac Semen." There can be neither, in a most pure Spirit. — "7. No Beginning or End in the Act of Generation." But, according to the Idea now given, we may grant both.

— "8. Nor any such Dependence of the Son upon the Father, as is the Dependence of the Effect upon its Cause." If by the Cause he means the Efficient Cause, we ans. — No proper Father is, as such, the Maker, or Creator, of his Son, nor ever was, or can be. — In short, says he, "They will have the Begetter and Begotten to be not only alike, but plainly or altogether equal, in Essence, Existence, "Power, Dignity, and in one Word true Deity." And so they are, If the Son was, from Eternity, in the Form of God; if he thought it no Robbery to be equal with him; if he was in the Beginning with God, and was God; and if all Things were made by him, &c. &c. &c. And so he must be, if He and the Father are One, &c. — If these Things, I say, are so, The Son, and the Father are omnimodously equal, excepting only in this, That He is the Son, and not the Father; and the Father is the Father, and not the Son.

In the next Paragraph, p. 26. He honestly grants, "That this Idea of Generation does not overthrow, "i.e. is not inconsistent with the Idea of Deity:" And this every one must grant, who believes the Doctrine of the Trinity: But infilts upon it, "That "it is wholly inconsistent with the Idea of Generation properly so called." Why so? "Because, "between this Hyperphysical Generation and that "which is properly so called, nulla remanet ne mi- "nima quidem Similitudo, there remains no Likeness, "no not the least." Ans. But, if his Idea of Ge-

genation, properly so called, is evidently false, as all the
the World do, and I think, must agree; and the Idea of this *Hyperphysical* Generation agrees very well, with the *true*, i.e. the new *Idea of Generation* properly so called, as it really does; as I have, I conceive, sufficiently shewn; then all is still right. — Suffer me to add, 1. His *"own most orthodox* Explanation of the Words, *Son* and *Generation*," when spoken of the second Person, *"That they emphatically signify, that the second Person has the same "Essence and Nature with the first, and did from Eternity coexist with him;"* Thes. 20. agrees well enough with the *Old Account* of the Generation of the Son, viz. That the Father Did, from Eternity, communicate his own Essence and Perfections to the Son. — For, here are the *first* and the *second Persons*; here is their Coessentiality, or their having the same Essence and Nature; and, here is also, their Coexistence from Eternity: And this is all, that is in his *most orthodox* Sense of these Terms! Let every Reader judge. — It will be said, I have added the Word, communicate. — I have so; because, the *Ideas* *"of Father, Son, and Generation,"* if we had no more to say, seem naturally to suppose, or imply, a *communication*; and, in the Judgment of our Fathers heretofore, they actually, in this Case, did: And no Man has, or can, prove, either that it is impossible; or inconsistent with the *Nature, Perfections, or Blessedness of the Deity*; or, of either the Father, or the Son. — But, 2. If we take Perrault's Account *"of Generation properly so called,"* to be the *true* one, as is egregiously the most probable, and transfer the *Ideas* to the *Generation* of the *second Person*, then, as we have seen, most of his Objections appear to be indeed no *Objections* at all, but merely his own Mistakes. So that, I think, I may conclude,

1. That, if this learned Man had heard of, and considered Mr. Perrault's Opinion, and then applied his *Ideas*
Ideas "of Generation properly so called," to the Generation of the second Person; he could not but have seen, that his Difficulties would have almost all vanished; and therefore, that he might have saved himself the Labour, of making such a Stir in the World. According to him, in "Generation properly so called," there is, as we have heard; "No proper Production, or giving Being to that which is not; the Father does not exist before his Son; nor is there any Change in Procreation, but the going forth of the little Animalcule, into a more convenient Place for Augmentation; &c. &c." — Let these then be applied to the Generation of the second Person, and you shall find, "That the Words, "Son and Generation, emphatically signify, That the "second Person, has the same Essence and Nature "with the first, and existed with him from Eternity." — This, I humbly conceive, might have removed his Scruples: And seeing he is so open, and express, in the Doctrine of the Trinity, might have fully satisfied him. — Because, Since an Order, among the ever-blessed and undivided Three, there ever was, and must have been, and is also acknowledged; 'tis hard to think, that any one can doubt, That that Order is natural, and therefore necessary: And himself has honestly yielded, "That this Idea of Generation is consistent with the Idea of true Deity." But, if it is consistent with the Idea of true Deity, and of Generation properly so called also; it might, I think, have given him the fullest Satisfaction. — Let others judge. — And, 2. I leave it to all, who were acquainted with the learned Dr. Ridgley and Dr. Anderson; Whether, if they had known of such an easy, plain, and natural, Way of getting clear of those Objections, which the Arians and Socinians urge, with so much Confidence and Importunity, against the commonly received Notion of the Generation of the Second Person, &c. which are all drawn
drawn from the mistaken Opinions of the Generation of Animals, which had, for so many Ages, been, I think, universally entertained: Whether, I say, had they known of such an easy, plain, and natural, Way to get rid of those Objections, and had well consider'd it, they would not have heartily embraced it, and cheerfully acquiesced in it. — They were both of them very zealous for the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity above-mentioned, and very strenuous in defending it: But could not, so well, digest "the Communication of the whole Divine Nature, or "Essence from, or by, the Father to the Son;" (tho', to the best of my Knowledge, they never opposed it; and only said, they thought it not so convenient a Way to explain the Doctrine of the Trinity, or the Sonschip of Christ;) nor reconcile it, with his Deity. They therefore, it seems, thought themselves obliged to deny, that he was a Son, as God; and to take this Title, the Son of God, even when the Adnouns, own, or proper, begotten, or only begotten, &c. were annexed, to be a Title of Office and not of Nature; and to signify the Mediator, or be of the very same Importance precisely with that Title; which, I am well satisfied, neither of them would have done, if they could have extricated themselves out of those Difficulties. — Well then, here, I humbly conceive, is a clear, a ready, Method to get rid of them all: And to retain also the Truth, and, I hope, the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth. Those Difficulties all arose from mistaken Notions of the Generation of Men, which they applied to the Generation of the second Person: Let their Disciples then, hearken to the truer Account of the Generation of Men, and of all Animals; and then, if they please to transfer, or apply, the true Ideas, to the Generation of the Son of God, most, if not every One, of those Difficulties will vanish; Yea, and every Thing will appear to be, just as they would have it. For then,
Here will be *two distinct Divine Persons, coessential*; and therefore, *coeternal*; and consequently, every Way *equal*, excepting only, That there is a *natural*, and therefore, *necessary Order* among them; according to which, they are not only the *first* and the *second Persons*, but the *Father*, and the *Son*. — Here, the *Father* is not the *Efficient Cause* of the *Son*, nor before him, &c. Nor was the *Son*, as such, *produced* by him, nor is he *inferior* to him, or, properly, *dependent* upon him, &c.—Here, the *Father*, as such, has all the *natural Preeminence* and *Prerogatives* of a *Father*; and yet, the *Son*, as such, is as *necessarily existent*, I had almost said, as *self-existent* as he: For, the *Idea* of a *Father*, among Men, does no more imply *self existence*, than the *Idea* of a *Son*; every *Father* as well as every *Son* being, at the same Time, *made* by *God*, and equally *dependent* upon him. — According to these *Ideas*, tho' the *Title*, the *Son of God*, primarily and strictly taken, denotes the *second Person*, as such, *and him only*; yet, may it, even with the distinguishing *Adverbs* and in the *New Testament*, denote the complex *Person* of the *Mediator*, in the full Execution of his *Office*: — And then, as I hinted already, as this *Title*, the *Son of God*, implies his *Coexistence* with the *Father*, the *Words*, his *Generation*, or *being begotten*, may denote only some *Mission*, or *Manifestation*, or *his goings forth* to do what no One but such a *Son* could do, which would be an *irrefistible Evidence* of his *coessential and coeternal Sonship*. — In these, I say, I appeal to the Disciples of these two learned Men; Whether as many of them as knew them won't *acknowledge*, 1. That I have given the principal, if not the only, *Reasons* of their leaving the *Catholic Church*, in the *Doctrine* of the *proper*, and *coessential Sonship* of the *second Person*. And, 2. That what has been now offer'd, would have *satisfied* them, and brought them back to their *Old Faith*. — And, 3. Tho'
3. Tho' I might not, by any Thing here said, have convinced the worthy Author, with whom my chief Business now is, (who has erred in many more Things, than any of those now mentioned; and in Points of greater Moment too;) yet, I think, I may allledge, That, if he had considered Mr. Perrault's Opinion, as it well deserves, he would not have talkt so very unphilosophically, and so unlike himself, and so very positively too, in many Cases, as he has done: And, as to those Errors, in which he stands alone, viz. "That Christ's human Soul is properly the Son of God;" p. 150. that this Title "Son of God cannot necessarily imply his divine Nature, &c. p. 63. &c. if, thro' the Grace of God, I do not confute them all, I am very willing, That every Word I have urged against them, should pass for just Nothing.—I would not, however, by all this, be thought,

N. B. 1. To presume to say I have, or can convey to any other, clear, distinct, and much less adequate Ideas of the coessential Sonship, or Generation, of the second Person of the Trinity; and yet, much less of the Manner of it. Hic Mens deficit, that I may speak with some of the Ancients, nec mea tantum sed Angelorum. All I pretend to, is to prove the Matter of Fact, That he is a coessential Son. And This, or the τὸ ἑαυτῷ, as the School Phrase is, viz. that he is the own, only begotten, or coessential Son is, as clearly, fully, and strongly, revealed in Scripture, as any Thing is, or can be, in any Words; and this, even that he is the only Begotten of the Father, &c. the weak, the ignorant, the young, may most firmly believe, and steadfastly profess; and must do so, if they expect Salvation by him: But, the τὸ δόξης, and the τὸ πιστεύετε, I. e. the Why, and the How, are not so revealed; but, if at all, much more generally only. — Should it then be askt, as some are presumptuous enough, when they are talking of such
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sublime Things to forget all Decency; Why is the First Person, the first; and the Second, the second? Answ. They are each of them, naturally and necessarily, what they are, and who they are.—Why is the first Person called the Father, &c. Answ. Because he really is so.—Might not He have been called the Son? Answ. No. Because he is not, could not be, the Son.—Thus, several such bold Questions, may be more easily answer'd than some think.—Should it be asked, How the Son coexisted with the Father? Answ. The blessed Three only knows this, clearly and fully: But, in general we may say, He coexisted with the Father, just as the Father coexisted with him.—Each of them is called, Jehovah, in some Hundreds of Places in the Bible; and therefore, is Jehovah: And consequently, they necessarily exist, and every where; and therefore, tho' distinct Persons, they are ever, and every where, in and with each other, &c.—But enough, if not too much by far, of these adorable Things, which are incomprehensible and past finding out.—Through the Grace of God, I desire not to exercise myself, in Things too high for me: And always to stand in Awe of that Question, Job xxxviii. 2. Who is this that darkens Counsel by Words without Knowledge? Blessed be his Name, I can very readily receive, and most securely and firmly believe, what I find plainly and clearly in his Word; especially, if it runs thro' it, and occurs in a great Variety of very emphatical Phrases, which mutually explain or illustrate each other, without enquiring Why? or How? when he has thought fit to conceal them: Or, so much as desiring to know what is so evidently above me, and which he would not have me now know.—Nor, Would I have it supposed,

N. B. 2. That this great Mystery, the coessential, or proper Sonship of the second Person, is in every Respect, or indeed in any, to be exactly measured by, or fully resembled to, or compared with, the Sonship
or Generation of any Creature. — God is a Spirit, John iv. 24. a most pure Spirit: And therefore, there can be no Sort of Likeness between these two Generations, if I may so speak, but what is merely analogous. — 2. The Divine Nature is most singular and indivisible: And consequently, cannot be communicated, if I may so say, by Parts or Halves; or subsist in different and divided Beings. — 3. The Divine Essence is absolutely infinite, betwixt which and what is finite, there is no Sort of Proportion. And, by Consequence, — 4. These Conclusions, It is so and so, in human Generations, and therefore it must be so, exactly so, in the Generation of the Son, if it be a "Generation properly so called;" or, No such Thing is, ever was, or can be, observed in human Generations; and therefore, there can be no such Thing observed in this: These Conclusions, I say, must appear, even to the common Sense of all Men, not only most precarious and uncertain, but most presumptuous and ridiculous. — Nor,

N. B. 3. Would I have any to think, That what has been now offered is sufficient, to answer all the Questions, which may be proposed; or remove all the Difficulties, which may be started, concerning this adorable Mystery: Or give full Satisfaction to those, who will not be content with the Testimony of both the Father and the Son, and the Holy Spirit also, in the Scriptures of Truth. — There is no End of insinuating, asking, doubting, demurring, objecting: And little good can be expected, from any Attempt to reply to them; or to persuade the unbelieving and obstinate. — The only Way to have Ease, and Peace, in all these Cases, is to cast down Imaginations, (λογίσμοὺς κκαθαρίζεις, casting down, demolishing, purging out, or throwing away Reasonings, Thoughts, Arguments) and every Thing that exalteth itself against the Knowledge of God; &c. 2 Cor. x. 5. If we would know the Truth, let us to the Law and
to the Testimony. We are sure, That God cannot lie: — That he would not deceive us: — That he well knew how to reveal his Mind, so easily, and clearly, that even the weak, and the ignorant, who sincerely and diligently meditate upon his Word, begging fervently, that he would open their Eyes, shew them his Truth, and lead them in it, should not fail of knowing it, in all Matters of Moment, sufficiently for his own Glory, and their Happiness: — That the Catholic Church hath, from the Beginning, most zealously and steadily contended for the coessential Sonship of Christ; and cannot help thinking, they could not be mistaken, in the Sense of all those Scriptures, upon which it is founded: — And shall endeavour, by and by, to prove, That this Doctrine, even the coessential Sonship of Christ, is the Rock upon which the Church is built. — Let us then receive, and believe the Word of God, without Demur, Hesitation, or enquiring Why? or How? — If Men will not believe, surely they shall not be established. Isa. vii. 9.

Should any, after all, ask, Why we have enlarged so much on these Things, and been so very particular in answering all these Objections? Anf. — 1. The Importance of the Subject made it necessary. Much depends upon it: The more accurately therefore, and clearly, all Objections are propos'd and answer'd, so much the better. — 2. To shew those, who may be too apt to doat, upon great Names, That there is not, indeed, so much, in some high and fanciful Notions, or Pretensions to great Attainments, as they may be too ready to think. — 3. To let the weak, but honest, Believer see, That there is Nothing so momentous, in all the deceitful Opposition, that has, or can be made, to the coessential Sonship of Christ, as, in the least, to shake his Faith in the catholic Doctrine. — 4. To convince even those, who are fondest of Novelties, That all, or almost all, of the Arguments which are produced to support them, are, in reality
reality, founded upon evident, great Mistakes: And consequently, do no Service, if it is not to expose those who urge them. — 5. That I might, by the by, give an Hint, That true Philosophy is not, in any Thing, inconsistent with true Divinity: And, That no Objections, whether from Phsyics or Metaphysics, against any of the Mysteries of the Christian Religion, do ever come home to the Point; or, are sufficient to overthrow them. — 5. That all may see, That the more the Secrets of Nature, and Providence, are known, the more clearly may several abstruse Points, in the Christian Theology, be understood, and more easily defended. — I myself have long thought, That some Discoveries in the New Philosophy, and some Notions lately introduced, or illustrated and maintained, by Men of Figure in the learned World, tho' supposed to bear very hard upon some favourite Doctrines of the reformed Churches, (and, perhaps, so vehemently inculcated for that very Reason!) do, when all Things are well considered, in very Deed, confirm them not a little.

'Tis like enough, 'twill be expected I should shew, How the Father is, in the most proper Sense, a Father; and the Son, in the most proper Sense, a Son: Or, at least, That they are so.—For, should we suppose the Son, as the Father's own Son, to be in the truest, strictest, and most sublime Sense a Son, and vice versa; yet may it be askt, How can it be said, That he is a Son, in the most proper Sense of the Word as it is used among Men, when there are so many Ideas implied in the one Case, which can have no Place in the other?

In Answer to this, I shall prove every one of these four Superlatives, very clearly, and as briefly as I can.

1. If the Son, as such, is God, as the Father himself speaking to and of him, as the Son, expressly acknowledges, Heb. i 8. And, if he is not another, a strange,
a strange, or a new God, as he is never said to be in Scripture, and indeed cannot be; then he must needs be the same God with the Father. — But, if as the Son, he is the same God with the Father, he is, in the truest Sense, his Son, as is self-evident: Because, if he is so, we have here Coessentiality, (however the Son came by it) and consequently, Coexistence, and Coequality, and the most omnimodous Likeness possible also, which plainly imply all the chief Ideas of Sonship in the truest Sense. — Or thus shorter, If God is One: And if the Father, as such, is God, and the Son, as such, is God; then, it is self-evident, they are the One God: But, If the Father and the Son are the One God; 'tis undeniable, That the Son is, in the very truest Sense, his Son.

2. If the Son, with Truth, could say, I am in the Father, and the Father in me, as he does, Job. xiv. 10, &c. and, I and the Father are One, as he does, Job. x. 30, &c. &c. 'Tis self-evident, the Son is, in the strictest Sense, his Son: Because, no other Son could ever, with Truth, have talk’d of the Relation between him and his Father, in any such Strains.

3. If the Son, as such, is God; and therefore, is coessential, coeternal and coequal with the Father, then is he, in the most sublime Sense, a Son; as is self-evident, and needs no Proof. — And

4. As to the last Superlative, That the second Person, as such, is a Son, in the most proper Sense of the Word, as it is used among Men; tho’ there are many Ideas implied in the Words, Son and Generation, when spoken of Men, that can have no Place, when we apply them to the eternal Generation of the Son of God. We may answer, That all the Ideas, drawn from the Generation of Animals, which can have no Place in the Sonship and Generation of the Second Person, plainly imply manifold Imperfection; and are also visibly inconsistent, with an indivisible, and spiritual Nature; and therefore, must be far remov
moved from it: But, where all the most perfect Ideas of Sonship meet, and the most perfect Manner of Generation also; there, I humbly conceive, the Son may be rather said to be a Son, in the most proper Sense, than not. — But, for the farther Satisfaction of the learned Roel's Followers, we add these five Thoughts more.

(1.) A Word may be used properly, in several Cases, or of several Objects, tho' all the Ideas may not be implied, in every one of them; or, tho' the very same Idea, or Ideas, may be somewhat enlarged in one Case, and restricted in another; or, tho' many Circumstances, either in the Nature, or Qualities, &c. of the Things signified by that Word, may differ vastly. — The Term, Legs, is properly used to signify those Members, of all Sorts of Animals, upon which they stand, or walk; tho' some of them have but two, others four, or more; tho' some of their Legs may be shorter or longer, stronger or weaker; tho' some of them may have more or fewer joints, which may differ in Size, Shape, or Colour; and, in short, be hardly any how alike, &c. yea, and tho' the almost only Idea, that can be applied to them all, is that which is taken from their Use. — And thus, the Terms, Head, Eye, Hand, &c. when used of Animals; the Terms, Seed, Plants, Blossoms, Leaves, Flowers, Fruit, &c. when we are speaking of Vegetables; and the Words, Skill, Acuteness, Learning, &c. when talking of Men; are all used properly, tho' the Ideas signified by them, when attributed to distinct Kinds, Sorts, or Individuals, may have hardly any Thing, in them similar; or but very little. — Thus also, the Terms, Wisdom, Goodness, Holiness, Justice, Dominion, &c. are used properly both of God and Men: And yet, the Wisdom and Goodness, &c. of God, are essential and infinite, &c. whereas, the Wisdom, and Goodness, &c. of Men, are finite, changeable, given to us or acquired by
by us, &c. — Why then should not the Son of God, be said to be, in the most proper Sense, a Son, or to have been begotten by him, when all the chief and primary Ideas denoted by the Words, when spoken of Men, (even his eternal Coexistence in, and with, the Father, and his Goings forth from him as a Son, &c.) are plainly implied in this Case; tho' some inferior and less important Ideas, in Human Generation, are not? — Let them not say, That the Ideas, of Sonship and Generation, necessarily imply Imperfection: Because, 1. If they do so, when used among Men, they imply rather the Imperfection of our Nature, than of our Persons. — For, 2. They imply no Manner of Imperfection, but what is, or was, common to all the Fathers, as well as all the Sons of Men. — Because, all the Fathers were once Children, except the first, and he was immediately created by God. — 3. They imply no Sort of Imperfection, inconsistent with Coessentiality and Coexistence: And therefore, when transferred to the Second Person, can imply no Imperfection at all; because, the Divine Essence is absolutely above all possible Imperfection. — And, 4. What Imperfection can be conceived in Eternal Coexistence in, and with, the Father: Or, in the natural or necessary Communication of the indivisible Divine Essence and Perfections to the Son, from all Eternity? — But, (2.) When we say the first Person is, in the most proper Sense, a Father; and the Second, in that Sense, a Son: We do not, need not, say, That all the Ideas, of Paternity and Filiation among Men, are, or can be, transferred to the Divine Persons; or, That the Generation of the Second Person is, in every Thing, to be resembled to, or measured by, Human Generation: 'Tis enough, if the principal Idea, or Ideas, are transferred and retained. — The Generation of the Volatiles of all Sorts, differs, in many Things, at least in the Manner of it, from that of the various Species of the Beasts of the Field; and
both of them, vaftly, from that of the Fijhes.

And yet, were we, in any of those Cases, to call the Begetters, Fathers, or the Young, Sons, as is sometimes done; the Words, Generation, Father, Son, would, I think, be properly used, in all those Cases: And every Body, even the weakest, would understand what we meant; and would still retain the Idea of the Relation between the Begetter and Begotten, tho' they might hardly have any Ideas at all, or those but very general, obscure, and indistinct, if not wholly false, of the Manner of their gendring or being engendred. — 'Tis just so here. We say, when we speak after our Fathers, That the first Person is, in the most proper Sense, a Father; because he communicated his whole Nature, with all that is essential to it, to the Second; and according to Mr. Perrault, because as a Father he sent forth his coexistent Son from Self, and so manifested him to have been in, and with him, from all Eternity, as his Son: And, That the Second Person is, in the most proper Sense, a Son; because the whole Divine Essence with all its Perfections were communicated to him from all Eternity, by the first; or, upon the Account of his Coexistence in the same Essence with him, and his Goings forth from him, &c. And all this, without presuming to determine the Manner of these Things; and much more, without "supporting the Analogy of those "Names in every Respect."

(3.) I said, That the Son is, in the most proper Sense, a Son; because, I could not think it amiss to speak after the Holy Ghost; or, to use the Expressions, which he had used before us. — Yea, I should have been very injurious, to the Second Person; and unjust to the Catholic Church, whose Faith I am defending, if I had not taken particular Notice of them, and set them in the clearest Light I could. — The Apostle is very express, ὅς τε ἐὰν ὑπῆρχε ὑμῖν ἐφεσάκα, Rom. viii. 32. Is quidem qui proprio Filio non pepercit, He
that spared not his own, or his proper Son; for, so
the Word is: But, if the Son, is his proper Son, the
Father, is his proper Father. — And the Jews charge
our Lord, in so many Words, with saying, that
God was his Father, τὸν θεὸν ἰδίου, Patrem proprium,
his proper Father, John v. 18. and therefore, by so
doing, with making himself equal with God. — This
Charge, high and grievous as it is, if not true! he
was so far from denying, (which he might very easily
have done, many Ways, and ought to have done,) That he strongly confirms it, and proves by many
Arguments, ver. 19, 23, 26, &c. that he really
was so. — But, if the Father, is his proper Father,
and He, his proper Son, then are these Terms, I
humbly conceive, used, in the most proper Sense,
of the first and second Persons in the Trinity, let Men
oppose it with ever so many Cavils; with which the
serious, honest Believer has very little to do; and
therefore, needs not at all trouble himself.

(4.) I would ask, Whether the blessed Virgin was not,
in a truer, stricter, higher, and more proper Sense too,
the Mother of that which was conceived in her, Mat.
i. 20. of that Holy Thing which was born of her, Luke
i. 35. than any other Mother ever was, of any other
Child: And, Whether that Child, was not, in a
more true, stricter, higher, and more proper Sense too,
her Son, than any other Son ever Was, of any other
Mother? No Body, I conceive, can doubt of it.—
The Angel told her, she should bring forth a Son,
ver. 31. who had been long before promised, as the
Seed of the Woman; Gen. iii. 15. and God is said, by
the Apostle, to have sent forth his Son made of a
Woman, &c. Gal. iv. 4.—The Virgin is said to have
brought forth her first-born Son; Mat. i. 25. and she
herself called him Son: — Elizabeth, Simeon, and
the Evangelists, called him her Son, Luke i. 43. Ch.
2. ver. 27, 34. Mat. i. 2. 47, &c. — And yet, ma-
ny of the Ideas, signified by the Words, conceive,
Mother,
Mother, Son, in ordinary Cases, can have no Admittance in this. — Here was no proper Father, nor any pre-existent material Animalcule, as, I am inclined to think, there has been in all other Conceptions. — Here was a creating, and not a begetting. — In short, every Thing here was extraordinary, preternatural, miraculous! — But, Was she, in any Sense, the less his Mother; or he, in any Sense, the less, her Son? No: By no Means. — Was she not then, in a truer, higher, stricter, and therefore, in a rather more proper Sense, his Mother, than any other Mother ever was, or could be, of any other Son? And was not He, in all these Senses, rather more her Son, than any other Son ever was, or could be, of any other Mother? — I humbly conceive he was. He being the Seed of the Woman, conceived in a Virgin, made of a Woman, &c. his blessed Body was made, or created, of her Substance; (as the Body of the first Woman was made of the Rib which God had taken from Adam: Gen. ii. 22.) not one of which, could ever have been said of any other Mother, or Son. — Her Love to him therefore, must have been, naturally, by many Degrees, more intense and fervent; and her motherly Care of him, and Sympathy with, or for him, egregiously more affectionate and tender, than in any other Case: Forasmuch, as her Relation to him, was exceedingly nearer, and her Interest in him, so much more natural and, above Parallel, endearing. — And, on the other Hand, the merely natural Love, which, in other Children, is, naturally, divided between the Parents, being, in him, centered in her alone, his purely natural filial Love to her, must have been, naturally, above Comparison, more strong and flaming; and his Care of, Pity for, and Affection towards her, superlatively more constant and active. — So that, as the Ties of Nature between them, were closer, their purely natural Endearments must needs have, upon that Account,
count, had there been no other, much more exquisite; and consequently, their merely natural Happiness, in their singular Relation to each other, egregiously more exalted, and delicate. — Here then was a Son, in the truest, strictest, highest, and I doubt not to say, the most proper Sense, tho' several of the Ideas implied, in what we commonly call natural Generation, could have no Room in his. Here we have Sameness of Nature, the Communication of the same Nature from the Mother to the Son, or, if you will, his Participation of the same Nature, &c. which are the first and chief Ideas in natural Generation; and therefore, was the Mother, I conceive, in a more proper Sense, his Mother, and he, in a more proper Sense, her Son. — In fine, 'tis because of the Difference we find, betwixt the Ideas of this, and other Generations, that we conclude, That Christ was in the truest, strictest, highest, and consequently, in the most proper Sense, a Son. To confirm this, somewhat at least,

N. B. One of the Names of the Son that was given, and the Child born to us, Is. ix. 6. is Wonderful! May we not then think, That it was with Respect to, or upon the Account of, this miraculous Conception, as well as some other Things, that he had this Name or Title? — May we not then, with Reverence, say, That he is wonderful as God, i.e. the coessential Son of God; and wonderful also as Man, the Seed of the Woman, and made of her! Wonderful as the Son of a Woman, without a Man; and wonderful as the Son of God, without a Wife! — May we not venture to say, That his singular Relation to his Mother, as her Son, is the very likest, comes nearest to, and does best resemble, his Relation to God, as his Son, of any Thing in Nature: And that, consequently, he is his coessential Son? — However, Christ is indeed a Wonder of Wonders! — Wonderful in his complex Person, Natures, Offices, Relations, States! —

Wonder-
Wonderful as Man, in his Conception, Birth, Life, Doctrine, Miracles, Death, Resurrection, &c. Altogether Wonderful! — But

5. When pleading for the coessential Sonship of the second Person, or, in Roel's own Words, Thes. x. That the Son, the second Person of the most holy Trinity, was from Eternity begotten of the Father; and Thes. xx. That the most Orthodox Sense of the Words, Son and Generation, is, that they emphatically signify, That the second Person hath the same Essence and Nature with the first, and did from Eternity coexist with him: — When, pleading, I say, for this, (and I plead for no more, when I plead for the coessential Sonship of the second Person!) I could not well avoid saying, That he is, in the most proper Sense, the Son of the Father; because, I conceive, the Phrase, coessential Sonship, does really, and necessarily, imply it. Nor can I help believing, that every Body will say with me, That a coessential Son, is, in the most proper Sense, a Son. — No; will this learned Man and his Followers say, that cannot be. "Between "Generation properly so called," and the Generation of the second Person, there remains no Likeness, "no "not the least." — But, say I, their Ideas " of "Generation properly so called," i. e. of human Generation, are all false. Let them rectify these, and then apply them to the Sonship of the second Person, and they will see, as I have hinted above, that, in all the principal Ideas, they very well agree, as far as the Ideas we have of an infinite, and most pure Spirit, will permit us to carry them. — In fine, We are apt to think, That the Reasons, why the most High, in his infinite Wisdom and Goodness, has chosen to call the first and second Persons in the Trinity, by the Names of Father and Son, is to signify to us, — i. That the Relation of the first Person to the second, is the nearest to, and is best resembled by the
Relation of an own Father, to an own Son, among Men, of any Relation in Nature, except, that between the Virgin and her Son, purely as such. — 2. Because the Father is as properly, a Father, and the Son as properly a Son, as they can be. And consequently,—3. These Words both could and would excite in us, the most familiar, easy, and clear Ideas of this Matter, which he saw necessary for us, and thought meet to excite in us; or that we were capable of, in this present State. — And I cannot help being persuaded, —4. That, if any Thing in the World, within our Reach, or of which we have any Knowledge, could have given us more distinct and adequate Ideas of the Generation of the second Person, or the Manner of it, so as to have strengthened our Faith and Hope in our dear Redeemer, and enflamed our Love to or Delight in him, Our most gracious God and Saviour would have kindly indulged us with it. — This then he thought sufficient: Let us therefore, be content with it, and thankful for it, and careful to improve it, and make the best Use of it; without daring to enquire Why, or How, or break through unto the Lord to gaze, Ex. xix. 21. lest we perish. — Can we, by searching, find out God? Can we find out the Almighty unto Perfection? Job xi. 7.

Before, I conclude this, I must remove some Objections, which, I am well aware, will be made to me, which indeed require an Answer, and will be of Use throughout all that follows.

Obj. 1. Tho' I seem, and with much Zeal too, to oppose the learned Roe, yet, by adopting Per- rauli's Opinion of the Generation of Animals, i.e. "of Generation properly so called," I do, in Effect, fall in with him; and believe (not that the Son of God was, in a proper Sense, begotten of the Father, but) that he coexisted with him from all Eternity; and therefore, is unoriginated, and, ἀνωτέρως i.e. God of him.
himself, as well as he; and consequently, is not, in a proper sense, his Son.

Anf. 1. Tho' I am much inclined to believe Perrault's Notion, of the Generation of Animals, to be true; and to apply his Ideas, to the Generation of the Son of God: I shall not contend so earnestly for my so doing, till I hear how serious and judicious Christians relish it. Nor shall I, till then, ever say any Thing more, against the old Account of the Generation of the Son, but that it gives Occasion to many seemingly strong, but really needless Objections; and does not so well agree, with the true Ideas of human Generation. — 2. When Mr. Perrault's Ideas of Generation properly so called, are applied to the Generation of the Son, they are much, if not exactly the same, as we have heard, with what Roel calls the most orthodox sense of the Words, Son and Generation. Thes. 20. — 3. Had Mr. Roel heard of Perrault's Notion, and consider'd it well, it would, I conceive, have removed all his Difficulties; and saved him the Trouble, of making such a needless stir in the World. — 4. Had he embraced it, he needed not have gone near so far from the common Faith, as he has done: Yea, needed not, in any one Thing, but in the Change of a very few Expressions, which are founded, I conceive, upon palpable Mistakes; and therefore, deserved to be cashtier'd; especially, when it may be done without any Danger, and a very probable Prospect of several desirable Advantages. — 5. His not doing it, has led him to many Things, which seem of much greater Moment, than he was aware of. Such as, — 1. To deny, That there is any Natural Order, among the blessed Three, either of Subsisting, or Working! — 2. To affirm, That whatever Order there is among them, is purely Economical; and therefore, voluntary and arbitrary! — 3. To rob the first Person of all the Prerogatives of a Father, and purely as such; by grant-
ing, That he, who is now called the first Person, or the Father, might have been called the second, or the Son; and consequently, might have been appointed, and sent, to be incarnate, and become obedient unto Death! &c. all which, to me, appear shocking, contrary to the whole Scripture, and what turns all Things upside down! — 4. To give the Son, and as such, an omnimodous Equality with the Father, and as such; which is absolutely inconsistent, with all the Ideas of Father and Son, whether used properly or improperly; and directly contrary to his 10 Thesis, "That the Son, the second Person, was begotten of the Father from Eternity." &c. &c. So that, I answer directly to the Objection, — 5.

Tho' I incline to apply Mr. Perrault's Ideas of the Generation of Men, to the Generation of the Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity: Yet, I do not agree with Mr. Roel, in any one Thing now controverted, if it is not to doubt of, or to deny, the Propriety and Truth of the old Account of the Generation of the Son, which, as all own, is founded on the old Ideas of the Generation of Animals, and which are now, generally, thought to be false. — And This is the only Thing, wherein I differ from the common Language of the Catholic Church. — I say common Language; because, I do not differ, in one Hair's breadth, from the common Faith. For,

1. I firmly believe, That there are Three distinct Persons in the most holy and undivided Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. — 2. That there is a natural, and therefore, necessary and unalterable, Order among them, both of Subsisting and Working. — 3. That the first Person could never have been called, nor acted as, the second; and vice versa. — 4. That the first Person is properly, a Father; and the second properly, a Son. — 5. I reserve all that Preeminence and Precedency that is natural to a Father; and, in a Word, all the Prerogatives of a Fa-
Father, and purely as such, to the first Person: And hence, He might, very naturally, choose, appoint, and commission, his only Son to be the Mediator, &c.—And, 6. I believe there is some Sort of a natural Subordination in the Son; or, That the Son, as such, is some Way naturally Subordinate to the Father, as such: And therefore, That there was a Becomingness in it, that he should be deputed to be the Mediator, &c. and not the Father. — All this I leave with the judicious, serious, impartial Christian, who, I am sure, will acquit me of all affected, unnecessary, or hazardous Innovation.

Obj. 2. You have talk'd so very expressly, and emphatically, of three distinct, and proper, coexistent Persons, that you must surely, for aught we can conceive, make them, or believe them to be, Three distinct Spirits, or Minds, which is neither more nor less, than pure Tritheism. — To this I answer directly,

Ans. What I have said is no more Tritheism, than the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, from the Beginning, is Tritheism. — For, 1. However they express'd themselves, they must have believed them to be three distinct proper Persons; because, they all believed a real Trinity: And, That the Father did really, some Way or other, beget the Son; and that the Son was really, some Way or other, be gotten: That the Father was not the Son, nor the Son the Father, &c. — 2. However they express'd themselves, they must, they did, believe them to have been, from all Eternity, coexistent Persons: Because, they believed, That the Father was always a Father; never without the Son, or Ἰδιός; &c. &c. and that the Son never began to be; or, was without a Beginning, and always a Son, &c. &c. But, if the Father was always a Father, and the Son always a Son; They must have, as such, coexisted from all Eternity. — 3. They all believed, that the blessed Three did
did all subsist in one Divine Nature; or, were coessential; and that the Father and Son are one thing, &c. and therefore, are the one only, the living and true God: But, if they are the one only God, they cannot possibly be three Gods.—4. Our Saviour is express, God is a spirit, John iv. 24. Not two or three spirits: And, I and the Father are one thing, Ch. x. 30. &c. Not two things: And we read, in numberless passages of Scripture, of Jehovah, and Jehovah, and Jehovah, but never of three Jehovah's: And, of God, and God, and God, but never of three Gods.—We therefore believe, 5. That tho' each of them is Jehovah, they are all the one Jehovah; and though every one of them is God, they are all, but the one God.—Thus God, who knows best, and cannot lie, has plainly and expressly revealed himself, all over his Word: And thus we most firmly believe, according to our baptismal covenant; and, by receiving his testimony, have set to our seal, against all the blasphemous Antitrinitarians in the World, that God is true. Jo. iv. 33.

Let it then suffice, in a Word, once for all, to say, That it is essential, and therefore absolutely necessary, to the Divine Nature, to subsist in three distinct persons: And, that it necessarily, tho' not without their wills, subsists in the first person, as a Father; in the second, as a Son; and in the third, as proceeding from them both. Or, if you will, That there are three distinct, and necessarily existing subsistences, or persons, in the Godhead, a proper Father, a proper Son, and a third which properly proceedeth from them both.

Thus far have I now ventured, contrary to my custom, in these mysterious and adorable things! And now, O Lord, to thee do I look. Thou knowest how fearful I am, at all times, to say any thing, on such subjects, without, besides, or beyond, thy word; and to wander from the footsteps of the flock;
Flock: In every Thing I have said amis, O Lord forgive, and prevent its doing any Hurt, to any of thy People; and bless any Thing that may conduce to the Instruction, Excitation, Establishment, or Recovery, of those, who truly fear and love thee, according to the most earnest Desire of thy poor and most unworthy Servant, for the Sake of thine only begotten, the Son of thy Love, and our only Redeemer and Advocate. Amen.

II. We shall now " survey the several Senses, " (which our worthy Author alledges, p. 5.) have " been usually put upon this Phrafe Son of God:" And that, in Consequence of an Endeavour, " to " find the true Idea or Meaning of it in those Texts " wherein the Belief of Chrifi to be the Son of God " is made the great Requisite in Order to Salvation, " and a necessary Ingredient of Christianity." p. 2. This is an awful Thought indeed! enough to make us all look about us.

Of these Texts, he has given us six celebrated ones, p. 3. and 4. which are all, I conceive, clear, full, and home to the Purpose. John iii. 18. Ch. xx. 31. 1 John v. 13. Ch. iv. 15. Ch. ii. 23. and Acts viii. 37. — These we have mentioned already, p. 12. and added to them about twice as many, p. 13. the more to confirm a Point of such vast Importance.

His first Argument proposed " by Way of a " disjunftive Syllogism," begins thus, p. 5. "This " Name, Son of God, hath been supposed to be " given to our Lord Jesus Chrift upon some or all " of these five Accounts, (1.) Because of an Eternal and Unconceivable Generation by the Person " of the Father in the Sameness of the Divine Es- " fence. (2.) Because of the glorious Derivation of " his human Soul from God before the Creation of " the World. (3.) Because of his Incarnation or " coming into this World by an extraordinary Con- " cession, and Birth of a Virgin without an earthly Fa-
Father, by the immediate Operation of God. 
(4.) Because of his Resurrection from the Dead, and high Exaltation. (5.) In order to point out that glorious Person who had in general some sublime and singular Relation to God, and who also was to sustain the Character and Office of the Messiah, the Saviour of the World.

Here, let the impartial Reader diligently consider, and carefully remember, these few Things.

1. The Ambiguity often hinted above. The Question is not, whether this Title, the Son of God, may be, and is actually, given in Scripture, to the Word made Flesh, in his whole complex Person; or, to the Messiah, and as such; which no one of us ever once doubted: — But, Whether it does not originally, and especially if strictly taken, denote the second Person in the most holy Trinity, and purely, as such; or, Whether the second Person, and purely as such, is not indeed the coessential Son of the Father; and might not have had this Title, from all Eternity, antecedently to, or abstracting from, all Consideration of his Mediatorial Undertaking, or Office; which he strenuously denies, and we stedfastly affirm?

2. That if he had invincibly proved, That Christ, the Mediator between God and Man, may be, or is actually, called the Son of God, upon all these four last Accounts, which is, I think, impossible to be done; yet it could never have fully served his Purpose, or opposed the Catholic Doctrine of the Sonship of our Redeemer, except he had also proved, That the second Person in the Trinity, and purely as such, is not, and therefore cannot be called, the coessential Son of the Father; which he has but very feebly attempted, and can never, indeed, be done.

3. Many great and eminent Men, who have most zealously, strenuously, and successfully, contended for the coessential Sonship of the second Person in the
Trinity, have granted, yea and pleaded, That Christ is, or may be called, the Son of God, upon four of these five Accounts. — I shall name but two, and those two of the greatest Lights and Ornaments, the Church of England ever had; (and she has had a great many,) even that universal Scholar, who was indeed a Sort of a Prodigy in Learning, the famous Dr. Isaac Barrow, and the most worthy, and judicious, Bishop Pearson. The former, enquiring into " the Grounds and Respects upon which this Relation of our Saviour to God is built, or the Reasons why he is called the Son of God; tells us there are several expressed or implied in Scripture. * 1. Christ is called the Son of God, in Regard to his temporal Generation, as being in a Manner extraordinary conceived in the Blessed Virgin by the Holy Ghost, Luke i. 35. Gal. iv. 4. — 2. Christ also may be termed the Son of God in Regard to his Resurrection by Divine Efficacy; that being a Kind of Generation, or Introduction into another State of Life immortal. Luke xx. 35, 36. Acts xiii. 32, 33. — Others, says he, are upon this Ground called the Sons of God: — How much more then may he? — 3. Christ is capable of this Title by reason of that high Office, in which by God's special Designation he was inftated. — If ordinary Princes and Judges have been called the Children of the most High: Pf. lxxxii. 6. — With how much greater Truth and Reason may he be called his Son? John x. 35. — 4. Whereas God hath constituted our Saviour Heir of all Things, given him to be Head above all Things to the Church, put all Things under his Feet, given him Power over all Things to the Church, — exalted him to, or at, his Right Hand, — and committed all Judgment to him; well may

he in that Respect be entitled the Son of God; as thereby holding the Rank and Privilege suitable to such a Relation: He being the chief of the Family, and next in Order to the great Paterfamilias of Heaven and Earth. — In these Respects is our Saviour properly, or may be fully denominated the Son of God, with some Peculiarity and Excellency beyond others: But his being with such Emphasis called God's only begotten Son, (denoting an Exclusion of all others from this Relation upon the same Kind of Ground) doth surely import a more excellent Ground thereof, than any of these mentioned," &c. Thus far this great Man, with his usual Sagacity, Judgment, and vast Compass of Thought. On which I obs. 1. His Modesty. "Christ is called the Son of God, may be termed, is capable of this Title, and well may be thus entitled:" His Modesty, I say, in not affirming without what appeared to him sufficient Proof. And, tho' I humbly conceive, that Christ is never actually so called, upon any of these Accounts, yet I can readily agree with him, That he may be so termed, is capable of this Title, &c. — 2. Among all these Senses, there is not a Syllable of our worthy Author's second Account, viz. "That this Title signifies the glorious peculiar Derivation of his human Soul from God the Father, p. 10" Whence I gather, That there was no such Fancy known in his Time; or, that he thought it groundles; and therefore, not worth any Notice. — 3. That none of these, nor altogether, were in his Judgment, inconsistent with the coessential Sonship of Christ.

Of much the same Mind is the other great Man, who gives us the same Reasons, tho' not in the same Order, and, I think, with more Positiveness. 1. "It cannot be denied that Christ is the Son of God, for that Reason, because he was by the Spirit of God born of the Virgin; Luke i. 35. — 2. 'Tis un-
undoubtedly true, That he being designed to so high an Office, (as that of the Messiah,) he must by Vertue thereof be acknowledged the Son of God, Jo. x. 34 — 36. — 3. He must be acknowledged the Son of God, because he is raised by God out of the Earth unto immortal Life. Luke xx. 36. Rom. i. 4. — 4. Christ is, after his Resurrection, made actually Heir of all Things in his Father's House, — from whence he also hath the Title of the Son of God. — But besides these four, says he, we must find yet a more peculiar Ground of our Saviour's Filiation, totally distinct from any which belongs unto the rest of the Sons of God; that he may be clearly and fully acknowledged the only begotten Son. * — From these, the same Observations offer themselves, as from the former. — Suffer me only to add, That, if, by these Expressions, "he must be acknowledged because, or by Vertue thereof," he means, that they are irresistibl Decla

rations, or Evidences, that He, who had assumed our Nature, was, from Eternity, the Son of God, we are agreed.

I need not give any more Quotations, to shew their Opinions: Nor will there be any Occasion for Citations, from the Writings of the Protestant Dissenters, not a few of whom have granted the same. Nor will it be necessary, after the Hints given, to acquaint the Reader, how ready I should be to excuse these lesser Mistakes, in Persons of so very great Eminence, and real Worth: But, because, as I humbly conceive, they are Mistakes, I shall take the Liberty, with all due Deference, to give my Reasons, why I think them so, and, at the same Time, propose what I take to be the Truth. — The first of these will come naturally in, when I consider "the

* Pearson's Expos. of the Creed, Art. 2. p. 105, 106.
five various Accounts, upon which this Name the
Son of God hath been supposed, according to our
Author, to be given to Christ:” The last we shall offer in the Words of the learned Piæte, a Man who had a very clear Head, and solid Judgment.*

Chrift, says he, is not called the Son of God,
either because of his Conception of, or by, the Holy Spirit, or because of his Ordination to the Mediatorial Office, or his Resurrection from the Dead, or because of his Exaltation to the Right Hand of the Father. — These are not the Reasons, for which he is called the Son of God, tho’ from them we may gather that He is the Son of God, whence the Apostle tells us, Rom. i 4. That be was declared to be the Son of God with Power by his Resurrection from the Dead.”

This will, I hope, be clear, if we remember,
1. That the second Person as such, as has been and shall be, by and by, farther proved, is a coessential, or natural, and consequently, an eternal Son. — 2. If so, he was the Son of God, and therefore might have been so called, not only abstractive from all these, but, in the Order of Nature, even before he could be designed for the Mediatorial Office: — But it is not likely, That one who is, and is acknowledged to be, the Son of God by Generation; or his own, proper, or peculiar Son; should be called his Son, on any of these, or any lower Accounts. — 3. He is, for the same Reasons, and upon the same Grounds, called the Son of God, that he is called his only begotten Son: But he could not be called his only begotten Son, upon any of these four Accounts. Er.—He could not be

* Non igitur Christus dicitur Filius, aut propter ejus Concepti-

tem ex Spiritu sancto, aut propter ejus Ordinationem a Munus Mediatorium, aut ejus Suscitations a Mortuus, aut Exaltationem

ad Dextram Patris. — Ha non sunt Rationes, propter quas dicit

us Filius Dei, etsi ex illis Christum suum Filium Dei colligere

called, I say, his only begotten Son, on any of these Accounts: —-- Because, if the Word, begotten, is taken in a proper Sense, 'tis evident, he is a coessential Son; which, at once, demolishes our Author's whole Scheme: If, in an improper or figurative Sense, all true Believers are, in that Sense, said to be born of God, and begotten of God; and then 'tis as evident, He is not, the only begotten. — 4. All those Texts which prove the Son, as such, to be God, (as those evidently do, Jo. x. 30. Heb. i. 8. Col. i. 13 — 17, &c.) invincibly prove him to be a coessential Son; and consequently, not there called his Son, for any such low Reason. — 5. I cannot pass Piétete's chief Argument, from Heb. iii. 3 — 6. where the Apostle, says he, " teaches us that Christ " was the Son of God, as God;" (tho' there, I conceive, he is spoken of in his complex Person, as the Messiah,) " where he faith, that Christ as a Son was " over his own House, ver 6. after he had said, ver. " 3. that he had built the House, and ver. 4. that " he that hath built all Things is God." — And, 6. When I proved at large, p. 127 — 131. that no one, neither in Heaven nor on Earth, is ever, in the Singular Number, called a, or the, Son of God, but our Lord himself; N. B. I should have put the Reader in Mind of his Creed, in which he professes his Faith, in Jesus Christ, the Father's only Son! Whence it is evident, That, in the Western Church, for many Ages past, this has been an Article of their Faith, That God had but one only Son, who being there proposed as the Object of our Faith; and consequently, of our religious Worship, Fear, Obedience, Love, Trust, &c. as well as the Father, is, by Consequence, professed to be his coessential Son, and therefore, God equal with him. This, I conceive, is of some Weight, and therefore, should not be forgotten. N. B. The Eastern Church, instead of his only Son, keep to the Scripture Phrase, his
his only begotten Son, which is very much the same. Proceed we then to his five Accounts.

Those five we have given already, in his own Words. The first, which is the principal, and, in my Opinion, the only true one, he flatly denies, and opposes with all his Might, and by all Means; the three next, he gives better Quarters to; and then fixes upon the last, and pleads strenuously for it. — We, on the contrary, firmly believe the first; doubt of, or deny, the next three; and partly admit the last. We shall therefore, as he has done, dispatch those we oppose; explain that, which we think is, in some Sense, true; and then establish that, which we are, through Grace, to defend. — Begin we then, with his Second, in which he stands alone, or almost so; this new Article of Faith being reserved, for a very late Discovery!

II. Some may suppose the Name Son of God relates to his human Soul, and signifies the glorious peculiar Derivation of it from God the Father before the Creation of the World, and that in this Sense he is called the first-born of every Creature, and the Beginning of the Creation of God. Col. i. 15. and Rev. iii. 14. — that so in all Things he might have the Preeminence. Col. i 18." — p. 10.

This we have had, under our Observation, several Times; and have freely examined, and rejected it. See p. 125, and p. 73 — 77, &c. where I have honestly, and very particularly, exposed that Paragraph "about the Apostles Paul and John," &c. tho' we have as many more Observations upon it in Reserve. But, I cannot here so pass it, and therefore now add. — 1. Some may suppose any Thing; but, Suppositio nil ponit in esse. Supposition is no Proof. But, what "some may suppose in this Paragraph, in the next he is very much inclined to believe," and boldly, at last, affirms, "That the pre-existent Soul of Christ — is properly
"the Son of God, p. 150, &c. &c." — 2. There is not the leaft Syllable of Christ’s human Soul, in any of the Texts cited; no, nor in the whole Epiftle to the Coloflians, nor Book of the Revelation. — Nor, 3. Is there, to the beft of my Remembrance, any the leaft Syllable of the glorious, or peculiar Derivation of it, in all the Bible. — Yea, 4. The Texts quoted, will not, cannot, bear his Sentfe. — He does not deny, yea, he often confefles, That Christ’s human Soul was a Creature, and nothing but a Creature, tho’ the firft and chief of all the Creatures: But the Words, upon which he builds this Fancy, that Christ’s human Soul is properly the Son of God, oblige us to refeft it. — The Son of his Love, Col. i. 13. is ἡγεύτων τὰς ξύσεως, born before all Creatures, ver. 15. and therefore, not created, but born or begotten, before them; and consequently, not a Creature, but a Son, yea, an Eternal Son. To anfwer his Purpofe, it fhould have been πρωτος κτίσεως, as we may learn from the very next Line, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κτίσθη ἡ ἀρχή, for by him were all Things created. — He is begotten or born, they created or made. The Holy Ghoft makes, and keeps up, the Distinction; and the distinct or proper Signification of the Words, and fo ought we. — In the other, Rev. iii. 14. He is ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς ξύσεως τῆς Θεοῦ, the Beginning of the Creation of God. Not the firft Person, or Thing, he made: But He who gave a Beginning, or Being to all Things; or He by whom, and for whom, they were made. Ἡ ἀρχὴ, the Beginning, excludes all Beginning of his own: And therefore, this Divine Title could never belong to his human Soul. — But, 5. Did these Words themselves afford any Ground for the shuffling Interpretation of the Arians, which is much the fame with our Author’s, the Contexts would strongly reftain us from fuch a Dream. Because, in that Paffage, Col. i 13, — 17. it is faid of the Son, all Things were created by him, and for him. And
And he is before all Things, and by him all Things consist. Not a Word of which ever was, or could be, true of his human Soul. And in the Epistles to the Asiatic Churches, he is said to be Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last, he that hath the seven Spirits of God, and the Amen; &c. Titles peculiar to Jehovah, the true God only, and which never could belong to any Creature. --- And, 6. As to his other Text, "Col. i. 18. that so in all Things he might have the Preeminence," it can do him no Manner of Service; no, not the least. For, allowing that these Words respect his human Soul, surely, it may have the Preeminence among, or before, the Members of his Body the Church, of whom only the Apostle speaks in that Verse; as will be manifest to every one that considers it.

After all, "he cannot think this precise Idea is the very Thing designed in those Texts, wherein our Salvation is made to depend upon the Belief of Christ being the Son of God; because, there have been Thousands of Christians, who have been saved, and yet have not entertain'd this Opinion concerning the Soul of Christ, &c. p. 10, 11." Anf. 1. 'Twould have been strange indeed, if they had entertain'd an Opinion, which they had never heard of; p. 10. and which very few Thousands, any where, have heard of, to this Day. --- 2. 'Till he tell us what he means, by the Derivation of his human Soul; and what, by "the glorious peculiar Derivation of it; I cannot see how any one can entertain his Opinion. --- 3. I have proved, That his human Soul, however derived, is not properly the Son of God; and every one must see, that there is not a Syllable of this Soul in any of his Texts. --- But seeing, according to a Hint already given, my present Purpose, is not to pursue this Notion, any further, except when I meet with something which must be removed:
moved: I shall only, en passant, very briefly, offer a few more Thoughts, out of many, sufficient, I humbly conceive, to make all serious Persons beware of it; and excite them to consider it well, before they incline, in the least, to favour or embrace it; and much more, before they undertake to maintain it, or dispute and contend for it. I do not offer them as absolute Certainties, or as invincible Arguments; but rather, that they may be well weighed, before we embrace This Notion: — They are these.

1. This human Soul, according to him, "is a supra-angelical Spirit," and not only more glorious than, but before, all the Angels: And therefore, I humbly conceive, very improperly called a human Soul. The Arians, who call the Logos a supra-angelical Spirit, talk, I cannot but think, more accurately, when they say, That, when this Spirit was made Flesh, Jo. i. 14. it supplied the Place of a human Soul.

2. It seems as great a Solecism, and very unphilosophical, to speak of the actual Existence of a human Soul, so exceeding long, before the Creation of the human Species: Or, before any One Man was made.

3. A supra-angelical Spirit united to a human Body, as our Souls are to our Bodies, would not constitute a true Man; even tho' that Spirit and that Body, were derived from God, in a very peculiar Manner. If this be so, as, I humbly conceive, it is, then these Things, and several others, I sincerely think, will clearly follow. — 1. That, had Christ's human Soul been (pardon the Expression) a supra-angelical Spirit, He could not in all Things, if indeed, strictly speaking, in any one Thing, have been made like unto his Brethren: Heb. ii. 17. Nor could he, perhaps, in Reality, and in a proper Sense, have been their Brother. (2.) He could not himself have suffered, being tempted, either what they suffer, or as they
they suffer. ver. 18. — (3.) He could not have been touched with the feeling of their Infirmities, so as became their great High-Priest: Nor could he have been in all Points, if indeed in any one Point, tempted like as they are. Ch. iv. 15. (4.) He could not have such Compassion upon the Ignorant, and upon them that are out of the Way, as was absolutely necessary for us, in this State of Temptation, Darkness, Sin, and Misery. Ch. v. 2. — In fine, (5.) He could not, in Strictness, have been One of our Species; and consequently, could neither have been our Prophet, Surety, Priest, Sacrifice, Intercessor, Advocate, King, nor Saviour, &c. — I shall offer no more now, on this Head, but refer the kind Reader, if he thinks it worth his while, to the Rescue of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism, p. 63 — 65. and the Answer to Mr. Gibbs's miserable Letter, p. 26 — 36. both of which I acknowledge to be mine; wherein he will find a great deal to this Purpose, which may give him farther Satisfaction, and which will not, in the Opinion of many, be so easily confuted.

4. This Notion of the Pre-existence of a supra-angelical Spirit, which was to be Christ's human Soul, especially, if we take in a great many loose and unguarded Things relating to it, and several offensive Expressions about the Logos, I am heartily sorry to say, looks so very like, differs so very little from, and comes so very near to, the Abomination of Arianism, that it well deserves to be better consider'd by all, who truly love the Doctrine of the Trinity. — The Arians talk, and with a great deal of professed Reverence too, of "the glorious peculiar Derivation" of that supra-angelical Spirit, which they call the "Logos, from the Father before the Creation of the "World:" And Dr. Clarke seems to think, That the Word, begotten, in the present Case, denotes or implies something between necessary Existence, and being
being created! — They will freely grant, I think, That the Logos, which supplied the Place of Christ’s human Soul, is as “near a-kin to God,” (a Phrase of our Author’s,) if the Expression is, in any Sense, tolerable, as any Thing, which is not God, can be. — They ascribe all the great and glorious Things to it, which our Author has done to this human Soul: And I cannot see, how either of them can well add any more, that is conceivable by us; if they, the Arians, do not add true and proper Divinity to the Logos, and be, to Christ’s human Soul. — Briefly, the Arians, I think, will not scruple to grant, That the supra-angelical Spirit, which supplied the Place of Christ’s human Soul, is, in some near and extraordinary Manner, to use some other suspicious Expressions of our worthy Author, “united to God, and has God–head, in some special Way, in or with it, &c.” — How far then does this Notion, with all he has said concerning it, differ from Arianism? I do not say it does not at all differ; because he speaks sometimes of the Logos and this human Soul, as two distinct Persons: But, it had been better, had he kept farther from it. However, That I shall, at this Time, leave to others. I only wish, it had been somewhat more consistent with what he has said of the Deity of the second Person, in his Christian Doctrine of the Trinity.

III. I say therefore, in the Third Place, that this “Title, Son of God, is given to Christ, sometimes upon the Account of his Incarnation and miraculous Birth. Luke i. 31, 32. Thou shalt bring forth a Son, — he shall be called the Son of the Highest. ver. 35. The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, Therefore also that Holy Thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.” — p. 11. This also with the next Paragraph, has been considered already, p. 48, 49. &c. I now only add, 1. This sometimes is only, at most, this once. 2. It does not come up to the Point in Question, as we shall see.
fee presently; and himself owns, a very few Lines after. "This cannot be the chief Meaning of this "Name, — For surely the Belief that the Man "Christ Jesus was begotten of God and born of a Vir-
"gin without an earthly Father was not made the "Term of Salvation; — doth not seem to have any "such special Connection with our Salvation; —— "doubtless many a poor Creature might become a "true Believer in Christ when he was upon Earth, "by the Sight of his Miracles, and hearing his "Doctrine, without the Knowledge of the parti-
"cular Circumstances of his Incarnation or Birth; "and many were converted by the Apostles, with-
"out any Notice of it, —— for we scarce find "any Mention of it in their Preaching or Writings." p. 12, and 13.

Anf. 1. "The Man Christ Jesus," is never, in Scripture, said to have been begotten of God. — 2. He, who was "born of the Virgin," was not only Man, but God-Man; and his Mother was there-
fore, really, θεοτόκος, Dei-paræ, the Mother of him who is God. Acts xx. 28. Rom. ix. 5. 1 Tim. iii. 16, &c. — 3. If Christ was born of a Virgin, it was certainly, "without an earthly Father." — 4. Those Prophecies, The Seed of the Woman shall bruise the Serpent's Head, Gen. iii. 15. and that, If. vii. 14. Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his Name Immanuel, were Prophecies of such Moment, so very emphatic, so generally known among the Jews and believing Proselytes, and so universally understood of the Messiah; that I can hardly help thinking, that the more considerate and intelligent, at least, who really believed him to be the Christ, knew also, very well, that he was to be, and was actually, born of a Virgin. — And therefore, 5. If the bare Nescience of this Doctrine, which is really a Fundamental; (because, had he not been conceived by the Holy Ghost, "without an
an earthly Father," He could not have been holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from Sinners, Heb. vii. 26. absolutely without Blemish, and without Spot; nor could that which was born of the Virgin have been, τὸ ἀκριβῶς, THAT HOLY THING; nor could his blessed Body have been called, as I humbly conceive it is, THINE HOLY ONE; Acts ii. 27.) If, I say, the bare Nescience of this, may be thought not so very criminal: Surely, a Disbelief of it, and willful Opposition to it, must have been inexcusable; and therefore, very dangerous. — But, 6. I cannot see, how any of the believing Gentiles, could have been baptized into his Name, without some Knowledge of this. — And 7. There seems not to have been so much need of frequent mentioning a Thing, so very well known; and, at that Time, not only, no where, contradicted, but most cordially and unanimously believed, without any Hesitation: Not to add, That the Apostles, no Doubt, mention'd it, wherever they saw it necessary. In fine, — 8. Tho' we should allow, that "his Incarnation and miraculous Birth," were Ground sufficient for giving Christ this Title, the Son of God; they could never have been sufficient for calling him, the own, or proper, or the only begotten Son. For, says Dr. Barrow, "the first Adam did also immediately receive his Being from the Power and Inspiration of God; (God formed his Body and breathed his Soul into it;) Isaac, Sampson, John the Baptist had also a Generation extraordinary and miraculous; and Sarah herself received Strength to conceive Seed; Heb. xi. 11. which Productions do not so greatly differ from the Production of Christ as Man." &c. ibid. p. 232. And Bp. Pearson, "Surely the framing Christ out of a Woman cannot so far transcend the making Adam out of the Earth, as to cause so great a Distance as we must believe between the first and second Adam; or to place him in that Singular
Eminence which must be attributed to the only begotten. p. 107." — So that granting what we need not, cannot do, yet the second Person in the Trinity may be, and most certainly is, the coessential Son of the Father. And therefore we might go on, But,

Because Christ's miraculous Conception and Birth are, according to the Socinians, those most malicious Enemies of his Divinity, as well as of his Cross, the chief, if not the only Reason, why this Title, the Son of God, is ascribed to him, we must consider this Matter more particularly, tho' very briefly. Let the Reader then observe,

1. That the Logos was, in the Beginning, with God; and was God. — That all Things were made by him, and that without him was not any Thing made that was made; are the very first Words of the Gospel according to John, a Writer noted for a noble Simplicity of Stile, above all the Writers in the World. — If they are true, 'tis undeniable, That Nothing that was made, was made without him: That therefore, he was the Maker of all Things: And consequently, That himself, as such, was not made: That therefore, he not only existed before any Thing was made; but, by consequence, That he was, from Eternity, a necessarily existing Person: And therefore, God over all, as he is expressly stiled, Rom. ix. 5. — This Divine Person, the Logos, was made Flesh, Jo. i. 14. and his Disciples beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father; ver. 18. and consequently, the Logos and the only begotten are the same Person; or, these two Titles signify the very same Thing. — But this is not all, It was the Father's dear Son, the Son of his Love, i. e. the only begotten, by whom all Things were created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones or Dominions, &c. Col. i. 13 and 16. Yea, it is added, in the clearest, and most emphatic, Words that could be used, All Things were created by him and for him. And he is
BEFORE ALL Things, and by him ALL Things consist. ver. 16, 17. Whence 'tis as clear, as Words can possibly make it, That the Son, as such, was before all Things: That he is the first Cause and last End of all Things: And That, as all Things, from the highest created Spirit, to the most inconsiderable Particle of Matter, were, at first, made by him; so are they, to this Day, sustained and govern'd by him. — And, if this is not enough, the Father's own express and most emphatic Words to, and of him, are more than sufficient, one would think, to confound all the Opposition of Hell. But unto the Son, be, the Father, ver. 5. faith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever; &c. Heb. i. 8. — And, Thou Lord, in the Beginning, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth; which, by the by, was not the least Part of the Work; and the Heavens, the highest as well as the lowest of them, are the Works of thine Hands: They shall perish, but thou remainest, &c. ver. 10 — 12. — From all which, these Things invincibly follow, if the Father himself did not exaggerate prodigiously! That the Son, as such, is God; and therefore, a coessential Son: That, as such, he has a Throne, an everlasting Throne: And, That he was not an Instrument in the Creation of all Things, as the Arians, as ridiculous as blasphemously, speak; but, in the strictest Sense, the Author, Efficient Cause, and Maker, of them all. — He himself laid the Foundation of the Earth! The Heavens, all of them, are the Works of his Hand! — Here are no Prepositions, for his Enemies to quibble about.--- Here is no Room to wriggle about the New Creation, which they dare not say shall perish! — What, more plain, express, or emphatic, Words are, any where in Scripture, used to declare, That the Father himself is the Creator of all Things? Yea, What more clear, and strong Words, and full home to the Point, (especially if we take in with them that Con-
text, Col. i. 13 — 17. and Jo. i. 3, &c.) could have been used to prove, That the Son was, in the truest Sense, the Creator, the first Cause and last End, of all Things that were made? I may defy them all to answer any of these Questions? And therefore, N. B. from these, I draw these invincible Conclusions. 1. Against our worthy Author, That the Son, as Son, is God; and therefore, That he is a coessential Son: That it is the second Person, who is, and is called the Son: And, That these Things could never be said of Christ's human Soul; and consequently, That it is not properly the Son of God, and cannot, with Truth, be so called. — And, 2. That the odious, and accursed Doctrine of Socinus, who shamelessly denied, That our ever blessed Saviour, had any Existence, (but in the Decree, as you, and I, and all Men had,) before his Conception in the Womb of the Virgin, is, (1.) In itself, a mere palpable Delirium. And (2.) In him, One of the most open, and avowed, Contradictions to the whole Word of God, which he pretended to believe, that ever entred into the Heart of Man. — And (3.) In many of his Followers, 'tis not at all strange, That, in this, they have, long ago deserted him, and are really ashamed of him. — May not I then ask, 4. What Regard they owe to this Man's Authority, in other Things? And, Whether they have not great Reason, to doubt every One of his Nostrums? &c. — But,

2. If Christ indeed made all Things, he, most certainly, existed before his Conception; against the odious Blasphemy of Socinus: And, if he was, really, the Son of God, before he laid the Foundation of the Earth; he was, most evidently, a coeternal, coessential, and coequal Son, against the Abomination of Arius. — For, if he was then his Son, he did not cease to be his Son, when he was manifested in the Flesh: Nor did, nor could, his infinite Condescension to become Man, change his pre-existent Nature; or make
make him less the Son of God, than he was. — The Fathers express Words to, and of him, put this out of all possible Doubt. They shall perish, but thou remainest: Heb. i. 11. and ver. 12. καὶ ἐστὶς ὁ ἄνυμος ἐστὶς, Thou art the very self-same He, i.e. always the unchangeable, or the very same from Everlasting to Everlasting. — And therefore, should we grant, that in Luke i. 35. he is called the Son of God, upon the Account of his supernatural Conception, it would be still true, That he is a coessential and coeternal Son; and therefore, a Son, upon an infinitely higher Account. — But, we need not yield this. For,

3. This Text, I humbly conceive, proves no such Thing. — Because, 1. "Were his miraculous Conception and Birth," the Foundation of this Relation; or, the Reason, why he is, and is called, the Son of God; then he should have been, and been called, the Son, (not of the Father, the first Person, but) of the Holy Ghost, the third; which yet he never is. There is, I think, no Mention of the Agency of the Father, in his Conception: But, the Agency, of the Holy Ghost is mentioned, in several very strong, and significant Phrases. The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, &c. Luke i. 35. 'Tis expressly said, That the Virgin was found with Child of the Holy Ghost, Mat. i. 18. And the Angel, in so many Words, told Joseph, That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost, ver. 20. i.e. says that learned and most judicious Annotator, Mr. Samuel Clark, upon this Place, "Proceeds from the powerful Work of the Holy Ghost, (who yet cannot be called the Father of Christ, as Man, because he bestowed a different Nature on him from his own, which is the Part of a Creator, and not of a Begetter.)" — 2. Had this been the Foundation of this near Relation, between God and Him, I am apt to think, that the Words had run, therefore also that holy Thing that shall
shall be born of thee, shall be the Son of God: Whereas they are, shall be called the Son of God, which admit easily, I conceive, of another more natural, and emphatic Sense also, viz. This miraculous Conception shall be the Evidence and Proof, or solemn and public Declaration, That God is now manifested in the Flesh; — That the Father has now sent forth his Son, made of a Woman; Gal. iv. 4. — That thou art the happy Virgin, who shalt conceive, and bear a Son, and shalt call his Name Immanuel; II. vii. 14. — Who, as he really is, the eternal Son of God, so shall he still be called, i.e. owned and acknowledged, notwithstanding his amazing Condescension to empty himself, and take upon him the Form of a Servant, —— and become obedient unto Death, &c. Phil. ii. 6 —— 10. I say Immanuel, or God-Man; because, he that was born of the Virgin, was not Man only, but God and Man in one Person: So that, neither was God changed into Man, nor Man into God; —— nor are there two Christs, one the Son of God, and the other the Son of Man; but the two Natures are personally united, in one Christ —— 3. I am inclined to take this, for the true Sense; because, otherwise, as I hinted above, Christ as Man, had been the Son of the second Person, as well as of the first.— The miraculous Conception of his Body, was really a Creation; But all Things, that ever were made, were made by the Logos: If therefore, this Creation was the Reason why he had this Title, Christ, as Man, was the Son, yea the only begotten, of himself, as the Logos; which seems not a little absurd. — Should it be said, not more so, than that he created his own Body and Soul too. Anf. This is not at all absurd. Yea, upon the Supposition of his assuming our Nature, it was absolutely necessary: Nor could he, I conceive, in Strictness, have been said to have taken upon him the Seed of Abraham, Heb. ii. 16. —— had he not been indeed the Creator. —— But, the Relation of a Crea-
Creature to its Creator, is one Thing, and that of a Son to his Father, is quite another. — In fine, 4.

1 is, perhaps, not only needless, but vain, to seek for any other Foundation of Christ's Sonship, or Reason for his being called the Son of God, but his Eternal Generation. And, I doubt not, the two great Men, I have spoken of with so much Honour, would have thought so, had they ever heard of several Things which I have now to consider.

"IV. Christ may be sometimes called the Son of God, because of his Resurrection from the Dead, and his Exaltation to universal Dominion, by the peculiar Favour and Power of God. In this Sense Christ is said to be begotten of God, &c. Acts xiii. 32, 33" p. 13. But the Question is not, Whether Christ may be so called, because of this or the other Thing; except that Thing be the Foundation, or Ground, of this Relation; or, to use his own Words, p. 15. "except this Title depend upon it:" which he there owns it does not. — However, "'tis certain," says he, p. 14. that the Name Son of God, cannot directly and chiefly signify his Resurrection and future Exaltation in all those Places of the Gospels, where the Belief of it is made the Term of Salvation." And, 'tis certain, say I, that it never did, nor can, either "directly and chiefly," or any other Way, "signify his Resurrection, &c." in any of those Places, or any where else. — Four or five Reasons, he gives for this.

"(1.) Because he is very often called the Son of God, long before his Death, Resurrection, &c." p. 14. True; He is so; and his own, begotten, only begotten Son also: And he most certainly was, what he was called. — (2.) "The Jews were required to believe him to be the Son of God long before his Death and Resurrection. &c. p. 15." No doubt, they were required to believe all that was written of
of him: And all that the Baptist, or himself, had taught concerning him. "Nor did Christ himself "in plain Language openly and publickly preach "his own Death and Resurrection to the Mul-
titudes." *ibid.* — This seems not so consistent with the former Sentence; and is, I conceive, itself a Miftake. See *Jo. ii. 19 — 22. Ch. iii. 14 — 16. Ch. vi. 51 — 56. Ch. vii. 19 and 33. Ch. viii. 28. Ch. x. ver. 11 — 18. Ch. xii. 23 — 36, &c.*

"(3.) The Apostles themselves, who were true "Believers in the Son of God did not know that he "was to die and rise again, &c." p. 15. An aston-
ishing Truth! which yet undeniably proves, "That "this Title the Son of God in those Texts does not "depend upon his Resurrection and Exaltation." &c.

*ibid.* — "(4.) 'Tis abundantly evident from Scrip-
ture that he was the Son of God, before he died "or rose again, because he was only *proclaimed or "declared to be his Son* by his Resurrection and Ex-
lation: The Apostle Paul explains it thus, "*Rom. i. 4.*" p. 15. Very right! And this An-
swer will serve, for a full Reply to all those Texts, which he produces to prove, That Christ has this Title "given him, on Account of his Conception, "Birth, Office, Resurrection, high Exaltation, or "being appointed Heir of all." — The second Person in the Trinity was, as such, the Son of God, his only begotten Son: And therefore, when he took upon him our Nature, he was only, by these, manifested, de-
clared, proved, and proclaimed, to be what he always was. — His Sonship was not founded, or did not de-
pend, upon any, or all of these: But they are the undeniable Proofs, according to the Scriptures, That He, who had, by this miraculous Conception and Birth, become Man, and, (after his offering himself a meritorious Sacrifice for Sin,) rose again from the Dead, &c. was the coessential Son of God, who had, from Eternity, undertaken, and in the Fulness of
Time, was made Flesh, That he might, by being made a Curse for his People, redeem them from the Curse of the Law. Gal. iii. 13. In a Word, this Title does "not directly or chiefly signify any one, " or all, of these:" Nor was it, at first, given him, because of them: But, he was so stiled, because he was indeed the coessential Son of God; and all, and every one, of these were so many convincing Signs, or undeniable Confirmations, of what he called himself; even that he was, notwithstanding his unparallel'd Humiliation, the only begotten of the Father; and, in particular, his Resurrection and Exaltation were such.

I. His Resurrection, which is ascribed, (1.) Sometimes to the Father, Acts ii. 24 and 32, &c. because, in the Economy of Grace, He sustains the Majesty of the Deity, and vindicates the Glory and Honour of it; and is therefore to be considered, as exalting and accepting the Satisfaction given by our Surety; and thereupon, releasing and discharging him, when he had, to the full, answered all Demands upon him. — (2.) Sometimes to the Son himself, Jo. ii. 19 — 22. Ch. x. 18, &c. because, whatever he undertook, he was to do of himself, and by his own Power; and whatever he purchased, was to be the Purchase of his own infinitely meritorious Obedience even unto the Death of the Cross: — And because, by his Resurrection, he was, in an especial Manner, to display and confirm his Divinity, &c. &c. — And, (3.) Sometimes to the Holy Ghost, Rom. iii. 11. 1 Pet. ii. 18, &c. not only, because all the blessed Three concur in every Work, as we have heard, without themselves, or relating to the Creatures; but, because the Holy Ghost was given to Christ, as the Head of the Church, (though, not by Measure, Jo. iii. 34.) that, by him, Christ, as Man, might cast out Devils, Mat. xii. 28. and consequently, might do all his wonderful Works;
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and to teach, and assure Believers, That he, who could, and did, raise up the Head, could, and would also, raise up the Members! — Now, in, and by, his Resurrection from the Dead, The Three that bear Witness in Heaven did, in the most glorious Manner, declare and proclaim his coessential Sonship. — The Father had, as we have heard, attested it by the Prophets, and several Times, immediately, by a Voice from Heaven: But, in raising him again from the Dead, he did it, in a yet more public and uncontestable Manner. — The Son had often ascribed this Honour to himself, proclaiming himself the Son, the only begotten of the Father; and avowing himself to be so his Son, as that he doth whatsoever Thing the Father doth, Jo. v. 17—19. and that he is one with him, Jo. x. 30, &c. But, his Resurrection was the highest possible Proof, that he could possibly give, or that could possibly be given, that he really was so; and that he raised himself also, as he said he could, and would. — And the Holy Ghost would never, by raising him again, have set his Seal to a Lie, to convince the World, That all that Christ had said was Truth; and consequently, that he was so the Son, as to be One with him, &c. had he not indeed been so. — For, his Resurrection put the Truth of all that he had ever taught, promised, threatened, or said, out of all Doubt.

2. His Exaltation to universal Dominion, was another invincible Evidence of his coessential Sonship; and that, many Ways. — 1. As it, unexceptionably, confirmed his Veracity, who so often foretold his own Resurrection and Advancement to it; and, even then, when he could say, I am a Worm, and no Man, Pf. xxii. 6. and ver. 27 — 31, &c. --- 2. As it was a most glorious recognizing his natural Right as an own Son, yea an only begotten; after he had so emptied himself, as to become obedient unto Death; when it was very hard to believe, That the greatest Sufferer that ever was,
was, was even then, when assaulted by all the Powers of Darkness! insulted and, most spitefully and cruelly, abused, by all Sorts of Men upon the Earth! deserted, yea, and bruised by the Father! was, I say, indeed, his only begotten Son. — 3. As it so conspicuously manifested his Qualifications for that Dominion. For, surely, the most High would not have exalted any one so far, as to give him all Power in Heaven and on Earth, Mat. xxviii. 18. &c. who had not Wisdom and Prudence, Patience and Goodness, &c. to fit him for such superlative Honour; which no mere Creature, how great and glorious soever, ever had or could have. — 4. As it is therefore, a visible and continued Demonstration, That he was a Divine Person, and equal with God, and consequently, a coessential Son; no one, who was not equal with him, being capable of such Authority, Power and Glory. — Whence I gather, That as this does not originally signify, so neither is Christ called, the Son of God, on the Account "of his Exaltation to universal Dominion:" But, That this Dominion actually presupposes his coessential Sonship, necessarily requiring Divine Perfections in him who can execute it. — I should conclude this, but that I cannot pass these Words, That "Christ's Exaltation to universal Dominion is by the peculiar Favour and Power of God." A strange Expression!

I shall not ask several Things, which might be ask'd: But, taking it for granted, that there is little need of Favour, except where there is no other good and lawful Claim; I must observe, 1. We have already put it out of all Doubt, if God's own express Words can put any Thing out of all Doubt, That the Son, as the Son, is God; and, as such, has a Throne: Heb. i. 8. That, in the Beginning, he laid the Foundation of the Earth; and that the Heavens are the Works of his Hands: ver. 10. That all Things
in Heaven, and in Earth, were created by him and for him: Col. i. 13 and 16. And, that he is before all things, and that by him all things consist. ver. 17, &c. &c. — 'Tis therefore undeniable, That "the universal Dominion" over them all, is his, by Nature; by all Right; and therefore, necessarily: For, surely, he hath the supreme Dominion over all the Works of his Hands. — And therefore, 'tis certain, 'tis infallibly true, That, as the Son, he has not this Dominion, by "the peculiar Favour of God." --- 2. The Exaltation of the Son, when made Man, or of the Mediator, and as such, was not by mere Favour, if at all by Favour. For, Whatever there was, in his Exaltation to this Dominion, more than his natural, and therefore unalterable Right, was necessary to answer the glorious Ends of his Mediation; and, for that Reason, was promised him, in the Covenant of Redemption, H. lii. 12 -- 14. Ch. liii. 9 -- 12. &c. &c. upon Condition of his bearing the Iniquities of his People, and making his Soul an Offering for Sin, &c. — When therefore, he had to the utmost, fulfilled all his Engagements, and by his own Power, he had a Claim and Right, in Equity and Justice too, a dear bought Right! to all that was promised him. --- But this is not all, for, 3. By his Obedience unto the Death of the Cross, he, in the strictest Sense, merited his Exaltation, in all the Steps of it; so that it became to him, in his whole complex Person, in Strictness, a just Reward, and no more. --- He merited his Resurrection, Heb. xii. 13 — 20. &c. --- His Exaltation to the highest Authority, Dominion, and Power, Phil. ii. 6 -- 11, &c. — His being glorified with the Father, with the Glory he had with him, before the World was, Jo. xvii. 4, 5. — His sitting down with the Father on his Throne, Rev. iii. 21. &c. — and His being ordained of God to be the Judge of the Quick and the Dead, Acts x. 38 — 43. Jo. v. 27, &c.
\&c. And therefore, to talk " of his Exaltation by " Favour," be it ever so peculiar, seems to me to detract prodigiously from his Merit! Yea, the more peculiar the Favour was, the Merit will, perhaps, be thought the less. — But now, 4. Had Christ's human Soul been properly the Son of God, even supposing it to be as great as it could possibly be, 'tis self-evident, (1.) That it was never, could never be, called God, by the Father. (2.) That it never laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c. (3.) That all Things were not created by it, and for it. (4.) That by it all Things do not consist. And, (5.) 'Tis capable of the clearest Proof, That it could never, by all it could possibly do, have, in the strictest Justice, merited its own Resurrection and Exaltation to this Dominion, and much less the Resurrection and Glorification of all Believers: And consequently, these Scripture Passages could never, with Truth, have been spoken of it, as such. — To conclude this, 5. Tho' Christ was raised from the Dead, by " the " Power of God," in the Sense, and for the Reasons, already hinted; yet, As no Man could take his Life from him, without, or against, his own most free and generous Consent, which was the principal Thing required of, and accepted in, the Offerer of a Sacrifice: And, as he had Power to lay it down of himself, i. e. as his own Act and Deed; (for, so much, his own most observable Words, ἄλλ' ἵνα τιθημι, ἀ'ωτιν ἀ' η' ἑπαυτή, most emphatically declare,) so he had Power, to take it up again. Jo. x. 17, 18. — But, such a Power being equivalent to a creating, i. e. an infinite Power, his human Soul, which was its self but a Creature, neither ever had, nor possibly could have: And consequently, 'tis Demonstration, That it never was, never could be, dignified with this most glorious Title, the only begotten Son of God, because, or upon the Account, of any such Power, without
without which he neither was, nor could have been, "exalted to universal Dominion."

"V. The last Sense in which Christ is called the "Son of God, is to signify that glorious Person who "was appointed to be the Messiah, the anointed Sa-
vior who was derived from God, and did bear "some very near and extraordinary Relation to God "above all other Persons; and therefore he is called "his Son, his own Son, his only begotten Son, his be-
"loved Son. — And this he takes to be the true I-
dea of it, as it is generally used in the New Tes-
tament, and especially in those Scriptures where "the Belief and Profession of it is made necessary to "the Salvation of Men." p. 16.

This we had before, and considered it very par-
ticularly, and half a Dozen Paragraphs more, where-
in he tries to explain, and prove it. p. 34 — 49. Nothing then, is here necessary, but to offer a few Observations, desiring the Reader to keep them constantly, in his Mind, throughout. And

1. Since the Relation of a Father to a Son is the nearest of all natural Relations, I refer it to every one to say, Whether he would not have thought, That One, who bears so very near and extra-
ordinary a Relation to God," as to be "near a-kin "to him," p. 26. and called, God's own, his be-
gotten, yea only begotten Son, was not indeed a coe-
fential Son? Or, whether any but a coessential Son, could have been so called, with either Truth or Pri-
erty? But,

2. Since he says, "he has made it appear, That "the Name, Son of God, cannot necessarily imply "his Divine Nature; &c. p. 63." &c. and is ex-
press, "That this is his present Theme, to prove "that this Name, in the New Testament, does not "generally (if ever) signify his divine Nature; &c. "p. 45" &c. and therefore, every where denies, "that Christ is a coessential Son," yea, seems to plead,
plead. That "God has not, yea cannot have, a coe-
'sential Son;" p. 36—38. & passim. And since
he is plain, "The pre-existent Soul of Christ in
whom the Divine Nature or Godhead always
dwelt, is properly the Son of God, derived from
the Father before all Worlds, as his only begotten
Son; p. 150, &c." — Since, I say, he is, in all
these, plain and clear, These Things will undeniably
follow. — That, in his Opinion, this Title, Son of
God, is never the Title of the second Person in the
Trinity, and as such: — That it does not, yea cannot,
necessarily imply Christ's Divine Nature: — That
therefore, our Author does not imply his Divine
Nature in it: — That consequently, when he gives
Christ that Name, he means only his pre-existent
Soul, or that Soul incarnate: — That that Soul was
a glorious Person, before all Worlds: — That it was
appointed to be the Messiah, or Saviour of Men: —
That it was to have a Body prepared for it, for the
full Execution of that extraordinary Office: — And,
That when it was united to that Body, it was still, or
that Soul and Body now united, became, a glorious
Person. — But, 3. Christ's human Soul, how glorious
soever it is, was never a Person; neither before its
Union with his Body, nor after it: — And much less
was his Body, (or in our Author's Words, his Flesh,) ever a Person, tho' he will have it, "That it was
formed or begotten by the Father, in so peculiar a
Manner, as no other Man ever was." p. 12. For,
If either, or both, of these ever were, or now
are, a Person; since 'tis granted by our Author,
that the second Person in the Trinity, who, as such,
is unchangeable, was united to this Person, it will
evidently and necessarily follow, either, That one of
these Persons did, upon this Union, cease to be a
Person; or, That they were, one Way or another,
in or by it, confounded or blended together into one
Person: Or, That there are two Persons in the
E e Messiah;
Messiah; and therefore, two Christ's: Or, That neither of these Persons either were, are, or could be, the Christ. One of these, 'tis plain, must follow.

As for the first, Nothing, some think, can be more absurd than to imagine, That a true, or proper Person, continuing to exist, should ever cease to be a Person: Because, if it ceases to be a Person, it not only ceases to be what it was; but, in their Opinion, ceases to be. — The second, That these Two Persons, and consequently, their Two Natures, were, in, by, or upon, this Union, some Way or other, confounded or blended together, into one Person; is either the very Heresy of Eutyches, (condemned in the famous General Council of Chalcedon, the most numerous and one of the most considerable, the Christian Church ever saw) or very much so; and is pregnant with numberless Absurdities; contrary to the whole Scripture; Luke xxii. 42. Jo. i. 14 — 18. Rom. i. 3. 4. Phil. ii. 6, 7. Heb. ix. 14, &c. and really eververse of our Salvation. — The third, That there are Two Persons in Christ, and consequently, two Christs, is the very Heresy of old imputed to Nestorius, and condemned by the third General Council; is contrary to the whole Scripture; If. ix. 6, 7. Acts xx. 28. Rom. iii. 4. Ch. ix. 5. Gal. iv. 4. &c. and destructive also of our Salvation. — The 4. That neither of these is, was, or could be, the Christ; as is plain from this, That the Christ was to be God-Man; This also, I say, is directly contrary to the whole Scripture, and absolutely eververse of our Religion. — One, or other, of these must follow from this Nostrum. His Disciples may chuse which: For it is hard to say which, of the last three, is the most ridiculous and ruinous. — But to go on,

2. As Christ's human Soul was never a Person, neither before, nor after, its Union with his Body; 'tis self-evident, it could never "be appointed to be "the Messiah, the anointed Saviour." Because, nothing,
thing, that is not a Person, can be an Agent, or, in a strict Sense, do any Thing at all; and much less, execute any Office; and yet much less, such an Office! — I may, I conceive, add 3. If it was not a Person, it could neither, with any Truth, or Properity, be called a Son, an own Son, &c. — 4. Supposing his human Soul, had been a Person, it could never have been "appointed to be the Messiah:" Because, how glorious soever it was, it was never capable, nor could be made capable, of that Dignity, as being no Way, Par Negotio, equal to the Task, as our Author himself has owned. --- 5. How nearly soever this Soul was related to the Father, the second and third Persons in the Trinity, were, in an infinite Manner, more nearly related to him. --- In fine, 6. It was the second Person in the Trinity, and not his human Soul, that agreed, in the Covenant of Redemption, to become our Surety and Saviour; and for that Purpose, to become our near Kinsman, &c. For,

The Son that was given to be the Saviour, was to be called the Mighty God, If. ix. 6. as his human Soul could never be: --- 'Twas the Logos, who was made Flesh, Jo. i. 14. and who is called the only begotten Son, &c. ver. 18. and not a Creature: --- 'Twas God, i.e. the Son, as is evident, who was manifested in the Flesh; 1 Tim. iii. 16. and not Christ's human Soul: --- 'Twas God, (ο Θεος, with an Article,) i.e. the Son of God, who purchased the Church with his own, proper Blood, Acts xx. 28. and no created Person: &c. &c. --- 'Twas, I say, the second Person in the Trinity, who is acknowledged, (Christ. Doct. of the Trinity, Prop. 14. & passim) to be true God, tho' a distinct personal Agent, or distinct Person from the Father, who undertook to redeem his People. --- Well then, If he is true God, he is from Eternity so: — If a distinct personal Agent, he needed nothing "to strengthen his Personality," to use an Expression, tho' almost unintelligible, well
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known.
known to our Author: — This Divine Person, is, as such, in many Passages, stiled the Son, the own Son, &c. of God: — 'Tis as the Son of God, that he is, and is called, God; this being the Title, whereby he is distinguished from God the Father: —Ever since he emptied himself, and took upon him the Form of a Servant, &c. He is both God and Man, in one Person, as the Scriptures now quoted, and many others, put out all Doubt: — And this ever-blessed Person, God-Man, is commonly known by the Title, Christ, or the Christ: And hence, 'tis plain, That, when we speak of the Christ, we mean that glorious Person, who is God-Man, the Messiah. From all which, I here offer these Demonstrations, against our Author's principal Nostrums.

This Title, the Son of God, says he, "signifies that glorious Person who was appointed to be the Messiah: — Christ's human Soul, and as such, say I, neither ever was, now is, nor ever shall be, a Person: —Therefore, this Title, the Son of God, neither ever did, does, nor shall, signify Christ's human Soul, and as such. Q. E. D. Or, if you will, Christ's human Soul, as such, is not properly, the Son of God.

This Title, The Son of God, says he, signifies that glorious Person, who was appointed to be the Messiah: — The second Person in the Trinity, say I, and he only, and as such, was that glorious Person who was appointed to be the Messiah: — I therefore, the second Person in the Trinity, and he only, and as such, is, strictly speaking, the Son of God; or, 'tis he only, who is honoured with this Title. Q. E. D.

This Title, The Son of God, signifies, says he, that glorious Person who was appointed to be the Messiah: — That glorious Person, say I, when appointed to be the Messiah, had the Divine Nature, and no other Nature, but the Divine: — Therefore, if this Title presupposes, implies, or signifies any Nature; it
it always, every where, and necessarily, "even in " the New Testament," pre-supposes, implies, or signifies, the Divine Nature. Q. E. D.

When this glorious Person emptied himself, and took upon him the Form of a Servant, &c. he did not, could not, cease to be the Son of God: And therefore, this Title neither did, nor could, lose its strict, primary, and only proper Signification: And by Consequence, This Title, every where, pre-supposes, implies, or signifies, his Divine Nature, or coëssential Sonship. Q. E. D.

Several more might be offered, but these may suffice at present, since some others must come up in another Place. — Were our worthy Author alive, I should freely alledge what, as I oftener than once hinted to him, I supposed was, at Bottom, his main Design, —— which can never succeed, without the Art of reconciling a great Bundle of manifest Contradictions, to say no worse. —— But,

Having thus dispatched these four Senses of this Title, we return to his first, which we have p. 6.

"The first of these Senses is patronized by many " Writers," Yes, by the whole Body of the Catholic Church, from the Beginning to this Day! tho' " he is persuaded this can never be the Sense of " this Name in these several Texts before cited!"

ibid. "viz. That an eternal unconceivable Generation " of the Person of the Son by the Person of the Father " in the Sameeness of the Divine Essence, consubstantial, " coequal and coeternal with the Father, is included " in the Name Son of God." p. 6.

Had our worthy Author pleased, he might have expressly'd our Minds briefly, in the Words of the Nicene Creed, which are familiar, and clearly give our Sense, viz. That the Son, even the second Person, " is God of God, very God of very God, be- " gotten, not made, being of One Substance with " the Father, &c." or in those Expressions, " He " is his eternal, and coëssential Son," which are com-
mon and easily understood: But this Definition, Description, or I do not know what to call it, (to the best of my Remembrance, having never read, or heard, it before,) is so very Scholastic, as to be hardly intelligible! — However, to avoid trifling, seeing what, I suppose, he means by it, has been the Faith of the Christian Church, in all Ages: Let us try to bring it down, to the Capacity of the weak and unlearned, in these few Propositions.

One, viz. the first, of the blessed Three, is, in many Passages of Scripture, called a Father, a proper Father; and said to have begotten another, who is, as often, styled a Son, his own or proper, yea only begotten Son: They are therefore, both of them Persons; and the first a proper Father, and the second, a proper Son. — If the Son was begotten, or was a Son, before the Foundation of the World, &c. as we are sure he was; Col. i. 13 — 17. Heb. i. 8 — 12. &c. then was this Generation, in Scripture Language, "eternal," or from Everlasting. — If the Manner of this Generation, is infinitely above us, and but very generally revealed, as we know it is; Pro. xxx. 4. Is. ix. 6. &c. then is it to us, almost "unconceivable."

— If the Father begat, and the Son was begotten, as we are sure from many Passages; Ps. ii. 7. Jo. i. 18. &c. then was "this a Generation of the Person of the Son, by the Person of the Father."— If the Divine Nature is immense; and if the Father is in the Son, and the Son in him, as Christ assures us, Jo. x. 38. Ch. xiv. 10, 11, &c. then is this "Generation in the Sameness of the Divine Essence." — If the Father is a proper Father, and the Son a proper Son, as we have super-abundantly proved; then it is self-evident, That the Father and Son are coessential; or, that "this Generation is consubstantial." — If "this Generation was consubstantial;" or, if the Son have the same Nature with the Father, he is "equal with him," as to his Essence: Because, as the Divine Essence is indivisible, to the Divine Perfections.
fetions go with it, and can neither be seperated, nor divided, from it nor themselves. — If the Father was never ἀλλόγος, or without a Son; and if the Son never began to be, or always was a Son; then it is undeniable, That "this Generation was coeternal." —

All this now may be easily assented to, as a Matter of Fact, not only by the unlearned, but by those of very ordinary Capacities. And all this, I humbly conceive, I understand; and so may they, sufficiently for their Direction, in all the Acts of Faith, Worship, Obedience, and Love, which we owe to the Eternal Father, and to his coeternal, and consequently, coessential Son. And this is enough, for us to know, of this adorable Mystery, in our present State.

All we plead, in the Controversy before us, is only, That the second Person is indeed, and as such, what he is so often in Scripture, said to be, even the own, the only begotten Son of the Father; and, That the human Soul of our dear Redeemer, is not, properly, the Son of God, nor is ever so called. — The former of these, tho' very frequently revealed in the Bible, and as expressly, clearly, and fully too, as any Thing can well be, he very confidently denies; but the latter, tho' no where revealed, so far as I can find, he positively afferts: And, to introduce and confirm this, it was, as I am apt to think, that he so resolutely, rejects and opposes that. Scholastic Niceties, in this Case, I desire to have nothing to do with. — That Things are so, as all alledge; or, that the Matter of Fact is so; the Scriptures have made undeniable; for he that believeth not God hath made him a Liar, because he believeth not the Record that God gave of his Son. 1 John v. 10. The Modus, or the How, we acknowledge is above us; and, being but generally revealed, cannot be comprehended by us: Yea, cannot be comprehended by any, but themselves Two, and Him who searches all Things, yea, the deep Things of God. 1 Cor. ii. 10. — When

Doctrines
Doctrines are only revealed in general, in Part, or darkly, general, imperfect, or obscure Ideas, are sufficient: And no other are required of us, or expected from us. — There always were, and will be, yea, must be, manifold Imperfections and great Insufficiency, in all our Ideas of Things so sublime and abstruse; and especially of that unsearchable, incomprehensible Being we call God, his Essence, Perfections, Decrees, and the ever-blessed Persons in the Godhead, &c. were the Revelation of them, inconceivably, more particular, clear, and full, than it is. — Let us not, however, deny or reject what we know, because we cannot know all Things: Or, doubt of what is certain, because we meet with many Things which are not so. — But to proceed, Against this Sense of the Title, Son of God, our Author offers three Reasons,

1. If this be never so true, yet it is confess'd to be unconceivable.” Not in itself: And not absolutely so, or altogether so, even to us. That it is, we may, we do, conceive; tho' how it is, we well cannot. “Now, if it be so very unconceivable, so mysterious and sublime a Doctrine,” It is not more so, than several which himself did, and all Christians do, believe; and which even the Light of Nature teaches! “then I do not think the gracious God would put such a difficult Test upon the Faith of young Disciples, poor illiterate Men and Women, “in the very Beginning of the Gospel, and exclude them from Heaven for not believing it.” p. 6. A strange Reason indeed, as ever was! You have every Syllable of it. To which I might answer,

1. As I have given, and incline to believe, another Account of human Generation, upon which this, so far as I can understand it, seems to be founded; I might say, That this is not, perhaps, the Scriptural Sense of this Title; and therefore, I need not defend it; But, because the Catholic Church seem to
to have taken it, for the primary, the true, if not
the only Sense, we shall try to support it. — 2. I
might plead, That this Doctrine is neither so "un-
"conceivable, nor so mysterious and sublime," as
that we can have no Ideas of it at all; or, as we can-
ot give a rational Assent to it. — 3. I might al-
ledge, That these Words, "then I do not think,"
are neither Reason nor Proof. — 4. I might, per-
haps, boldly affert, That this very same Text, was,
from the Beginning, put upon all Disciples; the
Young as well as the Old; the unlearned, as well as
the learned; &c. as seems undeniable, from the Form of
Baptism. — And, 5. I might, without Fear, say,
That many, of the poor and illiterate, have truer
Ideas of these Mysteries, than the great, and the
learned. — The poor and the illiterate, who are evan-
gelized by the Gospel, have generally so much Mo-
desty, as to think the most High is wiser than them-
selves; and so much Faith, as to believe, He will
not deceive them. — They therefore, humbly take
Things, as they find them in their Bibles; come to
the Word, for Instruction, and receive it with Meek-
ness; dare not dispute, nor ask Why, nor How, when
they cannot meet with any Answer in the Scriptures; are
not distracted with Heretical Cavils, or Philosophical
Quirks, &c. and seldom so far puff'd up, as to
swell themselves, and dream, that they know more
than all the World ever did, &c. as many of the great,
and the learned, or those who think themselves so,
alas! too often are! — One of the Fathers, used
wittily to speak of a learned Ignorance, which con-
stitls in a being willing to be ignorant of what is in-
finitely above us, and of what God has concealed from
us: Or of what we can never know, or would do
us no real Service, if we could. — Happy are they,
upon more Accounts than One, who are so learnedly
ignorant! But, to wave these, and some others, at

pre-
I shall answer, in another Manner, by some Interrogations only. — And, what does he mean by "unconceivable?" — Is it, that we can have no Conceptions of it at all? This I absolutely deny, and appeal to the Propositions, into which I have thrown this Sense. — Is it, that we can have no clear and distinct Ideas of it? And, May we not have as clear and distinct Ideas of this Sense, even as he has given it; yea, much more clear and distinct than any Man can have, of several Things himself has offered upon this Subject, in the Christian Doctrine, &c. Propof. 9, 10, 11, &c. p. 100 — 134. if compared with these Papers? &c. I appeal to all the Admirers our Author has in the World. Had he been alive, I should have produced more, than one or two. — Is it, that we cannot conceive the Modus of it? Pray, how few Things are there, of which we can conceive, the Manner? — Is it, that we can have no adequate, and comprehensive, Ideas of it? And can we have any such Ideas, of any of the Divine Perfections, &c. I had almost said, of any Thing else? — 2. What is this, That is "unconceivable and so mysterious," &c? Is it the Doctrine of the Trinity? No. This he has confess'd, tho' in every Respect, as "unconceivable, "able, as mysterious and sublime," as the Point in Debate, ever was, or can be pretended to be: Yea, tho' that Doctrine, in the Judgment of the Catholic Church, cannot be believed, or professed, without professing also the coessential Sonship of the second Person. — Nor could he, nor can any Christian now, deny, That "this Doctrine was put as a Test," (I dare not say difficult Test! because, it ill becomes us so much as even to surmise, That it is a difficult Test, to believe the Truth of whatever God has revealed as a Matter of Faith;) "upon the Faith of young Disciples, poor illiterate Men and Women, in the very Beginning of the Gospel," &c. (I mean, ever since
(since the Ascension of Christ,) even upon all the Gentiles, that were converted to the Faith; and that, if not before, yet when, they were baptized. — We all know who, and of what Spirit, they were, who said, This is an hard Saying, Who can hear it? Jo. vi. 60. — 3. What then is this difficult Test? Is it, That the first Person is an own, or proper Father, who begat the Son; and, that the Son is an own, or proper Son; yea, his only begotten; and therefore, "consubstantial, coequal, and coeternal with the Father?" Why! Be it ever so difficult, Christ did, again and again, as we have heard, assert and proclaim it, in express Terms, or in Words fully equivalent; and that, in the strongest Manner: — The Disciples, over and over, professed it; Jo. vi. 69. Mat. xvi. 16. yea, and were sure of it: — Martha knew and believed it, Jo. xi. 27. and so did Nathanael, Ch. i. 49: — And the Apostles, every where, preached it. Rom. viii. 32. Gal. iv. 4. Heb. i. 8 — 12. Ch. iii. 3 — 6, &c: — Yea, this, as we shall see, was the Doctrine of the Prophets; and was also, generally, believed and acknowledged by the Jews, both before his coming into the World, and when he was in it, as our Author seems fully to own; p. 73, 74, &c: — And has been, as all the World know, the constant Faith of the Catholic Church, every where, and in all Ages, ever since. — So that, "This was not such a difficult Test," but that it was "put upon the young Disciples, &c. p. 6." and the "poor and the ignorant, the labouring Men and "the Children;" p. 7. and was received, without any Demur, by all true Believers; and openly professed also, by them all, without any Hesitation. —— I myself have often heard such People publickly professed, That the second Person was the eternal Son of God, his only begotten, &c. and that he became Man, by taking to himself a true Body and a reasonable Soul, &c. and talk much more like our Lord and his Apo-
files, than the great and the learned. — And, till of late, this Doctrine was, with much Diligence and Zeal, instilled into the tender Minds of all the Children of Protestant Dissenters. — And, 4. Was this Doctrine, of the coessential Sonship of the second Person, yea, or the Manner of it, more unconceivable, than some, if not every One, of the Attributes of God, which the very Light of Nature teaches, and confirms? --- Or, the Doctrine of the Creation of the World, and all Things in it, visible and invisible, &c. out of Nothing, which Reason even forceth us to admit? --- Or, the Resurrection of the Body, without the Belief of which, no Man can with Truth be, or be called, a Christian? 

1 Cor. xv. 12 --- 22. and ver. 42 --- 44. &c. --- Yea, I think I may add, or many of the Miracles recorded both in the Old and New Testament, which every one, who professes to believe his Bible, will blush to say he doubts of? I, for my Part, as firmly believe, That those Miracles were wrought, where, when, by whose immediate Agency, or by whose Ministry, we are told they were, as if I had been present, and seen them with my Eyes. — And, as to some of them, I do not know, but, I have almost as clear and distinct Ideas of them, as if I had seen them, and had had also Opportunity and Leisure to have considered, and examined, them with the greatest Care. — And, I may, I think, well venture to say, That, when any one of the Enemies of the coessential Sonship of Christ, shall give me clear, distinct, direct, and satisfying Answers, to all the Questions which have, or may be, ask'd ; (for Example, concerning the very first in the Old Testament, even Moses's Rod being turned into a Serpent, &c. Ex. iv. 1 — 4. and the very first in the New, viz. Christ's turning Water into Wine; Jo. ii. 1 --- 11.) I may then promise, to give them clear, distinct, direct, and satisfying Answers, to all they shall ask me, concerning the coessential Sonship of the
the second Person; not to add the Doctrine of the Trinity also! — These great and Fundamental Doctrines, of our Religion, (if they are indeed two, and not rather one only,) are revealed in Scripture, as Matters of Fact; and professed, in Baptism, as absolutely necessary to be believed; and as being also of the very last Importance, for regulating the whole of our Worship and Practice: And not, as he alleges, as "mere arbitrary and unoperative Speculations;" p. 3. which are therefore, of very little or no Moment; and which may be, in his Opinion, entertained, or rejected, with very little, or not very much, either Profit or Danger! And therefore, they ought to be believed, professed, and maintained, at least, as readily, and firmly, and constantly, as the Truth of the Miracles; which are recorded, not as Problems to be lightly talk'd over, canvass'd, and bandied about, on every Occasion; &c. but, as plain, and unquestionable, Histories of those Works of Wonder; and the highest possible Proofs also, of the Divine Commission of every one of those by whom they were wrought. — Blessed be his Name, I never found any Difficulty, in believing what God said. — Having all the Assurance, which intrinsic and extrinsic Evidence can give me, That, All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, 2 Tim. iii. 16. 2 Pet. i. 21, &c. I can as readily, as stedfastly, and with as much Rational Security too, be persuaded of the Truth, of the Things therein revealed; (tho' I do not pretend to answer every Thing, which may be proposed concerning them;) as I can be of the Things I now see, or that I am now writing. — Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed. Jo. xx. 29.

2. Nor indeed is this eternal Generation and "consubstantial Sonship clearly enough revealed in Scripture for us to make it a fundamental Article in any Age, and to damn all who do not receive it." p. 6. Anf. 1. Those very Words, and in this Order, are not indeed, any where, literally, found in Scrip-
Scripture: But the Thing we mean by them; or the proper, and therefore, essential Sovereign of the second Person is, as we have heard, (in several Places, and particularly, p. 135 — 140. & passim,) as plainly, fully, and strongly, revealed, in many Passages, as it can be. — And the Men, who can think to evade these, may, as easily, pervert any Words, which can be possibly chosen. If they think otherwise, let them tell us what Words would convince them. — 2. Whether the Doctrine we plead for, be a fundamental Article, or not; if it be a Truth, and much more a Truth, of considerable Moment, as it certainly is, if it be a Truth; it ought not to be denied, and much less opposed. — 3. It is so nearly connected with, if it is not indeed founded upon, the Doctrine of the Trinity; that, if the Opposition to it is not an Error contra, it is certainly one, circa Fundamentum. — 4. What was not a fundamental Article, at least, ever since the Canon of Scripture was closed and sealed up, neither ever was, nor could be made so, in any succeeding Age. — 5. We never pretended to make any Doctrine a fundamental Article, which Christ has not made one: And, as those, who do, take too much upon them, their Authority needs give no honest Christian any Trouble. — "I cannot see Evidence enough in the Word of God to make the Salvation of all Mankind, the poor, the ignorant, — (even in such a Day of Knowledge as this is) to depend on such a Doctrine, — confess'd by the most learned and pious Christian, to be attended with so many Difficulties, which, after the Labour and Study of near 1400 Years, (he might have said 1700) is so unconceivable in itself, and was at first so obscurely revealed," &c. Anf. Whether "the Salvation of all Mankind, or of any one Man, depends upon it," is not, with me, the present Question; but, whether it be true: — I am very sorry, that Popery and Deism should be making such Ravages, and a loath-
Loathsome Luke-warmness, &c. should be everywhere prevailing, "in such a Day of Knowledge as this is;" which makes me afraid, That such a Day of Indifference about, or Hatred of, the Faith, of itching Ears, Error, and Ignorance, &c. is its truer Character: — As many Difficulties it is attended with, the most learned and pious Christians, have, in all Ages, believed it; many of them have suffered, unto the Death, for it; and many more lived, and died, in the Comfort of this, that the eternal Son of God had become their near Kinsman: — There needs neither very much "Labour, nor Study," to find it in the Bible, if we will but dip into it; no, nor to understand it, as far as it can be understood by us, in this State of Imperfection and Darkness; if we will but believe plain, easy, familiar Words: — It is not "so unconceivable in itself;" but that "even the poor, the ignorant, labouring Men," &c. may readily assent to it, as a Matter of Fact; and a Doctrine, which may also, not only regulate their Worship, but establish their Faith, confirm their Hope, and excite and enflame their Love: — And, It is so far from being true, that it "was at first so obscurely revealed," that it was clearly enough revealed in Old Testament Times; it was well known to the Jews, when our Lord was in the World; and was then as clearly preached, and as convincingly defended, by himself. Jo. Chs. iii. v. viii. x. xiv. &c. as ever it has been since. — The last Reason is the weakeft of them all.

"3. There have been some very pious and learned "Men in several Ages," Which Ages? "who "have acknowledged Christ's true Godhead," Who were they that did this, and did not believe his coessential Sonship? "and yet supposed that his Sonship "referred rather to his human Nature," I desire first to see this explained, and then the Fact proved. "Or
or to his Office of Messiah, than to such an Eternal
Generation:" p. 7. I know there have been several such, who, I believe, well deserved this good
Character: But, I know none of them, who ventured to say, "I have made it appear that the Name
Son of God, cannot necessarily imply his Divine
Nature," &c. or, "That his human Soul was
properly the Son of God," &c. &c. All of them,
whom I knew, or have heard of, and the learned
Roel in particular, believed, That this Title denoted
Christ's whole Person; and consequently, could not
but "imply his Divine Nature." — None of them,
not one, divided his Natures, so as to seem to di-
vide his Person, and make two Christs. — None of
them, Not one, when they used this Title, spake of
him only, as Man, &c. &c. — "And there are some
in our Age — who heartily believe the eternal God-
head of Christ," Do they indeed believe, That,
as God, he is a distinct Person, from the Father?
and yet doubt of or disbelieve this eternal Gene-
ration," But, Is this Doubt, or Disbelief, either a suf-
cient Proof, or the genuine Fruit, of either their
good Learning or sincere Piety? " and I will
never pronounce an Anathema upon them. p. 7."
No, nor I neither; upon any one, who heartily be-
lieves the eternal Godhead of the second Person. — Our
Author has this Anathema so very often up, for we
have had it before, that it seems he is much afraid
of it; tho' I never heard of any one, who was for
pronouncing it upon him: And, as for the Judg-
ment of the most High, He knows them that are his.
—— The "most learned and pious" are not ab-
solutely exempted, from gross and damnable Errors,
any more than from heinous and grievously aggra-
vated Immoralities: If therefore, he permits any, of
them that are his, to fall into such Errors, he will ei-
ther keep them, from the practical Effects of them;
or sooner, or later, give them Repentance, to confefs,
forfake, and turn from them, to the Truth; or, it may be, forgive them, as some think, in some Cases, at least, upon a general Repentance, as he does those, who cry with the Psalmist, Who can understand his Errors? Cleanse thou me from secret Faults. Ps. xix. 12. i.e. I conceive, from unknown Sins; or Sins, which tho' really Sins, he did not know to be such.

These now are all the Reasons, "that persuade "him," or all the Proofs he gives, "that this "cannot be the Sense of this Name!" p. 6. And what, I pray, is there in them, that looks either like a Reason, or a Proof? For my Part, I can neither see any, nor any Thing that has the clear Ap- "pearance of any! But, so zealous is he for this Notion, That he will answer all our Objections also against it! — He makes us object, as well we may.

"Objet. Some will say, If the Name Son of God, "doth not signify eternal Generation by the Father, "in the Sameness of the Divine Essence, yet surely its "muft at least import Chrift’s true and eternal God- "head." p. 7, 8. Why really, one would think so, if he indeed has the Divine Essence; and can hardly think otherwise; especially, when the Adnouns, own, proper, begotten, only begotten, are affixed to it. — The Christian Church have, always, every where, and universally, been of this Mind; Roel and others overcome, by the Evidence of Truth, have frankly acknowledged it; and, if the Scriptures are the Word of God, and Chrift himfelf speaks the Truth, common Sense, strongly confirms it. — But, our Au- thor gives three Anfwers to it, of much the fame Importance with his Reasons.

"Anf. 1. This Name Son and Sons of God is "often used in the Bible, and applied variously to "Men and to Angels, as well as to Chrift:” p. 8. This also, or somewhat like it, we had before: And in it are several little Fallacies, and plain Mistakes.
The Name, *Son of God*, in the Singular Number, is never applied to any mere Creature, either in Heaven or Earth, but to the first *Adam* only, if to him; but it is never, can never, be applied to any One, but *Christ* alone, when the Adnouns, *own, &c.* are added: And *Christ*, never is, never could be, called *Sons of God, &c.* "— but it is never used — " to signify true and eternal Godhead — but in " those Places under Debate," ibid. Here are more *Mistakes*, and of the same Kind. — This Name always signifies a *Divine Person*, and as such, and not directly the *Divine Nature*: — I have given about twice the Number of his Texts: — And have proved, from many Passages, That it is used of the *second Person*, and purely as such; and therefore, (1.) That it " necessarily implies his *Divine Nature."" And, (2.) That then, " his human Soul, is not pro-
" perly the *Son of God."" See *Jo. v. 19. Col. i. 13* — 
*17. Heb. i. 8. 10. 11. &c.* — Withal, if it " fig-
" nifies true, and eternal Godhead, in those Places," 'tis more than sufficient for ever to demolish his whole Scheme. ——— " And therefore when " *Christ* is called eminently and absolutely the " *Son of God*, the Meaning of it does not ne-
" cessarily rise higher than that he is the most " eminent of all other Beings (Men or Angels) " that are called *Sons of God,* without a certain De-
" termination whether he be *true God,* or no, by " the mere Use of that Name. ibid." — Here are more *Fallacies*, than I care to point out. — The *Conclusion* will not, cannot, follow from the *Pre-
" misses*; because, there is more in *it*, than in *them.* —
The Name *Son of God*, is not, in them, used emi-
" nently or absolutely, as it is in the *Conclusion.* —
Had it been so used in them, the Proposition had been eminently and absolutely false: Because, no one *Angel*, or *Man*, ever is, or ever can be, called, eminently and absolutely, *the Son of God*; nor are any
any Number of either, or both of them, in that Sense, the Sons of God, or ever so called. — I shall only add: That, since these two Adverbs plainly hint, that this Title is often applied to Christ, in a lower Sense; 'twould not be hard to prove, That, when he is called, eminently and absolutely, the Son of God, the Meaning necessarily is, That he is his Son, in a Sense "far more proper in itself," to use Bp. Pearson's Words, "and more peculiar to him, "in which no other Son can have the least Pretence "of Share or of Similitude; and that his Filiation "is totally distinct from any which belongs to his "other Sons." Expos. of the Creed. p. 106, 107.

"Anf. 2. This Name Son of God cannot necessarily signify his true Godhead any otherwise, than "by supposing it primarily to signify his coessential "Sonship, and then consequentially that the Son of "God is true God, because his Father is so." p. 8. This we readily grant; and think it Reason, or Ground, sufficient; especially, when the Adnouns, own, proper, only begotten, are prefixed to it; had we no other Reason, to believe him to be the true God. "Now, we have before proved, that this Name "cannot necessarily signify his coessential or consub-

"stantial Sonship, &c." — Pray where? We have given every Syllable, that but looks this Way; and have fully answered them too: And, if the intelligent, impartial Reader, can see any Thing like a Proof, he must, see what is not be seen.

"Anf. 3. It is evident from some Part of the "Conduct of Peter and other Disciples during the "Life of Christ on Earth, that they did not heartily believe they had the true and eternal God "among them, and that their Master was the true "and eternal God, as when they rebuked him, "when they questioned his Knowledge of some "Things, when they wondred, and were astonifhed "at his working Miracles, &c. as, says he, I shall ...
"shew, hereafter: Yet they then believed him to be the Son of God; — and profess this Belief roundly, &c. Therefore this Name does not certainly declare his Divine Nature." p. 8. and 9. — This Argument, in short, is, "They believed him to be the Son of God:" But, had they believed, that this Title declared his Divine Nature, they would not, as they did, "have rebuked him, &c. And therefore, "it does not certainly declare his Divine Nature." Anf. This Conclusion, 'tis plain, does not at all follow from the Premisses. — Or, "Therefore, they did not believe, That this Title declared his Divine Nature." Anf. Supposing they did not believe this, What then? Therefore it did not, indeed, declare this? I deny the Consequence. --- But, because he harps upon this oftener than once, we shall answer it fully hereafter.

"Obj. 2. It will be said then, How comes it about, that when the High Priest asked our Saviour, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? "And Jesus answered, I am. Mark xiv. 61, 62. "he charges our Saviour with Blasphemy, ver. 64. "if his calling himself the Son of God did not imply his true Godhead?" p. 9. --- The Jews charged him, before this, oftener than once, with Blasphemy, Jo. v. 18. Ch. x. 33. and after this also, even when he was before Pilate, Ch. xix. 7. upon the very same Account. --- But, tho' this Objection has been thought, by the Catholic Church, in all Ages, unanswerable: Our Author answers it presently, and seems to boast of it too, "I have shewn, --- Thus it appears," &c. p. 9.

"Anf. It is evident that the Design of the wicked Jews was to fix the highest and most criminal Charge they could against him: — " And a higher, and more criminal, Charge they could not possibly fix on him, or any other Person in the whole World, even the most wicked; if he was not, in-
indeed, what he confess'd himself to be; and in their Sense also: Because, if he, indeed, was not, His Answer much better became Satan, the Father of Lies, Jo. viii. 44. than the Saviour of Men! —

And, had he not then, really, been the Son of God, and in their Sense of that Title, Would he not, even at first, have, plainly, yea, and with Horror, denied their malicious Charge? --- Would he not have taken Care, to prevent all such Accusations for the future? — Ought he not to have done all in his Power to have kept his Disciples, and other Followers, from such a grievous Error? &c. &c. — “But there was no "sufficient Foundation for this Charge, which our "Saviour in another Place fully proves, John x. "33, 34. as I have shewn elsewhere in what fol-lows.” And we shall wait till we see this, and then forever confute it. — "Thus it appears," Not yet I am sure! "that tho' it be fully agreed that "Jesus Christ, the Son of God, has true Godhead "belonging to him,” What an odd Phrase is this? I wish his Friends would but explain it. — I do not know but every Sabellian, Arian, Nestorian, Eutychian, and Tritheist, in the World, may confess this, in a full Consistency, with their respective blasphemo-ous Notions! “because Divine Names and Titles "are given to him,” Given! To whom? To the Son of God? Why then; this puts it out of Doubt, That, if those divine Names and Titles are proper, and signify any Thing, the Son, as such, is Divine, or, is God: And therefore, a coessential Son --- If then they are given to the "true Godhead belonging to "him,” I shall only now ask, Is this true Godhead a Person, or not? If it is not, those “divine Names "and Titles,” are given to what is not a Person, which is not a little strange; and the personal Pro-noun, him, to something not a Person, which is ei-ther very figurative indeed, or not a little absurd: Not to allege, that this looks like Sabellianism! &c.--- If
If this true Godhead is a Person; since he, everywhere, speaks of the Son of God, as a Person; here are either, (1.) Two Persons in the One Christ. Or, (2.) Two Christs. — If these divine Names and Titles are given to Jesus Christ, the same Difficulties occur, as is plain. "yet this Name Son of God, " does not necessarily and certainly discover or imply it." i.e. that he has "true Godhead belonging " to him." And this, if it be Sense, shall be fully confused. "Thus much for the first supposed " Sense of this Name." p. 9. 10. Thus you have every Syllable of these two Paragraphs. — And, to avoid trifling, May I not ask, How he could prove, in his Way of reasoning, " That the divine Names " and Titles given to Christ, do necessarily and " certainly discover or imply, that he has true God- " head belonging to him?" or is the true God?

May I not argue, as he has done, p. 8 — 10. thus, " Divine Names and Titles are, in the Bible, " applied variously, even to Men, (viz. Magistrates, " Pf. lxxxii. 6. and, as some think, Prophets," Jo. " x. 34, 35.) as well as to Christ: And therefore, " when those Divine Names and Titles are emi- " nently and absolutely ascribed to him, the Mean- " ing of them does not necessarily rise higher, than " that he is the most eminent of all other Men, " (Magistrates or Prophets) to whom those Names " and Titles are given, without a certain Determina- " tion, whether he be the true God, or have true " Godhead belonging to him, or no, by the mere " Use of those Names and Titles?" — But, I have no Inclination to

I wish his Admirers would consider these, &c. — Advance we then, to another Proposition,

VI. Tho' our ever blessed Saviour, when on Earth, did never, but once, so far as we know, directly, or in express Terms, profess himself to be the Me-
Yet he was never, from his Entrance upon his Public Work, to the Day of his Death, shy, or backward, to declare, proclaim, and profess, his Divinity, both in private and in public, yea, and inculcate the Belief of it; by calling himself often the Son, the own, the begotten, the only begotten, Son of the Father; and maintaining and proving, that he was, as such, equal with God, Jo. v. 17—19. and that he and the Father are One. Ch. x. 30, &c. &c.

The latter Part of this complex or compound Proposition consists of two Parts, 1. That he was never shy, or backward, to declare, and proclaim, himself to be the Son of God; and that, many Ways, by calling God his Father, speaking to and of him as a Father, claiming the very nearest Relation possible, to him, &c. and styling himself his Son, his own, his only begotten, whom he loved, who was ever with him, &c. All this, I say, is so frequently, and clearly revealed, that no One, who believes the Bible, ever did, or can, doubt of it. How full and express is he upon these, in his Conference with Nicodemus, Jo. iii. 16—18. when before the Jewish Sanhedrim, Ch. v. ver. 17—47. in his Disputes with the Pharisees, Ch. viii. 18—59. in his Answer to the Jews, Ch. x. 24—42. in his Mediator Prayers? Ch. 17. &c. &c. — 2. That this was a proclaiming his true and proper Divinity, is, I humbly conceive, as clear and undeniable. Thus, when he taught his Disciples, That all Things were delivered to him, the Son, of his Father; Mat. xi. 27. and all Power in Heaven and in Earth; Ch. xxviii. 18. --- That he had Power to lay down his Life; and Power, as the Son, to take it up again; Jo. ii. 19. Ch. x. 17, 18. --- That he was, as the Son, equal with God; and to prove it, declares, That Whatsoever Thing the Father doth, these be, the Son, doth likewise; That the Son quickneth whom he will; That all Men
Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father; That he, the Son, hath Life in himself, can raise the Dead, and is appointed to judge the World; 
--- That the Son is Eternal; Ch. viii. 58. and One Thing with the Father, Ch. x. 30, &c. &c.—When all these are well considered, they declare his true and proper Divinity, as the Son, if any Words can do it. --- But, seeing all these, and many Things more to the same Purpose, must be enlarged upon, in a Chapter by themselves, we shall now pass them, when I have offered these Two Observations.

(i.) That, tho' our Lord, as we have already hinted, did, on many Occasions, both in public and private, expressly and solemnly, charge and forbid his Disciples, and others, to tell any Man that he was the Christ; or to speak of him under the Character of the Messiah, till after his Resurrection! Mat. viii. 4. Ch. ix. 30. Ch. xvi. 20. Ch. xvii. 9. &c. &c. Yet, he never, any how, charged, or forbid, any Man, To say, or declare, that he was the Son of God, when, or wherefoever, they pleased! --- And yet,

(ii.) That he very seldom, if ever, either in public or private, so far as we know, filed himself, by this Title, the Son of God, or his begotten, &c. or openly, and in so many Words, confes'd, That he was his Son; except when he had to do with the more learned, as Nicodemus, Jo. iii. and the Pharisees, Chs. viii and x. or, when he was before the Sanhedrin. Ch. v. and Mark xiv. 62. &c. ——-
The Reasons of both which remarkable Observations, we shall have, by and by.

The former Part of this Proposition, That our Lord, when on Earth, did never, any where, or at any Time, but once, so far as we know, in public or private, in express Terms, declare, or confess, himself to be the Messiah, till he was upon his Trial:

This,
This, I say, needs no Proof. — If any one doubts it, let him shew when, or where, he did so, in express Terms. — Our learned Author, however, "confeffes, there are two or three Occasions also "which our Lord took to profefs himfelf the Mes-
"fiah, in direct and plain Words;" p. 77. and yet gives us but two, viz. "Jo. iv. 29." it fhould have been 26. " and Ch. ix. 37." in which are no fuch Words as Chrifi, or the Messiah! These notorious Slips here, and in feveral other Places, inclines me to think, there have been feveral Miftakes in the Co-
py, &c. Our Lord's Words, ver. 35. are, 
Doft thou believe on the Son of God? Wherein he, expressly, proposes himfelf, even as the Son of God, for the Object of Faith: And therefore, strongly profefs himfelf to be the coeʃsential Son of God; because, if he had not been a coeʃsential Son, he could not, as a Son, have been the Object of Faith. — In like Manner, he seems to talk, p. 24, 25.

"If we consult the Gospel and Epiftles of St. "John, we shall find the Name Son of God and "the Name of Chrifi used very promifcuoufly for "one another," And fo they well might, because they denote the very fame Person; tho' these Names are not strictly fynonymous: Nor is the Foundation, or Reason, of them the fame. He could never have been the Chrifi, had he not been the Son of God: But, he was, from Eternity, the Son of God, in the Order of Nature, before he was, or could be, appointed to be the Messiah. "and sometimes with a "Defign to explain each other," — This is, to fay the leaft, very ambiguous. We use to explain what is lefs known, by what is more known: Which of them then, explained the other? — He often, before the Jews, profefsed himfelf to be the Son of God: But never once, to be the Chrifi.
— They had right Ideas of the Meaning of the Title, the Son of God! even, That he who was the Son
Son of God, was equal with God! Jo. v. 18. yea, and was God! Ch. x. 33. But they seem, in his Days, to have lost all true Ideas of the Office of the Messiah! — I say, they knew well the true Meaning of the Title, the Son of God: For, otherwise, Our Lord would, I cannot but believe, have corrected their Mistake, and set them right in a Matter of such Importance: — Or else would have roundly denied their Consequence, and told them plainly, That the Title, the Son of God, in the highest Sense, did neither presuppose, imply, nor signify, Equality with God: And therefore, That, tho' he used that Title of himself, he was not guilty of Blasphemy, and did not make himself God. Might he not have asked them, How such a Fancy came into their Heads? Did they ever hear of a Son of God, that was equal with him? Yea, and was God? &c. — " and both " to denote the great promised Redeemer, the Saviour " of the World." This they might do, tho' one of them, strictly speaking, was a Title of Nature, and the other of Office. 'The Texts he quotes, tho' no way against us, may be afterwards considered: Only the last, I cannot now pass.

" And that awful Text, Jo. viii. 24. is certainly " to be interpreted the same Way, If ye believe not " that I am he, ye shall die in your Sins. That is, " as Christ himself explains it in the next Verse, " that I am the same that I said unto you from the " Beginning; that is, the Christ, the Messiah, the Son " of God, the Saviour of the World." p. 25. But we must carefully remember, That, so far as we know, he had never, before them, used any of those Titles, but one; nor said to any one Jew, no not once, that he was the Christ, the Messiah, the Saviour of the World; but only, That he was the Son of God: And therefore, this Answer was only a persifling in it, That he was, as he had often said, the Son of God. — He goes on, " Nor is the Absence of the Word He in the
'the Greek any Bar to this Interpretation, for the 'Expression is the fame, Jo. iv. 29. ἐγώ εἶμι.'—
Anf. 1. We are not enquiring here about the Interpretation, till we firft agree about the literal and common Sense of the Words. — 2. Supposing the Meaning of our Lord's Answer, is juftly translated, by adding the Pronoun, He; and that the Sense our Author puts upon it, be also right, viz. I am the Messiah; I see no juft Reason, for dropping the Emphasis of the Phrafe, ἐγώ εἶμι, (which was a well-known Title of the most High,) in either of the Passages.— For, 3. In his Answer to the Jews, the Phrafe, ἐγώ εἶμι, I am (see Ev. iii. 14.) implies no more, than the Sense which they themselves put upon this Title, the Son of God; viz. That, by assuming it to himself, he made himself equal with God; yea, made himself God. — And, 4. In reply to the Woman of Samaria's Creed, Jo. iv. 25. I know the Messiah cometh: When he is come, he will tell us all Things: This moft emphatic Name, or Expression, would give her higher, and jufter, Thoughts of the Messiah, than perhaps, she had ever heard; keep, or recover, her and her Country Folks, from the selfish, unworthy, carnal, and low Ideas of the Messiah, which the Jews had entertain'd, and with which they were then generally bewitched; and confirm her Faith, That he could, and would, tell them all Things. — He closes the Paragraph thus, " and Jo. ix. 37. ἐστιν ὁ Κυρίος, be it is," (which by the by, comes no way near the Point,) " where we " are sure that Christ means that be is the Messiah." But, whoever will read the Passage, he will see he means, That he is the Son of God: And, That the Word Christ, or the Messiah, does not occur in all that Chapter; but ver. 22. where we hear of an Αἴ, to excommunicate any Man that should confess him to be the Christ. — After all,
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'Twill
'Twill be alledged, That these Titles are all tantamount, denoting the very same Person, and conveying to us the very same Ideas. Ans. They do indeed frequently denote the same Person; and, so far, are synonymous: But, they are ascribed to him, upon different Accounts; and do not, always, convey to us the very same Ideas; and therefore, they are not, strictly synonymous, and of the same Signification.—They are all Titles of the Messiah, and as such: But, the Reason, or Foundation, of them is very different; and sometimes they excite in us very different Ideas.—The Title, the Messiah, which in the Greek, is ὁ Χριστός, the Christ, are, properly, and directly, Titles, or rather, a Title, of Office; and, primarily, imply his Relation to his People, or Work: But, the Title, the Son of God, does neither, primarily, properly, nor directly; nor, indeed, if we consider the natural and common Signification of the Words, and take them strictly, any other Way, imply, or denote any Office; but is a Title of Nature, which primarily and literally excites in us the Idea of his Relation to his Father; and, I humbly conceive, that only.—But, because it is about Words, the proper, or improper Signification and Use of them, we are now disputing; an apt Simile, or Example, once for all, may make the Debate and Importance of it, more plain, to the honest, serious, and unlearned Christian.

These three. The King's second Son, The Duke of Cumberland, The Generalissimo of our Army, are all Titles denoting the very same Person: But, 'tis plain, they are not of the same Signification; nor are they given to him, upon the same Account. They express very different Relations, and, when taken strictly, raise in us very different Ideas.—The first, denotes his Relation to his Royal Father; and is, evidently, a Title of Nature: The second, his Peerage; and is, manifestly, a Title of Honour: The third,
third, his Relation to the Army; and is, undeniably, a Title of Office. — Any one of the three may be, and sometimes are, used when speaking of him; and considering, that it is well known, that every one of them belong to him, and him only; every one of them is sufficiently distinguishing: But, 'tis evident, the Words are not of the same Signification; nor do they, directly, raise in us the same Ideas. — He was the King’s second Son, before he was either of the other: He would still have been so, had he never been any of the other; or were he to resign his Commission: So that the first is natural, which can never be taken from him; whereas, the other two, were freely given, &c. — Were the Question put, What is the Meaning of these Words, The King’s second Son? 'Twould be thought an odd Reply, The Duke of Cumberland! — Or, if it were askt, Why, or upon what Account, is he, and is called, the King’s second Son? 'Twould be thought a very strange Answer, Because he is the Generalissimo of our Army! — Let us apply these to the Case in Hand. "The Christ, the Messiah, the Son of God, the Mediator," &c. are all Titles given to our Lord, in the New Testament: They all denote the same Person, and him only: And therefore, any one of them, is sufficiently distinguishing: — But, the Words do not signify the same Things; nor are these Titles given to him for the same Reason, or upon the same Account; nor do they raise in us, or convey to us, the very same Ideas. — The Idea of this Title, the Son of God, is evidently more strict, and singular; the Idea of, the Christ, &c. more complex. — He was the Son of God, antecedently to all Consideration of, and independently upon, his Office; and will be so, when he shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God even the Father: 1 Cor. xv. 24 — 28. And therefore, his Sonship was not founded, nor does it depend upon, his Office. — Were the Question put, Why is Christ called
called the Son of God? I can't but think, it would be an odd Answer, because he is the King of the Jews, or the Mediator, &c. — But, were it asked, Why is he called his begotten Son? The Answer would sound very strange indeed, Because, he is not at all his Son, and neither was, nor could be begotten of him! And, were the Query, Why is he called the only begotten of the Father? The Answer would found very strange indeed, Because, he is not at all his Son, and neither was, nor could be begotten of him. And, were the Query, Why is he called the only begotten of the Father? The Answer would found very strange indeed, Because, he is not at all his Son, and neither was, nor could be begotten of him. And, were the Query, Why is he called the only begotten of the Father? The Answer would found very strange indeed, Because, he is not at all his Son, and neither was, nor could be begotten of him.

The only Time our Lord ever, directly and in express Terms, declared, or confessed, he was the Messiah, (till he was brought to his Trial before his Judges, Ecclesiastical, Mark xiv. 61, 62 and Civil, Jo. xviii. 32—38. where be before them and Pontius Pilate witnes-sed a good Confession, 1 Tim. vi. 13.) was to the Woman of Samaria, who seems to have had truer Notions, both of the Person, and Office, of the Messiah, than
the Generality of the Jewish Nation, yea their learned Rabbins, then had. — That poor Creature having given him two principal Articles of her Creed, I know the Messiah cometh, &c. Jo. iv. 25. why, says our Lord, I that speak unto thee am, or, as we translate it, am he; Ver. 26, which he never did, on any Occasion, to the Jews; no, not when questioned upon it! — After that solemn Declaration, Jo. viii. 24. If ye believe not that I am, or, as it is in our Translation, that I am he, ye shall die in your sins; when they immediately asked him, Who art thou? Ver. 25. tho' he had then a fair Opportunity to profess himself, in so many Words, to be the Messiah; yet he did it not, in express Terms: But only replied, Even the same that I said unto you from the Beginning, i. e. the Son of God; and in their Sense of this Title too, so his Son, as to be equal with him; which his Words, ὃς ἐγώ εἰμί, I am, plainly enough imply. — Yea, when afterward they seem even impatient, to know the Truth; and therefore ask, How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly, Jo. x. 24. παραδώσω, freely, above board, in Words we can't mistake: Whence 'tis clear, he had not hitherto been so open, or plain. And now, tho', one would have thought, he could not have handsomely waved, or declined, a direct, full, and categorical Reply; yet he only answered, as before, I told you, and ye believed not: &c. Ver. 25. — Now, he had never once told them, that he was the Christ, the Messiah, or the King of the Jews; but only that he was the Son of God, Chap. v. 17—47. and that before Abraham was, he was the I am, i. e. the Eternal, Unchangeable, I am; Chap. viii. 58. — And his Discourse following his Answer, Chap. x. 25.wherein he is very plain, I and the Father are one, εἰς ἕν οὐδὲν, are one Thing, Ver. 30. seems necessarily to lead us to this Sense. — One more Evidence, I cannot pass,
When the Baptist sent two of his Disciples, for their own full Satisfaction, and that they might be thoroughly established in the Truth, with that most important Question, Luke vii. 19. Art thou be that should come, or look we for another? i. e. in short, Art thou the Messiah? — His Answer is very remarkable. He does not readily reply, Yes, or, I AM; as to the Woman of Samaria: But, Go your Way, and tell John what Things ye have seen and heard, how that the Blind see, the Lame walk, the Lepers are cleansed, the Deaf hear, the Dead are raised, &c. Ver. 22. For, in that same Hour he cured many of their Infirmities, and Plagues, and of evil Spirits, &c. Ver. 21.—But, Why this Answer? Why so shy to such Messengers, and such a Message! — We reply, 1, That he might shun all Ostentation; &c. and avoid all unnecessary Disputes with the Scribes, and the needless Cavils of the Multitude, &c. — 2, That he might suit himself to the Weakness of the two that were sent, who envied him for their Master's Sake; Jo. iii. 26. and, remembering also that the Baptist himself was then a Prisoner, might have been offended, had one, in such low Circumstances, and who made to mean an external Appearance, openly avowed himself to be the Messiah. This, I conceive, may be gathered from Ver. 23. And Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me. — And 3, That he might put Honour upon John, by leaving it to his Sagacity and Integrity, to answer his own Question, to the full Conviction of his Disciples, from the Things their own Eyes had seen, and their own Ears had heard. q. d. Go tell your Master what you have seen and heard; and he will easily, clearly, and thoroughly, resolve all your Doubts concerning me; by shewing you, that those Prophecies of Isaiah, Chap. xxxv. 4—7. and several others, which always have been, and must be, understood of him that should come, and of no other; and by which, the Messiah
Messiah, when he should come, was to be known; are, even before your own Eyes, most fully, exactly, and to a Tittle, fulfilled in me: And consequently, That I am your God, who was to be manifested in the Flesh, and to come and do all these Things. — These will be sufficient to keep you from stumbling, at the Meanness of my outward Appearance; &c. And him you will attend to, and regard, with less Prejudice, than you would, at present, do me: And, by these Means, you will also be the more readily disposed to receive, and believe in me, to your own eternal Salvation. — But,

This Remark, which cannot but seem strange to many pious Christians, naturally requires a clear, and full, Resolution of these Three Questions. Did our Lord, indeed, never once, till upon his Trial, declare to, or among, the Jews, That he was the Messiah? — What Reason can be imagined, or assigned, for this his Reservedness? — Did he never tell his own Disciples, that he was the King of the Jews, or speak to them of his Kingdom, or promise them a Kingdom?

Quest. 1. Did not our Saviour, indeed, declare, and proclaim, himself in so many express Words, to be the Messiah, neither to the Scribes and Pharisees, nor to the Multitudes, till he was upon his Trial?

Ans. He never did, not so much, as once, so far as we know, in so many Words, so much as say, either to the Scribes and Pharisees, or to his ordinary Hearers, or the Multitudes, or any other, except to the Woman of Samaria, That he was the Messiah! Yea, so far was he from boasting of it, from talking of it, upon every Occasion, &c. that he never allowed any of the Jews to speak of him under that Character! And expressly forbade, yea, Solemnly charged, those who were healed by him, to say to, or tell no Man that he was the Christ. — I cannot re-
member any Exception. — He bid the Leper, whom he had cleansed, to go and shew himself to the Priest; Mat. viii. 4. and the poor Man, out of whom he cast a Legion of Devils, to go home to his Friends, and tell them, how great Things the Lord had done for him; Mark v. 19. and charged the impotent Man, to sin no more; Jo. v. 14. &c. &c. but never proclaimed himself to be the Messiah! — Yea, tho' his Fore-runner, the Baptist, declared indeed openly, That he was before him, and exceeding greater, and more glorious than he; Mat. iii. 11. that he was the Lamb of God, Jo. xi. 29. and the Son of God: ver. 34. Yet he never, in so many Words, stiled him the Messiah! What he said of him, was true only of the Messiah; and sufficient also, to incline his Disciples, to take him for the Messiah; nor was it without Effect, for he came to prepare a People for him, and prepare his Ways: Luke i. 17. and 76. But he never, in express Words, called him so. — This, I presume, is not a little confirmed, from the Message he sent by his two Disciples.—As for the Twelve Apostles, they believed, and were sure, That he was the Christ the Son of the living God; Jo. vi. 69. as Martha also, and many others of his ordinary Hearers and more intimate Acquaintance, I make no Doubt, did: But, so far as we know, he never to, nor before, them assumed to himself this Title! — Yea, we certainly know, That, when he sent them out, he ordered them, Mat. x. 7. to preach saying, The Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand; and gave them Commission also, and Power, to work Miracles: ver. 8. But, gave them no Command to proclaim, in express Terms, That the Messiah was come! And much less, That he himself was He.

Quest. 2. How can this strange Shyness, this unexpected Reservedness, be accounted for? — Would not every One, and not without some probable Ground, have thought, That, if he was, indeed, the
the Messiah, he would, on all proper Occasions, or
now and then at least, have openly proclaimed it:
And, if he could also have clearly proved that he
was, would have, in so many Words, avowed, and
maintained it, even to the Faces of his Enemies? —
What sufficient Reason then could there be, why he
was not more explicit, in this most momentous
Case?

Ans. 1. That serious Christians may not be here
mistaken, let them remember, That, from his
Baptism, (when the Father and the Holy Spirit did
both, personally, bear Witness to his coessential Sonship;
and consequently, That he was the Christ; Mat. iii.
16, 17) to the Day of his Death, he left no proper
Opportunity, every where, and to all Sorts of Peo-
ple, to declare, yea and prove ; that he was the
CHRIST : Tho’ not in direct Terms, and in so many
Words, yet by several infallible Proofs. — Such as,
1. By the Titles, which he either assumed himself,
or accepted from others; some of which, primarily,
and evidently, signify his Divine Nature, some his
Human, and others, suppose or imply the Union of
both Natures, in the Person of the Messiah. (1) By
those Titles, which, directly and necessarily, signify
his Divine Nature, viz. the Son, the begotten, the only
begotten Son, of God, which he so frequently assumed
to himself. These the Jews very well knew, as our
Author has owned, were Titles peculiar to the
Messiah. Pf. ii. 7. If. ix. 6. &c. They also well under-
stood the true Import, or Meaning, of them; nor
did they ever mistake it, or vary from it! as we
have, and shall, put out of all Doubt. (2) By those,
which he either commonly took to himself, or ac-
cepted from others, and which, chiefly and clearly,
denote his Human Nature; viz. that peculiar One,
the Son of Man, and those, the King of Israel, Jo. i.
49. the Son of David, Mat. xx. 30, &c. which are
I i 2
acknowledged to be Titles of the Messiah, and that with Respect to his Manhood — Now, when he assumed, or accepted, those Titles, which were proper to the Messiah and him only, He, constructively, if not directly, acknowledged himself to be the Messiah; and that so plainly, and fully, as no one of common Sense could either mistake, or doubt of, his Meaning: For, surely, he would neither have assumed, nor accepted, any Title which did not belong to him. (3) When the same Persons, who so well knew the true Import of the Title, the Son of God, heard him assume that Title one Day, and stile himself the Son of Man the next, they could not but think, (if he spoke Truth, and knew also what himself said,) That he spoke of himself as both God and Man, as the Prophets had often done of the Messiah, Pr. ii. 7—12. If. ix. 6, 7. Jer. xxiii. 5, 6, &c. and therefore made himself the Messiah. And, it is plain enough, they knew, or were sure, he spoke of himself as, or made himself, the Christ. —

2. He proved himself to be the Messiah, by his Doctrine, and his Manner of delivering it, and the Effects of it, &c. — His Doctrine manifested itself to be Divine, when he expounded and vindicated the Law, exploded the false Glosses of the Scribes, and confronted the Traditions of the Elders, &c. &c.—He delivered it, with a certain Divine Majesty proper to himself; an Authority, becoming his Dignity; an inimitable Plainness and Sweetness; and a most convincing Power and Efficacy; &c. Mat. vii. 28, 29. Luke iv. 22. Ro. vii. 42. according to the Prophecies of him. Ps. xlv. 2. Is. xi. 2. Ch. l. 4, &c. So that those, who were not converted, were convinced! And, they who would not believe, had nothing to reply, or oppose.—3. By His Miracles, especially if we consider their Number, almost past numbering! their Nature, requiring infinite Power!
his Manner of working them, at a Distance! with a Word! in the Twinkling of an Eye! &c. &c. These, I say, put the Matter out of all Doubt. If we now take all these together, the Evidence is so irresistible, That it is no wonder it rendered all, and every one, who knew the Scriptures, and heard him, and saw his Works, and yet received him not, wholly inexcusable. — This was his own Judgment, upon the whole, If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had Sin: But now they have no Cloke for their Sin. If I had not done among them the Works which no other, ἀλλ' ἦν, did, they had not had Sin: But now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father. Jo. xv. 22, 24. I might have added his Life, and the most perfect Example he has given, &c. &c. but these may suffice.

Why then, will you say, did he not tell them plainly, who he was? Ans. He told them often, and as plainly as was possible, That he was both the Son of God, and the Son of Man. — But, why did he not expressly tell them, That he was the Messiah? Why was he so studiously cautious in this Point? Especially, since this was the very Thing chiefly aimed at, in, and by, all his Discourses, and Miracles, even to shew, and to prove, That he himself was, indeed, the Messiah!

Ans. 2. Several Reasons may be suggested for this, when I have remembered the Reader of these Things.

The Hebrew Word, Messiah, and the Greek Word, Christ, both signify anointed: — Among the Israelites, Prophets, Priests, and Kings, (who were all Types of Christ, the great Prophet, Priest, and King of his Church,) were anointed; and sometimes stiled, the Lord's anointed, and called by himself, my anointed: 1 Sam. xxiv. 6. Pf. cv. 15. 1 Kings xix. 16. Lev. viii. 12. and 30. &c. — Hence the glorious promised Saviour was, frequently, by the Prophets, emphatically
cally stiled, the Messiah, i. e. the Anointed:—Whether it was, because Kings were more frequently anointed; or, because of the greater Solemnity of their Consecration; or, of the Superiority of the Regal, to the Prophetical and Sacerdotal, Offices; or all of these; the Title, the Lord's anointed, came to be reserved, and, in a Manner, appropriated to Kings:—In one of the principal Predictions, of Him that was to come, Dan. ix. 25. He is stiled, Messiah, the Prince;—From that Time, none of the Princes of the Jews were anointed; and they had no more Kings:—Not long after, this Title, the Messiah, or the Anointed, was commonly given by way of Eminence, to the great expected Deliverer:—Many great Things being foretold of, the unparallel'd Dignity of his Person; and of his Kingdom, the Extent, Glory, and Perpetuity of it; &c. the numerous Conquests he was to make; &c. the Peace, Splendor, Magnificence, and Felicity of his Reign; &c. the extraordinary Blessings wherewith he was to enrich his happy Subjects; &c. and that he was to reign in Zion God's holy Hill, and sit upon the Throne of David his Father; &c. Ps. vi. 12. Ps. lxxii. throughout. Ps. cx. 5, 6. Is. Chs. xi. xxxv. xlix. lv. &c. Dan. ii. 34, 35. and 44. &c. &c. These Prophecies, I say, in process of Time, came all to be taken, (even contrary to the plain Scope, yea and clear express Words of many, if not most by far of them,) by the degenerate Jews, in a narrow and carnal Sense, which was every Way unworthy of him; as if he was to be a Temporal Prince, who was to come with an irresistible Power to overcome, yea, and destroy all their Enemies; to restore the Kingdom to Israel, Exalt their Nation to the highest Pitch of Honour, Power, Happinefs, if not to live among them, in Person, for ever! &c.—That this was, in Fact, the Case, at least in almost every Part of it; especially, after they fell under the Roman Yoke, is too evident, from the New Testament,
to be denied: — This strange, unworthy, and vile Notion gradually prevailed, among all Sorts; and the more their Necks were galled, the deeper Root it took: — The Infection, at last, became Epidemical; and the whole Lump was leaven'd! — By Degrees, the Word, Messiah, came to be with them, the same with Messiah the Prince, or the King Messiah, i. e. in their mistaken Opinion, a mighty temporal Warrior and Conqueror; &c. and all other Thoughts of him, his Person and Offices, and all other Expectations from him, were either almost forgotten, or wholly dropt and lost; or very much altered, obscured, or corrupted! — Hence it was, that, when they could not but know, and, 'tis plain, did actually well know, That the Time of the Coming of the Messiah, foretold by the Prophets, was at Hand; they long'd so vehemently for his coming, as to be ready to follow every wicked Impostor! &c. see Jo. i. 19—27. Ch. vii. 26. 41. Mat. xxiv. 11. and 24. Acts v. 36. Ch. xxi. 38. — The growing national Prejudice continued, till all seem to have been tainted! — Yea, The Disciples themselves were so invincibly enchanted, That neither the plain Admonitions, nor frequent and clear Instructions, Mat. xvi. 20, 19—23. Luke xiii. 31—34, &c. &c. nor the Example, Jo. xii. 7. no nor the Sufferings and Death, &c. of their blessed Master, could recover them! Acts i. 6. or give them truer Ideas of the great End of his coming! — And, as for his ordinary Hearers, they once intended to take him by Force, and make him a King: Jo. vi. 15. Upon a Time, Luke xix. 11. they thought the Kingdom of God should immediately appear: And, when he made his public Entrance into Jerusalem, the Cry of the Multitude was, Hosanna to the Son of David, &c. Mat. xxi. 9. i. e. Save or prosper, this King we pray thee, &c. From all these now, we may safely learn the Causes of his not openly, and frequently, declaring himself, in express Terms, to be the Messiah.

1. That
1. That the Scribes and Pharisees, &c. who, most cruelly and desperately, hated him, (not only for his Doctrine, but chiefly because of his low and mean Appearance in the World, which prodigiously, yea, and totally, disappointed all their carnal Expectations from the promised Deliverer!) and therefore; had he, in express Terms, avowed himself to be the Messiah, i. e. the King of the Jews, would have most readily and spitefully, and with many Aggravations, &c. informed against him, as a seditious and dangerous Person; yea, a Pretender to the Crown; and therefore, an Enemy to Cæsar, &c. as they afterwards, as maliciously as fallly, did: Luke xxiii. 2, 5, 10. Jo. xix. 12.—That, I say, they might have no just Matter of Accusation against him, no, nor any Pretext for any, he so studiously declined to call himself the King of the Jews. — 2. Least, by his assuming that Title, he himself should have given any Umbrage to the Romans; or, any the least Handle to Pilate, to molest, and persecute him, before his Hour was come: Or given them any Advantage, upon any Account, either against himself, his Disciples, or ordinary Hearers, as if he had been an ambitious, worldly minded Person, or proud, a Self-seeker, &c. — 3. That he might give no Occasion, of any Sort, to the great Multitudes, that followed him wherever he came, to imagine, he ever designed to set up for a temporal King. — And, 4. That he might, by Degrees, lead them all, and the World also, to juster Thoughts of himself, his Person and Offices, &c: — And let them know, That he was the Son of God, who was come to seek and to save that which was lost; Luke xix. 10. and to save his People from their Sins, Mat. i. 21, &c. from Satan, Acts xxvi. 18. and from this present evil World; Gal. i. 4. and not from Cæsar, or their Subjection to the Romans. — And this brings us to the last Question,

Quest. 3.
Quest. 3. Did our Lord never tell his Disciples (nor any others,) That he was the King of the Jews, or of Israel; nor speak to them of his being a King, nor of his having a Kingdom; no, nor promise them a Kingdom?

Ans. Tho’ he was sometimes stiled the King of Israel, and believed, by as many as indeed took him to be the Christ, to be the King of the Jews; Jo. i. 49. Ch. xii. 12—16, &c. Yet he never, so far as we know, no not once, called himself, in so many Words, the King of Israel, nor confessed that he was the King of the Jews, till he was upon his Trial. — He spoke indeed often, and most expressly and solemnly, of a Kingdom, which he sometimes called his Kingdom: But it was a Spiritual and not a Temporal Kingdom; the Kingdom of Heaven, &c.—Thus, when his Forerunner entred upon his Ministry, he began with this, Repent ye: Mat. iii. 2. For the Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand. — In the very same Strains, did himself, Ch. iv. 17. commence his own public Work: And, when he sent out the Twelve to preach, Mat. x. 7. he put the same Words into their Mouths: — Yea, in many of his Parables and Discourses, Ch. xi. 11. Ch. xiii. ver. 24, 33, 44, &c. he calls the New Dispensation, or the State of the Church under the Gospel, the Kingdom of Heaven! — But, in all these, there is not the leaft Word, or Circumstance, which favoured the Carnal Notion the Jews had entertain’d of the Kingdom of the Messiah! — Not a Syllable of such mean, perishing Things as Worldly Grandeur, or external Power, Pomp, Opulence, Vanity! &c. — Not a Letter to feed the Pride, Avarice, Malice, &c. of that degenerate Age; or flatter the vain Expectations of that narrow-spirited, and selfish Race! — All here is pure, spiritual, and heavenly, having a direct Tendency to wean them from such base, and low Things; and lead them, to seek first the Kingdom of Heaven, and
to set their Affections on Things above. — He himself came from Heaven, i. e. condescended to empty himself, and assume our Nature, &c. That he might gather a People out of the World, instruct, renew, sanctify, and prepare them for Heaven, whither he declared he was to go, to prepare a Place for them, Jo. x. 9—18. and ver. 27—29. Ch. xiv. 2, 3, &c. Yea, Instead of promising his Followers worldly Riches, Honours, Pleasures, Delights, or indeed any sensual and fleshly Prospects; he told them, plainly, what they were to expect: Mat. viii. 20. Ch. x. 16—22, &c. And many of his Instructions were designed to prepare them for Contempt, Reproach, Poverty, and Persecutions of all Sorts; and to teach them how to behave wisely, peaceably, contentedly, yea and joyfully, under them, resigning themselves wholly to the Disposals of Providence, &c. &c. — In short, many of his Doctrines, his Promises, as well as most perfect Example, were intended, chiefly, to eradicate their selfish, narrow Hopes, &c. to sweeten their Natures, and inspire them with the most ardent Love to all, who feared God, and loved their blessed Master; yea, and with universal Benevolence to all Men, &c. in the Expectation of the heavenly Inheritance, in another World! — From all which, 'tis plain, That, tho' he was, and is, a King; and had, and has, a Kingdom; his Kingdom is not of this World.

'Twill, perhaps, after all, be thought strange, That our Lord should not only never, in express Terms, profess himself to be the Messiah; but, so often, and so solemnly, charge his Disciples to tell no Man that he was, or, to speak of him, under that Character; when he was so ready, and before the chief of his Enemies too, on all proper Occasions, to proclaim, maintain, and prove, That he was the Son of God, his own, his only begotten Son! What could be the Reason? — Did not this Title plainly imply the other? And, Did not the Jews know,
know, That, when he called himself the Son of God, his Design was to intimate, that he was, indeed, the Messiah? — Ans. These two Titles, the Son of God and the Messiah, did both belong to him that was to come; or, both denoted the same Person; and, therefore, might be used of him, promiscuously: — The Jews were very sensible of this, as is plain enough, and our Saviour well knew it: — But yet, they are not, strictly speaking, synonymous; nor is the Foundation of them, or Reason of ascribing them to him, the same; nor would they, nor did they, in the Roman Governor, nor, perhaps, in the common People, excite the very same Ideas. — And therefore, tho' his avowed Declaration, That he was the Messiah, might, and very probably would, and could not but, produce the Effects above hinted; yet his assuming the Title, the Son of God, neither would, nor did. But, That the unlearned Reader may the better understand this, let him remember,

1. That, as we have observed above, Our Lord seldom, if ever, at least publickly, called himself the Son of God, but before the more intelligent and learned, as Nicodemus, the Scribes, Pharisees, and their Council; who might know better, how to make a right Use of it. 'Twould convince them, That, as mean, and miserable, his external Appearance was, he yet openly avowed himself to be a Divine Person: — And might, and shoul'd, therefore, have led them more carefully, to search the Scriptures, that they might see, (1) Whether the promised Saviour, was not to be Emmanuel, God-Man? If. vii. 14. Ch. ix. 6. &c. &c. (2) Whether they did not, in so many Words, call him as God, the Son of God, his begotten Son; Pro. xxx. 4. If. ix. 6. Pf. ii. 7, &c. and as Man, the Seed of the Woman, Gen. iii. 15. the Seed of Abraham, Gen. xii. 3, &c.
and the Son of David: Ps. lxxxix. 27—37, &c. (3) Whether they did not, in many Places, clearly speak of a two-fold State of his; and that, the Messiah was to be first humbled, and afflicted, &c. and then exalted? Ps. xvi. 8—11. Ps. xxii throughout, Is. liii. 13—15. &c. &c. (4) Whether they were not very particular, and express, concerning the singular and unparallel’d Depth of his Humiliation? Ps. xxii. Pf. lxix. 1—4. compared ver. 20, 21. Is. lii. throughout, Zech. xiii. 7, &c. &c. (5) Whether they were not very clear, and full, in declaring, That the Messiah was to be the Light, the Saviour, and King, of the Gentiles, as well as of the Jews? Ps. xxii. 27. Pf. lxxiii. 10, 11. Pf. xcvi. throughout, Pf. cxvii. 1, 2. Is. xlii. 4—6. Ch. xlix. 6. Ch. xliv. 22, &c. Ch. li. 5, &c. &c. (6) Whether they ever say, That he was to be a temporal Prince; That his Kingdom was to be of this World; That he was to conquer his People by Fire and Sword? &c. Or whether the Blessings, and Salvation, he was to bestow, were not spiritual and heavenly; tho’ often predicted, under the Type of sensible, and worldly Things? see If. ii. 1—5. Ch. xi. 1—10. Ch. xii. 3. Ch. xxxv. 7—10. Ch. xlii. 17, 18. Ezech. xxxvi. 25—38. Mal. iv. 2, &c. &c. And, to add no more, (7) Whether all the Prophecies relating to the Messiah, and in particular those concerning his Family, and the Meaness it was to be reduced to, the Place and Time of his Birth, the Miracles he was to work, &c. &c. were not exactly, and to a Tittle, all fulfilled in him? Is. xi. 1 Mic. 5, 2. Dan. ix. 24—27. Is. xxxv. 5, 6, &c. &c.

2. Our Lord, on those Occasions, chose this Title, the Son of God, (which could give no just Reason, to his Enemies, to accuse him of being a Rival of Cæsar, &c. this, being absolutely unworthy of a Divine Person;) That, when it should come to
his Ear, it might strike the Roman Governor with Reverence and Fear, as it actually did. Jo. xix. 3.

— And,

3. He seems to have used this Title chiefly, That, by putting them in Mind, of the infinite Dignity of him, who had, from Eternity, undertaken to be the Saviour of his People, i. e. to be the Messiah, he might convince them of the Stupidity of that national Prejudice, which had even enchanted them. — And had they considered it well, and suffered it to have had its full Weight with them, it could not, one would think, have failed even of breaking the Charm. --- Nothing can be conceived more unworthy of the most High, than that he had such a Purpose: Or, of the Eternal Son, than that he should have humbled himself, and be made Flesh, &c. to execute it. — 'Tis a Contradiction to all the Perfections of the Divine Being; directly contrary to the whole Scriptures; and vile and unjust in itself! Yea, If the Eternal Father could have entertain'd such a Purpose, it might have been easily perform'd, without those most astonishing of all Events, the Incarnation, Sufferings, and Death, &c. of his own, only begotten Son. — Had he but raised up an Abraham, a Moses, a Joshua, a Sampson, a David, &c. and lengthened out their Lives far from half the Length of Methuselah's it might have been easily done. — Say not with those most malicious Enemies of his Cross, the Socinians, That the Ends of the Sufferings and Death of Christ, which we assign, are as unjust, &c. and every Way unworthy of the Most High: Because they are not so. — Mankind, in general, by the Use of expiatory Sacrifices, every where, &c. have agreed they are not so: — The Scriptures are clear, full, and strong, in assigning the Ends which we assign; and therefore, we are sure they are not so: And the Things themselves confirm us in it, that they are not so. — Yea, so far is this from being true,
true. That in, and by, the Scheme of Redemption, we have the most glorious Display of the Veracity, Holiness, and Justice of God, &c. and of his Regard for the Glory of his Law, and the Honour of his Government, on the one Hand: And of his Goodness, Mercy, Grace, and Love to the World, on the other, that ever was, or could be given. So that the Ends intended by his Obedience even unto the Death of the Cross, and all his unparallel'd Sufferings, were really the most glorious of any that could be conceived; every Way worthy of our Immanuel: And which none in Heaven, or in Earth, but himself, either were or could be made, capable of compassing.

Mat. xx. 28. Rom. iii. 24—26. 1 Jo. i. 7. Ch. iii. 16. Ch. iv. 9, 10. Rev. v. 9—14. &c. &c. And, 4. The Reasons why our Lord so often stilled himself the Son of Man, especially before the Multitudes; and, in private, with his Disciples; were such as these, (1) As we have hinted, That he might inculcate it upon them, That he was that Son of Man, who was to be a Man of Sorrows, and acquainted with Grief; to be wounded, bruised, scourged, cut off out of the Land of the Living, and stricken for the Transgressions of God's People, because he was to bear their Iniquities, &c. Is. liii. 3—12. Ch. I. ver. 5—7. Zech. xiii. 7. &c. To inculcate this, I say, upon them; and, by Degrees, to prepare them for, and to reconcile them to all this, or fortify them against it. —2. That, as Man, he might suit himself to the Estate of Humiliation he was in; shew how dearly he loved the World, and how contented he was with his Circumstances in it; &c. make it appear, that, as his Condition was low, his Heart was lowly; and as He, who was rich, πλούτος, αυ, (being the Heir of all Things, Heb. i. 2.) ἱπτομένου, had beggar'd himself, or made a Beggar of himself, 2 Cor. viii. 9. so he was satisfied to be accounted as one. I do not know but I may add. That, by a frequent mentioning
tioning of this Title, he might the more familiarize his future Suffering to himself; Heb. v. 8. and be the better fitted for it. — But the chief Reason, I humbly conceive, was, 3. That, by his so studiously forbearing to call himself the Chrift; his avoiding all Names of worldly Honour, Grandeur, &c. and assuming this humble Title, like one delighted with it, &c. he might gradually wean them from that Prejudice which had taken so deep Root in them, as well as in the great and the learned, That the Messiah was to be a temporal Monarch, &c. — One would wonder, how the Disciples, considering their Circumstances, could be so strongly possis'd with it: But so it was! And, to root out this wretched Notion, took he all this Pains. — And, hence, (1.) Tho' he always carried himself as God manifested in the Flesh, as his Doctrine, Miracles, and whole Conversation witnessed: Yet, he never, any where, took State upon him; never affected worldly Pomp, Greatness, or Power, no, nor meddled with secular Affairs; &c. never assumed a coercive Authority, or gave any the least Reason to any of them to think, that he, in his Heart, aspired after, or would have accepted, Dominion. &c. Yea, would not so much as speak to one's Brother to divide the Estate with him, Luke xii. 13. &c. &c. (2.) When he observed any Thing in them carnal, or selfish, or aspiring, he always check'd it: And, when they contended, which of them should be the greatest, he told them plainly, and with much Solemnity, That the Way to be greatest in his Kingdom, was to be the most humble, the Servant of all, Mat. xx. 25 — 28. &c. — Yea, in the whole of his Behaviour before them, he, (3.) Shewed even a Contempt of all these; &c. never spoke of any such Things to them, and much less promis'd them any of them; &c. but, was very express, That the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to mi-
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And consequently, That, if they would be his Servants, they must follow his Example. — In fine, (4.) So far was he from giving them any Reason to expect the Honours, Riches, or Pleasures, &c. of this World, That he told them plainly; they were to be persecuted, imprisoned, scourged, spoiled of all, put to Death, yea, and hated of all Men for his Names sake; &c. 

And now, Would not one have thought, that all this would have totally eradicated this groundless Principle? Yea, must have done it, if they had had any Regard, for what their blessed Master said? And yet, so incurably were they bewitched with it, that nothing could recover them, till the Holy Ghost was poured out upon them!

These Things I thought might be of very great Use, upon many and various Accounts, to the young Student, and the plain honest Christian: And therefore have expatiated so much upon them; for which, I hope, they will readily excuse me. — Proceed we then to the last Preliminary.

VII. Whereas, in the one complete Person of the Redeemer as such, there are two distinct Natures, the Divine and the Human; He is a Son, and frequently so called, in Respect of each of those Natures: i.e. As God, he is, and is often called, the Son of God; and as Man, he is, and is often called, the Son of Man.

The latter Part of this Proposition, (That as Christ, as Man, is really the Son of Man, so is he, as such, frequently stiled, the Son of Man,) is not, cannot be, denied. — Hence is he called the Son of the Virgin, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham; Yea, as we have hinted, p. 128, 129. the Son of every One of his Ancestors, according to the Flesh, from the Virgin to Adam: And the Reason is, because
cause he was of them, ἐξ ἃν τῶν κατὰ σάρξ, as to what concerned the Flesh; or, of them as concerning the Flesh he came; Rom. ix. 5. i.e. to use a common Phrase, because he had the Blood of every one of them in his Veins, and took Part of their Flesh and Blood; Heb. ii. 14. and therefore, was not ashamed to call them Brethren. ver. 11. Here, let us only remember, 1. That therefore, this Title, the Son of Man, strictly speaking; or, if we consider the common, grammatical, and proper, Use of the Words, is a Title of Nature, and not of Office: And therefore, signifies only his Human Nature, or his Relation to his Ancestors.—But, 2. The eternal Son of God having taken upon him the Seed of Abraham; or, assumed his human Nature into a Personality with himself, (and so prevented its Personality,) that, in and by it, he might fully execute the Mediatorial Office; this Title, the Son of Man, I say, does often, in Scripture, by a Figure very frequent in all Languages, signify, or denote, the complex Person of the Redeemer, as appointed to, and in the actual Execution of, that most glorious Undertaking. Mat. xxvi. 64. Luke xix. 10. Jo. xii. 34, &c. &c. — And yet, 3. Tho' it, in many Places, signifies, or denotes, the complex Person of the Messiah, and in the actual Execution of his Office: Yet it, every where and without Exception, has an especial Respect to his human Nature, pointing directly to his unparalleled Humiliation, &c. in it; or to some very extraordinary Actions, or Passions, of our blessed Lord, as Man. Every one, who will but consult the Passages, may see this. — And 4. As the Delights of the Eternal Son, before the Foundation of the World, were with the Sons of Men! Prov. viii. 31. So, when he became our near Kinfman, he seems to have been so much pleased with his New Relation, as to have been highly delighted with the Title, the Son of Man! And therefore, as if he had even gloried in it, he more fre-
quently used it than any other; particularly, before his Disciples and other Followers! and especially, when the Time of his Death drew near!

The second Part of this Proposition, (That Christ, as God, is indeed the Son of God, and often, in Scripture, so called,) I hope, we have, by this Time, sufficiently proved; and shall, through Grace, put it, by and by, out of all rational Doubt. --- Taking it then here for granted, I now, only offer these Observations. --- 1. This Title, the Son of God, strictly speaking, is also a Title of Nature: Or, if we consider the common, grammatical, and proper, Use of the Words, denotes, or signifies, only his Divine Nature; or his natural Relation to God the Father, as his own Father; and not his Office. --- 2. The only begotten Son of God, having condescended to be the Mediator between God and Man; and having assumed our Nature, (that, in and by it, he might act the Mediator's Part,) and so become God-Man, or God and Man in one Person: This Title, the Son of God, does often, by a Figure very usual in Scripture, and in all Sorts of Writings, denote, or signify, the whole complex Person of the Redeemer, or God-Man, as called to, and in the actual Execution of, that stupendous Undertaking. Jo. v. 25. Ch. ix. 35. Mark xiv. 61, 62. &c. &c. And yet, --- 3. Tho' it, in many Places, denotes the complex Person of the Messiah, as God-Man, and in the actual Execution of his Office; yet, even in all those Passages without Exception, where it is taken in this large Sense, it has a particular Respect to his Divine Nature, plainly leading us to remember, That it was the natural and coessential Son of God, who had undertaken our Redemption; and that it was the infinite Dignity of his Person, as such, and that only, which render'd his Obedience unto Death, even the Death of the Cross, infinitely meritorious and satisfactory. --- And therefore, 4. That this Title, every where, and necessarily, pre-
pre-supposes, implies, or directly signifies, his Divine Nature.

Against all this, Our Author puts an Objection into our Mouths, which, tho' we have had before, or somewhat very like it, you shall have every Word of it, and his Answer to it. --- "If it be allowed, "that there are any Places of Scripture where the "Name Son of Man denotes the humane Nature of "Christ, or that he was really and truly Man," Surely it signifies his human Nature, if it signifies any Nature at all: Nor can it, possibly, signify any other. "why may not the Name Son of God as well sig- "nify his Divine Nature, and denote that he is true "and real God?" p. 33. --- And, Why may it not, say I? — The Catholic Church have always thought this Question, unanswerable: But our learned Au- thor makes nothing of it! "To which I answer, "that the Case is widely different;" ibid. Where- in, or upon what Account? "for the Name Son of "Man is never applied to any Person who is not true "and real Man;" 'Twou'd have been strange, in- deed, if it had, for this plain and evident Reason: Because, there is no one Creature, in the Universe, who is not really and truly Man, who either was, or could have been, either in a proper or improper Sense, called the Son of Man. "and the Scripture apply- "ing it absolutely and eminently to Christ, shews "him to be the chief of the Sons of Men:" --- Anf. 1. I want to know the Meaning of these two Adverbs, "absolutely and eminently," in this Place. —— 2. Tho' Christ, even as Man is, blessed be his Name, the great Restorer of Mankind; and so egregiously the chief of the Sons of Men, that the very greatest of them, were never worthy to bear his Shoes; Mat. iii. 11. Yet this Title, as we have hinted, is applied to him, not so much, if at all, to denote his Greatness, as the unparallell'd and unconceivable Depth of his Humiliation, who was the Person to, and of, whom, the
the Father himself said, *As many were astonished at thee; his Visage was so marred more than any Man,* &c. *If. lii. 14. &c. &c.* and who could say of himself, *But I am a Worm,* and *no Man!* &c. *Pf. xxii. 6. &c.* "But the Name *son of God* is applied often in the *Old Testament,* and in the *New,* " both to *Angels* and to *Men:""] But this, say I, is a great Mistake. See p. 127--131. &c. For, (1.) No one in Heaven, or in Earth, but himself, is ever, in Scripture, *filed the Son of God:* And it would be a Blunder, indeed, to say, that *Angels* and *Men,* in the Plural Number, are called *the Son of God* in the Singular. No one, I say, (having thought more fully of that Text, *Luke* iii. 33.) but himself, is ever, in Scripture, called *the Son of God:* For, it is not *Adam,* but *Christ,* who is there so called, as I humbly conceive, for these Reasons. (1.) There is no need of an *Ellipsis,* where the Sense is plain, and full, yea, and very emphatic, without any. (2.) It seems very strange, to meet with upwards of *seventy of these Figures,* where there was no Occasion for so much as one of them. (3.) 'Tis yet much more so, That these Words, *which was the Son of,* should be, within the Compass of a few Verses, *seventy Times* at least, taken in the most *proper Sense;* to signify, that every one of those mentioned, was the Son of his Father by *natural Generation:* And yet, at last, and in the very same Line, should be taken *once,* and *but once,* in a very, if not the most, *improper Sense;* to denote, not that *Adam was the Son of God* by *natural Generation,* (as *Christ, as God,* or *the only begotten of the Father,* really is,) but only, improperly, by *Creation.*—

And, (4.) The Evangelist having carried up the Genealogy, to the *first Man,* there was no need to tell us, that *Adam had no Father,* except his *Creator:* But, there was great Reason to remind all, to whom his History should come, That *this Child,* who, tho' conceived miraculously, was yet *born in a Stable,* &c. was
was indeed *the Son* that was to be given unto us, and be called, *the Mighty God*; &c. *Is. ix. 6.* and consequently, was *God-Man*: Or, That He was not only, according to the flesh, the *Son* of every One of his Progenitors; but also *the Son of God*, and, as such, over all, *God blessed for ever*; Rom. *ix. 5.* or, as the Angel told Zacharias, Luke *i. 16*. *the Lord their God* — (2.) No one of them ever was, or can be, called *God's own*, *proper*, and much less only be-gotten *Son*. — But, these Adnouns were here very wisely forgotten! — And therefore, (3.) Those Angels and Men, who are called *his Sons*, are so called, in an *improper* Sense only, for this undeniable Reason: Because, they are all his *Creatures*; and therefore, not properly *his Sons*. “and yet they are not “true and real God;” No: they are not, cannot be. — *No Son of God*, but *his only proper*, *coessential Son*, is *true and real God*. “and therefore when this Name “is given absolutely and eminently to *Christ*, it can “necessarily be construed to signify no more, than “the most eminent and chief of all who are called the “Sons of God, or one who is above them all, in Cha-“racter and Office.” Anf. 1. This I considered before, and now again, deny, that this *Conclusion* does, or can, follow from his *Premisses*. — 2. The “most eminent and chief of all, who are called the “Sons of God,” is his *coessential Son*, his only be-gotten. — 3. We do not, or need not, believe that he is a *coessential Son*, and, as such, *the true God*, merely because of these Titles; tho' considering the *Number*, the *Variety*, the *Emphasis* of them, and how frequently they occur, they are a sufficient Foundation for the *Faith*, of any *rational Creature*: But, because there are so many and great Things affirmed of, or ascribed to, *this Son*, *Is. ix. 6.* *Ch. xliv. 22* — 25. Rom. *ix. v.* *Tit. ii. 13.* &c. &c. as even force us to deny the Bible, blaspheme the ever-blessed Author of it, or confess him to be a *coessential Son*; and there-
therefore, the true God, as he is also expressly, and very emphatically, called. 1 John v. 20. — 4. It is not "the Character" of this Son, but his Person: Nor his "Office," but his Nature, about which we are now contending. And, to name no more, — 5. His "Character and Office," as we have often observed, do necessarily pre-suppose, imply, or require, his coessential Sonship. — And this naturally leads me to his third Answer, to the first grand Objection, p. 38. which he makes, in our Name, against himself; which I promised to examine, and where we shall have more delightful Work. "Answ. 3. There are many Places of Scripture "wherein Christ is called the Son of God, and the "Son absolutely," If, by this Adverb, and that other, eminently, which come so often up, that I may observe it once for all, he means, in the highest Sense, in which this Title, the Son of God, is taken in Scripture, as he must mean, if it is to his Purpose; 'Tis, in itself, absolutely false; and, in him, a mere begging the Question, even against the clearest Proof: If any Thing else, it does him no Service. The only Sense of, the Son absolutely, in the Places where it occurs, that I can think of which is true, is that the Title, the Son, comes alone; or, that Christ is called only the Son, and not the Son of God or the Son of Man, or the own, only begotten Son of God; or, in short, without any Word or Expression to limit or fix the Sense: And thus I understand it. "where God is said to be his Father, "wherein we cannot suppose the Godhead of Christ, "is or can be designed in the most just and natural "Interpretation of the Text; such as are most of "these that follow, viz." p. 38 to 45. Here he quotes fourteen or fifteen Texts to prove this; some of which are as remarkable, and peculiar, upon several Accounts, as any in the Bible: And, would one think it, disputes as zealously, against the Truth, and
and the Catholic Church, as the Arians and the Socinians themselves do; yea, and in their Manner, and sometimes in their very Words! — These Jo. v. 18, 19, 20. Ch. viii. 38, and 44, and Jo. v. 30. will come up hereafter, when they shall be remembered: The rest you shall have in Order, with a direct Reply to each of them, when I have reminded the Reader of these few Things by Way of Question.

1. Should we grant that he is right, in all these Instances here given; Will it, Can it, follow, That he is so, in many more, where “the most just and necessary Interpretation of the Texts,” does even force us to believe he is wrong? --- 2. Because he may make a hard shift, plausibly, to pervert the Sense of this Title, the Son of God, alone, or without any of the Adnouns, own, proper, &c. to limit, and determine the Sense: Will he, Can he, conclude, That “the most just and necessary Interpretation of those many Texts,” in which he is stiled God’s own Son, his only begotten, &c. is, that he is not indeed his own Son? is not, yea cannot be, his proper, or only begotten Son? — 3. Should we allow, That this Title in every one of those Places, signifies the Messiah; and that the primary Design of it, in those Texts, was not directly to point out his Godhead: Is not the Messiah, and as such, God-man? Can then either his Person, or Office, be designed by this Title, if it does not imply his Divine Nature? — Is not his Divinity always presupposed to his engaging to be our Redeemer: And necessarily required, in his fulfilling that Office? — 4. Might not the first Person in the Trinity, who, as such, is a Father; and has, as such, all the Prerogatives of a Father; for the more conspicuous Display of the Divine Attributes, &c. out of his unconceivable Love to the World; delegate his own only begotten, and as such, his coessential Son, to an Office, in Appearance, indeed, beneath him, and unworthy of him: And might
might not this Son, upon mutual Promises agreed on between them, for Ends really worthy of them both, voluntarily and freely, in his unspakable Love to us, accept of a Commission from him, to execute that Office? — 5. If it was absolutely necessary for our Redeemer, to be God-Man: Might not the coessential Son, who had so greatly condescended, as to redeem us with his precious Blood, 1 Pet. i. 19, &c. humble himself so far, as to empty himself, and take upon him the Form of a Servant, and be made in the Likeness of Men, &c. Phil. ii. 6—11. &c. that he might have a Right, and be put into a Capacity, to act the Redeemer’s Part? Heb. ii. 9—18. &c. --- 6. When the Son had assumed our Nature, or taken a true Body and a reasonable Soul into a Personality with himself: Might not the two Natures, with all their essential Properties, remain distinct; so that, in his complex Person, all the Perfections of the divine Nature, and all the natural Imperfections and sinless Infirmities also of our Nature, might meet? ---7. If we consider him purely as Man, a mere Creature, made under the Law, &c. who was also to give his People a most perfect Example of all Righteousness: Was it not his Duty, always to fear, serve, worship, pray to, trust in, and love God, and do every Thing else, for his Glory? --- 8. Since the coessential Son voluntarily undertook to be the Redeemer, and, for that End, emptied himself, and took upon him the Form of a Servant; &c. since the Father is the first of the blessed Three, both in subsisting and working; since they all Three concur, in all their Works relating to the Creatures; and since the Son as such, accepted of a Commission from the Father, upon the Promise of his constant Concurrence with him, in the whole of his Work: May not I ask, Why may we not think, That the Redeemer, who is God-Man, and as such, especially when his unconceivable, if I may not say infinite, Passion drew near; when in his Agony; and
when forsaken of his God? Why, I say, may we not think, That, at all Times, but especially on those Occasions, he (not only might, but) actually would, and did, most heartily, fervently, and importunately, pray, or rather plead, that his Father would remember; and perform, his Promises to him, then when, as Man, he was in his greatest Extremity?—Would not this, that he had these Promises to plead, be an unspeakable Support, and Relief, to his holy, and blessed Soul, in that unconceiveable Distress?—Yea, with the utmost Reverence, as in his Presence, I speak it.—9. Why might not the second Person, and as such, plead the constant and promised Concourse of his Father, upon all proper Occasions; and especially, upon these now mentioned: And plead, I humbly conceive I may say, insist upon it, (see Jo. xvii. 24.) That all the Promises made to him in the Covenant of Redemption, might be fully performed?—Is it, any how, or upon any Account, more unbecoming, or unworthy of, the coessential Son, and as such, to plead for that promised Concourse, than it was to accept of the Promise of it, and rely upon it: Or, to insist upon the Reward, when he had fully answered all Demands upon him, than it was to undertake and sustain his Office, upon the Promise of that Reward?—Suffer me to obvserve farther,

N. B. 1. Christ being as truly God, as the Son of God, as he is Man, as the Son of Man, this Title, "the Son absolutely," i. e. (if true and to the Purpose,) without any other Words added to it, may denote him either as the One, or the other, or both, as the Context, the Scope, or Circumstances of the Place where it occurs, direct and require. — This is evident of itself, and the common Sense of all Men will grant it is so.

N. B. 2. When our Lord was, in a long Discourse, Jo. v. 17—47. Ch. x. 24—38, &c. pleading
ing, and proving, That he was a coessential Son, or so the Son of God as to be equal with him; he might, notwithstanding this, give several Hints, That, for the full Execution of his Office, he had condescended to become Man, &c. as their own Eyes saw: And consequently, might sometimes, in the same Discourse, speak of himself in Language proper only to the coessential Son; and sometimes sink his Stile to suit the Nature he had assumed, or the Character he then sustained. There is nothing in this inconvenient, improper, or improbable. — Yea, How could he speak of himself, and of Things concerning himself, what was absolutely necessary he should speak, if he had not? For,

N. B. 3. Had not our blessed Saviour, as proper Occasions offered, declared himself to be God the Son, and therefore, as such, the one true God, or equal with the Father, he had not publickly pro-claim'd himself to be the Divine Person, who the Prophets foretold, was to come; see If. ix 6. Ch. vii. 14. Ch. xxv. 9. Ch. xxxv. 4—7. Ch. xl. 9—11. Ch. xlv. 21—25. Jer. xxiii. 6. Zech. xiii. 7, &c. nor could judicious People, who knew the Scriptures, have, upon just Grounds, received him as the promised and expected Saviour: And, had they not seen, and been satisfied, that he was indeed true Man; and that he acted in Character as became him, and as it was written of him; they could not have been blam'd, if they had not acknowledged him to be the Christ. — And,

N. B. 4. In no one of the Texts, I am now to examine, but one, (which should therefore have had no Place here,) is Christ called the Son of God, but only, the Son: And therefore, as we have now observed, since he is both the Son of God and the Son of Man, this Title may be applied to him, as either the one, or the other, or both, as the Scope and Circumstances of the Passages may determine. — Should
Should I therefore grant, (1) That the Language of
any, or all, of these Places where he calls himself the
Son, and no more, is not the Language of the second Person; and could he also prove it; 'twould
be nothing against me, who am not pleading, That
the Title, the Son, every where denotes the second Person, and as such: But, that the Title, the Son of God, when strictly taken, always does. — Should
I say, (2) That Christ, in some of those Places, speaks of himself chiefly, if not only, as Man, as I shall prove he does; 'twould, no way, contradict myself, or serve our Author: Because, I freely grant, That this Title, the Son, when it comes
alone, and is applied to Christ, sometimes signifies only his human Nature; or that, when he uses it, he speaks of himself, as Man only. — (3) Should
I say, This Title, the Son, signifies the Mediator, and as such, as, at least, in several of those Places, it certainly does; (tho' sometimes with a particular Respect to one Nature, and sometimes to the other;) yet the Idea of Mediator necessarily implies them both.
— So that, let these Texts be interpreted how his Admirers can desire, they can never answer their Purpose, except they should insist upon it,—(4) That
this Title, the Son, is in them taken, "eminently " and absolutely." And then, I answer, If, by these Adverbs, they mean, that it is taken in the very highest Sense, in which this Title, the Son of God, is ever taken, when applied to the second Person, or to Christ; we shall, by and by, prove, That it is eminently and absolutely false: If they mean any Thing else, it no way serves their Cause; as every judicious and impartial Reader must see, whether he will or no. — And these now might suffice to shew every intelligent Person, how to reply to all that can be urged against the Truth, from these or the like Places, were there many more of them;
without observing how much our Author is mistaken, in the Terms he has given them; &c. or the sad Tendency of several ———— But, we shall here answer every one of them, directly and fully, in another Manner. — Proceed we then to his Texts

" Jo. vi. 28. I came down from Heaven, not to do " mine own Will, but the Will of him that sent me; " i. e. the Father. This does not sound like the " Language of Godhead," An out-of-the-Way Ex-

pression! " which is supreme and independent, and " can do all Things of itself, and by its own Will." p. 40, 41. — Anf. But, it sounds very like the Language of the second Person, who voluntarily con-
descended to receive a Commission from the Father; and who humbled himself also, egregiously, I think I may say infinitely, in the Execution of it: Yea, and could not possibly have done this Will, had he not indeed been a coessential Son.

" Jo. xiv. 28. My Father is greater than I. 'Tis " hardly to be supposed that Christ here intended to " speak of his Divine Nature." And it could be no News to the Disciples, nor any other Persons upon the Face of the Earth, to tell them, That God the Father was greater, yea infinitely greater, than his human Nature! " The eternal God is the greatest of " Beings, and can acknowledge no greater than " himself." But, the eternal Son has an eternal Father, who has all the natural Prerogatives of a Father; and therefore is, as such, or so far, and in this Sense, greater than he. — Withal, tho' Christ might not here, " intend to speak directly of his " Divine Nature," as indeed he did not; this Title, the Son, might " necessarily imply it:" And, if taken in its most eminent Sense, certainly does so. — But, our Author seems to have quite mistaken the Scope of this Passage: For, our Lord does not here, I humbly conceive, speak directly of any of his Natures, but of his
his Estate of Humiliation as Mediator, and chiefly as Man, &c.

"Jo. xiv. 31. As the Father gave me Commandment, even so I do. This does not seem to be the Language of supreme Godhead, which receives no Commandment from another." p. 41. It does not indeed seem to be, nor is it, the Language of the Father; the first Person in the Godhead, who neither ever did, nor will, nor can, receive Commandments from another." But it is, plainly, the proper Language of the Son, the second Person, who humbled himself, or condescended to accept of an Office under him; and, by Consequence, to receive Commandment from him. —- After all, "Language of Godhead, and of supreme Godhead," and several other such strange and uncouth Phrases, are far from being proper: —- But, too clearly, conceal some Thing under them.

"Jo. xvii. 5. Father, glorify me with thy Self, with the Glory which I had with thee before the World was. Surely Christ as God does not offer up "Prayers to the Father," p. 41. This and the Three following Paragraphs you shall have verbatim, the subject Matter contain'd in them requiring a direct, and very full Reply. Answ. 1. And surely, say I, the Son of God, i. e. the second Person, now made Flesh, might offer up Prayers: Or rather, if you will, might claim, and insist upon, the Performance of the Promises made to him. -- For, these Words are not so much, if at all, a proper Prayer, i. e. a Desire of, or Supplication for, something out of mere Favour; and which therefore might be granted, or denied, according to mere Pleasure, without any Injustice: But, a proper Claim of what was now due to him, (not only by Promise; but) in the strictest Justice. "q. d. says that most judicious and accurate "Annotator, Mr. Clark, upon the Place, Now I "have done my Work pay me my Wages for it, "Phil.
It was actually the second Person who made this claim: Because, Christ had no other real Existence, before the Foundation of the World, but as the second Person, or in his Divine Nature: At least, the Catholic Church have generally thought he had no other; and the Scriptures, so far as I have observed, do, no where, affirm he had.—But, 3. No one, who was not a coessentiai Son, could, or durst, have offered up that Prayer, which is indeed a Sampler of his Intercession in Heaven, as our Advocate with the Father. 1 Jo. ii. 2. — Yea, 4. It would have been direct Blasphemy in any One, but the second Person, in any Act of Worship, to use such Words of himself, as those, vers. 2, 3, 10, 20, 22, 24. if I may not say, to use any one Verse in the whole Chapter. — "and much less could " he pray for a Glory, which his Divine Nature " once had, of which he seems divested at present. " All this is hardly consistent with supreme Deity " belonging to his Sonship," This new, and almost unintelligible Expression wants sadly to be explained! However, if it is consistent, tho' hardly, all may be still well. " i. e. either to be divested of his Glory, or to pray for the Restoration of it." p. 41. Anf. --- 1. The essentiai Glory of the Divine Nature is absolutely, and in itself, always the same. — 2. The essentiai Glory of each of the three Persons, and purely as such, is also, absolutely, and in itself, always the same, and can neither be laid aside, nor interrupted: Nor can any one of them divest himself, or be divested, of it, any more than of his Godhead. — But, 3. The second Person, who purely as such, was in the Form of God, (as his human Soul, never was,) and thought it not Robbery to be equal with God, (as his human Soul must have thought it; and as the second Person must needs have also thought it, had it not been strictly true;) The second Person, I say who was in the Form of God, might, and did, vo-
voluntarily suffer his Glory to be vailed from us: Or might, and did, to use our Author's Words, so far divest himself of it, as to empty himself, as the Apostle expresseth it, and take upon him the Form of a Servant, and be found in Fashion as a Man, (neither of which, I conceive, his human Soul could do, or, with Truth, be said to have done,) and humble himself, (not only to be a Man of Sorrows, and acquainted with Grief, &c. but) to become obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross! Phil. ii. 6—8. [Be it here, by the way, remembred, That the Humiliation of the highest possible Creature, was just nothing to the Humiliation of the coeessential Son of God: — That the Obedience of no mere Creature to his Creator, could be, with any Emphasis, called an humbling of himself: —And, That the Obedience of no created Person, could be, in the strictest Sense, meritorious; and much less Satisfactory, for any other Person; and yet much less, for all the Redeemed. &c.] And, 4. The Word made Flesh, or the coeessential Son of God in our Nature, might be reviled, abused, &c. &c. put under an ill Name, &c. yea, and be condemned as a Malefactor, a Deceiver, &c. or a Blasphemer, for calling himself the Son of God; and when suffering for our sins, be made a Curse for us; Gal. iii. 13. yea, and be forsaken of his God! Mat. xxvii. 46. &c. Might, did I say? Why, it was really so. The Word made Flesh actually suffered all these: For, it was One who is called God, and with the Article too, who purchased the Church with his own Blood: Acts xx. 28. And the Son of the Father's Love, through whose Blood we have Redemption, was He by whom, and for whom, all Things were created. &c. Col. i. 12—17. 1 John iii. 16. — And who, that had seen him in the Garden, in an Agony, or on the Cross; and had heard him cry, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me! could have then thought, That he was indeed, the only begotten of the Father? How hard was this, then to be believed? Verily,
Verily, Flesh and Blood could never have revealed it to any Man. Mat. xvi. ver. 17. — And, 5. Why might he not then have prayed, or insisted upon it, That the Father would glorify him, according to his Promise, (1.) By wiping off all those Reproaches, &c. — (2.) Justifying him in all that he had said of himself, &c. --- (3.) Giving the highest possible Proof, that he was indeed his only begotten Son, &c. by raising him from the Dead; —— (4.) And conferring upon him all that additional Glory, which was promised him as God-Man, such as the Ascension of his human Nature into Heaven? &c. &c. — This being, in my Opinion, the chief Text which Mr. Fleming, as I remember, produced for his principal Noftrums, I have been so particular in considering it; and shall therefore illustrate it also, by a common Simile. When we speak of an Eclipse of the Sun, everyone now knows, that the Expression is improper. It is not the Sun that is then darkened, (as the Moon really is when she is in an Eclipse,) but our Earth. The Light of the Sun is not then, absolutely and in itself, in the least diminished: But the Moon, by coming between it and us, hides it from us, that we cannot see it; and hence proceeds the Darkness. —'Twas just so, in the Case before us. The Glory of the Son of God, the second Person, and as such, was, absolutely, and in itself, always the same: But, when he came to tabernacle among us, the Veil of his Flesh and the unconceivable Depth of his Humiliation, in, or under it, did so very much intercept the Rays of his Glory, That it was not easy, yea, without Divine Revelation and the Concurrence of his Grace also, hardly possible, for them, who saw him in the Days of his Flesh, steadfastly to behold his Divine Glory, or, clearly, see that he was indeed, the coessential Son of God.

"Jo. xx. 17. Christ says, I ascend to my Father and your Father," Yes, προς τοῦ πατέρα μου καὶ τοῦ πατέρα ὑμων, to the Father of me and the Father of you; and
and not τον πατέρα ἡμῶν, our Father, as he has taught us to say; plainly hinting a Distinction; and, That the Foundation of this his Relation to the Father was quite different, from the Foundation of theirs to him. And, indeed, Generation and Adoption are wholly different, yea, and inconsistent. "and to my God " and your God." Where the same Manner of Expression, the God of me, &c. is used; tho' for another Reason. "So 2 Cor. xi. 31. and 1 Pet. i. 3. "the Father is called the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."—Ans. God the Father is, (1.) actually the own Father of Christ, as God, i. e. of the second Person: As he is his own Son, by a proper Generation. (2.) He is, or may be called, the Father of Christ, as Man; because he created him: But then, it is only in an improper Sense, that he is his Father. And, (3.) He is, I think, or may be called, his Father, but improperly also, as Mediator; because he concurred in, and to, the personal Union of the two Natures in him; and appointed and called him to that Office. — And he is the God of Christ, (1.) As Man; because he not only created his human Nature, but chose it to that most peculiar Honour, to which any created Thing was ever advanced, viz. to be personally united to the only begotten Son of God.—(2.) I do not know but I may say, As the second Person in the Trinity, tho' not purely or merely as such; but as he had voluntarily condescended to accept of a Commission from him, and act as his Deputy, in Consequence of a Covenant between them. And, (3.) As the Word made Flesh, or the Mediator; for as much as he had engaged to do every Thing for his Glory, expecting his Concurrence, and a full Reward at last. "Now the Father cannot properly be the "God of the Deity of Christ," Another very odd Expression! And what then? Because he is not, properly, the God of the Deity of Christ: May not he be the own, proper Father of his own, only be...
gotten Son? "i. e. his Creator, his absolute Governor, and his Object of Worship, which is the "proper Sense of my God in all other Scriptures." This, I humbly conceive, is a Mistake. The Expression, my God, every where in Scripture, directly and primarily denotes a Covenant Relation, between God and him that uses it: But, in a Covenant, there are mutual Promises, and, if I may so say, mutual Obligations on both Sides. — And hence, when God declares his Covenant Relation to any People, or Person, he always calls himself, or promises to be, their God: And, when they, or any of them, plead such a Relation, or the Promises made to them in the Covenant, they stile him their God, or our God; and each of them for himself, my God. — Thus did our Lord himself. If. xlix. 4, 5. Mic. v. 4. Mat. xxvii. 46. &c. — Whence it is plain, That those Expressions, in these Texts, refer to the eternal Transactions, that were between the Father and his Son, relating to our Redemption. — "Nor is there "any sufficient Reason then why we should contrive "the Words my Father, as relating to the Deity of "Christ, since the Words my God cannot be so con- "trived: And since both these Titles seem so inti- "mately connected and referring to one and the "same Subject." p. 42. Anf. 1. The Texts do not say, That the Father is properly the God of the Deity of Christ: And therefore, it may be sufficient, if we can shew, as we have done, That he is, in any Sense, his God; and much more, in so many Sensees, tho' improperly only. 2. Tho' these Titles are so intimately connected, as to refer to one and the same Person, they neither refer to the same Nature in that Person; nor, precisely, to the same Relation that is between the Father and the Son. — But seeing, 'tis plain, there is nothing in these Texts that can do him any Service, we go on,
"Mark xiii. 32. Of that Day and Hour knoweth no Man, no not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." p. 42. This being the Passage, which the Arians and all other Enemies of the Divinity of Christ, and the Doctrine of the Trinity, have, in all Ages, had perpetually in their Mouths; and of which they are incessantly boasting, as absolutely unanswerable; we shall the more carefully examine it. — Their Argument is this, The true God knew the Day of Judgment, i. e. the Day and Hour when it shall be: Christ, when he spake these Words, knew not, as he tells us himself, of that Day and Hour: Therefore, he was not then, and consequently, is not now, The true God. Or, thus shorter, The Son knew not the Day of Judgment: And therefore was not, could not be, God. — One would not have expected our learned Author among them: But, since it is otherwise, we shall first consider every Syllable he has said; and then, offer some other Thoughts, upon it.

"I confess it may be said in that Paragraph he is called the Son of Man, ver. 26." He is so; and no where in all that Chapter, nor indeed, but twice or thrice, in that whole Gospel, the Son of God, tho' he, a great many Times, in it, stiles himself the Son of Man. "yet it must be granted that the more natural Sense of the Words is, Of that Hour knoweth not the Son of God, but only God the Father."— Why; if it must, it must! --- But, Whence does this appear? Has he any Thing, any Word, to support this must? No: Not so much as one Syllable! Only it would suit his Purpose; and therefore, he roundly afferts it: And consequently, it must be granted! But, tho' an Angel from Heaven should say it, Gal. i. 8. we should not, durst not, grant it. "but only God the Father!" And now, Will any of his Admiring, upon second Thoughts, affert This? — The second Person in the Trinity, and as such, is not
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God
God the Father: And yet he grants, within four Lines, as we shall see presently, (if his Words have any Sense, and are true;) that he did know it! ———
The Holy Spirit, the third Person, is not God the Father: And, did not he, who searcheth all Things, yea, the deep Things of God, 1 Cor. ii. 10. know the Day of Judgment? Could not, did not, he, who knoweth the Things of God, as the Spirit of Man which is in him knoweth the Things of a Man, ver. 11. know the Day of Judgment? ——— 
'This Text does so plainly "shew Christ's Ignorance of the Day of Judgment "as he is the Son," —He should have here added, "of "God," and in the second and third Line below also; or else, it is not at all to the Purpose: Or, "absolutely;" and then it would have been absolutely false. But, the Fear of God, I hope, refrained him. — This Title, the Son, when applied to Christ, may, as we have often heard, signify either the Son of Man, or the Son of God, or the Mediator, and purely as such. —If it here signifies, as it certainly does, the Son of Man, and purely as such, we freely grant, That Christ, as Man, did not know the Day of Judgment. —If it signifies, the Son of God, we believe, (and so, I think, does our Author, in the two very next Lines,) That he knew, and knows, all that the Father does. See John xxi. 15—17. Mat. ix. 4. Jo. ii. 24, 25. Jo. xiii. 4. Rev. ii. 23, &c. —If it denotes the Mediator, God-Man, I cannot help thinking, That he knew it: Because, if the Eternal Son, and purely as such, ever knew that Day; I cannot believe, That his taking our Nature, or his undertaking and executing that Office in it, could make him forget it; or, that he could forget it. "that tho' it be "granted the Divine Nature of Christ knows the Day of Judgment," i. e. That God the Son, or the second Person, knows it. This must, I say, be the Sense, if it has any; and if it is not downright Sabel- lianism! If he means the former, we are agreed;
but then, every one almost of these Lines contradicts another: If the latter, it destroys the Doctrine of the Trinity; and overturns the whole Christian Faith. "yet as a Son, he does not:" It should have run, "yet, as the Son of God, he does not:" or, it is not at all to the Point: And, had it been so, 'twould have been Answver enough, to have replied, Neither does this Text say so, nor any other. "therefore as a Son, he hath not a Divine Nature, or true Godhead." Thus you have had every Word of this strange Paragraph. I need say no more to it; nor indeed can I, without seeming to delight to —

—— If any Man, upon the Face of the Earth, shall, from these Premisses, draw a just Conclusion, which shall destroy the Cause I am pleading, I have done. —— I cannot help saying, I am apt to think, that there has been several Mistakes in the Copy, &c. for surely, such Paragraphs as this and some others, wherein are so many little Things, &c. could never come from our worthy Author.

But, I cannot, so lightly, pass this celebrated Text; and therefore, must ask,

Quest. i. Who, or what, does, or could he, here mean by, "the Son of God?" —— It cannot be the second Person, in the Trinity: Because, he is positive throughout, That he, as such, neither is, nor is ever called, his Son, or a Son. —— It cannot be, "the Divine Nature of Christ," to use one of his own Expressions: Because, as he grants, it knows the Day of Judgment. —— It must therefore be his human Nature, if he has any Nature at all: For verily he took not upon him the Nature of Angels; Heb. ii. 16. and the Scriptures never speak of any created rational Nature, but the Angelic and the Human. — If he means his Human Nature, I want sadly to know, Whether these two Titles, the Son of God, and the Son of Man, do not, with him, signify the very same Thing precisely: Or, if they differ at all,
all, Wherein, or how far, they do differ? Should it be said, "His pre-existent Soul, is properly the Son of * God,* and is a *supra-angelical* Spirit. Anf. Wa-
ving the *Impropriety* at present, and supposing also all this to be true; our Author has, in another Place, said enough, in my Opinion, to make us think his *human Soul* could not but *know* the Day of Judgment.

" Supposing the Divine *Wisdom,* in *Prov.* viii. pri-
"marily to signify the Idea of the Divine Counfels
"and Decrees about Creation and Redemption, it
"may be properly said, This *Wisdom* was *begotten*
"or *brought forth* before the Creation," (May it in-
deed? We shall see presently.) " and all this Sy-
"tem of Divine Counfels being deposited with the
"pre-existent Soul of *Christ,* (in whom are all the
"*Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge,* &c. p. 46.)

Then, surely, it could not be ignorant of the Day
of Judgment! — " And those who believe the Doc-
"trine of the *pre-existent Soul of Christ,* have made
"it appear," Yes, perhaps to themselves! " that if it
"refer to Christ, it is very probable this *pre-existent
"Soul* considered as having the *Divine Nature united*
"to it," This sadly wants to be explained, " is
"here represented as commencing its Existence, its
"Union with Godhead, receiving its Commission,
"and beginning its Office." p. 47. Anf. 1. Surely,
"it did not commence its Existence, after the *divine
"Nature* was *united* to it. 2. I want to know what
he here means by *Godhead;* and what Kind of an U-
nion this was, &c.—However, supposing, I say, all
this to be true, I can hardly think any Thing more
improbable, than, That among all " those Counfels
" and Decrees about Creation and Redemption,
"which were deposited with this *Soul,*" there shou-
d be nothing relating precifely to the Day of Judgment.

— Are *all the Treasures of Wisdom and Know-
ledge,* indeed in it, or him: And could it, or he,
then be ignorant of that Day? — Did he not, when
when he had received his Commission, know all that were given him of the Father? Jo. vi. 37. Ch. xvii. 2. and 6. &c. — Was he not, by his Office, to be the Shepherd of the Sheep, who was to give his Life for them, &c. Jo. x. 14. — 18. and give an Account of them? And does he not know them: John x. vers. 11. 17. 27. &c. yea, and call them by their Names? ver. 3. — Are they not in his Hand, and does he not give unto them Eternal Life? ver. 28. &c. — And does he not, thro' all that Chapter, speak of the first Person as his Father, and of himself as his Son, vers. 17. 18. 30. 36. &c. — And could he then be ignorant of the Day of Judgment? Yea, I must ask,

Queft. 2. How the Arians, and others, who dream, That the Logos supplied the Place of Christ's human Soul, and that he had no other Soul; nor any other Thing in him, that was immaterial and rational: How, I say, can they interpret this Text? — All these Things now quoted, and several others to the fame Purpofe, (not to mention the many Proofs he had given of his knowing the Thoughts and the Hearts of Men; Mat. ix. 4. Ch. xii. 25. &c. nor what the Evangelift afferts very clearly, fully, and solemnly, That he knew all Men, Jo. ii. 24. and knew what was in Man, ver. 25.) he affirmed of himself, long before he told his Disciples, That the Son knew not the Day of Judgment! — Can all these Passages then be indeed true, if he was really ignorant of the Day of Judgment? — If he really knew his Sheep, Jo. x. 14. 27. &c. &c. and other Sheep whom he was to bring home; ver. 16. If he could call them by their Names, ver. 3. and knew all that the Father gave him, Ch. vi. 37. and was to lose none of them; ver. 39, &c. &c. — If all these, I say, are really true, surely he knew when, and where, they should be born, and live; &c. which of them should be last called, and converted; &c. &c. when the Number of God's Elef
Elest would be accomplished; &c. and when he would give unto them eternal Life: And therefore, one would think, could not but know the Day of Judgment. — From all which, I conceive, we may conclude, 1. That there are two distinct Natures in Christ, the Divine and the Human: And that, as God, i.e. the Son of God, he knew all these Things, and consequently, the Day of Judgment also; but that, as the Son of Man, he did not know them all, nor this in particular. 2. That, till they can prove, That the eternal Son did not take unto himself a true Body, and a reasonable Soul, which can never be done; this Text can never, with a good Grace, be urged against his true and proper Divinity, except they deny all those other Passages. — And, 3. That, if they cease their Noise and Blustering about this Expression, till they have well considered, and confuted, what I have here offered, as I would fain hope they will, we shall hear no more of it in haste. — Should it be asked of us,

Queft. 3. Since Christ's Words, neither the Son, are plain, How we ourselves can get over this Difficulty?

Ans. We see no Difficulty in it at all, no not the least; any more than there is, in that Passage, Luke ii. 52. And Jesus, i.e. the Child, who was not only born of, but made of, the Virgin, and as such, increased in Wisdom and Stature, &c. i.e. increased in the one, as he did in the other, even as, mutatis mutandis, other Children do. — This Text clearly explains the other, and makes every Thing easy and expedite: And, if this no Way derogates from the Glory of our ever blessed Redeemer, the other cannot. — Our worthy Author confesses, Pref. p. 5. " That Christ the Son of God, is both God and Man; " — perfect God and perfect Man; — and that he who " suffered for us, was God and Man, tho' one Christ."

Well then, that we may remove every Thing that
but looks like a Difficulty, we shall first offer a few Propositions, and then consider this Context.

1. If Christ is perfect God and perfect Man, let these Propositions be well remembered, (1) The two Natures, tho' personally united in him, were and are, yet distinct; or else he could not be perfectly and purely, either the one, or the other. (2) If they were distinct and perfect, he had in his Person, all that is essential to them both, distinctly. — Very well. Christ, as Man, was a Creature, a mere Creature, and as much so as other Men: — As Man, he could know nothing, as God does; but learned Things by Sensation, Observation, and Reflection, &c. according to his Age and Capacity, just as other Men: — What could not be known, any of these Ways, he must have been ignorant of, as well as they; unless it was, one Way or another, communicated to him by Revelation: — The Day of Judgment could not be known, any of these Ways: — Let his Capacity, as Man, have been as great as possible, he could not possibly know all Things: — God, i. e. any of, or all, the ever blessed Three, might reveal to him more or less, as he, or they saw meet; and that, at what Times, by what Means, in what Manner, to what Degree, and for what Purposes, he or they thought Good: — It was no Diminution of his Character, as Man, not to know what was above his Capacity, as such; what was no Way necessary, or could answer no valuable End, in his then present Circumstances; provided, he had always the full Knowledge of every Thing, which could, any how, contribute to the successful and effectual Accomplishment of his glorious Undertaking: — The Knowledge of the Day of Judgment, was no more necessary to him as Man, nor could have been any more useful to him, at that Day, than it is to us now; to whom it would be really, upon several Accounts, dangerous and hurtful; for which Reason, God has, in great Wisdom and Love to us, concealed
... And himself, in these Words, signifies, That God had not revealed it to him, as such. —— And that this is the Sense, will appear, ———.

2. If we consider the Time, the Occasion, and the Persons to whom our blessed Lord spake these Words. They are Part of the Answer, he gave his Three Favourites and Andrew, Mark xiii. 3. who, (perhaps presuming too much, upon the Familiarity where-with he distinguished and honoured them,) asked him privately, When shall these Things be? &c. or as Matthew has it, Ch. xxiv. 3. What shall be the Sign of thy coming, viz. to execute thy Judgments upon Jerusalem, ver. 20. and of the End of the World, when the universal and final Judgment shall commence? ver. 26. 27. — Our Saviour, (well knowing, that it would be of great and manifold Use, to the believing Jews, to have some Signs, whereby they might know when the former should draw near; and to his Church, in all Ages, to have some, to acquaint them with the Approach of the latter, &c.) gives them many and various, interspersing many weighty Cautions, and Instructions, and Exhortations also how to improve them, so as that they might be always ready: ——— But, as to the Day and Hour, i.e. the precise Time, it was no Concern of theirs; would do them no Service; and therefore, they were not to ask any Thing about it. And, to make them easy, He assures them, That no one, no not the Angels, neither the Son, knew it, but the Father; not excluding the second and third Persons, as we have heard, but Creatures only, all of them, even the greatest, the Son of Man himself, and as such, not excepted. — He well knew their Temper, Mark. x. 35. Jo. xxi. 21, &c. and the Prejudice they were under, &c and that they would be very fond to know the very Time, even to the Day and Hour. That he might therefore, check this vain Curiosity, teach
teach them *Humility* &c. and prevent any farther Sollicitations, about such Things which they had no Concern with, did he give this *very particular* answer. q. d. What was necessary for me, as the Son of Man, either to know or to teach, the Father hath revealed to me; *Jo. v. 20. Mat. xi. 27.* and *I have made known unto you; Ch. xv. 15.* and shall farther explain, and confirm every Part of it, hereafter; *Ch. xvi. 12.* But the *precise Time* of the Day of Judgment, which was not necessary for me, now in my present State, to know, he hath not. — I am easy and satisfied, not desiring now to know it, seeing it is his Pleasure; and so should you. — *The Disciple is not above his Master; Mat. x. 24.* Learn then of me, for I am *lovely in Heart.* *Ch. xi. 30.* — What is that Day, and that Hour, to you? 'Tis not for you to know the Times or the Seasons, which the Father hath put into his own Power. *Acts i. 7.* i. e. 'Tis not your Business; would be of no real Service to you, nor any other; yea, might and would do Hurt: Refrain therefore your *sinful Curiosity*; trouble not yourselves with what does not belong to you; you have other Work enough to do; mind that. — That, the Disciples took those Words, or might and should have taken them, as spoken of him only as the Son of Man; or that he spake of himself only as such; seems to me undeniable, (1) From the Words of the beloved Disciple, to Peter, a few Days after, ἀ Κριῶς ἐγώ, *It is the Lord.* *Jo. xxi. 7.* (2) From the Apostle Peter's own Confession, LORD, thou knowest *all Things:* And therefore, he could not but know the Day of Judgment. *ver. 17.* And, (3) From that glorious Confession of Thomas, ἀ Κριῶς μᾶ ὡς ἢ ὂς ὁ τόπος ὤς, *My Lord and my God:* And therefore, surely, did, as such, *know that Day.* *Ch. xx. 28.* — And thus, I hope, we have rescued this Text forever, from the vile Drudgery to which the Enemies of his true and proper Divinity, have long striven to *press it,*
it, tho’ in a direct Opposition to the whole Word of God. — We therefore proceed to the next Passage, of which also you shall have every Word.

"Jo. iii. 35. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all Things into his Hands." — Whence I conclude, That therefore, he is a coessential Son: Because, if he were not, He could not possibly have received all Things from him. — "ver. 34. God giveth not the Spirit by Measure unto him." — This also seems necessarily to imply his Divinity: Because, if the Recipient was finite, he could not have possibly received the Spirit, but, if I may use the Expression, in some certain Measure. — "All this implies an Inferiority or Dependency." What Words imply any Thing, which we have not granted? Does the Father’s loving the Son imply this; or any Inferiority of Essence in him! Or, his giving all Things into his Hands, any Dependency, which is beneath a coessential Son, who voluntarily condescended to accept of a Commission from him, and act as his Servant, upon the Promise, that he would give all these Things to him? — "As a Son he receives all from another, which Godhead cannot do." p. 42. — Our good Fathers would have replied directly and roundly! He received all Things, as well as his Essence, from his Father; and, could not have been a proper coessential Son, if he had not. — 2. That it is full as improper, to talk of Godhead’s giving, as receiving! And, I shall say nothing against either of these. — But, they would, I believe, all of them have also said, That this Title, the Son, in these Texts and some others which we have now vindicated and explained, and many more, denotes the Person of the Messiah, who, as such, is both God and Man; and therefore, necessarily, (not only presupposes, but) implies his Divine Nature; and consequently, does his Cause no Manner of Service, nor ours any Hurt.

"Luke
"Luke xxiii. 47. When the Centurion or Captain, saw the Miracles at the Death of Christ, he cried out, Verily, this Man was the Son of God. He cannot be supposed to mean that this Man was the true and eternal God, &c. p. 42. 43." Anf. 1. There is a Mistake here. These Words are found, Mat. xxvii. 54. and not Luke xxiii. 47. — 2. Christ is, by the Centurion, called the Son of God; and not "the Son absolutely," in his Sense; and therefore, this Text should have had no Place among those Passages where, he will have it, he is so called. — We shall consider it, with Pleasure, by and by. —

The last is,

"1 Cor. xv. 28. Then shall the Son also himself be subject to him that hath put all Things under him, that God may be all in all. This is a Character of "too much Inferiority for true Godhead." p. 43. What is this Character? Is it that Christ is called, the Son; and is, at last, to be subject, &c? — We may answer in his own Words, to one of our Texts, the very next Page but one, "The Name, Son of "God, is not here used;" and therefore, is not to "our present Purpose." p. 45. Or we may say, this Title, the Son, may denote our Saviour, as Man; or, as the Mediator, as we shall shew presently it does in this Place: But because this Text is not without its Difficulty, as all Parties find; We shall therefore, more carefully consider it, when I have reminded the Reader, 1. That Christ, as God, is the Son of God; and, as Man, is the Son of Man; see p. 256. 257. 2. That each of these Titles, the Son of God and the Son of Man, tho', strictly and properly, both Titles of Nature, do sometimes denote and signify the complex Person of the Mediator, and as such. see p. 256. 257. 3. That, when Christ is stiled "the Son absolutely," i.e. if it be Sense and true, when this Title, the Son, is given him, without any Word added precisely to determine, whether he is spoken of as God, as he is the Son
Son of God; or, as Man, as being the Son of Man; or, as the Messiah: This Title may, yea must, denote him either as the Son of God, or as the Son of Man, or as the Messiah, and, as such, both God and Man; and that either with a more peculiar Respect to his Godhead, or Manhood, as the Scope, or Circumstances, of the Text or Context require. — These remembred, let us observe,

1. Our Lord is not, in all that long Chapter, I Cor. xv. no, nor in all that Epistle, so much as once, called the Son of God. — 2. He is not, in all that Chapter, so much as once, spoken of purely, or merely, if at all, as God. — 3. He must therefore be considered, all thro' it, either merely as Man; or, in his delegated Capacity, as the Mediator, and, as such, God-Man. — 4. It is plain, That, thro' the whole Context, he is considered as the Mediator, but with a very particular Respect to his Human Nature. —

For, strictly speaking, 5. 'Twas only as Man, he could die; ver. 3. 'twas his blessed Body only, which could be buried; ver. 4. 'twas only as Man, he could be raised up, and be seen of his Disciples; ver. 4 — 8. &c. — And, 'twas only as our Redeemer, he could die for our Sins; ver. 3. and rise again, and that by his own Power; ver. 4. comp. with John x. 18. become the first Fruits of them that slept; ver. 20. 23. and the glorious Person, in whom all shall be made alive. 21 — 23. Yea, 'Twas only as the Redeemer, or Mediator, that he bruised the Serpent's Head, Gen. iii. 15. put away Sin by the Sacrifice of Himself, Heb. ix. 26. and obtained Eternal Redemption for his People, ver. 12. by which Means he also came to have such an Interest in them. &c. 1 Pet. i. 18 — 20. &c. — And it is only as such, that he shall deliver up the Kingdom: I Cor. xv. '24. — For he must reign till he, i.e. God hath put all his Enemies under his Feet; ver. 25. even Death itself! ver. 26. — From
From all which, 'tis plain, That it is not the Son of God, and purely as such, but the Redeemer, the Delegate, and as such, who shall be subject to God even the Father. ———— Let us therefore return to our Author; and, tho' the Paragraph be long, you shall have it also, verbatim.

"The Argument stands thus: If the Son of God be true God considered as a Son, then he is origin- "nally and necessarily Lord of all,"—He is so. "and then it must be said 'tis by his own voluntary Condescension that he is so far depressed and humbled by the Economy as to become the Father's "Deputy and Vicegerent;" I should rather have said, with the Apostle, By his own voluntary Condescension, He, who being in the Form of God, thought it no Robbery to be equal with God, yet emptied himself,—humbled himself, and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross, Phil. ii. 6—8. and so was made a Curse for us. &c. Gal. iii. 13. For, I humbly conceive, the coessential Son, might, possibly, by another Economy, have "become the Father's Deputy and Vicegerent," without so humbling himself, or being depressed, thereby, "and when that Economy ceases, he is of course exalted to his "Equality with the Father," As an own Son, he was necessarily, coessential with the Father, and, purely as such, he desired no other Glory, after his Humiliation, than that which he had with his ownself before the World was. Jo. xvii. 5. "and to his essential and "natural Lordship over all. p. 43." If the Son of God be true God, considered as a Son, his essential and natural Lordship over all was never, could never, be laid aside; nor could there, possibly, be any Inter- cision of it. It was always the same, and could no more be diminished, or parted with, than his Essence or Godhead. See p. 269--272. "But the Representation "of St. Paul is just the contrary:" Is it so? This is News indeed! Pray, where? "In many Parts of his Wri-
Writings (particularly Phil. ii.) he shews, that the "Son of God is not depreft but exalted by the Oeconomy to the Kingdom." This is so very strange, that, I cannot help thinking, there must have been many accidental Mistakes in the Copy: For surely, Our learned Author could never talk at this Rate.—I have given some Clauses from that Context, in this very Paragraph: And If, for One, who thought it no Robbery to be equal with God, &c. to empty himself, take upon him the Form of a Servant, — humble himself, and become obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross, be not to abase and depress himself: I may defy all the World to tell me, How he could humble himself, or be depreffed, more!—His Glory, as a Son, was from Eternity, with the Father, as one brought up with him, and daily his Delight, &c. Pro. iii. 30. But when, for the full Execution of the Office he had undertaken, he became Man, he was first to be humbled and then exalted. And, as his Humiliation was to be as deep as possible, even, if I may so say, to the lowest Hell: His Exaltation was to be fully answerable to it, even to the highest Heaven. — So spake the Prophets of old, Ps. xxii. throughout, If. lii. 13 — 15. Ch. liii. i — 12. &c. So spake be himself, Mat. x. 24, 25. Ch. xix. 28, 29. Ch. xx. 18. 19. and ver. 28. Ch. xxv. 31 — 46. &c. and so did all his Apostles. Luke ii. 7 — 21. Mat. xxvii. 26—54. Rom. iii. 24—26. Ch. iv. 25. Ch. viii. 3 and 32. i Pet. i. 18—20. Ch. ii. 21 — 24. Rev. v. 9. &c. — In a Word, he was first to suffer, and then to reign. —— For, (1) Tho' there were many and great Reasons, why the Mediator should empty himself, &c. there were none why he should be always humbled. — (2) 'Twas neither consistent with the Wisdom, the Goodness, the Justice, nor the Truth of God, that he should have been for ever deprest. — (3) 'Twas not possible, in itself, that the Glory of the eternal Son, should be, always veiled.
veiled and hid: — (4.) The two Natures personally united in the Messiah, were never to be divided: (5.) There was a Glory designed for him, as God-Man: (6.) He had in, and by, his human Nature, merited the highest Glory possible for it: And, (7.) Had not the Redeemer been exalted, he could never have accomplished his great Work, even to save his People from their Sins, and all the woful Effects of them; and give them the Kingdom; &c. &c. — “And he tells us in this Text, that when the Son gives up this "Oeconomical Kingdom, he comes again into Sub-
jection; Then shall the Son himself be subject "to the Father;" Anf. 1. His essential and natural Lordship over all, when we consider him purely as the Son, tho' it might be hid for a Time, from us, is and was always, in itself, the same, without any possible Alteration. —— 2. Christ Jesus, before he emptied himself, and took upon him the Form of a Servant, &c. Phi. ii. 7, 8. was, or existed, ὑπάρχων, in the Form of God, and ἐξ ἐστιν τῷ ἐμῷ Θεῷ. i. e. literally, thought it no Robbery, i. e. no Usurpation, no Presumption in him, or nothing but his Due, to be equal with God, ver. 6. i. e. to reckon himself, speak, and act, upon all Occasions, as one equal with him: And therefore, was not then, in any Subjection; for the mere relative Subordination of a coessential Son to his own Father, was not Subjection. 3. What then could he mean, by his coming “again "into Subjection?” He was not, properly, in any Subjection, till he emptied himself, —— and humbled himself, &c. — He was never in any such Sub-
jection, but once; even in his Estate of Humiliation.— I hope our learned Author could not think, he would ever come into any such State again. — 4. The Oe-
conomical Kingdom was given him for certain Ends; and therefore, only till those Ends should be fully an-
fwered; and consequently, must then be given up: But, surely, he is not, after all his Obedience, Sufferings,
ferings, and Conquests, to be reduced to a worse State, than he was in before. The very Thought is highly blasphemous, and, being full of Contradictions, absolutely impossible in itself. — 5. So far from it, that the Apostle assures us the Issue shall be, That every Knee shall bow, — and every Tongue confess, That the Lord Jesus Christ, i. e. the Person of the Mediator, God-Man, is in the Glory of God the Father. ver. 10, 11. — And therefore, 6. His Conclusion, "which " plainly shews, that considered as a Son, he is na-
" naturally subject to the Father; and that at the End " of this economical Exaltation he shall return to " his natural Subjection, and shall be so for ever " when God appears all in all. This is most evi-
" dently the Meaning of the great Apostle." That all this, I say, is either manifestly false, or another Ignoratio Elenchi, i. e. a Conclusion beside the Que-
" tion, or I do not know —— —— several Sheets wou'd not be sufficient, for a full Answer to it, as it well deserves. — I shall only remind the Reader,

1. Christ is not, in all that Chapter, called the Son of God; but, only the Son: And therefore, he may be either spoken of as the Son of God, or as the Son of Man, or as the Mediator, as the Scope and Circum-
stances require. --- 2. Though the only begotten, and purely as such, was subordinate to the Father; he was yet a coessential Son; and therefore, not properly, (or only by voluntary Condescension,) in Subjection. 3. As such, he expected, yea, he desired, no higher, no other Glory, than that which he had with the Fa-
ther, as his only Son, before the World was: And in-
 deed, seeing he existed in the Form of God, &c. i. e. not only in the Nature, but in all the Glory of God, he could not possibly be exalted any higher. --- 4. This Glory is absolutely inseparable from the Essence: And therefore, it was as absolutely impossible it should be ever taken from him, laid aside, or inter-
rupted,
rupted, &c. as it was that his Nature, or his Sonship, should be taken from him, &c. — 5. The Economical Kingdom was not given to him, purely as the second Person, or the only begotten; but, as having condescended to become the Redeemer, and for that Purpose, to become our near Kinsman: And therefore, because he could not fully execute that Office, but in, and by, our Nature; nor be actually invested with, or inaugurated to it, till he had redeemed his People with his Blood; therefore, I say, he is not commonly thought to have entred upon his Kingdom, in the highest and most proper Sense, or commenced his Reign, till his Resurrection or Ascension. — 6. When he shall have given up the Kingdom to God even the Father, as the coessential Son, and as such, shall be no Lofer, upon the whole, by or for his amazing Humiliation, but shall receive all the Glory promis'd him in his whole complex Person, as Mediator: So shall he, as such, be, to all Eternity, the Means of the blessed Union between God and his People; and shall reign also, for ever and ever, as the Head of his Church, tho' not in that Way, that Dispenfatory Way if I may so call it, which he now does. — Surely, the Union between him and them, shall never be dissolved: Because, as the Church, can never be without a Head, the Head can never be without a Body, Eph. i. 22, 23, &c. — Surely, when the Marriage of the Lamb is consummated, no Divorce shall ever follow: But they shall continue in that State to all Eternity. If. liv. 5 — 10. Hos. ii. 19. Jo. xii. 26. Ch. xiv. 23. Ch. xvii. 24. 1 Thes. iv. 17. — As he is the Light of his People, in this World; the Lamb is the Light of the New Jerusalem above. Rev. xxi. 2, 3. — As he is their Life, and quickens whom he will, here, Jo. v. 21. and continues to be their Life, while they are here; Col. iii. 4. So, Because he lives, they shall live also, hereafter, for ever, Jo. xiv. 19. &c. &c. And, 7. To wave many other, even necessary Things,
the Difficulty arising from this Passage may, I hope, be enough, or to Satisfaction, clearly answered thus, Tho’ the Redeemer, and as such, is often spoken of as God’s Servant, and consequently, some Way, in Subjection to him, If. xlii. 1. Ch. liii. 11. and accordingly, did all he did for his Glory; Jo. viii. 28, 29. Ch. 10. 37, 38. &c. Yet, to answer, all the Ends of his Office, All Power is given to him in Heaven and in Earth, Mat. xxviii. 18. &c. and consequently, he sits at Helm managing all Affairs in the World, according to his own good Pleasure; &c. all Things in his Church are, in a very particular Manner transfigured in his Name; &c. he is all, and in all, unto his People; and does, in his own Person, so eminently exercise the Authority and Dominion of God, (as if the Father had resigned the Sovereignty to him) especially since he judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son; John v. 22. &c. as if he were, indeed, no Way, or upon no Account, subject to him; at least, not visibly, and manifestly so. — Well then, since these are so, When all Things, at the End of the World, shall be subdued unto him; &c. When he has sentenced the Wicked to Everlasting Punishment, and received the Righteous into Life Eternal; Mat. xxv. 46. &c. and, When all the Ends of this Dispensation, shall be fully answered: Then shall he deliver up the Kingdom, presenting all those that were given to him perfect and without Spot, &c. Eph. v. 26, 27, and resign that Dominion also over all Things, which was given him chiefly for their Sakes; and so put an End to the present external Dispensation of the Kingdom, by the Word, Sacraments, and other Means of Grace: — And then shall the Son, i.e. the Mediator, also himself, who has so long acted as having the Sovereign Power, be subject unto him who gave him that Dominion, by resigning, as it were, his Commission, and manifesting himself evidently to be, as he had always been,
been, tho' not so visibly and clearly, a Substitute or Deputy: That God, essentially considered, i. e. the whole Trinity, may be all in all, as Christ now is; Col. iii. 11. and the present Economy, by a Vicegerent, and all the external Means, whereby Christ now communicateth himself to his People, may for ever cease. — Our learned Author begins the next Paragraph thus,

"This Text will not prove that Christ is not "God, p. 44. No, blessed be his Name, nor any other. — "for he is so by personal Union to the "Divine Nature," I earnestly desire to know the Sense of this: Having some Reason to question, whether any Christian ever heard such Words before. — "he is God manifested in the Flesh," He is so, Eternal Glory be to him who took upon him the Seed of Abraham! But, it was the second Person only, and no other, who was so manifested. — "he is God and "Man in one complex Person." He is so, or he could never have been our Redeemer: However, the blessed Three, are not one Person. — "But, in "most or all these Scriptures," which we have con sidered, "it is manifest, that the Character of "Christ as a Son is set far below the Father; not "only in Order or in Office, but in Knowledge, "Power, Sovereignty, Self-sufficiency and Au thority, &c." Ans. Christ is not here called the Son of God: — Nor is this Title, the Son, used in several of these Places in the highest Sense, in which this Title, the Son of God is: — As the Son of Man, he is infinitely inferior to the Father in all these: — As Mediator, he condescended to be a Delegate, to receive a Commission, and consequently Commands from him; &c. &c. I am glad, however, to hear, "That Christ, (as God the Son) or "in his Words, in his Divine Nature, is equal to "the Father in Power and Glory," ibid. Because then
then, he is not the Father, but a proper Son really distinct from him. — But,

While my Hand is in, I must retort the Difficulty, (not only upon our worthy Author, who resolutely denies the coessential Sonship of Christ, or that he is God of God; but) upon our Arians and Socinians, who obstinately oppose his true and proper Divinity; and ask, What Answer they, or any of them, can give to this Difficulty? Our Author will have it, That Christ's human Soul, which he grants is a mere creature, "is properly the Son of God:—The Arians dream, That the Logos is not God; and therefore, must be a creature:—And the Socinians will have it, That Christ when on Earth, was a mere Man, thence, Rifum teneatis, made a God! Well then? Was not this human Soul, the Logos, and this Man, always finite Beings, omnimodously dependent upon God? &c. — Was it possible, that either of them could be in the Form of God; or have the Divine Names, and Titles, &c. attributed to them? — Could either of them possibly be capable, of all Power in Heaven and Earth, &c. Or be all and in all to Believers? &c. — Were not they all naturally, and therefore necessarily, every Way, in every Sense, and always, subject to the Father? — Could there possibly be any Doubt of this, by any Man in his Senses? &c. — Could any possible Dispensation alter the Nature of Things? — Or, Can a creature possibly cease to be a creature? Or, to be always, and omnimodously, subject to his Creator? — What then is, what can be, the Meaning of these Words, Then shall the Son also himself be subject, &c? — When I shall hear a satisfactory Reply to these Questions, I have several more ready.

Thus have we considered these Texts, and, I hope, explained, and vindicated them, to the Satisfaction of the serious Reader. We have shewn, That,
in some of them, this Title, the Son, denotes the human Nature of Christ only; that, in others, he is spoken of as the Mediator, but with a particular Regard to his human Nature; and in others, with a more particular Respect to him, as God the Son, who had undertaken to be Redeemer. And must say it again, That if the serious Christian remembers, That Christ, as God, is the Son of God; and as Man, the Son of Man; and that the Mediator, as such, or in his complex Person, is often called the Son of God, or “the Son absolutely,” i. e. if it be Sense, and true also, without any Adnoun or other Word joined to it: And consequently, That when he is called “the Son absolutely;” this Title may either refer to him purely as the Son of God, or purely as the Son of Man, or as the Mediator, as the Scope or Circumstances of the Passages direct and require: If, I say, he remember these, he needs not be much moved, with any Thing which can be urged from these, or any the like, were there ever so many of them. — Go we on then to,

C H A P. IV.

Some Considerations upon his Subordinate Questions, with proper Answers to the most plausible Things offered in support of his Notions: Or, An Answer to that Question, Did the Disciples of Christ fully believe that he was the true God during his Life-time, or not till after his Death and Resurrection? p. 70.

A Direct and plain, but brief Answer, we have given, in general, to this Question; p. 20. and
and have, and shall, by and by, more clearly and fully, prove it to the Conviction of all, who will be satisfied with the Word of God, and the Testimony of the Three Witnesses in Heaven, for a Proof: But, “in order “to solve this Question,” our learned Author “makes these five following Enquiries; p. 70.” every one of which, with all his Answers to them, with his Design in proposing them, we shall consider, very briefly, if worth the while, as they come in our Way.


“1. What Notion had the Jews in general concerning their Messiah?” p. 71.

His Design in this Section, as appears from his Questions and Answers, p. 72 — 76. and the Conclusion of it, “In short their Notions of this Matter “were so very confused, so uncertain, so inconsistent, so various, that they cannot be reduced “to any certain or settled Scheme of Sentiments. “p. 76.” is obliquely to deprive us, of any Assistance, from the Principles of the ancient Jewish Church, in support of the coessential Sonship of the Messiah?

He cannot deny, That “the Old Testament furnished them with sufficient Prophecies concerning “his divine and human Nature, his spiritual Kingdom, his Sufferings, his Death and Resurrection, “&c. p. 71.” He might have said, That many of those Prophecies were so plain, full, and minute, that they lookt rather like exact Histories of Matter of Fact, than Predictions. “yet so wretchedly blind- “ed were they with the corrupt Glosses of their “Teachers and with their own foolish Prejudices,” (which they also learned from their Teachers, those blind Guides who caused them to err;) “that they did agree “in no Notion concerning him more universally, “than that he was to be a temporal Prince, that he “was never to suffer, nor to die, &c. ibid.” Granting this, What then? — Tho’ they had so far turned
turned aside from the Truth, as to have perverted, or forgotten, their Creed; The Old Testament, especially as explained and illustrated by the New, strongly supports the Doctrine of the Trinity, and the coessential Sonship of Christ: And therefore, through the Grace of God, we shall neither suffer those Proofs to be wrested from us; nor shut our Eyes, against so clear a Light, because the degenerate Jews shut theirs. But I must observe, That here, as in many other Cases, he is very general and ambiguous, which may lead plain serious Christians into great Mistakes! For, his first Words,

"The Jews old Opinion," one would think, was their Opinion, in their old and best Times; or if not so old as the Patriarchs, or Moses, or David, or the prophetic Ages after the Revolt of the Ten Tribes; yet at lowest, of Ezra, Nehemiah, and the Men of the great Synagogue: Whereas, he seems to mean their Opinion, when our Lord was upon the Earth!

—Abraham saw Christ's Day; Jo. viii. 56. and knew that he was the true God; (not the first Person, but the Second;) for, when he appeared to him, Gen. xviii. 1. he heard him call himself, Jehovah; ver. 13, 14. and he also in his Intercession, called him Jehovah, ver. 30, and the Judge of all the Earth; ver. 25. and knew, I conceive, as well as Moses, That he was Jehovah, who rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah Brimstone and Fire from Jehovah out of Heaven. Ch. xix. 24. So that, tho' he well knew, That Jehovah is one; or, that there is but one Jehovah; he knew there were two, who were so called: Or, he knew Jehovah and Jehovah, but not two Jehovahs.

—Jacob knew, that the Man who wrestled with him, was God; Gen. xxxii. 24 and 30. (who is called by the Prophet, God, Hof. xii. 3. the Angel, ver. 4. and the Lord God of Hosts, &c. ver. 5.) and even when under the Spirit of Prophecy, worshipped him as the Angel which redeemed him from all Evil.

Qq
Gen. xlviii. 16, &c. — And hence, when we remember, that he appeared to them, in a bodily Shape, as a Man, as a Prelude to his Incarnation, we may learn what was the Faith of the Church, concerning the promised Redeemer, in their Days. — Should it be said, That this was Christ's pre-existent human Soul, which appeared, &c. and not the second Person. We Anf. 1. This is gratis diuum, said without any Proof, or any Appearance of any. — 2. Tho', in those Days, and for many Ages after, we find he was often called an Angel, the Angel of the Lord, the Angel of his Face, or Presence, &c. yet we find no Mention, no not the least, of his human Soul. — 3. The Patriarchs spoke often to him, and of him, and worshipped him as God, the God of his People, Jehovah, &c. without any Apprehension, so far as appears, of any such human Soul. — 4. Himself often assumed the Names, and Titles, accepted the Worship and did the Works, &c. of the One true God; but gave no Hint of his having then, any human Soul. — And, 5. To the best of my Knowledge, There remains no Tradition, of any Sort, That the Jewish Church, from the Beginning, if I may not say, to this Moment, ever heard of, and much less entertained, the Opinion of his pre-existent human Soul, &c. Yea, — 6. We shall shew, by and by, That Moses, David, Solomon, Isaiah, and the Prophets, knew his coessential Sonship; and therefore, reasonably presume, That this was the common Faith of the Jews, in the several Ages wherein they lived.—And, 7. I cannot think it possible, That, in the Days of Ezra and Nehemiah, when the Canon of the Old Testament was closed and sealed up; and when they had three, if not more, Prophets alive, to explain Things to them; the Jews in general, should not have some right Notions of the Person, Natures, and Offices, of the promised Saviour, and his spiritual Kingdom: Or be ignorant, That he was
was first to be humbled, and then exalted; or to suffer, die, rise again, &c. &c.—See, besides the many Texts quoted above, Hag. ii. 9. Zech. ii. 10—13. Ch. iii. 8, 9. Ch. vi. 12, 13. Ch. ix. 9. Ch. xi. 12, 13. Ch. xii. 10. Ch. xiii. ver. 1 and 7. Ch. xiv. 4. Mal. iii. 1. Ch. iv. 2, &c. —— They did indeed, soon, alas! too soon, degenerate; and, had I Time, I might give some Hints, when, by what Means, and by what Steps, &c. Things grew worse and worse, till they came to that almost desperate State, in which they were, when Christ was in the World; when, (excepting that their Love to Idolatry had been check'd, or cured, in and by their Captivity in Babylon,) they were, generally, more corrupt, both in Faith and Manners, than ever they were, at any Time before. — And, I have sometimes thought, when considering the first and second Chapters of Luke, that there was a remarkable Change for the worse, very visible among those in the Tribe of Judah, between the Time of our Saviour's Birth, and his Baptism. — But, to pass many such Remarks as these at present, I shall only ask, What could be expected from those, who so shamefully gloss'd away, the Sense of the moral Law; but, that they would also sadly corrupt the Faith? — And, What Regard can we owe to the Opinion of such People? &c. &c.

I might also ask, what he means by "the Jews " in general?" &c. 'Tis enough for us, if the wisest and best of them, wherever they were, had a right Opinion concerning the Messiah, &c. —— Should the Question be put, What Notions have the Church Party, or the Protestant Dissenters, in general, concerning Predestination, Grace, the Trinity, &c? Or, How far they differ from their Old Opinions? &c. 'twould not be easy to give a just and direct Reply. —— However, to his own Query, he answers,

Qq 2

1. They
I. They generally believed he should be a Man of their own Nation, of the Tribe of Judah, of the Seed of David, &c. p. 72. I do not think there was a native he in the whole World, who retained the Profession of the Jewish Religion, that did not believe all these. — And, as for the Exception he makes, from Jo. vii. 27. in the next Paragraph, it proceeded, in my Opinion, rather from willful Perverseness, &c. than Ignorance.

2. They believed that he had an Existence before he came into the World;" p. 73. This they must have believed, because he could not come into the World, before, or till, he had an Existence. — for, the Prophet speaks of him as "a Ruler in Israel, whose Goings forth have been from of Old, from everlasting." Mic. v. 2. — Whether "this Opinion was universal," ibid. or not, one would think, That whoever thought these Words were spoken of the Messiah, must have believed him to have existed from Eternity: And consequently, if then the Son of God, a coessential Son. — But, the Jews, in those Days, had never heard of any pre-existent human Soul of his:" Or, if they had, these Words could never have been spoken of it.

3. They believed that he had some glorious "and eminent Relation to God." p. 73. It was not possible, That any one who believed the Old Testament, could have any the least Doubt of this. "This appears from the Name of Honour that the Messiah was universally known by amongst them, viz. The Son of God, ibid." This we had before, and answered it also; p. 70, &c. and shall only now add, If "all the Jews talkt with him under this Name, as being the common Name of the Messiah, and perfectly well known amongst them." ibid. then surely they knew the Meaning of it: Or our Lord would have set them right. —— Well then, what higher.
higher, or more glorious, personal Title could possibly have been given him? — If he is the Son, the own Son of God, &c. and, as such, equal with God, which was their Sense, and the only natural and proper Sense, of that Title; then is he God the Son? And we can give him no higher Title, if we do not call him God the Father. But surely, our learned Author would have been greatly offended, to have heard any One call the Messiah, God the Father! I might have added, That it is undeniable, That the Jews did not use this Title, the Son, "as a Name of Office," or not chiefly, and only so; but, as a Name of Nature, as it always is, in every other Case.

"4. The Prophets in the Old Testament frequently intimate the Divinity of Christ;" p. 74. They do so: And, I'll add, they do it clearly, and strongly; yea, and as a Son too. Ps. ii. 7—12. Pro. xxx. 4. If. ix. 6. Ch. xl. 10—12, &c. What follows about Dr. Allix's and Mr. Fleming's Account of the Memra, &c. is out of my Way at present. I have read them both, &c. ———— "But what doubtful Hints or plain Evidences there might be, that Christ was to be the true God, yet the Jews in Christ's Time did not generally believe it." p. 75. Anf. 1. Supposing this, What will follow? That it was not, clearly and fully, revealed in the Old Testament; or known, and believed, by their Fathers? By no Means. ——— 2. The Jews could not but know, That the Word, ELOHIM, which we commonly translate God, is plural: ——— That there were several, to whom this Name, and the other Titles of the Most High God, and his Perfections also, are ascribed in Scripture: ——— That, how intimately forever united they are, and how insepapably forever they act, in all their Works relating to the Creatures, they are spoken of, as distinct personal Agents: ——— That there is not only a Distinction, but
but an Order among them: --- That one of them is sometimes stiled the begotten Son of another; who is, therefore, his own, his natural Father: --- And that this Son was he, who had undertaken, and was anointed, to be the Messiah; as we have, and shall, farther prove, &c. --- 3. What much confirms me in these two last Thoughts is, that the Opinion, That God most high, had a Son, an own Son, who was to be born of a Virgin, become Man, and the Governor, if not also the Redeemer of the World, &c. was then dispersed far and wide, and well known to many of the Heathens. I need not mention the Sibylline Oracles, nor offer any other Proofs of this, but the famous fourth Eclogue of Virgil, which was written near the Time of our Lord's Birth, and is now known to every School-Boy; and particularly that glorious Line, so much, so justly admired,

_Cara Deum sohotes, Magnum Jovis Incrementum!_

Which, I conceive, very clearly and strongly expresses the Idea of a proper and coessential Son; and was, however he came by it, most certainly taken from Isaiah, or some other of the Prophets, or some Jewish Tradition. — I, for my own Part, have been long persuaded, from many Passages of the Æneid, as well as of that Eclogue, that Virgil was no stranger to the Septuagint, (a Translation of the Old Testament into Greek,) not unknown to many learned Heathens long before that Poet was born. —— But, says our Author,

"Surely if the Pharisees had but embraced this Opinion, they could never have been at a Loss to have answered our Lord's Question, Mat. xxii.

43—46. *If Christ be David's Son, how doth he in Spirit call him Lord?* It was plain by their Silence and Confusion, that they did not believe his Godhead. p. 75. Anf. i. Whence did our Author learn this? 'Tis plain, indeed, that they gave
gave him no Answer: But, the Text speaks nothing of their Confusion. --- 2. 'Tis certain they believed, That God had a Son, who was equal with him, Jo. v. 18. and who was God, Ch. x. 33. and that they charged Christ, with giving out himself to be that Son. --- Or, 3. If they did not know, that the Messiah was to be God, Jehovah, &c. and therefore, the true God, they must either have been very ignorant indeed, or almost incurably obstinate: Because, all this is so frequently, fully, and emphatically, revealed all over the Old Testament. Gen. xviii. 13, 25, &c. Numb. xxi. 5—9. compared with 1 Cor. x. 9. Pf. xcvi throughout, &c. If. ix. 6. Ch. xxxv. 4—6. Ch xl. 9—11. &c. Jer. xxiii. 6, &c. Hos. i. 7. Ch. xii. 3—5, &c. Zech. xi. 13, &c. Mal. iii. 1—4. --- 4. We can otherwise, much better, account for their Silence. And, to pass their Pride, Enmity against him, &c. They knew very well, That our Lord, by all his Parables, Miracles, &c. designed to prove himself to be the Messiah; tho' he had never, for the Reasons above given, expressly so called himself: --- They remembered the Dilemma he brought them into, by a Question he asked them, but a little before: Mat. xxi. 24—27. --- They perceived, that, if they should deny that Christ was the Son of God, and as such, the true God, they had the Scriptures, the Judgment of their Ancestors, and their own Sentiments also, all directly against them; and if they should confess him to be the true God, he would then turn it upon them, and say, How could they then, for shame, dream of his temporal Kingdom, &c? And therefore, seeing they were resolved to hold fast that vile, that ridiculous Opinion; and knowing that, which Way soever they replied, he would be too many for them; they wisely thought, it would be best for them to hold their Peace. --- But, 5. I must retort this, upon our learned Author, thus, Had they known, any Thing "of Christ's glorious pre-existent human Soul, &c."
they might have readily, and without any Confusion, answered him, and perhaps have kept their scandalous Prejudice too! Tho' Christ is David's Son, "according to (his fleshly Original, or) the Influence of "the Flesh into his Birth, p. 50." (if these Words are really intelligible!) Yet, his "pre-existent hu-
man Soul is a supra-angelical Spirit, &c." and therefore, is He, upon that Account, HIS LORD also. I humbly conceive, I may add, — 6. Had this been the Case, they would have openly derided him for his silly Question. — But, we wave several others, and proceed to,

"S E C T. II. What Ideas did Christ give his "Disciples of himself?" p. 76 — 83.

"Anf. : . He takes particular Pains upon many Oc-
casions to shew that he was sent from God, or re-
ceived Commission from Heaven to teach the Doc-
trines which he taught, and perform those glo-
rious Miracles which he wrought, to confirm "both his Doctrine and Commission: And then "refers to John v. vi. viii. &c."—He did so: And his Works infallibly proved both these; tho', in the Chapters referred to, his Discourses were rather Apologies for himself, or Answers to and Reasonings with the Pharisees, the Sanbedrim, and the murmuring cavill-
ing Capernaites, than Instructions to his Disciples.

"2. He proves by most infallible Evidences, "that he was the Messiah, the Saviour of Mankind:" He did so: Tho' this could not have been done, as we have shewn, without declaring and proving, That he was the coejstitial Son of God, and, as such, equal with him. ——— See what we have offered to this Purpose. p. 36, 37, &c.

"3. He often takes Occasion to declare, that he "had a Being before he came into this World. Jo. iii. 
"13. Ch. v. 38. and 51. &c." p. 77. Yes: But, (1.) He never, so far as I know, spoke one Word of his pre-existant human Soul; which, I am inclin'd to
to think, he would have done, once at least, had he had any. (2.) He is very solemn, in declaring himself the only begotten Son of God, whom he sent into the World; and that he that believeth on him, the Son, and as such, is not condemned, &c. Jo. iii. 16—18. &c. But, to believe on him, or in his Name, is an Act of religious Worship: Whence I conclude, he is a coessential Son, and as such, the true God. (3.) In some of the Texts quoted, Our Author has, upon his own Principles, much over done it; and, in others, as much under done it. — Christ's human Soul was not "the living Bread, which came down from Heaven; &c." Jo. vi. 51. — He that was sent, "not on- ly came down from Heaven, but came forth from the Father; Ch. xvi. 28." and could say, παρευθέναι ἐμείναι, I am from, or of him, viz. as a Son. Ch. vii. 29. &c. &c.

"4. He assumes to himself the Character of the Son of God, in a more eminent and superior Way than Men or Angels are his Sons; for he "calls himself the only begotten Son of God. Jo. iii. "16. 18. p. 73." Anf. (1.) The Title, the Son of God, is not properly, if at all, a Character, but a Title of Nature. (2.) In every Sense, in which the Word, Son, is used, except its only proper Sense, to denote the natural Relation of one that is begotten, to him that begat him, there are many who have been called the Sons of God: But, Christ is an only begotten Son: Whence I conclude, as above, That he is a Son, in a quite different Sense from all others; or, in the only proper Sense, i.e. a coessential Son. (3.) He not only assumed this Title to himself, but accepted it often from others. — And therefore, to pass several Things, (4.) What more would he have had our Lord to have said? Yea, What more could he have said, to prove his coessential Sonship, than he has said, "John v. 19—23." which I have, and must yet farther consider? — He owns "these cannot be fup-
posed to be spoken of any mere Creature," Right. 
And therefore — they give some Intimations of his
Union with Godhead, &c." p. 79. — This suspi-
cious Language needs Explication. Is, or was, this
a personal Union? — If it was, Which of the Per-
sons does he mean? — If it was not a personal U-
nion, and with a particular Person, What was this
Union with Godhead? &c. &c. — No other Name is
here mention'd, but the Son of God, or the Son; and
therefore, if these Words are true, they must be true
of him, as the Son: Not chiefly, not merely, if at
all, as the Son of Man; and therefore, as the Son of
God: And consequently, " the meer Name, the Son
of God, in these Passages, gives," with his good
Leave, "some Intimations of his Divinity." ibid.
And, I may add, having proved it, every where else
in Scripture, from the Beginning to the End.

5. He sometimes takes Opportunity to acquaint
them with his most intimate Union or Oneness with the
Father, &c. p. 79. He does so: And does it as
clearly, and strongly, as it is ever done; or as it
could be done, in a Consistency with the Distinction
of the Two ever-blessed Persons. — " For when he says, John
x. 29. My Father, who gave me my Sheep, is greater
than all;" Yes: He is absolutely, yea, infinitely
greater than all, who would endeavour to pluck them
out of his Hands. — " yet he adds in the next Verse,
" I and my Father are one:" Yes: These Two Per-
sons, the Father and the Son, are Una, Unum, One
Thing. — One Thing, as having the same Essence;
and therefore, One in Consent, Will, and Power,
who will most perfectly concur, and agree, in preserving
the Sheep: And consequently, Whatever Prerogative,
or Greatness, the Father as such has, which the Son,
as such has not, it is purely relative and personal,
and fully consistent with their Coessentiality. —
which I think are Intimations of a superior and
inferior Nature, and that the Divine Nature of the
the Father was in him." p. 79. — Which Words give these Intimations? Not, surely, the Words, Father and Son: — Not the Order in which they are placed, I and my Father: — Not the Predicate of this Proposition, εν, one Thing: — What then? — Why, either these, 1. "The Father is greater than all." Anf. No surely: For the Words, Father and Son, intimate their having the same Nature, and not a "superior and inferior Nature;" and the Words, εν εσμεν, are one Thing, put it out of all Doubt. Or, 2. These, "Who gave me my Sheep," Anfw. This Expression intimates, indeed, a Priority of Order, which is natural; and an economical Superiority and Inferiority, which on the Part of the Son, as such, is purely voluntary: But, it plainly presupposes, and requires, an Equality, or rather sameness of Nature; because, had not he, to whom the Sheep were given, been equal with God, he had been no Way Par Negotio; and could neither have redeemed, led, kept, nor saved them. — It will be said, That, when he spake these Words, every one saw he was Man, and had our Nature. Anf. Yes. Blessed be his Name, He, who thought it no Robbery to be equal with God, had emptied himself, and taken upon him the Form of a Servant, &c. which if he had not done, he could never have been the good Shepherd, &c. John x. 11 — 18. But this was no Way inconsistent, with his being a coessential Son, as God. Or, 3. These, "That the Divine Nature of the Father was in him." Let it be remembered, that the Person he here calls him, is Christ: And then I answer, Christ may be considered as Mediator, and as such, God-Man, or merely as the Son of God, or merely as the Son of Man. — If we consider him as Mediator, he is God and Man in one Person: And therefore, Since there is but one Divine Nature, "the Divine Nature of the "Father was, and is, in him?" — If merely as the Son of God, and if he is indeed his own, his only be-
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gotten Son, then surely he is coessential with him: And therefore, the same Divine Nature, which is in the Father as a Father, is in him as a Son: — If merely as the Son of Man, he has no other Nature but the Human. —— But, he is not, in any of the Texts here quoted, called the Son of Man; and therefore, in every One of them, his coessential Sonship is necessarily implied. I, for my own Part, believe. That, in every one of them, he is spoken of, as the Mediator, and as such, as God-Man: But, with a very very peculiar Respect to his Divinity. —— Let the Reader impartially consult the Passages, "John iii. 16 — 18. Ch. v. 19 — 23. Ch. x. 29. 30. and "38. Ch. xiv. 7 — 11. Ch. xvi. 28. p. 78 — 80." and his own Eyes will convince him.

"6. There are also several other Intimations that our Lord gave of his Divinity, tho' it was not the Doctrine that he thought fit at that Time to teach in plain and express Language. —— Thus the Words, Mat. xviii. 20. seem to denote a divine Omnipresence: — Those, Ch. xvi. 19. found God-like: And, when he promises the Disciples, as Luke xxi. 15. or says, as John ii. 19. he imitates divine Language so much, that it might have led the Disciples onwards to the Belief of his Deity. "p. 80." — Anf. Why, really, if it did not, they were, indeed, very slow of Heart to believe: And very slow of Understanding also! But, to be more particular, I must ask him again, What would have pleased him: Or, What should Christ have said, which he has not said? — 1. Would He, who was so lowly in Heart, have given any Intimations of his Divinity, had he not indeed had Divinity? — Wou'd he, who was the most perfect Example of Humility, have used Words of himself, which seem to denote a divine Omnipresence; or, found Godlike; or, imitate divine Language; &c. had it not become him to do it? — Or, Would the most self-denied Person that ever was,
was, and who most studiously shunned all Ofsentation, &c. have claim'd to himself what was not his Right, or spoken of himself in Strains, which did not belong to him. — 2. How could he have more clearly, fully, and strongly, intimated his coessential Sonship than he has done? — I want sadly to know, 3. How could our Author then say, That “Christ did not think fit at that Time to teach his Divinity, in plain and express Language? Surely he would not have had him to call himself the Father: And he has as plainly, expressly, and emphatically, called himself his Son, his only begotten Son, &c. as he could! Surely he would not have had him forget the Distinction of Persons in the Trinity; his own voluntary Condescension; his economical Subjection; Exinanimation, &c. &c. — What should he then have said, in his State of Humiliation, that he has not said? — Would he have had him to talk out of Character, and of his Exaltation, before he could say, But I am a Worm, and no Man? — Did he not behave, while he was in the World, just as the Prophets said he would, &c. — 4. Is it not somewhat strange, That he should so often mention his Sonship; speak to, and of, the Father, with all the Familiarity of a coessential Son; and in Strains, which found Godlike? &c. and yet never, in plain Terms; no, nor in any Terms, so far as I can find, of “the Pre-existence of his Human Soul;” or, of “the glorious peculiar Derivation of it from God?” — 5. Is not this alledging, That our Lord “did not think fit to teach his Divinity, &c.” either a mean Equivocation, very unworthy of himself; or to use a Law Phrase, a direct Protestatio contra Factum? — 6. I desire earnestly to know, How he could instruct his Disciples, or any others, Who, or What, the Messiah was? What he was to do, or suffer? What Benefits he was to procure and confer, &c. and how he was, or could be,
be, qualified for all these, &c. without teaching them his Divinity? &c. &c. — But — —

What he has said of "Christ's Active and Passive Behaviour, p. 80—83." is true, and exceeding well said: And tho' we need "not lay the whole "Stress of the Cause," i.e. of his "being true "God, upon this;" because we have many more Proofs: Yet we might "venture to do it;" because, if we did, we should be in no very great Danger.

"One special Reason why our Lord did not pro-
"claim his own Godhead," -- which he says "is evi-
dent and sufficient," is very strange indeed!
Marginal Notes. p. 82. "He must have done it ei-
ther with plain and convincing Proofs of it or with-
out them." Ans. He did actually give both plain, and convincing Proofs of it: And those who were well-dispos'd, and did seriously consider them, were con-
vinced by them; so that it was the Fault of all who had those Proofs, if they were not fully convinced. See John i. 14. I say, convincing Proofs, if calling and proving himself the own, the only begotten son of the Father; and if doing the Works, and ac-
cepting the Worship of the true God, be such. Jo. v. 17—47. Is. 25. 6—9. Ch. xxxv. 4—6. comp. with Mat. xi. 2—6. Ch. xlv. 22—25. comp. with Mat. xi. 28. &c. Jer. xxiii. 6. comp. with Mat. xx. 28. Jo.x.3o. &c." If he had only asserted it plainly, with-
out convincing Proof, he had hastened the Malice of "the Jews to put him to Death for Blasphemy." —
The Jews had not Power to put any one to Death:—
When they actually did charge him with Blasphemy before Pilate, which put the Governor into a Fright, John xix. 7. 8. he did not ground his Sentence upon that Accusation, as is plain from the Title over his Cross: ver. 19. —And yet, our Lord did often, and most solemnly, assert his coessential Sonship before them; and that in such Words, and with such Cir-
cumstances, that they presently charged him with making
making himself equal with God; Ch.v.17,18.&c. which he was so far from denying, that he proved it by many plain Arguments, which were, really, convincing Proofs! ver. 19 — 47. — I call them convincing Proofs, not only because they were, in themselves, sufficient to convince: But, because they, seem to me to have, then actually convinced them. --- For, They never, so much as once, interrupted him, in all that long, that glorious Apology! They never opposed one Word, to any Thing he said! They seem to have heard him com posedly, with Attention, without murmuring, and to have been so struck with the over-bearing Evidence of his Defence; and the divine Authority, and Majesty, which appeared in his Person and Delivery; that, if they were not effectually convinced, they had nothing to object, durst not gain-say, but were obliged to be silent: And therefore, suffered him peaceably to finish his Discourse, and then permitted him quietly to depart! Whereas, having afterwards hardened themselves, in their Pre-judice and Unbelief, they no sooner ever heard him speak in such Strains, but they were filled with such Madness and Fury, that they sought to take him, &c. Ch. vii. 29, 30. or, took up Stones to cast at him, Ch. viii. 58. 59. or to stone him! Ch. x. 30, 31. — "On the other Hand, if he had given most convincing Proofs of it, while he asserted it, the Jews and "Gentiles had been restrained from putting him to "Death at all; for St. Paul tells us expressly, 1 Cor. "ii. 8. Had the Princes of this World known it, they "would not have crucified the Lord of Glory. This would require a long Answer; but, passing several Things, it may suffice in short to say, There is a mighty Difference between the most convincing Proofs considered abstrac tly, or in themselves, and convincing, overcoming Grace. ——— The most convincing Evidence we (I mean every Man hath, or can,) have of any Thing, at least next to our own Existence,
is that of the Being of a Deity: And yet, some have denied, That there is a God! --- Men generally acknowledge, and are most firmly persuaded, That God sees what they do: And yet, very few of them, alas! act as if they did! --- Yea, the most convincing Proofs are not, in themselves, effectual against rooted Prejudice, wilful Unbelief, habitual Enmity! &c. --- I shall therefore only ask, 1. Was the Ignorance of those who crucified our Lord, a sufficient Excuse? --- 2. Will not sufficient Proof render the Unbelief of all, who have, or might have it, a heinous Crime? --- 3. Will not sufficient Proof render all, who have it, ceteris paribus, equally obliged to believe? &c. --- 4. Could any Proofs, in the present Case, have actually convinced the Jews, and impressed the Conviction, so as to have restrained them, from what they did, without sufficient Grace? &c. And, to name no more, 5. What Proofs were wanting, which, all Things considered, would have been more convincing, merely as Proofs? I may defy the World to name me any One! But, I must observe upon a few Lines more, p. 83. "And tho' we can never tell exactly what makes "the personal Union between the divine and human "Natures in Christ," We cannot, I humbly con- "ceive, ever tell exactly what makes the Personal U- "nion, between our own Souls and Bodies: But, as this comes the nearest to, or most resembles that, of any "Union between such different Substances known to us; "so, by seriously considering this, and carefully ex- "amining what we may learn from Scripture concern- "ing that, we shall, with the Illuminating Grace, which "is promised to all those who ask it as they are re- "quired, arrive at as exact a Knowledge of it, as is ne- "cessary for us in this World. "yet perhaps this may "be a just Evidence of a personal Union with the "Godhead, (viz.) when the Actions and Characters "and Sufferings which Christ performed and suf- "tained, might be properly said to be performed "and
and sustained immediately by God himself." To treat this, and such suspicious Language, which occurs, in almost every Page, as it well deserves, would be thought by some, I shall only observe, 1. Here is no Mention of the second Person!—2. "A personal Union with the Godhead," is neither the Language of Divines nor Philosophers, Christians nor Jews.—3. The human Nature of Christ, was not, is not, personally united to the Godhead as such, i. e. to all the Three Persons in the Godhead; but only to the second, even the Son.—4. "The Actions and Characters and Sufferings, which "Christ performed and sustained," were not the Actions and Characters and Sufferings of the Father; for, to say so would be downright Patripassianism; nor of the Holy Spirit, for, we find no Intimations of any such Thing in Scripture: But only of the Person of our Redeemer, even the Son, the second Person, in our Nature.—And therefore, 5. They "could not be properly said to be performed and "sustained immediately by God himself," whatever he meant by these Words, "God himself:" Because, (1.) God himself cannot at all be properly said to suffer Pain, or die, i. e. to sustain Sufferings immediately. (2.) The Actions of Christ, as Man, (for Example, his eating, drinking, walking,) cannot be "properly said to have been performed immediately "by God himself," who as such neither eats, nor drinks; &c. no, nor by the Son of God himself, and as such; but of the Man Christ Jesus, and as such; or, if you will, of the Mediator, but purely as Man.—They may indeed by a Figure, (which the Fathers called Communicatio Idiomatum, and we a Communication of Properties, if not by a much more common one, even a Synecdoche;) be said to have been done "by "God himself;" because, they were done by One, who is not only true Man, but also the Son of God, and, as such, true God: But they cannot be properly said
said to have been performed even by the Son of God as such, and much less immediately. 'Tis a Maxim among Divines, That, when the first and the second Cause concur to any one Action, it is attributed to the next and immediate, i.e. the second Cause. Thus, Tho' it is God which worketh in us both to will and to do; Phil. ii. 13. for Instance, to believe and repent: Yet, because we ourselves work under, and with, his Grace, and so are really the next and immediate Causes, 'tis we who are said to believe and repent, and not He. — I shall leave the Intelligent Reader to make other Remarks upon this, and the like Passages, as he may a great many more: And to say, Whether they do not found more like the Heresies of Sabellius, the Patripaffians, if not the Eutychians, &c. than the Faith of the Christian Church, or the Scriptures of Truth? —— He concludes thus, "But I much question whether his Disciples in that "Day did certainly infer so much from these Words, "viz. I and my Father are one. I am in the Father, and "the Father in me." (Then they were certainly Two, how intimate so ever the Oneness was!) "The Father "who is in me doth the Works." (Not he only; for the Son, who doth what Things soever the Father doth, was neither unactive, nor passive.) "He that hath "seen me hath seen the Father." He hath so: And yet surely, he hath not seen that he was the Father.——

But our Author needed have made no Question of this: For, I dare assure the World, and shall be bound, through Grace, to make it good, That the Disciples, so far as appears, never "inferred so much," no, nor any such Thing, neither in that nor any other Day, "from these Words:" And, that he has inferred many other Things, which never came into their Minds; nor, for aught which can be proved, into the Minds of any others, till very lately.

'Twould, perhaps, be thought severe, &c. to hint what seems to have been the true Design of this Section:
tion: I shall therefore, leave the Reader himself to find it out; and proceed to another Subject.

"SECT. III. What Idea the Disciples had of "Christ in his own Life-time?" p. 83—86.

We agree, "That the Disciples did not understand and effectually learn all that our Lord taught them," till they were filled with the Holy Ghost: Acts ii. 4. And, that "there were many Things which they could not bear in his Life-time. John "xvi. 12." Let us then hear "the Sentiments they "(actually) entertained concerning him," while he was here,

"1. They firmly believed that he was sent of "God. Jo. xvii. 8." p. 84. They did so: And it was next to an absolute Impossibility, that those, who saw and heard what they did, should not. — Numbers, besides them, most firmly believed this.

"2. They were convinced that he was the true Messiah. "John vi. 69. p. 85." They were so: And were also sure, That he was the Son of the living God. And, I humbly conceive, That he was the Son of God, before he engaged to be the Messiah; and that he could not have been qualified for being the Messiah, if he had not. — And yet, as convincing the Proofs of his being the Messiah were, they were not effectual to restrain one of them from betraying him, another from denying him, and two more, at least from doubting it. Luke xxiv. 21.

"3. That he had a peculiar and glorious Relation to "God, p. 85." 'Twas absolutely impossible, That any One, who knew and were sure he was the Messiah, could doubt of this. "that he was the Son of "the living God," They could not have believed that he was the Messiah, without believing this. "which primarily referred to the Dignity of his "Person," 'Tis plain, it did so! —— Why then, (1.) 'Tis primarily a Title of Nature, and not of Office; which alone, overthrows Dr. Ridgeley's Notion.
tion. (2.) Did they, could they, think, That this Son, was, as such, a mere Creature; though a very glorious one? &c. — " and oftentimes included " in it also his Character, or Office as the appointed " Saviour." Yes. And when the Eternal Son had un-

dertaken that Office; and even when he had assumed 

our Nature into a Personality with himself, and, in 

his whole Person, had enter'd upon the Execution of 

his Office; it was still the most glorious of all his 

Personal Titles; and frequently used also, for the Sup-

port of his People's Faith and his own Honour and 

Glory, to denote his complex Person and as Mediator. 

— The three Texts he quotes must be considered 

by and by. 

" 4. They believed also, that he had an Existence " before he came into the World. p. 85." They could 

not possibly doubt this: Because, it was impossible, 

that he could come into the World till he had one, 

or before he existed. — But, he durst not say, p. 10, 

11. they believed, that his Human Soul then existed: 

And therefore, when they professed, and were sure, 

that he was the Son of the living God, I cannot help 

thinking, they were sure he was the second Person, 

and, as such, the coessential Son, now made Flesh. 

And the Text quoted, "John xvi. 28. and 30. I came 

forth from the Father, &c." makes much for me. 

" This, says Mr. Clark, confirms us in the Belief of 

" thy Deity and Omniscience." 

5. " They believed also that God was in a most " eminent and peculiar Manner present with him, " &c. p. 86." This is so plainly implied, in the 

former Thoughts, that those, who believed them, 
could not possibly doubt of this: Not to add, That 

Nicodemus's Reasoning is clear, invincible, and con-

vincing. Jo. iii. 2. No one can do those Miracles which 

thou dost, except God be with him. — " But they " did not seem to have any fixed and certain Belief " of such a peculiar and personal Union of the Man 

" Christ
"Christ Jesus with the true God during his Life-time, as to give him the Name and Title of God." This Sort of uncouth Language comes so often up, that I can hardly, with a safe Conscience, help setting it in its true Light!

They never, neither during his Life-time nor after it, heard, or spoke, one Word of his personal Union with the true God, in his Sense of that Title: — They heard him often, and plainly, speak of the Father and the Son, which were the personal Titles of Two distinct Persons; and therefore, could not but know, That the One was neither the other, nor them both: — They never called him the Father, but always the Son, which was the Title proper to him: — They could not but know, that, when he called himself the Son of God, in the Way and Manner he did, the Jews always charged him with making himself equal with God, or making himself God, Jo. x. 33. and that he never denied that he was; and therefore, I humbly conceive, could not but believe, That he was actually equal with God, i. e. the Father, and being a coessential Son, was indeed God, tho' not the Father: — This they might believe, tho' they might not always either speak, or act fully up to their Faith: — When he is spoken of as Mediator, the Name God is economically ascribed, if not reserved, to the first Person, the Father with whom he mediates: — Notwithstanding the personal Union of the Divine and Human Natures in the Mediator, "The Man Christ Jesus," as such, had never the Name and Title of God given him, either during his Life-time or after it; nor never will: — And, to wave some others, I do not know but I may add, That, supposing them to have been most "certain that he was the true God," they might doubt, Whether, during his Estate of Humiliation, they were "to give him the Name and Title of God," without particular Instruction from
from himself; which he, in his Wisdom, had not thought meet to give them, for the Reasons hinted above, or the like.—— If "they did scarce understand his Oneness with the Father, in so sublime a Sense," it was not, because it was not so clearly revealed before his Resurrection; for it was as clearly revealed before it, as after it: But, it proceeded from their Prejudices, their Weakness, their Slowness of Heart to believe and understand, &c.—— And yet, I am satisfied, they believed, That there is but one God: That the Father was the true God: And, That the Son was a coessential Son, and therefore equal with him.—— After all, the Question betwixt us is not,

What Idea they had: But, what Idea they might and should have had: Or rather, What Idea we, who have the whole Scriptures complete, ought to, and may now, have of Christ.—— Were a Socinian, or modern Jew, disputing against the Satisfaction of Christ; and, in prosecuting his Purpose, should divide his Discourse into several Sections: What would our Author have said, had one of them begun thus, What Idea the Disciples had of the Death of Christ, with the glorious Ends and blessed Effects of it?—— Surely he would have smiled, had either of them answered, 1. They firmly believed, that he was the true Messiah; and therefore, was never to die. Jo. xii. 34, &c.—— 2. They believed, that he was to be a King, a mighty Conqueror, &c.—— But, 3. Had the Socinian, without either Fear or Shame, asserted, That he was not to be a Priest, till after his Resurrection! nor offer his Sacrifice, till he ascended into Heaven! &c. that he was only a metaphorical Redeemer, and that the Sacrifice which he offered as a proper Sacrificer, was only a solemn Address! &c. &c. Would he not, and with some Zeal too, have told the Jews, That the Old Testament Sacrifices in Blood, with the acknowledged Design and Effects of them,
were all typical Prefigurations of the great, and true Sacrifice, even his own precious Blood, which he was to offer as the Price of Redemption; &c. and that several of the Prophets had, in the clearest and fullest Manner, prophesied of his Sufferings, and Death as a Sacrifice for Sin, &c. Pf. xxii. throughout, If. lii. 14. Ch. liii. throughout, &c. &c. And, Would he not have told the unbelieving Socinian, That their ever blessed Master had so plainly, and frequently, yea, and emphatically, told them, That he was to suffer many Things, and be crucified, &c. that he was to lay down his Life for the Sheep, &c. and give his Life a Ransom for many, &c. &c. and therefore they might, they ought to, have known better? &c. &c. — Would he not have thought, That all their Arguments against it, were poor, pitiful Sophisms; and all their Reasonings like the senseless, perverse Chat of some conceited, obstinate, peevish Boys? &c.

The Design of this Section is so plain, that the serious Christian will excuse me if I pass it.

"S.E.C.T. IV. What Evidence they gave of believing his true Deity. p. 87—94."

The plain Design of this Section cannot be mistaken. Several Things recorded by the Evangelists, have been thought sufficient Evidence, that the Disciples and others believed him to be, what the Prophets foretold he was to be, even Immanuel, God in our Nature: Pf. ii. 6—12. If. vii. 14. Ch. ix. 6. Zech. xiii. 7, &c. &c. But, Our Author, with his "Doubtings, perhaps's, &c. tries to invalidate them all! and is very zealous in it too!

"1. Upon some special Occasions they worshipped him." p. 87. And, considering the Faith of the Jews, in thofe Days and ever since, if the Worship they gave him was "Religious and Divine Worship, 'tis an irrefragable Argument, (1) That they believed his true Deity: Because, if they had not, their
their worshipping him with religious and divine Worship, had been, in them, wilful, and direct Idolatry. (2) That he knew himself to be the coessential Son of God, and as such, really God: Because, if he had not, he would not, could not, have accepted religious and divine Worship from them, without daring Robbery of the most High, making himself an Idol, &c. — He gives us five Instances, where the very same Verb is used, which is commonly used to signify religious and divine Worship; even those of " the Leper, Mat. viii. 2. the Ruler, Ch. ix. 18. " the Woman of Canaan, Ch. xv. 25. the blind Man, " Jo. ix. 38. and the Disciples that were in the Ship. " Mat. xiv. 32, 33. — But it may be doubted, " says he, whether all this arises to the Notion of " religious and divine Worship, since this Word is " sometimes used in Scripture, referring to moral " or civil Honours paid to our Fellow-Creatures, " 1 Chron. xxiv. 20. Mat. xiii. 26." &c. —— It is so: And very frequently, in this Nation, we use the English Word, Worship, to signify civil Honour; as when we bow to a Justice of the Peace, and call him your Worship, &c. —— But, it is not from the mere Use of the Verb, προσκυνεῖν, nor the English Word, Worship, that we reason: But, from the whole Action; or all that was said, and done. —— The Leper did not only worship, i. e. bow his Head or Body, and " pay him a more high Degree of " Reverence and Obeisance," p. 88. but professed his Faith in his Power to make him clean: And the others, besides the Respect they paid him, professed their Faith, that he could cast out Devils, raise the Dead, &c. —— Were any serious understanding Christian now to see, and hear one who had the Leprosy, bowing reverendly, and saying to another, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean: Would he not think, and say, either, That the Leper believed
lieved him to be the Lord, who could make him clean; or that he was a mere Fool; or distracted; or, that he mocked the other; or, that he really made an Idol of him, in expecting that from him, which he could not do, and attributing that to him which did not belong to him? &c. And, Would he not think, and say, That he, who accepted such an Address, and did not admonish, or reprove him, &c. either took him for a mad Man, &c. or was himself a vile, proud Monster, &c. or, indeed, the Lord, who could cleanse him? — but, I must be more particular, when I have observed,

1. That the Enquiry, in the preceding and following Sections, was concerning the Ideas the Disciples had of him, or, what he had taught them, &c. and so his Words, in this, seem plainly to imply: Whereas, of the six Instances here given, four or five, so far as appears, were not his Disciples. and had never seen him till that Day! — So that,

2. Those four or five Instances, are no Way to his Purpose: And therefore, should we grant every one of them, and every Word he has said upon them, and that all his Doubts, &c. in these Cases, are reasonable, they do him no Service. — But, we shall shew, that every one of his Perhaps's are groundless. And therefore,

"As to the Leper's worshipping him, I think we may be sure, it was with "Religious and Divine Worship," and therefore, an "Evidence that he "believed his true Deity."—Whether this Sort of Leprosy among the Jews, was only an Uncleanliness, or a real Sickness, or both, I am not so certain. These Things however, concerning it, I conceive, we certainly know. — 1. The Leper was not sent to the Physician; nor do we read of any Medicines, of any Sort, or any other Means, prescribed, either for his cleansing or Cure. — 2. The Priest, to whom he was sent, neither pretended to cleanse, nor heal him;
but only to pronounce him clean, or unclean, according to the Directions prescribed, Lev. xiii. and xiv. — 3. The Jews generally think, and several Things render it almost certain, That the Leprosy, was a Punishment, or Brand, inflicted immediately, by God himself, for some particular Sin: And consequently, could be neither removed, nor in the least abated, by any natural Means, whether applied externally or internally, till he himself interposed. —

4. This, we are sure, was the Case with Miriam, Numb. xii. 10 — 15. Gebazi, 2 Kings v. 27. and Uzziah, 2 Chro. xxvi. 19—21. the only three Lepers, whose Names are mentioned in the Old Testament. — And, 5. Hence it would appear, That this Leprosy differ'd greatly, if not totally, from the Disease known at this Day, in Europe, by that Name. — It seems therefore clear, — 6. That none could cleanse the Leper, i. e. remove the Effect, but He who could remove the Cause, i. e. forgive the Sin: And consequently, That none could cleanse the Leper, but God himself; because, none but he can forgive Sin. — Of this Mind, was the King of Israel, 2 Kings v. 7. Am I God, that I should recover a Man of his Leprosy? And of this Mind was the Leper, of whom we are speaking; and therefore, believing Christ to be the Son of God, and, as such, his coessential Son, and equal with him, he worshipped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt thou canst make me clean. q. d. Lord, I firmly believe, that, thou art the Son of God; and therefore, if it be thy good Pleasure, thou canst forgive my Sin, the Cause; and, consequently, canst also remove my Leprosy, or make me clean: — I know also, that thou art most merciful, and ready to forgive the Penitent; and most wise, and knowest when it is most seasonable, to remove the visible Effects of thy Displeasure for Sin: — I cannot tell, if it is agreeable to thy Wisdom, or consistent with thy Glory, so soon to make me clean: — But I leave my most humble De-
fires with thee, Thy Will be done. The likeliest Way, in such a Case, to obtain a gracious Answer, that cou’d be conceived! — But, if the Leper had any Doubts of Christ’s Divinity; his Answer, and what followed, could hardly fail to remove them.

"As for the Ruler of the Synagogue, Mat. ix. 18." Since the other Rulers, the Scribes, and the Pharisees, well knew the Meaning of the Title, the Son of God; even that he who assumed it to, or used it of, himself, was equal with God, &c. we have no Reason to doubt, that this Ruler was of the same Mind: And his Request, That Christ would come, and restore his dead Daughter to Life, may confirm us in it. Whence I conclude, that he worshipped him with religious and divine Worship.

As to "the Woman of Canaan, her Case was singular. She was not a Descendant of Abraham; was not, for aught appears, a Proselyte; had never seen Christ: And yet, was one of the most eminent Believers that ever was! — She had heard of him, and of his Works: And, Faith cometh by hearing. — ’Tis plain, from all that pass’d, that she was a Woman of good Sense and quick Apprehension, as well as of such a strong Faith, as would take no Denial. — She knew, by Report, That our Lord had, and therefore could, cast out Devils; &c. and consequently, was the Messiah, the Son of God: No one of the Prophets, nor any other before him, having ever pretended to do any such Thing, which plainly required divine Power. — She might, possibly, have heard, That, to cast out Devils, was the proper Work of the Messiah, who was to bruise the Serpent’s Head: And, That the Son of God was to be manifested, to destroy the Works of the Devil. — These and the like, or, what other Hints she might have had, concerning the expected Saviour, from Tradition then very common, as we hinted above, all around, far and near, among the Heathen; and what other Things she,
who lived just on the Borders of Canaan, might have heard, or learned, from some pious Jews her Neighbours; or otherwise, from those who had heard him, or seen his Works, and perhaps had themselves been healed by him; and what she herself had then observed in him, to raise her Idea of him, and encourage her Faith in him and Expectations from him, I cannot say: But, it seems plain, she, at that Time, spake and acted, under a very special Influence of the Holy Spirit; and neither would, nor could, have acted the Part she did, if she had not. — And therefore, seeing 'tis clear, that she spake to him, as to a Divine Person; I humbly conceive, we may be satisfied, that the Worship wherewith she worshipped him, was Religious and Divine Worship: Or else, that our Lord would have admonished, and directed her, as he did the young Ruler, Luke xviii. 19. instead of giving her so very ample a Commendation. And the Grant of her Request, Be it unto thee, even as thou wilt, " sounds so God-like, and " imitates divine Language so much, that it might " have led," and considering her Sagacity, Humility, Importunity, and Constancy, I conceive, could not but, yea, did actually, lead " her onward " to the Belief of his Deity," should we suppose her to have been, even to that Minute, utterly ignorant of it.

The Case of the poor blind Man, John ix. is rather more clear. He was not so much as enquiring after Christ; or minding him, in the least; so far was he from expecting, that he either could, or would, open the Eyes of one that was born blind! ver. 30—32. But, our Lord, saw him, as he was passing by, ver 1. and without being asked, or, so far as appears, speaking one Word to him, spat on the Ground, having no Water at hand, made Clay, —— anointed his Eyes, —— ordering him, for the Trial of his Faith, what to do; ver. 6, 7. and then went his Way, before his,
his Patient was so happy, as to see the extraordinary Person, who had not only opened his Eyes, but done it by such Means as were more likely to close, or keep them shut, than to open them; and on the Sabbath-Day too, against the then received superstitious Interpretation of the Law of the Sabbath!—All the Account, he could afterwards give of his wonderful Physician, was, that he was a Man called Jesus, that he made Clay, and anointed his Eyes, &c. ver. 11. Whence he very rationally, and justly, concluded him to be a Prophet; ver. 17. and that he was not a Sinner, as they falsely and maliciously alleged, but a Favourite of Heaven and of God; &c. and, as a sure Proof of it, had done to him, what had never been done since the World began. ver. 30—33. — As the open, judicious, and brave Apology, for his glorious Benefactor, (for which they, in their mad Zeal, excommunicated him, ver. 34.) shews him to have been a sensible, grateful, well-disposed Man; Our Lord, when he had found him, (that he might further instruct him concerning himself, and confirm him in it, That he was indeed, πατὸς Θεός, of God, or from him, viz. by Eternal Generation;) said unto him, Doth thou believe on the Son of God? ver. 35. A Question which necessarily pre-supposes, and implies, his true and proper Divinity. πίστεύω εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, to believe on the Son of God, is an Act of religious and divine Worship, John xiv. 1. if any Act of Worship can be so: But, our Lord assures us, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. Mat. iv. 10. And therefore, if he then spake Truth, and is here consistent with himself, 'tis undeniable, That He is the Lord our God, and That he proposed himself, the Son, as the Object of Divine Worship; and consequently, That the blind Man should worship him, as the Lord his God. — The poor Man's Answer plainly declaring, that he was very ready and willing to
to do it, as soon as he should know. Who he was: ver. 36. Our Lord presently replies in the clearest, and fullest Manner, Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee. ver. 38. q. d. I, whom thine Eyes see, and who am the very Person who opened them, Am the Son of God, who, according to the Prophets, was to be given, to be the Child born, whose Name was to be called the Mighty God; if. ix. 6. even the Virgin's Son, Immanuel, God with us. Ch. vii. 14. I am he whom Isaiah calls your God, and of whom he prophesies, that I was to come, and that, when I should come, Then the Eyes of the Blind shall be opened, &c. Ch. xxxv. 4, 5. &c. Doft thou then believe the Report, I now make to thee? And, Doft thou not only believe, that I am what, and who, I tell thee, I am: But, Doft thou believe on me, as the promised Saviour? i.e. Doft thou receive me, and yield thyself to me, as thy Saviour; who has given thee full Evidence, that I can save thee from thy Sins, and open the Eyes of thine Understanding, &c. by opening thy bodily Eyes, which thou knowest none but God could do? Upon which, the Evangelist informs us, That he readily, and heartily, said, Lord, I believe. And, to testify that he did, προσευχομεν αυτον, be worshipped, or adored him. q. d. Notwithstanding the Meaness of thine Appearance, and the malicious Surmizes of thine Enemies; &c. &c. I firmly believe what thou sayst of thyself, That thou art the Son of God, now come unto the World: And, I receive thee, and accept of thee, as my only Saviour: And, in Testimony of it, I now most humbly worship thee as Emmanuel, My Saviour and my God.

"The Leper, Luke xvii. 15. who was the only One of the Ten that were cleansed, who glorified "God, and fell down on his Face at Christ's Feet; "Luke xvii. 15, 16!" was a Samaritan: And consequently, 1. For aught appears, no Disciple: And
And therefore, should have had no Place here. —
But, if he was, 2. It is not said, That “he gave “Christ Thanks, as the glorious Means and mira-
culous Instrument of his Deliverance,” Words that need to be explained! Nor, — 3. Is it certain, that “he did not know, That Christ who healed “him, was himself the true God.” p. 88. Because,
(1) Our Lord had been two Days among the Samari-
tans, by whom he was also kindly received. Jo. iv.
40 — 42. — (2) Many of them believed on him, for the Saying of their Town’s-Woman. ver. 39, and
many more believed on him, because of his own Word:
ver. 41. for that they had heard him themselves;
and declared, they knew that he was indeed the
Christ, the Saviour of the World. ver. 42. — Whence it appears, — (3) That his Word had more Succefs
among them, than generally among the Jews: And,
That they had clearer, and better, Notions both of
his Person, and Office, than the others. And, (4)
For any Thing we know, probably he might have heard our Lord, when he was in Samaria, call him-
selt the Son of God; or might have heard from his Neighbours, that he had. — Or, Those, who
knew that he was indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the
World, might, many other Ways have heard, as well as Virgil, &c. that he also was the Son of God,
and therefore the true God.

In a Word, I cannot help thinking, That, in the four former Cases at least, they worshipped him with religious and divine Worship, for these Reasons. —
1. It cannot be doubted, that every one, whom he healed, or dispossessed, &c. “paid him moral or civil “Honours;” and yet, none, I think, but these, are said to have worshipped him. — 2. These Instances were all extraordinary, requiring more Power and Authority, than ever had been given to any Creature.
—— No one, before him, had ever pretended to cleanse a Leper; raise the Dead, only by taking them by
the Hand; or, open the Eyes of one that was born blind; &c. — 3. The happy Persons were, every one of them, endued with a very extraordinary Degree of Faith; and were also, at that Time, under the exciting and quickening Power of the Holy Spirit. —

4. The Manner and Circumstances, as well as Words, of their Address, seem to make it plain, that it was religious and divine Worship they paid him. — And,

5. I cannot bring myself to think, That our Lord, who was meek and lowly, would, in his Humiliation, have accepted of such Worship, had it not been religious Worship; or healed them, till he had admonished them, had they ascribed more to him than was his Due.

The Case of the Disciples, Mat. xiv. 25 — 33. I humbly conceive, is undeniably for me. — Jesus went unto them walking on the Sea, — he bid Peter come to him on the Water, — caught him when he was sinking, — when he was come into the Ship, the Wind ceased. — — Here were several Miracles, and such as they had never seen; no, nor heard of! Upon this, they came and worshipped him, saying, Of a Truth thou art the Son of God. And therefore, the Object of religious and divine Worship.

"2. The Scene he gives us of Peter's Words, "when in a great Surprize, Luke v. 4. Depart from "me, for I am a sinful Man, O Lord," is exceeding good; and his Thought, "he might at this Season "have an overwhelming Glimpse of his Divinity," I, for my Part, readily admit and believe: But, he adds, "it may be easily said, that this Miracle alone, "the great Draught of Fishes, was not sufficient to "give a just convincing Proof of his Godhead. "p. 89." Anf. I do not pretend to know, what "might be, to our Author, a just convincing Proof," But, it is plain, that taking it, with all the Circum-

stance of it, it exceedingly astonished them all; yea, rather more, than some others we have now con-
dered,
dered, which were, as, I humbly conceive, I have made appear, a 
just and convincing Proof of it: 
— This might still convince them the more, who had seen so many of another Nature: — The 
"overwhelming Glimpse of his Divinity," would give them the most convincing Proof that could be given them: — And, Peter's Words make it evident, That himself was, at least at that Time, most fully convinced, &c.

"3. The Apothies seem to make a Petition to " Christ for spiritual Mercies in a Way of divine " Worship, Luke xvii. 5. And the Apothies said to " the Lord, Increase our Faith; which Address seems " to have more of the Appearance of Religious " Worship paid to him by them, than any other " Expression I know of before the Resurrection of " Christ." 89, 90. This I have given verbatim.— "

Ans. 1. Here we have, "they seem to make a Pe- "tition to Christ!" Surely, this was a Petition, if any "Words can signify a Petition: And "they made it "too," if they knew what they were saying, and did not jest with their blessed Master. — 2. It was certainly, "for spiritual Mercies," if the Increase of "Faith, be a spiritual Mercy! — 3. It was certainly, "in a Way of Divine Worship," Whether we con- "sider the Object, the Matter, or the Manner of it, or the End of the Disciples in making it. — 4. It had "not only "the Appearance of Religious Worship," but was really either religious and divine Worship, or downright Idolatry! Yea, It not only "seems "to have the Appearance," But was indeed, if it "was any Thing, actually religious Worship.— And, "5. It will be hard to find, any greater Appearance of "religious Worship paid to him," by them in a "Body, either before or after his Resurrection. — "But I must wave several Things here, — — — Yet,

So very zealous is our learned Author, upon this Head, That if he must grant, That this was indeed
"religious and divine Worship," and that Christ also accepted it; yet, says he, "some would question whether this Petition did evidence their firm Belief of his Godhead," for a Perhaps or two, which I do not now care to mention, and this strange Observation, "For it is remarkable, that when he forgave the Sins of the Man sick of the Palsy, Mat. ix. 2—8—though the Scribes and Pharisees charged him with Blasphemy, yet the Multitude only velled and glorified God who had given such Power unto Men."—What, I pray, is this to the Purpose? We were speaking of the Disciples, who were never called the Multitude.—Surely, they might, and did, know more than the Multitude. But, enough of these. His parallel Case, Mark ix. 22. p. 91." is of one who was no Disciple, &c.—and yet might be turned against him, with a Witness.

4. The Disciples may seem to own his Omnisalence, John xvi. 30, &c. but probably, at that Time, they understood this all Things, in a limited Sense, (as the Woman, 2 Sam. xiv. 20.) &c. If so many may be's, perhaps's, and probably's, may pass for Arguments, 'twou'd hardly be impossible, to prove, that Monster of Monsters, Transubstantiation! For the utmost Inference the Disciples make from it was, that Jesus came forth from God, ver. 30. not that he was God himself." p. 92. —But, If they had known, that he was a coessential Son, and, as such, equal with God; and intended also, in these Words, to profess as much; they could not possibly have made a higher Inference from it," except they had said "by this we believe that thou art the Father!" and not, that thou camest forth from him, viz. as a Son.—The great Mr. Clark's Note upon this is, "This confirms us in the Belief of thy Deity and Omnisalence." He gives another Reason for this, because Christ had told them, "but
"but a very little before, that he himself did not " know the Day of Judgment." But, there, as we have fully proved, he spake of himself as the Son of Man; whereas, here, he spake of himself as the Son of God, who, as such, came out from God, ver. 27. came forth from the Father, ver. 28. and could say, all Things that the Father hath are mine, ver. 15. and that the Spirit of Truth shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you, ver. 14. &c. all which make it undeniable, that he speaks of himself, as a coessential Son. It makes it, I say, undeniable, 1. Because all the Disciples, by his own Confession, p. 10. 11. quoted above, knew Nothing of his pre-existent human Soul; and therefore, could not think, that that was it which came out from God, &c. 2. They could not dream, that his Body, which was made of a Woman, came forth from the Father. 3. He must therefore, have spoken all these of himself, as God the Son. And, 4. These Words cannot, if we take them all together, be properly predicated of any but a coessential Son: Because, it would be hideous Blasphemy in any, but such a Son, to use such Expressions of himself. ———

" 5. They believed that he was the Messiah; who "is spoken of in several Places of the Old Testa-
"ment, as the true God." They did so: Nor is it possible, one would think, to read, and believe, the Old Testament, without believing it. See Is. ix. 6. Ch. vii. 14. Ch. xxv. 6—9. Ch. 35. 4—6. Ch. xl. 10—12. &c. &c. "But as we cannot find that "the learned Doctors of that Age did generally un-
derstand those Prophecies, or believe the true Dei-
"ty of the Messiah, &c." p. 93. This is another Protetatio contra factum. The learned Doctors of that Age, understood the Prophecies so well, That they readily, and always, put the only true Sense upon our Lord's Words, when he spake of himself, as the Son, who wrought the same Works with the Fa
ther, John v. 17, 18. or was One with him, Ch. x.
30. &c. even that he made himself equal with God, 
or made himself God. " so neither do we find any " Hint in the History of the Gospel, that the Apo-
" filed themselves before the Death of Christ under-
" stood these Prophecies, so far as to apply them to " the Messiah in that Sense; &c." p. 93. 'Tis well 
they understood them afterwards! And yet, Would 
one think it, the first two Lines of the very next Pa-
ragraph sufficiently confirm it, and confute himself!
6. "They believed and confessed him to be the Son of " God." They did so: And that he was the Christ, 
i.e. the Son of God, now become the Son of Man, 
that he might fully execute the Office of the Messiah. 
They had also heard himself often file himself 
the begotten, the only begotten Son of God: And, no 
Doubt, believed he was really what he called him-
sel. And what do we, what can we, desire more? 
Yea, What could He say more, if he had not called 
himself the Father? " but, says he, this Title does 
" not necessarily amount to any more than a glorious 
" Likeness to God, &c." But, say I, we have 
proved the contrary; and these Texts, If. ix. 6. 
Phil. ii. 6. Col. i. 13---17. Heb. i. 8. 10. 11. and 
many the like, put it out of all Doubt.
" Thus I have mentioned the fairest and strongest 
" Evidences that I can find of any Degree of Faith 
" or Belief they had of the Deity of Christ during his 
" Life," And fairer, and stronger, Evidences could 
not then, yea cannot now, be given of his Deity; 
especially the last. And 'tis not a little strange, 
that our worthy Author, should so zealously reason 
against plain Fact; or forget, That there are three 
Persons in the Godhead; and that Christ is not the 
first, but the second; &c. " and 'tis possible they 
" might sometimes have a Glimpse of that glorious 
" Doctrine." p. 93. This was not only possible, 
but our Lord has assured us, Mat. xvi. 17. That 
Flesh
Flesh and Blood had not revealed it unto them, but his Father which is in Heaven.

The Design of this Question, and of his Answers to it, is too palpable to be mistaken; and his Management of the Whole, too ——— for me to take any more Notice of it. Let the Reader only remember,

1. That the Disciples were not only weak Men, but under the Power of very strong Prejudices, from which no Instructions, &c. could deliver them, till the Holy Ghost was poured out upon them!

2. That therefore, though we should grant every Word he has said, through all these Sections, tho' we dare not grant but a very few of them, it would do him no Service. The Sufferings of the Messiah, with the glorious Ends and Effects of them, were as clearly, fully and emphatically prophesied of under the Old Testament, if not more so, than his proper, i.e. coessential Sonship! And yet they could not be brought to believe, that he was ever to suffer!

3. What would our Author have said, If a Socinian disputing against the Satisfaction of Christ, had given so many, and such little, Things concerning the Disbelief of the Disciples? &c. But ———

"S E C T. V. What Indications the Disciples gave during the Life-time of Christ of their Disbelief of his Godhead, or at least of the Uncertainty of their Faith in that Matter."

P. 94.

The Design of this is manifest to all, and gives a very strange Proof of our learned Author's extraordinary Zeal for his Nostrums! — His Argument, in short, is this. — The Disciples so firmly believed, that he was the Son of God, his only begotten, as never to disbelieve it; no, nor shew any Uncertainty about it: And therefore, had they as firmly believed, That "this Title, did necessarily imply his Divine Nature," p. 63. or, that "as the Son of God, he" was
"was true God;" they would never have given any
Indications of their Disbelief of it, or the Uncertainty of
their Faith in that Matter: But, they did actually
give some Indications, of their Disbelief of the Godhead
of the Son as such; i. e. that Christ, as the Son of God,
if at all or in any Sense, was indeed true God; or, at
least, of the Uncertainty of their Faith in that Matter;
Ea. They either disbelieved, or, at least, were un-
certain of, his Godhead; either absolutely, or as the Son.
To which we might reply, 1. Supposing all this,
What then? Will it follow, That this Title, the
own Son, the only begotten Son of God, does not neces-
arily imply coessential Sonship; because they did not
believe it did? Or, That Christ was not the true
God, because they did not believe he was; or, were
uncertain, as to that Matter? By no Means.—2. They
could not be brought, to believe he was ever to
suffer such Things, as the Prophets had most clearly
predicted; and himself had, over and over, assured
them of, as plainly as it could possibly be done! So
strong, so deeply rooted, were their Prejudices! Besides,
3. The Disciples were weak Men, slow of Heart to be-
(i. e. says the great Mr. Clark, That had a mean O-
pinion of Christ’s Power and Care of them.) who
sometimes also were apt to forget what they had seen,
but a little before, Mat. xvi. 9, 10. yea, whose
Heart was hardened, Mark vi. 52. so that they nei-
ther perceived, nor understood, what they might ea-
sily have done, Ch. viii. 17. and Ch. xvi. 14. &c.
&c. And, 4. Sometimes they spake before they wist
what to say, Mark ix. 6. and sometimes, not know-
ing what they said, Luke ix. 33. &c. &c.—In such
eartbien Vessels was the Treasure of the Gospel put,
that the Excellency of the Power might be of God, and
not of Men! 2 Cor. iv. 7. —— Let us then consider
the Answer he gives to his own Question.
"1. If they had a firm and steady Belief that he
"was the true God, —— they would, some where
"or other, have evidently expressed their Faith in this
"Mat
"Matter," p. 94. Anf. 1. If they indeed, believed him to be God, they believed him to be the true God: Because they knew of no God, but one. — 2. They as evidently expressed their Faith, that he was the Son of the living God, as they possibly could do. — "They would have upon some Occasion or other, address’d him as Thomas did, My Lord and my God." —— Anf. Our Lord had never expressly styled himself God, but only the Son of God: — They might need Direction in that Case: — The Name, or Title, God, was not so suitable to his Estate of Humiliation: — The Economy might then require this Title, to be generally referred to the Father: —— And the Jews knew, That the Son of God, was indeed God. Jo. x. 33, &c. "We cannot " but suppose also, that among their Doubts and " Queries," many of which, to say the least, were very weak? "they would have askt him this ob- " vious and important one, How could he be God, " and his Father be God also, and yet not two Gods? " p. 94." —— Why, if they had, He could, I con- ceive, have given them no other Answer, than he actually did; I and the Father are one. &c. " They did not talk of him to the World under " any Character of Godhead." p. 95. A poor begging the Question! Did they not believe, and pro- fess him to be the Son of God? And was not this a Character of Godhead? —— And that he was the Messiah? And, Could they speak of him as such, without implying his Divinity? &c.——But these, and many the like, deserve ———

2. "If they had believed him to be the true " God that made the Heavens and the Earth, &c. " they would not have been so surprized, as they " were, Luke viii. 24, 25. or astonished, as they " were, Ch. v. 9. or marvelled, &c. as Mat. xxii. " 19, 20." Anf. (1) Should we suppose, that all this proceeded from Weakness, it would do his Cause.
Cause no Service, But, (2) Surely their Surprize, &c. at these Miracles, if we consider them well, with all the Circumstances of them, was no Indication of their Disbelief: Or, if they were, they might, by a more close Attention, have strengthened their Faith. — (3) When they were astonished, Luke v. 9. they had been but lately acquainted with him: — The Obedience which the Winds and Waves immediately, and in an Instant, paid to his Commands, Luke viii. 24, 25. could not, I am apt to think, fail to remove all their Doubts of his Divinity, if they indeed had any: — And much the same we may say of the Barren Fig-tree. Mat. xxi. 19. 20. — When we remember, that all he said to it was, Let no Fruit grow on thee hence forward, &c. and that it immediately withered away; not only the Leaves, but the Body of the Tree, and in an Instant, &c. and that none could do this but God, we may easily perceive why they wondered, &c.

3. "If they had believed Christ to be the great " and glorious God, they would not have treated " him with such an indecent Roughness, as they " did, Mat. xv. 33. when they answered, Whence " should we have so much Bread in the Wilderness to " fill so great a Multitude! — and ver. — 12, &c. nor " would Peter have been so free as to give such a " Rebuke to his God! as he did, Ch. xvi. 22." p. 96, 97.—We might Anf. 1. The Disciples were Galileans, a heavy, ignorant, and stupid Sort of People: Jo. i. 46. Ch. vii. 52. They had not been polished by such Education, as to make them Masters of good Breeding: Fishermen have, commonly, a Roughness, and Rudeness, about them, more than their Neighbours: And therefore, it is not so strange to hear such indecent Language from them, &c. — 2. The affable, sweet, and loving Way, in which our Lord, at all Times, so familiarly conversed with them; his Readiness to cover their lesser Faults, or excuse
excuse them; his Tenderness to them, upon all Occasions; &c. might, at last, so much embolden them, as to transgress the Rules of Good Manners. — Familiarity, says the Old Proverb, is apt to breed Contempt. — 3. Even good, and wise Men, sometimes forget themselves; speak before they think, and what does not become them: And many unworthy Things may drop from their Mouths, not only without any ill Design, but, perhaps, with a good One. — 4. 'Tis plain the Disciples themselves were, in all these Instances, much to blame. They considered not, &c. Mark vi. 52. Perceive ye not yet, neither understand, &c. said their blessed Master? Ch.viii. 17--21. Whence 'tis plain, they ought to have known better, and might have known better! Have ye your Hearts yet hardened, πεποφωμινυ, callous or brazen, i. e. stupid, and insensible, so as nothing will make any deep and lasting Impression upon them? --- He is there speaking of the Miracles of the Loaves, which could not possibly have been wrought, but by one who is the true God. --- He, who could multiply five small Loaves, &c. could make a World! And indeed, all Things were made by him. Jo. i. 3. So that, if they did not believe the Deity of Christ, it was not for want of Evidence! For, their Eyes saw, and their Ears heard! ver. 18. And therefore, he sharply rebukes them! ver. 21. — These Passages then, are so far from serving our Author's Purpose, in the least, that they quite overthrow it! — 5. As to Peter's Case, we know his Temper, his Forwardness, &c. nor was this the only Time when he spake, not knowing what he said. — But, it will be urged, "We cannot suppose he would give such a Rebuke "to his God." p. 97. And therefore, 'tis plain, "he disbelieved his Master's Godhead." Anf. Tho' honest Peter said what he said, out of a Sort of Love to him; yet, it was very ill, and very ill said. X X
There was a great deal of Arrogance, Ignorance, carnal Wisdom, &c. &c. in it: And therefore, our Lord gave him the severest Reproof, he ever gave to any. --- But it will not follow, that he did not firmly believe, that Christ was the coessential Son of the Father, and as such, the true God, or equal with him. For, (1) He had, again and again, solemnly, and deliberately professed the contrary: Whereas, these Words were spoken hastily, and without Consideration; as his Denial of Christ afterwards was. — (2) The holiest mere Man that ever lived, did not always speak to, or of, the most High, according to his Faith in him; Such is our present Imperfection! — It is one Thing to have a fixed; yea, habitual, Belief of the Being and Perfections of God; and quite another, to think, speak, or act, at all Times, according to Principle. — Where is he to be found, who always behaves, as in the Presence, and under the Eye, of the Omniscient? — How often did the Children of Israel, the Body of that Nation, (who had the Pillar of Cloud, in which the Lord went before them; who were fed and clothed by Miracle, &c. and who could not possibly, one would think, doubt either of his Presence with them, or his Power, &c.) call them both in Question? — And, 3. To give an Instance to confront all these, When God had told Moses, (who knew as much, and, I conceive, a great deal more, of God, than Peter did of Christ; who had seen all his Wonders in Egypt, and at the Red Sea, &c. &c.) That he would give Flesh to his People in the Wilderness; and Moses said, shall the Flocks and the Herds be plain for them, or shall all the Fish of the Sea be gathered together, &c. Numb. xi. 19. — 22. 'tis plain from God's Answer to him, (Is the Lord's Hand waxed short?) That Moses, even the renowned Moses, by whom the Law was given, and by whom God saved them, &c. 'Tis plain, I say, that he doubted the Promise, and spake very indecently
decently and unlike himself: And that, tho’ God was graciously pleased to pass it by, yet he kindly reproved him for it, Thou shalt see now whether my Word shall come to pass unto thee, or not. ver. 22. see also, Ch. xx. 7—12. --- But now, Did ever any one think, That “these were Indications of his Dis-
belief of the Deity” of him that promised? &c. I think not. They were, ’tis true, plain Evidences of the Imperfection of Grace, and of the Remains of Unbelief, &c. even in Moses; as the Examples, we are considering, are of the Imperfections and Weak-
ness, &c. of the Disciples: And that is all. No mere Man ever yet behaved, in all Cases, as he ought and might; no, nor never will in this World.

“I might add also, that tho’ the Virgin Mary “under the Influence of Rapture and Inspiration, “expresses herself thus, Luke i. 47. My spirit hath “rejoiced in God my Saviour,” p. 97. Then, surely! she knew, — 1. That she was under Inspiration. ----- 2. That Christ was really her God and Saviour. And therefore, — 3. If ever she forgot this, or suffered the Impressions to languish, or wear off, it was her great Imperfection, and her Fault. “yet if she had “firmly believed her Son to be her God, she would “not have chid him so severely when he was twelve “Years Old, Luke 2. 48. Son, why hast thou dealt “thus with us? p 97.” --- Anf. I can perceive no chiding at all, in these Words: Nor any Thing, but what was becoming, and exceedingly tender and affectionate. She and Joseph had fought him for-
rowing: --- And had they known were he was; or had he told her, he had Business at the Temple, &c. and must tarry some Time; they had been easy. And, I verily believe, he would have told her, or gone with her, had he not been under some sudden and special Influence of the Holy Ghost.---With-
all, his Mother might firmly believe him to be God.
manifested in the Flesh; and yet could not but remember, that he was made of a Woman; and consequently, was true Man; and that she was his Mother, who was therefore to take Care of him: And yet might not know, that it was proper for him, as such, and at his Age, to tarry behind, without acquainting her with it. --- He had never done any such Thing before; and therefore, seeing he had not told her, that he would, or must, tarry, she might, she ought, in Duty as a Mother, to enquire what had kept him behind. --- And his Answer, How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not, &c. (q. d. says Mr. Clark, Having had such Notice several Times, Who, and What I am, you might have learnt from thence that I have another Father to serve and obey) which has more of a Rebuffe in it, than her Question, makes it pretty plain, She was to blame; and that he would remind her, That, tho' he was her Son according to the Flesh, he was from Eternity the coessential Son of God, and must therefore mind his Business: And, that he came to do his Will, and not theirs.

"4. If they had thought Christ was the true God, they would never have tried to entertain his Curiosity, by showing him how magnificent the Buildings of the Temple were, Mat. xxiv. 1." p. 97. 98. I am inclined to think, it was not to entertain his Curiosity, which might have been often so entertained before; but to move his Pity, (by trying, if they could thus prevail with him, to revoke, or at least suspend, that dreadful Doom, Ch. xxiii. 36 — 38.) that they showed him the Buildings of the Temple: And, if so, this was rather an Indication of their Belief, than Disbelief, of his Deity! --If I am here mistaken, this Action of the Disciples was only another Instance of their Incogitancy, or Weakness, &c.

"5. His
"5. His Hint from Jo. xvi. 30. p. 98." I have already considered, and turned it against himself. —

In the next Page, he tells us, "These Things will "give Occasion to three or four Questions."—They all lie out of my Way, at present, but the first: And therefore, (since they are of the same Kind with most of the rest, would require a very long Answer, and several Remarks which I am not now disposed to make, &c.) I shall wholly wave them.

"Quest. Did the Disciples believe him then to be a "mere common Man? p. 99." A strange Question, and yet ambiguously worded!—Moses, Solomon, and I-saiab, &c. were mere, but, I think, not common Men. Even the wretched Socinians, those malicious Enemies of his Divinity and Cross, who dream he was a mere Man, do not, I suppose, degrade him so far, as to think he was a common Man! Even they will hardly scruple to agree to every Thing he has offered, p. 100. except the Pre-existence of his human Soul. —— It was almost impossible, that any one should take him for a Common Man. None of the Jews did, Mat. xvi. 14. no not his Enemies, Jo. vii. 46. — But, —— I need say no more. —— Proceed we then to
Plain and clear Proofs, of the Coessential Sonship, of the Second Person of the ever-blessed Trinity: Or, That this Title, The Son of God, so frequently ascribed to the Second Person, or to Christ as God, does, directly and primarily, denote his Deity, or natural Relation to the Father, whose Son, whose only begotten Son he is.

This being the principal Thing, which will, of itself, determine the Controversies between us, we shall be the more careful in advancing, and illustrating, the Testimonies we produce; and removing whatever may be offered to weaken them. And, tho' our learned Author seems to limit the Question, p. 1. "to the true Meaning of the Name Son of "God, given to Christ in the New Testament," (as Dr. Clarke, in a Case nearly parallel, very unfairly, if not—— did!) We shall enquire into the true Meaning of it, in both Testaments: And that, for these Reasons. — 1. The second Person is, in the Old Testament, sometimes styled, the Son, the Son of God, his begotten Son, &c. as well as in the New. — 2. The Scriptures of the Old Testament were given by Inspiration of God, 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, &c. and Holy Men of God spake, and wrote, in them, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, 2 Pet. i. 21. &c. as well as in the New. — 3. The Faith of the Church of God, was, as to the Substance of it, and in all Essentials, the same of Old as now. Acts xv. 8 — 11. Eph. iv. 4 — 7. 2 Cor. iv. 13. Rom. iii. 30. &c. — 4. The New Testament explains the Old Testament, as the Old confirms the New: And indeed, each of them do much illustrate the other. — 5. Our Lord and his Apo-
Apostles, on all Occasions, appealed to Moses, and the Prophets, for all that they delivered: Nor did they preach any other Doctrine, or teach any other Commandments, than those had done before them, or said should come. Mat. iv. 4—10. Ch. xv. 3—9. Ch. xxii. 29—46. Luke xxiv. 25—27. and ver. 44—47. Jo. iii. 14—18. Ch. v. 45—47. Ch. vi. 45. Ch. vii. 23. Acts ii. 16—36. Ch. ix. 22. Ch. xiii. 32—41. Ch. xv. 14—18. Ch. xvii. 2, 3. Ch. xxvi. 22, 23, &c. &c. —— 6. The Old Testament is as much a Part of our Rule, as the New. Whatsoever Things were written afore Time, were written for our Learning, &c. Rom. iv. 23, 24. Ch. xv. 4. &c.—Yea, 7. They were able to make even Timothy wise unto Salvation, and the Man of God Perfect, throughly furnished unto all good Works. 2 Tim. iii. 15—17. Luke xvi. 29—31. — In fine, 8. The Church itself, and the Faith of Believers, are built upon the Foundation, not only of the Apostles, but of the Prophets. Eph. ii. 20.

Begin we then, with our Proofs from the Prophets, and then we shall proceed to those from the Apostles, and our blessed Lord himself; that, out of the Mouth of those two Clouds of Witnesses, and of Him who is the Amen, the Faithful and True Witness, Rev. iii. 14. the important Truths, we are contending for, may be established. And, because Moses, that great Prophet, both spake and wrote of him; Yea, and all the Prophets from Samuel, and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these Days, &c. Acts. iii. 20—24. Ch. x. 43. i. e. both who he was that should come, and what he came to be, to do, to suffer, to purchase, to promise, and to bestow upon his People, we shall begin with Moses, and then offer a few Things from several of the rest, as we meet with them in our Bibles.

I acknowledge the Terms, Father and Son, as ascribed to the First and Second Persons in the Trinity, are
are not, any where, found in the Writings of Moses. And therefore, it may be suggested, That no Testi-
monies deduced from them, can come home to the Point in Hand. But, tho’ these very Words, thus
applied, do not, any where, occur in them, yet, there are not a few Things, to be met with in them,
which are very much to Our Purpose. —— For, i. In them we find the Doctrine of the Trinity, i. e. of
Three, which are plainly distinguished, by distinct Per
tonal Names, Characters and Actions; to whom the
essential Names, Titles, and Perfections of, as well as the
same Works and Worship, which are proper to, the One
only true God, are frequently, and clearly ascribed:
But if so, each of them is the one true God; and is
always spoken of as such, even when acting in a de-
Ch. xi. 5 --- 9. Ch. xii. 7, 8. Ch. xvii. 1 --- 22. Ch.
xviii. 1. 13. 25. &c. &c.—2. We no where, in them,
have any the least Hint, so far as I can perceive, of
a created supra-angelical Spirit, or a pre-existent human
Soul, to which any of those Divine Names, Titles,
or Perfections, &c. are, or could be, attributed.
To be more particular.

1. We read in the Books of Moses, of a Plurality
of Persons in the Deity. —— And God said, Let
US make Man, Gen. i. 26. Behold the Man is become
as one of US, Ch. iii. 22. Let US go down. &c. Ch. xi.
7. --- 2. There we find the plural Word, Elohim;
to denote a Plurality of Persons, in numberless
Places, joined to a Verb singular, implying the
Unity of the Godhead: And, sometimes we
meet with it joined with a Verb in the plural Num-
ber, more clearly, and emphatically, to point out
the Plurality of Subsistences, in the One Divine
Essence. Thus, Gen. xx. 13. When God caused me to
wander, hitbhhbu othe Elohim, literally, THEY the Al-
mighties, errare facerent, did cause me to wander.
—— So also, Ch. xxxv. 7. because there God ap-
ppeared
peared unto him, Niglu Elohim, (literally the Al-
powerfuls, revelavient, had revealed to him. &c.
This will appear more plain, from the Passage re-
ferred to, Ch. xxviii. 12, 13. where, if the Ladder
Jacob saw in his Dream, represented the second Per-
son, as Mediator, see John i. 51. the LORD GOD
who stood above it, most certainly was the First Per-
son: And so, here were Two Almighty Persons re-
vealed unto him.——In a Word, in Moses's Writings,
we frequently hear, 1. Of ONE, who, in some pec-
culiar Manner, or Sense, is called JEHOVAH, the
LORD GOD, God Almighty, the God of Abraham,
Jacob, &c. who is never said to be sent, or
employed on any Message; and who is never said to
have appeared in, or under, or with, any visible
Shape, Form, or Similitude whatsoever.——2.
Of ONE who is, every where, called by those very
Names, and distinguished by those very Titles; and
who also expressly titles himself, El Shaddai, God
Almighty, or God All-sufficient, Gen xvii. 1. Ch.
xxxv. 11. the God of Bethel, xxxi. 13. the God of
Abraham, and Isaac, &c. Ex. iii. ver. 6. &c. yea,
assumes that most august and incommunicable Title,
that Name of Essence, JEHOVAH: And JEHOVAH,
Ch. vi. 2, 3. and ver. 6—8. &c. &c. Who also
did the Works of, and accepted the Worship due, and
reserved, to the One true God only, Gen. vi. 13. and
17. Ch. xvii. throughout. Ch. xviii. 23—33. Ch.
xix. 24. Ch. xxviii. 16—22. Ch. xxxv. 1—15.
&c. &c. who yet, is sometimes called an Angel,
the Angel, of the Lord, and of his Presence or Face;
and who appeared often to the Patriarchs, in, or un-
der, some visible Symbol, and usually in a human
Shape, and acted as one sent by the other. &c. Gen.
xxvii. 1, 3, 22. Ch. xxxii. 24—30. Ch. xxxv. 7.
and 13. &c. &c.—And, 3. If ONE called the Spirit,
and the Spirit of God, who moved upon the Face of the
Yy
Waters,
Waters, Gen. i. 2. strove with the old World, Ch. vi. 3. was in Joseph, Ch. xli. 38. rested upon the Elders, Numb. ii. 26 came upon Balaam, Ch. xxiv. 2. (and is, in my humble Opinion, in his own Person, expressly called God, and the Almighty, ver. 4.) and with whom, those excellent Mechanics, Bezaleel and Aholiah, were filled. Ex. xxxi. 3 and 6. &c.—So that, the Three Persons, in the ever-blessed Trinity, were well known in the Church, in Moses his Days, and indeed, as we have heard, from the Beginning. But, this is not all, For, by comparing several Places together, we shall find,

That it was the second of these, who was to assume our Nature, and who was actually God's own Son, whom he sent forth, made of a Woman. Gal. iv. ver. 4. This will appear so plain, from these Considerations, as to admit of no rational Doubt.——1. It was he who appeared with the two Angels to Abraham, who were all, at first, called Men, because they appeared in human Shape, Gen. xviii. 2. And yet, He is stiled Jehovah, ver. 1. 13. 17. 20. 33. &c. and the Judge of all the Earth, ver. 25: But, the Father judgeth no Man, having committed all Judgment to the Son. Jo. v. 22. For we shall all stand before the Judgment-Seat of Christ; Rom. xiv. 10. who is both Lord, ver. 9. and God, ver. 12.——2. It was this Angel of the Lord who appeared unto Moses in the Bush, Ex. iii. 2. who is called Jehovah, and God, ver. 4. and in so many Words, proclaims, I am the God of Abraham, &c. ver. 6. I am that I am, ver. 14. and Ch. iv. ver. 11. Have not I the Lord? It was he, I say, who sent Moses to Egypt, giving him Power to work Miracles, ver. 9. promising to be with him, ver. 12. who went before the Camp of the Israelites, by Day in a Pillar of Cloud, and by Night in a Pillar of Fire, &c. Ch. xiii. 21. comp. with Ch. xiv. 19. who is called God, and Jehovah, whom they tempted, Numb. xxii. 5. who sent the fiery
fiery Serpents among them, ver. 6. &c. &c. But, this was He, even the Son, who had undertaken to be the Saviour of his People; and who, after he had been sent forth in the Likeness of sinful Flesh, Rom. iii. and had put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself, Heb. ix. 26. was declared to be the Son of God with Power, by his Resurrection from the Dead. Rom. i. 4. This, I say, was Christ, as is undeniable from these Reasons, among many others. (1.) Moses knew, and could not but know, and no Doubt told others, whose Reproach it was, which he esteemed greater Riches than all the Treasures in Egypt: But, the Apostles assures us, Heb. xi. 26. That it was the Reproach of Christ. (2.) I cannot help thinking, That he and the Pious Part at least of the Congregation, well knew, That it was the promised Deliverer, who had brought them out of the House of Bondage, and conducted them in the Wilderness, and that That Rock that followed them was Christ, &c. 1 Cor. x. 4. — And, (3.) 'Tis undeniable, It was him they tempted, for which they were destroyed of the Serpents. ver. 9. &c. &c. —

3. He who called himself the good Shepherd, John x. ver. 11. and 14. and is stiled, the great Shepherd, Heb. xiii. 20. and the chief Shepherd, 1 Pet. v. 4. He, I say, and not another, was the Shepherd of Israel of Old, who dwelt between the Cherubims, that led Joseph like a Flock, Pf. lxxx. 1. and did this by the Hand of Moses and Aaron. Pf. lxxvii. 20. — But He, we have seen, was not a Creature, no not a created supra-angelical Spirit, nor a pre-existent human Soul, but Jehovah, the Lord God, the God of Abraham, &c. the great Ehye asher Ehye, I am that I am, literally, I shall be what I shall be, i.e. Immanuel, God in our Nature, who should save his People from their Sins. But, to be yet a little more particular,

Moses spoke, and wrote, both of the Divine and Human Nature, of him that was to come; and of all Y y 2
the Offices also, which he was to execute, as our Redeemer: But, not a Syllable, so far as I can find, of his pre-existent human Soul. — 1. He spoke, and wrote, of his Divine Nature, as is undeniable from those Passages now quoted, and numberless others. That he was God, God Almighty, &c. &c. and yet a distinct Person from another, (to whom all those Names, Titles, and Perfections, &c. are also ascribed,) and sent by him, and acted as his Angel. — Here then were Two Persons, the one the First, the Father, the Sender; the other the Second, the Son, the Sent. — 2. He spoke and wrote of his human Nature. That he was to become the Seed of the Woman, Gen. iii. 15. the Seed of Abraham, in whom all the Nations of the Earth should be blessed, Gen. xxii. 18. &c. and of Isaac, Ch. xxvi. 4. and Jacob, Ch. xxviii. 14. &c. &c. — 3. He spoke and wrote of him as the Messiah who was to be the Prophet, Priest, and King of his Church. (1.) The Prophet, from the midst of his People, like unto Moses, Deut. xviii. 15—18. but infinitely preferred before him, ver. 19. as a Son over his own House, and as God who built the House, and all Things. Heb. iii. 3—6. — (2.) The Priest, who was to offer a Sacrifice for Sin, typified by all the Sacrifices of the Ceremonial Law, but of infinitely greater Value; inasmuch as, tho' it was not possible that the Blood of Bulls and of Goats, should TAKE AWAY SINS, Heb. x. 4. &c. He appeared to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself, Ch. ix. 26. and hath, by one Offering, perfected for ever them that are sanctified; Ch. x. 14. and having thus made an End of Sins, Dan. ix. 24. he entred in once into the holy Place, by his own Blood, having obtained eternal Redemption for them, Heb. ix. 12. and there appears in the Presence of God for them, ver. 24. as their Advocate with the Father, 1 John ii. 2. and ever lives to make INTERCESSION.
CESSION for them; Heb. vii. 25. and from thence commands also the Blessing upon them.——Now it is clear, from Scripture, and common Sense too, that none but one, who was God-Man, could do all this. — Had he not been Man, he had had no Blood to shed, no proper, meritorious, satisfactory, Sacrifice to offer: And had he not been God, the true God, the Sacrifice of himself could not possibly have had so much Worth, as to take away Sins, and perfect for ever them that are sanctified. — Yea, had he not been true God, he could never, by his Obedience and Death, have obtained Eternal Redemption for any One of them; could never have raised his own dead Body from the Grave; and consequently, could not have ever lived to make Intercession for them: But, having been made a Curse for them, when he was crucified, must have continued under that Curse for ever. — Now this Divine Person, was not the First Person, the Father; and therefore, it is plain, it was the Second Person, the Son.—What do I say? Christ, as a Priest, who was also to be the Sacrifice, and the Altar too, was indeed both the Substance, and the End, of the Ceremonial Law. —— And, (3.) The King of his Church, even the Shiloh, to whom the gathering of the People was to be; Gen. xlix. 10. and consequently, was to reign for ever, and of whose Kingdom there was to be no End: And therefore was certainly both the Son of God, and the Son of Man. See Luke i. 31 — 35. comp. with ver. 16.

I have enlarged so long on these Things, not only to shew, That the Faith of the Church, as to all the principal Points in Dispute, was the same, as to the Substance of them, in Moses’s Days, as in our own: That the Old and New Testament, bear Witnesses to each other: That the Old confirms the New, and the New illustrates the Old, representing the Shadows, Types, Prefigurations, Prophecies, and Promises of that,
that, which had not a little Obscurity in them, as plain historical Facts, which may be much more easily, clearly, and fully understood: But chiefly, because our Lord himself appeals to Moses, in that long Defence against the supposed Crime of making himself equal with God, by saying, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. John v. 17, 18. and 46.

— I take it for granted, That Christ knew what he said: — That he could and would talk to the Purpose: — That he would neither trifle with them, nor amuse them, nor impose upon them: — And consequently, would not have called Moses to prove the Point in Question, if he had not indeed been clearly and fully, for him: — But if he is, we may certainly learn, even from him, That the Son of God is a coessential Son, and as such, equal with the Father; and consequently, That it is the second Person in the Trinity, as such, and not his pre-existent human Soul, that is called, and is, the Son of God.

I need not tarry to shew, That he, who appeared to Joshua as a Man, and declared that as Captain of the Host of the Lord he was come, Ch. xv. 14. was the Mediator, (this being a chief Part of his Office as such;) and is, Ch. vi. 2. expressly called Jehovah: — That the Angel of the Lord that came to Bechim, and speaks as the true God, Judg. ii. 1 — 5. was the second Person: — That it was he, who appeared in human Shape, to Gideon; and is expressly called, Jehovah; Ch. vi. ver. 11, 14, 16. &c. and God. ver. 36. 39: — That it was also this Angel of the Lord, who, in like Manner, appeared to Manoah and his Wife; Ch. xiii. and is stiled by him, God. ver. 22. and by her, Jehovah, ver. 23. and who tells them his Name was secret, or rather, wonderful; ver. 18. which is one of the Titles given to Christ, by Isaiah; Ch. ix. 6: — That Job knew that his Goel, near Kinsman, Redeemer, i. e. the Messiah, liveth, and that he was God: Ch. xix. 25 — 27. — That
That David, Solomon, and Isaiah speak of him as the Son, and, as such, as God; of which more presently:—And That Jeremiah mentions, one whom God would raise up unto David, a King, who yet should be called, and therefore indeed be, Jehovah our Righteousness; Ch. xxiii. ver. 6. &c. &c.

— But, this Divine Person, who is spoken of in all these Passages, was not the Father, as is confessed; and therefore, must be the Son: And consequently, seeing he is in them, and in many other Texts, stiled Jehovah: He is, and must be acknowledged to be a coessential Son. — But it is Time to proceed to those Passages, wherein the first Person is expressly called a Father, or the second the Son.

And here, we must dispute some principal Texts with this great Man, who saw very well, That, if the Sense of this Title, the Son of God, when applied to Christ, in the Old Testament, was then known, and fixed, and received, 'twould be in vain to try to wrest it to another, and an infinitely inferior one, in the New. He therefore opposes many of them, and urges whatever has been offered, even by several Antitrinitarians, to pervert their true Sense! and has suggested somewhat of his own, with a very plausible Air! —— Come we then to them, in Order as we meet with them.

SECT. I. Proofs of the coessential Sonship of Christ from the Prophets.

The first of them is, "that remarkable Text, "Ps. ii. 7. Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee; which has been usually interpreted, to signify the eternal Sonship of Christ as God." p. 47. To which he gives five Answers! It seems he thinks it very remarkable indeed. — "i. 'Tis evident that in Acts xiii. 33. St. Paul applies this to the "Resurrection of Christ, —— and not to any eternal "Generation." Anf. Did the Apostle say, He was not his Son before? If he did not, then, it is plain, his
his Resurrection was not the Foundation, or formal Reason, of this Denomination, but the solemn and public Declaration of it, as we have heard from Rom. i. 4. and our Author has acknowledged, p. 14.— "2. Christ is here said to become a Son by a Decree; " &c." ibid. But here is no such Thing said. No such Sound, no such Sense! Nor can any such Meaning be put upon, or wrested from the Words! Tho', according to this learned Person's own Notion, Christ did indeed become a Son by a Decree, whether the Word Son " relates to the Glory and Excellency of "his Person! or to his Office!" p. 20. —— "3. 'Tis " spoken literally of the Exaltation of David to his "Kingdom, as the Type of Christ." How does he prove this? How can it be proved? " and not con- " cerning the natural Production or Generation of "David; and therefore, it must in the Antitype "signify mystically the Exaltation of Christ to his "Kingdom, and not his natural eternal Generation." p. 47, 48. Strange Reasoning! Must every Thing then, in the Type, have something, in the Antitype, exactly to tally with it? Or, cannot this, in several Things, egregiously, yea infinitely, exceed that? Is it not certain, that, in all such prophetic, or mystical Passages, several Circumstances, agree both to the Type and the Antitype; several, more or less, to the one, or the other; and several, to one of them on- ly? —— "4. The Word, this Day, never signifies "Eternity in Scripture in any other Place, and why "then must it do so here?" ibid. Many Words have a peculiar Signification, in one Place of a Book, which neither of them have any where else in that Book. —— But, I shall not stay to dispute about this Word here; because, if we can prove the proper, or coessential, Sonship of the second Person, I hardly think, that any one will question the Eternity of it. — Not to add, Non amo nimis argutam Theologiam: We have no need, blessed be his Name, of any Arguments that
that are either strained, or far-fetched, or not obvious and well supported, to prove the coëssential Sonship of the second Person, &c. — Let us therefore consider this glorious Passage, which is the first, in the Bible, wherein the second Person is expressly called the begotten Son of God; is plain enough of itself; and is thrice quoted in the New Testament, from whence we may, more clearly and certainly, gather the true and full Meaning of it.

The Psalm is Prophetical. — The coming of the Son of God, i.e. the second Person, in the Flesh; his Exaltation to his Kingdom, maugre all the Opposition of Hell and Men; and the Extent, and Glory, and Continuance, &c. of his Reign, are the Contents of it. — Of him, and of him only, does the Prophet here speak. — There is not a Syllable in it, which does not agree to him, in its plain, and obvious, yea and fullest, and strictest Sense; and is not exactly true, to a Tittle: But there are but very few, which, with all the wrestling in the World, can be, any how, applied to any other; and even then, in a very low and diminutive Sense, and far short of the plain Import of the Phrases: Yea, 'Twould be direct Blasphemy, &c. to apply several of them to any, but himself. — The Father, in this Verse, calls him his Son, declares he had begotten him, and speaks of him with the utmost Complacency. — He promises him a widely extended Dominion, if not an universal Monarchy, ver. 8. irresistible Power, and sure Conquest, ver. 9. so that, if even Kings would be wise, they would serve him with Fear, even in the midst of all their Glory, ver. 10. And, If he is not stiled Jehovah, ver. 11. as seems to me undeniable; yet it cannot be doubted, he is proposed as the Object of Worship, even of his People's Allegiance, Obedience, and Trust, i.e. in New Testament Language, Faith. ver. 12. Therefore he is the Lord their God, Mat. iv. 10. and is expressly so called, by the Angel. Luke i.
16. — This is the more remarkable, because Jehovah only is the Object of religious Trust; If. xxvi. 4. those only who trust in him are blessed; Jer. xvii. 7. but cursed is the Man, that trusteth in Man, ver. 5. i. e. as I take it, in any Creature whatsoever, should we even grant it, (if there indeed be any such,) to be a supra-angelical one. — To be yet more particular, The Psalmist, having in Vision, or by the Spirit of Prophecy, a clear Prospect of the outrageous Opposition, that would be made to the setting up the Kingdom of the Messiah, begins with a triumphant Defiance to all his Enemies; ver. 1 — 3. reads their Doom; ver. 4, 5. introduces the Father as proclaiming, that he had set up his King in spite of them all; ver. 6. and the Son declaring his own full Assurance of this, from what the Father had said to him, according to the Agreement between them, in the Covenant of Redemption. ver. 7. — So that the Words are the Words of God the Son, and the Psalmist speaks them in his Name. — The Word, Hbuck, as commonly, and frequently, signifies a Statute, Ordinance, or Law, as, (if not much more so, than) a Decree, or Resolution, i. e. something determined, and done, and past already, as a Decree or Purpose of something future. — The Phrase is not, Thou shalt be my Son, or I will make thee my Son, as it should have been, "if Christ was to " become a Son by the Decree;" but, Thou art my Son: And therefore, he was so, and must have been so, before the Decree could be told him by the Father. But, If he was then a Son, he was then also a begotten Son; for surely, he was not as a Son, begotten after he was a Son, unless, as a Son, he was twice begotten: And consequently, this Decree was not a Purpose, or Promise, to make him what he was not; but, in the most evident, public, and glorious Manner, to declare what he always was, and had continued to be, notwithstanding, and during, his deepest
deepest Humiliation; and that the Father would give uncontestable Proofs of it. — So that, the Verse may be thus paraphrased, I, the Messiah, will declare the Decree, i.e. will reveal and publish the Purpose of the first Person concerning me; or rather, his Agreement with, and Promise to me, when I undertook to save his People from their Sins, and for that End, condescended to become Man, and humble myself even to die upon the Cross, and under the Curse; the Lord, the Father, hath said unto me, for my Encouragement and Support under all I am, as Man, to go through; Thou art my Son, as thou always wast, tho' it will not be easily believed, when thy Glory shall be so very much, almost totally, eclipsed; this Day, the Day of thine Incarnation, and more especially of thy Resurrection, and Ascension to my Right Hand; have I begotten thee, declared and made it appear before all the World, that thou indeed art, what thou didst, or shalt, so often declare, even my own, proper, only begotten Son; And, as such, the Lord God, in whom thy People shall trust. ver. 12.—But, before he leaves these Words, "He adds, 5. This Text is cited in Heb. i. 5. "where it is joined with God's Promise in future "times to be a Father to Christ; I will be to him a "Father, and he shall be to me a Son; which does "not signify Eternal Generation." p. 48. What if it does not?—Does it signify any Thing inconsistent with it? — Is it unusual, or impertinent, among Men, for an own Father, to promise, with much Pleasure, to be a Father to a worthy obedient Son? In such Cases, there is a strong Emphasis in the Expression. I will be more so than ever: Whatever others are to me, I'll delight to call him my Son: I shall think it an Honour, yea my greatest Happiness, that I have such a Son. — The Promise here referred to is that, 2 Sam. vii. 14. (which the Psalmist also seems to have in his Eye, Pf. lxxxix. 26, 27. and
we may add, Ps. lxxii. 17. in the Margin, *He shall be as a Son to continue his Father's Name for ever;*) in all which, Solomon is originally meant, as is, I conceive, too evident to be denied; and Christ, only more remotely: Nor is he, in those Places, considered purely, or principally, as God, or the second Person, but as Mediator, God-Man; and that with a peculiar Respect to his human Nature, his being the Son of David. — This Promise then, I say, primarily respected Solomon, who was not then born, ver. 12. He was to build the House for God, ver. 13. which his good Father's Heart, was set upon doing. ver. 2, 3. 'Tis supposed he might, and would, commit Iniquity; ver. 14. But God assures David, that his Mercy should not depart away from him, as he took it from Saul. ver. 15. Now, none of these can be understood of Christ, or of any but Solomon. — But, Christ was undoubtedly meant, in the Clause referr'd to; because, "the Apostle applies it to him." He was so. — And the Words are express, "he shall be to me a Son." Yes. But they are not express, that he was not his Son, from Eternity; or, that he was, long after that Prophecy, to begin to be his Son; and much less, that the formal Reason, of his being, or being called, the Son of God, was his being promised to David, as his Successor in his Kingdom; &c. — The plain Meaning then is, when the promised Seed, who shall proceed out of thy Bowels, is come, notwithstanding the external Meanness of his Appearance, I will, (by my Presence, and Spirit with him; the Signs, Wonders, and Miracles, I will do by him; mine infinite Love to him, and Complacency in him; and my full Acceptance of him, and my People for his Sake; &c.) manifest, and declare, before all, That I am his own proper Father, and be my only begotten, the Son of my Love. He shall build an House for my Name, even his Church; and I will establish
The throne of his Kingdom for ever. See Luke i. 32, 33.

The same Answer will serve, for the other two Passages. David himself was, perhaps, primarily intended, in Ps. lxxxix. and Solomon, in Ps. lxxii. Several Things in both of them, do not so naturally, directly, and literally, refer to Christ, as to them: But, several of them, must be applied to him; because, they do not appear, at all, or in any Sense, true of them. But, in both, He is prophesied of as the Messiah, that was to come; and principally, with Regard to his human Nature: His Divinity being only implied, or taken for granted; it being well known, That it was the Son of God, who was to come into the World, and that he was David's Lord, before he was to be David's Son. Ps. cx. i.—To proceed, Our Author is at great Pains to weaken our next Argument also, from

"Prov. viii. 24, 25. where Wisdom says, Before "the Hills, was I brought forth, &c. which whole "Chapter is generally interpreted concerning the "divine Nature of Christ. p. 45." — It has been, now is, and ever will be, generally interpreted of him; nor can it, with all the torturing in the World, without making pure Nonsense of a very great Part of it, be interpreted of any other: But, I never heard of any One, who interpreted it, merely, wholly, or solely, of him as the Son of God, or of his divine Nature.—No; Christ who is the Speaker, here speaks of his divine Nature, and of his Office too: Of himself as, from Eternity, the Son of God, but rejoicing in the Prospect of his becoming also, in Time, the Son of Man.

"Anf. 1. He neither here affirms nor denies, "that the Divine Nature of Christ, has any Sort or "Manner of Derivation from the Father." ibid. And yet, one of his chief Designs, throughout, is to alledge, or prove, that it has not; And, if it has,
his darling Nostrum is not only manifestly false, but most dangerous. " But that the Name Son of God, " in the New Testament, does not generally (if ever) " signify his divine Nature; this, says he, is my " present Theme:" To which we again reply. 1. If it ever does, 'twill be hard to give a good Reason, why it should not generally, yea always, do. 2. If it signify this, in the Old Testament, 'twill be a strange Attempt, to prove that it does not this also, at least sometimes, in the New. " And therefore the Allegation of this Text out of Proverbs is not to our " present Purpose." It was always a Piece of Prudence, to let those Things alone, which could not be meddled with, without Hazard. But, we believe the whole Word of God is our Rule: And therefore, think it our Duty, to search it diligently, and weigh every Syllable of it carefully, that we may gather his Mind in it, from the whole. " nor is the " Name Son of God there used, nor is God called " his Father." ibid. But, if there are several Phrases there, fully equivalent, and which strongly confirm the Truth, we conceive it is much to our present Purpose: Tho', by the Way, the very same Thing, may be objected to not a few of his own Texts.— If I have not given you every Word of this Paragraph you shall have every Syllable of the next. " Anf. 2. I dare not deny this Chapter to relate to " Christ;" 'Tis hard to think, that an honest Man, can deny it. —— " Yet it does not follow, that " it refers only to his divine Nature, as I shall shew " immediately." p. 45. Nor do I know any one, who ever said it did. —— " And it must be ac- " knowledged, that it is very hard to prove, that " this 8th of Proverbs does certainly, denote the Per- " son of Christ. p. 46." I am so far from ac- "knowledging this, that, I humbly conceive, it is ea- "sily capable, of the most certain Proof. Pray, what does it denote in, or of Christ, if it does not sup- pose,
pope, or principally denote, his Person? "Athana-
"fius himself sometimes explains it another Way." And if, upon second Thoughts, he altered his Mind, and then gave the true Sense; all is well. — "Bi-
shop Patrick, that noble Commentator, will scarce 
"allow of it;" And not a few others, as noble 
Commentators as he, admit it most readily, and upon the clearest Evidence, and with all their Hearts. — "and many others have been of the Opinion, 
"that Solomon means only Wisdom as a Principle of 
"Contrivance and Counsel, whether human or di-
"vine;" Strange Words! But, who those many 
others are: Or, What could induce them to dream, 
that Wisdom, i. e. the Speaker of, or in, these Passages, 
is only a Principle of Contrivance and Counsel; and much more to add, "whether human or divine;" is 
so far above me, that I must leave them to those ma-
ny others. — "or at most, the ideal World in the 
"Mind of God, tho' he uses such Sort of personal 
"Characters in his Description of this Wisdom, in 
"the Hebrew Idiom." Stranger still! That this I-
deal World should be so personified! and be intro-
duced, as calling to Sinners, teaching, exhorting, 
proclaiming what it was, declaring what it did, &c. &c!—Would one have 
expected these, from our worthy Author? — If the Socinian Notion, (that, by Wisdom here, we are to understand that Perfection, or Attribute, of God, so called; or, as some express themselves, that Quality, or Virtue, &c,) be here intended: I would only ask, 
1. Why should this Perfection be so personified, and 
gloriously celebrated, rather than his Power and 
Goodness, which were as conspicuously displayed, in 
the Works of Creation and Redemption, as this? — 
2. Could any one possibly doubt, that the Wisdom 
of God, was always with him, as well as his other 
Attributes? — 3. Upon this Supposition, What 
Sense can these Phrases have, I was set up, ver. 23.
I was brought forth, ver. 24, 25. I was there, ver. 27. then was I by him, as one brought up with him,—rejoycing always before him? ver. 30. I most earnestly desire to know, if any one can tell me.—4. Might not these have been said of, or by, the other Perfections now named, with as much Truth, Propriety, and Emphasis too, as of this?—I am heartily sorry, I am obliged to make such Remarks.

"'Tis granted that many of the Ancients explained it of Christ," Yes; by far the greatest Number, and those too of the greatest Weight and Authority. "but some of the Fathers supposed it to mean the Holy Spirit;" And some of the Moderns, we see, suppose Things full as absurd. "and all Men know they were but very poor Expositors, "who dealt much in Allegory, and in straining of plain Texts to their Purposes," &c. p. 46. And yet, I do not know, if any one Instance, of großer straining a plain Text, to serve any of their Purposes, can be produced, out of any of their Writings, than this we are now examining! But, if the Ancients were "but very poor Expositors," we have, at least, Nineteen in Twenty, if not Ninety-nine in a Hundred, and those the most learned too, through all the middle Ages, and of the Moderns also, all witnessing to the coessential Sonship of the second Person!—I cannot conceive the Reason of this Gird upon the Ancients, if it was not, because "all Men know" they were, and are, clearly, fully and strongly, against himself: And therefore, least any should be moved or swayed, by their venerable Names, they are branded, as "but very poor Expositors!" But, had any of them, who were not stigmatized as Heretics, patronized any of these New-fangled Notions, I doubt not we should have heard of this "excellent "Father," and the other "excellent Father!" I shall only add, I pretend to so much Acquaintance with the Ancients, as to wish that the same Good Sense,
Sense, Seriousness, Piety, and Zeal for the Truth, appeared, as generally, in the common Run of the Writings of our Day, as in theirs. He has not yet done.

"Ans. 3. Supposing the Divine Wisdom in Prov. viii. primarily to signify the Idea of the Divine Counsels and Decrees about Creation and Redemption," ibid. i. e. Supposing, what cannot be supposed! Who can suppose, that an Idea should be represented as a Person, calling, promising, &c. as set up, or anointed, ver. 23. &c. as rejoicing, and having Delight? ver. 30, 31. &c. p. 46.— "it may be properly said, This Wisdom (i. e. this Idea!) was begotten, and brought forth before the Creation," May it so? Did any one before this, ever hear of the begetting an Idea; or of an Idea's being begotten? If any one ever did; if he considers what he is saying, I cannot think, he will alledge that the Expression is proper. — " and all this System of divine Counsels (i. e. this Idea) " being deposited with the pre-existent Soul " of Christ; (in whom are all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge,)"—That all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge are in Christ, as God, or as his Son, I as surely believe, as I do that they are in the Father: But, supposing that his human Soul existed before the Creation, yet, I must, with all Humility, question, whether it was capable of receiving, or containing, all this System, i. e. this Depotitum. But,—2. Should we grant its Capacity, 'tis plain that all this System, was not, in fact, deposited with it; because, our Author declares that, "as the Son of God, "He knew not the Day of Judgment." p. 42. The Strength of this Argument refts upon these two, (1.) That the Day of Judgment was fixed in this System, and was a Part of it; which, I verily suppose, none will deny. And, (2.) That such a supra-angeli-cal Spirit, as was capable of receiving this Depositum, could never forget, and totally too, such a remark-
able Part of it; which, I really think, no one will affirm. — "this human Soul of Christ, thus vested " with divine Ideas," what? and is this proper too! — "may be included in Solomon's Idea of Wisdom." p. 47. i. e. in his Idea of this Idea! But, What does he mean by Solomon's Idea? The Words are Christ's own Words. His, and his only. — This glorious Account of his Person, Generation, Characters, and Works, he gives himself, who best cou'd do it; and only borrowed Solomon's Pen: For, Solomon, with all his Wisdom, could never talk in these Strains, or write this Chapter. —— But, What if this human Soul were included in this Idea? Will it therefore follow, That "many Things, in this Chapter, do not " seem much more naturally to refer to his God- " head," which was the Objection he was to re- move? p. 45. By no Means. — Thus have I given you these four Paragraphs, almost Word for Word, and have considered them so largely, chiefly to shew what very hard Shifts even learned Men are put to, in Defence of their own private Opinions, when once they have wandered from the Truth: And how un- willing, yea how backward, they are to give up their Nostrums, as long as they can have any Thing to say for them, be it ever so weak, or even perfectly ridi- diculous!

In his next Words, he gives us a Supposition, and from thence, infers a Probability; which, tho' very far from being well-supported, we might grant, without any great Detriment to our present Cause. And therefore, we shall now pass them, and proceed to consider this glorious Chapter, which, for these many Years, I could hardly ever read, without thinking I was reading a Chapter in the Gospel ac- cording to John. —— And here, we shall shew, —

1. That it is a proper Person, who speaks quite Throughout. —— 2. That he is a Divine Person, even one of the ever-blessed Three. —— 3. That, as such,
fuch, he is a Son, the Son of God. And yet, — 4. That he speaks, in most of the Verses, as the Messiah, our Saviour. This I say, we shall do, when we have only observed these few Things.

That the first eighteen Verses of Jo. i. will give great Light, for the understanding of this Chapter: — That the Divine Speaker does, at least from ver. 4. of this Chap. quite throughout, act the Prophet, and Teacher, of his Church; thereby shewing, that he was indeed the Logos, the Word; and perhaps, upon this Account, (as well as his being the Omnific Word, as Milton calls him, by whom the Father made all Things, that were made,) well deserved that glorious Title: — That (considering the well-known Occasion, and the Time of the writing of John's Gospel,) when the Holy Ghost filled him so emphatically, the Word, he probably intended to point us to this Chapter; and those Passages in particular, where he is filled Wisdom, or speaks of himself as the greatest Teacher, even the Light of the World (here the learned will call to mind the λόγος ἐνδιαθετὸς, and προφητικὸς of the Ancients) and the joint Maker of the World: — And That, perhaps, the first three or four Verses of this Chap. are a glorious Preface spoken by Solomon, to awaken Attention, and introduce this sublimely Divine Speech, with a suitable Solemnity.

1. That he is a Person, who here speaks, from ver. 4. to the Close, will appear very evident, from these Considerations. —— (1.) All the Pronouns, Personal and Possessive, which any Person, speaking of himself, ever used, or could use, viz. I, me, my, mine, are here found, in many Places, and with the greatest Emphasis. —— I. ver. 4. 17. 20. 23. &c. me. ver. 15. 16. 17. 18. &c. my. ver. 6. 7. 8. 19. 31. 32. &c. mine. ver. 14. —— (2.) The Divine Speaker instances, in a great Variety of his own personal Actions, which are also very beautifully and
and strongly express. — I call, ver. 4. I will speak, ver. 6. I love, ver. 17. I lead, 20. I cause, I will fill, ver. 21. I was there, 27. I was by him, — rejoicing always before him, 30. rejoicing in the habitable Parts of his Earth, and my Delights were with the Sons of Men. 31. &c. — (3.) A great Number of Personal Characters, are also ascribed to him. He is The ever-blessed Teacher and Exhorter; ver. 4. — 6. &c. The Truth; 7. 8. The Counsellor; 14. The King of Kings; 15. 16. &c. He is the Captain, or Leader of his People, ver. 20. And is very express, I was set up, or anointed, viz. to an Office. 23. I was brought forth; i. e. begotten, or born, as a Son. ver. 24. 25. I was there, 27. I was by him, 30. not as an idle, or unconcerned Spectator, but joint Worker with him; for, he made all Things by me. John i. 3. Heb. i. 2. I was daily his Delight; 31. the Father's Darling, as his only begotten. — In fine, He may be sinned against, and hated, to the utter Destruction of those that do hate him, ver. 36. and loved, and found, to the everlasting Happiness of all his own People. ver. 17. and 35. i. e. He is the Life, the Saviour, of his People, and the Judge of all the Earth, &c. ver. 21. 34 36.—If all these now, do not prove, that the Speaker is really a distinct proper Person, 'tis absolutely impossible to prove any Thing by Words.

2. That he is a Divine Person; and one, even the second, of the blessed Three. — If the former be well supported, and should Our learned Author demur to this, it is easy to evince it, beyond all modest Contradiction, from his personal Characters just named. The great Prophet of his Church, is the Truth, John xiv. 6. the Faithful Witness, Rev. i. 5. and the God Amen, or God of Truth, Is. lxv. 16. &c. all which agree well with, vers. 6, 7, 8. — He speaks in the Language of One who is the true God, ver. 14. Counsel is mine, and found Wisdom, I
am Understanding, I have Strength. See If. ix. 6. Ch. xlv. 24. John i. 4—9. —'Tis only by One, who is God, that Kings reign, &c. ver. 15. 16.—None but a Divine Person could promise, what we have, ver. 17—19. or, that he would cause those that love him to inherit Substance. &c. ver. 21.—It was the second Person, who was set up, or anointed, constituted, ordained, from Everlasting, &c. ver. 23. before the Creation of the World; i.e. in Scripture Language, from Eternity: He and no other. —It was he, by whom all Things were made, ver. 24—29. comp. with Col. i. 16, 17. &c. therefore, He was not made, but necessarily existing; and consequently, Eternal. —This was not the first Person, but one who was with him: But, there was none with him, before all Things, except his Son and Spirit.—Briefly, in his Favour is Life; in his Wrath is Death; and consequently, He is God over all. 35, 36. Rom. ix. 5.

3. That this Divine Person was, and is, as such, a Son, the Son of God, his begotten, his only begotten. —This being the very Hinge of the Controversy, we shall put it out of all Doubt; which will be easily done, if it be remembred, —That there is not, in the Verses to be quoted, the least Hint, that the Speaker was then a Complex Person, or had then two Natures: —That there is not a Syllable, in this Chapter, beneath, unworthy of, or any how unbecoming, the second Person, when he had undertaken our Redemption: —That there are many Things in it, which could not be said of any possible Creature, be it ever so high: —And, That it would be Blasphemy, to ascribe several of them, to any other, but one of the ever-blessed Three.—The Passages I now pitch upon, are these glorious ones, which come full home to the Point; are too clear and plain to be denied; and too direct and strong to be evaded, or glossed away.—The LORD
I was brought forth, ver. 24. and again, ver. 25. I was there, ver. 27. Then was I by him, as one brought up with him; I was daily his Delight, rejoicing always before him.

1. The Lord possessed me in the Beginning of his Way, before his Works of Old. The Objection taken, from the Septuagint, is well known; and has been, a great many Times, unansweredly answered.—The plain Christian hath nothing to do with it.—The Hebrew Verity is clearly, and fully, for us.—The Lord, the Father, possessed me, not as a Creature, or One of another Nature; and therefore, as a Son, and co-effential with him, as is plain from the next Verses.
—He possessed me, that is, In the Beginning I was, not began to be: I was with God, a distinct Person from him, and yet existing, or subsisting in him; John i. 1.—He possessed me, for I was always, and am in his Bosom: ver. 18. —I am his only begotten; ver. 14. but so, that I am still not only with him, but in him; and He with, and in me. John x. 38. Ch. xiv. 10 and 11.—So that, this Phrase clearly supposes, and implies, the ἐμπέριχαμαι of the Ancients; agrees well, with the modern Notion of Generation, formerly mentioned; and accounts for the several goings forth of the Son, frequently mentioned by some of the Fathers.

2. I was brought forth; ver. 24. and the same Words are repeated, ver. 25. Brought forth as a Son: And therefore, I am a Son.—These Expressions, can bear no other Sense: Nor will the Emphasis of them permit, or leave Room for, any Evagination.—The Verbs, 'alad, Psl. ii. 7. gignere, to beget, and 'bhul, parturire, to bring forth, in these Verses, are both emphatic. This latter does more properly denote the Act, or Part, of the Mother, in Child-bearing: And, strictly, signifies to bring forth with Labour, Pain, and Sorrow. And were they
they then chosen, by the second Person himself, (for he is the Speaker in both Places,) in vain, and without Cause? Was one of them repeated, so soon, and in such a Manner, without any Emphasis? And must they all pass, for little or nothing! Or would, or could, such strong Phrases, have been pitcht upon, either with any Propriety, or even Truth; only to intimate his being “created, in a peculiar Manner?” Words, by the by, of which no Man can form any Idea! But, both these will receive yet more Light and Force too, from what follows.——

3. I was there, ver. 27. and, I was by him, ver. 30. I was brought forth, says he, before the Mountains, and before the Hills; ver. 25. &c. in other Words, before the Creation, i.e. according to the Stile of Scripture, from Eternity.—— I was there; When? when he prepared the Heavens, when he set a Compass upon the Face of the Deep. &c. &c. ver. 27—29. i.e. when he, if I may so say, delineated, or drew the first Draught of them, and all along till they were all gloriously finished. — Well, but was he there, only as an idle, unconcerned Spectator? No. Had this been the Case, 'twould neither have been so much worth his while, to have entertained us, with such a pompous Account of little or nothing; nor ours to have so much regarded it.——Well then, How was he employed? Why, In working with the Father.— All Things were made by him, &c. John i. 3. Him, the Son, and as a Son too; at least, if the Apostle may be credited: For, By his dear Son were all Things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, — yea, and for him also. Col. i. 13 and 16.—Withal, if this is not superabundant Proof, the Father himself is yet more express, and strong to our Purpose. Thou Lord in the Beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c. Heb. i. 8—10. Will any one Man now say, “That this Name Son of God cannot necessarily imply his Di-
"vine Nature."—Should it be suggested, That even in these Places, it " denotes the Messiah," and as such. Anf. 1. Granting this, 'tis clear, it will not, it cannot, help our learned Author: Because, it is undeniable, " His Divine Nature is here necessarily implied." — 2. 'Tis evident, That, though the Perfon spoken of, is the Mediator; and, in most of the Verfes of that Chapter, is mentioned as the Mediator; yet is he, as such, God-Man: And, 'tis certain he is considered, ver. 10. as the Creator; and therefore, as God, and not as the Mediator; because, 1. None of the Divine Works ascribed to him, in that Verse, by the Father himself, were Mediatorial Acts, or any Part of the Mediatorial Function.—Nor, 2. Was his human Nature considered at all, in that Verse, or but very remotely: For, it was not his human Soul, by which all Things were created; nor did it lay the Foundation of the Earth, &c. &c. — It was the Son, whom the Father himself thus addrefles, Thy Throne, O God, ver. 8. — and, Thou Lord in the Beginning haft laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c. ver. 10. — The Son therefore, and purely as such, is, not only, in a strict and proper Senfe, a Perfon, but He who did all these Things: And confequently, as such, he is God, the true God; who, being infinitely perfect, could do them all. — But, as a Son, he is not the first but the second Perfon: And confequently, It is the second Perfon in the Trinity, and not Chrifl's human Soul, who is ftiled, and is, the Son of God. Q. E. D.

N. B. Here is one Text, and a very remarkable one too as any in the Bible, in which Chrifl is, I conceive, spoken to as a Son, where the Title is not, cannot be, a Title of Office, but of Nature: Or, where he is considered, as the great Creator of all Things, or purely as the coessential Son of God, and not as the Mediator between God and Man.

Then
Then was I by him, Halo, juxta, apud, as a distinct Person from God the Father; — as one brought up with him, aMon, nutritius, alumnus, as one begotten of him, and brought forth by him, ver. 25. and cherished, nursed, as it were, and brought up with him, as dear to him as his own Son; — I was daily, continually, and forever, his Delight, as an only begotten Son; — rejoicing always, without ceasing; — before him, as a wife and loving Son, before a Father, ver. 30. — These Words are spoken after the Manner of Men, and suited to our Capacities, that we might have the clearer, and more lively, Notions of the Divine Things contained in them: And, considering who was the Speaker, have in them the Force of a Thousand Arguments. — How familiar, how full, how strong, are these Expressions! How apt to raise our Ideas to the very highest? How sublime, yet how becoming, how like, such a Son! How worthy of such a Father! Were the second Person, indeed a coessential Son, Is it possible he could act more in Character: Or, talk in a Strain, more proper, or congruous to that nearest, and most sublime Relation? Were the first Person, in Reality, a coessential Father, Is it possible, his own Son could represent the Heart of such a Father, to an only begotten, in a more emphatical Stile: Unless it were in unspeakable Words, if I may allude to 2 Cor. xii. 4. which it is not possible for a Man either to utter, or understand? — Upon this Supposition, every Word has its natural, genuine, and full Sense and Force; and the Two Divine Persons are, most beautifully described, as acting in Character, the Father as the Father, the Son as the Son; and that, in Expressions the sweetest, dearest, most lively, and yet to us intelligible! But, upon any other, the Sense is infinitely sunk, the Beauty is lost, and the inconceivable Emphasis does almost totally vanish. —

Such
Such Language is so natural, from an own, a proper Son, and every Way so easy, so familiar, that we might reasonably expect it: But, from a Creature, even the highest possible, they seem quite to lose, not only their Propriety and Beauty, but both their Sense and Truth.—Need I add, What would our Author have had a coessential Son to have said? What could he have said, more clearly, fully, and strongly, to our Purpose? —To conclude this, This Verse most sweetly represents to us, not only the inconceivable Satisfaction, the Father and Son had, in their Counsels, concerning the Creatures, and, in particular, the Work of Redemption: But chiefly their most near and intimate, their most constant, familiar, and sweet Converse together; the infinite Complacency they had, and have, in each other; yea, and the unconceivable Delight, which all the Persons of the ever blessed Trinity have in themselves, and one another; wherein, by the Way, consists much of the Happine's of the Divine Nature. —Much, did I say? Yea, if the Expression may be allowed, infinitely the greater Part of it: For all the Pleasure, Complacency, and Satisfaction, (I dare not call it Happines!) which the ever blessed Persons in the Deity can have, in the whole Creation, seems in Reality, just nothing to this.—But, because none but themselves can comprehend the full Meaning of these Verses, we shall leave them, to the most serious Consideration of the pious Reader: And only say, That, if we have not put this Proposition, beyond all reasonable Doubt, we may well despair, of ever proving any Thing, by any Words.

4. That the Son speaks of himself, tho' not I conceive quite throughout, as the Messiah, our Saviour. —This our worthy Author, would have readily admitted. Every Verse almost, of this Chapter, which is all over Gospel, renders it undeniable.
niable. — He here acts the Prophet, instructing, calling, counselling, exhorting and persuading his People to come to, hear, and love him, promising Life to those that find him, ver. 35 and threatening Death to all who hate him; for so he interprets, or constructs sinning against, or not hearing him. ver. 36! — But, those most amazingly kind and loving Words must not be omitted, rejoicing in the habitable Parts of his Earth, as if these had been his chiefest Joy! and my Delights were with the Sons of Men! ver. 31. — When he was daily the Father's Delight, no Doubt, the Father was also his: But, how astonishing is this! Not only my Delight, as if this was the principal: But, my Delights were, as if all of them had been, with the Sons of Men only! — Oh thou eternal, and only begotten, essential Son of God, what was it in the Sons of Men, all of whom thou sittest lying wallowing in Sin! guilty, polluted, enslaved! Weak, Rom. v. 6. Sinners, ver. 8. Enemies, ver. 10. yea, Enmity, Ch. viii. 7. — What, Oh! What was it in them, which could be thy Delights! — What Communion could Light have with Darkness? Or, Purity with Filthiness? — Or, What was it thou wert to do with them, for them, or to them? ---Thine own Words, I delight to do thy Will, O God. Pf. xl. 8. are the best Answer. — But, What was this Will? Why; That, having undertaken to redeem his People from the Curse of the Law, Gal. iii. 13, &c. he might, in the Fulness of Time, take unto himself a true Body and a reasonable Soul; that so, he might have a Life to give a Ransom for them, Mat. xx. 28. and thereby put away Sin, by the Sacrifice of himself, which it was not possible the Blood of Bulls and Goats should do; Heb. ix. 26. Ch. x. 4 — 14. and, in the glorious Issue of all, bring many Sons to Glory! Ch. ii. 10. — Praise and bless him, O Heavens and Earth. — O all ye his Angels and People, Exalt him, Sing of him,
Rejoyce in him. — I have dwelt so long, upon this celebrated Gospel-Chapter, (tho' considering the glorious Subject, 'tis but little, very little, I can say upon it,) because, I humbly conceive, the Arguments from it are so irrefragable, that I could venture our whole Cause upon it alone: — But, I shall be briefer on the following.

Prov. xxx. 4. What is his Name, and what is his Son's Name, if thou canst tell? In which, these Things appear to me invincibly clear. Here are two distinct, true, and proper Persons: ---- One of them is the Son of the other; and therefore, the other is his Father: — They are Divine Persons, even Two of the Holy and Undivided Three; because, Divine Actions, Characters, and Works, are ascribed to them: — None, but One who is God, could gather the Wind in his Fists; bind the Waters; Is. xl. 12, or establish all the Ends of the Earth: — And, all these are attributed, not only to the Father, but to the Son, as we have just now heard. — 'Tis plain, That they who do these Things, have been always co-existent, and are also infinite, in Wisdom, and in Power, &c. — Whatever then may be meant by Name; whether the Nature and Essence, or Authority, or any Perfection or Perfections, of these Divine Persons; or, whether if by the Name of the Father, we are to understand his Person; and so of the Name of the Son; 'tis evident, the Name of the Son is as secret, unknown, and incomprehensible, as that of the Father: And therefore, the Question, or Challenge, runs thus, What is his (the Father's) Name, and what is his Son's Name, if thou canst tell? — They are plainly put upon a Level, as to this; and are equally, unsearchable, unconceivable, and past finding out: And consequently, these ever blessed Persons are equally God; because, the Name, (whatever be meant by the Word,) of no Being, or Person, who is not God, can be so secret, ineffable, and
and infinitely above us, as the Name of One who is.
— If then, by Name is meant Nature, Perfections, or Authority; these, in themselves, are the same; and they are equally, in both Persons, only in the One as a Father, and in the other as a Son: But, If by his Name, is denoted the Person of the Father, or his personal Property, and the Relation resulting from it, viz. Paternity, as the Schools speak; and by the Son’s Name, his Person, or personal Property, and the Relation arising from it, viz. Filiation: Yet still, the Name of the Son is as unsearchable and incomprehensible, as that of the Father; and therefore, He is God equal with him.

N. B. Here then is another Text, where the second Person is styled Son, his Son, —— 1. Without any Respect to our Redemption. —— And therefore, it seems undeniable, That the Terms Son, and the Messiah, or Redeemer, are not of the very same Signification: —— That this Title is not founded on his most kind Undertaking, but Antecedent to it: —— That he was, and is, his Son, and might have been so called, independently of, and abstracted from, his Messiahship: And therefore, it is a Title of Nature, and not of Office. —— 2. Hence ’tis clear, That his human Soul, even as fully qualified for our Redemption, is not here meant by his Son: Because, these Works, or Effects, viz. to gather the Wind in his Fists, to bind up the Waters in a Garment, and to establish all the Ends of the Earth, require infinite Wisdom and Power, in their Cause, which are not, so much as supposed to be, in this his Soul: And consequently, That it is the second Person, He only, and as such, who is, and is here styled, his Son. —— Withal, 3. ’Tis self-evident, that the Essence, Existence, Perfections, &c. of this his human Soul, be they ever so extraordinary, or far above us, are not so incomprehensible, as those of God the Father: Or, that the Name of it, might possibly be told by those, who
who could not, possibly, tell what is the Name of the other. — I do not remember, that any One of our Adversaries, ever medled with this Text! The Reader shall be left to guess the Reason.

If. ix. 6. For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the Government shall be upon his Shoulder: And his Name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. — Here, a great many Things offer themselves, at first View, which are clearly and fully for us; and, in my Opinion, do indisputably determine the Cause in our Favour. In Reality, so many Words, were it necessary to expatiate, so many Arguments. — One glorious and ever blessed Person, is the Subject of this Verse: — He is a complex Person, having, in him, the Divine, and the Human Nature: — He was to be born, and born of a Virgin, Ch. vii. 14. and therefore, was, as her Child, or as made of a Woman, True Man: — His Name was to be called, i. e. he should be really, and also declared and acknowledged to be, The Mighty God; and therefore, was, and is, the True God: — And consequently, He is, indeed, God-Man. —— This Person, tho' named, The everlasting Father, or The Father of Eternity, was not the First in the Trinity, as is self-evident; for, the first never was in any Sense, begotten or born; and never was to be called a Son, or a Child: — No one ever dreamt that this was the Third Person; for the very same Reasons, and many others: — And therefore, He was the Second. —— This Son, even after he was to become a Child born, or made Flesh, was to be called, i. e. to be proclaimed, and publickly own'd, to be what he always was, El Gibbor, The mighty God: Not a new, an inferior, a made, a puny God, (I desire the Reader to pardon the Non sense,) but the strong, the powerful, the mighty, and therefore, the true God. —— I say always
always was; because, if this Title had not always belong'd to him, it could never have belong'd to him: Or, he had never really been the mighty God, had he not been necessarily, and eternally so. — This Child's Body, purely as such, never was, never could be, The mighty God; nor, with any Propriety or Truth, be so filed. — His Human Soul, notwithstanding its enlarged Capacity and all its peculiar Privileges, never was, and consequently, never could be called, the mighty God. — It remains, therefore, That this glorious, This incommunicable Title, is due to Christ as God the Son, even the second, of the ever blessed Three; for, it is undeniable, it is here ascribed to the Son given to us: And therefore, This ever blessed Son is, as such, truly, and properly, The mighty God: And consequently, a Coessential Son. Q. E. D.

'Tis needless to enlarge any farther on this Text, at present: And therefore, I shall only remove an Objection or two out of the Way. 1. The Divine Person, who is the Subject of this Passage, is the Mediator, and is here described, as such. — Anf. Supposing this; the Mediator is both true God and true Man. — As God, he is the Son of God; and as such, here said to be a Son given to us: As Man, he is the Son of Man; and, as such, here said to be a Child born to us. — 2. The Mediator " has true " Godhead, in him, and upon that Account, he is " the true God; tho' he is not so, as he is the Son " of God." Anf. The Mediator is Godman, in whom dwelleth all the Fulness of the Godhead, which is indivisible, bodily. Col. ii. 9. But, the Expression, " has true Godhead in him, or belong- " ing to him," is, to say the least, hardly, if at all, intelligible.—Is the second Person, in the Trinity, as such, truly a distinct Person from the first! - Was it be, and as such, who undertook to be the Me-
Mediator? And, is not he, as such, here called a Son given? If so, we are agreed. — If not, Our Author must not have taken it ill to have been told, That an Arian might say all this, if not much more!

Dan. iii. 25. And the Form of the fourth is like THE SON OF GOD. To which our Author objects, p. 19. "The Son of God who was with the three Children " in the fiery Furnace, Dan. iii. 25. is so called, to " signify a glorious and excellent Being, that had " something Divine or Godlike in him;" To pass this, which needs much to be explained, I ask, Why? "for this is the Expression of Nebuchad-
nezzar, who is not supposed to know any Thing " of Christ or the Messiah." Anf. Nebuchadnezzar calls this Divine Person, whom he here styles the Son of God, his Angel; ver. 28. — How then, or whence, should we suppose, he knew any Thing of the Existence of good Angels? Or, of one eminent One, who, in the most emphatic or peculiar Manner, was his Angel? And, That the Son of God, was, or should be called, his Angel? or vice versa? &c. The only satisfying Account can be given is, that he knew these, some Way or other, by Revelation; and very probably, by his Conversation with Daniel and his Fellows. — That King was, confessedly, a great Genius; a Man of Parts, well acquainted with Men and Things: And such are usually inquisitive. — Daniel and his Companions had been long about the Court; were not only very intimate with him, but in great Credit and Confidence; and much trusted, and employed, by him.—Nothing then, is more likely, than that he would, (especially after that glorious Confession of the infinite Excellency of the God of Daniel, above all other Gods, Ch. ii. 47.) either out of Curiosity, or for Instruction, or both, enquire farther about his God; Who, and What, he was? How to be wor-
shipped?
hipped? And in what Manner, or by what Means, he made himself, and his Mind, known unto them? &c. — Or, that Daniel and his Friends would lay hold of some favourable Opportunities, to inform him of their Faith, concerning the true God; how he came to be their God, in Covenant; what great Things he had, in all Ages, done for their Nation, &c. and would yet, in his own Time and Way, do for them, and their Posterity; &c. and that it was He, who, for their Sins, had cast them out of their Land, &c. &c: And, in particular, to give him some Account of their Religion and Laws, which, as he well knew, were full as singular, as they were famous, &c. — On these Occasions, they would be naturally led to acquaint him, with his proper, and incommunicable Name: That, tho' this Name was peculiar to the one true God, yet it was ascribed to more than One: That one of these had often appeared, to their Ancestors in human Shape, and with or in a visible Glory; &c. which infaLLibly affured them, that he was the true God: That it was he, who brought them out of Egypt, and went before them, through the Wilderness, by Day in a Pillar of Cloud, to lead them the Way; and by Night in a Pillar of Fire, to give them Light; Ex. xiii. 21, &c. &c. and that he was, by Way of Eminence, stiled the Angel of Jehovah; &c: And that, in after Ages, he was revealed to them, by the Title of a Son, an own Son, a begotten Son, who had also promised, that when they should walk through the Fire, they should not be burnt; neither should the Flame kindle upon them; If. xliii. 2. the which Promise, the King and that numerous Assembly had lately, with their own Eyes, seen literally, and to a Tittle, fulfilled, &c. — If these, or either of them, (which are so very likely, that we can hardly doubt of them;) be granted, we clearly see, how Nebuchadnezzar came to talk so exactly, in the
Language of Scripture: — And his very Words, the Form, Aspect, Countenance, or Appearance, of the fourth is, not is the Form of, but is like the Son of God; seems even to force this Sense upon us. q. d. His Form exactly answers to the Accounts I have heard of his former Appearances. — Or, If we should suppose, as the Thing itself speaks, that he was now under some extraordinary Influence of the Spirit of Illumination, as he seems afterwards to have been, Ch. iv. 34—37 under sanctifying Influences; this will make the whole Matter yet clearer. — However, One or both of these must have been the Case; because, it is hardly possible any other Way, to account for the King's Words. — How could he know, that God had a Son! an only Son? That this Son, was his Angel? That he could restrain the Power of the Fire, so as to preserve his Servants in it, without the least Hurt, insomuch, that there was not an Hair of their Heads singed? &c. ver. 25, 27. Yea, how could he, or any Man, have used any such Expressions? To say, he spake in the Language of the Heathens, (whose Gods were fancied to have Sons, and Daughters too, some more, some fewer, and more or less eminent, or beloved,) is not true: For then, he would have mentioned which of their Gods, and which Son, &c. — And to say what our worthy Author has done in the Words quoted, is to say just nothing — — But — — —

Mic. v. 2. Whose Goings forth have been from Old, from the Days of Eternity. This Text is, upon several Accounts, very observable; and so has been reputed, in all Ages. — That the Messiah is the Subject of it, is not, cannot, be denied. — That the twofold Generation of his Person, as both God and Man, is here very particularly revealed, has been the constant Faith of the Catholic Church, from the Beginning. Here is plainly, a Generation, or Generations, from Eternity, and another in Time: Or,
Or, at least, goings forth from Eternity, which cannot agree to his human Soul, and can be true of no other but the second Person, as such; and another in Time, out of Bethlehem shall be come forth; &c. which can be applied to none, but the Child born of the Virgin, and as such. — This was the principal Text, that led some of the Fathers to talk of several Generations of the second Person, as such. — And, I cannot help adding, It is evidently more agreeable to Mr. Perrault's Notion of Generation, &c. than to the old one. — But, I shall not detain the Reader any longer upon this: Nor take any Notice, at present, of several Passages, which seem strongly to support our Doctrine, tho' the Terms, Father and Son, are not found in them. What I have offered is more than sufficient for our Purpose, viz. to prove, That the Title, The Son of God, as ascribed to him who was to come, was well known in Old Testament Times: — That it is a Title of Nature, and not of Office: — That it primarily, and always, supposes or denotes a coessential Son: — That this Son, and purely as such, is the second Person in the Trinity; tho' sometimes, this Title may design the complex Person of the Redeemer, in the Execution of his Office: — And, in one Word, That it necessarily, and therefore every where, supposes, or implies his true Godhead. Q. E. D!

N. B. From these Things, I humbly conceive, we may be fully satisfied, 1. Whence it was, that this Title was so common and universally known, among the Jews, when our Saviour was upon Earth, as this learned Author has acknowledged; and that, as the most glorious and most distinguishing Title of the Messiah. — 2. That the Meaning of it, as ascribed to the promised Saviour, is exactly the same in the New Testament, that it was in the Old. If he was a consubstantial Son then, he is most certainly so still. And, — 3. That hence it was that
that the Jews, in our Lord's Days, knew so well, and so readily, that God had a Son, who was equal with him; and therefore, was a distinct Person from, tho' of the same Essence with, him. Knew this, I say, so readily, that (when they heard him title himself the Son of God, or call God his Father, in such a peculiar Manner as he did, and no other could,) they, without any Hesitation, charge him with making himself equal with him. Proceed we then to our Proofs, from the New Testament, which are many, various, clear, and strong, and which come full home to the Point.

Plain Proofs of the Coessential Sonship of the second Person in the Trinity, as such, drawn from the New Testament only, and chiefly from Christ's own Words.

To produce, explain, and vindicate, all the Passages, in the New Testament, wherein Christ, the Mediator, or the second Person in the Holy and undivided Trinity, and as such, is called the Son of God, would swell this Discourse to a large Volume; and is really at present, I hope, needless: We shall therefore, now, confine ourselves to the Gospels, and illustrate the Argument with all Brevity, waving a great Number of other Texts, which are no less plain and strong for our Purpose, till, if we are encouraged, another Work shall be published, in which, with the Divine Assistance, I intend to prove, and confirm, the true and proper Divinity of Christ, from his Mediatorial Offices of Prophet, Priest, and King, of his Church.

That the Argument may be the clearer, we shall range our Proofs into these five Classes; viz. Thos where he is called the Son of God, without any other Word annexed: — Thos in which, the Father bears Testimony to him, as his beloved Son: — Thos wherein the Adnouns, own, proper, begotten, or
or only begotten, are joined to the Word Son:—Those in which the two Titles, the Christ, and the Son of God, come together:—And Those in which he is charged with Blasphemy, in making himself equal with God, only for saying, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work; or, making himself God, for much the same Reason; and for vindicating his own Words, with which they were highly provoked.

We shall not need to produce every one of the Texts, under each of these; but shall content ourselves with some few of the Principal, desiring the Reader to observe, That every new Class will the more clearly illustrate, and strongly confirm, all the former, and add not a little Light to those that follow———Begin we then with,

1. Those Texts, where Christ is called, the Son of God, without any other Word added to it.

N. B. We must not forget these most remarkable Things, before we go any farther,—1. When the Angel came to foretell the Birth of John, the Fore-runner of our Lord, he does not call our Lord, the Christ, or the King of the Jews: No, nor speak of him as a Man, or as any Creature; but, only as the Lord God of his People. Luke i. 16, 17.—2. When the same Angel, at the Annunciation, as we call it, of the blessed Virgin, had said unto her, thou shalt conceive in thy Womb, and bring forth a Son, and shall call his Name Jesus; he adds, in the first Place, as his chief and most honourable Title, He shall be great, (not as having a supra-angelical Spirit for his human Soul, but) and shall be called the Son of the Highest, ibid. ver. 31, 32. and then mentions his everlasting Kingdom, ver. 33.—3. Elizabeth also, when under the Spirit of Inspiration, stiled him My Lord, ver. 43. and his Mother, the Lord, ver. 46. and God my Saviour. ver. 47. And, 4. Zacharias called him ex-
expreSy the Highest: And thou Child, speaking of or to his Son, John, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest. — Why, or upon what Account? for thou shalt go before the Face of the Lord, i. e. of Christ, our Saviour, to prepare his Ways. ver. 76. Whence we may gather, these several Things, very naturally.

1. That the promised Deliverer was well known, in Old Testament Times, by the Titles of, the Lord, and the Lord God of Israel. Had it not been so, I cannot but think, That the Angel would not have so stiled him, when he spake of him to Zacharias; or would have, for several very obvious Reasons, added some other Name, or Names, to explain it; &c. — 2. That neither the Angel, nor Elizabeth, nor the Virgin, nor Zacharias, give any the least Hint of a pre-existent human Soul. —

3. That every One of them profess his Deity, as the Foundation of their Faith in him. — 4. That neither of them, when under the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit, degrade him so infinitely, as if he were only a made God, a God but of Yesterday, &c. or a new God, &c. as our blasphemous Antitrinitarians dream. So far from it, That one of them expressly calls him, The Lord their God, another God, and with an Article too, and a third the Highest, an incomunicable Title, peculiar to the one only true God. To proceed,

When his Fore runner pointed him out to the World, 'tis very observable, He did not begin thus, Behold the Messiah, the long expected King of Israel; but (to correct their false and unworthy Notions of the Messiah, and vain and foolish Expectations from him) thus, Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away (οὶ ἐξίποι, who beareth as a Sacrifice) the Sin of the World; Jo. i. 29. thereby very emphatically declaring, that he was to be the great Sacrifice for Sin; that his other Offices, were founded in this; that
that he was first to be humbled, suffer, and die, before he was to set up his Kingdom in the World; and that his chief Business, by his Doctrine, Life, and Death, was not to make his People great, but good; and to save them, not from external Slavery, but their Sins; and consequently, that his Kingdom was to be the Kingdom of Heaven, Mat. iii. 2. i. e. not a temporal, but a spiritual Kingdom.—And, to satisfy them, that he was an all-sufficient Saviour, every Way qualified for, and equal to, this great Task, he also bare Record, that this is the Son of God, ver. 34. — And that there might be no Doubt, about the Meaning of that most glorious Title, he tells his Disciples, That this Son of God cometh from above, and is above all; and therefore is supreme: Ch. iii. 31. That he hath seen and beard, i. e. he most certainly knew and most fully comprehended, that he testifieth: ver. 32: That God giveth not the Spirit by Measure unto him; and therefore, he giveth him immeasurably, which no possible Creature is capable of receiving or containing: ver. 14. That the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all Things into his Hand; ver. 35. but the highest possible Creature cannot so much as know all Things, and much less order, manage, and rule them:—And, That he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting Life; &c. ver. 36. and consequently, the Son, as such, is the Object of Worship, who is to be believed on, and trusted in; and has also Life in himself, and hath purchased everlasting Life, which he gives to his People. — But, He of whom all these Things are true, is most certainly true God: And therefore, the Son, as such, is the true God: And, by consequence, when this Title, the Son of God, is given to Christ, it denotes a coessential Son; and therefore, does necessarily suppose, or imply his Divine Nature. Q. E. D.
To illustrate this, and put it out of all Doubt with the plain Christian, let him remember these six Things, 1. I take it for granted, that the Baptist understood the Meaning of his own Testimony, and intended to instruct his Disciples, in the true Sense of it. — 2. Our learned Author has not so much as allledged, that John knew any Thing of his new fangled Notions: i.e. That he had ever heard of the pre-existent created Soul of the Messiah: Or, That this his human Soul was but a created, tho' a suprangelical Spirit; and much less, That it was this human Soul that was, or was called, the Son of God. — 3. It clearly appears, from what has been said, and will be yet more certain, and evident, from what follows; That, by this Title, the Son of God, which was of old ascribed, and indeed appropriated, to the second Person, who was, from Eternity, anointed to be the Saviour of his People, the Jews, commonly, if not universally, understood a consubstantial Son. — But, if so, 4. The Baptist could have no other Notion of this Title; and therefore, could design to convey no other Notion, or Idea, of it, to his Disciples. — And therefore, 5. Had the Sense of it been afterwards changed, this would have been plainly revealed, somewhere or other, that all might have known it, and might have been set right in this great, I may say, Fundamental Article. — But, 6. Since no such Intimation is, any where, given, we may be fully satisfied, That the Sense of this Title, when ascribed to Christ, is the very same that it ever was: And consequently, That, ever since this Title was applied to the second Person, the Church of God hath, in all Ages, and every where, understood it to denote a consubstantial Son; and, accordingly, have acknowledged, and believed in him, as such, i.e. as God of God. Q. E. D.

He that pleases may consult, Mark. xiv. 61—64. Mat. xxvii. 43, and 54. Luke xxii. 70. Jo. xi. 4. &c. &c.
&c. &c. But, having already considered several of these, and other Texts, where this Title occurs, I shall only offer a Thought or two upon these few more.

Mat. xi. 27. All Things are delivered unto me of my Father; but this, as we have just now heard, necessarily implies his Godhead; and no Man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any Man the Father, save the Son; therefore, they are equally incomprehensible to all the Creatures, infinite in themselves, and intimately and perfectly known to each other: Yea, it seems plain, that the Son knew the Father, as thoroughly, as the Father did him. The Words ὁμως and τις, and the compound Verb ἔπιθανότες are emphatic; and lead directly to these Thoughts. — The Phrase seems yet stronger, Luke x. 22. No one knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son. So that, they are equally past being found out to Perfection; and their Nature, Attributes, and the Relations in which they stand to each other, as distinct Persons, are equally unsearchable: And Therefore, The Son, as such, is God: Or, this Title implies true Godhead, and coessential Sonship.

Jo. vi. 46. Not that any Man, τις, any Creature, hath seen the Father; i.e. either hath, or can, immediately or fully, know his Essence, Counsels, Will; save he which is of God, πατρί τῷ Θεῷ, of, or from him as his Son, by natural and ineffable Generation; and therefore, so of him, as to be still with, and in him, as I am; be hath seen the Father. i.e. He, He and he only, hath intuitively and perfectly, been acquainted with himself, his Secrets, and Purposes: Nor can any Man know the Father, know him at all, or know him to be a Father, and much less to Salvation, but be to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. Mat. xi. 27. — Chrift then is, and τις, D d d
The Light of the World: — The Doctrine of the Trinity, is to be known only by the Revelation of the Word and Spirit, and not by the Light of Nature: — Nor should we had any Knowledge of the Distinction of the Three undivided Persons; or, that one of them was an own, i. e. a proper Father, and another an only begotten Son; had not this Son himself, who was, from the Beginning, the great Prophet of his Church, revealed them to us — These Words then, seem plainly to imply the Divinity of Christ, as a Son. See Jo. vii. 29.

Mat. xiv. 33. Then they that were in the Ship, came and worshipped him, saying, Of a Truth thou art the Son of God. — They, viz. his Disciples, ver. 22. had, from their first Acquaintance with him, firmly believed he was the Messiah, and constantly acknowledged him as such. — Even Andrew, Jo. i. 41. and Philip, ver. 45. who were neither the most eminent, nor most forward, of the sacred College, and of whom we hear but very little more, were yet, from the first, fully persuaded of this. — No Doubt, the more Miracles he wrought before them, they would be the more confirmed, in the Truth of this great Doctrine: But, there was something, in this, both in the Nature, and Manner of it, so very extraordinary, that they came and worshipped him, not as the Messiah, or not only and merely as such; but as him who was of a Truth, the Son of God; and therefore, the Object of Religious Worship. — The common, but mean and false Notions, they had entertained of the Messiah, as such, had no Relation to such extraordinary Works. — None of the Prophets had ever wrought such Wonders, and much less in such a Manner. — It lookt so like gathering the Wind in his Fists, Pro. xxx. 4. which none but the Almighty Father, and his equally Almighty Son could do: And seem'd so clear a Proof of his absolute Power over all Nature, that even the Wind
Wind and the Sea obeyed him; that they seem to have had rather higher Thoughts of him, than they usually, if perhaps ever, had before; and therefore, worshipped him, (which, so far as we know, they had never, I think, done before, on any such Occasion;) as having now, to their full Conviction, proved himself to be the Son of God, i. e. as the Jews generally understood it, the coessential Son, and therefore, equal with God. q. d. Lord, We know the Scribes and Pharisees seek to kill thee, because thou callest thyself the Son of God: But, had they been here, and seen, and heard, what we have now done, they might have had the fullest Conviction possible, as we have, That thou art indeed his only begotten; and therefore, equal with him.

Jo. ix. 35--38. Our Lord, (having found the Man which was Blind from his Birth, ver. 1. whom he had cured, ver. 6, 7. who had been called before the Sanhedrim, examined, and by them excommunicated, ver. 15, 24, 34. only because of the grateful Sense he entertained of the Kindness done him; and the just Regard he shewed towards, or for, his unknown Benefactor;) said unto him, Dost thou believe on πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν ὑιὸν τοῦ Θ.Σ., the Son of God? Upon his answering to his Question, Who is He, Lord, that I might believe on him? Our Saviour rejoins, Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee. Upon which, the Man readily replies, Lord, I believe. And be, προσευκυνεὶς, adoravit, worshipped him.— This was mentioned before, and we shall now only observe, That he does not call himself the Messiah, but the Son of God: That he requires Faith in himself, as such; and therefore, proposes himself, and as such, to the Man, as the Object of Religious Worship; which none, but one who was, as such, true God, could be: And, that the Man declared his Belief in him, and adored him; which, as a Jew, he would not, should not, durst
not, have done, had he not taken him to be, as such, *the true God, the one Object of Worship.* And therefore, That Christ, as the *Son of God,* is indeed *true God;* and consequently, a *coessential Son:* For surely, he would not have accepted *that Worship,* as the *Son of God,* which was not due to him, as such.

To wave many others, and that very observable One, Mat. xvii. 24—26. Of whom do the Kings of the Earth take *Tribute or Custom?* ἀντὰ τῶν ὑιῶν αὐτῶν, of their own Sons? &c. We shall add but one more.

Mat. xxvii. 34. *Now when the Centurion,* and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the Earthquake, and those Things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly *this was the Son of God.* To this our Author objects, "He cannot "be supposed to mean that this Man was the true "and eternal God," p. 43. — These were not the Words of the Centurion only, but of those that were with him also; several of whom might, perhaps, know the *true Meaning of that Title* better than he: Nor did he, nor any of them, mean, that He was the *Father,* the *first Person;* or, that *He only was the true and eternal God;* or, that he was only the *true and eternal God,* and not also *true Man.* — " but only that he was a great and glorious Person, "like God, or some Way related to God," — Pray What Ideas could the Centurion have of these Words, "like God, or some Way related to God?" I want much to know — However, If by this Phrase, re- related to God, he meant, with our Author, near a-kin to him, he express'd himself most strongly; and perhaps, as properly too, as he could do, when he called him the *Son of God.* — " or he was the Per- son "whom the Jews expected for their Messiah." That this only was not his Meaning, will presently appear evident; tho', by this Time, I have no doubt he firm-
ily believed him to be the Messiah. — "This Roman Captain could not imagine Christ to be God himself." Thus you have every Word of this strange Objection. — Anf. This Roman Captain had heard his Trial, before Pilate: Heard the Question proposed, Art thou the King of the Jews; to which he replied, Thou sayest it. Mark. xv. 2. i. e. It is as thou sayest: And heard him accused, that he made himself the Son of God; and therefore deserved to die, by their Law; Jo. xix. 7. the Law against Blasphemy, Lev. xxiv. 16. to which he gave no Answer; no, not one Word, (either to vindicate himself by explaining, excusing, or justifying, what he had said, or, to deny the Charge, tho' his Life was at Stake!) and consequently, might well have been thought to have acknowledged the Charge, that he had indeed made himself the Son of God; and well deserved to die, if he was not really, and in their Sense too, what he made himself to be.— Had these two Titles been of the very same Import, Pilate's last Question, had been perfectly ridiculous. Our Lord, having acknowledged that he was the Messiah, had really, upon that Supposition, acknowledged the other Charge also! — 'Tis then self-evident, That, tho' these Titles, the Christ, and the Son of God, denoted the same Person; yet they were not exactly synonymous, and did not mean the very same Thing in him, but were given to him upon several, and quite different Accounts; the former being a Title of Office, the latter of Nature. This the Centurion might, yea, could not but, know, as we shall demonstrate by and by.

We need not offer any more under this Class. What we have said is sufficient, especially since it will be much strengthened by what follows. But to all these he will object,

In all these Passages, the Baptist, the Disciples, the blind Man, and our Saviour himself, use this Title
Tide to denote the Messiah, and as such. Anf. Supposing this, Is not the Messiah, as such, Godman? Might not they then, in these Passages, have a peculiar Respect to his Divine Nature? Could all these have been said of his human Soul? Or, of the Messiah, had he not been true God? &c. This his Objection therefore, is, in reality, no Objection. Proceed we then to,

II. Those in which the Father publickly, by an audible Voice, bears Testimony to him, as his Son. We shall consider these two, the one at his Baptism, when he was just entering on his publick Ministry, and the other in his Transfiguration, to confirm him for his Passion, and prepare his Disciples against their Trial therein.

Mat. iii. 17. And lo, a Voice from Heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. — Here, the Repetition of the Article, by the Three Evangelists, who retain it also, in the History of his Transfiguration, must not be slightly pass’d by. The Words, I think, may be rendered, This is that my Son, that my beloved, whom Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets, did say should come into the World. — Let us then observe, That here was a glorious Revelation of the Trinity, the Three that bare Record in Heaven, Jo. v. 7. which gave Occasion to that triumphant Challenge of the Catholics of old, Abi Ariane, &c. Go thou Arian to Jordan, and there thou shalt see the Trinity: — This was the Father’s own Testimony; and plain, clear, and full, it was; the Language of a Father; expressive of his very Heart; and such as might be, in the present Case, expected from him. — He does not stile him, mine Elect, my Servant, as Is. xlili. 1. the Messiah, Dan. ix. 25. or my King, Pf. ii. 6. mine Anointed, as elsewhere; tho’ all Expressions of Love and Delight, as well as Honour: But, my Son, my beloved Son, thereby shewing, not only the high-
of possible Satisfaction with, and Complacency in him, but the Son's transcendent and infinite Dignity and Glory. — The Phrases themselves, the Circumstances, and the End also of this Testimony, will not permit us to take this Title, in any common, low, or improper Sense; but, in the very highest it will bear, as implying that he was his own, his only begotten Son; so his Son as no other ever was, now is, or shall, or can be, i. e. by proper Generation: Because, (1) In every other Sense, there are many, who may be called his Sons, yea, his beloved Sons. — (2) His being such a Son, was that only, whereby he was rendered equal to his glorious Undertaking. And therefore, (3) The Father not only declares himself well pleased with him, but in him, i. e. with all his People, for his Sake; because, such a Son, so every Way well qualified, had voluntarily engaged to lay down his Life for them, Jo. x. 15, 17. If. liii. 10—12. &c. to seek, find, and bring them home to him. Luke xix. 10. Heb. ii. 10. &c.

Mat. xvii. 5. During his Transfiguration, ver. 5. Behold a bright Cloud overshadowed them: And behold a Voice out of the Cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, Hear ye him. To pass many Things of the Time, Place, Design, and other Circumstances, of this Testimony, as well as of the Witnesses; and desiring the Reader to remember what we have said upon the former Text; we shall only here offer these few Thoughts. — 1. Moses that renowned Giver, and Elias the most zealous Restorer, of the Law, appeared unto them. — 2. That remarkable Addition, Hear ye him, in the present Case, and before those illustrious Persons, especially if we remember, that they spake of his Decease, and his Death, which was to be accomplished at Jerusalem, Luke ix. 31. (his Death being the Completion or Fulfilment of all that he was to do, and suffer, in his Estate of Humiliation,)
is very emphatic, implying many Things in it, viz. That this was the great Prophet foretold: Deut. xviii. 15. and 18. — That thou' hitherto, Believers were referred, chiefly, yea only, to the Law, and to the Testimony, If. viii. 20. now they must hear him: — Hear him, (not correcting the Law, or adding any Thing to that which was perfect before, Ps. xix. 7. or able to make Wise to Salvation, 2 Tim. iii. 15. so that even the Man of God might be perfect, &c. ver. 17. but) vindicating, explaining, illustrating, confirming, fulfilling it, and expounding in all the Scriptures the Things concerning himself. Luke xxiv. 27. — 3. That Moses and Elias heartily consented to this Testimony, and Command ; most willingly referring all the Honour they had, as Prophets, to the Son of God; and rejoicing to see all that was foretold of him, so gloriously fulfilled in him.—

4. That in this consists one chief Glory of the New Dispensation, above the Old, that, in it, God speaks to us in, or by, his Son. Heb. i. 1. — 5. That the Church is now, absolutely, and implicitly, to believe the Son: He, as such, being, as we have heard, the God, Amen, i. e. the God of Truth, is ἀυτοπιστος, worthy of all Credit, purely upon his own Account: And therefore, as a Son, he is a coessential Son, and equal with the Father. — What puts this out of all Doubt with me, is, — 6. That the Prophets of Old, even the most eminent and distinguished amongst them, prefaced their Discourses and Predictions, with a, Thus faith the Lord; even after their Authority was most established: But, Christ never once did! — His verily, verily, I say unto you; or his naked, I say unto you, was equal to, Thus faith the Lord! — And, seeing a Divine Faith, must needs have a Divine Testimony, to rest upon; and the Faith of the New Testament Church, cannot be supposed to be built upon a more weak, fallible, or disputable,
Foundation, than was that of the Old: It must needs be so: And therefore, Christ is Jehovah, not the Father, but the Son. — From all which it follows, even with all the Certainty and Evidence of Demonstration, That the Son, as the Son, is absolutely infallible, which Christ's human Soul, with all its Glories, neither was, is, nor can be: Because, no one Person can be absolutely infallible, who is not omniscient, yea, and infinite in all Perfections: And consequently, as a Son, he is infinite in all Perfections: And therefore, a coessential Son, and so equal with the Father. Q. E. D.

To this, all our Adversaries will object, 1. This Testimony was a public, solemn, and most glorious, Attestation of his being the Messiah. Anf. Who doubts it? But, he could not have been the Messiah, had he not been antecedently to that, the coessential Son of God; because, he had not been equal to the Office, if he had not.

Obj. 2. What End could it answer, for the Father to bear Testimony, That Christ was his coessential Son? Anf. Many, and those the most necessary Ends. — The Prophets had foretold, that it was the Son of God, one who had, formerly, assumed the Names and Titles, done the Works, and accepted the Worship, of the one true God, who was to save his People from their Sins: And therefore, the Disciples must be most convincingly assured, That the Son who was promised, was actually come upon that blessed Errand; and, that this was He. — Isaiah had predicted, Ch. xl. 9, 10, 11. That it was the Lord God who should come, and feed his Flock like a Shepherd: Seeing then, that Christ had declared himself the good shepherd, see Jo. x. ver. 11. and 14, &c. &c. it was therefore now most necessary, that the Father should bear Witness, that he was that Shepherd which was foretold; and consequently, the Lord God. &c. —— God had promised
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by Jeremiah, Ch. xxiii. 16. That the Lord would raise up unto David a King — whose Name should be called, i. e. who should be, the Lord our Righteousness! Jehovah, as God the Son, for, it is certain, he is not the Father; and our Righteousness, as the Messiah, our Saviour! Now, nothing could be more necessary, than the Father's Testimony, that this was the Person: And that he was Jehovah, as his beloved Son; and our Righteousness, as he in whom he is well pleased: Because, it is only for, or upon the Account of, his Righteousness, that he is so well pleased with any Sinners, as to forgive all their sins, pronounce them righteous, adopt them for his Children, &c. &c.

In short, If they will have it, That the Father here proclaimed his Messiahship, as I, for my Part, most readily grant, We must insist upon it, That there are two Ideas in this Testimony; not only that he is the Christ, a Deputy, a Servant, one in an Office: But, that he is more than so; even the Son, the own Son, the only begotten of the Father, and consequently, his coessential Son; which is always the first, the principal, the leading Idea, when we speak of the complex Person of the Messiah. — And hence, in the New Testament, the Father, as we have just now observed, never styles him, my Servant, or the Christ, but my beloved Son, who can, and will, do all my Pleasure; and in whom, I can, and do acquiesce. — N. B. His Office is the greatest Honour imaginable, yea, possible, to his human Soul, be it as great, and glorious, as it possibly can be; and to which it never had, nor could have, been advanced, had not the own, the only begotten Son, assim'd it into his own Person, or been personally united to it: But, his Deity, i. e. his Divine Nature, as the Son, or the second Person, is an infinite Honour, both to the Person of the Redeemer, as such, and to his Office.

III. Thosè
III. Those in which the Adnouns, own, proper, begotten, only begotten, are annexed to the Word, Son: Of which there are a great many, and all of them most memorable. — We shall now give a few Thoughts only upon the three or four, which first occur in the Gospel according to John.

Jo. i. 14. *We beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father.* Upon this observe, 1. He was then the Son, the begotten, the only begotten Son, not of the Deity, but of the Father. — It was not the Essence that begat another Essence, or begat itself; but the Father, the first Person, begat the Son, the second Person. — It is not, at all, or hardly, Sense, to talk of a Nature's begetting, but of a Person's begetting: Nor is it proper to say, an Essence is a Father, or a Son; but a Person, is the one or the other. — 2. It was the Logos, the Word, that was made Flesh, i. e. assumed our Nature into a personal Union with himself, (by taking unto himself a true Body and a reasonable Soul, the Word Flesh, being here taken synecdochically, for the whole that was Human in him, or his whole Manhood, as in innumerable Places of Scripture. — It was his Glory, says the Apostle, we beheld, i. e. the Glory of the Logos, even when made Flesh; and this Glory, was the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father, such as became, and could be found in no other but, his own, proper Son. Whence, I humbly conceive, that the Logos, i. e. the personal Word, and the only begotten, are convertible Terms; or that each of them, in strictness, denotes the second Person only; and then, ’tis undeniable from ver. 1—3. That the only begotten, as such, was in the Beginning, was with God, and was God, and that all Things were made by him: But if so, the only begotten, and as such, is the Creator of all Things, (as his human Soul, is not, cannot be, supposed to be)
and consequently is, as such, the true God; and therefore, God the Son. — Or, if this should be doubted, I cannot but think, from the Manner of Expression, &c. that, of the two Titles, the only begotten is rather the Superior, and more Auguft. And that, The Logos, or the Word, is a Title of Office, denoting the Omnipfic Creator, or the great Revealer of the Father’s Will, or both; and the Son, the only begotten, is a Title of Nature, expressing his coessential Sonship, or his having the same Nature and essential Perfections with the Father. — The Title, the only begotten Son, is never, was never, among Men, a Title of Office; nor is it ever so used; but always denotes the natural Relation between an own Father and his own Son: Whereas, the Title, the Logos, i. e. as we render it, the Word, (if it is not used to denote the Relation between Thought and the Mind whose Thought it is, or Speech proceeding from the Mind, as some of the Fathers seem to have conceived; and then, it is much, if not wholly, the same, with the Idea they had of the Generation of the Son; or, whereby they tried to explain the most intimate, and natural, Union of the first and second Persons, in the most Holy and Undivided Trinity: If, I say, this is not the Meaning of it, then this Title, the Word,) plainly denotes the omnipfic Word, i. e. the Divine Person who made all Things, Jo. i. 3. who spake, and it was done, &c. Ps. xxxiii. who said, Let there be Light, and there was Light, Gen. i. 3. &c. and who was also the great Revealer of the Will of God; either immediately, Ex. xx. 1—17, &c. &c. or by his Spirit in the Prophets, and that from the Beginning, till the Canon of Scripture was Sealed. 1 Pet. i. 11. Ch. iii. 18—20. Rev. xxii. 6 and 16, &c. And, if this is the Case, then ’tis evident, That, tho’ this Title, the Logos, plainly supposes and implies, infinite Power and Wisdom and indeed all Perfections;
Fections; and consequently, that he, to whom it is
given, is true God: Yet, it seems rather a Title
of Office, than of Nature. All this I leave with the
serious Reader, not daring any farther, to break
through unto the Lord to gaze. — — And, 3. The
Phrases are, We beheld, (we, even as many as received
him, to whom he gave Power to become the Sons of
God, ver. 12. or, at least, we the Disciples, who were
afterwards constituted his Apostles, Mat. x. 1, 2.
beheld) his Glory, i.e. saw, in some Sense, without our Eyes,
θεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν, the Divine Glory and Majesty
that was in him, the Glory as of the only begotten
of the Father, i.e. of one who was with him, and was
so with him, as to be God, tho' a distinct Person
from him.— This must be the Meaning, as is
evident, not only from all these Hints, and what
we shall subjoin under the next Proof, but from
this Consideration, That our learned Author, as we
have heard, durst not say, that all the Apostles did
ever arrive at his own Notion.— All he would venture
upon is, " Tho' the Apostles Paul and John, and
perhaps the rest of them arrived at this com-
plete Idea of his glorious pre-existent human Soul in
" due Time, &c." p. 10, 11. But, if they did not
arrive at it, it could not be said they beheld the
Glory of it: And yet, the Apostle assures us, they
i.e. all of them, beheld such a Glory, as was worthy
of the only begotten, now manifested in the Flesh;
and confirmed them in it, that he was indeed,
what he called himself, the only begotten: Whence
'tis plain, they did not, could not, think that he
was called the only begotten, upon the Account of
his Soul; Or, that his glorious human Soul, was
properly the Son of God. Q. E. D. — — — And this
is too much to confute this Fancy.

Jo. i. 18. No Man hath seen God at any Time; the
only begotten Son, which is in the Bosom of the
Father,
Father, he hath declared him. If the Reader will compare this, with our Explication of Mat. xi. 27. p. 385. he will clearly see, they very much illustrate each other; and that here, we have as many Arguments as Words. No Man, i.e. no one, no Man, no, nor Angel, i. e. no Creature; hath seen God at any Time; i. e. as the next Words shew, hath, or can, intuitively know him, his Mind, and Will; or, no Man could have known that he was a Father, or who, and what, he was, and what his Purposes are; &c. The only begotten Son, his own Son, who was always with him, and was God; οὐ, which is, not which was, or shall be, but is now, i. e. is, and was always, (which could not be said of his human Soul, when he was upon Earth, if it was not Omnipresent,) in the Bosom of the Father, near and dear to him, in him, and inseparable from him, and who knows the Father, as the Father knows him, and therefore is, as the only begotten, the true God; he hath declared him. All the Acquaintance his Church ever had of him as a Father, and of his Mind and Will, they had from him: But since his Coming, ἐξηγήσατο, he hath explained, more clearly revealed, his Person, Counsels, Grace, and Will. — Now, these Words are much too high, for any Creature. — Even the human Soul of Christ, neither did, nor could, know God perfectly; or as it was known of him: For, we have seen, that Christ, as Man, did not know the Day of Judgment. — 'Twill be said, In him are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge, Col. ii. 3. Yes, in Christ, Godman. — Yea, all those Treasures, as far as a Creature is capable of them, or as far as they were necessary for the perfect fulfilling his Work, were, or are, treasured up in his human Soul: But, absolutely, all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge could not be hid in it; be-
because, it was not capable of containing, or comprehend-"ing them; but in the second Person, who is, as such, the only begotten of the Father: In him, even when made Flesh, were all those Treasures hid.

Jo. iii. 16. For God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish but have everlasting Life. — For God, i. e. the Father, loved, not only spared, wished them well, and did them good, yea shewed them many undeserved Favours, but loved! the World, i. e. Men, not Angels; fallen Men, not fallen Angels; the Jews, as well as the Gentiles; and some of every Kindred, and Tongue, and People, and Nation! Rev. v. 9. So loved that he gave; not so as, there being, in Nature, no Parallel to it! but so that he gave the highest possible Evidence of it, which he gave freely, and out of pure Love! his Son! not a Man, not an Angel, not a Creature, even the highest possible, but a Son! not a Son, by Creation, or Adoption and Grace, but by Nature, a begotten Son! not one of more or many, but an only begotten! He had no more! not begotten in a common, low, or figurative, but in a full and proper Sense! that who: soever, of any Nation, or any Degree, without Exception, believeth in him, i. e. assenteth to all that is revealed concerning him, consenteth to be his as he requireth, receiveth him as the only Saviour, and giveth himself up to him as his Teacher and Ruler, and resteth upon him alone, for Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Redemption, should not perish! for ever, as he would most certainly do, if he did not believe in him; but have everlasting Life! i. e. all possible Happiness, without any Alloy, Inter-ruption, or End; a Title to it in his Justification, the Beginnings of it in his Regeneration, a growing Meetness for it in his Sanctifica-
tion, and, at last, the actual Enjoyment of it in Heaven forever.

What more now, would our learned Author have the Lord Jesus, when in this World, to have said, to determine the Case between us? — What more could have been said, had he intended, in the plainest and fullest Manner, to have decided for us? Or rather, forever to obviate all Doubts, Demurs, or Cavils, against the Truth? — Yea, I must again ask, What more can now be said? I want sadly to know. — For, 1. He is express, He is the only begotten Son of God. Therefore, no other, is so his Son; or his Son, in the same Sense that he is; or called his Son, upon the same Account, or for the same Reason, that he is. — No different Manner of creating, if these Words have any Sense, could have made him an only begotten Son. — 2. He was so, i. e. his only begotten, before the Father gave him, as the Words put out of all Doubt. He did not then become his Son, upon his being given, or after it; for he was his only begotten before. This Title then, was not ascribed to him, upon the Account of his being given, or sent, or in Consequence of it. Whence these Things are undeniable, (1.) He is not, cannot be, the only begotten Son, because of his miraculous Conception, in as much as he was the only begotten Son of God, before the Creation of the World. (2.) For the same Reason, he could not be properly stiled the only begotten, on Account of his Resurrection, Ascension, or Exaltation, because he was the only begotten, before he was first given. (3.) Seeing the Expressions, God gave his Son, &c. plainly imply his Office; (he gave him to be the Messiah, or as the Messiah,) I humbly conceive, 'tis undeniable, That he was the only begotten, before he was, or could be called, the Messiah, or could be designed to his Office; and consequently, This
This Title is not ascribed to him, upon the Account of his Office; and therefore, is not a Title of Office, but of Nature; and, by Consequence, he is a coessential Son.— But, if this will hold, This alone is sufficient, forever to confute that Notion, That the Titles, the only begotten Son of God, and the Messiah, are synonymous, i.e. of the very same Signification. — 3. He was the highest, the greatest possible, Gift the Father could give. He so loved, that he gave him, a Son, an only begotten! And therefore, could not possibly give any higher Proof, or Effect of his Love! But, let Christ's human Soul be ever so glorious; since it was but a Creature, God might have created another equal, if not superior, to it; and could have given that; which had been an equal, if not greater, Evidence of his Love to the World. — 4. He gave him to be lifted up upon the Cross, first as a Sacrifice for Sin; and then, in the Preaching of the Gospel; as a Saviour, that the wounded, sensible, Sinner might look unto him, and be saved, as the stung Israelites were to look to the brazen Serpent in the Wilderness, and live, ver. 14, 15. comp. with Numb. xxii. 7—9. — 5. Here then, Christ proposes himself as the Object of Faith, and Religious Worship; and consequently, as the Lord our God, whom only we are to serve. Mat. iv. 10. But, it is the only begotten Son of God, in whom the sensible Sinner is to believe: And therefore, he is the only begotten Son, and as such, the Lord our God; but if so, he is God of God, or a coessential Son. — 6. He is the Author of eternal Life, to all that obey him: But none, but one who is God, could either purchase eternal Life for his People, give them the sure Promise of it, a Right to it, prepare them for it, or keep and bring them to it, &c. And hence, the only begotten, is called and is, as such, the Lord of Glory, 1 Cor. ii. 8. the God of Glory, Acts vii.
2. over all, God blessed forever. Rom. ix. 5:
Q. E. D.

But, I cannot so lightly pass over this so remarkable a Text, wherein we have the whole Gospel, (in Miniature indeed, but) plainly, sweetly, and fully. — It is here evidently supposed, That the World was in a miserable, perishing, lost Estate; and had continued in it, had not God himself most kindly interposed. — It is clearly implied, that he did pity them in that State; and contrived a Way, for the Salvation of his People. And, in this we have, — 1. The glorious and divine Spring, Source, or Rise, of this Salvation, even the unparallel'd, stupendous, Love of God. God so loved, that, &c.

2. The Adorable Means of obtaining this Salvation, in the Undertaking and Mission of his only begotten Son. No other was, or could be made, equal to the Work: And therefore, tho' he had but one only proper, begotten Son, yet him he gave! Matchless Love! and on both Sides, truly Divine! 3. The prime and leading Dury of the Gospel, viz. Faith in him. That whosoever believeth, &c.

4. The great Salvation itself, expressed both negatively, should not perish, and positively, but have Everlasting Life. — But, among many other obvious Things, I shall only, at present, add, these few Thoughts.

1. That, in the Order of Nature, God's Love of the World preceded, not only this giving his Son, but the Purpose of it. — 2. That Christ was neither the Cause, nor the Foundation, as the Schools speak, of this Love, but the Consequent, or the Fruit, and Effect of it. God loved first, so loved, and then gave his Son: Or, so loved that he gave him. —

3. Tho' Christ is the only meritorious Cause of the Salvation of those, that were given him of the Father; Jo. 6. 37—40. Ch. x. vers. 11, 15, 17, 28. Mat. xx. 28. 1 Pet. i. 18—21. Ch. ii. 24, &c. &c. yet he was no Way, the Cause of their Election
Eleotion to it. — That was absolutely, and in every Respect free, Rom. ix. 11. Eph. i. 4—12. 2 Tim. i. 9, &c. &c. — 4. That, in the Order of Nature, or of Things, Christ was not the Father's first Eleet. — He first, so loved his People, as to choose them: And then, in Consequence of this, (and that he might save them, in a Way becoming himself, secure the Honour of his Law and Government, and display his own Perfections, and particularly, his Wisdom, Love, Grace, Holiness, Justice and Truth, to the uttermost, &c.) he chose his own Son, to be the Mediator between him and them, and redeem them to God by his Blood. Rev. v. 9. Herein is Love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the Propitiation for our Sins. 1 Jo. iv. 10. Rom. v. vers. 6, 8, 10. 1 Pet. i. 19, 20, &c. In all which Passages, The Love of God, towards his People, is not only spoken of as preceding the Mission of Christ, but as, in a Sense, the Cause of it. — And, 5. That the supreme and ultimate End of all the Divine Counsels, concerning the Redemption of Believers through Christ, was not the Glory of the second Person, as such; and much less, of that created, supra-angelical Spirit, which our learned Author says was his pre-existent Soul, and will have to be "properly the Son of God;" nor of his whole human Nature; no, nor of the Messiah, in his whole complex Person, and as such: But, the Eternal Glory of God essentially considered, i. e. of the whole Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, (each of whom, has a distinct Part ascribed to him, agreeable to the Order of his Subsistence, in the Deity, his personal Property, and the Nature of the Work itself;) and the essential Perfections of the Godhead, just now named, which are common to them all. — Thus, the Father is, in a peculiar Manner, said to have chosen his People, to have given them to the Messiah, to have laid their
their Sins upon him, to have demanded, and accepted, 
his meritorious Sacrifice: &c: — The second Person, 
when manifested in the Flesh, is said to have executed 
the Offices of the Prophet, the Priest, and the King, 
of his Church, to have brought in everlasting Righteousness, been made Sin, and a Curse for us; &c: 
—And the Holy Ghost, not only to convince us of Sin, 
to enlighten, lead, sanctify, quicken and comfort his 
People, &c. but to have been the chief Conductor of 
Christ, as Man, during his Humiliation, &c. In all 
these were, and are, the personal Glories of each, 
in a most astonishing Manner displayed! and shall be 
so to all Eternity. — I freely grant, there was a 
peculiar Honour due to the Person of the Messiah, 
and as such, as the Reward of his Humiliation, &c. 
and I desire to rejoice in it with all my Heart, 
That, after his Expiation, God hath highly exalted 
him, and given him, in his whole Person, a Name 
above every Name: But, all this is no Way inconsistent with the Proposition I am now illustrating; since, all his Glory, some Way redounds, to the 
Honour of all, and every one of, the ever blessed 
Three. 

There are many other Passages, wherein Christ is 
styled the own, or the begotten, or the only begotten 
Son, with several Circumstances, which strongly 
confirm the Catholic Doctrine, against all Innovations: But these, I conceive, may suffice at present, 
especially since our Argument will gather both 
Evidence, and Strength, in our Progress; tho' we 
may safely venture our whole Cause upon this single 
Clafs.

I would desire the Reader, only to remember 
what we have so often hinted. i. That, in every 
other imaginable Sense of the Word Son, many 
have been, are, or may be, styled Sons of God; except the true and only proper Sense, even a Son by 
Generation: — Christ is not, cannot be, called the
only begotten Son of God, in any of the former Senses: — None but he can be the Son, in the latter Sense: — Therefore, as no other is his Son by Generation, the second Person most certainly is.

2. That no Manner of Creation, whether of Souls or Bodies, be it ever so peculiar, can be a Foundation, for calling any one the proper, begotten, only begotten Son of God, with either Propriety or Truth. — For, how peculiar soever any Creation may be, it is still but a Creation; and nothing more: But, no sort of Creation, is Generation. — Well then, permit me to argue the Case a little, (1.) This Title, the Son, the only begotten Son, was often, if not always, taken, by the Jews, to signify his being equal with God, tho' as a Son distinct from him: And, Would not Christ then have set them Right, if it had not?

(2.) This is the highest Title our Lord ever assumed; or that, in their Sense, he could assume, or any other give him: And did he always, and everywhere, when he used it, conceal his Divinity? — (3.) Even when he said to Philip, be that hath seen me, hath seen the Father; Jo. xiv. 9. he doth not call himself the Father; but, tho' a Son, and because he was so, one in Essence with him.— (4.) What End could it have answered, to be so often, so emphatically, calling himself the Son, the only begotten; (unles it was to lead his Disciples, thro' all Ages, into most dangerous Errors;) if he was not really so, as his Words were then, and ever since, understood by the Catholic Church? — (5.) Can we believe, that Christ would have left the World in such a Mistake, when he might so easily have rectified the Matter? — In fine, They that can think so of him, may even think any Thing! as, Alas! we see they do.

IV. Tho' those in which the Titles, the Christ, and the Son of God, come together. Of these there are several;
several; but there are two, upon many Accounts, very remarkable, which must, for that Reason, be a little considered, when I have first mentioned some others.

Our Saviour having, at his first Interview with Nathaniel, in answer to his Question, acquainted him, that he knew Things absent as well as present, at a Distance as well as near; that Israel indeed, gathering what he was from what he had heard; as, by Divine Inspiration, cried out, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel, i.e. the promised Messiah, or long expected King of the Jews; for these three last, were very nearly, if not wholly, of the same Signification. — The plain Meaning is, Thou art the Son of God, who wait to become Man, to be our Deliverer, and Saviour, Immanuel, God in our Nature, Jo. ix. 6. comp. with Ch. vii. 14. and our God, Jehovah for whom we have waited, Ch. xxv. 9. &c.—We have considered the Devil's Testimony, Luke iv. 41. already. — Martha's Creed, Jo. xi. 27. is not to be forgot. Thou art the Christ the Son of God, which should come into the World, (i.e. Thou art the promised Messiah, even the Son of God, whose Appearance in our Nature has been so long promised, and so earnestly expected,) is so much the same with the two following, that we pass it.

When many of his Disciples went back, as not believing, or not relishing his Doctrine, tho' he had explained it, Jo. vi. 66. and he had said unto the Twelve, to engage them to a more full, explicit, and open Confession of him, Will ye also go away? ver. 67. Peter answered in the Name of them all, We believe, and are sure, ευνομαζοντες οτι ουδεμια θρησκευμαν, we know, that thou art, εξ Θεου του ζωντος, the, or That Christ, ουδεμια, the, or That Son, του Θεου του ζωντος, of the living God. — The Repetition of the Article, four Times, before
before four Words immediately following each other, is pretty rare; and renders the Passage both very remarkable, and very emphatic. q. d. Thou art that Son, of that God, who is, the only true and living God, and who declared, by a Voice from Heaven, that thou art the Messiah, the Saviour promised to our Fathers. Or, the Sense, I conceive, amounts to this, Thou art The one. The only begotten, and therefore, The coessential Son, of the one only living, and therefore true God, who wait to be also the Virgin's Son, and so God with us, God in our Nature: And this we firmly believe concerning Thee.

This very Confession, in the very same Words, is repeated, by the very same Mouth, as their joint Creed, on another memorable Occasion; when our Lord himself put the Question to them, But whom say ye that I am? Mat. xvi. ver. 15, 16. — And now, Can any one, after this, surmise, that they knew not their own Meaning? — Their ever blessed Master was much pleased with this Answer, and highly approved of it, declaring, at the same Time, that it was not by their own Sagacity, or Industry, or any other natural or human Means, but by immediate Divine Revelation, that they came to the Knowledge of this great, and fundamental Truth. For Flesh and Blood hath not revealed it unto thee, says our Lord, but my Father which is in Heaven. ver. 17. — And, Did they not then indeed know what they believed? and professed too! — Would Christ have so publicly, testified his Satisfaction with them, if they had not? — The Words of themselves are easy, and plain, and such as were familiar to them; and did they not then understand them? — Their Confession, was clear, and full, but short; and had they, no Right Apprehension of the first, and most obvious, Sense of it? Or, was there any need of superfluous Words in it?
It? — If this is Life Eternal to know the Father to be the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent; Jo. xvii. 3. it is plain, they had this Knowledge; and consequently also, Eternal Life. — Here then, they professed, That the Father of Christ was the Living God: That he had a Son: That their Master was He: And, That he was not only his Son, but his Son made Flesh, the Christ. — He was therefore his Son, before he was the Christ, and independently of his being so. — Whence 'tis self-evident, That his Sonship did not consist in his being the Messiah; or, was not founded upon it: And consequently, That he was not called the Son of God, because he was the Christ: And therefore, that these Titles are not synonymous; but that the former is a Title of Nature, necessarily implying his Divinity, and the other a Title of Office. Q. E. D.

I think I may also say, That this Confession is a compound Proposition, which is equivalent to, or made up of, two; Thou art the Christ, Thou art the Son of the living God. Nathanael's Salutation, Jo. i. 49. makes this evident, Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel; if these two Titles are not of the very same Signification? — The only Difference, between this Confession, and that of the Apostles are, Nathanael inverts the Order of the Propositions, and uses the Title, the King of Israel instead of the Christ, which are confessed to be, in their Sense at least, perfectly synonymous; and therefore, do hardly alter the Case. — Well then, taking both their Confessions for compound Propositions, I humbly conceive, they are much in the Nature of Enthymemes; and, if we thus consider them, the plain Sense of them will readily appear. — Nathanael reflecting upon our Lord's Words (Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the Fig Tree, I saw thee, Jo. i. 48. and there-
therefore saw what no other could see; and what could not be seen, in the Place where he had been; without some miraculous and divine Power;) gathered who, and what, he was; and, being also under the Impulse of the Spirit of God, proclaimed aloud, Thou art the Son of God: And therefore, seeing Thou art come into the World, and hast manifested thyself in the Flesh, I know Thou art the King of Israel, i. e. the promised Messiah. — On the other Hand, the Confession of the Disciples, and Martha, may run thus, We believe, and are sure, from thy Works, thy Doctrine, and the Fulfilment of all the Prophecies in thee, which relate to the Messiah, &c. that thou art, in very Deed, the Christ; and consequently, That thou art the Son of God, which should come into the World. — Whence 'tis evident, That, tho' these two Titles do both denote the Person of the Messiah, yet they are far from being perfectly synonymous, or having the very same Signification. — It is therefore clear as the Sun, that there are two Ideas, in all these Confessions, That he was the Christ; and therefore, the Son: Or, not only the Christ; but also the Son: Or, because he the Son was now made Flesh, 'twas certain he was the Son of God, which should come into the World; and therefore, the Christ.

Roel, Dr. Ridgley, and others, who agree in this, "that Christ's Mediatorship explains his Sonship, " and that he is Son as Christ or Mediator," would fain overlook this Difficulty. They do not well know what to say to it. Many Texts they bring, wherein the Mediator is, as such, called the Son; and where this Title denotes the Mediator; all which we freely grant: But, they bring none, can bring none, which say he is not an eternal and coessential Son; was not a Son, in the Order of Nature, antecedently to his Designation to that Office; or that he might not have been called the Son, had he never
never undertaken, or sustained it: And therefore, bring not any one Passage, offer not any one Thought, no nor Syllable, that comes home to the Point. — They do not much care to meddle with the Adnouns, own, proper, begotten, only begotten: And avoid considering these Tautologies. &c. &c.—

But,

Our worthy Author, who will have it, “that " Christ’s created, but pre-existent, human Soul is " properly the Son of God,” tries to get over this Difficulty another Way. He alleged p. 20, 21, &c. “That this Name Son of God originally denotes " the Glory and Excellency of the Person of Christ,” Indeed it always does this, in the true Sense of these Words. “but it includes also a Designation " to his Office, viz. that glorious Person — or- " dained to be the Saviour of Men.” But these are not the same! “Yet sometimes it is used, with a " special Regard to the Excellency of his Person, and " sometimes to his Office,” Ans. Tho’ this Name may sometimes be used to signify the whole Person of the Mediator, as such, and in the Execution of his Office also; yet his Divinity, which is always the primary Idea presupposed to, or implied in it, is, one would think, the chief Excellency of his Person: And, whether Men will think it or not, it is indeed infinitely above all his other Excellencies. — " It may seem to have some special Regard to the " Excellency of his Person, where it is joined by " Way of Exposition to the Word Messiah or " Christ, as a further Description of the Person " who sustained that Office; as in these Scriptures " Mat. xxvi. 63. Ch. xvi. 16. Jo. xi. 27. Which " Expressions mean thus much, Thou art the " Christ or Messiah, that glorious Person of peculiar " Relation to God who was ordained to this " Office. p. 21.” —— This Paragraph I have given without any Alteration, excepting only that
I have not given the Words of these Texts, at large; and thus reply.

1. The Excellency of his Person and his Office are, in Reality, two quite distinct, and wholly different Things; and, taking them as such, it was no Tautology to say, Thou art the Christ, the Son of God: Yea, there can be no true and saving Faith in him, without the Knowledge and Belief of them both; even That he is the proper, the only begotten, Son of God, now made Flesh, in Order to the Execution of the Office of our Redeemer.—But, if we take them, to be synonymous, as the learned Roel and Dr. Ridgley do, they make as poor a Tautology, as if one should thus address his Majesty King George, Thou art the King of Great Britain, Thou art the King of England and Scotland: Whereas, if we take this Title, the Son of God, in our worthy Author's Sense, who will have it, That it was "his pre-existent human Soul, that was properly "the Son of God," the Confession is not only very imperfect, but a very dangerous Error; not to add, That this created Soul, how excellent forer, could not possibly be capable of this Undertaking, which, tho' not indeed absolutely unworthy of the coessential, and therefore eternal, Son of God, was yet infinitely above any Creature.—2. How glorious forer any Person is suppos'd to be, and in whatever near and pecu- liar Relation he may stand to God, no Person called his Son, and considered purely as such, or with Respect to his Existence, can stand in any Relation to him, but either that of a proper, begotten, and therefore coessential Son, or of a mere Creature, the Work of his Hands.—Our learned Author, with much Zeal, pleads, That the Son of God, and as such, is only a glorious Creature sustaining the Offices of the Messiah. Upon which, I would ask, (i.) What then becomes of "the Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity?" — (2.) How, and with what
Truth, could the Messiah be, so frequently, so emphatically, stiled, God, Jehovah, the Lord God, the Lord our God, &c. as we have seen he is, both in the Old and New Testament? And, to wave several other Questions, — (3.) Wherein does this Notion differ from pure Arianism? ————

3. Whereas he says, that "this Name Son of God" is joined by Way of Exposition to the Word "Messiah or Christ," I would have the Reader to remember, that, in the three Texts quoted, the high Priest, Peter, and Martha, were the Speakers: And, Did they then explain the Word Messiah or Christ, of which, we are sure, they had some Notion, by another, of which they seem to have had none? Our Author durst not, as we have heard, venture to say, that even "Peter had, at "this Time, arrived at this his compleat Idea of his "glorious pre-existent human Soul;" and if so, we have little Reason to think, that the high Priest, and much less, that Martha had: And is it then to be imagined, that either of them would use a Name, which they did not at all understand, to expound another which, in some Measure at least, they did? ——— 4. When he talks "of a further Description of the Person of the Messiah," he seems to think, That the Person of the Messiah might be described, without taking any Notice of his Divinity; which is a very great, and obvious Mistake, and a direct Contradiction to himself: Or, That his Humanity is the first, and principal Idea in his Person; which, tho' it seems to run thro' the whole of this Performance, is, in Reality, to say the very least, to invert both the Nature and Order of Things. ———— Proceed we then to,

V. Those in which our Lord is charged with Blasphemy, in making himself equal with God, &c. for saying with some apparent Solemnity and Authority:
My Father Worketh hitherto, and I Work, &c. &c. and for supporting, and vindicating, his own Words.

The Texts are, Jo. v. 17, 18, &c. Ch. viii. ver. 54 and 56—59. Ch. x. 29—39. Ch. xix. 7. Mat. xxvi. 63—65. compared with Mark xiv. 61—64. — This last he hath tried to answer, p. 9, 10, and we have replied to it above. Of the first compared with the third he says, "they afford perhaps the most important Objection against his " Sense of the Name Son of God," p. 52. and therefore, tho' we have met with it already, he has brought it up twice more; has spent almost twelve Pages upon it; viz. 39, 40, and 52—63. and turns himself every Way to get rid of it! — We shall first remove what he has offered, by perplexing and perverting these Texts, to ward off the Blow; (these being the Places I formerly waved,) and then explain, illustrate, and confirm them in Order.

He begins, p. 39. "Jo. v. 18, 19. When the " Jews had made a strange Inference, and charged " Christ with making himself equal to God, because " he called God his Father, he answered, Verily, " verily I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of " himself, but what he seeth the Father do, &c. " This is not an Expression which represents the " Son as the true and eternal God," It does not indeed represent him, as the Father: Nor did our Lord intend so to represent himself. — — " or that grants " their Inference; for it is plain that this Expression " represents him under a Degree of Impotence and " Dependance, that he could do nothing of himself. Anf. 1. The ever blessed Three, in all their Works without themselves, do all concur as the One joint Cause, or, if you will, as the joint Causes of them: But each of them, as we have heard, according to the
the Order of their Subsistence and Working; or the Part each of them act in our Redemption.— 2. The Son, i. e. the second Person, and as such, is not a separate Being, or divided, from the Father; and therefore, neither of the Two, in any Thing they do, which relates to the Creatures, ever do, will, or, with the utmost Reverence be it spoken, can, act without the other: But, the Father, who is the First in Order, works by the Son, and the Son with, or as some say from, the Father; so that the very same Work, is the Work of, or is wrought by, them both, as one joint Cause.— 3. In a Word, in all of them, they naturally, consent, concur, and cooperate: And consequentially, our Lord's Words do not "contradict their, and our Inference, and deny "his Equality with God," but "rather allow and "confirm it." — For, If he indeed, can do what he sees the Father do, I humbly conceive, 'tis undeniable, he is Omnipotent: And consequently, equal with him; which is the very Inference they, and we also, draw from his Words, ver. 17. "The Sense of this Expression may be learned "from Jo. viii. 38, and 44. I speak that which I "have seen with my Father, and you do that which "ye have seen with your Father. — Ye are of "your Father the Devil, &c." — Is it so? 'Tis the first Time I ever heard so much; or, I am apt to think, any other Person ever did! And, Is the Sense of Christ's speaking what he had seen with his Father, to be indeed learned from their doing, that which they had seen with their Father, i. e. the Devil! God forbid. — I love our worthy Author's Memory too well, to say any more of such an odious Comparison, or Similitude.— But, How does he attempt to prove this? "Now 'tis plain that the "Jews had never seen the Devil do these Things "which they did, &c." —— And, If we are to talk
talk at this odd Rate, I do not know but I may add, And 'tis as plain, That Christ had never seen his Father turn Water into Wine, Ch. ii. 9. heal the Nobleman's Son, Ch. iv. ver. 50, or say to an impotent Man, Rise, take up thy Bed and Walk. Ch. v. 8. But, "And so also, that Christ doth all, "by God's Influence and Direction, is the plain Meaning of Christ's speaking or doing what he has seen with his Father." Anf. 1. If these Words are intelligible, they want sadly to be explained. 2. This clearly contradicts several other of his Sayings. 3. Is Christ the Efficient Cause of what he is said to do, or not? &c. — So zealous is he, that he goes on "Nor will the following Words destroy this Interpretation, Whatsoever Things the Father doth, "these also doth the Son likewise." Will they not? Then no Words can! — For, If they are true, the Son doth the very same Works, and all and every one of them also, ὅμοιως, pariter, similiter, in like Manner, equally, not less than he, or together and conjunctly with him. — "that is, whatsoever Things the Father contrives and appoints, the Son executes and performs as commissioned by the Father; or the Son performs them by the Father's Influence." p. 39, 40. Strange Words! You have every Syllable of them. — Is this then all, that the Father doth, in the Works of Creation and Providence? even to contrive and appoint them, and commission the Son to perform them! If so, I desire the Reader to turn to what I have offered upon this Head, p. 101, 105. &c. and then I answer, — 1. Then the Father can hardly, with either Propriety or Truth, be said to be the Efficient Cause of any one of them! or, in our Lord's own Words, be said to work them! — 2. Then the Son is, in strictness, yea in Truth, the only Efficient, or Worker, of every one of them! Then, — 3. He is, surely,
surely, Omnipotent; and consequently, a coessential Son: For He, who works all the Works of Creation and Providence, is the One only, the living and true God; tho’ not the Father, but the Son. Gen. i. 1, 3 and 31. compared with Jo. i. 1—3. — Col. i. 12—17. Ps. xcv. 1—7. compared with Heb. iii. 7—11. — Ps. c. 3. Ps. cii. 24—27. compared with Heb. i. 10—12. &c. &c. — As to the Expression, “the Son performs them by the Father’s Influence,” it, 1. Needs sadly to be explained. — 2. Whatever be meant by it, it no Way agrees with the former, but rather directly contradicts it: ’Tis evident, they cannot possibly be both true. For, 3. If the Son executes and performs them as commissioned, so far as he actually executes and performs them, he does it, not only as the next and immediate Cause, but does it also by his own Power, &c.

“Then it proceeds ver. 20. The Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all Things that himself doth,” p. 40. Whence, I humbly conceive, he is a coessential Son: Because, no Person of an inferior Nature, is, or can be made, capable of seeing and knowing all Things that the Father doth, and he will shew him greater Works than these, that ye may marvel.” i.e. He will with, and by, me, as his coessential Son, work yet greater Works, than curing the impotent Man, which will more evidently, and fully, convince you, that I had a Right to say what I said; and that I am, his own Son, and as such, indeed equal with him: — Or, he will enable me, as the Son of Man, to work yet greater Miracles, to convince you that I am the Messiah; and consequently, tho’ made of a Woman, and a Man of Sorrows, and acquainted with Grief, yet He who was to be called, the mighty God? — This, I say, must be the Sense; because, if we take the Words literally, they were not true. The
The Father never shewed him these, nor the greater Works, i.e. never did any of them before him, nor shew'd him how to do them. — "Hence it " follows, that the Father had not then shown to the " Son these greater Works," All that follows is, That our Lord had not yet had Opportunity, or had not yet thought Good, to do them; and therefore, the Father, who never wrought any such Thing without him, but always with him, and by him, had not hitherto, but would, at all proper Seasons, do them with him. " or given him Commission and " Power for the Performance of them," p. 40. Anf. 1. This is no Exposition of the former Words. — 2. I never heard of any Commission Christ had, but one; which was to do every Thing, which the faithful Execution and full Success of his Mediatorial Office required. — 3. He had all Power in himself, as God the Son, who made and upholds all Things that were made: Nor could he, possibly, be any how, upon any Account, or in any Degree, deprived of it: And — 4. The Father had given all Things, before this, into his Hand, Jo. iii. 35. as the Messiah: And consequently, Power to do these greater Works, when fit Opportunities should offer, without any either new Commission or Power, &c. "But this can never be " said concerning the Divine Nature of Christ, " which can receive and learn nothing new." The old uncouth Words! Anf. in short, 1. Tho' the Divine Nature is not, in any of the ever blessed Three, capable of any either Increase or Decrease: Yet the Second in Order might, and did, condescend to accept of an Office, for the mutual Glory of them all, and as such, act as a Delegate and Inferior. — 2. Tho' it is no where said, in Scripture, that the second Person, or the Son of God, as such, did, even in his lowest Condescension, ever either receive or learn any Thing New: Yet, as neither of them could act, (ad extra, as the School Phrase is,)
without the other; and, as the Second had, according to a Covenant between them, condescended to accept of a Commission from him, to act under, and for him, as a Deputy, he might, in the Execution of his Office, (especially having assumed another, and consequently an infinitely inferior, Nature) insist, as we have formerly hinted, upon the Fulfilment of the Promises made to him, and that the Father would, on all proper Occasions, concur with him, &c.

— And, 3. I do not know, but it may be as proper, to say, That the Divine Nature receives and learns, as that it shows or teaches.

Thus you have had almost every Word of these four Paragraphs, with a direct Answerer to them: And, that I am right, will, I conceive, appear from his own Words, in the very next Lines! "And tho' there are some Expressions in that Paragraph of Scripture down to the 30th Verse." — Ay, and in several of the following Verses also. "which seem superior to the Character of any mere Creature,"—Seem! Why, they are are absolutely superior: Because, he is plain, What Thing soever be (the Father) doth, these also (all and every one of them) doth the Son likewise, i. e. in like Manner and together with him, &c. "and which would have been hardly applied to Christ the Man, if not "united to Godhead;" — Were I answering any other, I would try to set these, and such like, suspicious Words, once, in the true Light. But, —

Our Lord himself is there the Speaker; and is answering a Charge, That be made himself equal with God: A very heinous one, the most heinous possible, if not true! — And, if asserting, That what Thing soever be (the Father) doth, these also doth the Son likewise, &c. &c. does not prove that he indeed made himself equal with God, I may defy the World to tell me, how he could have done it, if he had not directly said, I am equal with
with God, or express'd himself as the Apostle has, Phil. ii. 6. except he had, in so many Words, called himself the Father: And nothing less, it seems, would convince some People, That he was the true God, or equal with him! "yet " Christ considered as the Son of God throughout " that Paragraph, is represented as dependent on " the Father for all, and receiving all from the " Father," p. 4. Anf. 1. I cannot see one Syllable, in all those Verses, which speaks of his being " dependent on the Father for all;" no, nor any Thing like it, in his Sense of the Word dependent. — 2. Our Lord does not there speak of himself merely, as the Son of God; but, in several Verses at least, as the Son of God, who had condescended to become our near Kinsman, and act as the Father’s Delegate, and our Redeemer: And therefore, he might, in the same Discourse, speak of himself as equal with God, when considered purely as his coessential Son; and yet, as infinitely inferior to him, when considered merely as Man; and, in some Sense, as receiving many Things, (his Commission, Authority, Assistance, and Success,) as the Father’s Deputy. " which is hardly consistent with the Idea " of supreme Godhead," Ambiguous, suspicious Words! " if that were included in Sonship." Anf. 1. If, by Godhead, he means Essence, Nature, or Sub-" stance; then, if the second Person is the own Son, the only begotten, of the Father; and if these Words are true; he is certainly coessential with him: And the one supreme Godhead is in the Father, as a Father; and in the Son, as a Son. — 2. If, by the Idea of supreme Godhead, he means, the Idea of Paternity, or (if I must use the Word) Fathership, as he should mean from the Term Sonship, (if we have not here some poor Quibbles,) we Anf. — The Son never fpake of himself as the Father; nor did he ever assume to himself the Idea, or any of the Prerogatives, of
the Father, as such; nor did any other ever apply any of them to him, and much less call him, the Father. — And, 3. To receive any Thing, and much more all Things, from the Father, is not at all consistent with the Idea of the first Person, even the Father, who neither ever could, did, nor can, receive any Thing but Praise, Glory, and Service, from any other. But, 4. Our good Fathers, with the Catholic Church, would have thought it no Solecism to say, That the Son, i. e. the second Person, received Power, Wisdom, and all Things, together with his Nature or Essence, from the Father: And, I'll venture to say, That this is so far from being inconsistent with his being a coessential Son, that it plainly supposes and implies that he is so.

"Wheresoever Christ calls God his Father, he "himself stands under the special Character of a "Son." Even in this, as we have several Times hinted, there is one or more Equivocations. Christ is, properly, both the Son of God, and properly also, the Son of Man: And the Question is not, Whether this Title, the Son, when given to him, but whether the Title the Son of God, especially when the Adverbs, own, only begotten, are added to it, does not always, and necessarily, presuppose, imply, or denote, his coessential Sonship? And neither he, nor any one else, has, or ever can, give any one Instance, or Text, where it does not. "Now John v. 30. where he says, I can of myself "do nothing, I seek not mine own Will, but the "Will of the Father which hath sent me. — This "does not found like the Language of God- "head, &c." p. 40, 41. Tho' I had these Words up before; we again answer, 1. Language of God- "head sounds very Uncouth. 2. This is not the Language of the first Person, but of the Second. "3. 'Tis not the Language of the second Person, and
and purely as such; but, as having condescended to act in an inferior Capacity, and for that End, to take unto himself a true Body and a reasonable Soul: And therefore, this Language was very suitable to his Character. 4. As whatever the Father doth, he doth with, and by, the Son, i.e. the second Person, and never without him: So the second Person, and as such, does whatever the Father doth, not as a separate Being, but as one with him. And therefore, I may venture to say, 5. That whatever the Son, i.e. the second Person, and as such, does, he "does it of himself, and by his own Will," as well as the first Person, &c. —— But,

So very zealous is he to pervert this Text, which he says, "affords perhaps the most important Objection against his Sense of the Name," Son of God, that tho' we have had it twice already, he brings it up the third Time, p. 52. and turns himself every Way to obscure, evade, or wrest, it and a parallel Passage, from us; from thence to p. 63. And, to observe it once for all, uses the same uncouth, improper, ambiguous Expressions, &c. here, as almost every where else; and, by trying to "make it clearer," p. 53. does only the more pervert it, and intangle himself.

He gives our Objection thus, "If the Title "Son of God did not signify true Godhead, why did "the Jews charge Christ with Blasphemy, and say, "that he made himself equal with God, and seek "to kill him, because he said, God was his Father." "p. 52. Our Lord's Words were, My Father Worketh hitherto, and I Work, which are much more emphatic, than as he has given them.—

"And why do they charge him again with Blasphemy, when he said, I am the Son of God? "Jo. x. 33. because that thou being a Man, makes "thysel$ God." p. 53. The Words upon which they founded
founded this Charge were, *I and my, or* the, Father are one. see vers. 30, 31. "How could this be, if
" the Name *Son of God* did not signify Godhead?"
i.e. If this Title did not denote a *coessential Son*
To which he replies thus.

Answer 1. It is possible that some learned Men
" among them might have a confused Notice.
" from the Prophecies of the Old Testament,
" that the *Messiah* or the *Son of God* was to have
" true and real Godhead in him, &c." p. 53. ——
Verily, this seems to be very confused. The
learned Jews, who were but tolerably acquainted
with the Old Testament, might, yea, I conceive,
could not but know, That the Word *Elohim*, is
*plural*: That, tho' *Jehovah* is *One*, yet this
Title of *Essence* is ascribed to more than *One*:
That *one* of them was anointed to be the *Messiah*:
That this *One* was brought forth, or begotten of
another, and *brought up with him*; and was there-
fore *his Son*: That *this Son* who is said to be *given*,
was to be called *the mighty God*: That, when *their
God should come, then the Eyes of the Blind should be
opened, &c. and, *That he should feed his Flock like
a Shepherd, &c.* &c. as is undeniable from the many
Texts quoted above. —— "Yet I have much
" reason to doubt, whether they did certainly know
" that the *Messiah* was to be the *true God*, for they
" were most stupidly and shamefully ignorant of
" his true Character, &c." p. 53. — As ignorant
as they were of this, they knew very well the *true
Meaning of the Title, the Son of God*: And, That
he, who called himself so, pretended to be the *Messiah*, &c. — The other Reasons of his *Doubt*
viz. their "being puzzled at that Question, Mat.
" xxii. 45. "that they cannot be supposed to have
" known more of his *Divinity* than the Disciples
" did;" p. 54. or than *Peter*;" ibid, have been very
particularly considered and confuted. — His next
Reply
Reply, which he calls the plainest, &c. we have also met with before.

"Answ. 2. 'Tis evident that the Design of the "wicked Jews in these Places was to bring the "highest Accusation against him, &c. p. 55. —

Granting this, Would he not, Should he not then, have been the more careful to have vindicated his Character, and cleared himself from those "grossest "Calumnies," if they had indeed been so? — "If "ever he spake of his Kingdom (tho' he owned his "Kingdom was not of this World) yet they in their "Malice would construe it into Sedition, &c." ibid. 

— He never called himself a King, or their King; nor could they prove, before Pilate, that he had: But, when Pilate interrogated him, upon their Accusation, Art thou the King of the Jews; our Lord's Reply, acknowledging that he was a King, but such an one as needed give him no Umbrage, satisfied the Governor. — "And so when he called "God his Father, and declared himself to be the "Son of God, they in the Fury of their false Zeal "construe it into Blasphemy; as tho' to own him-"self to be the Son of God, were to assume Equality "with God:" — This Case is neither fully nor fairly represented! — "whereas Christ shews them "plainly, that these Words did not necessarily "imply such a Sense;" I have read it most care-fully many Times; and must say, if he shews this any how, I am sure he does it not plainly: --- And 'tis clear, they did not think he had. — "And this "is sufficiently manifest by the Defence which "Christ made for himself in both those Places." —

Surely he could have done it so plainly, and, I must say, ought to have done it, some where or other at least, as to have removed all Manner, or Reason, of Doubt; which, 'tis almost self-evident, he has not done. Let us however, consider the De-
fence.

"Jo. v.
Jo. v. 17. When the Jews accused him that by "calling 'God his Father," p. 56. (i.e. with such Circumstances, and in such a peculiar Manner, as he had done to their Faces,) "he made himself equal "with God, he doth by no Means vindicate that "Sense of his Name Son of God, but rather denies "his Equality with God considered as a Son, ver. 19 "— 30." — This is News indeed! — If the Reader will look to the whole Passage, and reflect upon what I have suggested a few Pages above, we shall leave it to his own Conscience, till it comes up again; and only now ask, In what Sense could he affirm "his Equality with God," if not "con- " sidered as a Son?" — His Inference from these, in the next Words, has really nothing in it, if we remember what has been again and again suggested already, That our Lord might, in the same Discourse, plead his coessential Sonship, and yet intimate his voluntary Condescension: Or, acknowledge his personal Subordination to the Father as his Son, when defending his Co-equality with him as God. And, in Reality, since they saw he was a Man, he could not have acted his Part, if he had not.

"The other Text where our Saviour is thus accused, and defends himself, is Jo. x. 30—39. Seven of these Verses, he has given us at length: But, if the Reader will consider the other two, he will see all he has said sufficiently confuted. "In "which Portion of Scripture we may observe these "three Things.

"(1) That Christ doth neither plainly and ex- "pressly own nor deny himself here to be true "God, &c." Strange! And what then? — He never, any where, so far as we know, to the Jews, either affirmed, or denied, these very Words of himself. "for this was not a proper Time to satisfy "the Curiosity of the malicious Jews in such a sub-
"lime Doctrine, in which he had not as yet clearly and
"and fully instructed his own Disciples." Stranger still! — Ans. 1. The Question the Jews proposed, ver. 24., was not a Question of Curiosity, nor merely about his Divinity; but, How long dost thou make us to doubt: If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. To which our Lord answered presently, ver. 25. I told you, i. e. as we have proved already, the Son of God, (for tho’ he had never expressly told them that he was the Christ; he was never shy of professing himself to be the Son of God,) And, tho’ ye believed not, the Works that I do in my Father’s Name, i. e. that I do with him, and by his Commission, they bear Witness of me, that I am indeed his Son, his only begotten, and therefore, coessential Son, tho’ I have emptied myself, and taken upon me the Form of a Servant: Because, no one but a coessential Son, can do what I do, and as I do. — Whence, I gather, that he did then, as “clearly “and fully instruct them, and his own Disciples “too,” that he was the true God, as ever he did, or could do, if he had not either used these very Words, or, expressly, called himself the Father.

"Yet (2) he gives several Hints of his Godhead," Yes, verily, and more than Hints. — “or his “being one with the Father, when he says, I and “my Father are one;” — And was this but a Hint? — “and when he says, ver. 38. I do the Works of “my Father, that ye may know and believe that the “Father is in me, and I in him;” — What, and are all these but Hints too? — What could he possibly have said more, or more fully, and strongly? — “by which he secretly intimated,” — Our Lord’s Words were spoken openly and above Board, were plain and not in Parables.” — that the Man Jesus “had also a Divine Nature in him,” — How now? And is there any Divine Nature, but One? — If his own Words are true, He and the Father are, ev.
unum, ONE THING. — "and was personally united " to God," — What, and is this Scripture Language? Or, the Language of any but Sabellians, &c.? — Our Lord calls himself the Son, and the first Person the Father, plainly declaring they are two Persons: And none but the Patripaffians, &c. ever dreamt, either that these two Persons were one Person; or, that the Father was personally united to the Human Nature of Christ. — " tho' he did not think fit to preach " his own Godhead plainly at that Time." p. 57.

To pass what ought to be said on these Words; or observing, that they almost expressly contradict the preceding Lines; I want sadly to know when, or where, he ever preach'd it more plainly? Thus, for the ——— of them, I have given you every Syllable of these two Paragraphs: And desire the learned Reader to say, Whether we may not find in them somewhat very like both Sabellianism, and Nestorianism, &c.

He goes on in the next Line, " And indeed if " he had not been the true God, and in that Sense, " one with the Father," — He should have added, tho', as a coessential Son, a distinct Person from him; for the Man Jesus was not the true God. — " we " may justly suppose, that he would upon this " Occasion have denied himself to be true God, and " thus roundly renounced the Conclusion itself which " they pretended to draw from his Words," p. 57.

— Suppose! We may be sure, he would. — Would he that was meek and lowly, have suffered them to surmise, That he made himself God, without his declaring his utter Abhorrence of any such hideous Blasphemy, had he not indeed been God? and had also said, and avowed as much? " as well " as he did deny the justness of their Consequence, " from his calling himself the Son of God." p. 58.

He did not then, it seems, renounce the Conclusion itself i. e. that he was really the true God! But only
only "the JUSTNESS of their Consequence," i. e. That this followed from any Thing he had then said! So that, as Logicians are wont to say, Tho' the Conclusion was materially true, it was not formally so! Or, tho' it was true in itself, and might be otherwise proved, it did not follow from these Premisses! — But, here are several Mistakes, besides his perverting the Sense of our Lord's Words. For, — 1. He had not, at that Time, expressly, called himself the Son of God: So that this was none of his Premisses. — 2. The Words, for which they took up Stones again to stone him, ver. 31, were, I and My Father are one, ver. 30, which they took to have a very different Meaning and Tendency. — For, 3. The Sense they put upon them, or the Inference they drew from them, was (not that he made himself equal with God, but) that he made himself God, ver. 33. and therefore, had not kept up the Distinction between the two Divine Persons. — So that, 4. They seem to me, to have put much the same Sense upon them, which our Author seems to have put on them, or on others not unlike them, in many Places where he talks of "the same numerical Essence or Nature," &c. "of the Man Jesus being personally united to God," p. 57, &c. "his most intimate Union with the Godhead of the Father," p. 61, &c. &c. —— So that the more he struggles, he finds himself the more entangled! As all will find themselves, who plead for Error: The farther they wade, the deeper are they in the Mire. "I say therefore (3.) The chief Design of his Answer, was to refute the Calumny of the Jews and the Weakness of their Inference, by shewing that the Name Son of God, doth not necessarily signify one equal to God," &c. p. 58. But, whoever will read the Verses will see, that there are no such Expressions in them, as we have just now observed: And consequently, That all this
is a mere **Evasion**, and nothing to the Pur-
pose.

"Prophets or Kings, Judges or Doctors of the
"Law were called **Gods**, and **Children** or **Sons** of
"the most High, Ps. lxxxii. 6. and in other
"Places of Scripture," Anf.—1. Only Magistrates
and Judges, I humbly conceive, and that most
improperly, p. 129, &c. — 2. Not one of them
fignly was ever fo distinguished. — 3. Much less
was ever any one of them said to be **his own, his**
**begotten, his only begotten Son.** — Nor, 4. Did any
one of them ever assume this Title to himself, or
say, I am the Son of God. — Nor, 5. Did ever God
himself honour any of them with those Titles, &c.
— Nor, 6. Are they ever called **Sons of the most**
**High,** but in that poetical Passage. "because they
"came from God,** &c." — No one is ever said
to have come from God, or come forth from him, but
**his own, only begotten Son.**

"Our Lord's Argument is a **minori ad majus,**
"They who where originally in and of this World,
"unto whom the Word of God came, had the Title
"of **Gods** given them: Therefore the **Messiah** who
"was not originally of this World, but was with
"the Father, &c. may surely be called the **Son of**
"**God** without danger of Blasphemy. p. 59, 60."
No doubt, he might: Because, if he had not
been really the **Son of God,** the only begotten, and
therefore his **essential Son,** and, as such, true
God, he could not, possibly, have been the **Messiah.**
"And indeed 'tis worth our Observation here,"
— And since it is so, you shall have every Word
of it.

"Tho' the Jews built Part of their Accusation
"upon his saying, I and the Father are One," p. 60.
— These were the very Words which excited,
and enflamed, their **Fury,** and on which they
principally founded their Charge. — "**Jesus did**
"not
"not directly answer to those Words;" — What then, did he shuffle with them! "nor undertake to " vindicate or explain them;" — The direct con- 
trary is manifest! "because he might design in " those Words to intimate his Godhead or his " Oneness with God the Father:" — Might design? 
Why, if he designed any Thing at all, 'tis self- 
evident, this was actually his Design, if he did not 
intend to amuse, or impose upon them, and deceive 
them. — " Therefore he neglects and drops this " Part of the Ground of their Charge," — Could 
any Thing be more unworthy of our blessed Lord? 
— This was the chief, if not the only, Ground of 
their Charge! And could he pretend to answer it, by 
neglecting and dropping it? — If these his Words 
were true, he made himself God, tho' not the 
Father: If they were not true, himself was certainly 
a Deceiver! " and applies himself intirely to answer " their Accusation, as it was built upon his calling: " God his own Father, and himself the Son of God:" — But, this was not their Accusation at this Time, 
as any one will see who consults the Place: And 
consequently, all this is but a mere Evasion.—How- 
ever, How, or when, did he answer their Accu-
station? " And this he did because he knew that this " Name did not necessarily imply Equality with " God, and so he could boldly refute their Inference " and renounce their Charge. p. 61. — Stranger 
still! Anf. 1. There is not a Syllable of Equality 
with God, in all that Chapter. — 2. Where did he 
say, or where is it said, or whence does it appear, 
that " he knew that this Name did not necessarily " imply this Equality? — 3. Where did " he " boldly," or any how, " refute their Inference?" — And, 4. Was " neglecting and dropping this " Part of their Charge, boldly to renounce it?" &c. — The Cause of all these Mistakes, is his con-
founding the two Passages, which, as we shall see, are not only distinct, but very different.—In short, 'tis plain, as every Child may see, That he did not deny their Charge, viz. that he made himself God, which he could not have done, without directly contradicting his own most solemn Words: And then all he denied was, That he was guilty of Blasphemy, or was the Father. — Whence I infer, and shall prove it presently, "That he both vindicated and explained his own Words;" and is therefore God. — But, would one think it, he begins his next Paragraph thus,

"Yet it should be observed also, that before "Christ leaves them," — The Words, ver. 39. Therefore they sought again to take him: But he escaped out of their Hands; as well as those, Ch. viii. 59. make it plain, that they intended tumultuously to have murdered him, had he not, (which might have the more convinced them, that he was indeed God,) miraculously delivered himself, and so escaped their Fury. "He leads them to his "Godhead," — Did he so? Why then, (1.) He confirmed his own Words, ver. 30. and acknowledged their Charge, That he made himself God! This, 'tis undeniable, he did, if it was possible to do it! unless there are two Godheads. (2.) 'Tis as plain, he made himself a coessential Son: Because he speaks of himself, as the Son of the Father, quite through that Discourse! And thus, he clearly, and expressly, yields the Cause to me! For which I heartily thank him. Magna est Veritas, & prevalebit! " i.e. to his most intimate Union with God the "Father, ver. 38. and 30. p. 61." Right. 'Tis evident, yea, and undeniable, from ver. 33 and 30. That his Union with the Father, was as intimate, as the Union of a coessential Son, possibly could be.

He
He as strangely, gives up his Cause in the next Paragraph. ibid. "And indeed if we take the Word "Son of God" to signify necessarily in that Place "an Equality with the Father," As we shall shew presently, it necessarily does. "we plainly take "away the Force of our Saviour's Argument and "Defence," Why, our Saviour's Design, Ch. v. 17—47. was, evidently, either to prove, and de- fend, his Equality with him, or to shuffle and wriggle with the Jews. "we leave the Accusation "of the malicious Jews in its full Force against "him." p. 61. — Answ. (1.) If, by their Accu- sation, he means, That, he made himself equal with "God," Ch. v. 18. we believe, that it was plainly implied in his Words: And know, that our Lord was so far from thinking it an unjust Accusation, that he acknowledges it, and strenuously defends it, yea and clearly and invincibly proves it. — (2) If, by their Accusation, he means, That he violated the Sabbath, by curing the poor Man on that Day, and bidding him take up his Bed, and walk: We answer, That, by neither of these, was he to be accounted a Breaker of the Sabbath; and that the Jews could not but know, that their Accusation was most false, and malicious. — Because, They could not deny, that the Cure Christ had wrought was, all Things considered, above the Power of Nature or second Causes: — That therefore, it required Divine Power; and consequently, was really a Work of God: — That, supposing our Lord, as the blasphemous Socinians contend, to have been but a mere Man, or only a moral Instrument in the Hand of God, as the Prophets of Old were; then God him- self was indeed the Worker, and not he, who only spake a few Words, and at his Command: — That the most High would not have owned him so much, as to cure the Man, had he not approved of what he
he did and said: — That the Man's carrying his Bed shewed, evidently, to all who saw him, the Perfection of his Cure; and so, was for the Glory of God: — And, That ordinary Prophets had, as the Jews acknowledged, Authority to dispense with Rites, Ceremonies, and indeed all Circumstantial, &c. &c. (3) If, by their Accusation, he means, That "he made himself God, Ch. x. 33." we believe he did so, tho' not in their Sense; and our Author, if his Words have any Meaning that is true, has, as we have just now heard, acknowledged that he did; and, 'tis plain, that the Jews thought that he, at least designed to prove it; ver. 39. yea, and our Lord has in Fact, clearly proved it, ver. 37, 38. But, (4) If, by their Accusation, in either or both of those Passages, he means their Charge, that be blasphemed when he said what he said; we are so far from leaving that Charge, in its full Force against him, that we believe his Words were not, at all, Blasphemy, but implied several great and divine Truths; and that our Lord continued to declare, and prove, that they did so: Or, in his own Words, p. 62. "that he indeed designed to let them know that he was actually equal with God, but that he was no Blasphemer, because it was a great Truth." — But says he, "Now that he did not design this, — seems evident to me, because his Answer cannot reach this Sense;" ibid. "Tis evident he never denied this Sense, when charged with it: And we shall shew presently, that his Answer did fully reach it. —" and if strained to this Sense, 'tis very obscure "and far fetch'd:" --- Our Lord's Answer, as we shall see, is in itself, plain enough: But, our Author confounds two Passages, which are not the same, but really different, and brings them from so great a Distance, as from Ch. v. to Ch. x. and from Words spoken at a great Distance of Time too;
too: and hence their pretended Obscurity!

"It might also have been spoken in plainer Language twenty Ways," Anf. I dare not pretend to teach, or correct our Saviour: — His Language was so very plain, that the Jews never, but once, mistook the Sense; and then but in Part only: — Christ never, but once, answered as if they had mistaken it, or corrected their Mistake: — He invincibly proves, that he was equal with God: — And, it would not be easy, to speak this Sense, in much plainer, and stronger Language too, twenty Ways, &c. — "and he would doubtless have proved it by plainer Citations out of the Old Testament, which assert the Divinity of the Messiah, "&c." Anf. The Scriptures never anywhere assert such a Divinity of the Messiah, as our Author seems every where to intend: — He needed not bring any Citations to prove the Divinity of the Messiah, which seems to have been a Thing known, and acknowledged, among the Jews: — His Doctrine and Works, were to be the principal Proofs of the Messiah: — Christ gave a great many invincible Proofs, of his Divinity, as we have heard: — And, "'Tis next to impossible to assert his Equality with God, as his Son, more fully and emphatically than he has frequently done. Jo. v. 17. Ch. x. 30, &c. &c. — From all which 'tis evident, That our Lord's Design was, not only, no nor at all, "to shew the Falseness of their first Inference, ibid." but to explain, illustrate, and confirm, his own most solemn Words. — Whence

I conclude, and shall by and by demonstrate, That nothing can be more false, than to tell us, p. 63. "That the Belief of Christ to be the Son of God in some more eminent Sense than all the antient Prophets and Kings were," (tho', most certainly, he was and is so,) "i.e. to be the glorious Messiah, (as he most undoubtedly is,) "is all
"that Christ directly and plainly design'd in calling "himself the Son of God, &c.": — I'll add, That nothing can be more certain, than that, by this Title, he did directly, and plainly, yea primarily, design to reveal, proclaim, and confirm, his own coessential Sonship, or Equality with God: And that he has most strongly confirmed it also. — — But, So easily are even great Men brought to think those Things apparent, which they wish were so; especially, when they have long fancied, zealously maintained, and have even begun to dispute, that they are so! that he concludes, "Thus, I have "made it appear that the Name Son of God cannot "necessarily imply his Divine Nature, &c." ibid. But, may I not ask, Where; or How? — By what Evidences, Reasons, or Proofs? — What Nature does it then necessarily imply: For one, at least, it must? — I earnestly desire an Answer, having, I conceive, more than sufficiently proved, That he has made no such Thing appear. — Let the serious, impartial Reader judge, the Scriptures being his Guide, or Rule.

Having thus discus'd every Thing, of any the least Moment, which our learned Author has offered, to wrest those Texts from us, and turn them against their literal, plain, and obvious Sense; we now return to consider them more closely, beginning with the first.

Jo. v. 17. Our blessed Lord having, on the Sabbath Day, at the Pool of Bethesda, with a Word speaking, cured an impotent Man that had been diseased thirty eight Years, and bidden him Rise, take up his Bed, and walk; ver. i—8. the Jews quarrel with the Man for carrying his Bed on that Day; and being informed, that it was our Saviour, who had made him whole, &c. they persecuted him, and sought to slay him, for this supposed Crime: — And therefore, having, as is generally thought, brought
brought him before their Sanbedrim, and read his Indictment to him; or interrogated him, Why he did, or How he durst do, such a Thing? ver. 8—16. Our Saviour gave this direct Reply, which superabundantly justifies what he had said, or done, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. v. 17.—Words exceedingly solemn, and emphatic, if any Words ever were: And, no Doubt, pronounced, as his Way was, as by One having Authority.—In them, He proclaims his most peculiar Relation to God, i.e. the first Person, as his Father; or, That he himself was so his Son, "as no other Son, "or Sons, can have the least Pretence of Share or "Similitude:" — That, tho' the Father rested on the seventh Day, from the Work of Creation, and appointed that Day to be kept as a Day of Rest, in Remembrance of it; yet he did not absolutely cease from working, but continues, incessantly, to uphold, preserve, provide for and govern, &c. all his Creatures: —— That therefore, he never ceases to work, on the Sabbath, any more than on other Days: — And yet, that they neither did, could, nor durst, pronounce him a Breaker of the Sabbath. — But they might have, and, no doubt, had he said nothing more, would have asked, What is that to thee? Darest thou presume to say, That thou canst do, or dost, whatever he does; and therefore, mayst, or dost, also work, whenever he works? —— Yes, says our Lord, He worketh hitherto, and I work. i.e. Whatsoever he does, ad extra, I also do: And therefore, Whensoever he works, even on the Sabbath Day, I also work with him: And consequently, can no more be blamed, for doing these Works, on that Day, than He. —— That this was his Meaning, his glorious Apology, as we shall see, puts out of all Doubt.

Well, How did the Jews bear this? What Construction did they put upon these his emphatic Words?
Why, they took them as, I humbly conceive, every honest, judicious, and thoughtful Man would have done, in their plain and natural Sense; as implying, That be made himself equal with God: ver. 18. And therefore, sought the more to kill him. — A Charge, or Crime, so very heinous and satanical! had it not indeed been plainly implied in his Words, and the very Sense, our Saviour intended they should take them in; That, if he had had any Regard for the Glory of God, or the Salvation of Men, or any Concern for his own Character, &c. Yea, had he not been lost to all Sense of Truth, Modesty, Humility, &c. he would, he ought, he could not but have, even with Horror, shewn them their Mistake, and have set them Right; which he might easily have done, more than “Twenty Ways.” — He might, he should, have told them, He spake no such Words, he meant no such Thing, he detested any such hellish Thought, he abhorred every Thing so superlatively devilish, so desperately, so infinitely wicked, &c. &c. — But, Did he? — No: So far from it, that he, in a long, a Divine Apology, explain’d himself, and confirmed this Fundamental Truth, That, as the Son of God, he was, actually, equal with him; which we proceed to shew, when we have reminded the Reader of what we have often proved already. —

1. That Christ is called, and is, actually, both the Son of God, and the Son of Man; and is as truly God, as the Son of God, as he is Man, as the Son of Man. —

2. That therefore, each of these Titles are, when literally and strictly taken, Titles of Nature, and not of Office. —

3. That yet, each of them are sometimes used, in a larger Sense, to denote the complex Person of the Mediator, and as such, in the actual Execution of that Office. —

4. That therefore, this Title, the Son of God, may either signify the second Person and purely as such, or the Me-
Mediator as such: And that this Title, the Son, without any other Word annexed, may denote either the second Person and purely as such; or the Man Christ Jesus and purely as such; or the complex Person of the Mediator, as the Scope, or Circumstances, of the Passage may require. — 5. That therefore, our Lord might use this Title, the Son, in each of these three Senses, in the very same Discourse; as he actually, I conceive, did in this. — And, 6. That our Author has pitched upon some Clauses, which, by his Art, might be so perverted, as to seem to favour his Cause; but has taken no Notice of others, in the very same Verstes, which cannot, by any Art, be tortured to any such vile Purpose. — Let us then see how our Lord explains himself, and pleads, and confirms his Equality with God, i.e. the Father. He answered their Charge, thus,

Verily, Verily I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, ver. 19. but what heeth the Father do: — The plain, the full, Meaning of which is, q. d. Tho' I do not deny the Sense you put upon my Words, because it is strictly true; yet, I would have you remember, I am not the Father, who is first in Order and Operation, but the Son: And therefore, tho' I said He worketh hitherto, and I work, I did not say, nor mean, that I wrought first, or was the first; and much less, as divided from him, or without his Co-operation and Concurrence: But, that I wrought with him, and from him; so that, we work the very same Works, as One joint Cause, or, if you will, as two undivided and inseperable Causes, but each according to the Order of his Subsistence; He as the first, and I as the second, no one of us ever working without the other. — And that this is indeed the only true Sense, is plain from the next Clause of that very Verse, For what Thing soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise. — What Thing
Thing soever, ad extra, i. e. relating to the Creatures, in Heaven or Earth; and whatsoever, without Exception, the Thing be, whether according to, besides, above, or contrary to, the Power or established Course, or Laws, of Nature,—the Father doth, whether in the Kingdom of Nature or Grace,—these also doth the Son likewise, all of them, with the same Ease, Power, and Authority: So that the Operation of the Father and the Son, is really undivided, and their Works the same. And, as he never works without the Son, so neither doth, nor will, nor can, the Son do any Thing, but what the Father in him and be in the Father doth, or will, or can: And therefore, in accusing me, ye really accuse him. — Or, if we should suppose, that our Lord speaks of himself in this Apology, at least ver. 19 and 20. not strictly, and merely, as the second Person, (but as having condescended to be the Mediator, who had also assumed our Nature,) our Argument would lose nothing by it: Because, 'tis self-evident, That, in what Sense, or Capacity, soever, he could do what Thing soever the Father doth, he is most certainly equal with him in Power; and consequently, in all other essential Perfections; and therefore, in Essence also. — But, it will be said,

In the very next Verse, Our Lord is express, For the Father loveth the Son, Yes, He loves him as another self; and as his own self: Yea, and cannot but love him, who is the express Image of his Person. — "and sheweth him all Things that himself doth," p. 56. Yes. — The Father is the first in Order and Operation: And this Phrase, very naturally, denotes as much. — But, more particularly, we answer i. If these Words are spoken of him, purely as the Son of God, they intimate, I humbly conceive, That the Father does, as it were, begin, or is the first Agent, in every Work of the Blessed
Blessed Three. Or, 2. If we would talk with our Fathers, They point out that ineffable Communication as of his Essence, so also of all his Will and Purposes, &c. to the Son. — But, 3. Since he does not, in all that long Apology, file himself the Son of God, but only the Son, I rather incline to think, That our Lord here, throughout, speaks of himself as the Mediator, tho' with a very particular Respect to his Divine Nature. And then, as he condescended to receive a Commission from him, and consequently, to receive Commandments, &c. also; I see no very great Inconvenience in granting, That the Father did, on some particular Occasions, or always, some Way or other, acquaint him with his Will; or, what he would have done, together with the Place, Time, and Manner, &c. as well as the Work itself, which himself would concur in, or work with, and by him.— For, the Words themselves make it evident, That all Things, which the Father sheweth the Son, The Son himself was to do; either together with the Father, and as well as he; or, by himself, and without him. — "and he will shew him greater Works than these," Yes: And what then? "Thence I infer, that he hath not shewn all yet;" Not to trifle, I answer 1. We have proved above, that the Words are not, cannot be, taken literally. 2. The following Verses put it out of all Doubt, That the Father had shewn him, what these greater Works were; because, he certainly knew them: For, otherwise, he could not have told them of them, as every one, who can but read the Passage, must see he did. He adds, "and ver. 30. I can of myself do nothing," True: He could not, as the first Person, or without him, or as a Being separate from him, as they pretended he was. — "I seek not mine own Will, but the Will of the Father who hath sent me," Anf. (1) As his coessential Son, he did not seek his
own Will, in the first Place, or not only, or not as divers from, and yet, much less, as contrary to his: But, in seeking his Will, he sought his own, as being indeed the same with his. (2) As the Mediator, and, as such, God-man, he condescended to act in a delegated Capacity, and to become the Father's Servant; and therefore, had obliged himself to seek his Will, in Pursuance of the Covenant between them: But, seeing he knew the Father's Will, which was also indeed his own; and chose, yea delighted to do it; he really did his own Will; and that in the Prospect of the Glory that was set before him, as the Saviour of his People. Heb. x. 7.—13. Ch. xii. 2, &c. And, (3) As Man, he was not only subordinate, but infinitely, and in every Sense, inferior to him: And therefore, was not, at all, to seek his own Will, in any Case; or, only in a perfect, and absolute, Submission to his.

He concludes this, in these Words, not one of which is true, "All which Expressions sufficiently evince," Not a Syllable of them, nor altogether, evince any such Thing. — "that he did not intend to signify his own Godhead, or Equality with God, when he called himself the Son of God," Anf. 1. He did not, in all that Chapter, call himself the Son of God. And yet, 2. If he did not intend to signify this, 'tis evident, he shuffled with them. But, — 3. The coessential Son could not possibly prove his Godhead, as is evident, any other Way, but by declaring and proving, his essential Unity and Equality, with the Father. — I say as 'tis evident, except he had declared he had another Godhead; and consequently, that he was another God: And then, the Jews, might and would, have charged him, with making himself a new God, a strange God, whom their Fathers knew not; &c. and therefore, as our Arians and Socinians now do, That he made, at least, two Gods!

—How
—However, how does he prove this? “for in
his very Answer to their Accusation he represents
himself inferior to and dependant on God the
Father.” p. 56. Words very ambiguous! and therefore, in the present Case, exceedingly unfair.
To which we answer.

1. We have often observed, That Christ, God-
man, considered purely as the coessential Son of God,
was not the first but the second Person; second in
Order, and Operation; and therefore, subordinate
to the Father, as his own Son: — That, considered
as having undertaken our Redemption, he condescended
to be subject to him; yea, and become his Servant:
— And, That, merely, as the Son of Man, he
was infinitely inferior to him, and omnimodously
dependant upon him. — 2. That he might there-
fore, in this Apology, or any Discourse, prove
himself as a coessential Son, to be God equal with
the Father: And yet, relatively, subordinate to him
as his Son, oeconomically, subject to him as his
Servant, and infinitely inferior to him as Man, his
Creature. — 3. He does not, in all that Chapter,
call himself the Son of God, but only the Son, and
once the Son of Man. ver. 27. — 4. These Ex-
pressions, The Son can do nothing of himself, but
what he seeth the Father do, ver. 19. the Father
sheweth him all Things that himself doth, ver. 20.
I seek not mine own Will, but the Will of the Father
who hath sent me. ver. 30. naturally, and easily,
point out the Concurrence of the blessed Three,
in all their Works relating to the Creatures; that
the Son is the second, as in Order so in Operation;
and that as the Mediator, tho’ really equal with God,
he condescended to act as the Father’s Servant, and as
such, to seek his Will: But not at all, that he is
not a coessential Son, and, therefore, as such, equal
with him. — For, 5. In general, He doth what
Thing soever the Father doth; ver. 19.—And, 6. In
par-
particular, He quickeneth whom he will, i. e. by his own Power and Authority; ver. 21. — All Judgment is committed to him, ver. 22. which necessarily requires infinite Perfections, and therefore, presupposes his eternal, coessential Sonship; — He is to be honoured by all Men, even as they honour the Father; and therefore, he is equal with him, ver. 23. — He that believeth on him, is passed from Death unto Life; and therefore, he is God, the Author both of spiritual and eternal Life; ver. 24, 26. — And all that are in their Graves shall hear his Voice; &c. ver. 28, 29. — If these now do not invincibly prove, That the Son is God equal with the Father; and consequently, a coessential Son; 'tis absolutely impossible to prove any Thing by Words.

But, besides these, Our Lord brings other Witnesses to prove his Equality with God. — 1. John the Baptist, ver. 32—35. whose Evidence we have produced, and illustrated. — 2. The Father, ver. 36—38. whose Testimony we have also given, and vindicated. — 3. The Scriptures, ver. 39. which bear Witnesses to this great Truth, from the Beginning to the End of them, as we have heard, and may yet farther demonstrate. — And, 4. Moses, ver. 45—47. who, as we have proved, hath superabundantly testified the same Thing. What then would satisfy Men? — What would they have? — The Lord incline them to consider.

From this Time forward, we may observe, That, whenever he spake of his Divinity, i. e. spake of God as his Father, in so singular a Manner, or of himself as his own Son, &c. they always were either displeased, or cavilled, or reviled him, or in a Rage, or fought to murder him. — Thus, after he had multiplied the Loaves, Jo. vi. 1—14. a Miracle, if any ever was! when he came to make the Application, and call God his Father, and himself his Son; to tell them he was the Bread of Life, that he came
came down from Heaven, to give Life to the World, &c. ver. 32, 33, 46, (all Expressions neceffarily presupposing, or implying, his coessential Sonship;) notwithstanding the extraordinary Fondness they had just before expressed, they strove amongst themselves, ver. 52. cavilled, ver. 60. deserted him, ver. 66, &c.—In like Manner, when he seems to have again plainly enough hinted, That he was the Son of God, and, as such, God of God, Ch. vii. 28, 29. then they sought to take him, ver. 30. — But, These Things may be yet more particularly observed, in the following Chapter.

Jo. viii. 12. Our Lord having called himself the Light of the World, ver. 12. (for the Father being Light, the Son is Light of Light, as well as God of God;) the Pharisees scornfully reply, Thou bearest Record of thyself, thy Record is not true, ver. 13. — I am not alone, says Christ, but I and the Father that sent me, ver. 16. and he also bears witness of me. ver. 18. In which we may observe the Familiarity express'd, the Order of the Words, and the near and indissoluble Union between them. q. d. I am not alone in my Testimony, any more than in my Essence and Working: But, as neither of us exist, or work, without the other; or, as we are not divided in our Essence, or Working, so neither are we divided in our Testimony: (see ver. 29. Ch. xiv. 10, &c.) For the Three that bear Record in Heaven, are one, &c., unum, one Thing. — This seems to have again enraged them. ver. 20. — And, when afterward he speaks of himself, more plainly, as the Mediator, ver. 28. who would make his People free; 32. and they shamefully boasted, that they were never in Bondage, being Abraham's Seed: 33. Our Lord very expressly tells them, that they had another Original, or Father, besides Abraham; because, had they been the genuine Sons of Abraham, and like him, they would have followed his Steps, who rejoiced to see his Day;
and saw it, and was glad; ver. 56, &c. — Abraham, say they! What, Hast thou seen Abraham? Yes, says Christ. Before Abraham, γενέσθαι, was, was born, was made, existed, I am. — The Jews took his Meaning directly, as we have observed already, that he assumed to himself necessary Existence, or Eternity; and thereby made himself equal with God, or a coessential Son; and therefore, taking this to be, (in so mean a Person, as they thought, or rather would be thought to think, he was,) Blasphemy, they took up Stones to cast at him, ver. 56—59. — Or, perhaps, they put the same Sense upon these Words, which we shall see they did, upon another Expression, Ch. x. 30. — However, I shall only now add, 1. The delirious Interpretation, which Socinus gives of these Words, is really, not only beneath Contempt, but plainly contrary to their natural grammatical Construction; and would also render our Lord's Words either a poor Shuffle, or little better than Nonsense; &c. — 2. The Title, ἐγώ εἰμι, I am, plainly implies necessary Existence; is one of the Titles of the most High; Ex. iii. 14, &c. and is never, can never, be used of any, but one who is true God; &c. — Yea, 3. Could it be used of any but the true God, we can hardly think, That he, who was meek and lowly, would have so publicly, and with such Solemnity too, to the Faces of his Enemies, who seldom failed to pervert every Thing he said, assumed it to himself. — Especially, 4. Since he could not but remember, That they had lately accused him of Blasphemy, for talking in such Strains; and could not but know, that they would again be filled with Indignation; and that he, upon that Supposition, needlessly, not only stirred up Anger, but exposed himself to their Fury, &c. by using such Words. — 5. 'Tis clear, he speaks of himself, quite through that Chapter, as the Son of God now made Flesh. — 6. 'Tis evident, from their taking
taking up Stones to stone him, That they took him to have assumed to himself true and proper Divinity. And yet, 7. He did not so much as attempt to tell them, that they mistook him; or to set them right, in so important a Point!—Yea, 8. So far was he from doing this, That, by his miraculous Escape, ver. 59, for so it was, see Ch. x. 30. he confirmed the Truth, That he was indeed God; and might have confirmed them in it, That he, indeed, made himself, and as his Son too, equal with God. — And, to wave several others, 9. Had the Jews ever heard of his pre-existenc Soul, or had he now told them of it, 'tis self-evident, he might have seen Abraham, and affirmed as much without Blasphemy, &c.

Jo. x. 33. We find them charging him with Blasphemy; because he being a Man, made himself God; for saying, in so many Words, ver. 30. I and the Father are one. — This with our Lord's Reply, ver. 35, 36. being the Passage, which the Antitrinitarians, in all Ages, have pretended does either totally overthrow our Faith, That he made himself God, or equal with him; or, at least, very much weaken our Proofs of it: We shall, the more particularly, consider it; and shew that it invincibly establifhes it.

As our Lord walked in the Temple, ver. 23. the Jews, i. e. the Scribes and Pharisees, came round about him, as if they had been very sincere; and indeed much in Earnest; (tho' really with a Design to entangle, and ensnare him,) and said, How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. ver. 24. He immediately replied, I told you and ye believed not, ver. 25. Ch. viii. 25. Now, he had never, as we have proved already, told them, that he was the Christ; but only, That he was the Son, the own, the only begotten Son of God. Jo. iii. 16—18. Ch. v. 17, &c. The Works
that I do in my Father's Name, they bear Witness of me. q. d. As I told you, that I was the only begotten of the Father, the Divine Works which I do, (not as a mere Instrument, but) as indeed a real efficient working together with him, fully confirm what I say I am. — None but one, who is God, can do these Works: But, I do them: And therefore, I am God. — I do not pretend to be the Father, but only the Son: And therefore, I am a coessential Son. — The Father would not concur with me, in any Work, to confirm a Lie; and, by so doing, impose upon the World: And therefore, you may depend upon what I say. — And, tho' you believe not this, ver. 26. yet My Sheep bear my Voice; ver. 27. and consequently, believe, That I am the only begotten; that I do the Works of the Father; and that the Father worketh hitherto, and I work: And, by consequence, That I am equal with God. Ch. v. 17—19. — And, I give unto them Eternal Life, and they shall never perish, &c. ver. 28. which none but One, who is God, can say and perform! — I do not indeed promise this, as a separate Being from the Father, as the World supposeth me to be; or, as pursuing my own Glory and not his, or, as divided from his; or, as that they were not still his: For, tho' He gave me them; yet are they still in his Hand; and therefore, they shall never perish; ver. 29. because, in and for their Preservation, we jointly concur: He worketh, and I work. And, in Reality, says he, it cannot be otherwise: Neither of us can work, without the other: For, έν ἕνομον, unum sumus, We are one Thing. In which observe,

1. He speaks of himself and the Father, as two distinct Persons; as every Father and Son necessarily are. — 2. That the Verb plural ἐνομον, we are, puts this out of all Doubt. — 3. That, as he never said of himself, I AM God, for the Reasons given above, fo
so he does not here say, *I and God*, but *I and the Father*; that he might the more clearly keep up the Distinction of the Persons, even when he was most strongly to express their Unity of Essence.—4. What he affirms of them, are one Thing; *i.e.* in a Word, *I as the Son* and *He as the Father*, are as much One, as we possibly can be; or, every Way, and in every Sense, One, but that we are two personal Agents; or, as we are one in Essence, so are we in all Essential Perfections. — As his Omnipotence is *my Omnipotence*, so is *my Omnipotence* his; and so of the rest. —

5. The familiar Manner in which he speaks. — Supposing the Son to be a coëssential Son, Could he, possibly, speak more in Character, more familiarly, or more like such a Son? — But, 6. The Order of the Words, (*I and the Father*; and so it is, Ch. viii. 16, &c.) can never be enough considered. — They are joined, as the Subject of the same Proposition; he names himself first, and no Doubt with an Emphasis; he did it before his Enemies, who were ready to catch at every Word; and in Answer to their important Question! And therefore, not without a Design. — Could any Words be to them more irritating? — Was it then consistent with common Discretion, needlessly to provoke them? — Was this like one, who was meek and lowly? — Would it not, does it not, look like seeking his own Glory? — The Manner of Speaking, (which would not be suffered among Men, were not the Speaker at least equal to any of those before whom he named himself,) confirms me in it, That our Lord intended, in the most observable and emphatic Way, to proclaim his Coëssentiality with the Father. — I have often wondered, that, to the best of my Remembrance, I never heard of, or read, any One, who laid such a Stress upon this, as it well deserves! For my own Part, I have never considered it, for many Years past, but I was struck with it: And cannot help saying,
saying, That were I in any Doubt, or Doubts, about the Doctrine of the Trinity, and coessential Sonship of the second Person, this Order of these Words would, alone, forever remove them all.—

Durst any, but a coessential Son, have expressed himself in this Manner? before such a Company? &c. &c.

Well, How did the Jews bear this? — Why, they were so enraged, that, without waiting to carry him before their Sanhedrim, they took up Stones again to stone him, ver. 31. in a tumultuary Way, as they did the Proto-Martyr afterwards.—

And when our Lord most kindly expostulated with them, Many good Works have I shewn you from my Father: Which are my Credentials; and in doing which, he would not have owned me, and concurred with me, to confirm any Lie of mine; or, if I had not spoken the Truth, and for his Glory. — For which of those Works do you stone me? ver. 32. q. d. 'Tis full as reasonable to stone me for my good Works, as for any Words I have said: Because, my Works are the highest Proof, which either the Father, or I, can give of the Truth of my Words. —— When, I say, Christ had, in this tender Manner, reasoned with them; they answered him in their Fury, saying, For a good Work we stone thee not; but for Blasphemy; and because that thou being a Man makest thyself God, ver. 33. q. d. Good Works! they cannot be good Works; because, as we have told thee often, Jo. v. ver. 10 and 16. Ch. ix. ver. 14, 16, and 24. thou art not of God, but art a Sinner; yea, a Blasphemer; in that thou being but a Man, such a poor, mean, despicable Man, makest thyself God. — In which, let the Reader observe, 1. They called him a Man; and this, he did not, could not deny. —— 2. They pretend and insinuate, that he was no more but a Man, or a mere Man, and a very mean one too. — 3. They charge him therefore directly, with Blasphemy; a capital Crime! for which they were com-
commanded to stone him. Lev. xxiv. 16. — 4. They would here make good their Indictment, from his own Words, I and the Father are one, ἐν ίδίῳ ένιακώ σωματικώ, Lev. xxiv. 16. — What Man soever dare talk in this Strain, is guilty of Blasphemy: Thou hast done so, in our Presence: Therefore, Thou art guilty of Blasphemy. — Here now let these Thoughts be well remembered.

N. B. (1) The Words, on which they grounded this Charge, are not the same with those, Ch. v. 17. — Our Lord's Words, in that Passage, are, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work: Here, they are, I and the, or my, Father are one. — N. B. (2) The Sense the Jews put upon them, or the Inferences they drew from them, were not the same neither. Their Conclusion from that was, That be made himself equal with God: From this, That be made himself God. — N. B. (3) In the former Words, Christ, clearly and strongly, expresses the Distinction between the Father and himself, as being two Co-workers; and consequently, two personal Agents; without any plain, at least literal, Intimation of their Unity and Coessentiality; whence they conclude, and naturally enough, That be made himself equal with God: Whereas, in the latter, he not only expressly keeps up the Distinction between the Persons, but strongly, and very emphatically, intimates their Unity and Coessentiality; whence they infer, That be made himself God. — N. B. (4) Tho', for one, who was true Man, and not also God, to make himself equal with the Father, was really Blasphemy, as well as, for such a Person, to say, I and the Father are, ἐν ίδίῳ ένιακώ σωματικώ, one Thing: Yet, the Jews seem to have thought, that this latter Expression had more in it; and was rather more Blasphemous, upon some Account or other, than the former; and therefore, tho' they were exceedingly displeased with that, they permitted our Lord to make his Apology, they heard him out,
and suffered him to depart in Peace: But, they were so furiously enraged with him, for this, tho' his Defence was, in Reality, much the same, that they sought again to take him, &c. ver. 39. — So that, N. B. (5) They seem to have thought, That he either dropt the Distinction of the Persons altogether; or made these Words, I and the Father, to imply little more than a Distinction of Names, Characters, or Offices: And, that he really made himself the Father; or, at least, left not room enough for a personal Distinction betwixt them; and consequently, that, instead of using the Language of the Prophets, and of their Fathers, (for which, it would seem, they had still some Reverence,) he talk'd, if I may be allowed the Phrase, pretty much at least, in the Strains of the Sabellians and other Heretics. — That this was, in Fact, the Case, appears to me, from these Considerations, besides what has been offered.

This was one of the two, or three, principal Texts, on which the Heresy of Sabellius, and the Patripassians, &c. was founded: — If any Words could give any specious Pretext for such a Fancy, it cannot be denied, that these Words, I and the Father, ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ἐστι, we are one Thing, might; especially, because, 'tis evident from the Context, that Christ there reasons, as well he might, from their Unity of Power, to their Unity of Essence: — 'Tis plain, the Jews were more vehemently offended with these Words, than those, Ch. v. 17. for which, no other Reason can be imagined: — And our Saviour's Answer, puts it, I conceive, out of all Doubt. —— Well then, How did he behave? What Apology did he make? What Answer did he give?

Did he "shew them plainly, that these Words did not necessarily imply, that he assumed Equality with God;" as our worthy Author will have it?

P. 55.
p. 55. No: He did no such Thing. — Or, That he altered, or retracted, or even softened, any Thing he had said? No: Not at all. — Is there then any Thing like Evasian, or Shuffling, in our Lord’s Defence; or, did he decline to give a direct Reply to their Charge, as others have more than hinted? No. — Far be any such mean Things, from our dear Redeemer, the only begotten Son of God. — Did he then set them right, in that wherein they mistook him? Yes. — Did he give a direct Answer to the Charge? Yes. — And did he unanswerably confirm what he had said? Yes; in every Part of it, most fully. — For, as to the several Parts, or Articles, of the Indictment, which we have mentioned above, observe,

1. He allows himself to be a Man; and denies not that, in his then present Circumstances, he was a mean Man: But alludes, That several, who were but mere Men, had been, even in the Scripture, and consequently, without Blasphemy, called Gods; and therefore, so might he. — 2. He declares, That, tho’ he was a Man, and in a low and mean State also in the Eyes of the World; yet he was not a mere Man, or nothing but a Man; but, even as Man, inconceivably exalted above all other Men: And therefore reasons, from the lesser to the greater, Thus: If he, without Blasphemy, called them (Magistrates) Gods, unto whom the Word of God came, as the Scripture which cannot be broken, ver. 33. i. e. denied or found Fault with, affures us; Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, separated to be the Mediator, by whom Kings reign, &c. Pro. viii. 15. Thou blasphemest, because I said, (not that I am God, in your Sense, and as you hint, but) I am the Son of God? — Surely, He whom the Father hath sent unto the World, i. e. the Son, who was promised to be given, to be the Child born to us, may, even as such, with infinitely more Reason, and much
nuch more properly, file himself the Son of God, then they might be filed Gods. — 3. He strongly keeps up the Distinction of the Persons, I and the Father, He whom the Father hath sanctified; &c. and therein shews, that they were indeed two proper Persons, as all Sons and Fathers are. — 4. He, by so doing, rectifies their Mistake, That when he said, I and the Father are one Thing, he did not mean, That he was the Father, as they seem to me to have thought: But, tho' coessential with him, only the Son of the Father, and not the Father himself. — 5. He proves, That, as the Son of God, he was indeed, as they took him to mean, equal with him: And he does it, by the very same Argument he had used, Ch. v. 17, 19. If I do not the Works of my Father, (which require infinite Power, and which I really do with him, or as well as he,) believe me not: But, if I do them, as you cannot but see, I really do; tho' ye believe not me, believe the Works; ver. 28. and these will shew, infallibly shew, the Omnipotent Power of him, who works them; and consequently, That the Father worketh hitherto, and I work, viz. the very same Works, with him. — But, whereas they might have urged, Thou didst, in so many Words, and with much Assurance, say, I and the Father, are one Thing; He answers directly, — 6. I did so: And now I stand by it, That ye may know and believe, That the Father is in me, and I in him. ver. 38. i. e. faith the learned Mr. Clark, " That " the Divine Essence is the same in us both, (ver. 30.) " tho' there be a Distinction of Persons between us." And 'tis self-evident, That, as the Divine Essence cannot possibly be divided from itself, or the Divine Perfections, any more than the Divine Perfections can be separated from themselves, or from the Divine Essence: So, 'tis as evident, That the very same Perfections, which are in the Father and the Son,
demonstrate. That the self-same Essence is in them both; or, That they are, i.e., one Thing.

Thus have we clearly explained, and vindicated, this Context, which has been thought, by many, as well as myself, to have no small Difficulty in it, arising from the Mistake hinted above. — We have, I say, made every Thing plain, and easy, even to the meanest Capacity: Yea, and made it also appear an irrefragable Argument, for the Coessentiality of the first and second Persons of the Trinity; and therefore, of the coessential Sonship of the Second. Here the Reader will find no Wriggling, or mean Evasion; no declining any Thing, which seems to make against us; no advancing, nor supposing, any Thing precarious, or without both Reason and Proof: Yea, here he will see every Word, which could raise any Demur, or Doubt, fairly considered, and the true Sense of it fully established. —— And two Things further confirm me in the Truth; and, I verily think will fully convince every impartial Person.

1. When the Jews, upon his Trial, when they shewed their Malice to the uttermost, accused him of Blasphemy, they did not charge him with making himself God, (i.e. making himself the Father, or leaving no personal Distinction between himself and the Father;) but only, with making himself the Son of God. Jo. xix. 7. Whence it seems plain, he had convinced them, (1) That they had mistaken the Sense of his Words, Ch. x. 30.— (2) That he had asserted nothing more in that Verse, than he had done; Ch. v. 17, but only, more fully and plainly, exprest the Coessentiality of the blessed Persons. And,—(3) That he was so far from yielding, That he did not, "as a Son, assume "Equality with the Father," that he still maintained it, and proved it too, by the strongest, and most con-
convincing Argument possible; If I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not, &c.

2. This, I conceive, is rendered indubitable from their Carriage, Therefore they sought again to take him: ver. 39. viz. as a Blasphemer, for assuming Divinity to himself, which did not belong to him. And, I think also, I may add, That his miraculous Escape out of their Hands, was sufficient, not only to silence them; but confirm them in it, That he, as his own Son, thought it indeed no Robbery to be equal with God. Proceed we then to,

Jo. xix. 7. This is the last Text wherein the Jews accused him with Blasphemy. The Jews answered him, we have a Law, (the Law against Blasphemy, Lev. xxiv. 16.) and by our Law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God. — This I produce last, not only because it comes last in Order; but because it is, if I may so say, the Seal of all the rest, and confirms them so absolutely, as to leave no Room for a sober or rational Answer; yea, and hardly, for any wriggling, shuffling or evading; as will appear undeniable, if we consider,

(1) Every one, who will but read the Passages, may, yea must see, That, whenever the Jews heard him call himself the Son of God, his only begotten Son; or call God his Father, in that solemn and peculiar Manner, and with those Circumstances which he added; they always, and every where, put the same Sense upon it; and charge him with making himself equal with God, &c. and with Blasphemy, for so doing. — (2) 'Tis as undeniable, That they put the very same Sense upon this Title, in this their Charge, before Pilate: Because, 'tis self-evident, That, If they had put our Author's Sense upon it, or indeed any other Sense, their Charge
Charge would not have amounted to Blasphemy. For surely, it was not Blasphemy to say, "that his Human Soul was created before the Foundation of the World," (to pass the Inconsistency in these Words,) "tho' in a very peculiar Manner," nor to pretend to be the Son of God, i. e. the Messiah, if, by so doing, he had not, in their Opinion, made himself equal with God; no, nor to call himself his Son, in any low, or improper Sense, because others have, without Blasphemy, called themselves, or been called, his Sons, in all those Senses: And consequently, by their Law he ought not to have died.—Need I add, They would then have advanced the most criminal Charge against him, which they had any Thing like a Pretext for, &c. — And therefore, 3. 'Tis no less evident, That he is, really, So the Son of God, as to be, as such, equal with him; and therefore, a coessential Son; as will be manifest, beyond all sober or serious Contradiction, from these Considerations.

This Title, the Son of God, his only begotten, if taken in a strict and proper Sense, naturally, as is evident, denotes a coessential Son: — 'Tis undeniable, That the Jews always took it in a strict Sense; and therefore, always accused him with making himself equal with God: — 'Tis visible to every one, who can but read the Passages, That he never directly, or expressly, denied the Accusation, tho' he might easily have done it many Ways: — It can't be doubted, That it was his Duty, as the Prophet of his Church, either to have express'd himself, so plainly and fully, upon such an important Point, that his Followers might not mistake him; or, at least, to have corrected their Mistake, when he perceived they did: — A truly pious Person could not have heard such an Accusation, had it not been true, without Grief, Horror, Detestation: — He, who was meek and lowly, must have abhorred, I had almost said, infinitely
finitely abhorred the Suggestion, as most hateful, and abominable to God; and, with the utmost Care, and even Anxiety, have cleared himself of all such odious Suspicions:—Yea, a meer morally honest Man, had he been no more, must have protested against it, had it not been true, as a false, injurious, malicious Charge; and so exceedingly criminal, as to be indeed Blasphemy; and that the guilty Wretch well deserved to be put to Death:—He was now upon his Trial, before a Judge who seemed very ready to favour and release him, and very willing to put the best Construction upon any Defence he could make; and therefore, in Justice, and in Pity, to him, he ought, at least, to have offered something, if not to deny, yet to alleviate the Charge, or, one Way or other, to explain and defend himself:—

When a Prisoner at the Bar has not the Courage, so much as to deny the Indictment, no Judge, nor Jury, in the World, would think it unjust, no nor uncharitable, to find him Guilty, and proceed against him accordingly; yea, Silence in such a Case, has always, and every where, been reckon'd equivalent to a Confession, if the Prisoner is indeed compos Mentis:—If our Lord was not, really, so the Son of God, as to be equal with him, How easily might he have said, Tho' I called myself, the Son of God, I did not say, I did not mean, that I was equal with him; and therefore, I did not blaspheme; and consequently, ought not to die for what I said:—He either, as his Son, made himself equal with God, or he did not; If he did, he is indeed equal with him, because our Author confesses, He is the God of Truth; If he did not, Should he, Could he, have left such a heinous Imputation on himself, without a Reply:—His Life was then at stake, for Blasphemy, a Capital Crime, which justly exposed to Death; and therefore, to be silent, was, in Effect, to confess himself guilty; and consequently, to be Sinfully ac-
accessory to his own Death: &c. &c. — In fine, he who can think, That Christ would, or could, have been silent, under an Accusation of Blasphemy, for making himself to be the Son of God, as to be equal with him; if it was not, indeed, a great Truth; may even think, or say, any Thing of him they please, as, alas! we see many of them do, without either Fear, or Shame.

Well, How did Pilate receive this fresh Charge, as 'tis evident he took it to be? Why, we are told, be was the more afraid. ver. 8. — He was afraid, it seems, before; but he was much more so now. Afraid for what he had done! afraid to proceed! afraid to have any Thing more to say to, or do with him! — And went again into the Judgment Hall, ver. 9. that, by talking with Christ, he might inform himself farther about this New Accusation, which he had not heard of before; — and faith unto Jesus, Whence art Thou? — Not, Who art thou? Or, What hast thou done? But, Whence art thou? q. d. What is thy Original, and Generation? Art thou indeed from Heaven? Art thou, in Fact, the Son of God, and, as such, equal with him, as he perceived the Jews meant it? Or, Art thou such a Son of the God of the Jews, as we Romans believe the Sons of our Gods are? — Whence, 'tis evident, he took this to be a Title of Nature, and not of Office; as every unprejudiced Man in the World would have done. — And now, How easy would it have been, for our Lord, to have given us some Intimation of "his pre-exist ent human Soul, and its peculiar Derivation from God?" —— What a proper Opportunity was this, if the Jews had all along mistaken the Meaning of this Title, the Son of God, to have explained it; and have, for ever, wiped off the Stain of Blasphemy from himself; and prevented, forever, his People, from falling into this Error of the Jews; which, if it be an Error, is so far from being a small one, that it is, indeed, Blas-
Blasphemy? — Yea, whether we will hear it, or no; on one Side, or the other, there is really Blasphemy! If the Son, as such, is, in Fact, equal with God, as, we think, we are sure we have demonstrated, then it is plainly Blasphemy to deny it; and much more so, to oppose it, and wrest such a great Number of Texts to patronise this Opposition: — And, If the Son is not, as such, in Reality, equal with God, i. e. a coessential Son, 'tis plainly Blasphemy, to say he is; or, ascribe that Divinity to him, as such, which does not belong to him.

Well, What Reply did our Lord give to Pilate's Question? — But Jesus gave him no Answer. And therefore, as we have unanswerably proved, did, at least, tacitly allow, and, in Effect, confess, That he was the Son of God, as to be equal with him, i. e. a coessential Son. — And hence, by the Way, we may certainly learn the true Meaning, of the glorious Confession of the Centurion, and those that were with him. Mat. xxvii. 54. Truly this was the Son of God. — He had, some Space before, glorified God, saying, Certainly this was a righteous Man; Luke xxiii. 47. but having, with some others, seen and observed more of the Miracles that attended his Death; and reflected also more seriously, upon what they had heard, during his Trial; and that he had, (tho' like himself, without Ostentation!) really confessed, that he made himself the Son of God; they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God. And, if he was indeed a Righteous Man, he was truly the Son of God: Because a Righteous Man, would not have been silent, and so have, in Effect, sealed a Lie with his Blood.

Hence it was, that I called this Passage the Seal of all which has been said, upon this Class, if not of all the Proofs we have produced: Because, it confirms, and forever establishes, the coessential Sonship of Christ, beyond all that can, possibly, be soberly replied. — Our Lord died under the Impu-
ration of Blasphemy, for making himself the Son of God, and, as such, equal with him: And therefore, he did actually make himself a coessential Son, and this was a great Truth and not Blasphemy.—Or, He was accused for making himself a coequal, and therefore a coessential Son; which, would have been Blasphemy in him, to have done, had he not been indeed so: He did not so much as deny he had made himself such a Son: And therefore, we must conclude, he was really what they said he had made himself. — Yea, He did not so much as honestly explain his Words, tho' his Honour, Veracity, and Discretion, &c. yea, his Life was at Stake: And therefore, we may be sure, his Enemies did not mistake the true Meaning of them; or put any other Sense upon them, than that which, he intended they should put upon them, when he used them.

From this Text, which, all Things considered, may be said sufficiently to explain, and vindicate itself, or perhaps that it needs neither, being clear enough without them; I now, according to my Promise, offer a Demonstration or two, against all my Antagonists. I call it a Demonstration, because it is strictly so; being well assured, that every intelligent and impartial Person, will acknowledge it to be so. And,

1. I argue against Dr. Ridgley, Dr. Anderson, and all of their Mind; (as well as the learned Reel, and our worthy Author, so far as they agree with them;) who take this Title, the Son of God, to be a Title of Office and not of Nature; or, in their own Words, say, That "Christ is called the Son of God, " as Mediator, or the Messiah, &c." p. 53. and all who deny that the second Person is, as such, a Son; and consequently, That Christ is, in any Sense, a coessential Son. — Against them all, I say, we reason thus.
If not only the Jews and Pilate, but our Lord himself, took that Title, the Son of God, to be, properly and strictly speaking, a Title of Nature and not of Office; and this Title, the Christ, to be always a Title of Office and not of Nature; then is that, strictly speaking, a Title of Nature, and this a Title of Office. But they all most certainly did so: Ergo, They are so: Q. E. D. — Or thus,

Those Titles which were neither in the Opinion of the Jews, nor of Pilate, nor of Christ himself, strictly synonymous, were not strictly synonymous: But these Titles, the Son of God, and the Mediator, or the Messiah, or the Saviour, were neither in the Opinion of the Jews, nor Pilate, nor of Christ, strictly synonymous, i.e. of the same precise, but of a very different Signification: Therefore they are not strictly synonymous, nor of the same precise, but of a very different Signification. Q. E. D.

The Proposition, or the Major as it is called, is undeniable: Because, should we suppose, that the Jews erred through Malice or Prejudice, and Pilate thro' Ignorance, we are sure Our Lord himself knew, and could not be mistaken. — The Assumption or Minor, we prove per Partes, in all its Parts. —

1. 'Tis evident, That the Jews, who had falsely accused our Saviour, for perverting the Nation, and forbidding to give Tribute to Cesar, saying that he himself was Christ a King; Luke xxiii. 2. and for stirring up the People, teaching them throughout all Jewry, &c. ver. 5. advanced this, That he made himself the Son of God, as a new, a fresh Charge; and believing, that he thereby made himself equal with God, 'tis evident, they thought it, by far, his greatest Crime: And therefore, plainly enough hint, That, if the Governor should make so light of his Sedition and Treason, they had a Law, by which he ought to die, for a yet more heinous Transgression.

— 2. 'Tis as evident, that Pilate did not take these
these Titles, the Christ, and the Son of God, to be strictly synonymous, or of the same Signification precisely; but of a very different Signification: And thought that the former was a Title of Office, the latter of Nature; as he could not but see the Jews did. — When he examined him about his being a Seditious Person, an Enemy and Rival to Cesar, seeing his Accusers could prove nothing, his Questions were very natural, Art Thou the King of the Jews? Jo. xviii. 33. What hast thou done? ver. 35. Art thou a King then? ver. 37. And so was this, when they had accused him with making himself the Son of God, Whence art thou? q. d. Art thou indeed the Son of God, come down from Heaven to sojourn among Men? &c. — Withal, Had either the Jews, or the Governor, believed that these Titles, the Christ, and the Son of God, were strictly synonymous, nothing could have been more superfluous, yea ridiculous, than either this new Charge, or Pilate's new Question. — 3. Christ himself did, by his Silence, in this Case, absolutely, and forever, confirm this great Truth, That these Titles, the Son of God, and the Christ, were not strictly synonymous, but that a Title of Nature, and this of Office. — When the high Priest asked him of his Disciples, and of his Doctrine, Jo. xviii. 19. he answered directly, ver. 20—23. When the Governor put the Question, Art thou King of the Jews? ver. 33. he acknowledged it, but like one that was meek and lowly in Heart, as he was, ver. 37. But to this, Whence art thou? Jesus gave him no Answer. — Can any Thing then be more certain, than that these Titles, the Christ, and the Son of God, do not precisely signify the same Thing, but excite in us, or convey to us, very distinct and different Ideas? — And indeed, tho' he could not have been the Messiah, had he not been the Son of God; yet he was the Son of God, in the Order of Nature, before he
he could be designed to, and abstracting from all Consideration of, his Office.

This Demonstration then I have offered against this Notion, and am satisfied it can never be evaded, and much less confuted. I shall only add, N. B. This will remain a Demonstration, against Dr. Ridgley, &c. and their Admirers, even tho' it could be demonstrated, That the second Person is not a coessential Son: Because, it cannot be denied, That neither the Jews, nor Pilate, nor Christ himself, took these two Titles, the Son of God and the Christ, to be synonymous or to signify the very same Thing: And consequently, That Christ is not called the Son of God, as the Mediator or the Messiah. — I therefore hope their Disciples will, forever, freely give up this Nostrum, as I verily think themselves would do, were they now alive.

2. I offer this Demonstration against several other of our learned Author's Notions.

The Jews, when they heard him, in that solemn Manner, and with so many Circumstances, style himself the Son of God, his only begotten Son, &c. always, and every where, took him to have meant a coessential Son; and therefore, charge him with Blasphemy, for making himself equal with God: &c. Our Lord was so far from ever, clearly, or expressly, or indeed any how, denying it; as he would, and ought, upon many Accounts, to have done, had it not been true; that he always maintained and defended that Sense, either by infallible Proofs, or Divine Works; or both: Ergo, He is the coessential Son of God. Q. E. D. — Or thus,

Our Saviour was charged with this, as a capital Crime, upon his Trial, when his Life was at stake, and when the Glory of God, the Salvation of his People, &c. &c. did loudly call upon him to deny it roundly, if it was not indeed true; or explain himself clearly, if his Words were mistaken: But he did neither, no not in the least; and therefore,
since Silence at the Bar, is allowed by all, to be equivalent to a Confeffion, he did, in this Manner, confefs, That he was indeed the coeafential Son of God; yea, and fealed this great and fundamental Truth with his Blood: Ergo. He is indeed his ceofential Son, and, as fuch, equal with him. Q. E. D.
— And, in a Word,

Many Things we have heard of this Son, and, as fuch, which neither ever were, nor possibly could be, true of his human Soul, be it as great, and glorious, as possible: Ergo, His human Soul is not properly the Son of God. — Q. E. D. In Reality, it neither is, nor in Scripture is ever so called.

I need proceed no further at present, being pretty well afurred, That the Substance of what has been faid, can never be confuted. — A clear Cause pleads, and proves, itself. A very indifferent Pledger, with fuch a Cause, may do pretty well, againft all Opposition. — If any shall attempt a Reply, I affure them, I fhall neither wriggle, nor fuffle, nor meanly evade, in any Cafe. — My Weakneffes, Miiftakes, Blunders, or Nofence, they may be very free with. Let them quote my own Words fairly, as I do every Body's: Let them confute me, if they can, with Scripture, or Reafon; and they fhall find that, through the Grace of God, I fhall not shut my Eyes againft the Light. Only let ferior Things be managed feriorly, and I am pleased.

Thus, we hope, through the Divine Assistance, we have proved the Six Propositions. p. 55.

1. That the second Person in the Trinity, and as fuch, is often, in Scripture, called the Son of God: And therefore, is really fo, in some Sense or other.

2. That the fame Divine Person, as fuch, is often called his own, his begotten, his only begotten, Son.

3. That therefore this Title, the Son of God, and especially when these Adverbs are annexed, is a Title of Nature, and not of Office. And consequently,

4. That
4. That, in all Places where he is so called, it necessarily does either presuppose, imply, or denote, his Divine Nature. Nor can it be otherwise. And therefore,

5. That, as the Son, he is God of God, very God of very God, begotten not made. And,

6. That his pre-existent human Soul, is not, properly, the Son of God. I add, is never so called.

The Reader, I doubt not, will think it strange, as well he may, That I have not considered, and improved, the Form of Baptism. Mat. xxviii. 19. — The Reason is, I intend, if the Lord will, a Dissertation on that noted Text, having several Things to illustrate it, which, for ought I know, are new; when we shall not forget to prove, according to Promise, That the coessential Sonship of Christ, i.e. of the second Person made Flesh, is the Rock on which the Church is built; and therefore, That the Gates of Hell shall never prevail against it.

We should have, according to the Custom we design to follow, considered the Danger of erring, in this Case; and on which side, the greatest Danger most evidently lies: But, our worthy Author seems to have been well aware of it; and, in my Opinion, to have said enough, at present, if not too much, upon that Head.

Conclude we then, with the Angels, the living Creatures, and the Elders, to say and sing, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing, Rev. v. 11—14. which he had never been worthy to receive, had he not been God, the Son, and therefore, a Coessential Son: And Blessing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. — Amen, and Amen.