

A
L E T T E R

Writ in the Year 1730.

Concerning the QUESTION,

Whether the LOGOS supplied the Place of
a human Soul in the Person of JESUS
CHRIST.

To which are now added

TWO POSTSCRIPTS:

The first, containing an Explication of those
Words, the Spirit, the Holy Spirit, the Spirit
of God, as used in the Scriptures.

The second, containing Remarks upon the third
Part of the late Bishop of CLOGHER'S Vin-
dication of the Histories of the Old and New
Testament.

Search the Scriptures. For in them Ye think Ye have
eternal Life. And they are they, which testify of
Me. *John v. 39.*

Ergo nec Parentum, nec Majorum Error sequendus est :
sed Auctoritas Scripturarum, et Dei docentis Impe-
rium. *Hieron. in Jer. cap. ix. ver. 12 .. 14.*

L O N D O N :

Sold by J. NOON, near Mercers Chapel, in Cheapside,
and J. BUCKLAND, at the Buck, and W. FENNER,
at the Angel and Bible, in Pater Noster Rowe.

MDCCLIX.

[Price, Three shillings, sewed.]

T H E

P R E F A C E.

THOUGH the names in this Letter are fictitious, (as they always were, and the same that appear now :) it is part of a real correspondence. *Papinian*, who was a man of mature age, of great eminence, and a diligent reader of the sacred scriptures, has long since accomplished his course in this world. *Philaethes* is still living. The letter, sent to *Papinian*, was never returned. But *Philaethes* kept a copy of it. Though writ almost thirty years agoe, it has hitherto lain concealed in the writer's cabinet. Nor has it, till very lately, been shewn to more than two persons, one of whom is deceased. Whether this will be reckoned full proof, that the writer is not forward to engage in religious disputes, I

cannot say. This however is certain : He would have great reason to think himself happy, if, with the assistance of others, without noise and disturbance, in the way of free, calm, and peaceable debate, he could clear up a controverted point of religion, to general satisfaction.

If any should ask, why is this letter published now ? I would answer in the words of Solomon : *There is a time to keep silence, and a time to speak.* But whether the present season has been fitly chosen, the event, under the conduct of Divine Providence, will best shew.

The reader is desired to take notice, that whatever he sees at the bottom of the pages, is additional. There are also some additions in the letter itself, especially near the end, where more texts are explained, than were in the original letter.

For better understanding the argument, it may be needful to observe, for the sake of some, that by divers ancient writers we are assured, it was the opinion of *Arius*,
and

P R E F A C E.

v

and his followers : “ That [1] our Saviour took flesh of *Mary*, but not a soul :” “ that [2] Christ had flesh only, as a covering for his Deity : and that the Word in him was the same, as the soul in us : and that the word, or the Deity in Christ, was liable to sufferings in the body.”

Mr *Whiston*, in his *Historical Memoirs of the Life of Dr Clarke*, giving an account of the

[1] — σάρκα μόνον τὸν σωτῆρα ἀπο μαρίας ἐλη-
Φέναι, διαθεβαίμενοι, καὶ ἔχι ψυχὴν. *Epiph. de*
Arianis in Indic. T. i. p. 606.

Ἄλλα καὶ ἀρνῶνται ψυχὴν αὐτὸν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐλη-
Φέναι. *Id. H. 69. n. 19. p. 743. A. Conf. n. 48 . .*
51.

[2] Ἄρειος δὲ σάρκα μόνην πρὸς ἀποκρυφὴν τῆς θεῆ-
τητος ὁμολογῆι· αὐτὶ δὲ τῷ ἔνωθεν ἐν ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπῳ,
τεπέσι τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸν λόγου ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ λέγει γεγο-
νέναι. κ. λ. *Athan. Contr. Apollin. l. 2. n. 3. p.*
942 C.

In eo autem quod Christum sine anima solam car-
nem suscepisse arbitrantur, minus noti sunt . . . sed
hoc verum esse, et Epiphanius non tacuit, et ego ex
eorum quibusdam scriptis et collocutionibus certissime
inveni. *August. de Haer. c. 49.*

the Act in the Divinity Schools at *Cambridge*, in the year 1709, when Mr *Clarke*, then Rector of St *James's*, received the Doctor's Degree, says, at p. 20. 21. " In the course of this Act, where I was present, Professer *James* . . . digressed from one of the Doctor's Questions, and pressed him hard to condemn one of the opinions, which I had just then published in my *Sermons and Essays*. Which book he held in his hand, when he was in the Chair. I suppose, it might be this: that our Saviour had no human soul, but that the Divine Logos or Word supplied it's place However, Dr *Clarke*, who, I believe, had not particularly examined that point, did prudently avoid either the approbation or condemnation of it. Yet have I reason to believe, he long afterwards came into it, upon a farther examination: though, I think, he ever avoided, according to his usual caution, to declare publicly that his approbation, even upon the most pressing applications. Which is one great instance of that *impenetrable secrecy*, which Dr *Sykes* justly notes to have been in him, upon many occasions."

So Mr *Whiston*. Who clearly declares his own opinion. Who likewise supposeth, that the same was for some while received by Dr *Clarke*. But he seems not to have had any certain evidence of it. For, as he acknowledges, *Dr Clarke never publicly declared his approbation of it.*

Nevertheless it may not be disagreeable to see here what Dr *Clarke* himself says in his *Scripture Doctrines of the Trinity*. Part. i. ch. iii. numb. 998. p. 197. “ Matth. iv. 1. *Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderneys.* From this, and many other of the following texts, it seems, that the Logos, the Divine Nature of Christ, did so far *κενώσαι ἑαυτὸν*, diminish itself, as St *Paul* expresses it, Philip. ii. 7. that, during the time of his incarnation, he was all along under the conduct of the Holy Spirit.”

And Part. 2. sect. xxviii. p. 301. “ The Holy Spirit is described in the New Testament, as the immediate author and worker of all miracles, even of those done by
our

our Lord himself: and as the conductor of Christ in all the actions of his life, during his state of humiliation here on earth."

Before I finish this preface, I must make some citations from *Dr Robert Clayton*, late Lord Bishop of *Clogher*. Who, in the third Part of his *Vindication of the Histories of the Old and New Testament*, has expressed himself after this manner. Letter v. p. 80. 81. or p. 443. "*He who had glory with the Father, before the world was, emptied himself, or divested himself of that glory, in order to redeem mankind, and descended from heaven, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made man.* That is, He, who was a glorified pre-existent spirit in the presence of God, submitted to descend from heaven, and to have himself conveyed by the wonderfull power of Almighty God, into the womb of a Virgin. Where being clothed with flesh, and ripening by degrees to manhood, he was at length brought forth into the world, in the same apparent state and condition, with other human infants."

Again,

Again, Letter vii. p. 132. 133. or 482. §83. " And accordingly this exalted spirit was, by the wonderful power of God, as before related, conveyed into the womb of the virgin *Mary*, and was made man; that is, was made as much so, as his mother could make him, without being impregnated by man. And now being deprived of the immediate presence of God the Father, and being shut up in darkness, and the shadow of death, he was after nine months brought forth into life, in the form of a feeble infant, with all the weakness, and frailties, and infirmities of human nature about him. And as he grew up into life, and his reason improved, this only served to make the terrible change and alteration of his condition, so much the more perceptible, and the recollection of it so much the more grievous and insufferable. The dreadfulness of which state is hardly conceivable to us, because that we never were sensible of any thing better, than our present existence. But for any being, which had ever enjoyed the happiness of heaven, and had been in possession of *glory with the Father*, to be deprived thereof, and

to be sent to dwell here in this world, encompassed within the narrow limits of this earthly tabernacle, and the heavy organs, made of flesh and blood, it must, literally speaking, be to such a being, an hell upon earth." So says that celebrated writer.

To the Letter are now added two Post-scripts. Concerning which nothing needs to be said here. They who look into them, will see what they are.

One thing the author would say. He hopes, the whole is writ in the way of reason and argument, with meekness and candour, without acrimony and abuse: though not without a just concern for such things, as appear to him to be of importance.

Febr. 12. 1759.

T H E
C O N T E N T S.

A LETTER writ in the Year 1730.
Concerning the Question, Whether the
L O G O S supplied the Place of a human
Soul in the Person of J E S U S C H R I S T.
Page I.

THE FIRST POSTSCRIPT, Containing
an Explication of those Words, *the Spi-
rit, the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit of
God*, as used in the Scriptures. 80.

THE SECOND POSTSCRIPT, Contain-
ing Remarks upon the third Part of the
late Bishop of CLOGHER's Vindication of
the Histories of the Old and New Tes-
tament. 180

To be Corrected.

- P. 17. l. 15. for vere r. vero.
 P. 20. l. 17. r. *sanctified*.
 P. 43. l. 3. for on r. in
 P. 71. l. 19. for est r. et
 P. 75. l. 19. for *ος* r. *σε*
 P. 163. l. 1. r. 1. John v.
 P. 194. l. *last*. for that a name r. that name.

In the Notes.

- P. 8. l. 2. for out r. but
 P. 52. l. 4. for dignity r. divinity.
 P. 79. l. 3. for 2. Cor. xii. 31. r. 2. Cor. xi.
 31.

A
L E T T E R

W R I T

In the Y E A R 1730.

Concerning the Question, Whether
the LOGOS supplied the Place of
an human Soul in the Person of
JESUS CHRIST.

To P A P I N I A N.

YOU have, it seems, heard of the
correspondence between *Eugenius* and
Phileleutherus, and particularly of an
incidental question, concerning the *Arian*
hypothesis. You have been informed like-
wise, that I am well acquainted with this
correspondence. And, as it has excited your
curiosity, you demand of me an account of

B

it,

it, and also my own opinion upon the point in debate.

If it were proper for me to deny you any thing, I should entirely excuse my-self, and be perfectly silent: being apprehensive, that touching upon a subject of so much niceness and difficulty may occasion some trouble to your-self, as well as to me. But you are determined, not to accept of any excuses.

I must then, without farther preamble, declare to you, that I cannot but take the same side of the question, with *Phileleutherus*: though once, for some while, I was much inclined to the other.

However, whilst I was favorable to the supposition, that the Logos was the soul of our Saviour, I was embarrassed with a very considerable difficulty. For the Scriptures do plainly represent our blessed Saviour, exalted to power and glory, as a reward of his sufferings here on earth. But I was at a loss to conceive, how that high being, *the first, and only immediately derived being, by whom God made the world* [1], should gain any exaltation

[1] Dr. Clarke, *Scripture-Doctrine*, &c. P. 1. num. 535. p. 86. "The third interpretation is, that *the Word* is a person deriving from the Father (with whom he existed before the world was) both his being itself, and incomprehensible power and knowledge, and other divine attributes and authority, in a manner not revealed, and which human wisdom ought not to presume to explain."

altation by receiving, after his resurrection, and ascension, a bright resplendent human body, and being made the King and Lord of all good men in this world, and the judge of mankind, and, if you please to add likewise, being made higher than the angels, to whom, according to the same hypothesis, he was vastly superior before.

But to speak my mind freely, I now entirely dislike that scheme, and think it all amazing throughout, and irreconcilable to reason.

However, that we may not take up any prejudices from apprehensions, which our own reason might afford, I shall suspend all

B 2

inquiries

Ib. Part. 2. p. 242. §. ii. “ With this first and supreme cause and Father of all things, there has existed, from the beginning, a second Divine Person, which is his Word or Son.”

Page 297. §. xxvi. “ By the operation of the Son, the Father both made and governs the world.”

Page 298. §. xxvii. “ Concerning the Son, there are other things spoken in Scripture, and the highest titles are ascribed to him, even such as include all Divine Powers, excepting absolute independency and supremacy.”

A part of Mr. *Peirse's* Paraphrase upon Col. i. 15. 16. is in these words: “—and since he was the first Being that was derived from the Father. And that he must be the first derived from Him, is hence evident, that all other beings were derived from God, the primary and supreme cause of all, through his Son, by whom, as their immediate Author, all things were created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible: &c.”

inquiries of that sort, and will immediately enter upon the consideration of what the Scriptures say of the person of our Saviour.

He is called a *man* in many places of the Gospels. And every body took him for a man, during his abode on this earth, when he conversed with all sorts of people, in the most free and open manner. He frequently styles himself *the Son of man*. He is also said to be the *son of David*, and *the son of Abraham*. He is called a man, even after his ascension. Acts xvii. 31. *He has appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he has ordained.* 1. Tim. ii. 5. *For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.* And St. Peter to the Jews at Jerusalem. Acts. ii. 22. *Ye men of Israel, bear these words, Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him, in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know.*

Now if Jesus Christ be a man, he consists of a human soul and body. For what else is a man?

This title and appellation of *man* being so often and so plainly given to our Saviour, must needs lead us to think, that he was properly man, unless there are some expressions of another kind, that are decisive to the contrary. But we find, that he is not
only

only called a man, but is also said to be a man as we are, or like to us. *Hebr. ii. 17. Therefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren. iv. 15. We have not an High-Priest, which cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.* And see the second chapter of that epistle throughout.

Beside these plain expressions, describing our Lord to be a man, and like to us; this point may be argued from a great number and variety of particulars related in the New Testament. For two Evangelists have recorded our Lord's nativity. *St. Paul* says: *God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law. Gal. iv. 4.* If it was expedient, that our Saviour should be born into the world, as we are, and live in infancy, and grow up to manhood, as we do, and be liable to all the bodily wants, weaknesses, and disasters, to which we are exposed: must it not have been as needful, or more needful, and as conformable to the divine wisdom, that he should be also like unto us, in the other part, of which we are composed, a human soul, or spirit? [2].

More-

[2] “ And when we say, that person was *conceived and born*: we declare, he was made really and truly man, of the same human nature, which is in all other men.—For *the Mediator between God and men is the*

Moreover, this supposition does best, if not only, account for our blessed Saviour's temptation, and every part of it. For how was it possible, that he should be under any temptation, to try the love of God to him, by turning stones into bread! or by casting himself down from a pinnacle of the temple. How could all the glories of this world, and the kingdoms of it, be any temptation to him, who had made all things under the supreme being? Had he forgot the
glory

man Christ Jesus. 1. Tim. ii. 5. *That since by man came death, by man also should come the resurrection of the dead.* 1. Cor. xv. 21. As sure, then, as the first *Adam*, and we who are redeemed, are men; so certainly is the second *Adam*, and our Mediator, man. He is therefore frequently called *the son of man*, and in that nature he was always promised: first to *Eve*, as her seed, and consequently, her son: then to *Abraham*. And that seed is Christ. Gal. iii. 16. and so the son of *Abraham*: next to *David*, . . . and consequently, of the same nature with *David*, and *Abraham*. And as he was their son, so are we his brethren, as descendants from the same father *Adam*. *And therefore it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren. For he laid not hold on the angels, but on the seed of Abraham.* Hebr. ii. 16. 17. And so became not an angel, but a man."

"As then man consisteth of two different parts, body and soul, so does Christ. . . . And certainly, if the Son of God would vouchsafe to take the frailty of our flesh, he would not omit the nobler part, *our soul*, without which he could not be man. For *Jesus increased in wisdom, and stature*: one in respect of his body, the other of his soul. Luke ii. 52." *Pearson upon the Creed. Art. iii. p. 159, 160. the fourth edition. 1676.*

glory and power, which he once had? If that could be supposed, and that this want of memory of past things still remained; it might be as well supposed, that he had no remembrance of the orders, which he had received from God, and of the commission, with which God the Father had sent him into the world.

The supposition, of Christ being a man, does also best account for his agony in the garden [3], and the dark, yet glorious scene

[3] Luke xxii. 44. *And being in an agonie. . . .*
 Καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ.] I would put the question, whether it might not be thus translated? *And being under great concern.* I will transcribe here a passage of an ancient writer, representing the anxiety, or solicitude, of *Julius Cesar*, and others, when *Othavius Cesar*, then a young man, had a dangerous sickness. Χαλεπῶς δὲ διακειμένους, πάντες μὲν ἐν φόβῳ ἦσαν, ἀγῶνιζόντες, εἰ τι πέσειται τοιαύτη φύσις, μάλιστα δὲ πάντων ὁ Κάισαρ. Διὸ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν ἢ αὐτὸς παρῶν αὐτῷ ἐνθυμίαν παρεῖχεν, ἢ φίλος πέμπων, ἰατρὸς τε ἀποστατεῖν οὐκ ἐβῶν. Καί ποτε δειπνῶντι ἤγγειλέ τις, ὡς ἐκλυτος εἴη, καὶ χαλεπῶς ἔχοι. Ὁ δὲ ἐκπηδήσας ἀνυπόδητος ἦκεν ἐνθα ἐνοσηλεύετο, καὶ τῶν ἰατρῶν ἐδέετο ἐμπαθές-ατα μετὸς αὐτῆς ἀγωνίας, καὶ αὐτὸς παρεκάθητο.
 κ. λ. *Nic. Damascen. De Institutione Caesaris Augusti Ap. Vales. Excerpta. p. 841.*

I have observed, that some learned men seem studiously to have avoided the word *agonie* in their translations. In the Latin Vulgate is: *Et factus in agoniam.* But *Beza* translates. *Et constitutus in angore.* *Le Clerc's* French version is: *Et comme il étoit dans une extrême inquietude. .* And *Lenfant's*: *Et comme il étoit dans un grand combat. .* Which last I do not

scene of his sufferings on the cross, and the concluding prayer there: *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*

And the making the Logos to be the soul of Christ does really annihilate his example, and enervate all the force, which it should have upon us.

But it may be said, that there are some texts, which lead us to think, that Jesus Christ had a human body, but not an human soul: particularly, John i. 14. and Hebr. x. 5.

John i. 14. *And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.* But it should be observed, that *flesh*, in the scriptures both of the Old and New Testament, is oftentimes equivalent to *man*. Ps. lvi. 5. *I will not fear what flesh can do unto me. ver. 11, I will not fear what man can do unto me.* And in innumerable other places. And in the New Testament, Math. xiii. 20. Luke iii. 6. John xvii. 2. Acts. ii. 17. 1 Pet. i. 24.

What

think to be right. For the original word is not *ἀγῶν*, out *ἀγῶνία*. The Syriac version, as translated into Latin by Tremellius, Trostius, and others, is: Cum esset in timore, instanter orabat. I shall add a short passage from *V. H. Vogleri Physiologia Historiae Passionis* J. C. cap. 2. p. 4. Ideoque non immerito dici potest *ἀγῶνία* (quam in defectu commodioris vocabuli angorem Latine vocemus) promittudo rem quampiam aggrediundi, sed cum timore et trepidatione.

What St. *John* says therefore is this: *And the Word was made flesh*, or took upon him the human nature [4].

St. *John* says 1. ep. iv. 2. 3. *Every spirit, that confesseth, that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God. And every spirit, that confesseth not, that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God.* See likewise 2. ep. ver. 7.

It is well known, that in the early days of Christianity, particularly in *Asia*, where St. *John* resided, there arose people, generally called *Docetes*, who denied the real humanity of Christ, and said, he was man in appearance only. These St. *John* opposeth in his Epistles, if not in his Gospel also. Against them he here asserts, that Jesus had the innocent infirmities of the human nature, and that he really suffered, and died. But when he says, that *Jesus Christ came in the flesh*, he does not deny, that he had an human soul, or was man compleatly. Indeed, it is here implied, that he was man, as we are. [5].

Hebr.

[4] “ He took upon him our human nature, became himself a man, subject to the like frailties with us, and lived and conversed freely amongst men.” *Dr. Clarke’s Paraphrase of St. John i. 14. the fourth edition.* 1722.

[5] *Ecce in quibus verbis suis omnino manifestant negare se, quod ad unitatem personae Christi etiam humana anima pertineat; sed in Christo carnem et divinitatem tantummodo confiteri. Quandoquidem cum penderet*

Hebr. x. 5. *Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith: Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me.*

But it is reasonable to think, that [6] a part is here put for the whole, and that the
word,

deret in ligno, illud, ubi ait, *Pater, in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum*, divinitatem ipsam volunt eum intelligi commendasse Patri, non humanum spiritum, quod est anima. . . . Et his atque hujusmodi sanctarum scripturarum testimoniis non resistent, fateanturque Christum, non tantum carnem, sed animam quoque humanam Verbo unigenito coaptasse. . . . Aut si eo movetur quod scriptum est, *Verbum caro factum est*, nec illic anima nominata est: intelligant, carnem pro homine positam, a parte totum significante locutionis modo, sicuti est, *Ad te omnis caro veniet*. Item, *Ex operibus legis non justificabitur omnis caro*. Quod apertius alio loco dixit: *Ex lege nemo justificabitur*. Itemque alio: *Non justificatur homo ex operibus*. Sic itaque dictum est, *verbum caro factum est*: acsi diceretur, Verbum homo factum est. Veruntamen isti, cum ejus solum humanam carnem velint intelligi hominem Christum, non enim negabunt hominem, de quo apertissime dicitur, unus mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus . . . &c. *Aug. Contr. sermon. Arian. cap. ix. Tom. 8.*

[6] *A body* here is a synecdochical expression of the human nature of Christ. So is *flesh* taken, when he is said to be *made flesh*. For the general end of his having *this body* was, that he might therein and thereby yield obedience, or do the will of God. And the especial end of it was, that he might have *what to offer* in sacrifice to God. But neither of these can be confined unto his body alone. For it is the soul, the other essential part of the human nature, that is the principle of obedience." *Dr. J. Owen upon Hebr. x. 5. p. 29.*

word, *body*, is not to be understood exclusively of the soul. St. Paul writes to the *Romans* : *I beseech you therefore, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice to God.* ch. xii. 1: But no one ought hence to conclude, that the *Romans* had not souls as well as bodies, or that their souls might be neglected. No. The faculties of the mind, as well as the members of the body, were to be consecrated to God, and employed in his service. At the beginning of the next chapter St. Paul says : *Let every soul be subject to the higher powers.* Where the other part of the human nature is put for the whole.

And it is manifest from ch. ii. 16. . . 18. and other places, that the writer of the epistle to the *Hebrews* believed Christ to be man, or to have the human nature complete, like unto us. It would therefore be very unreasonable, to understand *body* in this place exclusively of the soul.

The words of the Apostle are a quotation from Ps. xl. prophetically representing the readiness of Christ to do the will of God in this world.

Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith. “ Which [7] words are capable of two interpretations. They may relate to our Lord’s nativity, when he, literally, entered into the world. Or they may relate to the entrance upon his ministry. Then it was,
that

[7] See *Beaufobre upon Hebr. x. 5.*

that *the Father sanctified him, and sent him into the world.* John x. 36. and xvii. 18. And then it was, that he devoted himself to God entirely. Nor can it be well doubted, that the prayer, which Jesus made, when he was baptised, and received the Spirit, which is mentioned Luke iii. 31. contained a declaration, equivalent to that in this place: *Lo, I come to do thy will, o God.* Compare John v. 30. and vi. 38."

I will now consider some texts, which have been thought by some to represent to us the pre-existence of the soul of our Saviour, before his conception in the womb of the virgin *Mary.*

The form of God, Philip. ii. 6. seems to me to have been enjoyed by our Lord in this world. It [8] denotes his knowledge of the hearts of men, his power of healing diseases, and raising the dead, and working other miracles, at all times, whenever he pleased, and all the other evidences of his divine mission. This sense does wonderfully accord with what our Lord says John x. 34 . . 36. and in many other places of that Gospel.

[8] *Μορφῆς, forma,* in nostris libris non significat aeternum et occultum aliquid, sed id quod in oculis incurrit, qualis erat eximia in Christo potestas sanandi morbos omnes, ejiciendi daemones, excitandi mortuos, mutandi rerum naturas: quae vere divina sunt, ita ut Moses, qui tam magna non fecit, dictus ob id fuerit Deus Pharaonis. *Grot. in Philip. ii. 6.*

Gospel. *Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are Gods? If he called them Gods, to whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken, say ye of him, whom the Father has sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God? But though he had so great power, he made himself of no reputation: he lived in a mean condition, and submitted to the reproaches of enemies, and at last to death itself. Which was plainly a voluntary submission. For being innocent, he needed not to have died, but might have been translated without tasting death.*

If this be the meaning of that text, then 2. Cor. viii. 9. is also explained: that [9] *though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor.*

John i. 15. *John bare witness of him . . . He that cometh after me, is preferred before me. For he was before me. And ver. 30. This is he, of whom I said: After me cometh a man, which is preferred before me. For he was before me. But I apprehend, that John the Baptist does not here say, that Jesus was before him in time. But he says: He who comes after me, has always been before me, or in my view. For he is my chief,*

[9] *Id est, cum vi polleret omnis generis miracula patrandi, etiam mortuos resuscitandi, personam tamen gessit tam humilem, ut ne domum quidem haberet propriam. Grot. in loc.*

chief, or prince, or principal." This suits what he says of the great dignity, and transcendent excellence of our Lord's person and character, at ver. 27. *Whose shoes latchet I am not worthy to unloose*: and ver. 23, *I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make strait the way of the Lord*: that is, I am the harbinger, or fore-runner, of the great person, who is about to appear among you. I am come before him, to prepare for his reception.

John viii. 58. may be thought a strong text for the pre-existence of our Saviour's soul. But really he there only represents his dignity, as the Messiah, the special favour of God toward him, and the importance of the dispensation by him. It is a way of speaking, resembling that in Rev. xiii. 8. *Whose names are written in the book of life, of the lamb, slain from the foundation of the world*, and explained 1. Pet. i. 20. *Who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world* [10]: See also Eph. i. 4. 2. Tim. i. 9. Tit. i. 2. The Jewish people have a saying, that [11] the Law was before

[10] Fuerat ante Abrahamum Jesus divina constitutio: infra xvii. 5. Apoc. xiii. 8. 1. Pet. i. 20. Constat hoc, quia de ipso ipsiusque Ecclesiâ mystice dictum erat, recente humano genere, futurum, ut semen muliebri contereret caput serpentis. *Grot. in Job. viii. 58. Vid. et Bez. in loc.*

[11] Sic *Legem fuisse ante mundum*, aiunt Hebraei. Vide *Thalmudem de Votis. Grot. ad Job. xvii. 5.*

fore the world was created. In like manner the Dispensation by the Messiah was before the Dispensation of *Abraham*, in dignity, nature, and design, though not in time.

The Jews were much offended at the words, recorded in the 56. ver. Nevertheless our Lord does not there say, that he had seen *Abraham*, or that *Abraham* had seen him in person. What he says is this : *Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day. And he saw it, and was glad* ; that is, he earnestly desired to see the time, when all the nations of the earth should be blessed, through his promised seed, the Messiah. And *by faith he saw it, and was glad.* Compare Hebr. xi. 13. [12.]

Another text proper to be considered here is John xvii. 5. *And now, o Father, glorify thou me with the glory, which I had with thee before the world was.* But this, according to the Jewish phraseology, may be very well understood of the glory, always designed for the

[12] Ceterum, ex Hebraeorum idiotismo, *dies alicujus* nihil aliud declarat, quam spatium quo vixerit aliquis, aut insigne quidpiam, quod ipsi vel facere vel ferre contigit. Quæ res notior est, quam ut testimonio egeat. *Dies ergo Domini* nihil aliud significat, quam ipsius adventum in carnem. Vidit enim eum eminus Abraham, fidei nimirum oculis, ut declaratur Hebr. xi. 13. . . . *Ac gavisus est,* . . . Respicit autem expresse Christus ad id quod dicitur Gen. xvii. 17. Abrahamum, accepta de nascituro sibi illo semine promissionis, sese prostravisse, et risisse. Unde et ipsi Isaac nomen imposuit Dominus. *Bez. ad Job. viii. 56.*

the Christ by the immutable purpose of God. See *Grotius* upon the place. That our Lord had not, before his nativity, the glory, which he here prays for, is apparent from the whole tenour of the gospel, and from clear and manifest expressions in the context. For the glory, which he now prays for, is the reward of his obedience. ver. 4. *I have finished the work, which thou gavest me to do. And now o Father, glorify thou me . .* And St. Paul says Philip. ii. 9. *Wherefore God also has highly exalted him, Hebr. ii. 9 . . for the suffering of death he was crowned with glory and honour, ver. 10. For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. And Hebr. xii. 2. Looking unto Jesus, who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame. And is set down on the right hand of the throne of God. And Luke xxiv. 26. Our Saviour says to the disciples, in the way to Emmaus: Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And St. Peter. 1. ep. i. 10. 11. Of which salvation the Prophets have inquired . . Searching what, or what manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified before hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. And St. Paul. Acts. xxvi. 22. 23. . . saying no other*

other things than those, which the Prophets and Moses did say should come: that the Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead. All harmonious, as we see; that the glory of the Messiah was subsequent to his obedience and sufferings on this earth. See likewise Rom. i. 3. 4.

Nor can I forbear to observe to you, that *Augustin*, who has largely considered the words of John xvii. 5. and in so doing quotes Eph. i. 4. and Rom. i. 1. . . 4. understands them of Christ's human nature, and explains them in the same manner that I have done. Quasi vere quisquam regulam fidei intuens, Filium Dei negaturus est predestinatum, qui eum negare hominem non potest. Recte quippe dicitur non predestinatus secundum id quod est Verbum Dei, Deus apud Deum. . . Illud autem predestinandum erat, quod nondum erat, ut suo tempore fieret, quemadmodum ante omnia tempora predestinatum erat, ut fieret. Quisquis igitur Dei Filium predestinatum negat, hunc eundem filium hominis negat. . . secundum hanc ergo predestinationem etiam clarificatus est antequam mundus esset, ut esset claritas ejus ex resurrectione mortuorum apud Patrem, ad cujus dexteram sedet. Cum ergo videret illius predestinatae suae clarificationis venisse jam tempus, ut et nunc fieret in redditione, quod fuerat in predestina-

tione jam factum, oravit, dicens: *Et nunc clarifica me tu Pater apud te metipsum, claritate, quam habui priusquam mundus esset, apud te: tamquam diceret, Claritatem quam habui apud te, id est, illam claritatem, quam habui apud te in praedestinatione tua, tempus est, ut apud te habeam etiam vivens in dexterâ tuâ.* *August. In Joan. Evang. cap. 17. Tr. cv. n. 8. ed. Bened. Tom. 3. P. 2.*

It has been thought by some, [13] that Christ, or the Son, appeared to the Patriarchs, and was oftentimes sent upon messages to men by the supreme being, before the times of the gospel. But where is the proof of this? It was the opinion of some of the ancient writers of the Church, who had a philosophy, that was a mixture of Pythagorism and Platonism. Nevertheless, this supposition, that God had employed the Son in former times, before the gospel, is overthrown by the very first words of the Apostle in the epistle to the *Hebrews*. *God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the Prophets, has in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.* It is also inconsistent with the Apostle's arguments to care and circumspection, steadfastness and perseverance, which follow afterwards:

[13] That opinion is modestly rejected by Mr *Peirce*, in his Paraphrase on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. Chap. i. ver. 2.

wards. Hebr. ii. 1. 2. 3. *Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things, which we have heard . . . For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast . . . how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him? See likewise ch. iii. 1. For this man was counted worthy of more honour than Moses . . . ver. 6. But Christ, as a Son over his own house.*

Still it may be said, that nothing but the pre-existence of the soul of Christ can suit those expressions of his being *sent from God*, and *coming from God*.

To which I answer, that the account here given by me is well suited to all such expressions in their utmost latitude, according to the stile of Scripture. For we may be all said to be sent by God into the world, without the supposition of a pre-existent soul. Especially are Prophets sent from God. But above all Jesus is most properly *the sent of God*, as he had the highest and most important commission.

So John i. 6. *There was a man sent from God, whose name was John.* Nevertheless none suppose, that *John* the Baptist came directly from heaven: but only, that he was inspired, and had a divine command to appear in the world, and bear witness con-

cerning the Christ, who would come presently after him.

And the commission, which our Lord gave to his Apostles, is expressed by himself after this manner. John xvii. 18. *As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I sent them into the world.* And xx. 21. *As my Father has sent me, so send I you.*

But, as before said, Jesus is *the sent of God*, as he had the highest commission. John iii. 34. *He whom God has sent, speaketh the words of God.* ch. iv. 34. *My meat is to do the will of him that sent me.* ch. v. 38. *Ye have not his word abiding in you. For whom he has sent, ye believe not.* See also ver. 23. 24. 30. 34. 36. And x. 36. *Say ye of him, whom the Father has sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?* And in the history of the cure of the blind man, recorded in the ix. chapter of the same Gospel, at ver. 7. *And said unto him: Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, which is by interpretation, sent.* Probably here is an allusion to our Lord's character, as *the sent of God*. And there may be an intimation intended, that he is the *Shiloh*, spoken of in Gen. xlix. 10.

There are some other texts needful to be taken notice of here. John xiii. 3. *Jesus knowing, that he was come from God, and went to God.* ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθε. xvi. 27. *For*
the

the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God. ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ τῆ θεῆ ἐξῆλθον. ver. 28. I am come forth from the Father, and am come into the world. Again, I leave the world, and go to the Father. Ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τῆ πατρός. This expression is explained in ch. viii. 42. Whence we perceive, that [14] thereby is intended our Lord's divine commission. *Jesus said unto them : If God were your Father, ye would love me. For I proceeded forth, and came from God. Neither came I of my self, but he sent me. Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τῆ θεῆ ἐξῆλθον, καὶ ἦκω. κ. λ.*

The reproaches, and contradictions, which our Lord met with, and the sufferings of his death, are often set before us. But if the Logos, that high and exalted spirit, in the *Arian* sense, was the soul of Christ; this part of his humiliation, in clothing himself with an human body, would have been frequently represented, and described, in the clearest, and most emphatical expressions.

Here, if I mistake not, is a proper place for setting down those observations upon this scheme, which reason may suggest, and were passed over before.

C 3

In

[14] Voyez cette façon de parler expliquée ci dessus. ch. viii. 42. par la mission. *Lenfant upon John* xvi. 27.

In *the first place*, I do not apprehend it possible, that so glorious and perfect a spirit should undergo such diminution by being united to an human body, as to become thereby unconscious, or to be greatly enfeebled. I think, that if this spirit were to animate, and take upon it the part of a soul in an human body ; it's power, cogitation, and knowledge, would subsist, and remain, even in it's infant state. In short, the human body would be swallowed up by this great soul. That soul would exert itself in the body, and sustain it with all facility, without rest, food, or any other refreshment, against all pain, and uneasiness, and every kind of infirmity. This, I say, would be the case, supposing so great a being to take upon it a human body. If an angel (as is supposed,) can move with agility a material-vehicle, made dense enough to be sensible to human eyes ; what influence would not this powerful Logos have over the grossest human body ? But this is not agreeable to fact, as represented in the New Testament. For there Jesus is said, to have *increased in wisdom*, as he grew up. And he had hunger, and thirst, and was *wearied with journeying*, and had all the sinless infirmities of the human nature, and was subject to death.

But *secondly*, supposing this humiliation to be possible, I think, it could not be reasonable. It is not reasonable, that so great a
being

being should submit to unconsciousness, or any such like debilitation. Consequently, it cannot be required by God. It is incongruous to all just notions of things, that any other spirit, beside a human soul, should be made subject to the infirmities of human flesh.

I forbear mentioning some things, which appear to me consequences from the Logos (in the *Arian* sense of that term) being the soul of our blessed Saviour. And, as they are not mentioned, they need not affect you, unless they should occur to your thoughts.

I now proceed to the introduction to St. *John's* Gospel. For I believe, you may be of opinion, that I must not pass it by entirely, notwithstanding it's difficulty. I will therefore explain it briefly, or a part of it at least, according to the best of my ability: still willing, however, to receive farther light from any one, that shall afford it.

In the beginning was the Word. By *beginning*, I think, cannot be intended the beginning of the gospel, but of the creation, or rather always, from eternity *was the Word.* *And the Word was with God:* that is, was always with God, though not fully manifested, till these last days of the world [15].

And

[15] 1. John i. 2. *For the Life was manifested. And we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto*

And the Word was God. Καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. Which sometimes has been rendred thus: *And God was the Word.* But there are learned men, who say, that then the Greek would have been Καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἦν λόγος: and, that the article being joyned with λόγος, therefore that is the antecedent, and our translation is right.

Here I had been wont to submit to what Dr Clarke says, *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, P. i. numb. 535. "Of these words there are only three interpretations. The first is, that the Word was that same person, whom he was with. And that is both a contradiction in terms, and also the antient heresy of *Sabellius*." But now that does not move me. I am of opinion, that *God* here is the same God that was mentioned before. St. *John* useth a gradation. First he says, *the Word was* always, before all time. Then he adds: *and was with God*: and lastly, that he *was God* himself. What follows confirms this interpretation. ver. 3. *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.* Who should this be, but God the Father, the one living and true God, and author of life, and all being? Are there more creators than

you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us.

I. Tim. iii. 16. *And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness. God was manifest in the flesh.*

than one? Would any Jew, or disciple of Jesus, ascribe [16.] the creation of the world to any, but God, or his reason, or understanding, or discretion, his wisdom, his power, his word, his spirit, which is the same as God himself? ver. 10. *He was in the world, and the world was made by him.* This needs no comment. ver. 11. *He came to his own, and his own received him not.* I pray, whose people were the Jews, but God's, his, who stiled himself Jehovah? He now came, in Jesus, to his own people. But they received him not.

St *John* therefore intends the one true God, not any inferior deity.

Shall I shew this more particularly from other places of his Gospel? It is observable, that St *John*, out of the many discourses of Jesus, (a great part of which he has omitted, as appears from ch. xx. 30. 31. xxi. 25.) has selected those, in which our Lord speaks very expressly of the commission, which he had received from the Father, and of his near, and intimate union with him.

In

[16.] The creation of the world is always ascribed to the one living and true God, in the old and New Testament. Gen. i. Ex. xxii. Job. xxi. 13. xxvi. 13. Pf. xxxiii. 6. cxxxvi. 5. . 10. cxlvi. 5. 6. Is. xlii. 5. xlv. 12. li. 13. Jer. x. 12. li. 15. and elsewhere. Acts iv. 24. xiv. 15. xvii. 24. Rev. iv. 8. . 11. x. 6. xiv. 7.