An Humble INQUIRY INTO THE Scripture-Account OF JESUS CHRIST: OR, A SHORT ARGUMENT Concerning His Deity and Glory, According to the GOSPEL.

1 Cor. viii. 5. To us there is but One God, and he is the Father, of whom are all things; and One Lord, viz. Jesus Christ, through whom are all things.

Augus. cont. Maxim. l. 3. c. 14.
Nec ego Nicenum Synodum tibi, nec tu Arminianum mihi debes, objicere. Scripturarum Authoritatibus, &c.
Thou shalt not urge me with the Council of Ariminum, nor I thee with the Council of Nice, but let us decide the Cause by Scripture Authority.

Printed in the Year M DCC II.
A Short ARGUMENT, Concerning the DEITY of our LORD JESUS CHRIST.

THAT the Blessed Jesus has the Title of God, ascribed sometimes to him in the H. Scriptures, is not denied by Arians, or Socinians, but it remains to be examined in what Sense that Character, as given to him, is intended. Nor is this an unreasonable or needless enquiry, since it is beyond all reasonable denial, that the Title of God is given in very different Sense in the Scripture.

1. Sometimes it signifies the most High, Perfect and Infinite Being, who is of himself alone, and owes neither his Being, nor Authority, nor any thing to another; and this is what is most commonly intended, when we speak of God in ordinary discourse, and in Prayer and Praise; we in the O. T. when it is designed to make mean it of God in the most Eminent Sense.

2. At other times it has a lower Sense, Greatness and Glory. Equivalent to this and is made the Character of Persons who I take that Title to be, which is so much are invested with Subordinate Authority used in the N. T. viz. the God and Father, from that Suprem Being: ther of our Lord Jesus Christ, Eph 1. 3. 17. Thus Angels are called Gods. Ps. 97. 7. Ps. 85. the God of our Lord Jesus, the Father of Christ, which made him a little lower than the Glory. For since Jesus Christ is the Chief God; as 'tis in the Margin; So Magi- of all Subordinate Powers, Rev. 1. 5. the Advocates are Gods. Ex. 22. 28. Ps. 82. 1. John Prince of the Kings of the Earth, and far 10. 34. 35. and sometimes in the singular above the greatest Angels, Eph. 1. 21. the Lord.
Lord of Lords, and King of Kings, he who
is Stiled the God of our Lord Jesus Christ,
is therein, in effect, Stiled the God of
Gods, or above all Gods.

Now the Question to be resolved is, in
which of these two Sense Chrift is said to
be God in the Holy Scriptures; the bare
Character of God determines nothing in
this case, because it belongs both to the
Supremacy and Subordinate Beings in Power
and Authority; But the Question is, whether
Jefus Chrift be the God of Gods, or
above all Gods?

He is indeed the Lord of Lords, but that
Notes an Interior Character, compared
with that of God of Gods, as appears by that,
1 Cor. 8. 5. tho’ it be included in the
Superior, so that he is above all Gods,
is also over all Lords, but not contrariwise:
In short, has Jefus Chrift any God over
him, who has greater Authority, and
greater Ability than himself or not? This
will decide the matter; for if he have a God
above him, then is he not the Absolutely
Supreme God, tho’ in Relation to Created
Beings, he may be a God (or Ruler) over
all.

Nor can we more clearly demonstrate
this point, than by shewing: First, that Jefus
Chrift expressly speaks of another God than
himself. Secondly, that he owns this God
to be above, or over himself. Thirdly, That
he wants those Supereminent and Infinite
Perfections, which belong only to the Lord
God of Gods:— Of these I shall treat in a
manner suited to vulgar Capacities; for I
judge it very indecent to speak or write of
Important Articles, (which the Common
People must believe, and must so far un-
derstand) in such a manner as leaves them
wholly unintelligible.

First, Our Lord Jefus Chrift expressly
speaks of another God distinct from him-
selt: Several times, we find him saying,
My God of another; Mat. 27. 46. My God,
why hast thou forsaken me? So John
20. 17. that he intended not to say, my
Self, my Self, why hast thou forsaken me?
This God then was distinct from himself,
as he declares in other places, John 7. 17.
he shall know my Doctrine, whether it be of
God, or whether I speak of myself. So John
8. 42. where it is to be noted that he does not
distinguish himself from him, as the
Father, but as God; and therefore, in all
just Construction, he cannot be supposed
to be that self same God, from whom he
Distinguishes, and to whom he Opposeth
himself. How manifestly are the one God,
and the one Lord distinguished, 1 Cor. 8. 6.
and that there may be no just pretence to
say with Placida, that the God and the
Lord, or the Caule of which all things are,
and the Cause by or through which they
are, are but two things said of the same
one God; We may see them more clearly
distinguished, Eph. 4. 5. 6. where by the
Interposing other things between the one
Lord, and one God, viz. one Faith, one
Baptism; it appears evidently that these
were not intended as two Characters of the
same Being. I think that none who im-
partyally attends to the Scripture History,
can doubt, whether God, and his Chrift,
are not two distinct things.

Secondly, Our Lord Jefus owns not only
another than himself to be God; but also
that he is above, or over himself, which is
plainly intimatated also by his Apoftles:
Himself loudly proclaims his Subjection to
the Father in many Instances: In General,
he declares his Father to be greater than he,
John 14. 28. 50. Co. 10. 29. he says he
came not in his own, but his Father’s Name
or Authority, John 5. 43. That he sought
not his own, but Gods Glory, nor made his
own. Will, but Gods, his Rule; and in
such a Portion of Subjection he came down
from Heaven into this Earth; so that it
should seem, that Nature which did pre-
exist, did not possess the Supreme Will;
even before it was incarnate, John 6. 38.
Again he owns his dependence upon his
God and Father, even for those Things,
which
which it is pretended belong to him as God, viz. the Power of working Miracles, to God, that is (not to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as some pretend, but) the of executing universal Judgment, of Father only; since it was the Father, Mat. all which he says, of my own self I can do 28. 18. who gave him all Power in Heaven and Earth, and who made him King declare his Subjection to another, not only as his Father, but as his God, which is emphatically expressed, in calling the most B. having done all in a Subordination to him; God, the God of our Lord Jesus, after and having Acted and Ruled in dependence his Humiliation was over, Eph. 1. 17. and on him, who shall have a Satisfactory, the Head of Christ is God; 1 Cor. 11. They Account of all given to him in the end, declare his Headship over the Universe, and This is a Glory peculiar to the Father, as the very Foundations of his Claim to Honour and Service, to be owing to the gracious Gift of God, Phil. 2. 9. to him that put all things under him, i. e. to God his Father, that God may be all in all, that is, his Subjection shall be then manifested by an open Solemn acknowledgment of it, when he shall recognize the for proving an Inferiority in the Son to his Supremacy of the Father in that publick Act of Surrender. So that, tho' formerly to the 29. where the Apostle says several (in the present State) all Judgment and Things to this purpose,

1. That all Things are to be put under it shall be otherwise, and God will more Christs Feet; all Enemies and Powers are immediately appear in the Government of to be Subdued to him: But adds that 'tis the future State', which shall not be, so Manifested, God must be excepted out of these much Shared. Probably, between him Things that are under him; and that for and the Redeemer, as the present Admiration reason, because 'tis he who did put nistration appears to be. This then will all under him; And how comes it to pass, be the issue of all our Disputes; God, all that it is so evident a Thing, that another in all, and the Son himself Subject under, must be suppos'd to be the great Author him. Can any thing be more Expressive of this Triumph of Christ? Why might of an Inequality between God and Christ? it not be done by himself independently But it will be laid by some, that by the as the Suprem God, and then there need Son here, is meant the Son of Man, or have been no exception, of any one Be-Christs as Man, while as God, he shall ing, out of the all things under him? But not be Subjected to the Father.

the Apostle knew that Jesus Christ must Ref. As there is no intimation of any needs Triumph by a Power derived from such distinction between the pretended God: to whom it was most eminently to two Natures of the Son here; so there is be ascribed, and then to one who had such enough in the Words, to shew, that they thoughts, it was manifest that there must be are (spoken of him, under his Higher one excepted from the all Things under him, Capacity and Character, in whom that because he must needs be above Christ. Monseigneur Claude maintains it to be true who enables him to Subdue all things, or of the Son of God, as to his (supposed) makes him a God over all.

Divine Nature: But tho' there is no need.
of Supposing such a Nature, (which I ther, what ever Character else they bear, think the Text plainly contradicts) yet So then Jesus Christ in his Highest Capab-
is Reason will hold to far, as to prove city, is inferior to the Father; how can he be the Words do speak of Christ, under the same God, to which he is Subject, or of, Highest Character he bears, by the Name of Son; for first, as he says, 'tis not said Thus it appears that Christ is so God, as to the Son of Man, but the Son absolutely be under a Superior God, who has set him o-ver all; And Suitable to this, is that Account which the Scripture gives us of the God-head of the B. Jesus, viz. Because he is invested comes under that Title; Nay more, 'tis said, even the Son himself with great Emphasis, qu. d. as Great and Glorious as he is with all his Grandeur and Power; he himself shall be Subject. Secondly, His Subject being opposed to his Reign, both must be understood of the same Subject; be sure the delivering up the Kingdom can only be done by the same to which it was com-mitted, and by which it was managed: Now I shall allow, that only in his hu-mane Nature Christ could give up his Kingdom, but then 'tis, because 'tis as Man Delegated, and Inhabited by God, that he fways and manages this Kingdom; and if this be allowed (as I think it needs must) that the Man Christ is sufficient, by help a God over him) had anointed him with from God, to manage his Universal Spiritu-ual Kingdom, I see no reason there will be Royal Power and Dignity (as Kings were to oppose those Unitarians who think instilled in their Offic-e, by anointing with him to be a sufficient Saviour and Prince, Oyl, among the Jews) which is an Ex-tho' he be not the only Supreme God; nor Plication of his God-head or Dominion; can any with reason attempt to prove him and this is laid to be above all his Kins, to be rich, from his Works and Office as not sure above the Father and Holy Spirit, King of his Church, since 'tis implied that (which only are pretended to be his Kins, as he, must do Homage to God the as God, by them who understand it of the Father, in delivering up his Kingdom to him; Supreme God head,) but above all other Sub-
and this very expression to God the Father, ordinate Beings; This is one plain Scripture, makes it plain, that there is no God the Son, Account of his being called God, for the: in the same Sense, or in the same Supreme, Things are spoken to him, and of him, uni
Franchise with the Father, because if there, der the Character of God. O God; Thy were, then he ought not to be excluded Throne, &c. v. 8. I think men shou'd be from this Glory of having such open Ho-well assured on what G.ounds they go, be-
mage paid to him, which is here ap- fore they affirm other reasonings of this Cha-
propriated to the Father only; and since rafter, to different from the Scripture Ac-
the Apostle speaks of the same God, (whom court: Let it suffice us, that God hath he explains to be the Father) to the end made him both Lord and Christ, Acts 2. 36.
of this Discourse, and says' he shall be all that he has exalted him to be a Prince and in all: How evidently do's he shew him to Savi.-ur. Ch. < 21, be far beyond all that are not God the Fa-
However, our Adversaries will gain nothing by alledging Texts to prove the Title of God, to be given to Christ since that may be, and yet it will not prove him to be the Suprem independent God; but only one who is inhabited of, and Commissioned and enabled by him who is so. As to that place, Philip. 2. 6, which is Corruptly rendered in our Translation; he thought it no Robbery to be equal to God: It is confes’d by adversaries themselves, that it shou’d be read thus, viz. that he did not assume, or Arrogate, or Snatch at, or Cover an equality with God; the Words are never known to be used in any other Sense, as is shown by Doctor Tillotson in his Discourses against the Socinians; also by Dr. Whitby in his Exposition on the place, and others. So that this rather denies than affords Christ’s equality to God, tho’ still he was in the Form of God, as that Notes the outward Resemblance of him in his mighty Power and Works, &c. which is the constant meaning of the word form in the New Testament.

But because some think such Perfections are in Scripture ascribed to Christ, as will prove him to be God in the highest Sense, I proceed to shew;

Thirdly, That our Blessed Lord Jesus Declares those Infinite perfections which belong only to the Suprem God of Gods. And ’tis most certain, that if he want one; or any of these Perfections that are Essential to the Deity; He is not God in the Chief Sense: And if we find him Declaring the One, he cannot challenge the Other; for to deny Himself to have all Divine Perfections, or to deny Himself to be the Infinite God, is the same Thing; Let us observe some Instances for the Proof of this Point.

1. One Great and Peculiar Perfection of the Deity, is Absolute, undervived Omnipotence: He who cannot Work all Miracles, and do whatever he List of Himself, without help from A-
How comes he to Aascribe nothing to that, since 'tis supposed to be equal in Power to the Father Himself, and more nearly Aligned to Jesus Christ, as the Operating Principal in Him? So John 14. 10. My Father in me does the Works, by which, 'tis evident there was no Divine Agent in and with Him, but the Father; He only has all Power of Himself, and needs no Assistance.

2. Another Infinite Perfection; that must needs be in the Deity, is Suprem Absolute Goodness: All Nations have consented to this by the Light of Nature; that T'ayebes, & Optimus Maximus, are the Prime Characters of the Supreme as the Orator says, he is One; quod nec Melius, nec Majus concipi Poteft: The Fullest, and Highest of all that are called Good; For indeed all other Good is derived from Him.

Now the Lord Jesus expressly Disclaims this Character, Mat. 19. 17. Jesus said to him, Why callest thou me Good? there is none Good but one, that is God, where 'tis most evident that he distinguishes Himself from God, as not the same with Him, and denies of Himself, what he affirms of God: And as to that Divine Perfection of Suprem Infinite Goodness; He Challenges the Man for presuming to say what seemed to Attribute it to Him, and leads Him off to Another; who, and who only was more Eminent so.

'Tis astonishing to see what Violence is Offered to the Sacred Text, by such as Maintain the Equality of Jesus Christ to God His Father: What a strange fetch is it to suppose our Lords Meaning to be This? quod. I know Man, thou dost not take Me for God as I am; Why then dost thou give Me the Title belonging to Him only: when there is not one Word in the Context looking this Way; For Christ never Challenges the Poor Man, with this, that he thought too meanly of him (as they suppose) but quite contrary, that he Thought or Spake too highly of Him; And verily if the Mans Error lay in this, that he thought too meanly of Christ, whilst His words otherwise were justly enough applied to Him: I cannot think our Lord would have rebuked Him in that Manner; for instead of keeping him still to the right Object, and rectifying His apprehensions about it, which only were wrong, He seems clearly to carry Him off to another from Himself, as not the right Object, without rectifying His Thoughts of Christ at all; and to what End could Christ Re- prove Him in such away, as never tells Him what was his Fault, rather tempts Him to run into another, and leads Him out of the Way.

It shou'd seem rather (if any such notion had been then conceived by any,) that the Man did think Him to be God; for if he thought Him to be the Suprem Good, that was to make Him God in His eye; and if He did not intend so much, but only meant it of an Inferior Good, how cou'd Christ rebuke Him for it, since that was no Fault or Error? And truly they who say Christ's Receiving Worship, when on Earth, proves His Deity, can hardly give an Account why the Man should give, or Christ Receive Worship from Him, as He did, Mark 10. 17, if he did not take him for God? However, whatsoever the Man thought, he says what Jesus Christ thought, was only proper to be said of God, and too much to be said of Himself, as the Obvious Sense of His Words declares.

And let me add, that if our Lord Jesus had on purpose left the Matter Disguised, not willing to discover who he was then; yet 'tis strange that the Evangelists who many Years after relate the Matter, when it was Necessary to have it believed, that Christ was Suprem God (as is pretended) that they I say, shou'd not un riddle the Matter, by inferring some Caution Clause, as that this He said to prove him,
him, or because he knew he denied His God-head, or the like; For sometimes on le's Occasions they enter such Cautions, John 6. 6. Ch. 21. 23. And yet tho' Three of the Evangelists relate this Discourse, they all do it the same way, and not one of them says a tittle to direct us to this Secret way of Interpretation, but leaves us to the hazard of a most Fatal mistake (even Recommended to us by this History;) if Jesus Christ were indeed the Suprem Good in as High a Sense as God His Father, which he so apparently here denies, and by that he denies Himself to be the most High God:

3. I will only add one perfection more, viz. Absolute Omniscience or unlimited Knowledge of all Things, Past, Present, and to come, Ps. 147. 5. His understanding is Infinite. So Isa. 41. 23. Acts 15. 18. known to God are all His works from the Beginning.

Now, tis plain our Lord Jesus Christ had not this Infinite Knowledge, Particularly not of future Things, such as of the day of Judgment, Mark 13. 32. Says he, of that Day knows no Man, no, not the Angels in Heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only. Here the Son professes His knowledge to be limited, and Inferior to the Fathers, i.e. the Son of the Father, or Son of God; the Son as above Angels in Knowledge, the Son in the most Eminent Sense: Now how is it possible the Son can be God Infinite, and yet have but a finite understanding? or can he be Equal in Knowledge to the Father, and yet not know as much as the Father? And be sure if he was not an Infinite God, when on Earth, he cannot be such afterwards: Thus we have seen Christ Himself, with His own mouth Disclaiming Infinite Original Power, Goodness and Knowledge to belong to Him, but attributes them to His Father only as another, distinct from Himself, from whom he derived of each in a dependent limited Manner.

What can be said against these plain Arguments? I imagine our Opposers have but one Shift left for the evading them, and that is a distinction which serves 'em in all Cases; for they say, Jesus Christ speaks these Things of Himself, as Man only, while he had another Nature as God, which he Refrained, and Excepted out of the Case; So that when he says, I cannot do thus my Self, or I am not to be called the Chief Good, or do not know this, &c. according to them, the meaning is qu.'d I have not these perfections in my humane Nature, but yet I know, and can do all unassisted, and am the Chief Good in My Divine Nature, which also is more properly my Self: The Vanity of which Subterfuge I intend now to lay open, by shewing how Aburdly this Distinction of the two Natures is pretended, to take off the Force of such Expressions from Christs own Mouth, which in their Natural and Undisguised appearance, do proclaim His Inferiority to God, even the Father, and I shall Dwell the more upon this, because it is the most Popular and Common Evasion, and comes in at every turn, when all other relief fails.

It wouldn't be no unreasonable Demand to ask, what Intimation of any such Distinction of two Natures they can point us to, in any of these Discourses of Christ? Why shouldn't Men Devise or Imagine for Him, such a Strange, and seemingly Deceitful way of Speaking, from no Ground, nor Necessity, other than that of Upholding their own precariou opinion? But I have several Remarks to make upon this common Answer.

That which in the First place I have to Object against it is, That our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ, if Himself was the Suprem God in any Nature of His own, Cou'd not have said such Things, (as I conceive) in any Consistency, with Truth and Sincerity, (which
(which he always maintained, strictly) he could not say Himself, could not do, or did not know the Thing, which all this while Himself could do; and did know very well, as before if he was the Superam, God, he could and did, for this were to make Him say what is most False, and to Equivocate in the most deceitful manner; for tho' we shou'd suppose he consisted of two Infinitely distant Natures, and so had two Capacities of Knowledge, &c. Yet since Himself includes them both, it follows, that the denying a Thing of Himself in absolute Terms, without any Limitation in the Words, or other obvious Circumstances, does plainly imply a denial of its belonging to any part of His Person, or to any Nature in it; For tho' we may affirm a Thing of a Person, which belongs only to a part of him; as I may properly say a Man is wounded or hurt, tho' it be only in one Member, suppose an Arm; Yet I cannot justly deny a Thing of him which belongs only to one part, because it belongs not to another; as I cannot say a Man is not wounded, because tho' one Arm be Shot or Wounded, yet the other is whole.

For instance, I have two Organs of sight, two Eyes; Now suppose I converse with a Man with one Eye shut and the other open; if being asked whether I saw him, I shou'd dare to say I saw him not (without any limitation) meaning to my self, that I saw him not with the Eye which was shut, tho' still I saw him well enough with the Eye which was open; I fear I shou'd bear the reproach of a Lyar and Deceiver, notwithstanding such a mental Reservations as some would attribute to the Holy Jesus. For knowledge is the Eye of the Person, Jesus Christ is supposed to have two of these Knowing Capacities, the one weak, the other strong and piercing that discerns all Things; now as such an one, the Disciples repair to Him, and ask Him, when the end of the World and time of His coming shall be: Mat. 24. 3. He answers them: by giving them some General Account of the Matter, but says that the particular Day and Hour he knew not, nor did any know but the Father, meaning, (say my opposers) that he knew it not with his Humane knowledge, tho' he knew it well enough with His Divine, at the same time, that he said, the Son knows it not, absolutely and indefinitely.

And yet if Jesus Christ had a Divine Knowledge and Nature, no doubt his Disciples (who, if any Body must be supposed to believe it) directed the question to that, rather than to the imperfect humane capacity; and yet in answer to it, he says, he knew not the day, which would not be counted Sincerity, or Truth in Men, much less was Jesus Christ in danger of it, in His mouth no Guile was; let us not impute it to Him.

That you may see this is fair reasoning, hear how some of the other side own it, when out of the heat of this controversy. See Doctor Stillingfleets Sermon, on Mat. 10. 16, speaking of the Equivocations of Popish Priests, whose common Answer, when Examined about: what they have known by Confe ssion, is that they know it not, which they think to vindicate from the charge of Lying; by saying, that in Confe ssion, the Priest knows Matters as God, not as Man, and therefore he denies to know them, meaning it, as Man. But says the Doctor this is absurd, because to say he does not know, is as much as to say he doth not any way know: Now if this be a good answer against the Papiests, as no doubt it is; Then sure 'tis so in the present Case: Therefore when Christ says, he knows not the Day of Judgment; 'tis as much as to say he does not any way know it; and consequently, 'tis a vain Shift to say, it was as Man only; we must beware lest we bring the Holy Jesus under such reproach for Equivocation, as the Roman Priests lye under; and
and make the Jesuits themselves think they have a good title to that name, by imitating herein, his own example; which in this very instance they allude with so great advantage according to this interpretation.

2. As a further evidence, that Jesus Christ intended no such distinction of two natures, as is pretended; 'tis to be observed, that he puts not the distinction, or opposition between the son and his father, Mark 13:32. Not the son knows, but only the father; by which 'tis plain, He had no thought of including any person or nature of his own among the excepted: For whatever was not the father, he says, was ignorant of that day; now 'tis certain, that in no nature was the son, the father; and consequently where none but the father knows, none who is not the father, can be intended; and since our Lord was making an exception in the case, he would not have forgotten to except the eternal word too, if there had been such a divine principle in himself, equal to the father and distinct from him; for 'tis a known rule, that an exception from a general assertion, confirms it as to other instances not excepted.

Will they say, that by the father is meant all three persons here? Viz. Father, son, and holy ghost? What! can the father as opposed to the Son, be put for the father and the son? What woful work will this make with scripture, to suppose that what are opposed to each other, do include each other, under the very characters by which they are opposed? As well may they say, that in the baptismal form, by the father is meant, father, son, and spirit, that he be distinguished from the other two; and I should despair of ever understanding the scriptures above all books that ever were written, at this rate of interpretation: No doubt, therefore, but the father as opposed to the son, excludes all that is the son, and then there could be no son of God that knew of the day which only the father knew of; and consequently no son that is God equal to the father.

3. Moreover, that interpretation must needs be unjust, which if admitted, will make all, even the most plain speech uncertain, and utterly insignificant: as this interpretation of Christ's words you'd do: For as I ask the patrons of this opinion, in what words Jesus Christ could in brief have denied himself to be God most high, if he had a mind to do it, more plain and full than these? In which he says, he knew not all things as the father did, nor could do all things, &c. So I would fain have them shew me, what words of that nature he could have used, which the same way of interpretation, as they here use, will not evade and make insignificant. For had he said, or sworn in plain words, viz. I tell you I am not the supreme God, and none but my father has that glory. They would upon the same reason still have said, This was to be understood of him as man only: So that no words professing himself not to be God, could be a proof of it, if this way of interpretation be allowed: So that I may safely say thus much, that the blessed Jesus has declared himself not to be the supreme God, or equal to the father, as plainly as words could speak, or in brief, express: And that this declaration made by him already is not to be evaded, any other way, that what will make it impossible his mind shou'd be understood by any words, he could have designedly used in the matter: Let any one try if this do not hold true; and sure it must be an absurd way of interpretation which leaves a man no opportunity or power of speaking his meaning plainly, so as to be understood.

4. Again, this way of interpretation, which the advocates of the opinion I oppose, are so much necessitated to, for upholding their
their Cause, does plainly overthrow it a
again; and may be turned against them
selves; for if it be just and true to deny of
Christ absolutely what belongs to him in
one Nature, because there is another Na-
ture in which it belongs not to him; then,
since to be the chief God belongs to him
(according to our Adversaries) only in one
Nature, and not in respect of the other,
or humane Nature, it follows that it may
as justly be said Jesus Christ is not God ,
nor to be worshiped or Trusted as such;
Nay, that he was not before the Virgin
Mary; according to them and the like;
and this without adding any limitation or
restriction, any more than our Lord does
in the place mentioned.

What would they say to one who shou’d
speak or preach so, That Jesus is not God,
that he cannot do all things, nor is equal
to the Father; &c. Wou’d they not con-
clude he was a Denyer of the Deity of
Christ? else he would never speak so un-
guarded: upon the same Account, when
Jesus Christ himself says it: that he can-
oft of himself do all things, nor knows all
things; and makes no reserves in his words,
we may conclude he also denies his being
Suprem God; else, if it be a just way of
speaking in him, it cannot be unjust in us
to imitate him, by denying him infinitely,
to be what he in any one Nature is not,
that he is not God, without adding
more.

Nay, After this way of Speaking which
they Attribute to Christ, a Man may be
Taught to say his Creed Backward; and
yet make a true profission of his Faith, by
denying of Jesus Christ in absolute Ex-
thensions, whatsoever may be denied of one
of his Nature, thus since the Apostles Creed
takes Notice of nothing to be believed con-
cerning Christ, but what belongs to his
Manhood (which is very strange, if there
were any Articles relating to this Divinity,
which must needs be most important) one
may venture to deny them all; with this

secret unexpressed Reserve, Viz: Meaning
it of the Divine Nature (to which they be-
long not) So that one may say, I believe
not that Jesus Christ was Conceiv’d of the
Holy Ghost, or Born of the Virgin Mary;
I believe that he never was Crucify’d under
Ponius Pilate, nor was Dead or Buried;
that he never Rose nor Ascended, nor will
Return visibly again; for his Divine Nature
(which ’tis pretended he had) was not ca-
pable of these Things; and since they say,
the Personality is Divine, here seems more
warrant to be bolder in denying indefinte-
ly of the person what belongs not to the
Divine Nature, whose the Personality is;
than in so denying, of the person what only
belongs not to the humane Nature; as
this interpretation makes Christ to do.

5. Finally, it weighs something with
me, in opposition to this way of interpri-
tation, that the Evangilists never take any
occasion (when they had so many) to sub-
joyn any Caution against taking Christ’s
words in their obvious Sense, when he says,
He did not know the Hour, &c. and the
like. If as we said, our Lord had no mind
to reveal his Divinity (tho’ I see not still
why he shou’d deny it thus) yet sure his
Apostles who wrote so many Years after,
whom it concerned to Reveal all impor-
tant Truths most clearly, wou’d not fail to
have set the Reader Right, by removing
such obvious Objections as the are against
the Suprem Deity of Christ; and laying,
he spoke this only in respect of his Man-
hood, that he knew not all things, &c.
But here is not one Caution given, as of-
ten we find there was about les Matters,
John 2. 21. ch. 11. 13. No doubt it was,
because they wou’d have the thing under-
stood as it fairly lyes, not thinking of any
such secret Reserve in Christ, of a Divine
Nature in his Person, to be tacitly except-
ed, when he had denied such perfections
of his Person indefinitely.

Thus it remains Good, that Jesus Christ
disclaims infinite perfections, to belong to
him
him as to the Father: and therefore that he is not the same infinite God with him, if we can believe his own Words: But before I conclude this Argument, I shall endeavour to Answer what ourOpposers offer on the contrary side: They say there is abundant Evidence from other Scriptures, that Jesus Christ has those perfections in him, which I have shewed in the formentioned places, he denies of himself; theseshay in Ballance to the other, and since both sides cannot be proved, it must be examined, which ought to yield? Particularly they say Omniscience is ascribed to Jesus Christ, even such as is peculiar to the Supream God, and since this indeed is that infinite perfection which they seem to alledge the most plausible Testimonies for its belonging to him, therefore I chuse to single out this in particular: I think I have made good the Negative already from his own Mouth, that he did not know all things: Nor can any thing of equal Evidence and Force be produced for the Affirmative, as will appear upon considerate Examination.

The instances usually alleged to prove the infinite Omniscience of Jesus Christ are either: 1. Such as speak of his knowing all things in General; or, 2. Of his knowing Men's Thoughts and Hearts in particular: To both which I Reply.

First, 'Tis Objeeted, that the Disciples ascribed to him the Knowledge of all things, as John 16. 30. ch. 21. 17. Thou knowest all things: 'Tis true, That as those Expressions are words of Admiration from the Disciples not yet inspired: So they are intended only to express a very great and comprehensive Knowledge far from infinite, Divine Omniscience, as appears.


2. In that it was common to ascribe all knowledge to Men of extraordinary Wisdom, especially when any intended to commend them highly: and were affected with wonder; for Admiration and Praise naturally inclines to run out into Hyperboles; thus the Woman of Tekoa under a surprising wonder of David's Sagacity cries out: My Lord knows all things on Earth, and is as Wise as an Angel, 2 Sam. 14. 20. and the Apostle in commendation of some Christians says, They know all Things, 1 John 2. 20. and 27. and yet his plain (such) Encomiums must have their limitations; and indeed the Jews seem to have thought that their Prophets knew, in a manner, all Things, Thus Luke 7. 39. When a woman of ill Fame Anointed our Lord's Head; the Pharisee says of him, If this Man were a Prophet, he would know what manner of Woman this is: And when the woman of Samaria found that he told her of all her secret Acts that ever she did, she concludes thus, Sir I perceive thou art a Prophet, John 4. 19. 'Tis no wonder then if the Disciples speak thus of him, thou knowest all things, without esteeming him more than the greatest of Prophets.

3. 'Tis evident they never intended more, by attributing all knowledge to him, from their own words in one of the Texts mentioned, John 16. 30. Where the Disciples tell us, how much they inferred from his Great Knowledge (which they describe and extol, by saying, Thou knowest all things) not that he was God, but one sent of God, by this we believe that thou camest forth from God: Not that thou thy self art that God. So that by these large expressions, they only intend to Attribute to him what a created Being is, by Divine Assistance, capable of; and therefore 'tis Violence to their words, to infer from them, that Jesus Christ is God, when themselves infer no such thing: who best knew their own meaning.

And yet if it were Granted that our Lord Jesus knows all things, i.e. which actually are; yet if he knows not all Extraviries too, which himself Denies, he comes short of infinite
infinite Omiscience. For ought I know, a finite Being may have a knowledge comuntrurate to this poor Earth, which is but a dust of the Balissance; and yet not know all Gods secret Purposes, or the Sentions which the Father keeps in his own Hand, Acts 1. 7.

2. 'Tis Obliected, That the knowledge of the Heart is acributed to Christ, John 2. 25, Mat. 9. 9. But especially, Rev. 2. 23, and this they say is what belongs to God only, as Solomon judges, 1 Kin. 8. 39, and God claims it as his eminent Glory, Jer. 17. 10, and yet Jesus Christ says, I am he who searches the Heart; therefore say they, surely he must be that God, who only knows the Hearts of all the Children of men. I take this to be the strongest instance that can be produced from the Sacred Text, for proving any infinite Divine Perfections to belong to the Lord Jesus Christ, and it shall be seriously considered.

In Answer hereto, I shall shew Two things. 1. In what Sense, the searching and knowing the Heart is made peculiar to God, and incommunicable to others, by those Texts: 2. That notwithstanding it be peculiar to him in some Sense, yet these Acts may in another Sense be justly Attributed to another, and perform'd by him who is not the Most High God.

1. As to the former, tho' Solomon say, Thou Lord only knowest the Hearts of all Men. Yet what if I say, 'tis no wonder that Solomon shou'd not know of any other to whom that Excellency was Communicated, since this Mystery of the Unreachable Riches and Fullness of Christ, and of Gods being manifest in his Flesh, and his High Exaltation of him, was hidden in the Ages past, and only manifested in the times of the Gospel; for 'tis in these latter times that our Lord Jesus has obtained his great Authority and Dignity, for which he has Received answerable Abilities: Yet I add, such Expressions in Scripture, appropriating some perfections to God, do only im-
cated to Prophets and Apostles; was there not something of this, if not in the Prophet Elias, telling the secret Counsels of the Syrian King, 2 Kings 6. 12. yet at least in the Spirit of Discerning mentioned 1 Cor. 12. 10. and in the case of Ananias and Saphira? Acts 5. I grant this was by Divine assistance of the Spirit of God, and by Revelation: Neither is our Lord Jesus Christ ashamed to own that His knowledge is sometimes owing to Revelation from God His Father, Rev. 1. 1. If any thou'd ask, how Jesus Christ comes to know all that he Reveals in those Seven Epistles to the Seven Churches, &c. The very First Words of that Book of the Revelations, may be an answer, It was the Revelation which God gave to Jesus Christ, &c. No wonder then that he says, he knows their Works, their Hearts, and their approaching Judgments and Tryals, when His own vart Abilities are assisted by God's Revelation.

But it will be said, that His searching the Heart, Imports it to be His own Act. Answer; So it may very well be; for whatever a Man knows, he knows it by his own Act; And why may not the Mind search, and yet be under the light of Revelation, and the Influence of Superior assistance? But yet after all, these Words of searching the Heart, are only an expression that denotes the Accuracy of His Knowledge, not the Manner of attaining to it, for taken properly, as applied to God, 'tis dishonourable to lay, he is put to make a search, since all things are naked and open to His view. And if they must be taken Strictly and Properly, as applied to Christ, then they belong not to Him in the same Sense as they do to God, and so can be no Argument of His being that God, which leads me to shew:

Secondly, That ther'es no absurdity in attributing this Knowledge of the Heart to Jesus Christ, tho' He be not the Most High God. That he knows things with some limitation as to the Degree, and in dependence on His Father, as to the Manner, appears by what has been said already: And therefore the knowledge of the heart attributed to Him, must be such as is consistent with His Subordination to the Fathers greater Knowledge.

'Tis pleaded, That 'tis not possible for a Finite Being to have such Universal knowledge of the hearts and ways of Men, as is ascribed to Jesus Christ, and which as Head and Ruler of the Church, and World, He ought to have, and therefore he is infinite God.

Answer, I am pretty sure, it can never be demonstrated, that it exceeds a Finite capacity to know the concerns of all on this Earth, when the enlarged understanding is assisted in the highest Manner by Divine influence and Revelation. The reason is, because the Object is Finite, and I challenge any Man to shew me how it can be impossible for a Finite capacity to Comprehend a Finite Object, as this World is, and wou'd be, tho' it were Ten thousand times greater than it is? I am Satisfy'd this can never be demonstrated to imply any contradiction in it; And that all such imaginations concerning it, Proceed Chiefly from too high a Conceit of Man, and too low apprehension of the infinite God; as if the distance between these two was so small, that there cou'd not be one made of a Capacity so much above Men, as to be Commencurate to them all, but presently he must be the most High God, as tho' that Supreme Being cou'd not produce one who shou'd be a Thousand times beyond all this Earth and its Inhabitants, and yet it be infinitely below Himself: Methinks, if the Sun was but an Intelligent Creature, and cou'd diffuse his Intellectual Influences as he do's his Natural; cou'd but fee and understand with his Beams and secret Influences, 'Tis easy to imagine what a Penetrating and Comprehensife Inledge he might have, but we may Entertain much greater thoughts of the Sun of Righteousness, Jesus Christ.
And I conceive a strong argument to prove Jesus Christ as Man, capable of such deep and extensive Knowledge, may be drawn from the Offices of Dignity and Power conferred on Him by God. For God has given to Him to be Head over all things, Eph. 1. 22. He has given or committed to Him all Judgment, John 5. 22. And that as the Son of Man, v. 27. in short, His Kingly Office by which He rules over all the World, and takes special care of all His Members, as it necessarily supposes His knowledge of the whole Estate of His Church and every Member of it, as far as is necessary for the Discharge of that Trust; So I think it undeniable proves this large Knowledge to be Exercised by Him as Man, however he gains it;

For, since this Office and Power is given, it cannot terminate in the Divine Nature; for who can give to God, any Dignity or Power, who has all Originally in His own Being? it must then be given to the Man, or humane Nature only: And if the Man Christ Jesus sustains this Office, and be invested with this Kingly Power, even with all Power in Heaven and Earth, then as Man we cannot deny Him to be suitably qualified for it, with all requisite Abilities, left we reproach God, as calling one to an Employment, who is not fitted for it, or Himself in assuming a trust which he is not able to discharge; besides, unless His humane Nature can execute this Power, it cannot be said to be given to it, for a Power which cannot be be exerted, or is impossible to be executed, is not given nor Received, any more than a Commission, or Grant to a Stock or a Tree, to bear Rule, not over the other Trees (as in Athanasius Apology) but over a Nation, or to Command an Army: ’Tis no Gift at all, if this were the case, that the Man Christ Jesus be utterly incapable of the Office and Government lodged in Him;

If it be said, That tho’ the Office and delegated Authority be committed to the humane, yet ’tis only executed by the Divine Nature in Christ. I answer, ’Tis most unreasonable to suppose this Trust committed to the Man Christ, who must at last deliver it up, 1 Cor. 15. 24. and yet the Management of it belong only to another Being: How can he be commended for being Faithful over the House of God, to Him who appointed or constituted Him, Heb. 3. 2. 6. when ’tis not expected he shou’d execute His Office? I grant indeed that His Kingly Office is executed by the Assistance of God, as he exerts His Divine Power and Wisdom, through the humane Nature of Christ, and Communicates of them in all fulness to Him, in whom it dwells; But to say, that the Man Christ does not execute His Kingly Universal Power, but that His Divine Nature (supposing it) does solely and immediately execute the Office given to Him as Man or Mediator, (for to God can nothing be given) is in my Mind a most Grofs absurdity; for ’tis to say, That God Officiates for Man, in Execution of a Delegated, or Subordinate Authority; or that He acts under the Authority, and in the Name of a Creature, which is not meet to be said of the Supreme God. It remains therefore, That as Christ’s Universal Kingdom and Headship, is by Gift from God (of which only the Man Christ is the Receiver) committed as a Trust to Him; So he certainly wants no ability to execute that Trust in the Nature entrusted with it; I say no ability, whether of Power or Knowledge, sufficient to render Him, a careful, vigorous, and every way most Efectual Head of His Body, and Ruler of the World, and to deny this, is to Rob Him of His greatest Glory.

Besides, What Benefit or Gift is it to the Man Christ, that the Divine Nature should execute a Power which it always had, and could Exercise without any Gift to Him? What Reward, or what Addition was this to Him.
Another Argument may be drawn, from that Comfortable Ground of confidence in a Christian Address to God, which the Scripture lays down, viz. The Sympathizing Compassion of our Lord Jesus Christ, towards His distressed Servants, arising from His own sufferings when on Earth, Heb. 4. 15. 16. Seeing we have not an High Priest, who cannot be touched with the feeling of our Infirmities, but was in all points Tempted as we are: Let us therefore come boldly to the Throne of Grace. Christ's having been tried with Sufferings, makes Him a more Compassionate carnelt Advocate for us; and this is our Comfort.

Now 'tis certain, This Compassion ariseth from His own experience of trouble, can belong to none but His humane Nature; the Divine Nature is Compassionate, but not for this reason, because it was Tempted, or grieved with Misery: No, it was only the Man Christ Suffered, and consequently feels a Sympathy from hence with His distressed Servants: And 'tis most certain, that if He Sympathize with them in their troubles, he must then know them in that Nature, which only has a fellow feeling of them, for none can Sympathize with the Miseries of others which he knows not of; so that they who deny Christ's humane Nature to be capable of the knowledge of all our Miseries, do in effect deny Him to be such a Compassionate Advocate as the Scripture represents Him, and Rob us of this Strong ground of Consolation and Hope in our approaches to God, which the Apostle wou'd have us to build on.

And this Doctrine has been so far from appearing, either impossible, or absurd to the reason of Mankind, that I might produce the content of a very great Number of learned Men, even among them who oppose my other Opinions. The Lutherans allow the Man Christ a sort of universal knowledge, as well as universal Presence which they Plead for. The School-Men, both Thomists and Scotists, allow Him universal Knowledge, tho' they differ in their way of explaining it.

And there was a time in the Sixth Century, when in the Christian Church some were branded with Heresie, under the Name of Agyoeta, who held Christ was ignorant of any thing, which I conceive must have been in relation to His humane Nature; for those Perfons owned Him to have a Divine Nature, and 'tis hard to imagine they cou'd attribute Ignorance to that. But (waving that Matter which is disputed) it is enough for my purpose, viz. to prove what Sense the Christian Church then had of Christ's extensive Knowledge as Man; that they who wrote against those Heretics, do expressly deny any ignorance in Christ as Man; for this we may produce two famous Patriarchs of the Christian Church at that time, viz. Eulogius of Alexandria, and Gregory of Rome: Those Heretics produced for their Opinion, Christ's Words, That he knew not the time of the last Judgment, as an instance of His ignorance: To this the Former Person says, that he was not ignorant of it, not as Man, and much less as God: The latter says, In Natura quidem humanitatis noviss, sed non ex Naturæ humanitatis. He knew it with the humane Nature, but that knowledge did not rise from the humanity; which is what I maintain as to the knowledge I attribute to him, but not extending it so far as to all futilities, which they did.

And I find not a few of the Modern Reformed Divines, (who when out of this Dispute) speak agreeably to this, and are far from thinking it Idolatry, to ascribe as much knowledge as I have done, to the Man Christ. Thus the Reverend Mr. Baxter, in his notes on Eph. 4. 16. plainly intimates, that he conceives an Angel might be made capable of Ruling the Universal Church on Earth by Legislation, Judgment, and Execution: For having said this,
this Task was impossible to any Power but Divine; He corrects him self by a ding, or Angelical at least; And sure the Man Chrift's Ability, is far Superior to Angels; besides that he has them Miniftring to Him, and giving Him notice of Matters if there be any Occasion; for he has Seven Principal Spirits, who are the Eyes of the Lamb sent forth through all the Earth, as the same Author interprets, Rev. 5. 6.

So the Author of a little Book, called the Future State, the same who wrote the Good Samaritan, a worthy Divine of the Church of England, says many things very Rational concerning the large extent of Chriff humanity Knowledge; that probably, He can as easily inspift the whole Globe of this Earth, and the Heavens that encompass it, as we can view a Globe of an Inch Diameter, P. 46. 47. that he intercedes as Man, and can be interceded in a case which he knows not? So again, P. 150. The like says Limborch in his Theol. Chrifti. lib. 5. C. 18.

Let me add only the Testimony of Dr. Thomas Goodwin, who was never I suppose cenfured for an Idolater among Difenters; And yet 'tis scarce possible that I shou'd attribute greater knowledge to the Man Jesus Christ than he. See his Select casos, part 3d, where he says, The humane understanding of Chrifi takes in all occurrences which concerns His Church. And that as he said all Power in Heaven and Earth is given me of my Father, so might he say all knowledge in Heaven and Earth is given me, that his Beams pierce into every corner, that he knows the Sore of every Heart, and concludes with the remarkable words, that as a Looking-Glass wrought in the form of a Globe, represents the Images of all that is in the Room, so the enlarged humane understanding of Chrifi, takes in all things in Heaven and Earth at once. It seems these Men did not take it to be the Peculiar Perfection of the Divine Nature to know the Hearts; So as that no Creature could partake of it by Divine assistance and Revelation.

Indeed, as to the manner of knowing the heart; We cannot tell how the inhabitants of the other World have access to our minds or to each others, but without doubt, Jesus Christ, whose eyes are as a Flame of Fire, has more proper abilities for penetration, as well as more Revelation from God, and more Capacity for receiving and Treasuring it up, than all others. In short, tis evident Chrift as Man, is the Great Administrator of Gods providential Kingdom, John 5. 27. As Man, he must Judge the whole World, Acts 17. 31. which implies vast and universal Knowledge: Who then dares say, that the Man Christ Jesus, has not a Knowledge as large as this narrow Earth, or as the Sand by the Sea shore, without any Hyperbole? I think 'tis beyond all reasonable doubt, and as this Doctrine has appeared Rational enough, and escaped all Censure, as far as I know, when delivered by others than the Orintarians; So I hope it must not be counted Heretical in them, for which others never Profes the Glorious Title of Orthodox.

Thus it appears, That all which is said of Christ’s extensive Knowledge in Scripture, is far from proving Him to be the Supreme Infinite God, it may be Accounted for otherwise very fairly; And the like may be also said with respect to other (which some call) Divine perfections attributed to Him, that they are no more truly infinite, as attributed to Him, than this of Knowledge, but that there are plain evidences of their being attributed to Him in a limited, and inferior Sense, in comparison of what they are, in the most Glorious God over all Gods; and therefore Men had need produce other sort of Arguments for the Supreme Deity of Christ, than from these Topicks.

Nor do I doubt but I could maintain my cause with equal advantage, upon the Head of Divine worship, which is another Topick, whence my opposers wou’d infer the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ; it were
were easy to shew, there is no Instance of I must have one who is supreme God and supreme Divine Worship given ultimately to him in Scripture, but on the contrary, that all the Honour it affixes to him, is such as speaks him to be inferior to the Father, and dependent on him; since it is wholly grounded upon what God his Father has graciously believed on him: Thus he requires Baptism (if that be an act of immediate proper Worship) in his Name, because all power in Heaven and Earth was given to him. Thus we must honour the Son (as truly not as greatly as) we honour the Father, because the Father hath committed, or given, all judgment to him, Joh. 5. 22, 23. Thus at the Name of Jesus must every Knee bow, and every Tongue confess him to be Lord; because as a reward of his Obedience the Father hath given him a Name above every Name: And 'tis added, that all this Homage is ultimately to the Glory of the Father. Worship which is thus grounded upon derived and borrowed Excellency, is not supremely Divine, and cannot be offered to the Infinite Self-originating, Independent Deity, without a great Affront, because 'tis not the most excellent, Mal. 1. 14. to praise an independent God, for Honour and Power granted to him by another, supposes a Falsity, and mingles Reproaches with Praise.

So that however there may be the same common external Acts, or Words; (such as bowing the Knee, and saying Glory and Praise, &c.) used to God and the Mediator, as also in some Instances, they are given in common to ordinary Men, yet the Mind of a rational Worshipper, will make a Distinction in his inward Intention, as no doubt but those devout Jews did, who in the same act, bowed their Heads, and worshipped both God and the King, 1 Chron. 29. 20. but I shall not pursue this any farther at present.

Moreover, I judge, that to assert Jesus Christ to be the supreme God, subverts the Gospel Doctrine of his Mediation; for if
inward Desires and Distresses of all Christians, or to know any one's Heart; And the real Person, or infinite Being, the other; how then can he be a compassionate Father in cases that he knows nothing of? for they worship three infinite supreme Be-Or how can he have a fellow-feeling of their ings or but One) object to them both; these Sufferings, which he knows not that they two great Doctrines are subverted, the Re- feel at all? What comfort is there in this alfs leave room for a Mediator in the account of Christ's Mediation? The Divine Godhead; but they destroy the Unity of Nature is precluded from it, because they the direct us to seek to that as the ultimate ther hand, they who hold true to the Ding- Object thro' a Mediator; and the Humane dentity, or one infinite Being under three modes, or Properties, or Relations, our cafe, nor knows our Hearts, whether we by plain consequence leave no place do by plain consequence leave no place for such a Mediator as they require, viz. for such a Mediator as they require, viz. One who is an infinite God, to be Medi- tor with the infinite God; when there is no other infinite Being but his own, and he cannot be thought to intercede with himself neither: So that to keep the Gospel Faith whole and undefiled, 'tis neces- sary that we avoid both these Rocks, by believing God and his Christ to be Two Beings, that so there may be room for 'One to Mediate with the Other: And that these Two are not two equal or supreme Beings, but one subordinate to the other, that so we may preserve the Unity of the supreme God.

Let us then bethink ourselves seriously, not what the Church in latter Days has thought of Jesus Christ, but what His own Apostles, when inspired, have thought of him: Methinks none was more likely, or ever had a fairer Occasion to represent his Lord in the height of his Glory, than the Apostle Peter, in the Day of Pentecost! That Day of Triumph, with the newly昇自己is by Office a God, or Ruler over all; and visibly inspired Apostles: Hear how made so by him who sets all things under his Lord Jesus before his Murthers, Acts 2, 22. Ye men of Israel hear these words, Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, 27, relating to the Unity of the supreme by Miracles, Wonders and Signs, which God God, and the one Mediator with him; so did by him in the midst of you: Again v. the Trinitarians have left them both among 36. Let all the House of Israel know affur- their several Parties. For as they are di- vided into two principal Parties (besides this whom ye have Crucified, both Lord and several Sub-divisions) both among Confor- Chrift. Now 'tis observable, the Apostle was
was aiming at such a Description of Jesus properly Christ is most High God, it is to say the inferior is supreme, and the Man is God, which cannot be, only by a Figure, as the Bread is Christ's Body, viz. by representation. And truly if the Business can be salved here, by making a personal Union between God and Christ, I see not why the Papists may not set up such another Union between Christ's Body and the Bread in the Eucharist, and then they may stoutly defend that 'tis the Body of Christ properly. But indeed nothing is more obvious than the unsteadiness of many Protestant Writers, when they write against the Papists and the Unitarians: How do they go backwards and forwards? And when they have triumphantly and fully beaten off the vain Assaults and Objections of the Papists, they take up their baffled Arguments, and urge them the same way (as others did against them) against the Unitarians; and what they have maintained against the former, as good Argument, notwithstanding Romish Evasions; these Arguments they oppose, when the Unitarians turn them against themselves, in the point of the Trinity, and they betake themselves to like Shifts and Evasions. Thus let the Papists object to them the Novelty of the Protestant Religion, and ask them where was their Religion and Church before Luther? They think it a weak Cabal, and can tell 'em their Religion was in the Bible, and in the Church among the Primitive Christians, however it lay hid in the time of common Apostacy; and yet the Unitarian they Things, as much as Christ's Body, and Bread are, and therefore cannot contradict any Christian Church for so many Ac- cated one of the other, in a proper sense, as held that Christ was not God? As or without a figure, as all our Writers against the Papists they will prove that the gainst the Romish Transubstantiation, argue. Fathers did not hold the Elements to be and is of equal force in the present case. Christ's real Body and Blood, because To be annoyed, imports, to be raised by them oft call them the Images thereof: But Authority and Honour confer'd; 'tis in let the Unitarian argue that Christ is not effect to say, the Person is a Creature, or the supreme God, because the Scripture inferior Being; and therefore to say that stiles him the Image of God; and therefor
fore not the God whole Image only he is; then, the thing it self and its image must be the same thing. Against the Papists, they can prove St. Peter was inferior to the Church, and the rest of the Apostles, (tho' not singly to each) because he was sent up and down by them: This Baronius takes hold of, and tells them by the same reason, they must grant the Arian Argument to be good, viz. That the Father is greater than the Son, because the Son is sent by him: But let an Unitarian argue thus, and then tho' the Father sends, and the Son be sent by him, yet they shall both be equal, and this shall make no difference: Against the Papists, they will boast, that they don't hoodwink the People in Ignorance; but bid' them inquire and examine, and the more the better, while 'tis ground of Suspicion, that the Papists cheat Men, by their keeping them from the Light; but now having to do with the Unitarians, they ask about, and bid beware of Reading and Disputing, they are for an implicit Faith, without examining into deep Mysteries; they bid us believe, not pry into them; tho' we only desire to examine whether the Scriptures do reveal any such Mysteries at all: the rest we will believe, if we could see that, and desire no other liberty in interpreting Scripture, than they take to justly, in interpreting Christ's words, This is my Body. Upon Protestant Principles the Unitarians think they can stand their ground, and defend themselves in these Matters, as easily as the Protestants can against the Papists.

As to Primitive Antiquity, so many Inquirers both among the Romish and Reformed Writers, have given their impartial Teltimony, that it runs for Arius's Dog-Drine, and have made such poor Apologies for those Fathers, as tho' they knew not, or were not careful of their fundamental Articles of Faith, till they came to be banded about in General Councils, that I think it not needful to say more here.

only one thing I would suggest. That allowing the Primitive Writers to speak in different places with great, at least seeming Discord (which any ingenious Man must grant) sometimes plainly declaring Jesus Christ inferior to, and the Servant of the Father, before his Incarnation; at other times giving him high Titles, as of one equal with God; yet 'tis far more reasonable to suppose the higher Expressions should be expounded according to the other, than the contrary; because in discouraging, and pleading for a beloved admired Object, as the Lord Jesus deserveth to be, 'tis very easy and natural to run out into Strains of Eloquence, and lofty flights of Praise, which must be interpreted not with strict Rigour, but with great Abatements; as is to be observed in some of their high Encomiums on the venerable Mystery of the Eucharist, as tho' with the Papists, they took the Elements for Christ's real Body, which yet they evidently did deny. But on the contrary, no Men are wont ever to speak diminitively on such occasions; they could not have a thought to lessen their Master's Glory; and therefore if they ever represent him as not the supreme God, nor equal to him, we have all reason to think, they then spake only the Words of Truth and Soberness, what the exact Matter required.

For my own part, as I write this under the serious Impressions of those great Relations in which the Blessed Jesus stands to me, whom I credit as my great Teacher; whom I desire to admire and love as my gracious endeared Benefactor, beyond Father or Mother, or Friends, &c. Whom I reverence as my Lord and Ruler, and solemnly expect, as my Final Glorious Judge, who is to come in his own, and in his Father's Glory, Luk. 9. 26. And in the mean time deal with God thro' him, as my only Mediator and Intercessor: So I earnestly profess, that 'tis not without grievous and bitter Relentsments, that I shou'd
Reed to truth on, if he be not the very supreme God, (the ranting Dialect of our profane Age) no, but still he was sure he is the true Christ, whatever else he might be mistaken in: 'Tis deliberate wickedness in Men to hazard the Reputation of the Truth and Holiness of the blessed Jesus, upon a difficult and disputable Opinion; to dare to say, That if they are mistaken in their Opinion (which I verily believe) then Jesus Christ is a Liar and Deceiver, a Mock Saviour, and the like: What is this but to expose him to the Scorn of Infidels?

So that I see, with sorrow, that to this very Day, even among professed Christians themselves, Christ Crucified is to some a Stumbling block, and to others Foolishness: If he be not as Good and Great, as the God who appointed him for a Saviour, tho' he be allowed to be a Man approved of God, by Signs and mighty Wonders which God did by him; and by whom God made the Worlds, as the Instrument, tho' he be granted to be One in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead, Joh. 14:10. So as it never dwelt before in Prophets or any other: tho' He be One with the Father, by Unity of Content and Will, as Calvin interprets Job. 10. 30. One in testimony with the Father and Spirit, as Beza and many others understand that in 1 John 5. 7. Tho' he be the most lively image of God that the World ever saw, so that he who sees him, does in great measure see the Father, as in a bright Mirror, Joh. 14. 10. Tho' he be owned and loved, as one far above Angels, and Archangels; and over all Powers in Heaven and Earth, a God or Ruler: The great Administrator of God's Kingdom, both on Earth, and in the invisible Hades, as having the Keys, or Ministreral Power of Death and Hell, Rev. 1. 18. Yet after all this, if he be not the very supreme God himself, nay to compleat the Aburdity; if he be not the same very...
God, whose Son and Image, he is; He shall be no Mediator for them; they do ex Hy- 
Pople from embracing the Christian Faith, 
pothesis; or on this Supposition, openly dis- 
own him for their Saviour and Confidence; I grant, that if it be the certain Truth of 
they are ashamed to trust in him, and seem Insufficient and Contemptible, than to Be- 
lieve on him. These things are to me a 
very grievous Offence, who think it a 
great pity, that so excellent a Constitution as the Gospel is, so amiable to contem- 
plate, so proper to entertain our thankful Admiration, for the Grace and Wisdom it contains; shou’d either be lost in the clouds of an affected Obliquity, or exposed to the derision of ungodly Scoffers.

Tis yet a further grief to think what a fatal Stop is hereby put to the Progress of clear Light and Peace shall shine on the Gospel, whose Rejection by Jews, Ma- 
hometans and Pagans, is undeniably occa- 
 tioned by the common Doctrine of the In- 
carnation of God; one may read in Le Enthroned Redeemer; for worthy is the 
Compte’s History of China, how the Hea- 
thens derided the Christians Doctrine of a 
Mortal God; and upon that account look’d Now to Him who loved us, and wash- 
upon Christianity as fabulous, as their own ed us from our Sins in His own Blood, and 
Religion: And Doctor Canisius, in his Book hath made us Kings and Priests to God; of Credulity and Incredulity, p. 118. Says even the Father, to Him be Glory and he could prove by many Instances out of Dominion for ever.

But this I confess unto thee, that after the way, which they call Hereby, so Worship I the God of my Fathers, believing all things which are written in the Law and the Prophets, Acts 24. 14.

FINIS.