



© 1991



DEFENCE

OF THE

DEITY AND ATONEMENT

JESUS CHRIST

IN REPLY TO

RAM-MOHUN ROY

OF CALCUTTA.

---

BY DR. MARSHMAN

OF SERAMPORE.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY KINGSBURY, PARBURY AND

LEADEN HALL STREET







ing to "maintain the peace and harmony of mankind at large, and calculated to elevate men's ideas to high and liberal notions of one God, while they were intelligible alike to the learned and the unlearned." but aspersed the miracles of Jesus, by comparing them to the fabulous miracles of the Hindoo sages, and hence described them "as not at best to carry little weight with them." This preface gave rise to the animadversions of "A Christian Missionary," the Rev. Mr. Schmidt, which were sent for insertion in the Friend of India, and to which the Editor of that work appended the observations contained in No. 1.

In reply to these observations there appeared soon after, "An Appeal to the Christian Public in Defence of the Precepts of Jesus, by a Friend to Truth." The Editor of the Friend of India, though then engaged in a more extended examination of Ram-mohan Roy's positions, felt himself constrained to lose no time in repelling the charge adduced against him, of having

“violated truth, equity, and liberality,” by applying the term *idolater* to the compiler of the *Precepts of Jesus*, as well as the charges brought against those who had renounced idolatry and embraced Christianity. This reply appears the *Seventh* of the series.

The fuller explanation of Rami-mohun Roy's opinions, mentioned by the Editor in the preceding articles, is contained in No. III. of the present work.

To this review Rami-mohun Roy published an answer, consisting of 173 pages, entitled “A Second Appeal to the Christian Public in Defence of the *Precepts of Jesus*,” the reply to which on the part of the Editor constitutes the last article of the present publication.



# C O N T E N T S.

## I.

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Observations by the Editor of the "Friend of India" affixed to a Letter sent for insertion in that work by "A Christian Missionary," on the subject of Ram-mohun Roy's publication entitled "The Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Peace and Happiness."</i> | - | - | - | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

## II.

|  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Remarks on certain Observations in "An Appeal to the Christian Public in Defence of the Precepts of Jesus, by a Friend to Truth."</i> | - | - | - | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|

## III.

|  |   |   |   |    |
|--|---|---|---|----|
| <i>Observations on certain Ideas contained in the Introduction to "The Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Happiness and Peace. Calcutta, 1820."</i> | - | - | - | 17 |
|--|---|---|---|----|

## IV.

|   |   |   |   |    |
|---|---|---|---|----|
| <i>Remarks on "A Second Appeal to the Christian Public, in Defence of the Precepts of Jesus, by Ram-mohun Roy."</i> |   |   |   |    |
| Introductory Observations   | - | - | - | 64 |

## CHAPTER I.

### *On the Atonement.*

#### SECTION I.

|   |   |   |   |    |
|---|---|---|---|----|
| The impossibility of a Sinner's being justified by the Divine Law | - | - | - | 71 |
|---|---|---|---|----|

#### SECTION II.

|   |   |  |  |    |
|---|---|--|--|----|
| General Remarks on the Evidence furnished by Scripture to the Atonement and the Deity of Christ | - |  |  | 78 |
|---|---|--|--|----|

VIII

SECTION III.

Evidence borne to the Atonement by the Pentateuch - 88

SECTION IV.

The Psalms examined respecting the Atonement - 102

SECTION V.

The Prophets examined respecting the Atonement - 112

CHAPTER II.

*On the Deity of Christ.*

SECTION I.

Evidence adduced from the Pentateuch - - - 144

SECTION II.

The Psalms examined respecting Christ's Deity—Animadversions on certain passages, noticed - - 152

SECTION III.

The Prophets examined respecting Christ's Deity—Animadversions on certain passages, noticed - - 166

SECTION IV.

Ram-mohun Roy's Second Chapter, "Natural Inferiority of the Son to the Father," examined - - - 194

SECTION V.

Ram-mohun Roy's Objections to the Seven Positions, considered - - - - - 217

SECTION VI.

Concluding Observations.—Personality of the Holy Spirit—Doctrine of the Trinity—Mosheim—Locke—Newton.—Reflections - - - - 248

A DEFENCE  
OF THE  
DEITY AND ATONEMENT  
OF  
JESUS CHRIST.

I.

*Observations by the Editor of the Friend of India, affixed to a letter sent for insertion in that work by "A Christian Missionary," on the subject of Ram-mohun Roy's publication entitled "The Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Peace and Happiness."*

[Friend of India, No. XX. February 1820.]

SINCE receiving the above remarks we have obtained a copy of the work to which they allude, which contains eighty-two octavo pages, exclusive of the introduction. This work while it furnishes an overwhelming proof of the truth and excellence of the Sacred Scriptures, since an intelligent Heathen whose mind is as yet completely opposed to the *grand design* of the Saviour's becoming incarnate, feels constrained to acknowledge that the precepts of Jesus the Saviour are so fully consonant with truth and righteousness, so exactly suited to the circumstances of mankind—those of his own countrymen, as well as those of the western world, tend so evidently "to maintain the



peace and harmony of mankind at large, and are so admirably calculated to elevate men's ideas to high and liberal notions of one God, while they are intelligible alike to the learned and the unlearned," that he feels constrained to recommend them to his countrymen as "the Guide to Peace and Happiness." While this recommendation of merely a part of the Sacred Scriptures, which "cannot be broken," forming as they do a harmonious whole, decides the question among the Hindoos respecting their paramount excellence, and of course their Divine Origin: the manner in which this is done, as is justly observed by our highly esteemed correspondent, may greatly injure the cause of truth.

It is well known that in Britain and on the Continent there are many who, while they do not openly deny Him, earnestly wish to degrade the Redeemer of the world to a level with Confucius or Mahomet, and to contemplate Him as the Teacher and Founder of a Sect, instead of adoring Him as the Lord of all, the Redeemer of men, the Sovereign Judge of quick and dead. These, viewing the Compiler of this work as a man new to the subject and not yet biassed (as they term it) in favour of any system of doctrine, will insist on his being far more likely to discover the genuine meaning of the Scriptures, than those who, educated in a Christian country, have been conversant from

their youth with the generally received interpretation of Scripture; and giving him full credit for having examined the whole of the Sacred Writings in the closest manner, will be pleased beyond measure to find that, by the testimony of an intelligent and unprejudiced Heathen, they have in Jesus Christ a Teacher who *cannot* search the heart—a Saviour (if the name may be still used) who does not reduce them to the mortifying necessity of giving up all their boasted rectitude of intention and submitting unconditionally to his mere grace for salvation,—who, while He, in their opinion, duly appreciates their native goodness of heart by submitting to them the noblest and most equitable precepts, never intends, as the Judge of all, to examine whether they cordially obey them, nor indeed lays claim to that Divine Nature which alone could render Him capable of judging the secrets of the heart, the hidden springs of action, at the great and final day. Meanwhile, the Deist and the Infidel will be no less delighted to find the miracles of Jesus Christ classed by a well-informed Hindoo with the Hindoo sage Ugusti's drinking up the ocean in a fit of passion, and his causing the Vindhya mountains to prostrate themselves before him; described to his countrymen as being such, as, if narrated, “ would be apt at best to carry little weight with them;” and hence represented as

being better suppressed, though his precepts are excellent. Whether this decision, in which the enemies of Revelation will so much triumph, be the effect of a most careful and thorough examination of the Sacred Writings—or of the *absence* of such examination, it is certainly important to enquire, on account of the many opposers of Divine Revelation still to be found in Europe; but, as it is impossible to do justice to the enquiry in our present Number, we intend to take up the subject more fully in the first Number of the Quarterly Series, which we hope will appear in two months.

## II.

*Remarks on certain Observations in “ An Appeal to the Christian Public in Defence of the Precepts of Jesus, by a Friend to Truth.”*

[Friend of India, No. XXIII. May 1820.]

SINCE publishing our last Number we have been favoured with the perusal of a pamphlet of thirty-two pages, which has just appeared under the title of “ An Appeal to the Christian Public in Defence of ‘ the Precepts of Jesus,’ by a Friend to Truth ;” in which he begs “ to appeal to the public against the unchristianlike as well as uncivil manner in which the Editor (of the Friend of India) has adduced his objections to the compilation by introducing personality, and applying the term of *Heathen* to the compiler.” He adds, “ I say unchristianlike manner, because the Editor, by making use of the term heathen, has, I presume, violated truth, charity, and liberality, which are essential to Christianity in every sense of the word.” While we fully agree with this writer, that truth, charity, and liberality are essential to Christianity in every sense of the word, we must intreat permission to plead not guilty to this charge, not even in thought.

Of the three generic terms applicable to natives of India, Christian, Heathen, or Musul-

man, the last was evidently inapplicable, if we were at all correct (as it now appears we were) in our conjecture relative to the compiler of the work in question; and of his wish to be denominated a Christian, the obscure hint conveyed by the "Friend of Truth" in the present Appeal is the first we have received. But the candid author of the "Guide to Happiness and Peace" will readily perceive, that as we belong to that class who think that no one can be a real Christian without believing the Divinity and the Atonement of Jesus Christ, and the Divine Authority of the whole of the Holy Scriptures, while we most cordially wish that he were altogether such, we could not term him a Christian without a violation of our own principles. We apprehend however, that the term "Heathen" unless accompanied with adjuncts which mark it as reproachful, to which class we were not aware that "intelligent" or "unprejudiced" belongs, cannot be candidly construed into a term of reproach, when it has been so often applied by the most eminent English divines to the best men who have ever appeared in the heathen world, and even to those who have been most averse to the popular idolatry of their countrymen. We cannot but think therefore, that this "Appeal to the public against the unchristianlike, as well as uncivil conduct of the Editor of the Friend of India," might have

been spared ; and that it required no very high exercise of the Christian virtues to avoid in this instance “ retaliation upon enemies, and the example of the Editors of the Friend of India.”

The attempts of Ram-mohun Roy to burst the bonds of superstition in which his countrymen have been held for so many ages, although they have gone no farther, and particularly his humane efforts in favour of that large portion of our unoffending Indian fellow subjects who are liable every day to be immolated on the funeral pile of their husbands, have given him a high place in our esteem. With our noticing the preface of the work in question, we feel assured its author is too candid to be offended. The ground he has himself so properly taken when investigating the works of his countrymen, forbids us to think he can be offended with a calm and faithful investigation of any thing published by himself ; and the circumstances of his own countrymen render the manner in which the Holy Scriptures may be introduced to them of the utmost importance. It will be at once granted that they alone are able to make the most ignorant wise unto salvation. But this depends wholly on the manner in which they are received. If a part of them alone be received because it contains certain valuable precepts, while the rest is esteemed scarcely worthy of notice, the Holy Scriptures are not re-

ceived as the word of God ; they are stripped of their peculiar majesty and authority, and degraded to a level with the writings of men. But when stripped of those doctrines (or dogmas) which enlighten the mind, awaken the conscience, and convert the soul, to those who thus receive them they are no longer the power of God unto salvation ; they rather become a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence. If the Holy Scriptures be therefore the only remedy for the misery of mankind, it is scarcely possible to injure men more than by presenting them in such a way as shall destroy their efficiency, since this is robbing the diseased of their only chance of recovery. In the present circumstances of India, therefore, none who have its welfare at heart ought to be indifferent to a point so important. Whether the preface to Ram-mohun Roy's work has this tendency or not, it certainly becomes him earnestly to consider, were it only for the sake of that respectable body of his countrymen who are likely to regard the Sacred Scriptures precisely as he represents them. When to this he adds the effect which his representation of them is likely to have on those in Europe, who, while they call themselves by the name of Christ, would gladly degrade him to a level with Confucius or Mahomet, and rather regard him as the Founder of a sect, than adore him as God over

all, blessed for evermore, we are ready to hope that his philanthropy will lead him to regret that he had not more deeply studied the whole of the Sacred Writings before he had thus delivered his opinion of them. The examination of the reasonableness of this opinion we shall reserve, as already mentioned, for the first Number of the Quarterly Series of the Friend of India, which is now in the press; in doing which while a regard to the best interests of mankind will not permit us to trifle, we trust that we shall not lose sight of that impartial candour which ought to pervade all discussions relative to the Sacred Writings.

We feel constrained however, though with much regret, to add a remark or two on the observations of the "Friend of Truth" in this Appeal, relative to the Circulation of the Scriptures, and to those Natives who have been baptized on a profession of faith in the Redeemer of men. In this instance we regret that the "Friend of Truth" had not previously sought the best information on the subject, which would have been cheerfully imparted had it been desired. He would then have learned that "European Missionary gentlemen residing on nearly the same spot upwards of twenty years," (nothing of course personal in all this!) "had *not* distributed among the natives" numberless copies of the complete Bible written in



different languages; for a few figures would express the number: and that these have *not been* “distributed in vain;” for a degree of light has already gone abroad into various circles in India of which he can have little knowledge, which there is reason to hope will never be extinguished.

With the “dogmas taught by these Missionaries which have completely counteracted their benevolent efforts,” the Friend of Truth is accurately acquainted, or he is not: if he be not, he should not have ventured this assertion; but if he be, he knows that while they are the leading doctrines of the New Testament, they may be summed up in the two following positions, that God views all sin as so abominable, that the death of Jesus Christ alone can expiate its guilt; and that the human heart is so corrupt, that it must be renewed by the Divine Spirit before a man can enter heaven. These two doctrines, with those connected with them, are the leading dogmas they have attempted to teach the heathen. But we may ask him, Without these two dogmas what is the Gospel? To persuade men to accept the Gospel or receive the Scriptures without believing these, would be like persuading a man in a deadly disease to commit himself to a physician possessed of a specific remedy by assuring him that he shall never be troubled with his medicine. If teach-

ing Christianity to the natives of India *with* these dogmas has effected little, still that little is all clear gain to the cause of righteousness; to have taught it *without* them would have effected nothing; it must have left the Hindoos nearly as they were: a God who does not abhor and justly punish all sin, is an idol still, a mere fiction of the imagination. Besides, this admirable way of circulating the Holy Scriptures by observing a profound silence relative to the dogmas they contain, must have ended in shame. Intelligent natives could scarcely have opened them without something of the dogmas already mentioned meeting them at every page. To have circulated the Scriptures, therefore, while their distinguishing doctrines were kept wholly out of sight, would only have led to a contempt of those engaged therein for their disingenuous conduct.

The "Friend of Truth" is not aware, however, "that we can find a single respectable Musulman or Hindoo who were not in want of the necessaries of life, once glorified with the truth of Christianity, constantly adhering to it." But does this prove that there have been none? may there not have been some without his being aware of it? Is he quite certain that he has carefully examined every case? We think he has not; and regret his venturing this assertion without such examination. Is it

a fact then that “nearly all who have changed their faith, have been allured by other attractions than by a conviction of the truth and reasonableness of these dogmas? By what means has this “Friend of Truth” ascertained this? Has he examined the hearts and scrutinized the motives of hundreds of persons whom he can scarcely have seen? A “Friend of Truth,” however, should have done this before he published to the world his suspicion of their hypocrisy, otherwise he may have fixed a stigma upon upright characters, which they may never have an opportunity of removing. But “they are nearly all employed or fed by their spiritual teachers.” This is a singular assertion. To be fed gratis then, and to live honestly by labour, are both marks of consummate hypocrisy! The coupling of these together was necessary, however; for had the “Friend of Truth” said, they are nearly all *fed* in idleness by their spiritual teachers, he must have forfeited all right to this appellation; for of no one native convert, not incapacitated for labour by disease or old age, can it be said that he is fed in perfect idleness for embracing Christianity. But is constant labour so much the delight of the natives of India, that Brahmuns and men of the highest families in the Writer cast, of respectable moral character, are to be easily found, who will renounce all the honours of cast for

themselves and their posterity, for the sake of gaining eight or ten rupees monthly by steady and constant labour? How many Brahmuns and Kaystas have turned Musulmans with this view in the last twenty years? Yet we have seen men of this rank in Hindoo society forsake the houses of their rich relatives in Calcutta, where they lived in ease and idleness, come to Serampore, and professing to believe the dogmas in question, submit, year after year, to a regular course of labour, proving themselves the most upright among all our native servants, and steadily resisting all solicitations from their wealthy relatives to return to a life of idleness and ease. The Missionaries of Serampore have now in their employ *thirteen* of the Brahmun and Writer casts, men correct in their morals and upright in their conduct. Let the "Friend of Truth," if he be able, prevail on an equal number of precisely the same rank (their morals we will waive) to renounce for ever all the honours of cast for the sake of receiving, in a state of perfect idleness, the monthly sum these gain by labour. But till he can do this, ought he not, as a friend to truth, to forbear publishing suspicions of base hypocrisy respecting those with whom he must be so imperfectly acquainted, merely because they have, professedly for Christ's sake, preferred a life of ho-

nest and constant labour, though attended with the loss of cast, to a life of ease and worldly honour in a course which they deemed contrary to the will of Him who created and redeemed them?

But it is not a fact that nearly all these *are* either fed or employed by their spiritual teachers. "Employed" we trust they are in some honest calling or other, for we inculcate it as a fundamental law of Christianity, that he who will not work should not eat. By their spiritual teachers, however, we are certain they cannot all be employed. We think that all their spiritual teachers in India besides, can scarcely employ an equal number with the Missionaries of Serampore; and for the information of this "Friend to Truth" we will give him the exact number employed at Serampore. They amount to *thirty-five*\*, including both men and women, for Christianity by no means forbids the employment in honest labour of the latter as well as the former; and thirty-three servants equally faithful and correct in their moral conduct, they do not possess among several hundreds. Precisely the same labour is required of them, however, as of Musulman and Hindoo servants, which accounts for the

\* In addition to these there are perhaps from ten to fifteen Native Christian Itinerants employed by the Serampore Missionaries in different parts of the country.

story of the “rebellious” ones given in this Appeal. Certain natives had been excluded from Christian communion for vice; for which, however, they were indebted to Hindooism, not to Christianity, and having as little relish for labour as for virtue, they left their employments, which had been continued to them notwithstanding their exclusion; and prevailing on two or three weak men of better morals to join with them, they presented a Petition to the Bishop of Calcutta with the hope of living without labour. Upon this petition his Lordship wisely frowned, which made the profligate abscond, and the weak quietly return to their employ acknowledging their folly. From this brief statement the “Friend of Truth” will see, that if there be indeed “a few hundreds of these native converts,” they cannot be all, or nearly all, employed by their spiritual teachers; and that the conduct of those employed by them in preferring Christianity with a life of constant labour and the loss of worldly honour, to idolatry with a life of idleness, and all the honours of the cast, united with their correct moral conduct, ought rather to be esteemed a proof of their sincerity in their profession, than adduced as a proof of their hypocrisy.

As the “Friend of Truth” chose to affirm these things relative to the native converts

under our own eye, we have felt it a duty due equally to Christianity and to India, to be thus particular in our reply, although we have done it with much reluctance.—And if, previously to asserting any thing again on this subject, he will consult the Missionaries of Serampore, who must be fully acquainted therewith, and to the accuracy of whose statements in pecuniary affairs he himself bears witness, the most exact information will be given him; which for him thus to seek previously to charging a large body of his own countrymen with gross hypocrisy, will, we apprehend, be no dishonour to his character as a “Friend of Truth.”

### III.

*Observations on certain Ideas contained in the Introduction to "The Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Happiness and Peace. Calcutta, 1820."*

[Friend of India, Quarterly Series, No. I. Sept. 1820.]

A FEW months ago when it was announced that a Compilation from the four Gospels by a native of India (it was supposed Ram-mohun Roy) was in the press, designed for the use of his countrymen, much interest was excited in all who had witnessed his laudable endeavours to expose the folly of the system of idolatry universally prevalent among his countrymen. The idea of a well-informed Hindoo's bearing witness to the authenticity and excellence of the Divine Writings, and recommending them to the perusal of his countrymen as being able to make them wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus, delighted all who felt an interest in the happiness of their Indian fellow subjects, and regarded their reception of the Sacred Oracles in all their divine authority, as the grand means by which this could be secured.

In proportion however as the friends of religion were delighted with the idea of a Selection from the Sacred Scriptures by a Hindoo, which should impart to the minds of his coun-



trymen his own ideas of their excellence, was their disappointment and regret, when they found that this Compilation, entitled “the Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Happiness and Peace,” instead of exhibiting these precepts as a sample of the whole Scriptures, and representing them as affording indubitable proof of the authenticity of its narratives and the reasonableness and importance of its doctrines, were in reality separated from that Gospel, of which they form so important a part, and held up as forming of themselves the way of life; an idea which perverts the grand design of the Gospel, and frustrates the grace of God in the salvation of men, the apostolic axiom applying with as great force now as ever, “If righteousness come by the law, Christ is dead in vain.”

But great as was this disappointment, it was heightened by their perceiving that the Introduction to this Compendium, instead of treating with reverence the other parts of the Sacred Oracles, unhappily tended rather to impugn them; the reader being told, that “historical and some other passages are liable to the doubts and disputes of free-thinkers and anti-christians, especially miraculous relations, which are much less wonderful than the fabricated tales handed down to the Natives of Asia, and consequently would be apt, at best, to carry little weight with them.”

These hints respecting the rest of the Sacred Writings, particularly when taken in connection with the note added at the foot of the page as a specimen of these fabricated tales more wonderful than the miracles of Christ, “that Ugusti is famed for having swallowed the ocean when it had given him offence; and for having restored it by urinary evacuation; and that at his command also, the Vindya range of mountains prostrated itself, and so remains;” appeared likely to convey ideas of them, so contrary to that deep and just reverence with which both the doctrines and the miracles they contain must be regarded, if they become the means of salvation, that those who duly venerate the Sacred Oracles could not but feel grieved that they should be thus held out to those, who, despising idolatry for its grossness and folly, might probably be enquiring for something on which they might build their hopes of future happiness.

It may be proper to observe, that we do not in the least censure any one’s forming a Compilation from the Sacred Scriptures, whether it be of its preceptive, prophetic, or doctrinal parts. We not only think that Ram-mohum Roy had as fair a right to fix on the preceptive part, as any one else has to select its doctrines, but that such a compilation might have been highly useful. But it is of importance

that every compilation be given as a *sample* of the Sacred Writings in all their excellence and importance, and not as a substitute for the whole; in such a way as to create a deep reverence for every part of the Scriptures, and not so as to depreciate the rest of the word of God. For a Compilation, therefore, to be represented as containing what is peculiarly excellent in the Divine Writings, and other parts to be described as comparatively of little value, we think highly injurious to them, and to the best interests of men. It is on this ground that we regret the manner in which this Compilation is introduced to the natives of India: for what the Introductory Preface strongly intimates, the “Defence” of the work since published actually affirms, that “it is too true to be denied, that the Compiler of these moral precepts separated them from some of the dogmas and other matters, chiefly under the supposition that they *alone* were a sufficient guide to secure peace and happiness to mankind at large.” These moral Precepts were, then, presented to the Natives of India as being of themselves sufficient to secure happiness and peace to mankind, while the great Doctrines of salvation were omitted as comparatively unimportant,—and even the Miracles of Christ, to which he himself refers the Jews as calculated to com-

mand belief, should they refuse his teaching, were omitted, as apt at best to carry little weight with them, being much less wonderful than the fabricated tales handed down to the natives of Asia. How different his idea of these miraculous works must be from that of Jesus himself, will appear in the sequel.

We cannot but consider it as a duty we owe to the cause of truth, to our Hindoo fellow-subjects, and even to the Compiler himself, to enquire, whether his thus treating the doctrines of Christianity arose from want of proof in the Sacred Writings respecting them, or from his want of diligence in weighing and examining those proofs of them which must have fallen in his way, not only while making this Compilation, but which are decidedly implied in many of the precepts inserted therein. In doing this, were we to have recourse to the authority of Christ's Apostles whom he commissioned to promulgate his doctrines after his ascension, we might demonstrate their truth and importance by an overwhelming cloud of witnesses. But, uncertain as we are whether the Compiler reposes equal confidence in the doctrines of the Apostles as in those taught by Christ himself, we shall confine ourselves to those furnished by the authors of the Gospels alone.

In making this enquiry we are assisted

by two data furnished by the very title of this Compilation. The precepts of Jesus are termed "the way to happiness and peace." To deserve this name, however, not only must they have been delivered by one whose veracity is indubitable, but by one most thoroughly acquainted with the connexion subsisting between the creature and the Creator, and with the nature and state of mankind. Without the former they could be of no value; without the latter they would be totally inapplicable to the state of men, and could no more ensure happiness to mankind than the laws of Draco secured happiness and peace to Athens. Whatever Jesus has said, therefore, deserves full acceptance for its truth, and the knowledge it displays both of God and of man. Further to render the Precepts of Jesus a sure guide to happiness and peace, we require the most perfect veracity and accuracy in the Narrators of these sayings and precepts. As Jesus wrote nothing himself, our having a single saying of his delivered as really spoken, depends on the veracity of the relators, and the accuracy of their information. The truth, benevolence, and wisdom of Jesus, and the faithfulness and accuracy of the four Evangelists, then, being so fully conceded in the very title given to this Compendium, we confess ourselves quite at a loss to account for the Compiler's not being convinced, even by

their testimony alone, of the truth and importance of those *doctrines* which must have met him so often while forming this compilation.

1. To begin with the most abstruse, and yet the most important of these, *the Deity of Jesus Christ*, is there no evidence afforded by Jesus himself respecting the truth of this doctrine? Can any evidence be desired more conclusive than the witness he has even obliquely given of himself? We have already supposed his veracity to be indubitable, his knowledge of God and of created beings to be perfectly accurate, and his love of virtue and goodness to be such as to render it impossible for him to assume those honours to which he had not the least right: this indeed will be done by no good man. Will a good man speak of himself as God? describe himself as doing that which none can do but the Deity? suffer men to worship him as God? refuse to undeceive men when they understand him as making himself equal with God? and direct himself to be regarded equally with God to the end of time? Yet has all this been done by Jesus of Nazareth, as will appear from the following instances.

No being possesses *ubiquity* but God himself; to no creature is it given to be in two places at

the same moment. Yet Jesus tells Nicodemus,\*  
 “ No man hath ascended up to heaven but he  
 that came down from heaven, even the Son of  
 man who is *in* heaven.” But he was at that  
 moment on the earth conversing with Nicode-  
 mus. What can this sentence mean, then? If  
 it be not a solemn affirmation that he, the Son  
 of man, was at that moment in heaven as well  
 as on earth, has it any meaning? If he did  
 not hereby affirm that he possessed the *omnipre-*  
*sence* of God, we have an affirmation without  
 meaning intermixed with the most important  
 instruction by one whose precepts are the guide  
 to happiness and peace. This however is not  
 a solitary instance; in Mark we have another.  
 Exhorting his followers to social prayer, Jesus  
 adds; “ where two or three are gathered to-  
 gether in my name, there *am I* in the midst of  
 them.” Here Jesus evidently claims *omnipre-*  
*sence*. If this promise did not extend to futu-  
 rity, he had even then more than *two or three*  
 followers, and to be with them all he must be  
 omnipresent. But the directions given evi-  
 dently point to future ages. If Jesus did not  
 possess omnipresence therefore, we have a sen-  
 tence without the least meaning delivered by  
 Him who declares, that for every idle word  
 shall men give account in the judgment.

\* See “ Precepts of Jesus,” page 79.

Again, Jesus ascribes to himself a *knowledge* and an *incomprehensibility of nature* equal with that of God, and peculiar to God alone, even in an address to God himself. “No man *knoweth the Son* but the *Father*; neither *knoweth* any man the *Father* save the *Son*, and he to whomsoever *the Son will* reveal him.” Here he declares, that the nature of the *Son* (the term by which he constantly designates himself) is as *incomprehensible* as the nature of the *Father*, the Lord of heaven and earth, that his own *knowledge* of the incomprehensible nature of the *Father* is equal to that of the *Father*, and that this knowledge is *peculiar* to himself, and communicated to no man but *by* himself and at his own *will*. If this be not assuming the attributes of Deity, we have language perfectly unintelligible made the ground of a solemn and earnest invitation to men, to come to *Jesus* for happiness. But if in these terms he justly describes his own Divine nature, nothing can be more suitable to the succeeding invitation, “Come unto *me* all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and *I* will give you rest.” Who can give rest to the troubled mind, but God alone? Whose *knowledge* beside can discern its griefs in all their multiplied causes? or whose *power* is equal to the mighty task of speaking peace to the heart?

The act of *forgiving sins* is so peculiarly the



prerogative of God, that for any to attempt it except in his name, has ever been justly accounted impious. We find Jesus however claiming this prerogative, and in the midst of the Jews, then better acquainted with theology than any people on earth. On seeing a man with his hand withered, he at once addresses him, "Man, thy sins are forgiven thee." This instantly strikes the Jews, the best theologians of the age; and they justly exclaim, Who can forgive sins but God only? What course does Jesus take to free himself from this charge of blasphemy now lying upon him? Does he explain away his words? Does he declare that he forgives sins only in the name of God as his prophet or messenger, as did Isaiah to Judah, Nathan to David, and Moses to Israel? Nothing of the kind: he replies by displaying another attribute of Deity, *almighty power*, in at once healing the man with the withered hand, and simultaneously asking them, Which was the easiest, to pronounce sins forgiven, or thus to heal? The spontaneous and almost involuntary approbation of all around, many of whom were sufficiently disposed to criminate Jesus, plainly discovers their ideas on the subject;—and their conviction may well suffice for ours.

*Almighty power* is also claimed by Jesus in the most unequivocal manner on a different occasion, even when charged by the Jews with

making himself equal with God. In such a case a wise and good man who meant nothing of the kind, would have repelled the charge with just indignation, or would have shown them calmly that they had mistaken his meaning. Yet Jesus does neither ; but, on the contrary, further ascribes to himself the power of *quicken*ing and *rais*ing the dead like the Father himself, adding, that the Father had committed all judgment unto him, “ that all men might honour the Son, *even as* they honour the Father ;”—and that the Father himself is not honoured by those who refuse to honour the Son. Can this language be reconciled to piety, sobriety, or truth, if Jesus did not intend to claim Divine honours as his proper right ? But, if his *precepts* be a guide to happiness and peace, he must have possessed these qualities in a superior degree.

The fact of his heavenly Father’s having committed to him the *final judgment* of all who have lived since the creation, may of itself serve instead of all other proof. Let it be recollected that on the accuracy and justice of this final decision, are suspended—not only the eternal destiny of countless millions, who are to be judged according to the secrets of their hearts, (for all other judgment would be incomplete ;) but the honour of God’s character, and the happiness of the whole universe to all eternity. Were this judgment to be unjust or inaccurate

in a single instance, it would be impossible that this fact should be concealed from the injured individual, or from the whole creation; and instead of the Divine character's appearing righteous and glorious in the eyes even of the wicked, it would for ever appear the reverse. No work, therefore, can be imagined so important as this—to mankind, to the interests of righteousness, to the character of the Supreme, and the happiness of every righteous being throughout eternity, which would be at once destroyed if the most distant suspicion of unrighteousness could exist against the character of Him whose Supreme Excellence constitutes all their felicity. Yet consider the qualifications requisite for this work.—To secure a perfectly accurate judgment of one individual, not only must all his *public* actions be known, but all the secret springs of those actions—all that was intended by them—all the conduct of others which rendered these actions with the feelings dictating them, either proper or blameable. It is further necessary that every *private* act be carefully scanned, every word duly weighed, and every secret thought fully discerned. But what being not *omniscient* can thus judge of the life of one individual through the term of seventy years? What being not *omnipresent* can thus be acquainted with the actions, words, and thoughts of all the indivi-

duals who compose only one age of mankind? What finite mind could search into past ages, accurately discerning every deed, and word, and thought since the creation? or *recollect* the mighty mass of information furnished by the secret and public actions of the millions who have lived in the remotest countries in every age of the world, were it communicated to him? What mind short of infinite, could even *arrange* all these actions, discriminate their nicest shades of criminality, and pronounce a sentence in which even men's self-love shall not be able to discern any thing unjust throughout eternity? One failure here, one circumstance overlooked, one feeling overrated, one action mistaken as to its motive, would at once tarnish the glory of the Divine Character and Government—quench the joys of heaven—and fill the universe with mourning throughout eternity. As all this must have been present to the Infinite Mind of the Father, his committing to the Son this mighty work, on the due execution of which the glory of his character and the justification of all his ways to men and angels, are suspended for ever, forms a testimony to *His* knowledge of the real character and attributes of Jesus, which leaves nothing to be added by men: and that he has thus done is declared by one who, if his precepts are “the guide to happiness and peace,” cannot be suspected of falsehood or mistake.

To these instances, which so evidently shew that Jesus claimed the attributes of Deity, ascribed to himself the works God alone can perform, and when charged with this by his most inveterate enemies, neither endeavoured to undeceive them, nor repelled the charge, might be added many others. That *worship* is due to no *man*, but to God alone, is universally allowed; but to one of the Evangelists was this fact confirmed in a most forcible manner respecting *angels*. Astonished at the things revealed to him, John was about to worship the heavenly messenger from whom he had received them. The angel promptly forbids him, saying, "See thou do it not: Worship God." Yet this evangelist declares, that the blind man whose eyes Jesus had opened, worshipped *him*, without giving the least hint that Jesus felt unwilling to permit this act, although he with such exactness relates the angel's refusing it. Did he think his beloved master less humble than the angel, or did he know him to be more worthy by nature? This he will himself decide, if we permit him to speak. He describes his Lord as speaking thus after his ascension. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord, who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty." And we see no reason why Jesus

should not be as fully believed after his ascension to heaven, as while giving those precepts on earth which form our guide to happiness and peace ; or why John the Divine should not be as worthy of credit, as John the Evangelist. John, however, is not alone in the testimony that his Master permitted himself to be worshipped : Matthew declares that he was worshipped by a leper whom he had healed ; by the mariners, when he had calmed the winds and waves by saying “ Peace ; be still ; ” and by his disciples themselves after his resurrection. This last fact is also confirmed by the testimony of Luke.

If we unite with this Jesus’s own idea of worship, we shall see at once in what light he regarded himself. That he thought worship due to no created being, he himself has fully satisfied us. When thus tempted by Satan, “ All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me ; ” he replied, It is written, “ Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him *only* shalt thou serve ; ” and that he applied the adverb “ *only* ” to worship as well as to service, is evident from his subtle enemy’s being silenced thereby. This renders it indubitable that Jesus himself regarded worship as due to God alone. Yet he constantly permitted *himself* to be worshipped ! If this

was not his native right, can this conduct be reconciled to the character of one whose precepts are a guide to happiness?

Were we indeed to quote every instance in the Gospels, in which Jesus claimed the honours of Deity, we should exceed all reasonable bounds; we will only refer the reader to such as occurred after his resurrection, and which have for their object *the perpetuating of His claim to Deity through every age of the world*. Among these we may mention his solemn declaration; “all power in heaven and in earth is delivered unto me.” Consider for a moment the import of this declaration. Of what value would this power be to one who could not be *every where present*, to ascertain in what instances it ought to be exerted? who was not *omniscient*, to discern in what degree it must be exercised to preserve the good and punish the evil? and *all-wise*, to discern, amidst the inextricable mazes of human action, who are innocent or guilty, and in what degree? Of what value could it have been to Mahomet, had this power been committed to him? Could he or any other mortal have managed the affairs of the world for a single day? Had he an arm like God? Could he thunder with a voice like his? Could he cast abroad his anger, beholding and abasing every one that is proud, and treading down the wicked in their place? Yet this power the

government of the world requires, no less than boundless knowledge, and infinite wisdom. Had Jesus not known himself possessed of these, could he have engaged men to trust in him by such a declaration, consistently with seeking their happiness and peace?

But the next instance is, if possible, still more strong; it is no less than his associating *his own name with that of God the Father*, in a sacred rite intended to remain in force to the end of the world: we mean that of Baptism. Could the author of precepts which form the only guide to happiness, have said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, baptizing them in the name of the Father, *and of the Son*, and of the Holy Ghost," if he had not been equal in nature with the Father? Had Jesus been merely man, could any thing have been imagined more subversive of truth and righteousness, than for men to the end of time to associate him with God the Father in that solemn act by which they profess to renounce the worship of every false god? Does he not hereby annihilate all worship to God the Father, unless as equally shared by himself? Yet if he did not give this command, we cannot depend on one of these precepts now published as the guide to happiness and peace. How could this escape the penetration of the ingenious compiler of this Com-



pendium?—It is needless to add, that this testimony of Jesus is equally decisive respecting the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

As though these were not sufficient, however, Jesus reiterates his claim to Deity by adding, “ And lo *I am with you always, even to the end of the world.*” Granting that this was not intended to imply guidance, protection, and success, still how could any one be present in every country, in every age, without being *omnipresent*? Did Moses, or Abraham, or any one of God’s messengers, ever make such a declaration? Did Mahomet himself, arrogant as he was? If this declaration were not intended to secure protection, guidance, and success, however, it is difficult to say what it could import. But if these were included in such a work as spreading the Gospel among the heathen, to the hopelessness of which the “ Friend of Truth,” in his “ Defence ” of the precepts of Jesus, bears such ample testimony, nothing short of the possession of Infinite Power, and Infinite Wisdom, could have warranted any teacher honestly to make such a declaration to his followers. And if in this triple declaration respecting his Deity, Jesus cannot be relied on, how can we rely on his precepts as the guide to happiness and peace?

II. The series of dogmas or doctrines which relate to *Jesus’s expiating sin by his death, his*

giving life to those who believe on him, his interceding with God for sinners, and his forming the *only medium* through which men can approach God, are also fully witnessed by himself; and than himself none could be better acquainted with his design in becoming incarnate. The Deity of Jesus Christ being once established, indeed, his *atoning for sin by his death* unavoidably follows. That He came as the Saviour of men is in words granted by all. But is he called the Saviour of men, because he gave them moral precepts by obeying which they might obtain the Divine favour, with the enjoyment of heaven as their just desert; or because *he died in their stead*, to atone for their sins, and procure for them every blessing, even his Spirit to enable them to trust in his death and merits for salvation, and from a principle of love cordially obey his precepts to the end of life? If he be termed a Saviour merely because he instructed men, he has this honour in common with Moses, and Elijah, and John the Baptist; neither of whom however assumed the title of Saviour. Indeed if he be esteemed merely a Teacher, the greater degree of honour must be given to Moses, for it was in reality *his law* that he explained and established. As he taught nothing which is not virtually included in these two great commandments, “thou shalt love the Lord thy

God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself," on which he himself declared the law and the prophets to hinge, it is evident that as to moral precepts he really added nothing to the original law given by Moses, although he explained and illustrated it in the most luminous manner. Moses himself, however, "esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt." For Him indeed to have come down on earth merely to illustrate a law given by his own servant, when he could have raised up thousands to do this work, seems in itself so unworthy of God, that even reason revolts against the idea. A heathen poet could lay it down as an axiom, that a deity should never intervene but on occasions worthy of his dignity. But if we view Jesus Christ as atoning for the sins of men, we have every thing perfectly in character: he became incarnate to accomplish that which could have been effected neither by men nor angels.

That he *professed* to come for this purpose and not as a mere teacher, will appear from circumstances, the very minuteness of which serves to enhance their value as testimonies. On his entrance on his public work one of this nature occurred. John the Baptist was a man so revered as a just man even by the Jews who crucified Jesus, that they accounted the defeat sustained by Herod's army sent against Aretas King

of Arabia, soon after John's death, a judgment from heaven on him for this murder. John after he had baptized Jesus, seeing him one day coming to him, said "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." The next day he repeated this testimony as he saw Jesus walking. This testimony, if it was not founded in truth, betrayed in John consummate folly as well as falsehood. His two disciples who heard him thus speak, immediately left him to follow Jesus. Now of the circumstances which occasioned their following him, Jesus must have been aware. He was also thoroughly acquainted with the Mosaic economy and the writings of the prophets, and knew well that a lamb, particularly the Paschal lamb, was constantly offered in sacrifice as an expiation to prefigure the Messiah who should come "to be cut off, not for himself;—but to make an end of sin,—to make reconciliation for iniquity,—and to bring in everlasting righteousness." If *he* was not sent to take away the sin of the world, therefore, he ought not to have encouraged their following him from this expectation; an upright and humble man would not. Much less would he have permitted Simon Peter to bring Andrew his brother to him under the express idea of his being the Messiah. Yet he did encourage this; and after this speech of Peter's,

upon which he ought to have frowned had it been a falsehood, he confers on him a new name, that of Cephas, a stone or a rock. But can we compare the conduct of Jesus in this instance, a young teacher who had as yet scarcely made a single disciple of his own, with that of John, revered by all Judah and Jerusalem as a prophet sent from God, without being struck with the contrast? When the question was put to John, whether or not he was the expected Messiah? he promptly replied, "I am not." But Jesus on the contrary, though scarcely known, receives this honour as his own without the least hesitation, and tacitly acknowledges himself the Son of God about to die for the expiation of sin, as was prefigured by the expiatory lamb appointed by Moses: and if his assuming this character *was* a deception, he labours to keep it up in the minds of his new followers, by referring to circumstances which constrain one of them to exclaim, "Thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel." But had he *not been* the expected Messiah, of whom he knew that the Prophets had united in predicting that he should die to expiate the sins of men, what excuse can be made for his thus acting? Must not the vanity and arrogance displayed in this case, contrasted with the humility of John their former master, have struck these disciples

themselves? When the ingenious compiler of this Selection carefully weighs these facts, he must, we think, be convinced, that if Jesus was not the Messiah about to *expiate the sins of men*, he was not one whose precepts ought to be esteemed a guide to happiness and peace.

In addition to his suffering himself to receive declarations which belonged only to the expected Messiah, with the predictions respecting whom, by Isaiah and Daniel, he was well acquainted, we find him soon after declaring himself the Messiah in the plainest terms, and in circumstances wherein to have taken advantage of the simplicity of his hearers would have been an eternal dishonour to any teacher. We allude to his conversation with the woman of Samaria, to whom, after explaining the nature of God's worship, and insisting that he must be worshipped "in spirit and in *truth*," he at once declares himself to be "the Messiah called Christ, who when he came should teach men all things." After such a conversation with this woman, how tremendously awful was this declaration, if it was not the truth! The testimony of the Samaritans also, after he had remained conversing with them two days, renders it impossible for us to doubt under what character he represented himself to them. "Now we believe, not because of thy saying, for we have heard him ourselves, and know that

this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world."

We have also an instance wherein he himself enquired of his disciples, evidently for their sakes, whom they thought him to be; and on Peter's replying, "Thou art the Christ, (the Messiah) the Son of the living God," he confirms the declaration by declaring that the knowledge of this fact was derived from his heavenly Father, whom he hereby makes a witness to its truth. From that time too he began to shew them, that, as predicted of Messiah, he was about to suffer even unto death; and to rise again the third day.

As Jesus drew nearer to the end of his mission, it was to be expected that he would speak more clearly on this momentous subject. This we find him doing on various occasions. Conversing with those who followed him because he had fed them by a miracle, he, following up the figure in his accustomed manner, exhorts them to labour, not for the meat that perisheth, but for that which endureth to everlasting life, which the Son of man was ready to give them: and at length adds, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." But what can this be which secures eternal life to those who trust in him? He drops the figure, and tells them plainly, that it is "his giving

his flesh for the life of the world." What can this mean but his being about to offer himself an expiatory sacrifice for the world?" On a subsequent occasion, he, after claiming precisely such a knowledge of God the Father, as the Father possesses of him, expressly declares "And I lay down my life for my sheep;" adding "Therefore doth my Father love me." Stronger expressions than these he could scarcely select in order to shew that he was about to die for the sins of men. With this declaration, however, accords that mentioned by Luke, "The Son of man is come to give his life a ransom for many," with a multitude of others, which we are constrained to pass over lest we should tire our readers.

When on the very eve of suffering, Jesus takes occasion to remind his disciples that his sufferings *were already predicted*. Betrayed by the avarice and perfidy of Judas, he says, "Truly the Son of man goeth *as it is written of him;*" and when in the hands of his enraged enemies, he forbears to deliver himself for this reason alone. "Thinkest thou," says he to Peter, "that I cannot pray to my Father and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then *shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?*" Nor is he silent respecting their *object and design*. When apprehended, he reminds his dis-



ciples that this scripture must be fulfilled, "and he was numbered with the transgressors." But why numbered with transgressors? Had he ever transgressed his heavenly Father's will? So far from it that he declares, "I do always the things that please him." To justify the guilty and condemn the innocent, however, are both an abomination to God. Yet we have the testimony of Him who came into the world that he might bear witness to the truth, that in his case the innocent "was made answerable." The fact therefore we cannot doubt, and the inference is inevitable, that according to this prophecy, which Jesus by thus applying testifies to belong to himself, "the Lord laid on him the iniquities of us all."

Let us however examine his idea of his sufferings when he was about to ascend to heaven. Surely he now had a clear view both of his sufferings and their glorious design. Thus then does he unfold it to his astonished disciples, "Thus it is written, and thus it *behoved Christ to suffer*, and to rise again the third day." But wherefore, when perfectly sinless in the sight of his heavenly Father and of every righteous being? The answer is, "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached among *all nations*, beginning at Jerusalem," whose inhabitants had imbued their hands in his blood. This confirms all that has been hitherto ad-

vanced. It was now evident to all that he *was* the Messiah,—that it *behoved* him to suffer—that these sufferings were finished,—and that nothing remained but for remission of sins through him to be proclaimed throughout the earth to all who repent of sin and trust in him. And that tremendous declaration, “If ye believe not that I am *he*, ye shall die in your sins,” extends to every individual now, as really as to the Jews to whom it was spoken.

To the same series of doctrines we must refer *his desiring his disciples to ask blessings in his name*. A little reflection will convince any one that this belongs to no Teacher. Never did John the Baptist, nor any of the prophets, direct any one to ask blessings of God in their names, not even Moses. There was never any real prophet indeed, who would not have trembled at the thought of directing any one to approach in his name, “a God glorious in holiness, fearful in praises.” The work of a Teacher, however great or worthy, is simply to deliver precepts which direct men to God independently of himself. If he to this add the promise of interfering with God in their behalf, he assumes a totally new character, constitutes himself a Mediator between the Deity and his followers, and on the very face of things needs that *omnipresence* which may enable him to receive the prayers of his followers that he may present

them to God, and that *omniscience* through which he may discriminate between the sincere and the feigned; otherwise he may have the prayers he presumes to recommend to the Deity thrown back upon him with shame, as the prayer of hypocrisy. But if he possess not *infinite merit* also, on what principle can he in his own name request of the Deity forgiveness and blessing for others?

That Jesus however thus encourages his disciples to petition in his name, is indisputable. He commands them to “ask and receive, that their joy may be full;” and declares that whatsoever they shall ask in his name, the Father will give them. But such a promise as this must have been soon put to the test; and if it were not fulfilled, what must follow but disappointment and shame, of which an upright and ingenuous mind would have been fully aware? Yea on what principle could the Father, infinitely righteous, give blessings to his sinful creatures for the sake of another, implying the forgiveness of sins, but on account of his merit and worthiness in dying for them? But that he does this, is so strongly enforced by Jesus, that he declares, “no one cometh to the Father but by me;” in other words that there is no acceptable prayer made to God throughout the whole earth, which is not offered in dependence on his merit for its acceptance. . Can this

declaration be made by him who in the same breath declares himself to be the *truth*, without demonstrating either that he had fully opened the way of access to God,—or that he was leading men to delusion and ruin, instead of happiness and peace? If we conclude these examples with the testimony of the aged John who fifty or sixty years before had leaned on the breast of his beloved master and imbibed his spirit, we admit only the testimony of one of the Evangelists, “ My little children, these things I write unto you that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. And he is *the propitiation for our sins*: and not for ours only, but also *for the sins of the whole world.*” Thus then we find the doctrine of Jesus’s atoning for the sins of men, and of his forming the only way of access to God, so fully interwoven into the instruction he gave to men, that, if it be taken away, nothing remains to which we can attach either truth or consistency.

III. If we also advert to the series of dogmas or doctrines which relate to *human depravity* and the necessity of *Divine influence* to change the heart and fit it for heaven, we shall find Jesus bearing ample testimony even to these. As he possessed infinite penetration (if it be lawful thus to describe his knowledge of man), and needed to learn nothing either from the

testimony of others or his own observation, what he says on this subject has peculiar force. It is neither the happy guess of a sagacious teacher, nor the result of a long train of reasoning inferring the feelings of one mind from what had been observed of another; it is the declaration of One, "to whom all things are naked and opened." Jesus, however, relative to man, lays it down as an axiom that the fruit and the tree are of the same nature; that "a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, nor an evil tree good fruit." "Either make the tree good and its fruit good," says he; "or the tree corrupt and its fruit; for the tree is known by its fruit."—The idea of that heart being good therefore, from which evil deeds, and words, and thoughts, are constantly springing, he at once discards. Would we however learn his opinion of the human mind, we have it fully given in the following passage, "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." Could he who invariably deemed the fruit and the tree one in nature, suppose all these to spring from an uncorrupt and sinless mind? Yet it is of *man in general* that he speaks, of the human heart as found in every age and in every nation; and if he made an erroneous estimate of human nature, how can we rely on *his* precepts as the guide to happiness

and peace? The wisdom and benevolence which shine through them, however, forbid our supposing for a moment, that he could be ignorant of human nature, or disposed to speak of it in terms of aggravation.

With this fully accords his solemn declaration to Nicodemus. "Except a man be born again, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." To this declaration the circumstances of Nicodemus impart a peculiar force. While he was evidently a man of education, we have no reason to suppose him a man of immoral character. Among those who paid so much attention to decency of conduct as did the Jews, and especially the Pharisees, of which sect he was, this would have been scarcely compatible with his being a ruler, "a Master in Israel." Nor does any thing appear in him of that malignity of disposition manifested by some of that sect: on the contrary, his coming to Jesus for instruction, though by night, circumstanced as he was, argued a mind highly candid and ingenuous. Yet to this man does Jesus enforce this doctrine in a manner that filled him with amazement, which wisdom would certainly have forbidden, had it not been indispensable. Could an exception have been made in favour of any, learned and ingenuous as was Nicodemus, he was the man in whose favour it should have been made. But Jesus admits of none; he il-

illustrates the subject in such a manner as to exclude all exception. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," is a sentence which necessarily includes all mankind; and to leave no doubt on the mind of Nicodemus, Jesus solemnly assures him that his inculcating this doctrine was the result of the most thorough knowledge, "Verily I say unto thee, we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen."

Jesus further confirms this doctrine by declaring that no man can come to him for salvation *unless drawn by God himself*. When surrounded by those who murmured at his teaching, he is thus decided in his language, "No man *can* come to me except the Father who hath sent me draw him." Surely to assist a man in doing what he can accomplish himself, is unworthy of the Divine character. Such a declaration therefore, if not the truth, would involve an insult on human nature, and imply a desire to share in the glory of human virtue totally unworthy of God. Yet Jesus enforces this doctrine as being of ancient date; "It is written in the prophets," says he, "and they shall be all taught of God;" and then adds, "Every man therefore who hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh unto me." Such then were indisputably the ideas of Jesus: ideas which he concealed not; but brought forward in the

most prominent manner, at the risk of displeasing those who professed the strongest desire to become his disciples.

But we must not overlook the source to which Jesus ascribes this inability. He never treats it as a natural inability, involuntary and excusable. He attaches to it the highest turpitude, he does not hesitate to impute it to the worst of motives. In his estimation it is a preference of darkness—such a hatred of the light as occasions its being avoided from the most unworthy principle, a fear lest evil deeds should be reprov'd. He, in a word, considers it as furnishing just ground of condemnation in the sight of God himself. It is evident therefore, that Jesus regarded this inability as wilful, criminal, and totally inexcusable, as the inability of an unprincipled man to act honestly, because he loves the gain of unrighteousness,—of one who cannot cease from impurity, because he so thoroughly delights therein. Conformably to this, he charges men's not coming to him, decidedly on their want of *will*. He tells the Jews, “ you *will not* come to me that you may have life ;” and follows up the charge by pointing out the cause, “ How can you believe *who receive honour one of another*, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only ?”

The same idea pervades his charge against Jerusalem; while lamenting over it, “ O Jeru-



salem ! Jerusalem !—how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and *ye would not !*” But was this criminality of the will trivial ? Trivial as it might seem, it led to their *killings the prophets of God*, and their stoning those sent unto them ;—and by the sentence of Him who cannot err, to their city’s being visited with desolation which overwhelms it even to this day. We indeed every day decide in the same manner : it is not the absence of ability, but the evident absence of the *will*, to assist us, which adds pungency to a breach of friendship. It is the *will*, the *intention*, which constitutes the essence of the crime in robbery, in murder, and even in treason itself.

If Jesus, however, describes the depravity of the human mind as total, wilful, and inexcusable, he no less clearly describes God’s merciful readiness to impart to every one who desires it, his Holy Spirit, which fully ensures salvation. His language is, “ Ask and ye shall receive ; seek, and ye shall find ; knock, and it shall be opened to you ;” and he solemnly assures us, that God will no more refuse his Holy Spirit to those who seek him, than a tender father would refuse bread to a supplicating child, or give him a serpent instead of a fish.—That Jesus deems the teaching of the Holy Spirit fully sufficient to secure salvation, and the

utmost purity and holiness of life, may be inferred from his saying, “Every one that hath learned of the Father *cometh unto me.*” But he further declares, “My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, *and they follow me:* and I give to them eternal life, *and they shall never perish,* neither shall any pluck them out of my hand.” To adduce further examples would be easy; but it would only tire the reader. These may suffice to shew that had the ingenious compiler of this Selection examined the subject with sufficient diligence, he might have found the most obnoxious of all the dogmas of Christianity, even those which relate to the Divine Sovereignty and the final perseverance of those who trust in Christ, contained, not merely in the Four Evangelists, but in *the teaching of Jesus himself;* and these doctrines not delivered in a number of insulated propositions separated from his general discourses, but inculcated in the plainest language and on the most familiar occasions, and so interwoven with the whole of his conversation and teaching, that if nullified, they leave behind neither *truth* sufficient to form a teacher, nor that *consistency* requisite for the success of imposture.

When these doctrines then so thoroughly pervade the teaching of Jesus, why were they omitted and his “moral precepts” *alone* given as the way to happiness and peace? How

could these doctrines be deemed unimportant of which Jesus himself testifies that "they are spirit and they are life?" To lay before men mere moral precepts as the way to happiness and peace,—and at the same time to remove from their view those doctrines which are the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, what is it but to consign them over to eternal death? That the most excellent precepts, the most perfect law, can never lead to happiness and peace, unless by causing men to take refuge in the doctrine of the cross, it requires little reflection to discover. A law, to deserve the name, requires *perfect* obedience on pain of its penalty being inflicted. How mistaken the idea that a law observed *occasionally*, or *partially*, can ever speak peace! What is *partial* obedience to the statutes forbidding robbery, murder, or treason? Can obedience for numerous years to these be regarded, if a man violate them but once? Is his murdering *daily*, necessary to constitute him a transgressor? Must a man have plotted treason against his sovereign every day of his life, to render him a traitor? Should he have obeyed the law fully for thirty, forty, or fifty years, will not the first breach of it render him guilty? If he obtain mercy and escape punishment, it must be because the law in his case is set aside: the law knows nothing of mercy. But what man has ever perfectly obeyed for a year, or a

month, or a single day, the law commanding supreme love to God and disinterested love to his neighbour? To set the most excellent precepts, as the way to happiness and peace, before men who have *already violated* them, what is it better than mocking malefactors condemned to death, by telling them, that they need fear nothing if they have never violated the law? Separated from his doctrines, the precepts of Jesus can no more give peace than the law as given by Moses. To those who have already violated the Divine precepts even in thought, (and this includes every man on earth,) must not every glimpse of happiness and peace arise from the *doctrines* Jesus taught together with his precepts? Yet the compiler of this Selection unhappily omits them, because they have been a source of dispute to unbelievers and anti-christians.

It is, however, scarcely just to charge on the "dogmas" or doctrines of Christianity those wars and that bloodshed which have occurred between nations merely termed Christian. War and bloodshed existed before the promulgation of Christianity in the world. Neither Christianity therefore, nor its "dogmas," created the *causes* of war and bloodshed. They existed in the human mind long before its doctrines were published; and it requires but a very slight acquaintance with history to convince any one that the quarrels and feuds between

the Arians and the Orthodox in the fourth and fifth centuries, were little more than that struggle *for power and wealth* which the cupidity and ambition of the human mind have exhibited in every age of the world, and that the "dogmas" which were made the pretext, merely furnished the *occasion*. Between the Papists and Protestants there was never any dispute respecting the Deity of Christ or of the Holy Spirit; and the oceans of blood which were spilt by the former, had far less to do with the truth of any doctrine, than with the preservation of that secular power and wealth possessed by one party, and denounced by the other as contrary both to Scripture and reason. The same may be justly said respecting the fiercest disputes between Protestants themselves. Among them, indeed, there has been little bloodshed on account of "dogmas" or doctrines of any kind; in general the disputes among them have ostensibly related to church government and rites and ceremonies; but the real object has been, the preservation of that power and wealth connected with ceremonies or forms of church government already established. All the war and bloodshed therefore, and the greater part of the disputes for which the "dogmas" of Christianity have been made answerable, ought to be placed to the credit of that ambition and cupidity, which Christianity

*found* in the human heart, but never *created* there. Let the “dogmas” of Christianity be separated wholly from wealth and power either as the reward of supporting or of opposing them, and in future we shall witness little of bloodshed respecting them,—and possibly little of fierce dispute. Even then however, if the doctrines of Christianity are of God, they will certainly be opposed by all who think that their opinion of themselves and of human nature is far nearer the truth, than that which God has expressed by these doctrines; and to expect that men should not cavil against them, is to expect that the carnal mind, while at enmity against God, should manifest the most cordial submission to the doctrines taught in his Sacred Word.

Is it, however, any dishonour to these doctrines that they have been the subject of dispute? Is it any wonder that men in God’s estimation transgressors, but in their own righteous, should dispute against the truths which convict them? What prisoner ever yet welcomed the witnesses which proved him guilty? or hailed with joy the statute which condemned him to death? But is a doctrine to be suppressed because it has been made the subject of dispute? It can scarcely be unknown to the compiler of this Selection, that *the very being of a God* has been for numerous

ages the subject of dispute among the most learned of his own country. But does he account this a sufficient reason for suppressing this doctrine? He knows that he does not. Why then should he omit the *doctrines* of Christ and his Apostles, because men have made them the subject of dispute? That Jesus himself esteemed his no *dishonour* to them, is evident from his expressly forewarning his disciples that this would be the case. He even declares with reference to them that he came "not to send peace on the earth, but a sword,"—that he came "to send fire on the earth," and almost longed to see it kindled. Yet did he view this as dishonourable to the doctrines from which he expected these effects to spring? Why then did he not withdraw them? They were as yet scarcely published by himself, and not at all by his Apostles. But if He, whose precepts are the guide to happiness and peace, did not refuse to teach them; surely we need not. If he who so loved men as to lay down his life to render them blessed, thought it important to their happiness that these doctrines should be published throughout the world, we need not profess a greater regard for the peace of mankind than he really felt.

While the testimony of Jesus himself to his Doctrines is so decisive, we cannot but wonder that his Miracles should not have found greater

favour in the eyes of the compiler of this Selection, when the amazing weight *which Jesus himself attaches to them*, could scarcely have escaped his notice. What *His* testimony is concerning them, the following passages sufficiently shew. We find him in one instance preferring them in point of weight to the testimony even of John. This however arose from no want of esteem for John: in that very passage he describes him as “bearing witness to the truth,” and terms him “a burning and shining light;” yet says he “I have *greater witness* than that of John: the works that the Father hath given me to do, they bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.” What testimony could be more weighty than that of the best man on earth? It was the witness of God,—to substantiate which *to us* nothing is necessary beyond a credible testimony that these works were really done.

When John, probably with the view of fixing their faith immovably on Jesus as the Messiah, sent two of his disciples to him to ask him “Art thou he that should come? or do we look for another?” Jesus merely calls their attention to his miraculous works, “Go and shew John again,” says he, “those things which ye do hear and see; the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are



raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached unto them." Beyond these works he deemed nothing necessary to carry the fullest conviction to the mind.—On another occasion Jesus describes these miraculous works as in some sense possessing a weightier degree of evidence than even his own teaching. When the Jews had charged him with blasphemy because "he being a man made himself God," his reply was, "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I do, *though ye believe not me, believe the works*, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him." Here it is evident that excellent as he knew his precepts to be, he esteemed his miracles to carry a superior weight with them even among his bitterest enemies.

In his last conversation with his disciples, he confirms this idea even to them. Philip had said, "Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us;" to which Jesus replies, "Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me, or else *believe me for the very works' sake*." In this instance it is evident that Jesus deemed his miraculous works suited to carry with them such weight, as not only to evidence themselves by their own intrinsic force, but to prove that He was equal with the Father.—But his declaration that his miracles increased to the highest the guilt of his enemies in rejecting him

as the Son of God, adds a weight to these works which nothing can augment, particularly when we consider, that he himself is the righteous Judge of quick and dead. After he had said to his disciples, "If I had not come and *spoken* unto them, they had not had sin, but now they have no cloak for their sin," he adds, "If I had not done among them *the works* which none other man did, they had not had sin," thus declaring *his works* to carry a weight with them which rendered his rejection as the Messiah, the Redeemer of men, perfectly inexcusable.

But perhaps the compiler imagined them apt to carry little weight with them among the Hindoos because *not done in their sight*, as they were in that of the Jews. Candour, indeed, requires this to be supposed; for if it be not, how can we account for the awful difference of opinion between him and their great Author respecting them? A little reflection, however, will evince the futility of this idea. If the weight of miracles consists in their being *seen*, rather than *testified* by credible witnesses, reflect for a moment within what narrow limits their weight must be confined. The miracles of Jesus could carry no weight with them in the very next age. Of course none of these had *seen* his miracles, why should they allow them any weight?—Even in the same age, they could

carry little weight with them in any other country. They could of course carry no weight with them at Rome,—in Greece—or indeed any where, except in Judea, for who in these countries had *seen* them done?—Further, as each work could only be done in *one place*, their weight would be confined to a very small number even among the Jews themselves! How few even of them had actually *seen* a miracle performed by Jesus. We know that Herod had not,—and probably many others of his enemies, who were still inexcusable in rejecting him.

If *credible testimony* however were not esteemed equivalent to *actual sight*, both as ground of belief and of action, the whole of the business of life would soon cease. We must give up at once all our knowledge of History: that Cyrus or Alexander, Scipio or Pompey, Mahomet, or Aurungzeeb, and a thousand others, ever existed, we know not, for we never *saw* them; we have only the testimony of others to the fact, and this perhaps not very credible.—We must also relinquish our knowledge of other nations. How many of us in India have ever *seen* London, or Paris, or Madrid, or Constantinople, or Pekin? We merely believe that these cities exist, on the testimony of others.—The public business even of the country in which we dwell, must also be suspended: how little can any one in authority *actually see* of what

may now be passing in India, or even in Bengal? And all mercantile transactions must cease at once, for who in Calcutta *has seen* the present state of the market in Europe, in China, and elsewhere? As they have no other proof than the testimony of others, and possibly this uncertain, how can men be expected to risk their fortunes when they *have seen* nothing with their own eyes?—The Courts of Justice too must be at once closed, for what Judge has ever *seen* the robberies and murders committed which are brought before him? or even what Jury? These when they sentence a man to death, have nothing to rely on but the testimony of others whose honesty may not always be above suspicion. Yet on this evidence does a judge pronounce a sentence which involves the death of a fellow-creature, and feels that to forbear, though *he has seen nothing* of the matter himself, would be to betray his trust, and violate his duty to his sovereign and his country. Could he do more had he seen the whole transaction with his own eyes?

It is evident therefore that *credible testimony* has the same force in urging us to duties of the most important nature, as our having witnessed things ourselves. But if the testimony of the Evangelists be not *credible*, how can “the *Precepts of Jesus*” be “the guide to happiness and peace?” And if their testimony respecting

the *sayings* of Jesus be so worthy of credit, how came their testimony respecting his *acts*, to be apt at best to carry so little weight with it? As they both rest on precisely the same authority, our ingenious friend must either admit the full weight of the *miraculous deeds* of Jesus, or no longer present his countrymen with his *sayings* or precepts, as the guide to happiness and peace.

If we combine all these facts, it will be evident that Jesus *must be* regarded as God equal with the Father, expiating the sins of men, and saving them by his mighty power—or the whole of the Gospels, no less than the rest of the Sacred Scriptures, *must be* rejected as a cunningly devised fable, involving a tissue of arrogance and deception unparalleled in the history of mankind. That one who had invited men to learn of him from his “being meek and lowly in heart” that they might “find rest to their souls,”—taught men “that he who exalteth himself shall be abased,” and “that there is nothing hid which shall not be made known and come abroad,”—solemnly affirmed that he sought not his own glory, and yet that he was “the truth” itself, and that heaven and earth should pass away, but not his word,—should after this declare himself to be equal with the Father, to have come down from heaven to expiate the sins of men and save them from the

love of sin, to govern the world, and to be about to judge all mankind after previously raising them from their graves—and *yet there be no truth in this declaration respecting himself,*—would form, (with deep reverence be it spoken,) a combination of arrogance, falsehood, and folly, unequalled in the annals of human imposture. And that all this should be found in One whose precepts are allowed by the most unbiassed to be worthy of being set before mankind as a sure guide to happiness and peace, involves a fact far more wonderful than any miraculous relation given in Scripture. We intreat the author of this Selection to weigh these things with the utmost care, not only for the sake of his countrymen, but from a regard to his own immortal interests, so deeply affected by that declaration of Jesus, “no man cometh to the Father *but by me;*” and that solemn warning, “If ye believe not that I am *He,* ye shall die in your sins.” In examining this subject we have carefully avoided every expression that could give him a moment’s pain; and we beg to assure him, that while our grand object has been to place the truth clearly before him, if there be found a single word of that nature, we are unconscious of any such wish, and intreat him to pardon the unintentional offence.

#### IV.

*Reply to "A Second Appeal to the Christian Public in Defence of the Precepts of Jesus. By Ram-mohun Roy. (pp. 173.) Calcutta, 1821."*

[Friend of India, Quarterly Series, No. IV. Dec. 1821.]

WHEN in our first Quarterly Number of the "Friend of India" we reviewed the "Precepts of Jesus," and the first "Appeal to the Christian Public," as we felt some doubt whether their author fully believed the Deity of Christ, we adduced a few passages from Scripture tending to confirm this doctrine. In doing this, we, to meet his views, confined ourselves to the Gospels from which he had selected the Precepts of Jesus, endeavouring to do it in such a spirit as might encourage him to enquire further after the truth. We feel thankful that this appeared to him so evident as "to encourage him in examining further into the fundamental principles of Christianity in a manner agreeable to his own feelings." Happy should we be could we feel equal pleasure in the result; but this Second Appeal to the Christian Public confirms all that we before only feared. It contains no less than an entire rejection of the doctrines of the Atonement, the Deity of

Christ, and the ever-blessed Trinity, as doctrines not to be found in the Sacred Scriptures, and we are told in the concluding page, that “if Christianity inculcated a doctrine which represents God as consisting of Three Persons, and appearing sometimes in the human form, at other times in a bodily shape like a dove, no Hindoo who searches after truth can conscientiously profess it in preference to Hindooism.”—Assured, however, that these doctrines have produced the only fruits of righteousness yet seen on earth, and this in exact proportion as they have been believed and realized, we feel constrained, as friends of India, to examine thoroughly our author’s reasons for rejecting them, which we hope to do in the spirit of genuine Christianity and with the seriousness of those who feel the weight of the Psalmist’s enquiry, “If the foundations be destroyed, what shall the righteous do?” Should what we may advance happily lead him to re-consider the subject and find the truth as it is in Jesus, this will afford us more solid satisfaction than the empty applause of a whole world; with which feelings he may rest assured that no expression will be intentionally admitted that can give him a moment’s pain, unless it be that salutary pain which may flow from the effect of truth on the mind.

We have before us a work of a Hundred and



Seventy-three Pages, to an examination of which we can scarcely devote half that number: and while to leave a single page unnoticed, might by some be deemed equivalent to leaving it unanswered, the mere transcription of the passages to be answered, were it done in every instance, would occupy nearly all the room we can give the reply itself. We shall therefore adduce such evidence for these doctrines, as, if sound, will render every thing urged against them nugatory, though not particularly noticed.

Our author attributes his success in discovering what he deems "Christianity not encroached upon by human opinions," to his having "sought to attain the truths of Christianity from the words of the Author of this religion, and from the undisputed instructions of his holy Apostles, and not from a parent or tutor," p. 108; which course, he thinks, has preserved his mind from "the powerful effects of early religious impressions," p. 161. To this may be added the mode of perusing the Scriptures which he recommends, and which we may hence presume he has himself adopted, that of "studying first the books of the Old Testament as found arranged in order, and acquiring a knowledge of the true force of scriptural phrases and expressions, without attending to interpretations given by any sect—and then studying the

New Testament, comparing the one with the other," p. 161. These circumstances, he thinks, enable him to maintain with confidence his opinions against so great a majority of Christian teachers found in nearly all denominations, " who appeal to the same authority for theirs." Whether this freedom for " the powerful effects of early religious impressions," has enabled him to discover the truth of Scripture in its most important doctrines, more fully in three or four years than others have done by the most unremitting study in thirty or forty,—yea so as to prove that the most learned and pious in every age of the church have been so completely mistaken as to transform the pure religion of Jesus into the most horrible idolatry, we will carefully examine. Could it be relied on indeed, his compendious method would deserve notice with a view to Christian education, as, on his plan, the most certain way of enabling any one to discover in a superior manner the truths and doctrines of Christianity, is, to leave him till the age of thirty or forty without any religious impression.

But are early religious impressions the only source of mistake? Is not the human heart the fabricator of its own prejudices? The partiality of friendship will often so blind a man's eyes as to prevent his crediting the clearest facts relative to an opposite party, though com-

pletely within the reach of investigation. Of this we have examples not only in political matters, where truths and facts received by one side are treated with the utmost contempt by the other; but in private disputes, in which facts come under our own view. Yea in some cases does not prejudice so completely pervade the mind as to blind us even to our own interests, and cause us to regard as false, facts known to be true by all our friends? Above all, does not that principle of self-righteousness which cleaves to all by nature, often blind a man to the clearest truths, because they are unpalatable? If this be the case, may it not be wise in our author to examine whether some secret bias of this kind may not have caused him to mistake respecting doctrines in their own nature of the most humbling tendency? But, supposing the mind to be free from every bias, is it not a fact that the Scriptures, composed as they are of a Series of Writings which occupied sixteen centuries in their delivery, require the most diligent study before any man can so fully digest them as conscientiously to teach doctrines directly opposed to those held by the mass of real Christians in every age? Much may be discovered at a first perusal; but such are the depth and sublimity of Scripture doctrines, that every new perusal to the end of life fully repays the humble mind. It is more

than thirty-five years since the writer of these lines began to examine them with an earnest desire, as far as he knows his own feelings, to find out precisely the doctrines of Scripture that he might rest on them the weight of his own salvation: and though he does not presume to deny that the author of this Appeal may have gained more in one year's perusal of the Scriptures than others in ten, still as his study of them is so recent, he can scarcely forbear intreating him to peruse them anew before he finally reject those truths which the great body of the learned and pious have concurred in deeming fully contained in the Sacred Scriptures, and essential to salvation.

On examining this "Second Appeal to the Christian Public," we find the author saying (page 8), that to deem "the most excellent precepts, the most perfect law, incapable of leading men to happiness and peace unless by causing them to take refuge in the doctrine of the cross" is setting at defiance the express commandments of Jesus; which, he insists, is done by the doctrine that "the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus on the cross is an atonement for the sins of mankind." We confess that when we first saw this sentence, we could scarcely believe our own eyes. A further examination, however, painfully convinced us that we had not mistaken his meaning; for

he does affirm that Christ's death was not intended as an atonement for sin; that men's own imperfect obedience to the Divine law, although the best and wisest of them "are constantly neglecting the duty they owe to the Creator and their fellow-creatures," p. 9, is yet sufficient to procure salvation, particularly if united with "repentance," which, according to him, "is declared the only means of procuring forgiveness of our failures." As the First and Fourth Chapters of this Second Appeal are levelled against the Atonement of Christ, therefore, and this doctrine is held up to ridicule in the latter part of the Sixth, while the Second and Third, with the Appendix, are directed principally against the Deity of Christ, (the Fifth having little on either of these doctrines,) we intreat permission before entering on the proof of Christ's Deity, to examine our author's opinion of the Atonement, and to establish that doctrine on Scripture evidence;—and if this should unavoidably imply the Deity of the Redeemer, the fault will not be our's, as we shall not have created this evidence, it having been deposited on record many centuries ago.

CHAPTER I.  
ON THE ATONEMENT.

SECTION I.

*The impossibility of a Sinner's being justified by  
the Divine Law.*

WE commence with our author's First Chapter: and here we can scarcely conceive how a man so intelligent should have mistaken so completely the nature of the Divine Law, which must be immutable, as to suppose it can reward or even forbear to punish *disobedience*. Yet this mistake evidently forms the foundation of all his opposition to the atonement of Christ. That the Divine Law punishes all disobedience however slight it may be, is evident from Paul's declaration, Rom. i. 17. "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against *all* ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." Such, indeed, is the nature of an immutable law, that if it be violated but *once*, its penalty is incurred, which the offender must suffer, or the law be set aside. Hence one violation of it destroys for ever that obedience which might deserve reward: he who has kept the law has not broken it, and he who has broken it, cannot have kept it. That the same man, therefore, should incur its penalty for *violating* it, and also

deserve its reward for *keeping* it, is an outrage on common sense. This will clearly appear if we refer to human laws, imperfect as they are. Were a man at the age of seventy to commit a murder, he would be a violator of the law against murder though his life had been previously spotless ; and for that one act he must receive condign punishment, or the law be set aside. The enquiry would not be, whether he had been every day stained with murder, but whether he had been once guilty of that crime. Nay were he to live a hundred years afterwards without perpetrating another murder, unless pardoned he would still be a murderer whose life the law demanded. Apply this to the Divine law, and we shall find that the man who violates it once, must be for ever characterized as its violator, though he should never repeat the crime. For him, therefore, to be rewarded as one who had kept the Divine law, would be directly contrary to righteousness. That repentance makes not the least alteration in a law, is self-evident. Human judges enquire not about the repentance of the robber or murderer ; but respecting his guilt. The Law indeed knows no repentance: to pardon a man on repentance, is, in his case to suspend the law.

This doctrine, the dictate of natural equity, our author might have found fully laid down in the Sacred Scriptures. Paul, Gal. iii. quoting from

the Old Testament, says, "Cursed is every one that *continueth* not *in all* things written in the book of the Law to do them," which fully confirms this doctrine; as "*all things*" include our duty to God as well as to man,—and a *continuance* in performing them is required if we would escape the curse. So then if there should be an omission of any of these even for a single hour, righteousness denounces the offender as accursed, just as the man who may perpetrate a murder though in less time, is justly deemed a murderer. Hence the Apostle, having proved that all violate the Divine law, declares that "as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse," which is indeed granted by our author when he confesses that the best and the wisest of men are "constantly neglecting the duty they owe to the Creator and their fellow-creatures."

Rammohun Roy attempts to explain away this and other testimonies of this nature, by intimating p. 6, that St. Paul alludes to the Mosaic law; by which we suppose he intends the *ceremonial* part of that law, for "he mean<sup>d</sup> the moral part of the law given by Moses, this is precisely the law which he himself insists that the Saviour came to explain and establish. It happens unfortunately for him however, that the list of crimes in Deut. xxvii, to which the denunciation quoted by Paul is annexed, does



not contain a single ceremonial transgression. Indeed, had the whole of them been such, this circumstance would have been against him rather than in his favour. The reason why the neglect of a ceremonial command brings the curse on the offender is, that God has enjoined that ceremonial rite. But if the command of Almighty God be of such tremendous weight as to bring down his curse on him who neglects a rite in itself indifferent, merely because He has made it the subject of a command, how much more must this be the case where a moral duty, the omission of which is in its own nature evil, is made the subject of his command ! Our author, we are certain, was not prepared to assert, that to omit a mere ceremonial rite commanded of God, brought his indignation on the offender far more than the commission of incest or murder. Yet this he does assert when he affirms, that in all these passages Paul intends the ceremonial law alone.

This at once explains the declaration made Rom. iii. 20. “ By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in God’s sight ; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” If our author will understand this to mean the ceremonial law alone, he must either deny that the moral law when broken does bring home to the mind a knowledge of sin, or affirm that it does it in a far less degree ; either of which is saying anew,

that to be guilty of incest or murder has in it far less of sin than the omission of a mere ceremonial rite. This also enables us to understand Rom. iii. 19. “Now we know that what things the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that *every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God.*” Does their being merely under the law render them guilty before God? By no means; the highest archangel is under the Divine law, but he is not therefore guilty before God, because he has ever obeyed the Divine commands. But for a sinner to be under the law, (and there is no man that liveth and sinneth not,) is precisely the same thing as for a murderer to be under the law forbidding murder; which, the moment it speaks, stops his mouth and brings him in guilty before his judge.

Should our author wish for proof that all men are sinners, he may find it in the same chapter, Rom. iii. drawn from the source he recommends for prior perusal, the Old Testament, “As it is written (in Psalm xiv.) There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. There is none that doeth good; no not one.”—Nor can they boast the absence of evil; for “Their throat is an open sepulchre,” or rather a sepulchre opened, sending forth its deadly stench on every side. “With their tongues they have used deceit. Their mouth is

full of cursing and bitterness: and the way of peace have they not known." Such is the description which the All-seeing God gave of man nearly three thousand years ago; and by repeating it at the end of a thousand years, he has fixed for ever his real character.

Let us now enquire; Did Jesus when on earth, regard men as perfectly righteous, or as sinners? This question he answers himself, "I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance"—to seek and to save them that are lost. If, knowing men to be sinners, he taught that those who had violated the Divine law could still obtain eternal life as the reward of their future obedience, chequered constantly with new failures as our author acknowledges, he not only denied his own atonement, and contradicted all that the Prophets had declared respecting it; but he completely set aside the law which he declares that he came to establish. Let us however examine the case of the lawyer adduced p. 7. by our author as a proof that Christ did this. And here it may not be improper to ask, Did Jesus who knew the hearts of all, regard this lawyer as perfectly sinless, an exception to all mankind, or as one righteous only in his own eyes? That the latter was really the case, will, we think, be evident on examination. Although of the same nature with those of whom Paul testified "There is none

righteous, no not one," he did not come to Jesus to enquire how he should be forgiven, but *what he should do* to inherit eternal life. In reply Jesus, with infinite propriety, taking him on his own principles as though he had been what he vainly imagined himself, a sinless man who needed no Saviour, directs him to the whole of the Divine law, adding, "This do and thou shalt live." And had he gone and sincerely attempted this, watching his own heart to discern those "constant neglects of the duty he owed to the Creator and to his fellow-creatures" found according to our author in the best and wisest of men, he might in one hour have detected his own guilt, and have come to Jesus as one of those sinners whom he came to seek and to save. A little reflection, indeed, will convince us that this self-righteous man at the moment he received this direction, was in the actual breach of the Divine law. In what spirit did he make this enquiry? "He stood up and tempted Christ." Had he loved God with all his heart, would he have wished to tempt his prophet? for as such at least he must have regarded Christ, unless he wholly rejected the testimony God had given respecting him. Had he loved his neighbour as himself, would he have wished to tempt a righteous man who had never given him any cause of offence? Or had he loved all men, would he have stood enquir-

ing who was his neighbour? What course then could our Lord have taken better calculated to open this man's eyes to his real state, than thus to take him on his own principles and set him actually to attempt that, on doing which he so vainly prided himself? Had Christ told him at once that he was a sinner, he might probably have replied as did another of these self-righteous persons, "All these things have I done from my youth up," but who, when by way of trial prescribed a step in which Levi the publican had found no kind of difficulty, that of leaving all for Christ, went away sorrowful, manifesting himself to be so complete a slave to the love of wealth and of human estimation, that he would not forego them even for treasure in heaven.

## SECTION II.

### *General Remarks on the Evidence furnished by Scripture to the Atonement and the Deity of Christ.*

WE now come to the evidence on which rests Christ's Atonement for the sins of men, which our author so unhappily attempts to ridicule, insisting that Jesus himself declares "the sole object of his mission was to preach and impart divine instructions," p. 58 ;—that his suffering death for the offences of others "seems totally

inconsistent with the justice ascribed to God, and even at variance with those principles of equity required of men," p. 62 ;—that he himself declares frequently " that he saved the people solely through the inculcation of the word of God, representing himself as a Saviour, or a distributor of eternal life, in his capacity of divine teacher," and that " he is of course justly termed and esteemed a Saviour for having instructed men in the Divine will and law never before so fully revealed," p. 65 ;—that " the term Lamb of God" is applied to him because he, as well as many of the apostles, being innocent was " subjected to persecution," p. 68 ;—that " he was sent into this world to suffer death and difficulties like other prophets who went before him," p. 69, while he was " pure as light, innocent as a lamb, necessary for eternal life as bread for a temporal one, and great as the angels of God, or rather greater than they," *ibid.* and that " the iniquity of one's being sentenced to death as an atonement for the fault committed by another, is so palpable" that—" every just man would shudder at the idea of one's being put to death for a crime committed by another, even if the innocent man should willingly offer his life in behalf of that other," p. 64. All these assertions we shall meet simply with Divine Testimony on this subject, from which there can be no appeal,

and with which, we think, our author should have made himself *fully* acquainted before he published them to the world. Every one who reads them will not be aware that he has not ; some will think it impossible that any man could have published them till he had most diligently examined every idea found in Scripture on this important subject, and hence, giving him credit for having thus done, will make no examination themselves.

The evidence given in Scripture to the existence of the Triune God, the Deity of the Son, and the Atonement of Christ for the sins of men, is to be found less in definitions and simple declarations, than as interwoven in precepts and commands, which is the case even with that which relates to the being of a God, all these doctrines being intended less for speculation than for that faith and cordial obedience which renovate the heart and produce the fruits of righteousness. The gratification of mere curiosity seems never to have been the object of Divine Revelation. Hence, of historical facts we are told—just as much as will be profitable to the mind. He who has given us history so ancient that profane history begins merely where it ends,—has developed the state of the antediluvian world, — and informed us that the angels who kept not their first estate, are reserved in chains under dark-

ness unto the judgment of the great day, could have added in a few pages, facts relative to that awful defection, to the state of mankind before the flood, or even to the history of the first ten centuries afterwards, which the literati of the present day would have deemed beyond all price. But this did not seem good to Him who has hidden from the wise and prudent those things which he has revealed unto babes. Hence we have scarcely a full creed given us in any part of the Scriptures. He who would believe to the saving of the soul, must in the very act unite to faith cordial obedience, in doing which he finds at length that he has a complete creed given him in those precepts which he has been obeying from the heart. So just is that saying of our Lord's, "He that *will do his will* shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." Doctrines delivered in the form of divine commands, however, involve in themselves a far stronger kind of evidence, than as though delivered merely as speculative axioms. Had they been given as simple declarations, they would have committed the *veracity* of the revealer, but when given as commands, they also involve his *goodness*. He who knowingly declares a thorough villain to be a man of the strictest probity, utters a falsehood; but if he bring him to me as one to whom I may confide all my property, he ruins me at



once. To declare of a man totally ignorant of medicine, that he is a most able physician, is a falsehood which deserves reprobation; but knowingly to introduce him to a friend near death, as one on whom he may rely for a cure, is deliberate murder. Thus to declare a thing true which is really false, misleads the soul; but to deliver it as a command leading to eternal life, is to be guilty of destroying for ever, an individual, a whole nation, and possibly successive generations.

The evidence which the Scripture furnishes both of the Atonement and the Deity of the Son, while all is the dictate of the Holy Spirit, may be traced up to *Five different Sources*, equal in authenticity, but differing in clearness and fulness. First, If the doctrine of the Atonement be found in the Scriptures, it is natural to expect that it will be either expressed or implied in the Old Testament. As men were sinners from the beginning, a doctrine so important must have entered into the religion of the ancient patriarchs and prophets. However much it might have been veiled under that obscure dispensation, still it must have existed, and must have formed the foundation both of their faith and practice. Evidence drawn from this source, it may be observed, if fully substantiated, unavoidably implies the truth of the doctrine, whatever be found on the subject in the

**New Testament.** If it be predicted that the Son should appear in human nature and die for sinners, we may be certain that for them he died, if he became incarnate and died at all; little as may have been said on this subject by himself or his followers. And, we may add, if he be described in these ancient writings as equal in nature with the Father; since he changes not, even the silence of the New Testament writers on this subject could by no means invalidate the fact.—Secondly, our Lord's own declarations furnish another source of evidence. Though when it displayed his own infinite love, he might have chosen to be silent on this subject, especially when his disciples even at his crucifixion knew not the Scriptures that he should rise from the dead, yet if in his humiliation he gave merely a hint, which, justly construed, would imply either his Atonement or his Deity, we need no farther testimony from one "in whom," according to our author, "dwelt all truth." Any application of a prediction, delivered in the Old Testament, respecting his Atonement or Deity, would be peculiarly conclusive, as it would assure us that *we* had not mistaken the meaning of the Holy Spirit in applying such passage to Jesus.—Thirdly, any declaration respecting his Atonement or Deity given by the Evangelists themselves, forms another kind of evidence. Among

other things which became the Saviour when he took on himself the form of a servant, was, the duty of acting conformably to that state : and although he could neither deny nor wholly conceal his Deity, he made it his chief business while on earth to serve and obey. But the Evangelists could say things respecting their beloved Lord which that propriety he never infringed, might forbid his saying while he dwelt on earth, a man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs. Hence every hint they give respecting Christ's Atonement or his Deity, is irrefragable evidence ; and their thus applying any passage in the Old Testament, renders its evidence incontrovertible, by assuring us that in our applying it we have neither mistaken the subject nor the person.—Fourthly, the writings of the Apostles exhibit their maturest ideas of the Redeemer. While they were guided by the Holy Spirit into all truth, they had on themselves the most awful responsibility which at any time ever attached to mortals. Entrusted on the one hand with the honour and glory of their Lord, whom they had seen lay down his life for them, they were on the other entrusted with the temporal and eternal happiness of future generations. Hence if they forbore to speak the truth respecting Jesus, they degraded their Lord ; if they exalted him beyond the truth, they ruined man-

kind throughout every future generation. And since they were aware that their writings and example would be imperative on all the future followers of Jesus, if in these circumstances they indulged in fancy while speaking of their Lord, instead of delivering to mankind the clear and sober truth respecting him, they deserved to be ranked among the basest of men. Whatever their practice and writings therefore declare or fairly imply respecting Jesus, may be relied on as indubitable evidence. This applies with particular force to the Apostle John. If we may rely on uncontradicted tradition, the circumstances in which he wrote were peculiarly important. Surviving all his fellow Apostles, he lived till nearly sixty years after the death of his beloved Lord ; and wrote at a time when his Godhead was impugned by some, and his human nature by others. This adds new weight to every expression he uses \* in describing his nature, either in his Gospel or his Epistles ; for if when he must have been conscious that the eyes of all the churches were upon him as the last of the personal disciples of Christ, he was not circumspect in the choice of his language when describing him,—if he even suffered an ambiguous expression to escape him in a tongue in which he had preached Christ at least for fifty years if it was not familiar to him from his infancy, instead of

being termed John the Divine, as he has been by the concurrent voice of seventeen centuries, he more justly merited the epithet of, the hoary Deceiver. If then they in these circumstances apply to Jesus any passage in the Old Testament relative to the Atonement or the Deity of the Son, this is a decided proof that in thus applying it, we are perfectly correct.—Fifthly, in the book of Revelation we have evidence originating in a different source. In vision, the truth and accuracy of the scenes in which rest on precisely the same authority with “the Precepts of Jesus,” we have the Saviour introduced in his majesty and glory, the heavenly world opened to our view, and the sentiments of the blessed above respecting Him expressed in the most unequivocal manner. On whatever is there expressed therefore respecting the Atonement or the Deity of the Saviour, we

- may rely as being not only the truth itself,—but the grand exemplar of our own language and feelings, should we ever be permitted to join the blissful assembly above.

Respecting the whole of this evidence we may add, that as all originates in the Spirit of God, one passage which clearly proves either the Atonement or the Deity of Christ, is quite sufficient. The Spirit of Truth being the same, twenty passages cannot render the doctrine more true than one; and the only reason why

we can wish more is, that if one stand alone, we *may possibly* have mistaken its meaning. Where evidence concurs therefore drawn from two of these sources, we have the most decided proof of its truth, as this vouches for its just application; and if these five kinds unite in any one fact, such security for its truth is given as is found no where else among men. Of these five sources of evidence, we in our last Review confined ourselves to the two contained in the Gospels. As by our author's quoting them, however, all the Scriptures are open to us, we may now avail ourselves of the whole. Still since he intimates that "were it a practice among Christians to study first the Old Testament as found arranged in order—and then to study the New Testament comparing the one with the other, Christianity would no longer be liable to be encroached upon by human opinions," we deem ourselves bound to adopt this mode, whatever be its disadvantages. In doing this we shall also examine those passages of Scripture on which he has animadverted in the Appendix, as these animadversions form the sinews of his work.

### SECTION III.

#### *Evidence borne to the Atonement by the Pentateuch.*

WE begin with the first Promise made to mankind, a passage which seems entirely to have escaped our author's notice, although it well deserves it. This occurs Gen. iii. 15. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it, or he, shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Respecting this promise, common sense dictates that it must contain a meaning worthy the wisdom of the Promiser. This it cannot have if we confine it to the serpent considered as a reptile. What could a reptile feel relative to the fate of its offspring through future ages? Of what individual serpent did the seed of the woman break the head so as for it to bruise his heel? But man had been tempted to his ruin, and Divine wisdom and mercy required, that the Tempter should be the object of this threatening. This explains the promise. The destruction of the Tempter's power is threatened. But his power is seen in his causing men to sin. The destruction of his power, therefore, is salvation to man: and "for this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil," John ii. 8. Jesus then is the Seed of the Woman, who suffered

from the malice of Satan while he on the cross destroyed his power by atoning for sin and reconciling man to God. If it be urged that man's being *delivered from the power* of sin is here intended, rather than an atonement for sin; we reply, that atonement for sin both precedes and originates deliverance from its power. Deliverance from sin is the greatest of all blessings; and man previously to atonement made, is, according to Paul, under God's righteous curse. But, till it be removed, curse excludes blessing; otherwise curse is no more curse. From this curse "Christ hath redeemed us, Gal. iii. being made a curse for us;—that we might receive the promised Spirit through faith;" which faith, changing the heart and purifying it from the love of all sin, destroys the power of Satan over the soul. This threatening then is a promise of complete redemption; and as such we have reason to believe that our first parents themselves received it, and were reconciled to God through faith in the promised Saviour.

This is illustrated by Gen. iv. 4. "And Abel he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And Jehovah had respect unto Abel and to his offering." Comparing this with Heb. xi. 4. we find that, "by faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." We have then in the first human



household a sacrifice offered and approved of God by such evident tokens that they are perceived not only by the sacrificer but by his brother. This tells us that if Sacrifices were not of Divine institution, they were sanctioned by the approbation of God in the very first instance. But what does a man say who brings a living victim and offers it in sacrifice? That he deserves death for his transgressions and offers this victim instead of himself. Indeed it is difficult to say on what other principle God, who preserveth man and beast, nor suffers a sparrow to fall to the ground without his permission, should approve the slaughter of an innocent animal, otherwise than for food.

When sacrifices were publicly enjoined on Israel however, their design was fully developed. Aaron, Lev. xvi. 17. with the blood of the beast he had slain, enters alone into the holiest of all, and *makes atonement* for himself, his household, and all the congregation of Israel: and if we turn to the New Testament, we shall find the Apostle who wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews with the express design of conveying just ideas on this subject, declaring, ch. x. 4. "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." If these sacrifices then were accepted of God as an atonement when he knew that it was impossible they should take away sins, he either accepted them

as an atonement knowing that they were *no atonement*, and thereby encouraged a deceptive worship, or he accepted them with a view to a real atonement. But the former idea while it would be blasphemy against God *who cannot lie*, would be fatal to all the religion of Abel, Noah, Abraham, Moses, and the other worthies of the Old Testament; as this, founded on sacrifices and constantly nourished by them, must have been founded wholly on falsehood. As sacrifices *did not* take away sin, although they believed that their sins were taken away, if they did not look forward to Christ's atonement, their faith by which they "wrought righteousness," was founded on deception,—deception fostered by God himself. In the acceptance of sacrifices by the God of truth, a future Atonement which could take away sins, is therefore unavoidably implied.

Moreover it was "*by faith*" that Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." This faith must have been founded on some declaration. We hitherto find nothing declared however, beside the first promise couched in the form of a threatening to the Tempter; and we are certain that Abel looked forward to Christ, as he is included in the same catalogue with Abraham who saw Christ's day and rejoiced, and Moses who esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt.

God's gracious acceptance of these sacrifices then as really foretold the future atonement as the strongest declaration; for thereon was suspended the eternal hope of Abel and of all who after him offered sacrifices in like manner: and for God to have encouraged in them an unreal hope, would have been—to give a stone instead of bread, and instead of a fish, a serpent.

Here however we are not left to induction. On referring to Heb. x. we find One thus speaking, "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me. In burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure." Sacrifices considered in themselves then, were never desired by God, they were approved merely with a view to *His* making atonement for whom God had prepared a body. Who this was, the apostle tells us, ch. ix. 26. "*Christ* hath once in the end of the world appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." We have thus the most direct evidence that Christ's future atonement furnished the only ground on which sacrifices were ever accepted: hence they ceased after he had offered himself a sacrifice for sin. Strange that in comparing the Old Testament with the New, this chain of facts should have escaped our author's notice.

These receive additional confirmation from Noah's sacrifice on his coming out of the ark.

This, like Abel's, was a burnt-offering; and respecting it we are informed Gen. viii. 21, that "God smelled a sweet savour;" by which is meant, that they were acceptable to him. This is also testified by His saying in his heart, "I will not again curse the ground for man's sake, although the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." This testimony of the Divine approbation to sacrifices necessarily gave direction to the religion of the new world; but did the Almighty while he still declared the existence of human depravity, declare himself propitiated by that which he knew was no atonement? Was he pleased with sacrifices in which he had no delight? or did he hereby direct the new race of mankind to One hereafter to come into the world and make a real atonement? The former is contrary to his righteous nature, the latter is subsequently confirmed by numerous testimonies. All the genuine religion of the new world, then, was founded on the future atonement. Nor was it unfruitful; it originated, among other fruits, the piety of Job and his friends, which if their hope was unreal, was wholly the offspring of falsehood.

Having mentioned Job, we may here advert to his testimony respecting the future Redeemer, Job xix. 25. "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand in the latter day upon the earth." This plainly shews that the

Messiah is not termed a Redeemer merely on account of his teaching or his example : these could be of no value to Job who lived so long before his appearance on the earth. He must therefore have styled him his Redeemer on some other account. Was this his becoming an atonement, or his delivering him from his temporary calamities by his wisdom and almighty power? If the former, this proves the Atonement, if the latter, it proves the Deity of the Redeemer about to stand the latter day on the earth.

Abraham adds additional evidence to the Atonement. He is thus addressed, Gen. xii. "Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee : and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee ;—and thou shalt be a blessing—and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." This affords another proof that doctrines are often delivered in the form of commands ; and that this, instead of lessening, enhances their weight. What could have been more dreadful than for Abraham to have left his country, his kindred, and every thing dear to human nature, and to have gone to a land in which neither he nor his posterity for above four centuries afterwards, were permitted to erect a building, or possess a foot of land except for a burying place,—upon

a mere deception, and this originating in the God of the whole earth? Respecting this promise however if we consult Gal. iii. 13. "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree, that the *blessing of Abraham* might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ;" we shall find that it fully foretels the Atonement. Want of room constrains us to pass over the evidence furnished by Isaac and Jacob, and by that singular type of our Lord's priesthood recognized in the Psalms and in the New Testament, in the person of Melchizedek king of Salem; nor are we able to notice that eminent prophecy respecting the Saviour delivered by Jacob on his death-bed. "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah—till *Shiloh* come."

In Exodus we are introduced into a new scene. The children of Abraham had now become a nation, and in bringing them out of Egypt with a mighty hand, Jehovah, the only true God, addressed himself in the most powerful manner to all the nations around. By the last plague he inflicted on Egypt he brought before Israel their own desert of death, and the atonement, the way of deliverance he had appointed for guilty man. This was done by the institution of the Passover. On this occasion the Israelites were directed to take a

lamb for each house, chosen on the tenth, and slain on the fourteenth of the same month in the evening;—then to take the blood, and strike it on the lintel and the two side-posts of the door; and afterwards to eat the flesh roasted, with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Respecting the blood thus sprinkled on the door-posts, God was pleased to say, ch. xii. 13. “And when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you when I smite the land of Egypt.” This Passover they were commanded to keep every year throughout their generations; and it will be seen that this solemn rite, which taught them that they, deserving death, were preserved from the destroyer through the blood of a lamb, directed their attention to a nobler victim, when it is considered that He by whom this was commanded, knew it to be “impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin.” On turning to the New Testament according to our author’s suggestion, we not only find John Baptist pointing out Jesus as “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world,” but Paul recognizing his death under this very figure, 1 Cor. v. 7. “For even Christ *our passover* was sacrificed for us;” and Peter confirming this testimony, 1 Pet. i. 18.—“Ye know that ye were redeemed—with the precious blood of Christ *as of a lamb without ble-*

*ish and without spot.*” Nay, pursuing our research, we find, Rev. v. the ideas of the redeemed above coinciding with those of the apostles below. In the midst of the throne and of the four beasts and the four and twenty elders stood “a Lamb as it had been slain,” the Mediator between God and man. This Lamb all the blessed falling down adored, saying “Thou art worthy—*for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.*” It was not then on account of Christ’s innocence merely, that he was compared to a Lamb; his being *sacrificed,—slain,—his redeeming them to God by his blood,* fixed on him the attention of the apostles and saints on earth, and of the blessed above. How different the opinion of our author respecting Christ from theirs who “see him as He is!” Rejecting his blood, he will hear of nothing but redemption by his instructions. Should he retain this opinion till death, how can he unite with them above?

The family whom God had chosen to preserve the knowledge of himself, being now about to be embodied as a nation, laws and religious ceremonies were prescribed then by God himself, from which they were forbidden to swerve in the least degree. In these, sacrifices with the express view of *making atonement* were ever prominent; and when we reflect that in these sacrifices themselves God had no plea-



sure, we are irresistibly led to the conclusion that they were intended to lead them forward to Him who should hereafter come in the body God had prepared him, and once in the end of the world put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. To substantiate this we have only to examine the Mosaic ritual. A High Priest was appointed, who, arrayed in garments made for glory and beauty, and bearing on his ephod and his breast-plate, engraven on precious stones, the names of the twelve tribes of Israel, appeared before God to bear their iniquities and even those of their holy things, that they might be acceptable before God. This High Priest, however, dared not appear before God in his own righteousness; a bullock and a ram were slain for an atonement for him, the blood of which was afterwards applied to his right ear, his right hand, and his right foot. When this atonement had been made to sanctify the high priest himself, he was to offer up morning and evening a lamb as a continual burnt-offering; which done, God declared that he would dwell amongst them, and be their God. In Lev. ix. 7, we find Moses thus commanding Aaron, "Go unto the altar and offer thy sin-offering and thy burnt-offering, and make an *atonement for thyself* and for the people; and offer the offerings of the people, and make an *atonement* for the people, as the Lord com-

manded ;” and ver. 23, 24, that this being done, “ the glory of the Lord appeared unto the people. And there came out a fire from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat,” in token of the Divine approbation. Yet this High Priest was permitted to come into the holiest of all only once in the year, and then not without blood.

The Annual Scape Goat teaches the same doctrine. In Lev. xvi. we find Aaron directed to take of the congregation two kids of the goats for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering. On these two goats he was to cast lots, that one might be for the Lord, and the other, “ presented alive to the Lord to make an atonement with him, and then to be let go for a Scape Goat into the wilderness.” The first goat he was to kill, and sprinkle the blood on the mercy-seat within the veil. While this was doing, no one of the congregation was suffered to be within even the holy place. All were to remain without till Aaron had thus made an atonement for himself, his household, and all the congregation of Israel. He was then to lay his hands on the head of the living goat, and “ confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel,” putting them on the head of the goat, and by the hand of a fit person to send it away into the wilderness. This was made a perpetual statute in Israel, “ to make an atone-

ment for all their sins once in every year." Commands like these did more than merely foretel the Atonement of Christ. As He who commanded them, had no pleasure in sacrifices, and knew that the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sins ; without a view to a real atonement to express approbation at these being offered, was to deceive the worshippers and leave them still in their sins. When we reflect that these included the best of men for the next fourteen centuries, with the prophets and all the succeeding writers of the Old Testament, can any thing be more dreadful than such a supposition ?

But strong as is this inference, we need it not ; we have *direct* evidence that this prefigured the atonement of Christ. The very plan our author lays down as the certain way to disprove this doctrine, that of comparing the Old Testament with the New, renders this fact clear as the light. In Heb. ix. the Apostle takes up this subject, and after describing the high priest's entering alone once a year into the Holiest of all with blood, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people, he says ver. 12, " But Christ being come a high priest of good things to come,—not by the blood of goats and calves, but by *his own blood*, hath entered once into the Holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," adding

ver. 15, “ For this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of *the transgressions that were under the first* (the Old) *Testament*, they who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.” He further declares, that since Christ could not have offered himself often, without often suffering since the foundation of the world, he hath “ appeared once in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;” and appealing to the most certain and solemn of all facts, the mortality of man and the judgment which follows, he adds; “ So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them who look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation,”—among which number may our author and ourselves be found at the great and last day!

In giving this brief view of the evidence for the Atonement of Christ furnished by the Pentateuch, we have been constrained to omit a number of minuter facts, highly valuable in point of evidence, as here the minutest rite appointed of God becomes strong testimony. To some this kind of evidence may be new, as they have been accustomed to attach this term only to clear declaration or prediction. Our Lord, however, in discoursing with his disciples previously to his ascension, tells them; “ These

are the words which I spake unto you while yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which are written *in the law of Moses*, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me;" in this threefold division of the evidence respecting himself contained in the Old Testament, assigning this the first place. The declaration of Moses relative to Christ's being raised up a prophet like unto himself, as it is urged exclusively against Christ's Deity, will be hereafter considered.

#### SECTION IV.

##### *The Psalms examined respecting the Atonement.*

OF the other Two Divisions, on our author's plan, to which we shall strictly adhere, the Psalms come next. In briefly examining both them and the Prophets respecting Christ's Atonement, we shall omit those passages which refer exclusively to his Deity, reserving them for a separate examination. In doing this, as every passage in the Psalms or the Prophets which our Lord adduced as speaking of himself, he thereby made his own, we shall be able fully to gratify the wish our author expresses p. 9, "As the reverend Editor has most fairly and justly confined himself to arguments founded on the authority of the Divine Teacher himself,

I should hope to be allowed to beg him to point out, in order to establish his position, even a single passage pronounced by Jesus enjoining a refuge in such a doctrine of the Cross as all-sufficient or indispensable for salvation."

We find the Psalms confirming every thing implied in the Mosaic ritual respecting the future Atonement. In them the Redeemer is described in almost every situation. The Second Psalm opens with a view of things immediately after his *resurrection*. "Why do the heathen rage, and the nations imagine a vain thing?" &c. &c. This rage was excited by the doctrine that Christ had made atonement for sinners, as we may learn by recurring to Acts iv. where the disciples, threatened by the rulers for preaching this doctrine, go to their own company, and lift up their voices with one accord to God in the very words of this Psalm, adding, ver. 27. "For of a truth, against *thy holy child Jesus*, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together." Their application of this prophecy was confirmed by a visible token of the Divine approbation.

Psalm xvi. 8—11. describes the feelings of the Redeemer in the *prospect of death*, as we are taught, Acts ii. 25—27, where the Holy Spirit recites the prophecy with a variation of phrase

made thereby as really the word of God as the original prophecy. "For David speaketh concerning him (Jesus of Nazareth), I foresaw the Lord always before my face, he is at my right hand that I should not be moved; therefore did my heart rejoice and my tongue was glad, moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope; because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." Here the circumstances which related to the death of Christ are noticed even to the fact that the body of Christ should not see that corruption which seizes other human bodies almost before the spirit has departed. Still in his humiliation the Holy Spirit recognizes his equality with the Father by styling him "the Holy One," a term applied in Scripture only to the Sacred Three.

In Psalm xxii. we have the words in which our Lord expressed himself while atoning for our sins, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" This Psalm is applied to the Redeemer, Heb. ii. where, declaring that it *became* Him by whom are all things and for whom are all things, to make the Captain of our salvation perfect through sufferings, Paul, ver. 11, from this Psalm demonstrates Christ's *human nature*; "For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are *all of one*, wherefore he is not ashamed to call them *brethren*;

saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren." But what need of proving his *human*, if he had not a *Divine Nature*? of proving him man, if Paul had not adored him as God over all blessed for evermore? Did Paul ever attempt to prove his own human nature? or even that of Moses? Was it ever said that Elijah or Moses was not ashamed to call the saints of God *brethren*?

Psalm xxxi. gives us the words in which after declaring "It is finished," Christ *resigned his spirit to his Heavenly Father*, "Into thy hands I commit my spirit." But it is in the fortieth Psalm as already mentioned, that the Son describes the joy and delight which he felt in assuming our nature that he might become a sacrifice for sin. "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, mine ears hast thou opened: burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required." It was then faith in the *real* sacrifice which was required when sacrifices were commanded. "Then said I, lo I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me; I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea thy law is within my heart." This is applied to Christ, Heb. x. 4—7. Having laid down the immutable axiom, that it is not possible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin, the Holy Spirit adds, "Wherefore when he cometh into the world he saith, Sacrifice and offering



thou wouldst not, *but a body hast thou prepared me.*" By these declarations various facts are established. They inform us that the *grand design* of the Son in becoming man, was that of being a SACRIFICE; which fully refutes our author's assertion p. 58, that "the sole object of his mission was to preach and impart divine instructions." How he could indeed affirm this with the following declaration before him, "Therefore doth my Father love me because I lay down my life that I may take it again," we are at a loss to conceive. Did the Father love the Son for doing that which it was no part of his work to do? And was it no part of his work to do that for which he had received the Father's command?—They also demonstrate that the SON DELIGHTED *in offering himself a sacrifice*, which refutes that dreadful assertion that Jesus "declared great aversion to the death of the cross," and merely "yielded to it as knowing that the will of his Father rendered such death unavoidable." That human nature in its pure state should tremble at the wrath of God, instead of despising it, was infinitely right; but that he who delighted to do his Father's will when he knew that this will was his dying on the cross in the body prepared for him, should yield thereto merely because the will of his Father rendered it unavoidable, is such a charge against the Prince

of Life as makes us tremble for its author.—— They furnish a complete answer to the declaration, p. 62, that it would be “a piece of gross iniquity to afflict one innocent being who had all the human feelings, and who had never transgressed the will of God, with the death of the cross for the crimes committed by others;” and p. 63 “that the iniquity of one’s being sentenced to death as an atonement for the fault committed by another, is such, that every just man would shudder at the idea of one’s being put to death for a crime committed by another, even if the innocent man should willingly offer his life in behalf of that other.” This iniquity, if it be such, the Father *willed*, since he prepared the Son a body in which to suffer this “palpable injustice,” and loved him for laying down his life and perpetrating the act. But should not a creature, a worm of the dust, who cannot fully comprehend the mysteries of his own being, pause before he arraign his Maker of gross injustice, and charge him with having founded all the religion of the patriarchs and prophets,—of the apostles and primitive saints,—of the blessed in heaven throughout eternity, on an act of palpable iniquity? *Has he* then “searched out the Almighty to perfection?” Has he ascertained, Thus far canst thou go in extending mercy to man—but no farther, on pain of being guilty of gross iniquity? We

forbear to enlarge ;—we hope for his own sake that our author has affirmed all this merely through ignorance, not knowing the Scriptures. May his eyes be opened ere it be for ever too late !

In Psalm xlv. we have the *Eternal Deity* of the Son fully revealed, while his *Incarnation* is spoken of as though actually effected. “Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness, therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.” From this passage, it is evident that our author’s act of “gross iniquity” was perpetrated by Him who loved righteousness and hated wickedness ! But who is this about so to equalize himself with men as to be one among them, perfect in righteousness ? Though it is not our present business to seek evidence of the Deity of Christ, we cannot shut our eyes against the effulgence which beams forth from these unsought testimonies ; “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.” Alluding to this and other passages, we find the Holy Spirit thus speaking, Heb. i. 8—12: “But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom,—and, Thou, Jehovah, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest ; and they all

shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up and they shall be changed ; but *thou art the same*, and thy years shall not fail." Here, He who cannot lie, ascribes to the Son, the *Names* peculiar to God, Jehovah, God ;—the *Attributes* of God, eternity, immutability, almighty power ;—and the *Works* of God, the creation and disposal of the heavens and the earth. Thus the mode of studying the Scriptures which our author prescribes as purging "Christianity from all human opinions" declares the Son to be Jehovah, the unchangeable God, the Creator of heaven and earth. But he is still right : these are not *human* opinions respecting the Son ; they are the testimony of Him who is from everlasting to everlasting, whose understanding is infinite, and who *cannot lie*. To his testimony, that of all the men on earth and all the angels in heaven can add nothing.

In Psalm lxviii. the Son is represented on his *mediatorial throne*, after having humbled himself to dwell on earth. "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive : thou hast received gifts for men, yea for the rebellious also, that Jehovah God might dwell among them." This we find applied to Christ by Paul, Ephes. iv. only the Holy Spirit describes Him there as *giving* these gifts to men, by raising up apostles, evangelists, pastors, and teachers to the end of his mediatorial kingdom.

In Psalm lxxix. Christ is described in his *deepest sufferings*. “Save me, O God; for the waters are come into my soul; I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing; I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me.”—The Holy Spirit is here pleased also to describe the *nature* of his sufferings by adding —“then I restored that which I took not away,” the honour and glory of that righteous law which sinners had violated. This Psalm is recognized as descriptive of Christ by the Evangelist John, ch. ii. 17; and by the Apostle Paul, Rom. xv. 3.—In Psalm lxxii. the *glorious effects* of the Redeemer’s sufferings are brought before us, in expressions never realized in Solomon’s reign. “In his days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace as long as the moon endureth. Yea all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him:—men shall be blessed in him; all nations shall call him blessed.”

Psalm lxxxix. also contains predictions fulfilled neither in David nor his posterity. “Thou spakest in vision to thy Holy One, and saidst, I have laid help on one that is mighty, I have exalted one chosen out of the people.—His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven.” Here we may ask, Where is the temporal throne of David now flourishing? Where are his seed

to be even found on the earth? But has that failed which God swore by his holiness to fulfil? Yes, unless this prophecy belong to the *kingdom of Christ*.

Psalm cii. describes anew the *sorrows* of the Redeemer when wounded for our transgressions, "My heart is smitten and withered, so that I forget to eat my bread. By reason of the voice of my groaning my bones cleave to my skin." In ver. 10, the cause of his sufferings is disclosed, "Because of thine indignation and thy wrath; for thou hast lifted me up and cast me down." While the reality of his human nature is demonstrated by those tremendous sufferings due to our iniquities, the Holy Spirit bears witness to his Deity, in that description which the Spirit applies to the Son, Heb. i. 7. "Thou, Jehovah, hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands." Such are the proofs of Christ's Deity which meet us while we are seeking evidence of his having been a man of sorrows.

In Psalm cxviii. occurs that prophecy of our Lord which when quoted by himself struck his enemies dumb: "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner." And in Psalm cx. we have both his *Priesthood* and his *Mediatorial Kingdom* brought before us; a Priest without atonement, however,

has no existence in the Old Testament. “Jehovah hath sworn and will not repent, thou art a *Priest* for ever after the order of Melchizedek.” “Jehovah said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool.” Want of room constrains us to close here our quotations from the Psalms, though so many passages remain unnoticed.

## SECTION V.

*The Prophets examined respecting the Atonement.*

NOTWITHSTANDING the abundant evidence for the Atonement and even the Deity of Christ already adduced from the Pentateuch and the Psalms, it would be injuring the truth were we wholly to overlook the Prophets, the third division declared by our Lord to contain things concerning him inevitably requiring fulfilment: and we trust our readers will bear with that fulness of proof which God has given respecting this doctrine, when they reflect, that it is the only hope of salvation to guilty man, the soul of all the true religion ever seen on earth, and the grand theme of praise with the blessed above throughout eternity.

The first passage we adduce from *Isaiah* relates to Christ's *birth*. Hitherto there had been a gradual and beautiful display of light respect-

ing the Redeemer of men. After he was announced to our first parents, the nation was predicted from which he was to spring, then the tribe, and at length the particular family of that tribe, while the sacrificial services prefigured him daily, and the hymns of praise which embodied the piety and devotion of these ages, unfolded his *Godhead* as well as predicted his *Incarnation*. The Prophets at length fix the *place*, the *time*, and the *manner* of his birth, bearing new testimony to his Atonement, and interweaving therewith the glories of his Godhead. Isaiah, in chap. vii. predicting his birth, identifies his Divine and his human nature: "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." This passage the Holy Spirit applies to Christ in Matt. i. 22, 23. "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold a virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel, which being interpreted is, "God with us." Our author's efforts to fix this prophecy on Hezekiah, together with that in chap. ix. "To us a child is born, to us a Son is given, and he shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," completely condemn his own cause. On these two passages he has expended no less than



twelve pages of his Appendix. Among other things he attempts to make us ashamed of Christ's human nature: "How inconsistent is it," says he, p. 140, "that a sect which maintains the omniscience and omnipotence of Christ, should apply to him a passage by which he is made subject to such a degree of ignorance as not to be able at one period to distinguish between good and evil." Alas! he forgets that all the glories of his unchangeable Deity would have been of no avail to us, had it not been for his human nature, the reality of which is demonstrated by his sinless infirmities. How far the Son chose to sustain or remove these by his native omniscience and omnipotence, his own infinite wisdom decided; but had he wholly hidden them under the perfections of his Divine nature, the enemies of redemption would as certainly have denied his human nature, as they now attempt to deny that he is "God over all blessed for evermore." To secure to Hezekiah that passage in chap. ix. our author gives us a translation or rather a paraphrase of it by Jonathan in his Targum, to which we shall merely oppose that given by Bishop Lowth, "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 Father of the Everlasting Age, the

Prince of Peace." And to fix on "the illustrious son of Ahaz" this in chap. vii. he insists p. 139, that the Heb. **הַעַלְמָה** and the Greek **ἡ παρθένος** should have been translated, not "a virgin," but "the Virgin," suspecting our translators of a previous determination to apply the term "virgin" as found in the prophet to the mother of Christ, in order that the high titles applied to Hezekiah might in the most unqualified manner be understood of Jesus. But our translators are charged wrongfully; they had not the most distant idea of these high titles being ever intended for Hezekiah. It is true the **ה** emphatic of the Hebrew, is generally rendered in the Septuagint by the Greek Article; they are by no means equivalent in value, however, as he may convince himself by referring to that excellent work on the Greek Article, for which the learned world is indebted to Dr. Middleton, now Bishop of Calcutta.

Our author would persuade us that the Evangelist Matthew ought not to be credited when he expressly declares, that all the circumstances of Jesus's birth happened for the sake of fulfilling this prophecy "spoken of the Lord by the prophet." And since the credit of all the Evangelists rests on precisely the same foundation, should he succeed, who can rely on the "Precepts of Jesus?" But their credit is per-

fectly safe ; a slight attention to the chronology of the Scripture would have saved him all this labour, by convincing him that Hezekiah *could not have been* the child at that time about to be conceived by the virgin, for this plain reason, that God never foretels *past things*, like the Hindoo sage Valmikee. He claims it as his peculiar prerogative that he “ declares *things to come* ;” and the birth of Hezekiah was not then a thing to come, for *he was at least Six years old when this prophecy was spoken !* This our author will see by merely comparing the fact that Ahaz reigned *Sixteen* years, with the following passage in 2 Chron. xxix. 1. “ Hezekiah began to reign when he was *Five and Twenty years old.*” Hence after allowing that the last day of one year and the first day of another, might be meant, still *Hezekiah must then have been six if not SEVEN years old when this prophecy was delivered*, though it were spoken to Ahaz the first month of his reign. Should not our author, before impugning the Deity of Christ on the ground of his superior knowledge of the Scriptures, have made himself previously acquainted with their chronology, at least on a point of this nature, when it would have cost him so little trouble ?

Isa. xi. describes the Redeemer in terms that preclude the possibility of his Atonement’s being an act of palpable iniquity. The Spirit

of the Lord was to rest on him as the spirit of wisdom and understanding—hence he could not be ignorant of the nature of the deed he was about to perform ; and “ to make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord.” Does the fear of the Lord lead to acts of palpable iniquity? or did the Spirit of the Lord fail to do his office? The concluding words of this prophecy evince, that its entire fulfilment involves all we can desire for India ; “ the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of Jehovah as the waters cover the seas.”

In chap. xix. another prediction is given respecting Christ’s kingdom. “ In that day there shall be an altar to Jehovah in the midst of the land of Egypt,—and it shall be for a sign and for a witness to Jehovah of Hosts in the land of Egypt ; for they shall cry unto Jehovah because of their oppressors, and he shall send them a Saviour and a great one, and he shall deliver them.” This passage our author quotes, p. 145, in a manner somewhat singular. To invalidate the proof of Christ’s Deity arising from his being termed our Lord and Saviour, he has selected four passages wherein the term “ Saviour” occurs, the first referring to Israel’s being delivered by Gideon, Barak, and others ; the second to its deliverance from the Syrians by the hand of Jeroboam, and the other two to Christ’s future kingdom, of which this is one.

It surely required but little knowledge to discern, that a man's delivering his country does not elevate him to an equality with God, or that to overcome an invading enemy, is an act totally different from "saving sinners from their sins." But to disprove Christ's claim to Deity by quoting his own deeds *against himself*, is quite a new mode of proof. Should our author doubt whether this prediction *does* belong to Christ, we ask him when, previously to his coming, did the Egyptians cry to Jehovah for deliverance? And when previously, was Israel the third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth, whom Jehovah blessed, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance.

In chap. xxxv. the blessings of Christ's kingdom are described in the most glowing language. The wilderness and desert are represented as rejoicing abundantly from seeing the glory of Jehovah. This passage contains expressions which forbid its being restricted to the return from Babylon: we are not certain that the eyes of the blind were then opened, the ears of the deaf unstopped, the lame made to leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb to sing; but all these wonders were realized when Christ became incarnate. The ransomed of Jehovah are also described as "returning

with everlasting joy on their heads." But who came to give his life a ransom for many? Surely not the Father, for he never became incarnate. Yet these are the ransomed of Jehovah.

In chap. xlii. we have a prediction applied to Christ by Luke, "He shall not cry, nor lift up nor cause his voice to be heard in the street;" nor is the cause of the Father's being pleased with him, concealed; "The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law and make it honourable." From Paul, 2 Cor. v. we learn however, that for those whom Christ justifies by his righteousness, he also atoned; "For he hath made him to be *sin for us* who knew no sin, that we might be made *the righteousness* of God in him."

Want of room constrains us to omit numerous other prophecies, that we may hasten to chap. liii. This memorable part of Scripture which proved the conversion of a most bitter enemy to Christianity, the Earl of Rochester, so fully describes the design of Christ's death, that it would be sufficient evidence, did it stand alone. The prophet having declared that he appeared to the Jews "like a root out of a dry ground, having no form nor comeliness," informs us why he was thus a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. It was through no sin of his own, "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows;" but as though to prevent

this being interpreted of his grief through our refusing his instructions, he adds; "He was wounded for our *transgressions*, he was bruised for our *iniquities*." But why was this necessary? Is not our repentance sufficient to make atonement with the "All-merciful?" Is it not the *only* means of procuring forgiveness for our failures? "All we like sheep have gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on *Him the iniquities of us all*." But if the Lord deemed this *necessary*, it should seem, according to our author, that Divine wisdom was mistaken; and yet, if God did it when it was *not necessary*, nothing could be more fatal to the Divine character. But was this the Father's act? Was it not the Jews persecuting an innocent person? He was indeed innocent: he had done no violence, neither was deceit found in his mouth; "Yet it pleased *Jehovah to bruise him; He hath put him to grief*." On this subject, then, the thoughts of the Divine mind are as remote from the ideas of our author as the east is from the west. He declares that it would be gross iniquity to afflict an innocent being, who had all the human feelings, with the death of the cross for the sins committed by others, nor would his willingly offering his life alter the case; even then the iniquity of being sentenced to death as an atonement for the faults committed by another, is yet palpable. Yet God who is

of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, *wills* this, yea delights therein: “*It PLEASED Jehovah to BRUISE him.*” In this discordance of opinion between our author and his Maker we are constrained to say, “Let God be true,—and every man a liar.” The remaining testimonies to Christ’s Atonement found in Isaiah we are obliged to overlook, to notice a few of those in the other Prophets.

*Jeremiah*, chap. xxiii. has the following prediction: “Behold the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David a Righteous Branch; a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is the name whereby he shall be called, *Jehovah our Righteousness.*” No temporal king of the seed of David, however, has since sat on the throne of Israel; nor is even the residence of the ten tribes at present certainly known.—Another passage, chap. xxxi. describes the Redeemer’s *reign in the heart*, being quoted Heb. viii. “Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people—for I will *forgive their iniquities*, and I will remember their sins no more.” As the



*righteousness* of Christ by which sinners are justified before God, was expressed in the last prophecy, the forgiveness of sin and deliverance from its power are the grand features in this. Thus Paul testifies 1 Cor. i. 30, that Christ "is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption." Our author deems the term "made of God" in this passage derogatory to the Deity of the Son, forgetting that when the Son had condescended to become man, it became the Father to exercise authority over the Son "made under the Law," as well as over others. Will nothing please our author but the Son's acting *without*, or in other words *against* the Father? Before he makes this the proof of his Godhead, however, he ought to prove the Father's Deity by his acting *without the Son*. But this he will never do; for "whatsoever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise."

*Ezekiel* also predicts the promised Redeemer. In chap. xxxiv. 13, he says, "And I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David, and he shall be their shepherd." David however was then laid in the grave and had seen corruption. In ver. 29, it is added,—"and I will raise up for them a Plant of Renown; and they shall no more be consumed with hunger in the land, neither bear the shame of the heathen any more."

*Daniel* not only describes Christ's kingdom by the stone cut out without hands which increased till it filled the whole earth; but he defines the nature of his atonement, and fixes the *time* when he should appear. We may indeed here ask, what is that doctrine on which this everlasting kingdom is founded? Is it our repentance itself as an atonement? or the death of Christ? Let the angel decide who came forth to give Daniel skill and understanding therein; "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon the holy city, to finish the transgression and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy—and after threescore and two weeks shall *Messiah be cut off, but not for himself.*" Christ then is here described as a *vicarious sacrifice* for the sins of men, and *his obedience* as that *everlasting righteousness* through which alone we stand justified before God. The Redeemer is also termed "the Most Holy," a name which declares him Supreme in all moral perfections, the peculiar glory of the Divine Nature. Who is holy as Jehovah? Psalm xviii.

*Hosea*, also, chap. iii. has a prediction respecting Christ's work and kingdom which can scarcely be misunderstood. "Afterwards shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord

their God, and David their King, and shall fear Jehovah and his goodness in the latter days.”

The Prophet *Joel*, chap. ii. 28, predicts that outpouring of the Holy Spirit which followed the atonement and ascension of Christ. “And it shall come to pass afterwards, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,” &c. This Peter applied to the day of Pentecost, which application of it was followed by a most signal proof of the Divine approbation; three thousand persons, some of them the betrayers and murderers of Christ, being at one time converted to God.

*Amos*, ch. ix. unites his testimony with that of the other prophets relative to the kingdom of Christ: “In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David which is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof, and I will raise up its ruins, and build it as in the days of old, that they may possess the remnant of Edom and of all the heathen which are called by my name, saith Jehovah.” This prophecy James applied to the call of the Gentiles, when the apostles had assembled to decide whether justification by faith alone should be the standing doctrine of the gospel; a question which it pleased not only them, but the Holy Spirit himself, to decide for ever in the affirmative.

Nor does *Obadiah* in his short prophecy

wholly omit the Redeemer's kingdom. He alludes thereto in ver. 21, one of the four passages which our author quotes to impugn Christ's Deity by shewing that the term Saviour is applied to *others*! "And Saviours shall come up on mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be Jehovah's." We may here ask him, when has the mount of Esau been so judged by any one beside Christ, as that the kingdom has in consequence become Jehovah's? Does this refer to any thing but a display of Christ's power in converting sinners? Should he reply, that as the plural number "Saviours" is used, this cannot refer to Christ, we ask him whether he has not, p. 98, affirmed that "the plural form is often used in a singular sense," as, "If his masters, meaning his master, have given him a wife?" "Whom shall I send? and who shall go for *us*? (that is, for *me*.)" Which side will our author here take? Will he read this "and Saviours, that is, a Saviour, shall come upon mount Zion," and thus declare himself so unacquainted with the Scriptures, that of the four instances he has adduced *against* the Saviour, two of them relate to *him*? or—acknowledge the Triune God?

*Micah*, in chap. iv. describes Christ's kingdom nearly in the same terms with *Isaiah*; and in chap. v. he predicts the *place* of his birth. "But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be

little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me who is to be Ruler in Israel, *whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting.*" This testimony to the Eternal Deity of Christ given in connexion with his birth as man, it is wrong to overlook. "From everlasting to everlasting thou art God," is the address of Moses to God; and, "Art thou not from everlasting, O Jehovah my God, mine Holy One?" that of *Habakkuk*, when addressing Him who is of purer eyes than to look on iniquity. Do not these three passages equally describe the Godhead?

Even *Nahum* does not overlook the Redeemer's kingdom. See ch. i. 15, "Behold upon the mountains the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace! O Judah, keep thy solemn feasts, perform thy vows; for the wicked shall no more pass through thee." And if *Habakkuk* has not expressly mentioned the Saviour, he was evidently no stranger to the doctrine founded on his atonement. His axiom "the just shall live by his faith," is adopted by Paul when declaring the peculiar excellence of the gospel, Rom. i. as it is written, "the just shall live by faith;" and again Gal. iii. 11. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God is evident; "for the just shall live by faith." This prophet also predicts the universal prevalence of the Re-

deemer's doctrine, ch. ii. 14. "For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of Jehovah as the waters cover the seas."

*Zephaniah*, the last of the prophets who flourished before the captivity, in ch. iii. evidently foretels the coming of the Redeemer. "The King of Israel, even Jehovah, is in the midst of thee: thou shalt not see evil any more." Who this King of Israel was who is also Jehovah, Nathaniel informs us, John i. "Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel," a declaration which the meek and lowly Jesus received not only without reproof, but with marked approbation.

Haggai, Zachariah, and Malachi lived after the captivity, the two former somewhat above five centuries, and the latter four centuries before the birth of Christ. Being therefore of a later school, their predictions form a distinct branch of evidence, and so decided is it respecting both the Atonement and the Deity of Christ, that did it stand alone, it would be sufficient. To the people discouraged by the humble appearance of the new temple compared with the old, *Haggai* says, ch. ii. "Thus saith Jehovah; The Desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory.—The glory of this latter house shall be greater than that of the former, saith Jehovah of Hosts." Wherein did this latter temple exceed the former in

glory, but in Jehovah's coming into it clothed in our nature?

*Zechariah's* predictions relative to the human nature and atonement of the Redeemer, can scarcely be examined without their testifying his Deity. In ch. iii. Jehovah says, "Behold I will bring forth my servant, The BRANCH—and *I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day.*" And in ch. vi. "Behold the man whose name is The BRANCH, he shall grow up out of his place: even he shall build the temple of Jehovah, and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and *the counsel of peace shall be between them both.*" Here we are constrained to enquire, What temple of Jehovah did the man whose name is the Branch build? No material temple certainly. He however changes the hearts of sinful men, and forms them "a holy temple unto the Lord." But to effect this in every age, he must be both omnipresent and omnipotent; the very first step towards this being a work of almighty power, equal by Paul's testimony, 2 Cor. iv. to that of "causing the light to shine out of darkness." He also "sits and rules on his throne." Yet who can sit and rule on this spiritual throne erected in the hearts of men, but he who is both omnipresent and almighty? And "*the counsel of peace is between them both.*" Who are these two counselling each other? The Father and the

Son. But unless they were *equal* in counsel and wisdom, how could they counsel each other? What could a *creature* add to God in counsel? "Who being his counsellor hath taught Him?" Does even a man ever take counsel with a creature of a lower nature,—his horse—his dog—or any irrational creature?

In ch. ix. 9, the prophet describes the *entry of Christ into Jerusalem*. "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold thy king cometh unto thee; he is just and having salvation; lowly and riding upon an ass and upon a colt the foal of an ass." And in ch. xii. 10, he refers to *his crucifixion*; "And I will pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and supplication, and *they shall look upon me whom they have pierced*, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son," &c. which prophecy John identifies ch. xix. 37, "They shall look on *whom* they have pierced," a prophecy on which our author expends two pages in the vain hope of getting rid of the inference, that in the Old Testament Christ is termed Jehovah. We say the *vain* hope, because the address of the Father to the Son, "Thy throne, O Jehovah, is for ever and ever," with numerous other passages, would render his criticism on this passage useless to his cause, were it perfectly sound. This criticism



however we must intreat our readers' permission to examine. The emendations of this passage which our author suggests are two, the first is that of changing "they shall look *on me whom* they have pierced," for "they shall look *toward me on account of him whom* they have pierced," on the authority of the Greek and Arabic versions, to get rid of the fact which the text as it now stands inevitably implies, that as the speaker is Jehovah, *He* was Jehovah who was pierced for our sins. As though distrusting his Greek and Arabic auxiliaries however, he suggests another emendation on the authority of "common sense," which is no other than that of changing the pronoun *me* in the text for the pronoun *him*. Of these two he must give up one, for they cannot stand together, his Greek and Arabic friends being decidedly against his second emendation, as both of them retain the pronoun *me*. Should he prefer the first emendation, we must beg leave to inform him that the Greek and Arabic versions are nothing to the Original Text; they are versions made by no one knows whom, and of value precisely as far as they are supported by the Text itself. If however he will adduce Versions, we will point him not only to our own, which we think is exceeded by few, but to Jerome's, which is far more ancient than the Arabic, and allowed to be far more correct; and


which, as well as the English, perfectly agrees with the original “*et aspicient ad me quem confixerunt.*” And before our author alters the Original Text, he must prove that the particle **אֵת** *eth*, which the best Hebrew Grammars define “a particle marking the accusative case governed by active verbs, or an emphatic particle denoting the very thing itself,” is rendered *on account of*, and that not in one or two instances, but in the greater part of those places in which it occurs. But this he can never do. He will find it used almost times without number with the accusative case of the substantive; about twenty-six times in the sense of the preposition *with*, and nearly seventy times with the Relative pronoun here used **אֲשֶׁר** *asher*, “which or whom,” and with scarcely one exception, in the exact sense given it in the passage by our English translators.

We can however easily try our author’s emendation on a few passages. This particle occurs with the relative pronoun in the following instances. Gen. ix. 24, “And Noah knew *what Ham* had done to him.” Numb. xxii. 6, “I know that *whom* thou blessest is blessed, and *whom* thou cursest is cursed.” Would these sentences be improved by reading them thus, “and Noah knew *on account of what* Ham had done to him.” “I know that *on account of whom* thou blessest is blessed, and *on account of whom*

thou cursest is cursed ?” We shall succeed no better if we render it *on account of* when united with a substantive. Thus the first verse of Genesis, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,” has this particle before “the heavens” and “the earth.” But were we to render it; In the beginning God created *on account of* the heavens, and *on account of* the earth, who would think the sense improved ?

Another prediction respecting Christ’s Atonement is given by Zechariah in ch. xiii. which also opens on us the full blaze of his Deity ; “Awake, O sword, against the man that is my fellow, saith Jehovah of Hosts ; smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered.” To this passage our Lord directs his disciples when about to atone for their iniquities : “All of you shall be offended because of me this night ; for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered.” To weaken the force of this passage our author advances a most evident truism : “It either was originally applied to Agrippa,” the *fourth* Edomitish king or ruler *after* the sceptre had departed from Judah, and slain *after* Jerusalem was trodden down by the gentiles,—“or is indirectly applicable to Jesus ; but in both cases his total subordination and submission to the Father of the universe is fully implied.” No one doubts that the Saviour placed himself in subjection to the Father when

he condescended to become subject to death. But the question is, what is he *by nature*? which question the Father here decides by calling him his “fellow” or “consociate.” Unable to deny this, our author merely hints in a note that עִמִּיתִי *Immithi*, “fellow,” signifies one that lives near another; “therefore the word ‘fellow’ in the English translation is not altogether -correct, as justly observed by Abp. Newcome in his improved version,” lately published by the Socinians in England. This critique however, if just, affords our author little help. When we consider that it is the eternal Jehovah who here terms the Son his “near dweller,” it only carries us back to the declaration of Micah, “whose goings forth are from everlasting,” or forward to that of John, “and the word was *with* God and the word *was* God.” *Immithi* however is derived from the root עָם *Im*, the meaning of which Parkhurst thus gives, “to collect, gather together, consociate. As a noun fem. עִמִּית *Immith*, it denotes nearness of condition or situation; and עִמִּיתִי *Immithi* (the word here used), a neighbour, a member of the same society.” We find it thus used in Lev. vi. 2, “If a soul sin and commit a trespass against the Lord, and lie unto his neighbour in that which was delivered unto him to keep, or in *fellowship*.” It is not then easy to say how the word here could have been rendered more accurately than by

“my fellow, my partner, or consociate.” In the Syriac Version \* of the New Testament this root is employed both to *form* and to *explain* the sacred name Immanuel. The name itself is written “*Immanouel* ;” and it is translated  *Imman Alohan*, “with-us our-God.” Thus the same root is used to denote the Redeemer’s union with us in human nature, when he was “made in all things like unto us, yet without sin,” and his eternal union with his Father in his Divine Nature ; which renders it clear that if in his human nature he was man, in his Divine, *he is God*, equal with the Father, his fellow, his consociate in the Godhead.

Zechariah has also another prediction, which renders it indisputable that the Son is termed Jehovah precisely like the Father. It occurs ch. ii. 8, 9. “For thus saith *Jehovah of Hosts*, After the glory hath He sent *me* unto the nations which spoiled you ; for he that toucheth you

\* It may not be improper to add respecting the Syriac version, that as it was the first ever made of the New Testament, it is expressed in the phrases used by the Apostles and Apostolic men. If Syriac was not spoken at Jerusalem, it certainly was at Antioch the capital of Syria, where the disciples were first called Christians, and from whence Paul and others were sent forth. And that the Gospels should be rendered into Syriac almost as soon as they appeared in Greek, was almost a thing of course, as well as that those phrases should be used to express the nature of Christ, which were in common use in this flourishing primitive church.

toucheth the apple of his eye. For behold I will shake mine hand upon them, and they shall be a spoil to their servants; and ye shall know that *Jehovah of Hosts* hath sent me." Here it is self-evident that *he who sends*, and *he who is sent*, are by the Holy Spirit both styled "Jehovah of Hosts."

With this accords the testimony of Malachi, ch. iii. 1. "Behold I (Jehovah) will send my messenger and he shall prepare the way before me: and *Jehovah* whom ye seek, shall suddenly come into his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in; behold he shall come, saith Jehovah of Hosts." Here the messenger who prepares the way before "Jehovah of Hosts," is predicted in the very terms used by the evangelist in describing John Baptist, which alone identifies Christ as Jehovah of Hosts. But the prophet adds another distinct fact, "Jehovah whom ye seek shall suddenly come into his temple, even the Messenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in." What can add to these testimonies of the Deity of the Son we cannot conceive. Jehovah is that Name which God declares to be peculiarly his own; Isaiah xlii. "I am Jehovah; that is my Name: and my glory will I not give to another, nor my praise to graven images;" and yet in the passages we have adduced, to say nothing of others omitted for want of room, the Son is styled

Jehovah no less than twelve or fourteen times. And if he who is Jehovah be not God, *there is no God in the universe*, Jehovah being witness, “Thus saith Jehovah, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, Jehovah of Hosts, I am the first, I also am the last, and *beside me there is no God*.—Is there a God beside me? Yea, there is no God; I know not any.” Since then Jehovah the Father distinctly sends Jehovah the Son, and declares, that beside Jehovah there is no God, we have the highest testimony in the universe that Jehovah, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, while distinct in person, are ONE in nature, even the TRIUNE GOD.

Thus by examining the Old Testament on the subject of Christ’s Atonement, and comparing it with the New in every instance required, as our author suggests, although no passage has been considered which does not relate to the work or the kingdom of Christ, we have before us such a body of evidence, corroborated by the Apostles, the Evangelists, and by Christ himself, as indisputably confirms not only the doctrine of his Atonement, but that of his Deity. As already observed, this evidence from the Old Testament is of peculiar weight. The Prophecies nourished the faith and hope of the best of men for above seven hundred years, the Psalms embodied their devotion for a full thousand years, and Sacrifices

offered by faith, formed the soul of all real religion from the very beginning of the world. For these then to have deceived men, would have destroyed the character of God, and the happiness of all righteous beings throughout eternity.

Had our Lord himself made no direct declaration respecting the design of his death, his referring his disciples to those predictions already named would have been sufficient, particularly in their circumstances. Yet it is evident that direct intimations of this nature were not withheld: such were, his declaring to them that he came to *give his life a ransom for many*, his conversing with Moses and Elias concerning his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem, Luke ix. 31,—his declaring that the Son of Man should be betrayed into the hands of men, and be killed, and rise again the third day,—that he was about to *give his flesh* for the life of the world,—and to lay down his life for his sheep;—and, above all, his discourse with them at the last supper, when he said, “*This is my body which is broken for you. This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.*” But his declaration to them, Luke xxiv. previously to his ascension, leaves nothing more to be desired: “*These are the words which I spake while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled*



which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and the Psalms, concerning me." And, displaying his Deity anew by "opening their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures," he added, "Thus it is written, and thus it *behoved Christ to suffer*, and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations."

The *Apostles'* maturest ideas respecting Christ's death and Atonement have been seen in the various quotations already given from them. Were more necessary, the following passages, to which multitudes might be added, are sufficient to shew, that *salvation through his death alone* formed the soul of their doctrine and of all their hopes:—"Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, Rom. iii. 24.—Jesus, was *delivered for our offences*, and raised again for our justification, ch. iv. 25.—When we were yet without strength, in due time *Christ died for the ungodly*, ch. v. 6.—We joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now *received the Atonement*, ver. 11.—*God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses to them*, 2 Cor. v. 19.—*Who gave himself for our sins*, that he might deliver us from this evil world, Gal i. 4.—We have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might *be justified*

*by the faith of Christ*, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified, chap. ii. 17.—I do not frustrate the grace of God; *for if righteousness come by the law, Christ is dead in vain*, ver. 21.—*Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us*, ch. iii. 13.—In whom we have *redemption through his blood*, even the forgiveness of sins, Ephes. i. 7.—I count all things loss, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having *mine own righteousness* which is of the law, but that *which is through the faith of Christ*, the righteousness which is of God by faith, Phil. iii. 9.—*Jesus hath delivered us from the wrath to come*, 1 Thess. i. 10.—The great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ—*gave himself for us*, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works, Titus ii. 14.—*Not by works of righteousness that we have done*, but according to his mercy he saved us, ch. iii. 5.—But Christ, not by the blood of bulls and goats, but *by his own blood*, entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us, Heb. ch. ix. 12.—Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, such as silver and gold; but *with the precious blood of Christ*, as of a lamb without blemish and spot, 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.—Who his own self *bore our sins in his own*

*body on the tree*, ch. ii. 24.—Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, ch. iii. 18.—*The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sins*, 1 John i. 7.—*And he is the propitiation for our sins*, and not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world, ch. ii. 2.—*Whoso transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God*. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, the same hath both the Father and the Son, 2 John, 9.—*Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life*, Jude, 21.—*Unto him that loved us, and washed us in his own blood,—to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever*, Rev. i. 5, 6.—*Thou art worthy, for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood*, ch. v. 9.—*These are they that have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb*, Rev. vii. 14.

We have now, on the plan suggested by our author himself, taken a general though a cursory view of the evidence found in the Scriptures, that the death of Jesus on the cross is an Atonement for the sins of men; and we have found this prefigured by Sacrifices enjoined of God and publicly approved by him while he had no delight in them, but had prepared a body for his Son. We find Prophecies afterwards de-

livered relative to the future Redeemer which predict the nation, the tribe, the family, and at length the place, the time and manner of his birth, together with numerous circumstances respecting both his life and his death. The books which contain these predictions are the Sacred Writings, which nourish the faith and the piety of all in this period who truly worship God. If then Jesus did not offer himself a sacrifice for our sins, a double deception was practised on his worshippers by the God of truth: the *sacrifices* were an illusion, and the *predictions*, falsehood, and all the real religion on earth prior to Christ's coming, was the offspring of deceit. The Scriptures, however, go on to relate, that at length *Jesus Christ is born* of the nation, the tribe, the family, at the time and place, and in the manner predicted. He is pointed out as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world. He himself refers to the prophecies as mentioning his vicarious death, and after his resurrection, commands his disciples to proclaim his death among all nations *as the Atonement for sin*. This they do every where, interweaving it into all their Epistles intended to guide Christians in future ages;—and one, the most venerable of them, represents it as the idea universally prevalent among the blessed in heaven. If then Jesus Christ did not make a real atonement for sin,

all the religion of the patriarchs and prophets, of the apostles and primitive saints, and even of the blessed in heaven, is built on deception,—the Old and the New Testament are full of falsehood,—and there has never been any true revelation given among men.

But if the doctrine of Christ's Atonement, prefigured by sacrifices and confirmed by prophecy, has actually nourished all the rectitude of conduct, the genuine piety and benevolence, found among men from the fall to the present day—if the Redeemer told the disciples that thus *it behoved him to suffer*, and commanded them to preach repentance and remission of sins through his name—and if the apostles filled with this doctrine their Epistles intended for the instruction of Christians to the end of time,—what shall we think of our author's professing to derive his knowledge of Christianity immediately from the Old Testament compared with the New, while he declares that this doctrine is founded on the most palpable iniquity? What shall we say to his impugning, p. 108, the doctrine of Christ's human and Divine Nature, even after having acknowledged it in Chapter the Second—and to his ridiculing his intercession, and the doctrine of his being qualified to perform the office of Mediator from his being God and man, by adducing a man's forgiving his horse at a

friend's intercession?—Yea what to his declaring, p. 118, that “for the Deity to have assumed a human shape, and to have been subjected to the feelings and inclinations natural to the human species, is inconsistent with the immutable nature of God?” If he does not *know* that this doctrine is contained in the Scriptures,—and charity forbids our imputing these declarations to any thing but ignorance, in what manner can he have compared the Old Testament with the New? And if this plain and obvious doctrine, which shines in every prophetic book in the Old Testament, and forms the basis of faith and practice throughout the New, has so completely escaped his research, how can we expect that he can have ascertained the truth respecting that doctrine, which while confirmed in the fullest manner by the testimony of Him who cannot lie, still remains the deepest mystery in heaven and earth? To an examination of further evidence respecting this doctrine, and of our author's objections against it, we now intreat the attention of our readers.

## CHAPTER II.

## ON THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

## SECTION I.

*Evidence adduced from the Pentateuch.*

IN thus examining evidence for the Deity of Christ, which we are constrained to term *further* evidence, by the fact, that those predictions which have foretold his Atonement have fully declared his Divine Nature, we are not left to infer, that if the blood of bulls and goats *could not* take away sin, Divine justice required a sacrifice through whom God *could be just*, while the justifier of the sinner; and that as there is a certain proportion between *all creatures* rational or irrational, but none between the highest archangel and his Creator, the blood of no mere creature could take away sin. We are *solemnly assured*, that it was Jehovah, the unchangeable God, the Creator of heaven and earth, for whom the Father prepared a body, before whom John Baptist was sent as his messenger, and against whom, as his fellow and consociate, the Father commanded his sword to awake—that it is Jehovah who is our righteousness, and in whom the seed of Israel are justified and glory,—and who,

being King of God's spiritual Israel, rules in their hearts as the omniscient and almighty Saviour. Thus, instead of being left to prove, that no one but Jehovah the unchangeable God COULD atone for sin, justify the sinner, and change his heart, the Father himself witnesses that *it is Jehovah* whom He hath appointed to this glorious work. Should any one object that the Father has given Jehovah the Son to do what a *creature* could have accomplished as well, this would not in the least affect the truth of the fact; it would be only a dispute respecting wisdom between Him whose understanding is infinite, and his creature the objector. The sole question then is, whether the Son be BY NATURE *God*, bringing omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence to his work, as well as infinite rectitude and mercy—or whether he be *a mere creature*, elevated to a state to which by nature he had not the least right. In other words, did he *humble himself* by becoming in our nature the Mediator between God and man, or did he by this act *really exalt himself*, and attain a rank in the universe for which his original nature furnished him with neither pretension nor capacity. The Scriptures know nothing of an intermediate rank between the Creator and the creature, between finite and infinite; nor does it give us the least hint that God ever has imparted any one infinite perfec-



tion to a finite creature. This indeed is impossible in its own nature. That the *receiver* must be of equal capacity and extent with the *thing received*, is a self-evident maxim. Be it power or knowledge, when a finite being has received a portion equal to his limited capacity, what is to become of the remainder? It will still fill the capacity of another finite being:—of ten thousand,—of all in the universe. Will this exhaust it?—Then it was never infinite; for infinite has no end. There must then ever be an *infinite* disproportion between the capacity and power of the Father and the Son *if he be a creature*, even though “he be great as the angels of God, or rather greater.”

This question *can be decided only by Divine Testimony*. Our reasonings relative to the Nature of God the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit, amount to—just nothing. We *know* nothing of the Godhead, but what God himself has revealed. This he declares, 1 Cor. ii. 11. “The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.” What the Spirit of God has revealed in his word then, is alone the proper subject of examination:—and we have already seen what God has declared of the Son in these passages which have been adduced as speaking *of his work alone*. As *far more*, however, is revealed respecting the nature of the Son, it would be doing injustice to the subject were we to over-

look those passages which exclusively testify to his Godhead. This Second Part ought indeed to be nothing more than an examination of our author's remarks on those passages of Scripture; for if there be a single testimony, either in the Old Testament or the New, which he has not noticed, he has opposed the Deity of Christ without duly examining the subject. -

Before we adduce further evidence we may observe, that as a righteous messenger of God *must act* righteously, such messenger cannot ascribe to himself deeds or attributes which belong to God alone. This did neither Moses, Elijah, nor any who wrought miracles either in the Old Testament or the New,—beside Jesus Christ; and so accurate were his ideas on this subject, that when the Jews ascribed to Moses the miracle of giving them manna, he at once denied it to have been his act, saying, “ Verily verily I say unto you, *Moses* gave you not that bread from heaven.” As the Son also entered on his Mediatorial work as soon as sin entered into the world, we may naturally expect to find him in the Divine Records acting from the beginning distinctly from the Father, though in all things one with him. This we find to have been the case. In Gen. xlviii. 16, we have One introduced as an Angel, to the distinctness of whom from the Father, our author bears the strongest testimony, by

affirming, p. 70, that *Angels* dispensed pardon and redemption as well as Christ, with the view of invalidating his Deity, and quoting Gen. xlviii. 16, “The Angel that redeemed me from all evil bless the lads.” Thus early then does One appear in the Scriptures *distinct* from the Father, and *able to redeem*. This Angel it is easy to trace. In Gen. xxxi. 11, we find Jacob telling his family, “*The Angel of God* spake with me in a dream saying, *I am the God of Bethel*, where thou anointedst the pillar, and vowedst a vow unto me.” On recurring to this transaction in ch. xxviii. we are told, “Behold, *Jehovah* stood above the ladder and said, I am *Jehovah*, the God of Abraham thy Father, and the God of Isaac, the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed.—And Jacob vowed a vow and said, If God will be with me and keep me in this way that I go — then shall *Jehovah* be my God.” This “Angel of God,” then, is here termed both *Jehovah* and God, and by Jacob chosen as his God, being also the God of Abraham and Isaac. God himself recognizes this transaction in ch. xxxv. “And *God* said unto Jacob, Arise, go up to Bethel, and dwell there, and make there an altar unto *God who appeared unto thee when thou fleddest from the face of Esau thy brother*.” If this be the Son speaking here, the Holy Spirit again calls him God; if it be

the Father, by saying “ *God who appeared unto thee at Bethel,*” the Father places this Angel on a perfect equality with himself. Jacob indeed in the very passage quoted by our author to prove that “ *angels have dispensed pardon and redemption to men,*” declares the Angel who redeemed him from all evil to be “ the God before whom Abraham and Isaac had walked.” How must our author feel when on reviewing the context he finds that he has been disproving Christ’s Deity, by shewing that the *God of Abraham* dispensed pardon and redemption as well as Christ !

In Exodus iii. 2, the *Angel of the Lord* appears to Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of an unconsumed bush, —“ And when *Jehovah* saw that he turned aside to see, *God* called unto him out of the midst of the bush and said,—— I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.” Here the Angel of the Lord speaking out of the midst of the bush, declares himself to be the same with Jacob’s redeeming Angel, the God of Abraham and of Isaac. Should any one urge that it was not the Angel who thus called unto Moses, but God the Father, this would only confirm the equality of that Angel with the Father, since he declares himself to be precisely what Jacob terms the Redeeming Angel. Christ also, John viii., declares himself to be

precisely what *Jehovah declares himself* in ver. 14. "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you." See John viii. 24. "If ye believe not that I AM," (*he being supplied*) "ye shall die in your sins;" and ver. 58, "Verily verily I say unto you, Before Abraham, was I AM." The Jews at once understood him to declare himself God, and took up stones to stone him. Nor did Jesus hint that they had mistaken him; he rather chose to work a miracle to deliver himself from them. When we compare this with his solemn declaration before Pilate, "To this end was I born and for this cause came I unto the world, that *I might bear witness to the truth,*" and reflect that had not this been the truth, he, from knowing their thoughts, was under the most sacred obligation to undeceive them, we can scarcely conceive a more solemn testimony to his equality with the Father.

A third testimony, however, fully confirms the fact that this Angel of the Lord who brought Israel out of Egypt, was the God of Abraham. It occurs Judges ii. 1. "And *an Angel of the Lord* came up from Gilgal to Bochim and said, *I made you to goup out of Egypt,* and have brought you unto the land *which I swore unto your ja-*

To these a fourth may be added from Genesis xxii. 11, 12. "And *the Angel of he Lord* called

unto Abraham out of heaven, and he said—Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing *thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from ME.*” This fourfold testimony then demonstrates that this Angel is Jehovah God, that he entered into covenant with Abraham, and was worshipped by him, by Jacob, by Moses and the whole house of Israel, and that it was He of whom Moses declared, Deut. xxxii. 12.—“Jehovah alone did lead him, and there was no *strange* god with him.” Moses also testifies that Christ is BY NATURE God when he further adds, “they have provoked me to jealousy with that which is *not God;*” for as the Apostles called on the Lord Jesus, teaching others to do the same, had Christ not been by nature God, they who were specially guided by his Holy Spirit, would have provoked God to jealousy with that which is not God. And in drawing the Galatians from the worship of those *who by nature were no Gods* to that of Jesus Christ, had HE not been *by nature* God, Paul would have drawn them from one idol to another. Such witness to the Son’s being BY NATURE Jehovah God, from Abraham,—from Jacob—from Moses—from Paul,—yea from the Son, and even the Father, leaves nothing on this subject to be further desired.

*Job* also testifies that the Redeemer is God in ch. xix. 25, 26, “I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand in the latter day

on the earth ; and though after my skin worms devour this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." Would we know whether by God, Job means some inferior deity, neither creature nor Creator; he tells us, ch. xiii. 3. " Surely I would speak to the *Almighty*, and I desire to reason with *God*;" and ch. xi. 7. " Canst thou by searching find out *God*? Canst thou find out the *Almighty* to perfection?"

## SECTION II.

*The Psalms examined respecting Christ's Deity—Animadversions on certain passages, noticed.*

IN examining the *Psalms* respecting Christ's Deity we shall there find the future Redeemer repeatedly described by the *Names* peculiar to the Godhead, Jehovah, God, the Almighty, while the *Attributes* and the *Works* peculiar to God are ascribed to him without the least hesitation. In the Second Psalm we omit for want of room the refulgent evidence to the Deity of the Son given in the body of the Psalm, to call the reader's attention to the last verse. " Kiss the Son lest he be angry and ye perish from the way; when his wrath is kindled but a little. *Blessed* are all they who *trust* in him." This passage alone furnishes a variety of testimony to the Deity of the SON. Destruction to

spiritual enemies is no where in Scripture described as arising from the wrath of a mere creature. Prophets denounced on men the wrath of God, and pronounced on them a curse in his name ; but here the Holy Spirit describes the *Son's* wrath as causing destruction, and this for contempt of himself. With this agrees John's testimony, Rev. vi. " And the kings of the earth,—said to the mountains, Fall on us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from *the wrath of the Lamb.*" Further, they are termed *Blessed who trust in him.* Jeremiah however declares, ch. xvii. 5. " Thus saith Jehovah, *Cursed* be he that *trusteth in man*, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from Jehovah." If then it be cursed to trust in man, but blessed to trust in the Son, he is God over all blessed for evermore. Thus the first time " the Son" is mentioned by name, his Nature and Deity are fully ascertained. He is equal to Jehovah ; Jeremiah in ver. 7. also adds, " Blessed is he that *trusteth in Jehovah ;*" and this Psalm says, " Blessed are all they that *trust in the Son.*" If then it be equally blessed to trust in the Son and in Jehovah, He is necessarily equal to Jehovah. Nor is it a trivial proof which results from Jeremiah's uniting trust in man with the heart's departing from the living God. The Apostles trusted in Christ, as did all primitive believers,



Eph. i. "We who first trusted in Christ." Did this withdraw their hearts from the living God? Let Paul decide, 1 Tim. vi. 17. "Charge them—to trust in the living God."

Psalm xxiv. ascribes those *Works* to Jehovah which are elsewhere ascribed to the Son. "The earth is Jehovah's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein; for he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods." In John ch. i. 3, we are informed that "all things were made by (the Son) and without him was not any thing made which was made." In *creating power*, then, Christ is equal to Jehovah.—Further in 1 Cor. x. Paul says, "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils. Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?" The Lord Jesus, then, is capable of being *provoked to jealousy* by the worship of idols *equally with Jehovah*. Deut. xxxii. 12.—With reference to Christ Paul adds, Whatsoever is sold in the shambles eat—for the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof. If this Psalm then speak of Jehovah the Father, the same *absolute dominion* over the earth is here ascribed to the Son as to the Father; if of the Son, he is there termed Jehovah.—In ver. 8, one is about to enter heaven as the King of Glory who is also called "Jehovah, mighty in battle." In Ephes. iv. Jesus, elsewhere styled the Lord of Glory,

ascends, having led captivity captive, which implies battle and victory. Here also the Son is either described as equal in *might* to Jehovah, or as Jehovah himself.—In Psalm xxxvi. 6, we have, “O Jehovah, thou preservest man and beast.” In Col. i. 3, “by him all things consist,” and in Heb. i. 2, “he upholds all things by the word of his power.” The Son then is either equal to Jehovah in *preserving power*—or Jehovah himself.

We have noticed Psalm xlv. in considering the Atonement of Christ: we now recur to it, with its explication by the Divine Spirit, Heb. i. in proof of his Deity. “But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O Jehovah, is for ever and ever”—and, ver. 10. “Thou, Jehovah, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years fail not.” This awful description of “the Son” from him who cannot lie, fixes for ever the Deity and Nature of “the Son of God.” We have no occasion to shew that the phrases “Son,” and the “Only Begotten,” inevitably imply an equality of nature with the Father; whenever “the Son” may be hereafter mentioned in the Divine Records, we have merely

to regard the term as the *proper Name* of One already described by Him who cannot lie, as Jehovah God, unchangeable, equally worthy of worship with Himself—equally tremendous in his wrath—equally potent to bless—equal in sovereignty, in creating and preserving power. This passage also fully explains 1 Cor. xv. He shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father. His original throne as Jehovah God, is for ever and ever. His Mediatorial throne remains for a season, and then ceases. He had not yet emptied himself of his original glory, yet he is now Jehovah God, ever “the same.” Nothing then, to which his infinite love prompted him, could make any change in him. His humbling himself for thirty-three years could make no alteration in his nature. Him who is in his nature unchangeable, what can change?

Psalm xxiii. 1. “Jehovah is my Shepherd, I shall not want,” united with Christ’s declaration John x. 16.—“There shall be one fold and one Shepherd,” has cost our author a whole page with the hope of proving, that Christ cannot be meant here, and hence cannot have been termed Jehovah. This speaks volumes against his system, as he hereby acknowledges that if Christ be really styled Jehovah, his cause is at once lost. As we have adduced so many other passages in which the Son is called Jehovah, we should have passed over this, had it not been

for our author's animadversion. He observes, p. 146, "David declared God to be his Shepherd. Jesus represents himself as the One Shepherd of the one fold of Christians, some of whom were already attached to him, and others were afterwards to become converts." But was our author ignorant that David was also one of Christ's fold,—and Moses—and Abraham? "But," adds he, "the term shepherd is applied to others (Moses, &c.) without conveying the idea of their unity with Jehovah." True; but did he never read of a *Chief Shepherd*, who when he shall appear will give the under shepherds a crown of glory? Above the Chief Shepherd, however, there can be no one. Unless therefore he place the Father *below* the Son, he must allow that the Son, if not Jehovah the Shepherd of David, is at least ONE with him. It is strange that among these *other* shepherds beside Christ, he should rank Him described Ezek. xxxiv. 23. "And I will set up one Shepherd over them, even my *Servant David*." Was he ignorant that David himself had seen corruption at least four centuries before this prophecy was delivered? His conclusion, however, exceeds all. Adds he, p. 147, "If they insist, *though without any ground*, upon interpreting this of Jesus, they must still attribute his shepherdship over his flock to Divine commission, and must relinquish the idea of

unity between God the employer, and the Messiah his *servant*." Yes, we must relinquish a *unity of nature* between the Divine Father and the Messiah whom he sent, just as much as we do between Cyaxares, and Cyrus employed to lead his armies, between Vespasian and Titus, between George the Third and his Son, now George the Fourth.

Relative to Psalm lxxviii. 18. "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men; yea for the rebellious also, that Jehovah God might dwell among them," our author, while he adduces the Jewish dream that it was Moses who ascended on high, i. e. to Sinai, and received gifts for men, the ten commands, still acknowledges that Paul "must have applied the verse in an *accommodated sense to Jesus*." But he, p. 153, insists that "it is equally absurd and unscriptural to interpret this passage so as to imply that the person who ascended on high and who received gifts for men that the Lord God might dwell among them, is the Lord God, because this would imply that the Lord God ascended and received gifts from a Being of course superior to himself." By this he again tells us, that if he who thus ascended on high be really Jehovah God, his cause is lost. While this, however, has been abundantly proved already, to ascertain it here we have only to examine

the context. The Psalm commences with an address to God in the third person. "Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered." At ver. 7, he is addressed in the second person, "O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people, when thou didst march through the wilderness, the earth shook," &c. The second person is retained till ver. 11. "Jehovah gave the word; great was the company of those who published it," and is resumed again in this, the 18th verse; "Thou hast ascended on high," &c. If one person be not addressed from the beginning, therefore, it is certain that he who ascended on high, identified by Paul as Christ, is "God who went forth before his people through the wilderness, before whom Sinai itself was moved."

On Psalm lxxxii. 6. "Isaid, ye are Gods," quoted John x. 35, our author to invalidate Christ's deity observes, "Jesus shews from this quotation that the term God, is figuratively applied to creatures of a superior nature." This displays an inaccuracy of idea and expression we should scarcely have expected in a work on the Deity of Christ. What creatures of a *superior* nature are here termed gods? Those that die like men. To whose nature is their's superior? Only to that of the brutes. What however is the *figurative* to the *real* application of the term God? If other gods die

like men and perish from under the heavens, must Jehovah who made heaven and earth, whose throne is for ever and ever?

Psalm lxxviii. 56. "They tempted and provoked the most high God," and 1 Cor. x. 9. "Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted;" have cost our author another page in attempting to disprove that Christ was the Most High God who was with Israel in the wilderness. But if Christ was "he who went forth before his people through the wilderness," as has just been proved from Psalm lxxviii. he was certainly *with them in the wilderness*, whether this be declared here or not. We cannot but remark our author's inaccuracy, however, in stating his opponent's doctrine on this subject. Says he, "How far cannot prejudice carry away men of sense! Are we not all in common with Jesus liable to be tempted both by men and Satan?" Then follow proofs to shew that Abraham was also tempted, with this interrogation, "Can the liability to temptation common to God, to Jesus, to Abraham, and all mankind, be of any avail to prove the divinity and identity of those important objects?" Now we never heard any one attempt to prove the deity of Christ merely *from his being tempted*. It is the Apostle's declaring that *Christ was He who was tempted in the wilderness*, and hence the Most High God described by the Psalmist

as tempted there, which is here adduced. This fact, if "him" should be added after the sentence, "as some of them also tempted," is proved by this passage, and if not, it is fully declared elsewhere.

The last passage from the Psalms on which our author offers any remark, is from Psalm cx. "Jehovah said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool," on which he observes, p. 122, "This passage is simply applied to the Messiah manifesting that the victory gained by him over his enemies was entirely owing to the influence of God." To this we reply, that after the Son had humbled himself so as to assume our nature and be appointed to the combat, it was not to be expected that the Father would *for-sake* him. But that Jesus had no might of *his own*, which our author would fain prove, is not a fact. To the inquiry of the Church in Isaiah lxiii. "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah?" Christ, declaring himself "mighty to save," answers, "*Mine own* arm brought salvation unto me." And in Rev. i. 8, he sets his might above doubt, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Surely he who is Almighty *needs* the aid of none in subduing his enemies.



Having noticed every passage in the Psalms on which our author has made any remark, we will adduce a few which have escaped his observation. Psalm lxxviii. affords new proof that the Angel of Bochim who caused Israel to go up out of Egypt, and brought them into the land which he swore unto their fathers, is equal to the Father in *might* and *forgiving mercy*, ver. 13. “He divided the sea, and caused them to pass through, and made the waters to stand in a heap. He clave the rocks in the wilderness, and gave them drink as out of the great depths. And they sinned yet more against him by provoking the *Most High* in the wilderness. And they tempted *God* in their hearts by asking meat for their lusts.—When he slew them, then they sought him, and they returned and inquired early after *God*; and they remembered that *God* was their rock, and the *High God* their *Redeemer*.” That the Son would have been with Israel in the wilderness, to rear that fabric of ceremonial worship, which should prefigure the sacrifice of himself and thus nourish their faith and hope for the intervening fifteen centuries, we might naturally have expected from his being the Redeemer of men, had it not been expressly declared. Paul in Heb. iii. 3, 6, confirms this fact, however, and anew declares his Godhead: “For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who

hath *buildd the house* is worthy of more honour than the house. For every house is built by some man; but *he who built all things is God.*" Here if the Apostle does not wander from his subject to the creation of the world, the "all things" refer to the house which Christ built in the wilderness, and in which Moses was faithful; and even if he does, as all things were made by Christ, he still confirms his Deity. It is indeed as easy to prove that there is no God, as that he who brought Israel up out of Egypt and led them through the wilderness into the land he swore to give their fathers, is not God over all, blessed for evermore.

Who that Angel was who brought Israel out of Egypt, we are anew told Psalm lxxxi. 9, 10, "There shall no *strange god* be in thee; neither shalt thou worship any strange god. *I am Jehovah thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt*; open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it." And that the application of the name Jehovah to the Son as well as the Father does not affect the *unity* of the Godhead, we learn from Psalm lxxxiii. 18, "That men may know that thou whose name *alone* is Jehovah, art the Most High over all the earth." But how shall we explain these numerous passages which declare both the Father and the Son Jehovah? Our Lord himself explains them when he says, "I and my Father are ONE;" and in no other way can

they be explained without the Scripture's contradicting itself: but our author properly insists p. 173, that "there is the strictest consistency between all the passages in the Sacred Books."

Psalm xcv. ascribes anew to Him who created all things, not only the awful name *Jehovah*, but *worship* and *universal dominion*, "For *Jehovah* is a great God, and a great King above all Gods—O come, let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before *Jehovah* our *Maker*; for he is our God, and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand." Here if the Son himself be not intended, who *made all things*, and without whom *was nothing made* which was made, the same language applied to the Father and the Son, demonstrates their equality. Psalm cxlvi. again identifies this equality, by ascribing to those who trust in *Jehovah* the blessedness ascribed in Psalm ii. to those who trust in the Son. "*Happy or blessed* is he who hath *the God of Jacob* for his help, whose hope is in *Jehovah his God*, who made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that therein is." Here if the Father be meant, he is again equalized with the Son; if the Son, he is anew styled *Jehovah*, the God of Jacob, who made heaven and earth.

We proceed to those passages in the Prophets declaring the Deity of Christ, on which

our author has offered any animadversion. We may, however, previously notice a passage or two in a book wholly overlooked by him, that of *Proverbs*. If in this book Christ be represented under the character of Wisdom, as divines have thought, and as seems implied in Christ's saying, Matth. xi. 19, "But Wisdom is justified of her children;" and Luke xi. 19, "Therefore said the Wisdom of the Lord, Behold I will send them prophets," fresh proof is here furnished to the Eternal Deity of the Son. In chap. viii. Wisdom declares, "Jehovah possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When he prepared the heavens, I *was there*—when he appointed the foundations of the earth, then I was by him *as one brought up with him*, and I was daily his delight, *rejoicing always* before him." These expressions can scarcely apply to an abstract quality, while the personification is not greater if Christ be understood here, than it is in John where he is described as the "Word." As he is "*the same*," necessarily self-existent, (no one else being "*the same*," but changeable at the will of another,) he was ever Jehovah God, self-existent and almighty; had he not, he could not have been "*the same*," he must have changed from non-existence to existence.

## SECTION III.

*The Prophets examined respecting Christ's Deity—Animadversions on certain passages, noticed.*

IN *Isaiah* the first passage descriptive of Christ's Deity on which our author animadverts is chap. vi. 5, 9. "In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw also Jehovah sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphim—and one cried to another, Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of Hosts, the whole earth is filled with his glory.—Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips—and mine eyes have seen the King, Jehovah of Hosts.—Also I heard the voice of Jehovah saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then I said, Here am I; send me. And he said, Go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed." As this glorious vision wherein the prophet received his commission, represented either the Father or the Son, we might have expected that it should be the Son, who had undertaken to re-

deem men, had founded the Israelitish church in the wilderness, and was now about to send a series of prophets to the only public body on earth which held the doctrine of his coming and atonement. Our author acknowledges that it must be applied by Jesus in *an accommodated* sense to the state of the Jews. If however it applies in *any sense* to our Lord, its reference to him is sufficiently proved. John's decisive testimony to this fact, chap. xii. 41, "These things said Isaiah when he saw his glory and spoke of him," creates him much labour. To break its force he says, p. 142, "The passage in the Evangelist is more correctly explained by referring it to John viii. 56. Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my day,—which cannot be understood of oracular vision, but prophetic anticipation; whereas the glory seen in the vision of Isaiah was that of God himself in the delivery of the commands given to the Prophet on that occasion." We may here ask, What has Abraham's *day* to do with Isaiah's vision? It is not the "*day*" of Christ which the Evangelist describes Isaiah as having seen,—but "his glory," which the Evangelist declares to be *Christ's*. He also fixes the *time* when Isaiah thus saw Christ's glory, even when it was said "he hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, that they should not see with their eyes nor understand with their

heard and be converted and I should hear them." This was precisely when Isaiah saw this vision in the temple. Since then, according to our author, this was "a vision of God himself," another is added to the many testimonies already given, that Jesus Christ is Jehovah.

To our author's criticism on Isaiah vii. 14, 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son,' &c. compared with chap. ix. 6, 'For unto us a child is born,' &c. we have already replied by shewing him, that a slight attention to the chronology of the Scriptures would have saved him this labour, by convincing him that Hezekiah must at that moment have been six if not seven years old; and that it is not the way of Him who rests his claim to Godhead on his declaring things to come, to *foretel* things already *past*, like Valmikee in the *Ramayana*. His mode of shewing however that "the illustrious Son of Ahaz" was not the only king of the select nation of God who was honoured with such names as—"Emmanuel, or God with us," and with such epithets as "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," deserves to be noticed. What instances does he bring that these names peculiar to God were applied to certain kings in Israel? Two: Gen. xxxii. 28, "Thy name shall be no more called Jacob; but Israel, God's Prince, (more properly a Prince with God) for

is a prince hast thou power with men and with God, and hast prevailed." And Psalm lxxxix. 18, "For Jehovah is our defence, and THE HOLY ONE of Israel our king." But who among the Israelitish kings was the Holy One of Israel? Is not the Holy One of Israel Jehovah himself? If not, what does Isaiah mean in ch. xlv. 3, "I am Jehovah thy God, *the Holy One of Israel*, thy Saviour." The proof, then, that "Emmanuel," the Mighty God, the Prince of Peace, are applied to certain "kings of this select nation," is, that Jacob was called "Israel," which is no name of God, and that Jehovah and the future Messiah are both styled the Holy One of Israel!

Relative to Isaiah xxviii. 16—"Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a sure foundation," &c. compared with Isaiah viii. 13. "Sanctify Jehovah of Hosts himself; and let him be your fear and your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stumbling stone and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel;" and with 1 Peter ii. 8,—our author charges Mr. Jones with wilful omission for the sake of drawing this conclusion; "this stone of stumbling and rock of offence is no other than Christ; therefore Christ is Jehovah of Hosts himself." Not having seen Mr. Jones's comment, we are unable to say whether this charge be just or not; but we think



no unfair means are needed to elicit this fact from this passage, nothing indeed beyond a clear statement of the context. The declaration is, that *Jehovah of Hosts* shall be for a *stumbling stone* and for a rock of offence to the *two houses of Israel*. But after the delivery of this prophecy, was he this to them prior to the coming of Christ? As the house of *Israel* was carried away captive a few years after the delivery of this prophecy, if not a year or two before, it is doubtful whether they ever saw this prophecy while in their own land. But *Christ has been* a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to all of every tribe for nearly eighteen centuries, while he has been for a sanctuary to all who have trusted in him. Christ is therefore the *Jehovah of Hosts* mentioned in this passage. As to his being *made* the head of the corner by his heavenly Father, this can no more affect his unchangeable Deity than his being made flesh.

Our author attempts to evade Isaiah xl. 3, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of *Jehovah*, make straight in the desert a highway for our God," by coupling it with Malachi iii. 1, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before *me*, and *Jehovah* whom ye seek shall suddenly come into his temple, even the

Messenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in,"—and confining his animadversions to the latter, on which he says, "In reply it may be simply observed, that we find in the Prophet distinct and separate mention of Jehovah and of the Messiah as the Messenger of the Covenant. John therefore ought to be considered as the forerunner of both in the same manner as a commander sent in advance to occupy a strong post in the country of the enemy, may be said to be preparing the way for the battles of his king, or of the general whom the king places at the head of his army:" p. 141, 142. This observation delivers up his cause wholly, as he thereby acknowledges, and most justly, that if Christ be Jehovah, his opposition to his Deity is vain, and rests his all on two persons being mentioned for John to precede, Jehovah and the Angel or Messenger of the Covenant. Now had there been two mentioned, this Angel of the Covenant has been already shewn to be Jehovah as well as the Father. But the fact is that Malachi does not mention two. It is *Jehovah* who was suddenly to come into his temple; and afterwards Jehovah and the Messenger of the Covenant are identified as the same person by the Prophet's adding "*He* shall come," (not *they*). That Jesus is Jehovah mentioned in Isaiah xl. 3, whose way John was

sent to prepare, is confirmed by the testimony of Zachariah and John his son, both filled with the Holy Ghost.

Our author also animadverts on ver. 10, in this chapter. "Behold, Jehovah God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him; behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him," as compared with Rev. xxii. 12, "Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be;" and to invalidate the proof of Christ's Deity which results from his being there termed Jehovah, he refers to John v. 30, 32, "As I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not my own will, but the will of him that sent me. The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son," but omitting the clause "that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father." He also quotes Matt. xvi. 27, "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works." These passages, however, do not in the least affect the question, which is not, by what *authority* Christ rewards, but whether he be *the person described as rewarding*; and this these very passages confirm, particularly Rev. xxii. 12, in which Christ claims this prerogative in the fullest manner: "Behold, I come

quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be." If we understand the Father as speaking in this passage of Isaiah, therefore, since Christ describes himself in precisely the same terms, this will prove his *equality* with the Father, which is equally fatal to our author's system. But that the Son is here intended is evident from the context: Jehovah God, who thus rewards, is there described as feeding his flock like a Shepherd, as stretching out the heavens like a curtain, and spreading them out as a tent to dwell in, as "Jehovah who created the heavens, God himself who formed the earth." Precisely the same language is applied to that "good Shepherd" who laid down his life for his sheep, and whom the Father, styling Jehovah, describes as having laid the foundations of the earth, and as about to fold up the heavens like a vesture, and change them like a garment in the end of time, while he himself is ever "the same." The Son of Man's coming in his Father's glory, can make no alteration in his eternal nature. If he is Jehovah, as the Scriptures so fully testify, "*he changes not,*" which is also testified of Christ by Paul, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." Neither his humbling himself, nor his receiving exaltation therefore, can in the least alter his nature. His glory he may for a season lay aside, but

his Divine Nature he can never change;—he can no more cease to be the Most High than to be the Most Holy.”

But why conceal the fact that he comes in *his own* glory as well as in his Father's? This is declared Luke ix. 26, “The Son of Man shall come *in his own* glory and in his Father's,” and Matt. xxv. 31, where he mentions his own glory alone, omitting his heavenly Father's, “When the Son of Man shall come *in his glory* and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory.” What his own glory was, we have been already informed by Isaiah, who in vision “saw his glory and spake of him.” These declarations explain every passage in which power and authority are said to be given or committed to the Son. By becoming the Son of Man he emptied himself of his glory, and became of no reputation, being in the form of a servant, the direct opposite of Godhead, the distinguishing characteristic of which is supreme dominion. In consideration of this the Father exalts him as *the Son of Man*, not as glorifying him with his own glory which he had with him before the world began, but with the Father's glory also in appointing him the Sole Judge of all creatures. Of this the slightest reflection will convince us. Judgment originally belongs to both the Father and the

But the Son was pleased of his infinite

mercy to *give himself* for our sins, and the Father was pleased to deliver to him *all power* in heaven and earth, and commit to him *all judgment, judging* no man *himself*, thus committing that work *wholly* to the Son, which by nature belongs to him in common with the Father. Further, all power as to providence and final judgment is committed to him not merely as the Son, but *as the Son of Man, the Mediator*, and *because he made himself* the Son of Man, as Paul testifies Phil. ii. 9. This Mediatorial kingdom, however, ends with the final judgment, when delivering up this kingdom to the Father, he remains *with him*, Jehovah God on his throne, as before he laid aside his glory to become Mediator. But as the Father's committing to the Son the entire work and glory of being the Final Judge of all, judging no man *himself*, does not change his glorious nature, so the Son's laying aside his glory and becoming man, in no way changes his original nature and Godhead. Hence, when on earth, he was in heaven; while he hung on the cross, he upheld all things by the word of his power.

We come now to Isaiah xlv. 6. "Thus saith Jehovah the King of Israel and his Redeemer, Jehovah of Hosts, I am the First, I also am the Last, and beside me there is no God," compared with Rev. i. 8. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord—the

Almighty;" in animadverting on which passage our author displays a degree of faith which exceeds any thing found among Trinitarians ; it is, that the Son of God after receiving the worship of the highest archangel at God's express command, *forbids John* to worship him, after having declared himself to be Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, the Almighty who searcheth the heart. As our author lays great stress on this passage, we trust our readers will permit us to examine it thoroughly. In this book five persons address John at different times; two of the elders around the throne, two angels, and He who is the grand speaker throughout the book, who in ch. i. declares himself Alpha and Omega, the Lord Almighty, of whom John's mind is full, and whom he after the first chapter often introduces without the least notice, while he previously describes every other speaker with the utmost care. This is the case with the first elder ch. v. 5, who said unto him, " Weep not ; behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David hath prevailed to open the book ;"—with the elder, ch. vii. 13, who asks John, What are these arrayed in white robes ?—with the angel ch. x. who had the little book and gave it him to read, —and particularly with the one of the seven angels having the last plagues, who shewed John the various things he saw, and respecting

whom John says, ch. xix. 10. "I fell at his feet to worship him. And he said unto me; See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God." Our author is so delighted however with this angel's forbidding John to worship him, that notwithstanding his declaration that "there is the strictest consistency between all the passages in the sacred books," he insists that this fellow-servant of John's, after having forbidden John to worship him, assumes the Godhead, and declares himself Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, like Jehovah himself, Isaiah xlv. This involves the belief of the following things, that the Lamb whom the blessed constantly adore, crying "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty," *forbad John* to worship him;—that while this angel was shewing John the bride the Lamb's wife, he was himself the Lamb in the midst of the throne,—and while shewing him the holy city, this angel was the Lamb who at that moment was the temple and the light in the midst of the Holy city he was then shewing him;—that the Son by forbidding John to worship him as a thing in its nature evil, after the Father had commanded all the angels of God to worship him, charges his Heavenly Father with folly, although our author declares them to be "ONE in will and design." Surely no Trinitarian could ever



boast faith equal to this: nor is this its full extent,—after this angel had forbidden the least act of worship to himself, he, with blasphemous inconsistency, arrogates to himself the peculiar language and prerogative of God by declaring himself the First and the Last; the Sovereign Arbiter of the eternal destinies of men. If this be Christ, what must become of “the Precepts of Jesus?”

Internal evidence however demonstrates that this angel neither said “Behold, I come quickly,” ver. 7, nor “I am Alpha and Omega,” ver. 13. By applying here the rule applied to every other work on earth, that when the speaker is not expressly named, his language designates him, every difficulty vanishes. In ver. 5, 6, of the preceding chapter, another speaker beside the angel is introduced in the same abrupt manner by “*And he said unto me,*” who adds, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end,” and whom we easily identify as He that sat on the throne, saying, “Behold, I make all things new.” He there also uses the very language found in chap. xxii. 6. “Write, for these words are true and faithful!” This continuity of the language, with the sameness of the manner in which John introduces the speaker in both chapters, as though he filled his whole soul, is in itself fully conclusive, particularly when contrasted with the pains he

takes to introduce the angel in ver. 8. "And when I had heard and seen, I fell down before the feet of the angel who shewed me these things." But this internal evidence is confirmed by another fact. It is declared chap. i. 1. that Jesus Christ sent and signified by *his angel* to his servant John things which must shortly come to pass. But beside this angel there is no one sent to shew John these things; and John himself expressly identifies this as "the angel who shewed him these things." This at once proves that it was not Christ the Angel of the Covenant, who forbade John to worship him, —but the angel whom HE SENT to "show John these things," and who was hence as much Christ's servant as John himself. That the blasphemous inconsistency in which this supposition involved this creature-angel, did not lead our author to examine these facts, is an instance of prejudice of which he has produced no parallel in any Trinitarian.

There are but two passages more on which our author offers any remark. One is chap. xlv. 23. "Unto me, (Jehovah) every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear;" as quoted Rom. xiv. "For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ; for it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to

God.” Here he observes, “ Between the prophet and the apostle there is a perfect agreement in substance, since both declare that it is to God that every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess, *through him* before whose judgment-seat we shall stand.” We here beg leave to ask our author where the phrase “ *through him*” is to be found? It must be in the author’s copy of the prophet and the apostle.—It is not in ours. But he adds, “ From this passage they say, it appears that Jesus swore by himself, and that thereby he is approved to be God according to the rule, that it is God only who can swear by himself. But how can they escape the context which expressly informs us that the Lord Jehovah, and not Jesus, swore in this manner?” We reply; merely by this, that the Son was Jehovah before he was Jesus; and that his becoming Jesus could not make him cease to be Jehovah. This context however proves that Jesus is Jehovah, did no other proof exist. He who thus swore by himself is, “ Jehovah who created the heavens, God himself who formed the earth;” who, we have already seen, is the Son of God.—It is also He who being a Saviour says, “ Look unto me and be ye saved, all ye the ends of the earth,”—and Jesus is so pre-eminently the Saviour, that there is salvation in no other. Further, the 24th verse adds: “ Surely shall one

say, In Jehovah have I righteousness and strength ;” and ver. 25, “ In Jehovah shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory.” But the righteousness ascribed to the Father is rectitude of nature and character, never obedience to a law, this belonging to the Son who condescended to be made under the law. That righteousness in which sinners glory, is never called the Father’s unless by accommodation, while it is *properly* the Son’s, wrought out by his obedience in our nature to his Father’s law. Jehovah therefore “ in whom men have righteousness, are justified and glory,” is no other than Christ, in whose righteousness Paul wished to be found, and in whom he gloried. Nothing then can be more complete than the evidence furnished by this context, that Jesus is Jehovah ;—and we intreat our author solemnly to weigh the import of that awful declaration in ver. 24, “ All that are incensed against him shall be ashamed.”

The other passage is Isa. liv. 5, misprinted Ps. liv. 5. “ Thy Maker is thy husband, Jehovah of hosts is his name,” compared with John iii. 29, “ He that hath the bride is the bridegroom,” and with Ephes. v. 23, “ For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church.” On these our author remarks p. 148, “ From this they infer that as the church is one bride, so on the other hand

there is one husband, who is termed in one place God, and in another place Christ. My reader will be pleased to examine the language employed in these two instances: in the one, God is represented as the husband of all his creatures, and in the other Christ is declared to be the husband or the head of his followers; there is therefore an inequality of authority evidently ascribed to God and to Jesus." Had our author examined the context with sufficient care, he would have found that these to whom God here declares himself the husband, are so far from being "all his creatures" that they are only one branch of his church, the Gentiles, the children of the desolate in opposition to the Jews, the children of the married wife, as Paul would have taught him Gal. iv. 27. If therefore he understand this passage of God the Father, the inequality of authority is entirely *in favour of the Son*, who was the husband or head both of these Gentile converts and of those in the Jewish church. But the fact is, that Christ is here meant, for he not only addresses this part of his church as Jehovah her Redeemer in ver. 8, but in ver. 17 adds, "Their righteousness is of me, saith Jehovah," which we have already shewn to be properly spoken of Christ.—We have now examined our author's every objection to those passages usually adduced from Isaiah to prove that Christ is Jehovah; and the evidence that

he is such, shines forth with such effulgence from these very passages, that, limited as we are for room, we fear to detain our readers longer by noticing other passages in this prophecy which witness the same fact, particularly as we must notice those passages which our author impugns in the other prophets.

Our author, p. 142, animadverts on *Jeremiah* xxiii. 5, 6, “ Behold, I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a king shall reign and prosper—And this is the name whereby he shall be called, Jehovah our Righteousness,” as compared with 1 Cor. i. 30, Jesus Christ is made of God unto us wisdom, *righteousness*, &c. on which he adds, “ I only refer my readers again to the passage Jer. xxxiii. 16, in which Jerusalem is also called “ Jehovah our righteousness,” and to the phrase “ *is made unto us of God*, found in the passage in question and expressing the inferiority of Jesus to God.” To this we merely reply, That this does not at all affect the question in hand, which is simply whether this righteous Branch of David, this King who shall reign and prosper, *be Jesus Christ*, or not ; and to prove this, we need only call in the testimony of the Angel to Mary, Luke i. 33, “ The Lord God shall give unto him the *throne of his father David*, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever.” This testimony then, without any aid from 1 Cor. i. 30,

declares that Jesus is Jehovah, this righteous Branch raised up to David, and hence, *Jehovah our Righteousness*. Relative to his “being made of God righteousness to us,” or in other words, to his righteousness being imputed to us by the Father for our justification, this can of course make no alteration in the Son’s eternal nature. If he was Jehovah before he became incarnate to “bring in everlasting righteousness,” which has been so fully testified, he must remain Jehovah for ever ; for “Jehovah changeth not.”

On ch. xxxiii. 16, which our author thus translates anew, “And this (name) which (man) shall call her, Jehovah our Righteousness,” we may observe, that it is the church of Christ, the holy Jerusalem. who bears this name to the honour of her glorious Head and Husband, who is indeed “Jehovah her Righteousness ;” but no one beside our author ever thought it fortunate that an innumerable company of sinful human creatures have not been deified on this account. If the church be really Christ’s spouse, it is not strange that her lord should permit her to bear his name. Nor does it furnish any occasion for mistake. In Isaiah iv. it is predicted that “seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel, only let us *be called by thy name* to take away our reproach.” Had this man permitted them thus to bear his name, no one

would have deemed these seven women, or any one among them, this very man himself; although all would hence have thought that there was some one to whom this name really belonged. In like manner, although this does not prove that the church is Jehovah, it does prove that there is One bearing that Name who has so loved her as to become “Jehovāh her Righteousness.”

As our author, to invalidate the fact that the sacred name Jehovah so often given to Christ evinces his Deity, observes, p. 140, “We find the name of God and even the name Jehovah applied as an appellative to others without establishing any argument for asserting their deity,” and mentions Jer. xxxiii. and Exodus xviii. 12, in which Moses terms the altar Jehovah Nissi, adding the sneer just noticed, “It is fortunate that some sect has not hitherto arisen maintaining the Deity of Jerusalem and this altar of Moses;” it may not be amiss to offer a remark or two on the subject of *Names* given by God in scripture. Although many given by men have been sad misnomers, witness Zedekiah “God my righteousness,” Absalom “Father of peace,” and others; yet in every instance wherein God has given a name, it has been strictly descriptive of the person, the thing, or the circumstance to which it refers. But while some of these are *Simple Names*, as Abra-



ham, Israel, and the incommunicable name Jehovah, the Self-existent, from the verb **הָיָה** *havah*, “to be, to exist,” which is applied to *no one* throughout the Scriptures beside the Sacred Three; others are *Compound Names* descriptive of *facts* relative to Jehovah, and given to both persons and things. These demonstrate the truth of these facts; but as they are not simply the name Jehovah, no one but our author supposes them proofs of Deity. Thus no one supposes that *Jehovah-jireh*, “the Lord will see or provide,” given by Abraham to the place where he offered Isaac, was intended to deify that place, but to perpetuate the fact that the Lord did there provide a sacrifice instead of Isaac;—that *Jehovah-nissi*, “the Lord my banner,” given by Moses to his altar, intended any thing more than that God was his banner against the Amalekites;—that *Jehovah-tsidkenu*, “Jehovah our Righteousness,” the name man should call Jerusalem or Christ’s church, was intended to deify her, but to demonstrate that her Lord and Head who is her Righteousness, is indeed Jehovah;—or that *Jehovah-shammah*, “Jehovah there,” in Ezekiel xlvi, which our translators have rendered, “the Lord is there,” was intended to deify the city he saw in vision; but to foretel that it should be Jehovah’s abode. These compound names, however, are not confined to such as include the name Jehovah;

*Hephzibah*, “ my delight in her,” is precisely of the same kind, and confirms the fact that God’s delight is in his church. Yea *Magor-missabib*, “ surrounded with terror,” was given by God to Pashur, Jeremiah xx. to denote his being made a terror to himself and to all his friends. Compound names, therefore, do not of themselves express deity; but they express facts more strongly than simple assertions or propositions. Thus the compound name *Jehovah-tsidkenu*, “ Jehovah our Righteousness,” given by the Holy Spirit to the Redeemer, perpetuates the glorious truth, that the Son who created our righteousness by his own obedience to the divine law, is Jehovah; and *Immanuel*, “ God with us,” equally perpetuates the fact, that he who took our nature, is, God over all blessed for evermore.

These being all the passages in Jeremiah which our author has noticed, we beg leave to mention one or two which tend to illustrate not so much the Name, as the *Divine Nature* of the Son. In chap. v. 22, we have this expostulation, “ Fear ye not me, saith Jehovah? Will ye not tremble at my presence, who have placed the sand for the bound of the sea by a perpetual decree that it cannot pass it; and though the waves toss themselves, yet can they not prevail?” This however is only a part of that work of creation ascribed to Him, who

while on earth exercised absolute dominion over the winds and the waves in *no name beside his own*.—Our author to impugn the Deity of Christ, also urges, p. 95, that “the epithet God is frequently applied in the Sacred Scriptures to others beside the Supreme Being,” adducing six instances wherein idols are termed gods, four wherein the term is applied to magistrates, and two wherein Moses is said to be a god to Pharaoh and instead of God to Aaron. This objection Jeremiah cuts up, chap. x. 11, as already mentioned. The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the earth and from under these heavens: which declaration sweeps away not only the gods of the heathen, but all magisterial gods, and even Moses himself as far as he aspired to the godhead. But from this general wreck of our author’s gods, Christ is exempted, he having “made these heavens and laid the foundation of the earth.”—In chap. xvii. God declares, “The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, who can know it? I *Jehovah* search the heart; I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways and according to the fruit of his doings.” He hereby informs us that he deems no one competent to the work of giving to every man “according as his works shall be,” who cannot search the heart and try the reins of the children of

men. We are hence assured that the Father, who alone perfectly knows the Son, did not commit to him *all judgment* so entirely as to judge *no man himself*, without knowing his infinite fitness for the work. Nor is he mistaken; the Son himself declares Rev. ii. 23, “And all the churches shall know that I am he who searcheth the reins and hearts;—and I will give to every one of you according to your works.”—In ch. xxiii. 24, God says, “Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him, saith Jehovah? Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith Jehovah?” And of Christ Paul declares Heb. vi. “Neither is there any creature *that is not manifest in his sight*; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do;” and Heb. i. 3, “that he not merely *jills all things*, but *upholds them* by the word of his power.”

In *Ezekiel*, ch. xxviii. God says respecting a man who arrogated to himself the honours of godhead, “Son of man, say unto the Prince of Tyrus, Thus saith Jehovah God, Because thy heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a god, I sit in the seat of God—yet thou art a man and not God, though thou set thy heart as God—Behold, thou shalt die the death of the uncircumcised by the hands of strangers; for I have spoken it, saith Jehovah.” How different the Father’s language to the Son! “Thy

throne, O God, is for ever and ever." Does he then respect persons? Why this different language to the Prince of Tyrus and to Jesus, when both suffered themselves to be treated as God?

Had our author examined the Prophet Daniel, he might have found a degree of proof respecting the Deity of the Son, as well as his atonement, by no means unworthy of his notice. - He declares ch. ii. that " God revealeth the deep and *the secret things*, he knoweth what *is in the darkness*." Paul says of Christ, 1 Cor. iv. 5, " Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both *will bring to light the hidden things of darkness*, and will *make manifest the counsels of the heart*." Our Lord himself however testifies that this is the work of God —Ye are they that justify yourselves before men, but *God knoweth your hearts*; as does also Peter, Acts xv. 8, " And *God who knoweth the hearts* put no difference between us and them." We have here another threefold testimony that Christ is by *Nature* God.—Christ's kingdom also, Dan. ch. i. and vii. breaks in pieces and consumes all other kingdoms, while itself is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away. In this kingdom, however, he is *adored and worshipped* by every one of his subjects. If then he were not God BY NATURE, the Creator of heaven and earth, he and his kingdom

must perish from under the heavens.—We have already observed that in ch. ix. 24, He who is to make reconciliation for iniquity and bring in everlasting righteousness, is styled “the Most Holy,” which declares him to be equal to the High and Holy One who inhabiteth eternity, witness Psalm xviii. “Who is holy as Jehovah?” This inevitably proves his eternal Godhead. If “the High and Holy One inhabiteth eternity,” does not “the Most Holy?”

On *Hosea* xi. 1, “Out of Egypt have I called my Son,” quoted Matt. ii. 15, our author observes, p. 120, “Both Israel and Jesus were carried into Egypt and recalled from thence, and both were denominated in the Scriptures the Son of God; but Israel, who is represented as a child of God, is described to have sacrificed to Baalim, and to have burnt incense to graven images—circumstances which cannot justly be ascribed to the Saviour.” The Evangelist’s quoting this passage, plainly shews that it referred to Christ as well as to Israel; but the difference is manifest. Israel was God’s *adopted* son, constantly rebelling against his father. Jesus was God’s *proper* Son, of the same nature with his Father (as is every proper son); and did always the things that pleased Him.—*Hosea*, ch. iii. 5, says, “Afterward shall Israel return and seek Jehovah their God and *David their King.*” As David however

had then been in his grave for more than two centuries; he could be sought only in heaven, in the same manner as God himself; but as our author does not allow of praying to deceased saints, who, unable to search the heart, cannot judge of the sincerity of prayers offered them, if we allow this prophecy any meaning, we are constrained to assign it to the Son of David, who searches the heart, and is equally omnipotent as Jehovah to bless those who seek him.

On no other of the Prophets beside Zechariah and Malachi does our author offer any remark, and to his animadversions on these we have already replied. There are, however, several passages in the other Prophets by no means unworthy of his notice. *Joel*, ch. ii. is quoted by Peter, Acts iii. “And whosoever shall call on the name of Jehovah shall be saved,” which Peter there applies to Jesus. Paul also addresses himself to all who in every place *call on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ*. This also proves Christ to be Jehovah.—*Amos* says, ch. iv. 13, “For lo, he that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, Jehovah the God of Hosts is his Name.” As these characteristics all unite in Jesus, we need no other testimony to his Godhead.—*Zechariah* says, ch. iii. 2, “And Jehovah said unto Satan, Jehovah rebuke

thee, O Satan, even Jehovah that hath chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee. Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?" This passage with ch. ii. 7, "Thus saith Jehovah of Hosts, after the glory hath Jehovah sent me," and ch. xiii. 7, "Awake, O sword, against the man who is my fellow, saith Jehovah of Hosts;" form another threefold testimony to the *distinct personality* of the Son and his *equality* with the Father.

We have now met our author on his own ground, and in compliance with his own suggestion examined the books of the Old Testament in their order respecting the *Deity*, as well as the Atonement of the Son of God. And although this has deprived us of those advantages which arise from selecting and condensing evidence, even this method has poured such a flood of light on the Deity of the Son and his Equality with the Father, as leaves nothing to be farther desired. It is not the voice of one writer merely, it is the uniform language of the Divine Writers through a period of nearly sixteen hundred years. This body of evidence adduced, is not founded on one or two passages which criticism might hope to shake; it is founded on nearly Two Hundred different Testimonies, which nourished the faith and piety of the true worshippers of God age after age. All hope of shaking it therefore is totally



vain. Could one or two of these testimonies be invalidated—or ten—or even twenty, this doctrine would still remain immovable. This however is only one of the five sources of evidence mentioned, that furnished by the Old Testament; the testimony of Jesus—of the Evangelists—of the Apostles—of the Blessed above in the book of Revelation, have been examined no farther than as confirming and illustrating this:—and we regret exceedingly, that after the utmost conciseness has been studied, our limits will allow us to take little more notice of the remaining evidence, than will be involved in briefly examining the objections of our author, contained in his Second and Third Chapters, to which we immediately proceed.

#### SECTION IV.

*Rammohun Roy's Second Chapter, "Natural Inferiority of the Son to the Father," examined.*

WHILE all the objections to the Deity of Christ in these two Chapters are completely met by the body of evidence already adduced, as it may be satisfactory to some to see how weak these are, we will briefly notice them, although their desultory nature will compel us in doing it to repeat again and again the evidence already adduced. We may first observe,

that the question turns wholly on the Divine *Nature* of the Son; and if the body of evidence already submitted to the reader, be decisive on this point, as he is "the same," his humbling himself to become man, can make no change in his nature. We may also add, that the season when he laid aside his glory and took on himself the form of a servant, was not the fittest to furnish proofs of his Deity; since his infinite love and faithfulness would constrain him to act perfectly as a servant, a character as opposite to that of *deity*, to which belongs supreme dominion, as the east is to the west. Hence, while thus emptying himself of his glory, he of course gave no farther indications of his deity than circumstances absolutely required.

Our author's first objection is, "Admitting for a moment, that the positions of the Editor are well founded, and that the Saviour was in possession of attributes and powers ascribed to God, have we not his own express and often repeated avowal, that all the powers he manifested were committed to him as the Son by the Father of the Universe?" To this we at once answer; *No*. That he was appointed by the Father to act as Mediator between Him and sinners, we have already seen; for without this he could have been no Mediator between his Father and his offending creatures, unless he

had acted as the Father's *Lord* instead of his Equal or Consociate. But that he even as Mediator possessed a single power, perfection, or attribute, which was not eternally inherent in his Divine Nature, we not only deny; but we ask our author to point out *one attribute* or perfection in the Father himself, which from Scripture testimony the Son has not been already shewn to possess. But to his argument. "The sun although he is the most powerful and most splendid of all created beings, has yet no claim to be considered identical in nature with God, who has given to the sun all the heat and animating warmth which he sheds on our globe." To this we reply. What is the sun to its Maker? If the sun has no claim to Godhead, has *its Maker* none? Yes; for our author says, "*God* has given to the sun all its light and animating warmth." But as all things were made *by Him*, and without him was not *any thing* made that was made, this God is Jesus Christ! — Further, says our author, "to effect a material change without the aid of physical means, is *a power peculiar to God*;" yet this power Christ not only possessed, but *bestowed* on his apostles. Thus does our author confirm the Deity of Christ in his first attack thereon. As his asking, "Did God then deify man by bestowing on him his own likeness and sovereignty over all living creatures?" is in

reality asking, Did God make him cease to be a *creature* by thus *creating* him? we presume he expects no answer.

The nineteen passages our author brings to disprove the Son's deity, by shewing, that while he thought it not robbery to be equal with God, he *really* emptied himself of his glory, took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, can prove nothing to his purpose, till they shew that his thus becoming incarnate changed that Divine Nature which he possessed from eternity, and respecting which the Father testifies, Thou, Jehovah, "art the same."——That "the kingdom which Christ delivers up to his Father" in I Cor. xv. is the Mediatorial kingdom, has been already shewn from the Father's own declaration, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." Not until a thousand years after this declaration was made, however, did the Son empty himself of his glory by assuming our nature; and his mediatorial kingdom is only for a season, yea he will have delivered it up to the Father *before* he fold up the heavens and change them as a vesture is changed. But *after* that period, his throne, as Jehovah God, remains for ever and ever. To say that in the mouth of the Father "for ever and ever" means only a limited pe-

riod, is to destroy the eternity of God himself. Thus, "Jehovah shall reign for ever and ever," that is, for a limited period, after which he ceases to reign, and there will be no God!

Relative to Christ's being the "First-born of every creature," we reply with Dr. Owen, whose work on Socinianism has never been answered:—"It is not said Christ is *πρωτοκτιστος*, first-created; but *πρωτοτοκος*, the first-born: and Christ is so the *First-born*, as to be the ONLY *Begotten* Son of God, He is so the first-born of every creature, that he is *before* them all, *above* them all, *heir* to them all, and so *no one* of them." That the "first-born," and the "first begotten from the dead," cannot be taken literally, is evident, for Christ in his human nature was neither the first-born of mankind, nor the *first* raised from the dead, as he himself raised Lazarus from the grave before he rose from the dead himself. Both expressions therefore necessarily denote *pre-eminence*; and that they refer to his Human Nature is fully proved by the context, in which his creation of all things simply and absolutely, is most emphatically expressed:—first, in general, "by him were all things created." Then a distribution is made of these "all things" into all things that "are in heaven" and that "are in earth." Then two terms are used which include all creatures whatever, namely "visible and invi-

sible;" and as things *invisible*, being of the greatest eminence and dignity, might seem exempted from being created by Jesus Christ, an enumeration is made of these, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers. This done, the general fact is again repeated, "all things were created by him," whether expressed in the enumeration or not;—and it is added, "all were created *for him*," as is said of the Father, Rom. xi. 36, "For of him, and through him, and for him are all things; to whom be glory for ever and ever." The whole is confirmed by a declaration completely fatal to the idea of his being a *creature*, "And he is *before* all things, and *BY him all things consist*." So also when John terms him "the first begotten from the dead," he describes him as equally omnipotent with the Father to bless the churches with grace and peace,—the Searcher of hearts,—the Almighty.

We have already said that no "powers" or attributes were or could be conferred on the Son, seeing that before he condescended to lay aside his glory, and take on himself the form of a servant, he was Jehovah, the Almighty God, omniscient, omnipresent, the Creator and Upholder of all, adored and worshipped by the highest archangel. That certain "powers" therefore were conferred on Jesus, not as a man, but "as the Messiah, Christ,

the anointed Son of God," is wholly groundless, for on Jehovah God, ever the same, no new "powers" could be conferred: and he was never man but as the Messiah. "Powers" therefore distinct from authority, in other words natural attributes or perfections, he received none; they necessarily existed in himself from eternity; otherwise God, who cannot lie, could not have said of him, "*Thou art the same,*" since the least addition of the least quality either before or after this period, must have dishonoured the Divine veracity for ever.—Our author's saying that Jesus spoke of himself "as vested with high glory *from the beginning* of the world," instead of *before the foundation* of the world, is unworthy of him. If it arose from carelessness, such carelessness was unworthy of one professing to investigate this doctrine. If it did not, it was worse.

His mention of the nature in which Christ "lived with God before the creation of the world, and of course before his assuming the office of the Messiah" in our nature, p. 17, is sufficiently curious; as is what he adds p. 18, that "in his mere *corporeal nature* Jesus was inferior to his Maker, and it must therefore have been his *spiritual nature* of which he here avowed the inferiority to that of God,"—for, afterwards he ridicules the idea of Christ's having two natures; see p. 108, 109, 118, and 172!!! We will

simply state the doctrine of Scripture on these points:—Our Lord prays, “And now, O Father, glorify thou me with the glory I had with thee before the world was,” which Micah declares was from everlasting—and the Father, by saying “Thou art the same,” that it was *from eternity*. But when he emptied himself of his glory, did he lay aside his *Divine Nature*, of which this glory was merely the shadow? Reflect for a moment on what the term glory implies. Understood either of praise or of grandeur, it is merely the *reflection* or *indication* of a *glorious nature*. When God the Father gave the Son glory, was it deserved glory, or not? If not, it was glory of which he was unworthy, and which it was infinitely unworthy of God to bestow. But if it was *deserved* glory, it was that of which his Nature was worthy,—and the Father’s giving it to him when no being existed beside the Sacred Three, was the Father’s attestation to the Son’s eternal Godhead. When men are exhorted “to give unto God the glory due to his name,” are they exhorted to give to God, his almighty and eternal Godhead? or merely to acknowledge its existence? Thus by the Father’s giving the Son glory before the world was, he testified that he necessarily possessed from eternity a Divine Nature worthy of that glory, even such as rendered him “the fellow, the consociate” of the Father. John



xvii. duly examined, then, cuts up the idea to support which our author quotes this passage.

Our author would fain have it granted him without his adducing the least proof, that the term Son necessarily implies an *inferiority of nature to the Father*. This however he asks in vain. Even the name "Son" implies an equality of *nature* with the Father. Among men the son may be inferior to the father in years, in knowledge, in office; but a *oneness of nature* with his father he must possess. Our question is indeed only about the NATURE of the Son. With Jehovah time and years can have no place;

"He fills his own eternal now, And sees our ages waste."

Every idea of time is cut off by Micah's informing us that the Son is from everlasting,—by the Father's declaring, "Thou, O Jehovah, art the same." To fix a limited duration to the terms "everlasting" and "for ever and ever," respecting Jehovah the Son, would be equally fatal to the eternal existence of Jehovah the Father. He who penetrates eternity and fixes the time when Jehovah the Son was not, may by the same arguments prove that there was a time when Jehovah the Father was not, and when — *there was no God in the universe*. In Rev. i. 8, when he styles himself, "Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the Almighty," Christ declares his own eternal ex-

istence in precisely the same terms used respecting the Father in a preceding verse, “Him who is, and was, and is to come.”

But we are wholly saved the labour of ascertaining by inference the Deity of the Son. His nature is defined and ascertained in the Old Testament as fully as that of Moses, or Abraham, or any other individual. It is there declared, as we have already seen, that “the Son,” whenever mentioned, designates a Being as tremendous in his wrath, and as potent to bless, as God the Father,—a Being who is Jehovah God, whose throne is for ever and ever, who hath created heaven and earth, who is adored by the highest archangel, and who is ever “the same.” Hence, whenever the Son is afterwards mentioned, the unchangeable Jehovah, the Almighty Creator of all things is as really intended, as the Father of Isaac is intended by Abraham, the Hebrew lawgiver by Moses, or the father of Solomon by David. He who after this Divine testimony defines the Son differently, or affirms him to be any other than this, in effect says to the Divine Father, “In giving this testimony respecting the Son thou art mistaken. Although thine understanding is infinite, and thou alone knowest the Son, I who am of yesterday, and incapable of understanding fully my own nature, feel certain that thy testimony concerning the Son *cannot* be

true, and that he *cannot* be what thou hast declared him." This is the precise language of every new definition of "the Son," and of every cavil at that already given of him by the Divine Father. But—let God be true, and every man a liar.

Our author hints that in the Sacred Writings others have been termed "the Sons of God." This however only proves that Christ is BY NATURE the Son of God, while all others are sons of God *by adoption, or metaphorically*. Christ, Rom. viii. 32, is termed God's *Own* Son in opposition to believers who are sons by adoption. To shew that he is of the same nature and essence with the Father, the Holy Spirit also terms him not merely the *Only Son*, but the *Only begotten* Son of the Father, thereby cutting off all others termed sons from being of the same nature. It is impossible indeed that He who is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,—who brought Israel out of Egypt into the land he had sworn to give their fathers,—who was worshipped by the patriarchs and prophets as the Maker of heaven and earth, and the giver of every blessing,—who is declared by the Father to be Jehovah God, and who declares himself to be the Almighty Searcher of hearts, should not be equal in nature to his heavenly Father.

These testimonies incontestably prove that the Son is not only one in "will and design"

with the Father, "but one in Nature." The declaration John xvii. 22, "that they may be one, even as we are one," was made at a time and to persons totally different from that in John x. 30, "I and my Father are One." The latter was made to the gainsaying Jews, and the former in prayer to his heavenly Father; nor is there the least hint given that any doubt had arisen among the disciples respecting the expression "I and my Father are One." Further, Christ did not pray that his disciples might be *one* with *Him and his heavenly Father*, with which thought our author has so amused himself. The oneness which Christ prayed they might obtain was, a *oneness among themselves* IN him and his Heavenly Father, of which he proposes the union between himself and his Father as the grand exemplar. But is there no other oneness between the Father and the Son than a concord of will and design? Does not this very comparison necessarily imply a *Oneness of Nature* between the Father and the Son? What is the basis of that union between the followers of Christ, which he prayed might become as perfect as that between the Son and the Father? Is it not a common human nature? Further, what completes their perfect union as Christians? Is it not their partaking of *one renewed nature*—nay, is not their union perfected in exact proportion as they *equally* partake of

this renewed nature ? If then a perfect equality in a renewed and righteous human nature, render Christ's disciples perfectly ONE, there must necessarily be a perfect equality of Divine Nature in its great exemplar, that between the Father and the Son, as the least difference here would render imperfect this ineffable concord of will and design. Instead of proving our author's point, therefore, this passage decidedly proves, that, with a Distinctness of Person, the most perfect Equality of Nature, essence, and holiness, must subsist between the Father and the Son. They are equally Jehovah, equally righteous and holy.

Our author, it seems, has forborne "to submit indiscriminately the whole of the doctrines of the New Testament to his countrymen," from experience that "such metaphorical expressions when taken singly and without attention to their contexts, may be made the foundation of doctrines quite at variance with the tenor of the rest of the Scriptures."\* Did He, then, who gave the whole of the Scriptures to men, possess less benevolence, or less wisdom than our author ? When he penned it, could he have been aware of the unavoidable import of this declaration ? If he was, what can we think of his humility ? If he was not, what of his ac-

\* See p. 22.

quaintance with the subject?—Nor can we conceal our surprise that his supposing the sentence, “That they may be one, even as we are one,” to imply nothing more than a unity of will and design between Christ and the Father, should have removed all his perplexity respecting the difference of sentiment found among the followers of Christ.” How was it that he did not feel struck with the absurdity of *a creature’s* creating all things and upholding them by the word of his power—of *a creature’s* being the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,—of the highest archangel’s being commanded to worship *a creature*—of the Father’s declaring *a creature* Jehovah, the immutable God,—of *a creature’s* declaring himself the Almighty, the Searcher of hearts? Had he found out a way to reconcile all these with Jesus’s being a *creature*, meek and lowly in heart, “in whom dwelt all truth?” with the veracity of God who cannot lie?—or was he ignorant that the Scriptures contain these declarations?

Nothing can be more incorrect than his assertion, p. 25, that Jesus in John x. disavowed the charge of making himself God. If he did indeed, the credit of the Precepts of Jesus is gone for ever; for, with reverence be it spoken, their author, after having borne the fullest testimony to his equality with God in ch. v. and ch. viii. at length prevaricates and retracts for

fear of death. Such however was not the Jews' opinion. The confession which our author terms *a disavowal*, was the very confession for which they sought again to take him, because they still thought he *made himself God*; and if in this they were mistaken, he refused to undeceive them, although he thereby so endangered his life, that nothing but his Divine prescience could have enabled him to foresee, that he should not fall a victim to their fury. Yet, had he died through refusing to rectify a mistake respecting his nature into which he had himself led them, he who came into the world "that he might bear witness to the *truth*" would have perished in pertinaciously witnessing a gross falsehood. This would also have been aggravated by the fact, that as he knew their thoughts, he *knew* that they had mistaken his meaning, and that his merely saying, "I do not intend to make myself equal with God," would have removed their mistake. Rather than say this, however, he wrought a miracle to deliver himself out of their hands. Yea, he at last chose to die under this very charge rather than clear up the mistake, if it was such. This was their last and grand charge, "We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God," which they esteemed *blasphemy* worthy of death. Our author therefore is incorrect when he says, that although

they accused him of being the Son of God, “ they relinquished the charge of his making himself equal with God ;” for he spends a page to prove, that a claim of sonship to God which implied *no equality* with God, so far from being blasphemy, was repeatedly made by good men in those Scriptures which they constantly studied. Whoever reads John x. from ver. 33 to the end, may perceive that our Lord’s reasoning is, “ Certain even in the Scriptures have been styled gods without blasphemy. Is it blasphemy then for *me* to claim an equality with God, who am *really* the Son of God, and do the works *God alone can do*, thereby proving that the Father is in me and I in him ?” So far were the Jews from deeming this a disavowal of his equality with God, that they instantly sought again to take him as persisting in his former testimony.

To our author’s query, p. 27, On what principle any stress can be laid in defence of Christ’s Deity on the prophetic expression quoted Heb. i. from the Psalms, “ Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,” we reply, merely on this principle, that it is spoken by **GOD WHO CANNOT LIE**. But we are astonished at the reasoning which, because the phrase “ for ever” *must* mean a limited time when applied to the throne of an earthly king, or the days of a people, can attach little weight thereto when spoken by



the everlasting God, of Him who “remaineth the same” when the heavens are folded up, and laid aside as a vesture—and we are shocked at the mind which could even distantly hint “that much weight could not be allowed” to the declaration of the only Being our author professes to worship.

The expression of Jesus to Mary, John xx. 17, “Go to my brethren,” &c. only proves that He who upholds all things by the word of his power, having taken on him our nature, was not ashamed to call his faithful followers “brethren.”—The language of Thomas was deemed a declaration of Thomas’s faith by the Lord Jesus, who searcheth the hearts, and of whose precept Matt. v. 37, this would have been a flagrant breach had it been a vain exclamation. Was he deceived?

Does John no where desire men to believe that Jesus is God? What then is the meaning of, “the Word was God”—“I am Alpha and Omega, saith the Lord, which is, and was, and is to come, the Almighty”—“All the churches shall know that I am he who searcheth the reins and hearts”—“I will be his God”—“God is greater than our hearts, and knoweth all things”—“Thou knowest all things.”—Of equal authority is Paul’s reiterated declaration, “God our Saviour;” Peter’s, “the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;” and Jude’s,

“ To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory, and majesty, dominion, and power, both now and ever. Amen.”

To our author's enquiry, p. 28, respecting what common sense points out, we reply, that his cause must be in a sad state when this enquiry is substituted for Scripture proof, and that common sense can easily understand how one *equal in Nature* to another may yet be *subordinate in Office*; for she sees it around her every day. Common sense, however, never flies in the face of Divine Testimony, which, as we have already seen, declares that He who is from everlasting, Jehovah God, the Creator of all things, unchangeable in his nature, adored by angels, patriarchs, and prophets, condescended to be made flesh, and made under the law, for the redemption of sinful men. But common sense may very naturally ask, When did He who was “ the Most Holy ” before he was anointed the Messiah, and who is ever “ the same,” need moral sanctification ?

The apostle John wrote to demonstrate the Deity of Christ against the gainsayers of his day; and while his simplicity and integrity assure us, that he has not admitted one vague or ambiguous term, this chapter (John i.) contains that fulness of evidence respecting Christ's Deity and humanity which will never be successfully impugned to the end of time. The

very first clause, "In the beginning was the Word," which our author wisely keeps out of sight, declares the eternity of the Son, and demonstrates his Godhead, he who is necessarily existent from eternity being the Eternal God. His distinct *personality* is then shewn, "the Word was *with* God;" and lastly his *Deity*, "the Word was *God*." But the apostle does not stop here; he demonstrates his Divine Nature from his *Works*, "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." He then describes his Humanity, "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the *Only* begotten of the Father," thus drawing a line of infinite distinction between him and all others termed the Sons of God. This passage alone is an answer to every thing said relative to Christ's being subordinate to his Father, his growing in knowledge, &c. If he condescended *to be made flesh*, it became him to become an infant of days, and to be in all things like unto us, yet without sin. Still, while thus incarnate, he was the Almighty Creator, upholding all things by the word of his power. In thus condescending to lay aside his glory and dwell in clay, indeed, he demonstrated his Godhead no less by his Almighty love and pity, than by his Almighty power and wisdom in creating and upholding all things. For that

child of man who can take advantage of his infinite condescension and pity in thus humbling himself, to impugn his Deity, we cannot but tremble.

The apparent contradiction implied with Deut. xxxii. 39, "I am he; and there is no god with me," we leave with our author, and ask him: Even if John was unacquainted with this passage, was the Holy Spirit by whom he spoke? We ask him farther, Who makes these passages clash? Only himself and those who like him would fain represent us as the worshippers of three separate Gods, which we deny as a flagrant falsehood. To us there is no contradiction; for we know that the Son and the Father are *ONE in nature* as well as in will and design. Our author's *begging* us to understand that passage merely in the latter sense, avails nothing. We can grant nothing but on proof, of which in this case we have not seen the least vestige.

As to our "being forced by believing the abundant testimonies which God has given of his Son, to view the Godhead in the same light as we consider mankind and other genera," we leave that with Him. He knows his own Godhead infinitely better than our author; and while we most firmly believe all he has revealed concerning himself, we leave what he has not revealed, entirely with Him whose language is,

“ To whom will ye liken me, saith Jehovah ?” Respecting the dreams and fables of Hindoo Polytheism, while we triumph in that pure and holy Revelation given by the Triune Jehovah, we add in his own language, “ He that hath a dream let him tell a dream, and he that hath my word let him tell it faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat, saith Jehovah ?” Whether their idols are one or ten thousand, we do not stay to enquire ; for “ the gods who have not made the heavens and the earth, shall perish from the earth and from under these heavens,”—and that they have not, their ignorance how and when they were made, sufficiently testifies. The “ *unity* of mankind,” however, is a curious idea : except in the First and Second Adam, where does it exist ? When were all mankind *One* even “ in will and design ?” Are all those in our author’s own city and neighbourhood one in idea, will, and design ? If they are, why does his book appear ?

That in saying, “ If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not,” John x. 37, our Lord meant “ works prescribed by the Father and tending to his glory,” no one doubts. But if he did not also mean works *proper* to his Father, he differed nothing from his own disciples. That he manifested his Godhead in sending his disciples *to work miracles in his own Name*, is a fact that will never be disproved. Nor is it

true that it was the constant practice of the Saviour to pray to the Father for the *power* of working miracles ; for he *never did them in his Father's name*, as was the invariable practice of the ancient prophets. It is indeed worse than trifling to enquire, whether he who had created heaven and earth, and who at that moment upheld all by the word of his power, was able of himself to turn water into wine, or to raise a man from the grave. If as his Father's Mediatorial Servant in human nature, he asked help of him, it was because he laid aside his own glory, and though rich, for our sakes became poor.—When working miracles however, we find him addressing his heavenly Father in two instances alone ; at the breaking of bread to the multitude, and at Lazarus's grave,—and even then he calls Lazarus from the dead without the least mention of the Father, a course at the most distant approach to which Moses would have trembled. Had he less piety, less love to his heavenly Father than Moses ? “Lazarus, come forth”—“young man, arise”—“peace, be still”—“I will ; be thou clean,” was the constant language of Jesus ; while, “Thus saith Jehovah, —if thou refuse to let my people go, I will bring the locusts into thy coasts.—Thus saith Jehovah, at midnight will I go out, and all the first-born of the land of Egypt shall die—Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you”—

“ behold, I will stand before thee on the rock in Horeb,” &c. was the language which accompanied the miracles even of Moses : and for saying, “ Ye rebels, must *we* fetch you water out of this rock ?” both Moses and Aaron were shut out of the promised land. Yet Jesus who did always the things that pleased his Father, says, “ My Father worketh hitherto, *and I work,*” a declaration which would have been blasphemy in Moses, and which the Jews deemed blasphemy in him—merely because they knew not “ the Lord of Glory.”

If it be declared in Scripture “ that the Father created all things by and for the Son,” it only proves anew that the Son is equal to the Father in Supreme Dominion, as well as in Almighty power, since he for *whom* all things are created, is necessarily the Supreme God. This is clear from Rev. iv. 11. “ Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power : for thou hast created all things, and for *thy pleasure* they are and were created.” Our author therefore closes this chapter on the “ Natural Inferiority of the Son,” by directing us to a passage which places his Equality with the Father beyond dispute, which inevitably proves that it is *He* before whom the blessed in heaven “ rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.” If after this he will

still believe the Son to be “*produced among created beings*,” his faith must transcend every thing yet named among those he terms Trinitarians.

#### SECTION V.

##### *Rammohun Roy's Objections to the Seven Positions, considered.*

WE now come to the last, and by far the easiest, part of our work, that of meeting our author's objections to the Seven Positions formerly advanced in support of the Deity of Christ. The first of these is, that *Jesus was possessed of Ubiquity*, grounded on John iii. 13. “No man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man who is in heaven.” This argument he allows “might *perhaps* carry some weight with it, were not the frequent use of the present tense in a preterite or future sense observed in the sacred writings, and were not a great number of other passages to determine that the term ‘is’ in this instance must be understood in the past sense. John viii. 58, ‘Jesus said unto them, Verily verily I say unto you, Before Abraham was, *I AM.*’ Here the same verb, though found in the form of the present tense, must obviously be taken in a preterite



sense," p. 32. Is it not singular, and does it not seem almost ominous to our author's cause, that he cannot raise an objection to the ubiquity of Christ without adducing a new proof of his Godhead? Why must this declaration, "Before Abraham was, I AM," be taken in a *preterite* sense? Because, if it be not, our author's cause dies. Did the Jews however understand it thus? So far from it that they esteemed it a decided declaration of Jesus's equality with the Father, and took up stones to stone him as a blasphemer, which indeed he would have been, had not this declaration been the truth itself. And Jesus himself, meek and lowly as he was, although he knew precisely in what sense they understood him, rather chose to work a miracle for his own safety, than to deny his own divinity, or even to hint that they had mistaken his meaning. Although Christ's ubiquity has been fully established independently of this passage by the body of evidence previously adduced, as "he who searcheth the heart," who "upholdeth all things by the word of his power," must necessarily possess *ubiquity*, we must still intreat our reader's permission to examine the assertion that the term "*is*" in this instance must mean "*was*." It is evident that all the present tenses in the sacred writings cannot be thus understood, nor even the greater part of them; for this would defeat the very

design of different tenses, and reduce language to a Babel of confusion. It is then only in particular cases that this can occur. In prophecy the future is often used for the present, because to the great author of prophecy all future things are present. In poetry, and sometimes in lively narrative, the present is with strict propriety used for the past, because the transaction is narrated as though passing before the reader's eyes. But this is neither a prophecy, nor a lively narration of past events. It is a grave, didactic discourse, on the clearness and accuracy of which depended the salvation of a man who had hazarded much in coming to Jesus for instruction, and who, so far from being quick of apprehension, had already mistaken Christ's meaning relative to that which forms the basis of real religion in the heart. Common humanity therefore, to say nothing of our Lord's infinite benevolence, demanded that in further discourse with him, no word should be used but in its direct and proper sense. All this is against the alteration proposed by our author, as it proves that *no necessity* exists for it, unless what arises from its being otherwise fatal to his system. Besides, the alteration here would be of no avail unless it were extended to the language of John himself, ch. i. 18. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son who *is in* the

bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." Nor indeed do we know to how many other passages the same necessity would extend, for no one knows the necessities of this system but those who, like our author, have undertaken to minister to them.

He "presumes, however, that no one will scruple to conclude, that the Son was actually absent from heaven during his locality on earth, who considers diligently John vi. 62, "What, and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he *was* before;" adding, "The verb *was* accompanied with the term *before* in this passage, positively implies the absence of Jesus from heaven during his stay on the earth," and mentioning several other passages descriptive of his *going away*, and among others, John xvi. 28, "I came forth from the father, and am come into the world: again, I *leave* the world, and *go* unto the Father." We have already remarked something ominous to our author's cause in his commencing his attack on Christ's *ubiquity* with a passage which proves him to be, the Eternal I AM; and this seems scarcely less so. Then our author is convinced that before Christ became incarnate, he *was* in heaven. If then he would only tell us how he was regarded in those realms of light and truth, previously to his descent on earth, he would himself settle this point. Here perhaps we can assist him.

The Father had given command, "Let all the angels of God worship him:" and that this was meet, appears from the Son's being Jehovah, the Creator of all. Down to the moment of his *leaving* heaven, then, he was worshipped by the highest archangel there. Thus in whatever sense John iii. 13, be taken, our author has fully established the Deity of Christ. To support his cause, he like some of his Unitarian brethren in Britain, should have denied that Christ had any existence before his conception by the virgin. This would, it is true, have cost him the labour of altering a few more passages of Scripture, and among the rest that which he has now adduced. But he would then have been consistent, whereas he now builds up the doctrine of Christ's Deity in his attempts to pull it down.

Our author having thus established the fact, that Christ was in heaven before his descent on earth, and the Scriptures having shewn, that he was worshipped there as Jehovah God, the Creator and Preserver of all, we have now a test by which to try the truth of his assertion, that the verb *was* with the term *before* in the passage just quoted, "positively implies the absence of Jesus from heaven during his stay on the earth." And *Jehovah came down* to see the tower which the children of men builded, Gen. xi. 5. And *Jehovah went his way* as soon

as he had left communing with Abraham, Gen. xviii. 33. And God *went up from* Jacob in the place where he talked with him, Gen. xxxv. 13. These passages then, on our author's system, *necessarily imply* that while Jehovah was down on earth to view the tower of Babel, to converse with Abraham and with Jacob, there was *no God remaining in heaven*. A little further acquaintance with the Scriptures might have convinced him, that Jehovah, who upholdeth all things by the word of his power, can never be absent from any place, and that when he is said to descend to any particular place, it is meant that he there manifests his presence in a more evident manner than in other places.

The inconsistency of the attribute of omnipresence with "the human notions of the ascent and descent effected by the Son of Man" we leave with our author who has these notions. We have them not; and to believe that he who upholdeth all things by the word of his power, is every where at the same moment, we not only find easy, but we find it impossible to believe the one without the other. He who upholds all things must necessarily be *present with* all things. With him we also leave the mind which can affirm that "*the Son*" implies "*the created*," after the only Being he worships has testified, that he is the unchangeable Jehovah, the Creator of heaven and earth.

We now come to the Greek criticism given to convince the English reader, that “is” in John iii. 13, must mean “*was*.” In this we are told “that the present participle ὄν, ‘being,’ is used in lieu of the third person singular ἐστὶ, ‘is,’ a true translation of which should be ‘the *ens*’ or ‘*being* in heaven,’ and as the nominative case ὁ ὄν, ‘the being,’ requires a verb to complete the sense, it should be connected with the nearest verb, ἀναβέβηκεν, ‘hath ascended,’ no other verb in fact existing in the sentence.” Were this criticism perfectly correct, it would not be of the least service to our author, as “he being in heaven,” is precisely the same as “he who is in heaven.” To make this the nominative case to the verb “hath ascended,” therefore, would completely prove the ubiquity of Christ,—or involve perfect absurdity. The state of the agent, “being in heaven,” necessarily precedes the action, and denotes the *present* time in respect of the act implied\* in “hath ascended into heaven.” As

\* Our author’s reference to Bishop Middleton happens to be *directly against* his own assertion. The example which the Bishop gives of the use of the participle is “*accessit amans pretium pollicens,*” respecting which he properly says, “surely in *pollicens* there is an adsignification of time, and that too *present* time in respect of the act implied in *accessit*; that act indeed is spoken of as being past, yet as having once been present; and the meaning is, that the two acts, viz. *accedendo* and *pollicendo*, were SIMULTANEOUS.” See p. 42.

“being in heaven,” and “ascending into heaven,” are *simultaneous* therefore, nothing but the doctrine of Christ’s being in heaven and on earth at the same moment, could prevent the sentence, “He *being in heaven* hath ascended into heaven,” from expressing the grossest absurdity.

The fact is however, that, while in Greek the participle preceded by the article, as in this case, contains within itself the force of an affirmation, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, “he who is in heaven,” is a descriptive phrase in reality belonging to “the Son of Man.” A similar instance occurs John vii. 50. “Nicodemus saith unto them, (he that came to Jesus by night, being one of them.)” This descriptive clause, “he that came to Jesus by night being one of them,” contains ὁ ἐλθὼν, “he having come,” a participle preceded by the relative precisely like ὁ ὢν, “he being.” This, however, our translators have rendered as a verb without the least hesitation. Further, in the same manner as Nicodemus is here the nominative case to the verb λέγει, “saith,” is οὐδεὶς, “no one,” the nominative to the verb ἀναβέβηκεν, “hath ascended,” in the passage under consideration.

Whether the *present* participle with the article, is used by John to express a *past* action which had now ceased and given place to its opposite, as must be the case if “he *being* in

heaven" means, "he having been in heaven and now is not," can be easily seen. The fact is, that John is more accurate in the choice of his participles, than even our English translators. He uses the present participle with the article no less than Sixty-Three times in this gospel alone, and no less than Seven times in this very chapter. These therefore will enable us fully to decide on our author's assertion. In this chapter, ver. 4, we have, "How can a man be born when he is old," literally "being old;" on our author's plan "having been old and now not being so." In ver. 15, "That no one believing on him should perish;" on his plan, "having formerly believed on him and now ceasing to believe." Ver. 18, "He not believing is condemned already;" that is, "He formerly not believing and now believing." Ver. 20, "Every one doing evil hateth the light;" i. e. "Every one having formerly done evil and now ceasing to do evil." Ver. 29, "He having the bride is the bridegroom;" i. e. "He formerly having the bride and now rejecting her." Ver. 31, "He being of the earth, is earthly," i. e. "He having been formerly of the earth and now ceasing to be so."

If we look further, to chap. v. we find the present participle used in precisely the same sense, and the same absurdity involved in giving it a *past* sense. Thus ch. v. 3, "In these



lay a great multitude of folk, being impotent, blind, halt, withered ;” i. e. “ In these lay a great multitude having been impotent, blind, halt, withered, and now ceasing to be so.” Ver. 5, “ And a certain man was there who had an infirmity thirty and eight years:” i. e. “ having had an infirmity thirty and eight years, and now ceasing to have it.” The consummate absurdity, not to say falsehood of doctrine and fact, which would follow from rendering these present participles in a PAST sense, as our author wishes to read John iii. 13, must be obvious to all. Moreover when John wishes to describe a past state of action or being, he chooses some past participle. Thus in the phrase, he *who came* to Jesus by night, this being a past action, he selects, not the present participle, but the second aorist. So also in ch. v. 7, “ He *having made* me whole,” John uses the first aorist. And in ch. viii. 31, “ Then said Jesus unto *those who believed on him,*” instead of the present, he employs the perfect participle. The apostle therefore evidently selects his participles with the nicest discrimination, suiting them exactly to the time he wished to express.

In his attempt to repel the second proof of the Saviour’s Ubiquity, “ For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,” our author is scarcely less unhappy. As if his every attempt

against Christ's Deity must tend to establish it, he asks, Is it not evident that the Saviour meant here by being in the midst of two or three of his disciples, his guidance to them when joined in searching for the truth, without preferring any claim to ubiquity? But if Christ guided them, must he not have been *with them* for that purpose? and if there were only two such little companies searching for the truth at the same moment, must he not have possessed *ubiquity* to guide them both? And if he was formerly with them, to guide them, has he left them now? How then can he be "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever?" But "there are certain expressions in the Scriptures wherein the guidance of the prophets of God is also meant by words that would imply this promise." Are there? Where? "Abraham saith, they have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." But does our author need to be told that this meant the *writings* of Moses and the prophets? And not to say that no author either sacred or profane ever thus expressed his fond hope of his writings being immortal, we ask, Did Jesus mean that they had *his* writings with them? Where were the writings of Jesus at that time, and where are they now? As if to cut off all occasion of mistake, he has not left us a single page penned by himself.

Our author has mistaken the meaning of the Second Position relative to the infinite comprehension and inscrutable nature of the Son. It was not intended to infer the deity of every thing which appears *to men* incomprehensible, as in that case the human soul must have been elevated to that honour. But we may safely infer, that if the *works* of God be thus incomprehensible to the human intellect, of Him who fully comprehends the infinite perfections of God himself, it must be said, "His understanding is infinite." It is not, however, this alone on which the proof of Christ's deity here rests. No *created* being can find out the Almighty to perfection; and Jesus declares that *his* nature is equally inscrutable. If he be a *creature* then, a claim to equal inscrutability of nature with God is here preferred by a Creature in whom "dwelt all truth." Indeed if he be a *creature*, the claim of Jesus to inscrutability of nature *is higher* than that of the Father! If he be not God equal with the Father, his capacity for knowledge must be *infinitely below* the Father's. But he declares that *he himself* can comprehend the nature of the Father; hence if he be a creature, he declares that the Father's nature is comprehensible *by a creature*, while he affirms that his own nature is comprehensible *by no creature*, but by God alone. We here leave our author to his choice. If he says

that the Son is equal with the Father, he allows that his nature is *no more* mysterious than the Father's; but if he says, that the Son is *inferior in nature* to the Father, he makes Him "in whom dwelt all truth," exalt his own finite nature above that of the only God whom our author professes to worship. To his claim of deity for "a leaf, a visible star, or the day of resurrection" from its precise time being not yet ascertained, it is sufficient to reply, that *these know nothing*, much less do they comprehend the mysterious nature of God.

To disprove the Third Position, that Jesus exercised in an independent manner the power of forgiving sins which is peculiar to God alone, our author quoting, not Mark, but Matt. ix. 8, "But when the multitude saw it, they marvelled, and glorified God *who had given such power to man*," asks, "Does not this passage convey an express declaration that Jesus was as much dependent on God in exercising the power of forgiving sins and healing the sick, as the prophets who came forth from God before him?" We answer: Only in the opinion of the multitude, who knew him not, but took him for a great prophet: not, however, in the opinion of the scribes, who were better acquainted with their own scriptures, and who, although they glorified him not as God, could not restrain themselves from acknowledging the

display of his Godhead by accusing him of blasphemy on that very account. Had they thought, however, that he exercised the power of forgiving sins and healing in as much dependence on God as Elijah or Moses, they could not have accused him of blasphemy; for they did not regard them as blasphemers. Moreover Jesus's refusing to repel the charge of having acted as though equal with God, and his confounding them by two further displays of his Godhead, one of his Omniscience in answering the undeclared thoughts of their hearts, the other of his Almighty power by healing the paralytic without the least previous or subsequent reference to God, (at the most distant thought of which Moses would have shuddered,) fully declared that he then knew himself to be, what he afterwards declared to John that he was, "the Searcher of hearts, the Almighty who was, and is, and is to come."

Whether the Apostles *were* thoroughly impressed with a belief that the Son *did not forgive sins as well as* the Father, which is the real question, (for no one supposes that the Son came to rob the Father of *his* prerogative of forgiving sins, as much the Father's as the Son's,) may be easily seen from their own trusting in Christ for the forgiveness of sins, which is so fully testified in their epistles.

Relative to *God's exalting* him to be a Prince

and a Saviour to give repentance and forgiveness of sins, it has been already shewn, that his Deity, from whence arises his right to forgive sins, could receive no exaltation, that being "ever the same." Hence when he asks his Father to glorify him even as he had glorified the Father, (no very modest request from a creature, for it was no less than as God over all,) he does not ask for any *new* glory, but only for that which he had with his Father from eternity. While, therefore, his right to forgive sins was unchangeably the same with the Father's, after he had voluntarily laid aside his own glory, it was meet that his Father should restore it to him as his Mediatorial Servant, and in this capacity publicly exalt him. Indeed, this exaltation of his human nature as Mediator was as much his own act as God, as it was the Father's, which necessarily follows from the Father and the Son's being "one in will and design;" and is most fully expressed in our Lord's declaration, John v. 19, "What things soever the *Father doeth*, these *also doeth the Son likewise.*" Hence he himself of his own will and pleasure forgives every sin which the Father is described as forgiving, the Father himself never forgiving one sin but in accordance with the *will* and intercession of the Son. Still the doctrine of these scribes was accurate: "Who can forgive sins but God only?" although,

not knowing the Lord of Glory, they charged Him with blasphemy who is God over all blessed for evermore.

To disprove the Fourth Position, that Almighty power is claimed by Jesus in the most unequivocal manner, appeared so important to our author that he has expended thereon nearly six pages. He is however constrained to allow that the passages on which this position is founded "taken simply as they stand," (precisely the way in which Scripture testimonies ought to be taken,) might very readily be understood as implying an assertion of equality with the Father. And had the clause "for the Father judgeth no man, but *hath committed all judgment unto the Son,*" been added, which he groundlessly charges us with having overlooked, the proof would have been still more complete. While the work of judging mankind belongs by nature equally to the Son and to the Father, the Father *judgeth no man*, but committing *all judgment* to the Son, even of the thoughts of men in every age and in every country, hath left on him the whole work in that great day which fixes the character of God, the destinies of all creatures, and the happiness of the universe throughout eternity. And if he be not God equal with the Father, all this is left on a finite creature who cannot search the heart of one individual!

In our author's declaration, that "no unprejudiced person can peruse the verses preceding and subsequent to those quoted to support the position, without feeling that a more explicit disavowal of equality with God can hardly be expressed by language than that which they contain." we are at complete issue with him; for if this be the case, the credit of "the Precepts of Jesus" is destroyed for ever. We have seen already that in chap. x. Jesus when he solemnly declared, "Before Abraham was, I AM," so convinced the Jews that he meant to claim equality with God, that he escaped death by their hands only by working a miracle to deliver himself; and that in the beginning of this very chapter, he claimed the peculiar prerogative of God in forgiving sins, and supported his claim by a display of his own omniscience and almighty power. If, then, he afterwards disavowed his equality with God, He "in whom dwelt all truth" was guilty of such prevarication as must for ever destroy his credit. Our author's own assertion, therefore, that "there is the strictest consistency between all the passages of the sacred books," might have convinced him, how much more likely it was that he had mistaken Christ's meaning in the body of this chapter, than that He "in whom dwelt all truth" had prevaricated and contradicted himself. Let us however carefully examine John v.



In the 16th verse we find that after our Lord had healed the impotent man and thrice demonstrated his deity, the Jews sought to slay him because he had done this on the sabbath day. To justify his conduct Jesus declares, “*My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.*” This provoked the Jews still more, because he had now said that God was his Father, “*making himself EQUAL WITH GOD.*” This observation, which is John’s, sufficiently shews us that not only the Jews, but John himself understood Christ’s calling God his Father, to be “making himself God.” This Jesus neither denies nor corrects; but adds, “the Son can do nothing of himself but what he *seeth* the Father do;” which must necessarily be the case, if, as our author affirms, the Father and the Son are one “in will and design.” But Jesus adds further, “For what things soever he doeth, *these also doeth the Son likewise.*” A more full declaration of equality with the Father cannot be imagined. How *could* the Son do *whatsoever* the Father doeth, if he were not equal to him in power, wisdom, truth, justice, mercy? Can the highest archangel *do whatsoever* the Father doth? Can he with him sit on the throne of the universe, preserving both man and beast, judging righteously, his eyes running to and fro the whole earth to make himself strong in behalf of them whose hearts are perfect towards him?

He then adds, “ for the Father sheweth the Son *all things* that himself doeth.” As he who spoke this was the unchangeable Jehovah, the Almighty Searcher of hearts, who had created all things, and at that moment upheld them by the word of power, we are at no loss for his meaning here. Indeed what finite being could *understand all* that God doeth, if *shewn* him? Who can find out the Almighty to perfection? Only He who alone knoweth the Father. Jesus adds, “ For as the Father quickeneth the dead, even so the Son *quickeneth whom HE WILL.*” Here then he declares himself equal with the Father in Sovereignty of Will as well as in almighty power. Was this a disavowal of equality with God? This informs us too that the Father does nothing *of himself*, nothing without the Son. Hence in every epistle, grace and mercy are sought equally of the Son as of the Father; and hence it follows also, that whatever the Father does in forgiving sin or in any other way, the Son as God does it with him, otherwise it could not be true, that “ *whatsoever things* the Father doeth, *these also doeth the Son likewise.*” The Saviour adds, “ For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son.” To create and govern mankind are undoubtedly the work of the Godhead, but of these the final judgment is the consummation, because it fixes the eternal state of all

who have been thus created and governed. This, then, is the grand work of the Godhead. The Father however, whose it is equally with the Son, *judgeth no man*, but commits all judgment to the Son, and to the Son as the Incarnate Mediator between God and man, *because* he is "the Son of Man." Is all this a disavowal of Deity?—But why has the Father done this? "That all men should honour the Son *even as* they honour the Father," although he was once despised as a man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs. To this glorious declaration of the Son's Godhead, our author merely objects, p. 46, that this means "likeness in nature and quality, and not in exact degree of honour." But what are the *nature* and *quality* of the honour paid to God the Father? *Divine honour* of the highest kind, and such as can be given to no creature! This alone then completely establishes the Deity of Christ. But the fact is, that this phrase as really refers to *degree* as to nature; see Matt. xx. 14, "I will give unto this last *even as* unto thee;" that is, *precisely as much*, one penny. Instead of disavowing his claim to Deity then, it is evident that our Lord here carried it to the highest pitch, and so confounded his adversaries, that they were unable to answer him a word.

In what sense the Prophet to be sent was like unto Moses, sufficiently appears from Heb.

iii. where the apostle, telling us that in his nature Christ was in all things like *unto us*, as well as to Moses, yet without sin, adds, that he “ was worthy of as much more honour than Moses, as he who builds the house is of more honour than the house ;” that is, as much as the Maker or Creator is worthy of beyond the *thing made*, adding even here, that he who made all things is God, which in Col. i. he declares to be Jesus Christ, as we have already seen. That the Messenger or Angel of God, as our author terms the Saviour, is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, has been already shewn from Judges ii. 3, “ And the Angel said unto them, *I made you* to go out of Egypt, and have brought you into the land which *I sware* unto your Fathers ;” and from Malachi iii. 1, “ And Jehovah whom ye seek, shall suddenly come into his temple, even the Messenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in.” Why should it offend our author that when the Son for the suffering of death took upon him the form of a servant, he was *really* made in all things like unto us though without sin, and hence that like man he was once an infant of days, and increased in strength and knowledge ? Had his human body been omnipotent, and his human soul omniscient and omnipresent, how could he have been made in all things like unto his brethren ? how could he have been “ *crucified in*

*weakness?*" how could he have "*suffered* the just for the unjust to bring us to God?" It is quite enough that he who united the human nature to his own, was from eternity the unchangeable Jehovah, "the Creator of the ends of the earth, who fainteth not, neither is weary."

Our author's objections to the Fifth Position, that Jesus's having all judgment committed to him, proves his omniscience, have been so fully met already, that scarcely any thing remains to be added. An Omniscient Creature, however, is a monster of which not the least trace is found in the Scriptures. And that omniscience is essential to the act of judging mankind, is almost self-evident, were the Scriptures silent hereon. But this God declares Jer. xvii. 10, "I Jehovah search the heart, I try the reins, *even to give* every man according to his ways and according as his work shall be." To say, however, that the Father searches the heart *for the Son*, and having accurately judged of every man's ways and doings by examining his *heart*, communicates the *result* of the process to the Son, that he may *appear* the judge, though naturally incapable of making the previous examination, is directly to contradict our Lord's declaration, that the *Father judgeth no man*, as in this case the fact would really be, that the *Son judgeth no man*, but merely receives

from the Father the *result* of his judging men's hearts. Did the Father really search the hearts of men and decide on their works *for* the Son, however, such a course were needless. That *his own* omniscience is fully equal to the work, he himself tells us, Rev. ii. 23, "And all the churches shall know that I am He which searcheth the hearts and reins; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works." Of the Father's having given the Son authority to judge, we have already spoken. His giving him "to have life in himself," refers wholly to his being the Mediator in human flesh; for of his Divine Nature's being the fountain of life we have the fullest proof: John i, "In him *was life*, and the life was the light of men." John xi, "I am the resurrection and *the life*." 1 John v, "This is the true God, and *eternal life*."

To the Sixth Position, that Jesus accepted worship due to God alone, our author objects, "that the word 'worship,' both in common acceptance, and in the Scriptural writings, is used sometimes as implying an external mark of religious reverence paid to God, and at other times as signifying merely the token of civil respect due to superiors; that those who worshipped Jesus did not believe him to be God, or one of the three persons of the Godhead and equal to God, and that Jesus in his acknowledged human capacity never prayed to himself

or directed his followers to worship or pray to him." Granting that "worship" in English, and προσκυνέω in Greek, are sometimes used to denote civil respect, and that the worship paid by the servant to his master, Matt. xviii. 26, and by the people to David, meant merely civil respect, still the position is not touched in the least degree. Whether the blind men, the lepers, the mariners, and others, knew what they did in worshipping Jesus, is not so much the question, as whether *Jesus knew*; for if he suffered them even through ignorance to yield him Divine worship, when Peter did not suffer it in Cornelius for a moment, unless he were God, he must have had less discernment, or less piety and concern for the Divine honour, than his own disciple. But were *all* who ever worshipped the Son, ignorant of his Deity? Were the apostles when they worshipped him after his resurrection? Was Thomas when he addressed him as his Lord and his God? Was Stephen when he committed to him his departing soul in language similar to that in which Christ on the cross had committed his to the Father? Was Paul when he besought him thrice that the messenger of Satan might depart from him? Were those who first trusted in Christ, and those who in every place called on the Lord Jesus? Were Paul, Peter, and John, when they sought grace and peace for the

churches from the Lord Jesus precisely as from God the Father? Above all, was the Father when he, addressing the Son as Jehovah God, ever the same, commanded all the angels to worship him? If these were not ignorant of his Deity, whatever might have been the case with the lepers, mariners, &c. he is God, infinitely worthy of worship;—or the apostles, the primitive saints, and the angels in heaven, were guilty of idolatry, and with reverence be it spoken, its grand encourager is the Eternal Father, “who will not give his glory to another.”

That in the state of humiliation in which his infinite love to sinners had placed him, and in which he declared, “If I honour myself, my honour is nothing,” he should pray to himself, or formally prescribe this to his disciples, was scarcely to be expected. To glorify him was the proper work of the Holy Spirit, who after his ascension was pleased to be known as “the Spirit of Christ,” and respecting whom Jesus declared, that he should lead his apostles into all truth. But he immediately led them to deem Christ “God the Saviour,”—“God over all blessed for evermore,”—“The only wise God our Saviour;” to pray to him, to trust in him, and to seek from him grace and peace, and all those blessings which God alone can bestow. If therefore Christ be not God equal with the Father, the Spirit of Christ, instead of



leading his disciples into all truth, led them into the most extensive system of falsehood and idolatry the world has ever beheld.

To the Seventh and last Position, that Jesus associated his own name with that of God in the rite of Baptism intended to remain in force to the end of the world, our author merely objects, that while a profession of faith in God is common to all the religions supposed to be founded on the Old Testament, they are distinguished from each other “by a public profession of faith in their respective founders, expressing such profession in language that may clearly exhibit the inferior nature of these founders to the Divine Being,”—and hence that the Jews “believed the Lord and his servant Moses,” and the Mohummudans profess faith in God and also in Mohummud his messenger—and Christians are baptized in the name of the Father and the Son, which epithet Son “ought to be understood and admitted by every one as expressing the created nature of Christ, though the most highly exalted among all creatures.” This abject begging of the question in dispute, we will afterwards examine. We shall first strike Mohummud, however, quite out of the question:—as the Koran’s pretending to be a Divine Revelation when it is not, stamps falsehood on its forehead; nothing it contains can prove or disprove any doctrine whatever. To its dreams,

as well as to these of the Hindoo writers, our answer is, "He that hath a dream let him tell a dream, and he that hath God's word let him tell it faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat, saith Jehovah?" The Jews, who alone remain, had no formulary by which each person devoted himself to the worship and service of God as do Christians in baptism. But had the passage quoted from Exod. xiv. 31, been that formulary, instead of being a part of a narrative describing their feelings when they saw their enemies lying dead on the shore of the Red Sea, the omission in the baptismal rite of the clause "his servant" would have been fatal to his objection. If it were necessary to add the phrase "his servant" to Moses, the proper name of a man who had never urged the most distant claim to Deity, for the sake of guarding against the appearance of placing a creature on an equality with God, how much more necessary was it here, when the Son had permitted the worship of his disciples, and pointed them to those Scriptures which described him as the Creator of all, Jehovah God, ever the same; and when He, acknowledged by our author himself to be the Supreme Being, is mentioned merely by the correlative term "the Father." If then the phrase "his servant" marks the *inferior nature* of this Messenger of God, the omission of it in the circumstances just mentioned, unavoidably

proves the *Equality* of the Father and the Son, and their equal right to the service, the worship, the hearts of all commanded thus to be baptized to the end of time. The fact is, that Jesus's having prescribed this solemn declaration himself, and his adding, "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world," would alone prove that he deemed himself equal with the Father. If being a mere creature, he left this baptismal declaration ambiguous for want of thought, never was there so fatal an ambiguity, as it involves not only the ruin to the end of time of the sincerest of mankind, who, if Christ be a mere creature, must have renounced the worship of those by nature no Gods, for that of one *also by nature no God*; but the corruption of the only system of religion which professes to deliver mankind from idolatry. But if he left this ambiguous with a perfect knowledge of all circumstances, in thus associating his name with that of the Father, the meek and lowly Jesus, in whom dwells all truth, if a mere creature, has exhibited an instance of falsehood, arrogance, and blasphemy, unparalleled in the history of men.

But we may as well examine the only initiatory rite found in the Old Testament: Circumcision, while it varies from Baptism in other circumstances, differs from it in this, that it was

performed *in no name*. Had it indeed, Jesus himself assures us, that it would not have been in that of Moses, when he says John vii. 22, “Not that it is of Moses, but of the fathers.” But by whom was it instituted? We find in Gen. xvii. that after God had promised to give to Abraham and to his seed, the land wherein he was a stranger, and to be their God, he added, “And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your fore-skins, and it shall be a token of the covenant between me and you.” This rite, then, was a token to every Israelite that the God of Abraham was his God. We have already seen, however, from Gen. xxviii. 13, that the God of Abraham was He who appeared to Jacob at Bethel, “the Angel who redeemed him from all evil,” and whom he intreated on his death-bed “to bless the lads;” and from Judges ii. 1, that it was the “Angel who rebuked the people at Bochim” after having brought them out of Egypt into the land he had sworn to give their fathers, even Jehovah “the Angel of the Covenant,” whose way John Baptist was to prepare. Thus a due examination of ancient but infallible records decidedly proves, that He who in baptism associated his own name with that of the Father and the Holy Spirit, was Jehovah who instituted the covenant of circumcision, and was solemnly chosen for their God by the pa-

triarchs, the prophets, and all the good in Israel down to that day. Hence, as he changes not, it is self-evident that he “in whom dwells all truth,” could have inserted his name in this solemn commission with no other view than that of being adored as Jehovah, to the end of time.

But never was there a more humble begging of the question than the assertion “that the epithet Son ought to be understood and admitted by every one as expressing the created nature of Christ.” Why ought it thus to be understood and admitted? Because our author has adduced proof that this is its real meaning? Of this not the least has appeared: can he even prove that among men a Son *must be* of a nature inferior to his Father’s? Why then must it be thus understood? Because otherwise the whole of his system dies. Its admission, however, is impossible: we dare not make thus free with the truth of God, the object of the present request. How can we say that God Almighty, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the Eternal Jehovah who changeth not,—the Creator of heaven and earth, upholding all things by the word of his power, and adored and worshipped, not merely by patriarchs and prophets, but by the highest archangel,—He who searcheth the reins and hearts, and who will give to

every man according as his work shall be,—is a “created being,” without having, not only the angels and the saints of God, but “every creature which is in heaven and earth and under the earth,” whose constant language is “blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever,”—rise up against us as false witnesses in the great and last day?

As our author declines renewing the subject relative to Christ’s declaration, “Lo, I am with you always even to the end of the world,” which however we are not aware he has ever yet discussed, we beg leave to remind him that this declaration rests on precisely the same authority with “the Precepts of Jesus;” while the declarations of Mohummud adduced by him, rest wholly on a counterfeit revelation. That unrighteous man, although he ventured to affirm many things respecting *past* events, in which no one could contradict him, yet never dared to declare to his followers; “Lo, I am with you always even to the end of the world.” Such however was the declaration of Jesus in whom dwelt all truth,—and among the myriads of his followers in every age who have prayed to him in every time of trouble whether of body or mind, who can stand forth and

say that he has sought him in vain?—or that Jesus has ever failed or forsaken any who have committed to him their all for time and eternity?

## SECTION VI.

*Concluding Observations.—Personality of the Holy Spirit—Doctrine of the Trinity—Mosheim—Locke—Newton.—Reflections.*

THE baptismal commission completely establishes the Personality of the Holy Ghost. If he in whom dwelt all truth has declared Him to be as distinct in person and as worthy of worship and adoration, as the Father and Himself, no farther evidence is needed either to his Personality or his Godhead. Were it needful indeed, a rich fulness of Scripture proof could be adduced respecting the Holy Spirit, as well as the Son; but the selection of a few passages will be quite sufficient. John xiv. contains the following testimonies to the *Personality* of the Spirit. Ver. 13, “And I will pray the Father, and *he will send you another Comforter.*” Ver. 26, “The Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom *the Father will send* in my name, *He shall teach you all things.*” Ch. xvi. ver. 8, “And when he is come, *he will reprove the world* of sin, of righteousness, and of judg-

ment." Ver. 14, "*He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.*" In the Acts we have these testimonies among others : Ch. v. 3, 4, "*Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?—Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.*" Ch. x, "*While Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said unto him, Behold, three men seek thee. Arise therefore and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them.*" Acts xiii. 2, "*As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.*" These testimonies drawn from passages void of all figurative language, of themselves completely establish both the Personality and the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

The Deity and the Personality of the Son and the Holy Spirit being thus established, the doctrine of the Ever-blessed Trinity needs no further confirmation : it follows of course. We shall therefore close our testimonies from Scripture, by laying before our readers three passages which bring the Sacred Three fully into view. The first we select from Isaiah xlvi. in which One is introduced who previously declares, "*My hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens: when I call unto them, they all stand up together;*" and whom therefore we



are at no loss to recognize. He however declares, ver. 16, “ And now *Jehovah God*, and *his Spirit* hath sent *me*.” The second is the passage already discussed, “ Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ;” and the third is the apostolic benediction, 2 Cor. xiii. 14, “ The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.” This last passage would alone confirm all the doctrines impugned by our author. Had the Lord Jesus been a Creature, *his grace*, his free favour, sought for the churches by the apostles equally with the Father’s, could have been of no value to them. Of what value to any one on earth is the grace or favour of any one in heaven who is not omniscient and omnipresent ?—the grace of Moses? of Abraham? or of the highest archangel? *Communion* includes intercourse and fellowship. But how can we have fellowship and intercourse with one who has no being, no existence ?—or with one who is not omniscient and omnipresent ? — With this testimony we are constrained to close ; for were we to bring forth and duly unfold all the testimonies to the Deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, contained in the New Testament alone, instead of a hundred pages, we should fill a large volume.

Respecting the opinions of men relative to the Deity of Christ and the Sacred Three during the first three centuries, we do not even enquire. Paul tells us that even in his time “the mystery of iniquity” had already begun to work; and John adds, that “many antichrists had already gone out into the world.” In doctrine and practice therefore, men in the first three centuries may have adhered to the Scriptures, or they may have swerved from them; but as this can be known only by bringing these to the Scriptures as the test, they are of no value while we have the Scriptures themselves. Nothing, however, can be more incorrect than what our author asserts respecting the doctrine of the churches in the three first centuries. Even Mosheim, suspected as he is of being unfavourable to the truth, establishes their faith in Christ’s Deity in the very passage quoted, p. 103, by our author against this doctrine. If those who were baptized “made solemn profession of their confidence in Christ,” this was no less than strong trust in him; and this, as they knew the Scriptures, they were well aware, would have rendered them accursed, had Christ been a *Creature*. All indeed that can be fairly deduced from Mosheim is, that in the first three centuries they had formed *no specific creed*, but simply believed what the Scriptures revealed

respecting the Sacred Three,—precisely like the Editors of this article. But would our author, who knows them well, be willing to rank them on his side of the question?

Respecting Locke and Newton our reply is precisely the same. Their opinions in divinity are nothing to us. If these agreed with the Scriptures, they were right; if not, they were erroneous; and that men eminent for science and philosophy, should yet err respecting Scripture doctrines, is nothing new. Not that we think this the case with either Newton or Locke. If Locke, as our author affirms, p. 161, really thought that the faith which makes men Christians includes their “receiving Christ for their Lord and King,” Locke knew that this included the belief of his omniscience and omnipresence, as without this, his being their King was only a solemn mockery: a *Creature King* in *heaven*, must have been more ignorant of his *earthly* subjects than the most stupid earthly despot.—Newton’s belief of Christ’s Deity appears as clear as the light from our author’s own quotation. When he said that Christians of all ages are represented as “*worshipping God and the Lamb*,” he was too well acquainted with the Scriptures to be ignorant, that to equalize a *creature* with God in worship, is the height of blasphemy.

As to those modes of defending the doctrine of the Trinity with which our author so amuses himself, we leave them with their respective authors. We need them not. To us the Scriptures are sufficient; and respecting every religious doctrine and practice, our language is, "To the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this, it is because there is no light in them."

We now intreat our author's permission to address to him a parting reflection. While we have endeavoured to meet his opinions as fully as our confined limits would permit, we have endeavoured to avoid every expression which might justly give him pain; and we now earnestly intreat him to consider in what a state these opinions have left him. He has forsaken idolatry, and has not wholly escaped reproach; but has he found the religion of the Apostles and primitive believers? Did they not trust in Christ, pray to him in all their sorrows, and through him continually seek access to the Father? Did they not adore him as the Omniscient Searcher of hearts, and as their Intercessor presenting their supplications to the Father united with his own all-prevalent intercession? And did not the consciousness of his being ever present with them, support and sustain them under every trial, and continually purify them?

**hearts?** In like manner, the humble Christian at the present day, who has perhaps never heard a single argument formally advanced in support of his Deity, lives almost intuitively on his Saviour as God over all blessed for evermore. His omniscience, his omnipresence, and almighty power, his infinite love, his boundless mercy and pity, are ever present to his mind. He realizes his Great Intercessor with the Father as acquainted with his inmost thoughts, his most secret desires, as sending him help in every time of trouble, as strengthening his faith, his hope, his love, his godly fear, and forming him after his own image. To all this he who rejects the Deity of Christ is an entire stranger. How can he pour out his soul to him in secret, when he does not believe him Omniscient? How can he come to him daily for help in time of need, when he does not believe him to be Almighty? How can he fear to displease him even in thought, when he does not believe him Omnipresent? Thus from all that communion with the Lord Jesus, which tranquillizes, rejoices, and purifies the soul, he is entirely cut off.—Moreover he can hold no communion with the Holy Spirit. How can a person who disbelieves his very existence, whether he hold communion with the Holy Spirit, or not, ever hold communion with the Holy Spirit, or ever be able to grieve him? And without Christ, with-

out the Holy Spirit, can he have communion with God the Father? How can he, when John declares 1 John ii. 23, “He that denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father,”—and 2 John ver. 9, “He that abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, the same hath not God;”—nay, when our Lord himself declares, “No man knoweth the Father, but—he to whom the Son will reveal him;”—and “No man cometh to the Father but by me”? How dreadful then, even in this world, the state of a man in these circumstances! He is without a Saviour—without a Sanctifier—without God—and without hope in the world, unless it be hope founded on delusion. And what are his prospects for the eternal world? There, in the only heaven the Scripture reveals, Christ is worshipped by the highest archangel; and the eternal song of the blessed is, “Thou art worthy,—for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.” Yea, every creature in heaven—unites in ascribing “Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.” In this song how can our author with his present views ever join? How can he unite in these adorations? Let us then affectionately intreat him to re-consider the subject, and peruse the Scriptures anew: and may the God

hearts? In like manner, the humble Christian at the present day, who has perhaps never heard a single argument formally advanced in support of his Deity, lives almost intuitively on his Saviour as God over all blessed for evermore. His omniscience, his omnipresence, and almighty power, his infinite love, his boundless mercy and pity, are ever present to his mind. He realizes his Great Intercessor with the Father as acquainted with his inmost thoughts, his most secret desires, as sending him help in every time of trouble, as strengthening his faith, his hope, his love, his godly fear, and forming him after his own image. To all this he who rejects the Deity of Christ is an entire stranger. How can he pour out his soul to him in secret, when he does not believe him Omniscient? How can he come to him daily for help in time of need, when he does not believe him to be Almighty? How can he fear to displease him even in thought, when he does not believe him Omnipresent? Thus from all that communion with the Lord Jesus, which tranquillizes, rejoices, and purifies the soul, he is entirely cut off.—Moreover he can hold no communion with the Holy Spirit. How can a person who disbelieves his very existence, whether he be a man or an angel, ever hold communion with the Holy Spirit, or be able to grieve him? And without Christ, with-

out the Holy Spirit, can he have communion with God the Father? How can he, when John declares 1 John ii. 23, “He that denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father,”—and 2 John ver. 9, “He that abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, the same hath not God;”—nay, when our Lord himself declares, “No man knoweth the Father, but—he to whom the Son will reveal him;”—and “No man cometh to the Father but by me”? How dreadful then, even in this world, the state of a man in these circumstances! He is without a Saviour—without a Sanctifier—without God—and without hope in the world, unless it be hope founded on delusion. And what are his prospects for the eternal world? There, in the only heaven the Scripture reveals, Christ is worshipped by the highest archangel; and the eternal song of the blessed is, “Thou art worthy,—for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.” Yea, every creature in heaven—unites in ascribing “Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.” In this song how can our author with his present views ever join? How can he unite in these adorations? Let us then affectionately intreat him to re-consider the subject, and peruse the Scriptures anew: and may the God



of all grace enable him to discern the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, that he may in future determine "to know nothing but Jesus Christ, and him crucified,"—in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

THE END.

LONDON :

PRINTED BY S. AND R. BENTLEY, DORSET-STREET.





