

www.CreationismOnline.com

STATEMENT AND EVIDENCE

OF THE

DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY,

IN

THREE LECTURES.

BY HUBBARD WINSLOW,
PASTOR OF THE FIRST CHURCH IN DOVER, N. H.

DOVER:
PUBLISHED BY SAMUEL C. STEVENS.

Printed by George W. Ela.

1829.

C 1396.16
✓

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBR...
FROM
THE BEQUEST OF
EVERT JANSEN WENDELL
1918

3

DISTRICT OF NEW-HAMPSHIRE, to wit.

DISTRICT CLERK'S OFFICE.

BE IT REMEMBERED, That on the fourth day of March, A. D. 1829, and in the fifty-third year of the Independence of the United States, Samuel C. Stevens, of Dover, in the said district, has deposited in this office the title of a book, the right whereof he claims as proprietor in the words following, to wit. "Statement and Evidence of the Doctrine of the Trinity; in three Lectures. By Hubbard Winslow, Pastor of the First Church in Dover, N. H." In conformity to the act of the Congress of the United States entitled "An Act for the encouragement of Learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts, and books to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned;" and also to an act, entitled "An Act supplementary to an Act entitled 'An Act for the encouragement of Learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts, and books to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned,' and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving, and etching historical and other prints."

CHARLES W. CUTTER, *Clerk of the District of New-Hampshire.*

A true copy as of Record—Attest

C. W. CUTTER, *Clerk.*

LECTURE I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS AND STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE.

I. THESS. V. 21.

"*Prove all things,*"—

MY RESPECTED AND BELOVED HEARERS.—It has ever been the tendency of religious controversy to distort the features of the christian system. A *disputed* doctrine attracts to itself the universal mind, so that other doctrines of equal importance are overlooked. Thus some one feature in the Christian system assumes an undue prominence in the public estimation, and the symmetry of the entire whole is spoiled. Every mind conversant with the history of religious controversy, will recognize the truth of this remark.

Christian *conduct* too, when regulated in reference to the avoiding of some prominent evil in sentiment or practice, rather than in direct reference to the entire model of objective christianity, as presented by God, becomes also distorted. The christian, instead of maturing under the complete and harmonious activity of all religious truth, on the elements of his moral being, and thus growing up erect, in the beautiful symmetry of a perfect man in Christ Jesus, by being subjected to the undue influence of some truths, and failing to receive a due proportion of influence from others, is often of deformed and unnatural growth. That is a noble oak that can always stand firm and erect, when the wind is perpetually beating upon it from one direction.

Another evil of controversy is, that the public mind acquires a morbid sensitiveness in regard to the disputed point, and does not bring to bear upon it a healthful and sober action. Minds which would be convinced of truth under other circumstances, will not under these. Indeed it requires, under such circumstances, no small degree of intellectual vigor and independence, to step aloof from all the impulses of passion and prejudice, and look down upon the whole scene, calmly and impartially inquiring, '*What is Truth?*' But it must be done. We must rise above prejudice, throw our will entirely away, and put our minds in the posture of candid enquiry, if we would learn the exact truth. To encourage the attempt, let us remember that the truth *is what it is*, whether we *wish* it so, or not. Our *wishes* cannot alter it, one way or the other. Let us also remember, that any other than a sincere, commanding desire to know and obey the truth of God, is infinitely unworthy of a rational mind, on its pathway to immortality.

Prove all things. That is, what is supported by evidence, *believe*; what is not supported by evidence, *reject*. If the doctrine of the Trinity is supported by conclusive evidence, I do not hesitate to acknowledge, that I wish to have you *believe* it. If it is not thus supported, I can say, with equal sincerity, that I wish to have you *reject* it. So I wish to do myself. If I know my own heart, I have but one desire respecting this thing; and that is, that we may all know the truth, and do our duty. I meet you not as a disputant; I meet you as a friend. A company of fellow-pilgrims to eternity, we wish to mutually assist each other. It were easy for us to throw dust into each other's eyes, but that we do not wish to do. We will rather assist each other to see clearly. If there be any thing for us to learn respecting the Being, to whom we are going to render our account, we wish to learn it. On such a subject as this—a subject involving the amazing interests of my own soul, and the souls of those to whom I minister, I cannot find it in my heart to dispute a moment. Every emotion that stirs within me, would rather prompt me to sit, with entire

docility, at the feet of the merest child in this assembly, if I could thereby learn any thing respecting the great God, and my duty to him and to you.

I dare not, beloved hearers, assume the responsibility of dictating to your faith. It is the duty and the privilege of every man to examine and judge for himself, responsible for his belief only to God. To God, as his master, he standeth or falleth. The extent of my duty, is simply to lay before your minds the *evidence* in the case, and then leave you to *judge for yourselves*.

Gladly would I avoid doing even this, at the present time, did not duty compel me. It is painful to me, to be under necessity of thus spending a moment on an abstract article of christian faith, when I wish to be employed in bringing all the moral machinery of the gospel, to act directly on your moral being. Life is short. While compelled to stand examining the evidence of truth, time rushes on, and hastens our probation to its close. Once for all, I inform you, that having now expressed my views on this subject, I shall leave it in future silence to your own reflections. The Word must be rightly divided. To avoid the evils of controversy, specified above, I am determined, in my preaching, to give a disputed subject only its *native* importance, in the great system of revealed truth.

But the command is upon us, '*Prove all things.*' If the doctrine under consideration be *true*, we must prove it true and *believe* it; if it be *false*, we must prove it false and *reject* it. No man can permit his mind to repose in indolent ignorance, or lie under the dominion of wilful prejudice, in respect to so momentous a subject, without incurring immense guilt and danger. God requires of us, intellectually as well as morally, according to our capabilities. What we *can* know of him, we *ought* to know. Our intellectual powers are indeed limited, and there must of consequence be a limit to our knowledge; but because we cannot know *every* thing respecting God, we have not therefore an apology for knowing *nath-*

ing. While forbidden to attempt a step beyond the limit prescribed to our minds by God, we are commanded to march promptly up to it. Not to come up to it, were indolence—to attempt a step beyond, were presumption.

If you entrust to your steward a sum of money, with directions how to employ it in your service, there are two ways in which he may fail of his duty. He may fail to employ it at all, and thus incur the charge of indolence, like the wicked and slothful servant in the gospel; or he may embark with it in unauthorized speculations, and thereby lose the whole, and thus incur the charge of presumption. In either case he is guilty.

God has committed to us limited powers of intellect. He has thus fixed the limit beyond which our knowledge, while in this state, cannot extend. He has given to us our first lesson, and commanded us to learn that, and wait his motion for the second. Now we may, on the one hand, make no intellectual effort, and thus resemble the idle school-boy, who sleeps away his time over his lesson; or we may attempt what is at present beyond our intellectual reach, and thus resemble the silly child, who affects to read, before he has learnt his A B C. The mind that is trained to accurate habits, will always endeavor to draw distinctly the line of demarkation, between what *can* be known, and what *cannot* be known, in our present state. As a general rule, *things*, and not the *modes* of things, are included in our present compass of knowledge. This may be illustrated by reference to a case in physical science. We know that the rays of light, by falling upon the eye, and passing through the chrysaline humor, and converging to a focal point upon the retina, in the optic nerve, produce in us the perception of seeing. We know the *fact*, that such a perception is produced, but *how* it is produced, we are utterly unable to determine. We might instance a multitude of similar cases, in physical science, but will proceed to notice some of those, which more immediately concern us as *religious* beings.

God has revealed to us the fact, that we shall continue to ex-

ist as intelligent, conscious beings, after death,—that death does not *extinguish* our being, but only change the *mode* of our being. What that other mode of existence is, no man in this state can know. Yet the fact revealed is perfectly intelligible, and fraught with amazing importance.

To deny the immortality of the soul, simply because we do not know *how* it exists, when separated from the body, were no less absurd, than to deny that the rays of light upon the optic nerve produce in us the sensation of seeing, because we do not know how they do it. The *proof* of the two facts rests upon different evidence to be sure,—that of the one on the testimony of our consciousness, that of the other on the declaration of God. But any presumption *for* or *against* the facts, resulting simply from our ignorance of their *modes*, is as strong in the one case, as in the other. So that, if the positive evidence in the two cases is equally good, the facts are equally certain.—Or, in other words, admitting the claims of revelation, if the testimony of God is as good evidence as the testimony of our consciousness, it is just as certain that the soul is immortal, as it is that we see the light of day. It is just as certain that we shall exist forever, as it is that we exist now.

Take another instance. God has revealed to us the fact, that he exists in every point of the universe at the same moment. It is an important fact, and every accountable being ought to know it; but no man, in his present state, can know *how* God thus exists. It is a mode of existence so entirely different from ours, which limits us to one particular spot at a given time, that we can form no conception of it.

Take another instance. God has revealed to us the fact, that there is a peculiar distinction in the godhead, by virtue of which he sustains certain important relations to his moral kingdom, the forms of which are to us developed, under the appellations of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and that these three are, in some way, so united, as to constitute one being. It is an important fact for us to know, because it is essentially connected with the whole system of revealed Christianity.—

But no man, while in this state of being, can know *how* God exists thus, because it is a mode of existence unlike ours. In this respect, as well as in respect to his ubiquity, the mode of his existence is altogether unlike that of man; and to deny that he exists thus, because *we* do not, and therefore cannot perceive how *he* does, were just as absurd as to deny that he exists every where at the same moment, because we do not, and therefore cannot perceive how he does. God may exist in this room as really as though it were his only dwelling place, although we are informed that the heaven of heavens cannot contain him. In *another* sense, he may exist in the person of his son Jesus Christ, as really as though that were the only form of his existence. By not discriminating between what can be known and what cannot be known respecting God, in our present state, many are always learning and never able to come to a knowledge of the truth. They undertake to be too wise. Instead of learning what they *can* know, they undertake to learn what they *cannot*. Instead of sitting down, in the attitude of docile children, to the book of nature, and the book of God, like the worthy disciples of Newton, or Locke, they launch away into an ocean of distempered dreams and fancies. Instead of employing the little portion of intellect committed to them by God, agreeably to his directions, they embark with it in fruitless and hazardous speculations, and the consequence is that they lose the whole. Thus while attempting to become wise they become fools. For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nought the understanding of the prudent.

You have only to become acquainted with Church History, and wade through the speculations of past centuries, to find ample testimony to the truth of this remark. Some have dove into things too deep, and because they could not know *every* thing respecting Jehovah, have come to the very sage conclusion that they could not know *any* thing; and so have settled down in sluggish scepticism. Others have affected an air of lofty arrogance, and asserted that they *know*, what it is certain

they do *not* know. They have even pretended to grasp the infinite God in their minds, and maintain that he must exist in precisely the same manner with themselves, when all the world may perceive that they attempt to dip up the ocean in a thimble.

True science is modest. It knows the limits of human knowledge. Up to this limit it walks, with firm but cautious step, and heaven-directed eye, but never attempts a step beyond. This modest course is the only one to sound knowledge in matters of religion, as well as general science. It gives to the mind a firm hold on the truth. It enables it to take in what it pretends to know, with an entire and perfect grasp. Thus it is not forever moving upon the wave of conjecture. It is not subject to being tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the slight of men and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but is *rooted and grounded* in the faith.

STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE.

Sermons and pamphlets, designed to subvert the doctrine of the Trinity, abound with assertions that God is One. All this has nothing to do with the question at issue. We fully believe that God is one Being. We believe the sentiment contained in the inspired declaration against the polytheism of the Gentile nations, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.' We have implicit confidence in the Word of God; and a single declaration from that source, is sufficient to settle in our minds the question, which the light of nature could never have settled, whether there be "gods many and lords many," or whether there be but One Almighty Being, on the Throne of the Universe.

While however we believe that there is but one God, we are aware that he does not exist in the same *mode*, in which man exists. The modes of existence may be many;—we know not how many. I will illustrate my meaning. The mode of man's existence is such, that he can occupy only *one* place in the universe, at the same moment. The mode of

God's existence is such, that he can occupy *every* place, at the same moment. An angel may be one being, existing only in spirit; a man may be one being, existing in soul and body; God may be one being, existing in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. An angel may have one mode of existence, man may have another, and God may have still another. You will not regard the above as a *definition* of the mode of God's existence, but simply an *illustration* of the fact, that there are different modes of being, and that the mode of God's existence is extremely different from ours.

The final commission of Christ to his apostles was, 'Go, ye, disciple all nations, baptizing them, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' The Eternal Jehovah is thus announced to us, as the object of our homage, existing, in some sense, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

God is not *three* in the *same* sense in which he is *one*. A triangle, for instance, is one in respect to its being—one triangle—and three in respect to its sides. A magistrate may be one in respect to being, and three in respect to office.

Suppose not that I admit the doctrine of Sabellius, by adopting a comparison, whose object is simply the illustration of one point; to wit, that there is a certain sense in which God is one, and a certain other sense in which he is three. The sense in which he is one, is expressed by the term *being*. He is one being. The sense in which he is three, is usually expressed by the term *person*. He exists in three persons. The term *person*, however, you will observe, is used simply by way of accommodation; or, if you please, *approximation*, just as we apply various other anthropopathic expressions to God. I am aware that some Trinitarians object to the use of this term, because objectors to the doctrine of the Trinity abuse it. But what term, taken from human vocabularies, and applied to God, is not liable to abuse? Not one. The mind that is *disposed* to take advantage, *can* do it not only of this, but of every anthropopathic expression in the Bible, that is employed to represent God. Such expressions we must use, because we

have no other. We must either say nothing about God, or we must apply to him human language; and he who takes advantage of this, is unkind to his species; because he takes advantage of a circumstance in our being, which is beyond our control. We have a distinct idea of the *existence* of the fact, which this term represents; but the *exact image* of the fact, in our present mode of existence, our minds are incompetent to perceive. Our apprehensions of God are obtained, by contemplating the qualities of our own nature, infinitely extended. But so different is the mode of God's existence from ours, that no *human* quality, by being extended and exalted indefinitely in our imagination, can paint to our apprehension an *exact* image of the *divine* quality, which it would represent. And even could we thus *perceive* it, in the mind, we could not thus express it in language; for all the perceptions of one mind must be transmitted to other minds, through the *media* of resemblances. Consequently that, which has no *exact resemblance*, cannot be *exactly* represented by language; even if conceived in thought. But we use the term person, to designate the distinction in the godhead, with as much definiteness of meaning, as many other terms possess, when applied to the Deity, which all adopt, and *must* adopt, who speak of God at all.

In regard to a Trinity of persons in the godhead, it is important for us to discriminate between the *fact itself* and the *mode* of the fact. By doing this, it may be readily perceived, that we are not chargeable with believing what we do not comprehend. Indeed it were absurd to suppose, that any mind *can* believe what it does not comprehend. It may and does believe in the existence of multitudes of facts, which *involve* incomprehensibles; but the facts themselves, the precise things which the mind believes, it must clearly perceive. What then are the facts which we believe, respecting the Trinity? They are these. That Jehovah exists in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—that the Father is Divine, that the Son is Divine, and that the Holy Ghost is Divine—that these three are so far

distinct, as to authorize the Scriptural application of the personal pronouns to each, I the Father, Thou the Son, He the Holy Ghost—that Jehovah, in each of these persons, sustains important relations to his creatures, just so far peculiar to each, as is represented in the Bible—and finally, that these three persons are, *in some way*, united in the one being God. The revealed *fact* that God exists thus, is what we profess to believe, and what we perfectly understand; the *mode* of his existing thus, we do not pretend to understand. So likewise the revealed fact, that God exists in every point of the universe at the same moment, we perfectly understand; the mode of his existing thus, we do not understand. We clearly apprehend the fact that the soul and body of man co-exist, but *how* they co-exist, we do not pretend to know. A candid and enlightened mind will not hesitate to acknowledge, that all objection urged against the fact of the Trinity, as involving mystery, lies with equal weight against the fact of the divine ubiquity, the co-existence of the soul and body, and a thousand other facts in moral and physical science, equally palpable, whose modes are not explained.

But we are told that some have attempted to explain the *mode* of the Trinity, and that they have explained it in different ways. And what if they have? So have some attempted to explain the mode of the co-existence of the soul and body; and they have explained it in different ways. What then? It is still a fact, that the soul and body co-exist, just as they did before a theory was ever framed upon the subject.

In the beginning of the eighteenth century, Sir Isaac Newton discovered the fact, that the planets move round the sun in elliptical orbits. Soon after appeared a host of theorists upon the mode of this fact. One conjectured that the planets were sustained in their orbits, by some gaseous fluid—another, that they were compelled and guided, by certain indefinable laws of attraction and repulsion—another, that the fact was produced by the immediate efficiency of God—and so on.—What then? Why, we find that the fact announced by Sir

Isaac is still as good as ever. The planets do still move round in their orbits, just as they did in the beginning of the eighteenth century. The different theories of men have not disturbed them at all.

At a much earlier period, Jehovah announced to mankind some important facts, respecting his existence. Soon after, men began to theorize upon the mode of these facts. And different men have framed different theories. What then? All the developed facts respecting Jehovah do still exist, just as in the beginning; and we have no expectation, that the different theories of men will ever affect them at all.

Facts in the Trinity, the modes of which are unexplained, are then admitted to exist. The world has not been laboring for ages to explain nothing. But because men have not succeeded to explain these facts, some have at length concluded to disclaim their existence! An *easy* expedient to be sure! But is this the worthy conduct of a sober, judicious mind, that professes to appreciate evidence? What? Practically adopt a principle, by virtue of which you may disclaim the very existence of Jehovah, and even your own existence too! Go, child of the dust! Immerse thyself in thy wisdom;—live and die in it! But God shall at last demonstrate thy wisdom to be folly.

On the same principle, by virtue of which you would thus reject the Trinity of God, you may also reject his Unity. Are we not as profoundly ignorant, of the mode of God's existing in Unity, as we are of the mode of his existing in Trinity? Most certainly we are. I know it is not easy to impress this sentiment on minds, that have not been accustomed to consider the amazing difference which there must be, between the mode of God's existence and our own. Nevertheless it is strictly true, and I cannot doubt that every thorough and candid mind, will perceive and acknowledge it. The mind, which does not know, that the mode of God's existence, *in every respect*, lies at present entirely without the boundaries of human knowledge, has its first lesson on this subject yet to learn.

But we do not object to theories respecting the mode of the Trinity, provided they be understood simply *as* theories. To show that the Doctrine involves no absurdity, we exhibit a theory respecting the mode, or in other words a way in which it *may* be; and until it is demonstrated that it *cannot* be, in the supposed way, we have legitimate title to both the theory and the fact. This is the precise value of a theory, in a sound, logical argument. Let me illustrate my meaning, by reference to a fact already adduced. It is a known fact, that the soul and body of man co-exist. Now for a theory respecting the *mode* of the fact. We give the following. They *may* be connected, through the medium of the brain. It has never been proved that they are not. We have then as yet a strictly logical claim to both the theory and the fact. Should it ever be proved that they are *not* connected in this way, we still do not renounce the *fact* of their co-existence; but conclude that they are connected in some *other* way. We renounce the *old* theory for a new one, the fact itself continuing the same.

Suppose it to be a revealed fact, (whether it is, we are to enquire in the next Lecture,) that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are each Divine, co-existing in the *one* eternal being, Jehovah. Now for a theory respecting the *mode* of this fact. We give the following. Their unity *may* consist in ONENESS OF ESSENCE. *No man is, or can be, in his present state, sufficiently acquainted with the elements of being, to be able to prove, that oneness of essence cannot constitute a plurality of persons.* He cannot prove this even in respect to created beings, much less in respect to the uncreated and eternal God. Our theory then is good, and the fact which it respects is entitled to rational belief, if sufficiently attested. *It is entirely above the reach of all objection.* But let not the fact and the theory be confounded. The theory is *ours* the fact is GOD'S.

A certain writer labored his way through a whole pamphlet, to show the amount of evidence requisite to sustain the doctrine under consideration. His object was, to push it as far as possible from the reach of evidence, and send the mind of the enquirer

to the Bible, with a previous determination not to believe it. Of what use is the Bible to one, whose mind has assumed this posture? His opinion is *formed*, before he *goes* to his Bible. He is prepared not to *believe*, though the Bible asserts. He has *anticipated* a revelation from God, and is already too wise to be taught by him.

This is an extremely loose and illogical method of treating *any* subject. The correct method of investigating a complicated subject is, first to analyze it into its elementary parts, then to examine each part carefully by itself. The present subject divides itself into three distinct enquiries. The first is, Does the doctrine, when correctly stated, involve any absurdity? We demonstrate that it does not. Then that point is settled. The doctrine is admissible to the common privilege of proof, and is to be believed, on the authority of evidence, just like any other fact in religion or science. The second enquiry is, Is the Bible the word of God? Is testimony from that source to be *relied* upon, as evidence in the case? We all acknowledge that it is. I am not now reasoning with deists and atheists, but with those who believe the Bible to be a revelation from God. This enquiry then is disposed of. Only one more remains. The third enquiry is, What does the Bible teach, in regard to this subject? We then approach the Bible, without any a priori bias *for* or *against* the doctrine in question. If the Bible *teaches* it, we are prepared to *believe* it; if the Bible does *not* teach it, we are prepared to *reject* it. This point established, the question is settled.

And here I cannot but remark, that we all have one common interest, and that is *to know the very truth*. **WHAT DOES THE BIBLE TEACH?** Tell me this, and you tell me what to believe. I would rather be silent in the grave, than speak to divert you from the word of God. O, thou Eternal Jehovah! on whose word is suspended the amazing interests of our immortal being! *to Thee do we come, to seek instruction*. What we know not, teach **THOU** us.

Here then, my hearers, for the present we part, hoping soon to meet again, to give our united attention to the Oracle of God, to hear that speak.

LECTURE II.

DIVINITY OF THE SON AND SPIRIT.

ISAIAH VIII. 20.

“ To the law and to the testimony:”—

MY RESPECTED AND BELOVED HEARERS.—We are all agreed that Jesus Christ possessed a *human* nature, in respect to which he was not simply, *inferior* to the infinite God, but was, like us, a created and dependant being. He was a man. I will not occupy your time in citing passages of Scripture in testimony of this, for I do not suppose that any of you doubt it.

The question at issue is, whether, in *addition* to his human nature, he also possessed a higher or *divine* nature. Trinitarians claim that he did, and this divine nature of Christ, is what they term the *second person*, in the Trinity of God. Having seen that the doctrine of a Trinity, in the being of God, involves nothing absurd, and admitting the Bible to be of divine authority, nothing remains for us to do in settling the question, but to ascertain what the Bible teaches. We will be consistent. If the Bible does *not* teach, that Jesus Christ is God, as well as man, I promise you that I will never preach such a doctrine. If the Bible *does* teach thus, then I will either preach accordingly, or I will reject the divine authority of the Bible, and profess not to “preach the word,” as Paul directs, but the vagaries of my own imagination.

As I am not to presume, that all of my hearers are acquainted with the original languages of the Bible, I will introduce the passages, under the form of the English version; but not without a strict and conscientious attention, to the genuineness, and precise import, of the original text.

Logicians make two kinds of definition, *nominal* and *real*. An object is *nominally* defined, by simply mentioning its *name*. When the object itself is known, and familiarly associated with its name, you have only to mention its name to another, and the object is immediately presented to his mind. When a term is thus used in a plain, unqualified sense, we cannot fail to apprehend the object which it represents, without violating the law of language.

The name by which the Scriptures designated the Supreme Being, is thus applied to Jesus Christ. Take the following instances. Rom. IX. 5. "Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh [i. e. in respect to his human nature] Christ came, who is *over all God* blessed forever." The Greek scholar will perceive, that the phrase, *over-all-God*, is exactly equivalent to the phrase, in English idiom, SUPREME GOD. John I. 1. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, *and the Word was GOD.*" Verse 14. "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." I. John V. 20. "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. *This is the TRUE GOD, and eternal life.*" I. Tim. III. 16. "And without controversy, great is the mystery of Godliness; *GOD was manifest in the flesh.*" This passage has been disputed. Some of the soundest Biblical criticks, such as Professors Knapp of Germany, and Stuart of this country, consider its genuineness as sufficiently attested. John XX. 28. "And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord, and my GOD. Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, *thou hast believed*: blessed are they that have not seen, *and yet have believed.*" Here Christ, instead of reproofing Thomas

for calling him God, or correcting his mistake, as honesty would seem to dictate, if he were not God, *commends his belief*. He even goes farther, and commends *others*, for believing as Thomas did, although they had not seen him. Heb. I. 8. "Unto the Son, he saith, Thy throne, O, GOD, is forever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom."

In the following passages the Greek particle, translated *and*, is equivalent to the English word *even*. As in Eph. V. 20. "Giving thanks always for all things unto God *and* the Father"—unto God *even* the Father, &c. Rom. XV. 6. "That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God *and* the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ"—glorify God *even* the Father, &c. The scholar, who is familiar with the Greek idiom, will recognize this usage. Titus II. 13. "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearance of the *great God*, even our *Saviour Jesus Christ*." The GREAT GOD, whose glorious appearing we are looking for, is none other than Jesus Christ. II. Tim. IV. 1. "I charge thee therefore before *God*, even the *Lord Jesus Christ*, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing." I. Pet. I. 1. "To them that have obtained like precious faith with us, through the righteousness of *God*, even our *Saviour Jesus Christ*." There are other passages of similar import.

So far then as a *nominal* definition can represent an object, the Scriptures represent Jesus Christ as divine. You perceive also, that not only the *name* of the Supreme Being is applied to him, but it is accompanied with the strongest epithets. He is the *great God*, the *true God*, the *supreme God*.

There is only one other form of definition, by which an object can be presented to another mind, and that is what is styled a *real* definition. It consists in specifying the known qualities of the object defined. It is entirely unambiguous, when qualities are specified in an object, which belong to that object, and no other. Thus we define God, in the most unambiguous manner possible, by saying, that he is the Being who

created all things, and is possessed of omnipotent power ; has eternal existence ; is omnipresent and omniscient ; and is entitled to the supreme homage of all accountable creatures. The Being, who possesses these qualities and claims, is God. There is no other being in the universe but he, that does possess them. If, therefore, the Scriptures reveal the *fact*, that Jesus Christ possesses them, they reveal the fact, that he is truly divine.

Let us then proceed to each of these enquiries.

1. Do the Scriptures teach us, that Jesus Christ created all things, and that he is possessed of omnipotent power ?

John I. 1—3. “ In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was, in the beginning with God. *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*” Compare this with Genesis I. 1. where it is said, “ In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.” Heb. I. 10, “ Thou Lord, [Christ] in the beginning, *hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands.*” Col. I. 16. “ By Him [Christ] *were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, principalities, or powers, all things were created by him and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist.*”

In Phil. III. 2. That power is ascribed to Christ, by which *he is able to subdue all things unto himself*—unlimited dominion over all things. Rev. I. 8. “ I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, [Christ] which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.” John V. 21—23. “ For as the Father raiseth the dead, and restoreth them to life, *so also the Son restoreth to life whom he pleases.*” Here precisely the same power is ascribed to the Son, as to the Father.

2. Do the Scriptures ascribe *eternal existence* to Christ ?

I. John I. 2. “ We bear witness, and show unto you, that *Eternal Life*, which was with the Father, and which was man-

ifested unto us." The context shows, that by "*eternal life*," is meant Jesus Christ. Thus the apostle predicates of Christ eternal life, or eternal existence.

In the Apocalypse Christ styles himself the Alpha and the Omega—the first and the last—That is, his existence is antecedent to all other, and will endure forever. He also speaks of the glory, which he had with the Father, *before the world was*. To the caviling Jews, who said that he was not yet fifty years old and could not have seen Abraham, he replied, Verily I say unto you, *before Abraham was, I AM*. He also styled himself the *root*, and the *offspring*, of David;—in his *divine* nature, being *antecedent* to David, and giving birth to his existence; and in his *human* nature, being *subsequent* to David, and descended from his loins. Heb. I, 10—12. "Thou Lord [Christ] in the beginning, hast laid the foundation of the earth," &c. In this passage, the antemundane existence of Christ, is evidently assumed. Heb. I, 8. "Unto the Son, he saith, Thy throne, O God! is forever and ever,—that is, without beginning, and without end.

3. Do the Scriptures teach, that Jesus Christ is omnipresent, and omniscient?

Matt. XVIII. 20. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, *there am I in the midst of them*." Matt. XXVIII. 19—20. "Go ye therefore and teach," &c.—"and lo, *I am with you always, even unto the end of the world*." It has been said, that Christ only meant by this what we mean, when we assure our parting friends, that we shall still be with them in spirit, though absent in body! This is one of those instances of superficial exposition, which rests upon the mere surface of the letter. Christ was to be present with his disciples, in such a manner, as to sustain them in their labors, and take cognizance of all their doings, so as to *judge them at last according to their works*. Are we present with our absent friends in such a manner as this? Rev. II, 3. "All the churches shall know, that *I am he, which searcheth the hearts, and I will give unto every one of you according to his work*." Jesus Christ is then

present with his disciples, in such a manner, as to take exact cognizance of all their conduct, and thus be enabled, as their final Judge, to *give unto every one according to his work*. He has thus given his *own* definition of what he means, by being present with his disciples, and it is too late for us to make another. Now compare this with Jeremiah XVIII. 10. &c. where Jehovah claims it, as his peculiar prerogative, to know the secrets of the human heart. "I, Jehovah, *search the hearts*, I try the reins, even to *give every man according to his ways*." Matt. XI. 27. "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, precisely the same omniscience is ascribed to the Son, as to the Father. Acts I. 24. "They prayed and said, thou Lord, *who knowest the hearts of all men*, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen." John XI. 17. "And he said unto him, Lord, *thou knowest all things*, thou knowest that I love thee." John II. 24—25. "But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, *because he knew all men*; and needed not that any should testify of man, for he *knew what was in man*." John VI. 64. "For Jesus *knew from the beginning* who they were that believed not, and who should betray him."

Christ is to be the final Judge of mankind, and, "is it possible for any being who is not *omniscient*, to judge the universe of intelligent creatures? Can he, for thousands of years, be present every where, and know what is transacted; can he penetrate the recesses of the human heart; can he remember the whole character and actions of countless myriads, so diverse in talents, temper, circumstances and situation; and yet be finite? be neither *omnipresent* nor *omniscient*? God claims it as his distinguishing and peculiar prerogative, that he knows the secrets of the human heart [Jer. XVII. 10.] what then must he be, who knows the secrets of all hearts at all times, and in all worlds. If he be not God, the proof that the Father is God is defective too, and we have the question again to dispute with the Manicheans, whether Jehovah is not a limited

and imperfect being." ["Letters to Rev. Wm. E. Channing on the divinity of Christ by Professor Stuart." See also Biblical Theology by Storr and Flatt, Vol. I, pp. 409—10.]

4. Do the Scriptures exhibit Jesus Christ, as an object of religious worship and homage?

Jehovah is expressly declared, to be the only proper object of all religious worship. The first commandment in the decalogue is, "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me." That is, thou shalt worship no other being in the universe, as God, but me. If then we find in the Bible authority for worshipping Christ, we must infer that he is the "*true God*." Heb. I. 6. "When he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, *Let all the angels of God worship him.*" Gal. I. 5. "To whom [Christ] be glory, forever and ever." John V. 23. That all men should honor the Son, *even as they honor the Father.* Phil. II. 10—11. "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Rev. I. 5—6. "Every creature which is in heaven and in earth, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne *and unto the Lamb.*—Rev. XV. 16. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God, and his Father, *to him be glory and dominion forever and ever.*" Rev. V. 9—14. "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation: and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and

glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, *and unto the Lamb*, forever and ever."

Is it *possible* for language to ascribe divine honor to any being, if this does not ascribe it to Christ?

We have also, unquestionable authority, both from the Scriptures and from Ecclesiastical History, that the apostles, and other primitive christians, worshipped Christ. Acts I. 24. "And they prayed, and said, Thou Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two, thou hast chosen." By Lord here is meant, the Lord Jesus Christ, [see verse 21, &c.] the usual appellation given to Christ, in the book of Acts. Here then is a prayer, offered by the inspired apostles, in reference to a very important event, addressed directly to the Lord Jesus Christ; in which he is acknowledged to *know the hearts of all men*, and in which *his pleasure is consulted*, and *his direction invoked*.

Acts VII. 59—60. "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep." A dying martyr, "filled with the Holy Ghost," with a clear vision of eternity dawning upon his soul, thus addresses his last prayer to the Lord Jesus, and requests him to receive his departing spirit. Let us ponder this well, and consider whether the time may not come, when we too, standing on the borders of the eternal world, may wish to pray as Stephen did.

II. Cor. XII. 8—9. "For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And he said unto me; My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly, therefore, will I rather glory in mine infirmity, that the power of Christ may rest upon me." Here the apostle asserts, that he *repeatedly prayed* to the Lord [Christ, see verse 9,] to be relieved of some infirmity, and

received an answer from him, that his grace should be sufficient for him. He therefore says that he will glory in his infirmity, that the *power of Christ* might rest upon him. Christians are represented in the Scriptures, as those who invoke or worship Christ. See for example I. Cor. I. 2. The passages in which the apostles ascribe divine honor to Christ are numerous. See the following, Rom. I. 7. I. Cor. I. 3. II. Cor. I. 2. I. Thess. III. 11—12. II. Thess. II. 16—17. Acts I. 24. II. Tim. IV. 14—17—18. Acts IX. 14.

Even the heathen observed the fact, that the primitive Christians were in the habit of worshipping Christ. Says Eusebius, in speaking of christians, "Whatever psalms and hymns were composed by faithful brethren, from the beginning, *praise Christ, the word of God.*" [Ecc. Hist. V. 28.] Says Pliny "Carmen, quasi Deo, soliti essent [i. e. Christiani] dicere secum invicem [Lib. 10. Epis. 97.] The translation is thus. "They [Christians] in social worship, sing a hymn to Christ, as God."

The apostolic benediction, as in Cor. XIII. 14. and the doxologies of the christian church, in all ages, ascribe divine honor to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as the eternal Jehovah.

In his *assumed, mediatorial* character, the Son is represented as *inferior* to the Father. [See John XIV. 28.] The following passages exhibit the same sentiment. II. Cor. VIII. 9. "Though rich, for your sakes *he became poor*, that ye through his poverty might be rich." Phil. II. 6, 7, 8. "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be *equal with God*, but *made himself of no reputation*, and 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, even the death of the cross." Now what are we to infer from the scriptural representation, that the Son *humbled himself*, and entered into a condition, in respect to which he was inferior to the Father, if he was *merely a created being*? A *creature* humbling himself, till he became, in his humbled condition, inferior to God! You might

as well say that a drop of water has been diminished, till it is not so large as the ocean! It were more than astonishing, that the inspired writers should have ever informed us that the Son, in his state of humiliation, was *inferior* to the Father, were it not an understood fact, that in his state of primeval glory, he was *equal* to him. It were mockery, to say that the Son humbled himself, by assuming human nature, so that he became, in that condition, inferior to God the Father, if he is *merely* a *created* being. Every *created* being, without taking a single step downward in humiliation, is more diminutive in comparison of Almighty God, than a particle of dust, in comparison of the whole material universe!

“If ye loved me,” says Christ, [John XIV. 28.] “ye would rejoice, because I go to my Father, for my Father *is greater than I*. If ye had disinterested benevolence in respect to me, ye would rejoice, that I am about to terminate my state of humiliation, and resume the glory which I had with the Father before the world was, [John XVII. 5.] for my Father in glory, is in a more exalted condition than I am, while in my present state of humiliation.

Jesus Christ possessed as really a *human*, as a *divine* nature. His *divine* nature was humbled, in respect to its condition, by being associated with a *human* nature. Hence we see the strictest propriety, in the application of the three distinct classes of scripture, which designate Christ. First, those which represent him as a human, finite being, subject to the various wants, and obedient to the duties of a man. Secondly, those which represent him as inferior to God the Father, from the humbled condition of his *divine* nature. Thirdly, those which recognize him in his *divine* nature, in which he is *equal* with the Father; by which he created all things, is omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, and by virtue of which is entitled to the highest homage of all accountable beings forever. Of a truth, the Prophet was not mistaken, [Isaiah IX. 6.] “His name shall be called **WONDERFUL**.”

Some have undertaken to say, that there is a *portion* of divinity in Christ. We might with as much propriety say, that there is a *portion* of God, in this house! God is as truly present in this house, as though it were his only dwelling place; although we are assured, that the heaven, and the heaven of heavens, do not contain him. Why be so slow to learn? Why not perceive and admit the whole obvious truth at once, that God exists in a different *mode* from us; and then we have no difficulty in admitting the revealed fact, that in the Son dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily, [Col. II. 9.] while, as the lofty and eternal One, he fills the high heavens with his presence and glory.

For ought that we know, Jehovah could, if he chose, in the second person of his Trinity, exhibit himself incarnate in all the worlds that he has ever made, at the same time. It might comport both with his own, and the blessedness of his creatures, thus to radiate his glory through the universe, and bring himself down to the apprehensions and the sympathies, of his creatures. Were such at last to appear to have been the fact, what an awful blank is thrown upon the perfections of God, by denying his Trinity, or his power thus to exist, and radiate his glory, through his empire of being! It is enough, however, for us to know, that God has thus developed himself to us; and whether such a developement is a matter of much importance to us, we shall attempt to inquire in our next Lecture.

The *doubtful* passages, in I. John V. 7. Acts XX. 28. Col. II. 3. I have not introduced, because I am unwilling to admit questionable evidence, on so important a subject. I wish to know the exact length, and breadth, and depth, of the foundation, on which I build my eternal hope.

Perhaps some of my hearers are not aware, that every passage in the Bible, has been assailed by scepticks. *Any man can dispute, and deny*; but it requires a *thorough investigator to prove*. In a moment, the "rude hand of licentious criticism," can dash its blot across a passage, that contains some unpalata-

ble truth; but it will require long and laborious research, to restore that passage, by going back to its origin, and demonstrating its claim.

The assaults of scepticks, have turned the attention of learned men, to a thorough examination of the genuineness of every passage in the Bible. The result of this examination, has established those passages, which are *relied* upon, in support of the divinity of Christ, beyond the reach of controversy. The passages just mentioned, are not relied upon; not because they have been proved to be false, but because they have not yet been proved to be true. The examination in respect to them, is not complete. It were irrelevant to this occasion, to present a detail of the evidence, as it now exists, in respect to these passages. I would simply observe, that it is such, that I cannot conceive, how any intelligent mind should venture to pronounce them false; while; at the same time, a cautious mind, that should wish to build its faith on demonstrable evidence, though the evidence *for* these passages, be much greater than that *against* them, would not choose to employ them as proof texts, on so important a subject.

Nor would I have you suppose, because a large number of passages from the Bible have been introduced, in proof of Christ's divinity, that I do not consider *one* as sufficient. A *single* inspired declaration from God, clearly expressed, conveys its contained truth to us, with as much certainty, as a thousand could do it.

Some have objected to the divinity of Christ, because it was not more clearly taught, in the Old Testament. The logic of the argument reads thus, 'It was not clearly taught in the Old Testament, *therefore*, it is not in the New!' And yet, all allow, that it was the very object of the New Testament, to teach additional facts, and throw light upon the Old Testament. To how great an extent the divinity of Christ was revealed to the patriarchs, and ancient saints, it is not important to inquire. How much has been revealed to *us*? is the question.

For the sake of presenting the argument, on this subject, as it exists in my own mind, in its most simple form, I will make the following suppositions. Suppose, first, that no intimation was given to the ancient saints, respecting the divinity of the expected Messiah. They were only taught to worship the One Being, Jehovah, in distinction from the idols of the heathen; and that he had, by some means, placed this sinful world under an economy of mercy, so that all, who repented and became obedient to him, should enjoy his favor. This was as large a measure of revealed knowledge, as was adapted to that age. If their belief and obedience, were commensurate with what was then taught them by God, they exhibited the fruits of a pious temper. They were sound believers.

Suppose again, that when Christ first made his appearance, and called his disciples, he gave them no intimations, respecting the fact under consideration. So there were many *other* facts, respecting himself and his kingdom, which he did not teach them at first. Many began to follow him, with the expectation of receiving the emoluments of an earthly kingdom; nor were they, for a long time, weaned from their carnal hopes, and truly converted to an experimental knowledge and enjoyment of that kingdom, which consists in righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. Christ announced to his disciples, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye *cannot bear them now*. Howbeit when he, the spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." [John XVI. 12—13.]

Suppose again, that after the ascension of Christ, the Holy Ghost, who came to teach what Christ had not taught, and to finish the revelation to man, developed to one of the disciples, the fact of Christ's divinity. Let John, if you please, be the honored one; he was eminently the "beloved disciple." And suppose that he, under guidance of divine inspiration, has, in a passage entirely unambiguous, and above all exception genuine, transmitted this fact to the world. Let that passage be the first in his gospel. John I. 1, 2, 3—14. "In the begin-

ning was the Word, [Logos] and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made. And the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us."

Now it is nothing to the point, whence the origin of the *term*, *Logos*. A whole volume, containing a mere history of the *word*, *Logos*, could do no more, towards determining the qualities of the *object*, to whom the apostle applies it, than the history of the word George, could do, towards determining the qualities of our illustrious Washington, to whom it was applied. The Apostle has himself given an account of the object, to whom he gives this name. 'He was in the beginning with God, and was God, [Implying at once a distinction in the godhead, and the divinity of the *Logos*] all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made, and he became flesh, and dwelt among us.' Here then is a passage, of unquestionable genuineness, whose import is perfectly explicit, and which teaches, as plainly as language can speak, the union of a divine nature, with the human nature, of Jesus Christ.

Suppose now, that this were the *only* passage in the Bible, which teaches this doctrine. If I disbelieve the doctrine, I virtually disclaim all confidence in the plenary inspiration of this Apostle; and not only so, but of all the other Apostles too; for their inspiration is supported by the same authority, which supports the inspiration of John.

On the other hand, as a believer in the revelation from God, I admit that it was given to the "beloved disciple," to make this last and most glorious developement. He turned the last key, and opened the last window of heaven, through which a flood of light pours, and rolls all the way through the revelations of past ages. Passages before obscure, are now rendered obvious. It is now distinctly seen, that the great work of human redemption is achieved by the union of a divine and human nature, in the person of Jesus Christ. "Man that he might suffer, and God that he might redeem," the burden of the prophet's song, and

the long expected Saviour, he now shines forth in full-orbed splendor, the Sun of Righteousness in the heavens. To pretend that the truth does not shine clearly now, because it did not in ages before, were no less preposterous, than to pretend that the Sun does not shine clearly at noon-day, because there was twilight in the morning.

∨The same mode of argument will also apply, to every passage, that ascribes to Christ a single attribute, which belongs exclusively to God. Is Christ declared to possess eternal existence? or omnipotent power? or a title to religious worship? If *either* be true, he must be divine. Do you talk of delegation? What is eternal existence, but that which has no beginning? What is omnipotent power, but that which has no greater? And, as God is true, who can be entitled to religious worship, but he alone?

And now, my hearers, I appeal to your candid judgment. How does the argument stand? If a *single* passage be sufficient to establish the divinity of Christ, and if the inherent possession of *one* divine attribute, is proof of the same, what shall we say, in view of *all* the passages, which we have cited, in proof of this doctrine; and in view of the fact, that all the attributes, which the scriptures ascribe to God, they ascribe to Jesus Christ; and many of them in language repeated over and over again?

Shall we admit that the Bible really teaches the Deity of Jesus Christ, or shall we deny it?

- THE HOLY SPIRIT.

We will next enquire, what the Scriptures teach us, respecting the divinity and personality of the Holy Spirit.

That the Holy Spirit is truly divine, is taught in passages like the following. Acts V. 3—4. "Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?—Thou hast not lied unto man, but unto God." By lying unto the Holy Ghost, he lied unto God. I. Cor. III. 16. "Know ye not that ye are the temples of God? and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?"

For the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." Because the Holy Spirit dwelleth in them, they are the temples of God. The Holy Spirit is possessed of *omnipotent power*. I. Cor. III. 8—11. "For to one is given, by the Spirit, the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge, by the same Spirit; to another faith, by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing, by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another diverse kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues; *but all these worketh that one and the self same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.*" Here the Holy Spirit is represented, as conferring a large variety of stupendous gifts and powers, and performing, at his will, those acts, which none but omnipotency can perform.

The Holy Spirit is *omniscient*. I. Cor. II. 10—11. "But God hath revealed them unto us, by his Spirit; for the Spirit *searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God*. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man, which is in him? Even so, the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." That is, no finite mind knows God perfectly, being unable to explore the deep recesses of his being; but the Holy Ghost does, *because he sees and knows all things*. "The Spirit discerns all things, even the secret purposes of God. The whole passage, from v. 9—13." says Morus, "attributes to the Spirit, 'Scire consilia Dei, ei soli nota, aliis omnibus utique ignota'—that is, "to know those counsels of God, which are known only to God, and are unknown to all others."

The Holy Spirit is also *eternal* in his existence. Heb. IX. 14. "Who, through the eternal Spirit offered himself." That is, through the Spirit, *whose existence is eternal*.

The Holy Ghost is exhibited, as an object of our religious worship; and that too, in the very same language, which is the vehicle of worship paid to the Father, and the Son. Matt. XXVIII. 19. "Go, ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy

Ghost." Thus, the religion which Christ commissioned his disciples to teach, recognizes, in its formula of christian baptism, the same divine homage, as due to the Holy Ghost, as to the Father and the Son. So also does the Apostolic benediction, which includes the Holy Ghost, with the Father and the Son, as a source of divine blessings. II. Cor. XIII. 14. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all."

The passages, in which the divinity of the Spirit is *implied*, are dispersed throughout the Bible. To be satisfied of this, the Greek and Hebrew scholar, may consult Wahl's *Lexicon of the New Testament*, and Gesenius', or Gibbs', of the *Old Testament*, in reference to this word.

Indeed, I am not aware, that the simple *divinity* of the Spirit, is seriously disputed by any. The only question is, whether there is that *kind of distinction*, between the Holy Spirit, and the Father, and the Son, which is claimed in the Trinity.— Whether the Holy Spirit is only *figuratively*, a divine *act*; or *really*, a divine *existence*;—not simply the existence of a divine *act*, but of a divine *agent*, which *does* act. Thus, when the Scriptures inform us, that God sends forth his Spirit, do they mean that he sends forth his *act*, simply; or something that *acts*? So when Christ informed his disciples, that the Holy Ghost should come, in his stead, to teach them, did he mean, that simply the *act* of God should come to teach them, or a *real agent*; which agent is divine, as we have seen, and is recognized by Trinitarians, under the appellation of the *third person*, in the Trinity?

That this kind of distinction does really exist, between the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, is conclusively taught, as I should suppose, in passages like the following. Matt. XII. 31. "Wherefore, I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son

of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Here the sentiment is manifestly inculcated, that there is a sense, in which one may commit sin against Jehovah, in the person of the Holy Ghost, in which sense he does not sin against him, in the person of the Son. Is there not then a real distinction between them? So Mark III. 28—29. "All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies, wherewith they shall blaspheme; but he that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness."

John XIV. 26. "But the Comforter [monitor, teacher] which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance." I am going from you, says Christ, but the Father will send the Holy Ghost, in my stead, to teach you. Is not the Holy Ghost then, most evidently, in some sense, really distinct from both the Father and the Son? Can any thing be *more* evident, than that such is the fact? John XV. 26. "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you, even the Spirit of truth, [the true Spirit] which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me."—Is not the same fact taught in this passage, as explicitly as language can do it? So again John XVI. 13. "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth."

The same kind of distinction is also clearly implied, between the Father and the Spirit, as between the Father and the Son, in the Apostolic benediction; and also in the final commission of Christ to his disciples, "Go disciple all nations, baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

On this article, I need not be tedious. If you admit the peculiarity, in the mode of God's existence, which recognizes the distinction, in respect to the Father and the Son, you will readily admit the same, in respect to the Father and the Holy Spirit.

I have thus, my hearers, by your kind attention, been permitted to exhibit to you, summarily, though I fear too imperfectly, the reasons for my belief, in the divinity of the Son and Spirit. So I believe, because I am thoroughly convinced, after the most candid and faithful examination, of which I am capable, that so the Scriptures teach.

A Trinity in the godhead, is a fact to be settled, only by the testimony of God himself. Every man knows, or may know, that it is a fact entirely *beyond* the reach of objection, and entirely *within* the reach of evidence. What then is the evidence? is the simple enquiry. Taunting sneers, and empty cavils, and artful caricatures, bestowed upon the Trinity, and other doctrines, in connexion with it, may serve, for a time, to prejudice and to bewilder, even sober and candid minds;—they may also afford amusement to thoughtless minds, though applied to the great and dreadful God;—they may answer well for declamation, and serve to help out a fine rhetorical flourish;—but they cannot *satisfy* the mind, which is *really in earnest to know the truth*. That mind will soon have learned, that the mode of God's existence is as high above us, as the heavens are above the earth; and that to affect to assail it, in this way, is only shooting straws into the sky.

What *do* we know, and what do we *not* know, respecting God, is still the question. Blot out every sentence, that ever declaimed upon the *mode* of his being, and you blot out just every sentence, that is good for nothing. All that is written upon this, or can be written, will soon pass into oblivion, with the dreams of the alchymist.

And even respecting the naked *fact*, of either a Unity, or a Trinity, in the being of God, all nature is mute. From one end of the earth to the other, and through all the starry heavens, there is silence. *How shall this silence be broken?* BY THE ORACLE OF GOD. The divine Oracle must speak, and we have only to hear. Only let a submissive will, and a docile temper, combine with an enlightened mind, to apply the

laws of sound interpretation to the Word of God, and the truth is settled.

I am fully aware that the Bible, like every other book, is susceptible of abuse. A sportive and wanton criticism, by violating the laws of a rational exegesis ; by taking passages out, from their scope and connexion ; by placing those that are plain, by the side of those that are figurative ; by being more in haste to explain away the Bible, than to unfold its true contents ; can, insidiously and plausibly, annihilate its legitimate import ; or make it mean any thing, and every thing, at pleasure. So ascendant is the will, in the human mind ; so effectually is it the prime and commanding organ of the soul's activity ; that he, who is *determined* not to believe a given truth, can always find plausible means to escape it.

His *responsibility* for so doing, is thrown by God upon himself, and he alone must sustain it. As a moral agent, his will is, and must be, free ; and for a right use of that, he is responsible to the Being who made it ;—and hence his moral obligation to believe. If he refuse testimony from God, not because it is not sufficiently evinced, but because he does not choose to receive it, he denies the power of a moral legislation over him, and virtually disclaims allegiance to heaven. He is a wandering star.

After all, such manœuvring with the Bible, though it may for a time *obscure*, cannot ultimately *destroy*, the testimony. Show me fairly, by the application of a candid and faithful exposition, that not one, of all the passages in the Word of God, inculcates the divinity of the Son and Spirit, and I have done with the doctrine forever. Show me fairly, by the application of the same, that one passage, and only one, if you please, of unquestionable genuineness, does teach it ; and, as sure as I am a sound and consistent believer in the revelation from God, I believe the doctrine. So long as I hold "*to the law and to the testimony,*" as divine authority, I hold to all therein contained. Is not this consistent ? I *profess* to build on this foundation, and on it I *do* build. If any think they have

a *better* foundation than this, to build upon for eternity, doubtless they will build upon it. But then let them not *profess* to build on this; when, *in fact*, they are building on something else. Let the truth appear, just as it is, and then all will be open and fair. Nobody will be deceived.

The doctrine contemplated stands alone, in lofty and independent grandeur, upon its own foundation, as God has laid it. It were the boldest arrogance, to attempt to alter its foundation an atom, for the better. Both they, who attempt to make it broader, and they, who attempt to make it narrower, are laboring in vain. It invites *no* human hand, to make it stronger; it defies *all* human hands, to make it, in fact, weaker.

Grateful for your patient hearing, thus long, I now leave the simple testimony, to your own disposal. A solicitous and affectionate regard to the immortal welfare of those to whom I minister, compels me to hope, that you will, at least, give to this subject, a prayerful and earnest attention. You *will* acknowledge, I know you will, that it is a subject of momentous interest.

Eternity is at hand. If there be any thing for us to know, respecting the Eternal God, and our various relations to him, and his kingdom, we wish to know it. What knowledge *can* be important to us, *if this be not*? On a subject like this, I will not, I *cannot*, dispute, or contend, a moment, with a handful of dust, that is soon to sleep by my side, in the grave. Peacefully shall we slumber together there, "where the weary are at rest," till the sound of the trumpet awake us; and we are summoned to appear before the enthroned Judge, whose Deity is now questioned! Remembering this, I am awed to silence—I would rather learn, than teach—I would rather hear, than speak.

LECTURE IV.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE DOCTRINE.

I. THESS. V. 21.

“Hold fast that which is good;”—

MY RESPECTED AND BELOVED HEARERS.—The way to obtain sound knowledge is plain. First, enquire what *is* supported, by good evidence, and what *is not*. Then, what *is not* thus supported, give to the winds. It is chaff. What *is* thus supported, “hold fast.” It is sound knowledge.

The mind that acts otherwise, in any department of learning, is always in a fog. It sees many things obscurely, and nothing clearly. It sees just enough, to make objections to the opinions of others; but not enough, to prove its own,—if indeed it have any to prove. Hence it is, that those who deal much in misrepresentation of *other's* views, furnish alarming proof of the unsoundness of their *own*. They can tell, most roundly, what they do NOT believe, (who can't?) but can they tell what they DO believe?—and prove that their belief, if they have any, is *supported by evidence*?

Negatives are cheap. On some subjects, they may answer; but in the kingdom of religion, they are insufficient. The undying spirit must have something, other than negatives, on which to repose its immortal treasure. Has God made a revelation to me? If so, what does it teach? Here, I cannot be put off, by simply being told, that it does *not* teach this thing—or that thing—or another.—All is well so far, if you make it

appear. But when you are fairly through, with telling me, what it does *not* teach, I expect you to tell me, what it *does*. A revelation from God, must certainly teach *something*;—and something *important* too. What *is* it? I am not half so anxious, to know what it is *not*, as I am to know what it *IS*.

Can you produce unquestionable testimony from the Bible, that he, who was in the beginning with God, and was God; who created all things, and without whom nothing was made, that was made, became flesh and dwelt among us?—and is Jesus Christ the object intended? Then you tell me of one thing, that is taught in the Bible;—and that is, the *supreme divinity of Jesus Christ*. You have produced the evidence, and the fact is proved. I shall ‘hold it fast;’—*just as fast as I hold the Bible*. I cannot let it go, without virtually disclaiming allegiance to all *other* testimony from the same source. I cannot then advance a step, in proving from the Bible. Even the immortality of my soul, is uncertain. I have, in principle, *taken leave* of the testimony of God.

This may not, at first, be apparent to all. While I am yet standing near the point of divergency, multitudes may incautiously follow me, because they see not the *end*, from the beginning. I have left the testimony of God, and planted my foot upon wave; and whither that wave will finally conduct me, is all uncertain. I am tossing upon a sea of dreams, and conjectures; and may soon be driven into the regions of a more dark and cheerless infidelity; unless, awakened betimes to my mistake, I am induced to return, and plant my foot, and fasten my faith, on the **FIRM WORD**, of Jehovah.

It appears, therefore, that were the contemplated doctrine an apparently *isolated* fact, in the revelation from God; as a fact, therein clearly taught, I hold it, as firmly as I hold the Bible.

I have premised the foregoing, that you may understand, distinctly, that we are not under necessity, as has been stated, of resorting to *ex-consequentia*, and collateral proof, for support of this doctrine. Be it known forever, that it stands alone, entire and erect, upon its own foundation, which God has laid for it, in Zion.

I propose, in the present Lecture, to contemplate some of its relative bearings; not for the purpose of *proving* it to your *faith*, (though proof, indirect, it certainly is,) but for the purpose of *commending* it to your *reception*. I wish all to know, that we are not herein, simply impelled to "hold fast, that which we" *must*; but invited to "hold fast, that which is GOOD."

It is the sublime purpose of the christian religion, to arrest the soul, in its progress to ruin,—to renovate its moral character,—to make it happy, by making it holy. The Omniscient, who penetrates its wondrous mechanism, knows the nature of the power, requisite to act upon it. Such a power, to be wielded by his Spirit, he has provided, in the gospel of Christ. Accordingly we find, that when this gospel is received, in its original, unmarred, simplicity and purity, applied by the Holy Ghost, it arrests the soul; liberates it from the dominion of sin; turns it to God; conducts it upward, from carnal to spiritual joys; and sends it at last from earth, triumphantly to heaven.

But no sooner do you *remove* any portion, of what is included in the gospel, than you endanger the salvation of the soul, upon which it is designed to act. It acts upon it with diminished power. Its legitimate capability is reduced, and the cause rendered inadequate to the intended effect.

It were presumption to aver, that God *cannot* make, even a *portion* of his truth, however small, effect the renovation, and salvation, of the soul; but we are certain, that such is not his constituted mode of operation. In the kingdom of grace, as well as of nature, there is a provident adaptation of means to ends. Where a whole gospel is *given*, a whole gospel must be *received*; or, the infidelity which denies a part, will render powerless the rest. The gospel, *just as God gave it*, is the power of God, and the wisdom of God, for salvation, to every one that believeth. To refine upon it, is to refine upon fine gold. Why so slow to learn, that God is wiser than man? Have we not heard, that the "wisdom of this world, is foolishness with God;" and that the "foolishness of God, is wiser than man?" [I. Cor. I. 25.]

Were this doctrine, therefore, among the *minor* things of the gospel; it were hazardous to annihilate its relative bearings, in the complex system of revealed truth. How then does the urgency of its demand accumulate upon us, on perceiving, that its obvious relative importance is such, that our reception or rejection of it, is calculated to essentially modify, all that appertains to our religious faith and practice.

1. *Our views of the christian atonement.* Is the Lord Jesus Christ a *merely created* being? Then, his sufferings and death are, in no essential respect, different from those of *other* religious teachers, and martyrs. He died, in testimony of the religion which he taught, and so did Stephen, and Paul, and Peter. He taught men to repent and love God, and so did they. He told men, that he was divinely commissioned to teach thus, and so did they. And finally, in proof of his sincerity, and his divine mission, he laid down his life in the cause; *and so did they.* Where then is that *peculiarity*, in the sufferings and death of the Son of God, so repeatedly and urgently claimed, throughout the Bible?

But when you contemplate the Lord Jesus Christ, as possessed of true divinity; then, you appreciate something, in his sufferings and death, infinitely diverse, both in character and importance, from any thing, in those of every other being, that has ever lived and died in this world. You behold "God manifest in the flesh," *suffering* as the *man*, Christ Jesus; but *enduring* his suffering, as the MIGHTY GOD.

This peculiarity, in the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, is exhibited in the Scriptures, as the *essential thing*, which constitutes the atonement for sin. In the cross of Christ, as an affecting expression of the evil of sin, is furnished a power of motive to obedience, which binds the obedience of the holy, and invites the penitence of the guilty, while mercy forgives and saves. Say you, that God can command obedience, *without* an atonement? How do you know that? Do you not know, that God's government is a *moral* government;—a government sustained by the power of *motives*? Do you know, that myriads, now obedient, might not fall from their allegiance

to heaven, were this expression of the evil of sin removed, or diminished, while mercy is bestowing pardon? Do you *know* this? If not, then, as a wise man, never again say, that a God of love can forgive sin, without an atonement. Never again say, that the grand peculiarity in the cross of Christ, which was to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness, [I. Cor. I. 23.] is an unnecessary intruder, into the sublime system of God's moral administration.

It is this, that sustains the sanction of God's law, while his mercy pardons the guilty penitent. It is this, that shall make heaven and earth to know, that Justice and Mercy, are enthroned, in glorious union, on high. It is this, that imparted inspiration to passages, like the following,—“For he hath made him to be sin, [a sin offering] for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” I. Cor. V. 21. “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.” Gal. III. 13. “Christ our passover, is sacrificed for us.” I. Cor. V. 7. “Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, [propitiatory sacrifice] through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past.” Rom. III. 25. “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” John I. 29. “Who his own self bear our sin, in his own body, on the tree.” I. John I. 7. “We have redemption through his blood.” Eph. I. 7. “He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquity, the chastisement of our peace is upon him, and by his stripes we are healed.” Isaiah LIII. 5—6.—It is this, that exhibits the sufferings and death of Christ, as furnishing the antitype to all the expiatory offerings, and sacrifices, of the Jews, which, we are informed, were typical of that one great offering of Christ, by which he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. [Heb. X.]

2. *Our estimation of the love of Christ, as manifested in his sufferings and death.* Is he a mere creature? What so distinguished an act of kindness in him, to lay down his life, to establish his religion, and confirm the faith of his disciple? Have not hundreds of others done the same? It was only

travelling up, from obscurity and reproach, into distinction and glory. Before his suffering, he was an obscure man. His name was scarcely known, even in Palistine. But after it, and by it, he was exalted to immortal praise. His name was proclaimed over the earth, as Lord and King; and sent in triumph, through coming ages, down to the end of time. How many, think you, from the long catalogue of earthly ambition, would rejoice to procure to themselves an immortality, in the same way?

Is Christ truly divine?—and as such, has he dwelt from eternity, in the effulgence of Heaven's glories? Then, indeed, we appreciate his exhibition, of condescending, and amazing, love for us. Then, he appears, not as one travelling UP, into a before unpossessed greatness, and glory; but as one travelling DOWN from the glory, which he had with the Father, before the world was, [John XVII. 5.] into obscurity, shame, suffering, and death. Then, you understand what is intended, by the declaration, that THOUGH RICH, for our sake, he BECAME POOR. Then, you perceive a *meaning* in those passages of Scripture, which represent the love of Christ towards this world, as infinitely surpassing all earth-born affection. It is, then, that the love of Christ *constraineth* us.

3. *Our estimation of the love of God the Father, in giving his Son to die for us.* Is Christ a mere creature? Then, I cannot perceive any so distinguished an act of kindness, on the part of God the Father, in giving him to die. Thousands of his creatures, he has given to die, for a far less object than this.

Is Christ truly divine? Then, we perceive a most illustrious meaning, in the declaration, that God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. [John III. 16.] God may declare to us, in language a thousand times repeated, that he loves us, and desires our salvation; but never does he make so perfect a demonstration of his unspeakable love, as when for our sake, he gives his glorious Son, to become incarnate, like us, for the suffering of death. [Heb. II. 9.] Here then is love, not that we loved God, but that *he loved us*, and sent his Son, to be the propitiation for our sins. [I. John IV. 10.]

I know we are told, by some, that it were *injustice* in God, to give an innocent being, to suffer for the good of the guilty. But where did they learn this? Surely not in the school of *analogy*. They read not this in *nature's* book. Injustice or not, it is a matter of *fact*, that he does thus, the world over. And certain we are, that they never learned it from the Bible.

We must remember, that Christ was *willing* to suffer. He *chose* to do it. Possessed of true divinity, he was possessed of *divine benevolence*. He saw, that by a temporary humiliation and suffering, in his illustrious personage, substituting, it may be, the *character* of the sufferer, for the *amount* of suffering, he could impart that impress to moral motive, and that sanction to the law of Heaven, which must otherwise be imparted, by the eternal suffering of all the redeemed. He could thus save an amazing amount of woe! He could sustain the existing motives to obedience, on the minds of all voluntary agents, and thus bind their allegiance to the Eternal Throne, in the very act, by which he opened the gates of heaven, to guilty millions; and invited them to repent, and enter in.—What tongue shall ever fully announce, the unspeakable glory of the cross of Christ, when thus beheld? Through all heaven it radiates, so resplendent, and dazzling, that even angels are startled at the sight; and uttering their thrill of joy, “strike a new note in bliss.”

Was it then injustice in the Father, to give his Son to die thus, for man's of redemption? *Injustice!* It was the highest conceivable act of *kindness*. It was *love*—love everlasting, and as high as heaven—in the Father, to *give* his Son to die, as it was also in the Son, to be *willing* to die; not, as slander will have it, to *make* the Father *merciful!* but to remove every obstacle, in the *way* of his mercy; that it may burst forth, from its everlasting fountain, and roll down to earth, to bless and to save repenting sinners.

4. *Our view of the evil of sin, and consequent inducement to repent.* Our view of the evil of sin, as expressed by the suffering of Christ, is measured by our estimate of the personage, who suffered. A small evil costs but a small sacrifice.

Is Christ a *mere creature*! Then, I cannot see that his humiliation, suffering, and death, on account of sin, has made an adequate expression of its guilt. I cannot feel, that the transgression of the law is, indeed, a crime worthy of the sanction ordained by heaven, when the temporary suffering of a *mere creature*, can sustain that sanction.

But do I contemplate the Lord Jesus Christ, as a Being divinely glorious? Do I regard him, as "God manifest in the flesh?" Does the Eternal, thus lay aside his glory, descend and veil himself in humanity, submit to death, even the death of the cross, before a sin can be forgiven? How great then its evil! And has the Lord of glory suffered thus for sin?—For *my* sin? *Then shall my soul abhor it!* I will be CRUCIFIED with Christ. When I would fasten the sentiment, with indelible impress, on my heart, that sin is the abominable thing, which God hateth; when I would discover the dreadful guilt of the soul, which loves it; when I would hear the MIGHTY ELOQUENCE OF GOD, pleading against it; then, let me look, and behold the Lamb of God, expiring for it, on the cross!

Did any of you hear it whispered, that a view of the expiatory sufferings and death of Christ for sin, is calculated to *diminish* the motive to a virtuous and holy life? What a libel, on both the *wisdom* of God, and the *character* of man! I confess, brethren, I had never dreamed that man was so depraved as this. I know not how far mercenary spirits may be impelled, in a line of ostensive obedience, by a cringing fear of penalty, or prospect of reward; but this I do know, that an appeal of unmerited kindness, made directly to the moral sympathies of the soul, is the most powerful and prevalent appeal, that is ever made. And I had never expected, that the same lips, which disclaim depravity in man, should also deny him the possession of even one chord, in his soul, to vibrate to an appeal of *love*! *And such an appeal!* This were depravity with a witness. The man, who has nothing in his soul, to respond to an act of kindness, is not only destitute of holiness, but, it would seem, of even the moral elements, from which holiness can be formed. Such an one would seem to be, not

only an *entire* sinner, but a *hopeless* one. If any moral motive *can* sway the heart, it is *love*, making a sacrifice for our good. Talk to me of penalty and reward, still my sin is sweet, and I will not let it go. But tell me its evil is so great, that it cost the sacrifice of the Son of God; and that God so **LOVED** me, as to give his only begotten Son, to die for my redemption;—tell me this, and my soul shall vibrate in a moment. This, this is argument, that I cannot resist. It is the argument of **CHRIST CRUCIFIED!** I will forsake my sin, and bind myself in eternal allegiance to God. If I do not, then, know that *other* motives come in vain.

5. *Our view of what is implied, by faith in Christ.* Is Christ our Redeemer, *simply* as our Teacher, and Exemplar? Then, faith in him, is a simple belief, that he is such; and *as such*, is entitled to our obedience.

Is he also our Redeemer, as the eternal Word incarnate, for the suffering of death, to make expiation for sin? Then, faith in him, is not simply a *belief*, that he is our teacher, and exemplar; but also a cordial *reliance* on his atoning sacrifice, as the ground of our pardon. Here is the foundation, that is laid, which is Jesus Christ; other than which, no man can lay; [I. Cor. III. 11.] on which immortal hope is built. Resting here, the troubled conscience finds sweet repose. Here, is the full significance of *Christ Crucified*.—Here, is seen the bow of promise, encircling the cross,—hope springs up afresh,—day dawns, and the day star arises, in the heart,—gratitude to God begins to burst forth, in spontaneous tribute, from the soul,—heaven is now begun, and its everlasting song commences, “**THOU WAST SLAIN, AND HAST REDEEMED US TO GOD, BY THY BLOOD.**” [Rev. V. 9.]

I might proceed, to notice several other particulars; in which, our religious views, and consequently, our religious character, will be seriously affected, by receiving, or rejecting, the divinity of Christ;—and also the same, in respect to the divinity, and personal agency, of the Holy Spirit. But neither does time permit, or necessity require it. Enough has been said, to evince the important relative bearings, of the doctrine under consideration.

A mere abstract belief, of the *trinity* of God, is, doubtless, of as little avail, as a mere abstract belief, of the *ubiquity* of God. But the *fact implied*, is of momentous importance.—That fact, is the supreme divinity, of the eternal Son, and Spirit; imparting all that is most peculiar, heavenly, and sublime, in the glowing image of the revealed religion.

Go, take down yonder Sun from the skies, and persuade me, that this world has as much light and heat, as before; then, may you remove this Moral Sun from my soul, and persuade me, that I have lost nothing!

The question at issue results, ultimately, in this,—Whether the revealed religion, is seriously a thing of great IMPORTANCE, or whether it is NOT;—Whether this world is really in a state of sin, and condemnation, such as to need an economy dispensing redemption, and mercy; or whether, such is our condition, that of redemption and mercy, we have little need;—Whether the gospel of Christ is, indeed, the *power* of God, and the *wisdom* of God, *for our salvation*; or whether our salvation is tolerably secure without it, and this is the language of hyperbole;—Whether there has been a mighty movement, on the part of God, in our behalf; so as to authorize and awaken a corresponding movement, on our part; or whether God has done but *little* for us, and expects but little, in return; Whether, in short, subjective religion, is little else than a *refined indulgence of the “lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, and the pride of life;”* or whether it is man, in the genuine dignity of rational, immortal being, with soul erect, and treasures in heaven, building a pillar of golden thought from earth, up to the throne of God.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

The human mind is of delicate construction. So nicely poised are the various parts of its complicated mechanism, that, unless applied to the materials of thought, with cautious and even action, it loses its exact balance, and becomes, in a measure, incapable of appreciating evidence. The imagination, or the will, or some other faculty, assumes an undue ascendancy;

and the mind thus learns to doubt, where it ought to believe, and to believe, where it ought to doubt.

Regardless of this, many employ their minds, as though they were *incapable* of receiving injury. They neither exercise discretion, in the *selection* of subjects, adapted to their stage of mental maturity; nor caution, in conducting the *examination* of them. They throw their minds, at random, upon every subject, that happens to come in their way; but allow them to bear, with steady and patient action, upon none. They will even sometimes plunge headlong, into the midst of elements, in which they are incompetent to move, entirely regardless of harm.

In conducting the examination of subjects, they fear not an unseasonable encounter, with all *imaginary*, as well as real obstructions, in the way of evidence. How many thus spend their days, in fighting a shadow!—They look at it, till it becomes a real monster, filling their whole vision. If they cannot *hit* it, they can *see* it; and it hides solid facts completely from their sight. They thus learn to cavil and resist evidence, where they ought to employ patient investigation.

It is painful to observe, that any thing like this, should have ever found admission into the sacred enclosures of religion. Subjects, involving the eternal interests of men, are of too momentous importance, to be thus treated. They claim, urgently claim, a cautious, sober, and thorough attention. In disposing of such subjects, to first 'prove all things;' and then, to 'hold fast that which is good,' is no less obedience to sound wisdom, than to a divine precept.

Perhaps no habit of mind is more distant from the spirit of this precept, than that of forever ruminating apparent objections. With more or less of them, every subject, in the kingdom of morals and of general science, is fraught; and it becomes an important part of our moral discipline, to hold the mind in defiance of them, in a posture of sober enquiry, until it sees the truth established, whatever it be, on a basis of solid evidence.

If, in the beginning of any enquiry, an objection to a claimed position is presented, demonstrably valid, the enquiry is done

at once. Truth and the objection are on the same side. Evidence to the contrary, exists only in appearance. But if the objection is *incapable* of being proved valid—if it is only an obtruding *may-be*,—then, the mind should turn away from it, to a thorough examination, and a candid estimation, of the *evidence* of the claimed position. If this is found conclusive, the claim of the objection is annihilated; and it should be cast forever from the mind. It existed, not to *destroy evidence*, but to discipline the moral virtues of the soul, in its pursuit of the truth. That soul alone is truly virtuous and noble, that marches *through* such obstructions to the truth; and then seizes and holds it, with an entire and eternal grasp. Such a soul evinces *character*, such as heaven approves and loves.

Should an apparent objection be perpetually obtruding itself on the attention, examine it. Scrutinize it narrowly. Know definitely what it is—its nature—its amount—so as to be able to appreciate its exact relative weight, if it have any, against resisting evidence. Know then, that an objection, which lies wholly in our ignorance of *modes*, is *just nothing*. It cannot weigh a feather, against evidence; for real evidence, when weighed against it, is the preponderance of *knowledge*, against *ignorance*. What *may be*, cannot annihilate what *is*. What we do NOT know, can never disprove what we DO know.

Now, directly to the subject in hand.—Suppose that one could hold his mind, for a considerable time, upon an abstract enquiry into the mode of the divine omnipresence.—‘A Being present, in every point of the universe, at the same moment! Occupying this single place, in the perfection of his being, and yet filling heaven, and the heaven of heavens! How can this be!’ He would soon begin to doubt the *fact*, were it not for the impossibility, of his long abstracting his mind thus, from the *evidence* of the fact. The evidence of the divine omnipresence, is *also* in this single place, and in every place.—Every object, which his eye does or can behold, in the universe, is a perpetual mirror, reflecting the image of God; and he must see it. He is, therefore, by his inability to escape the

evidence, compelled to believe the *fact*, of God's omnipresence, although he cannot perceive the *mode* of it.

Suppose again, that one suffer his mind to dwell exclusively on the difficulty of conceiving of the mode of the soul's existence, after death. The body is disorganized, and has returned to dust. All that constituted the living, acting man, seems to be lost. 'What can remain? Any thing? How can this be?' He begins to doubt the *fact*; and if he hold his mind long in this posture, he will doubt in good earnest. Many have done so, until they have actually doubted their immortality!

But here comes an important auxiliary to evidence. He *wishes* for immortality. He does not therefore dismiss the subject rudely, because of an apparent difficulty, for he has an agreeable interest involved in it. He therefore looks for evidence of the fact of his immortality, and finds it in the Word of God. In this article, he is willing to receive testimony from that source; and concludes to accredit the *fact* of his future existence, although he knows nothing respecting the *mode* of it.

Suppose again, that one hold his mind in exclusive attention to the mode of the fact, implied in the Trinity of God. 'How is this? *I* do not exist in this mode; how then can God!' He hesitates;—but ah! here the truth labors. Its evidence wants its auxiliary. He does not, as before, *wish* the fact true. His prejudice is, from various causes, set against it. Perhaps he does not like to renounce his "cast." He therefore still ponders the difficulty, and begins to be sure it is valid. In the mean-time, the *proof* of the fact is out of his sight. It is enclosed in the Bible. He has also heard something about interpolations, and ambiguous readings; and though they all amount, in sober fact, to the merest trifle, yet, every dust thrown into the scale, where the will and the prejudice lie, weighs a mountain. He soon becomes certain—*very* certain—that the doctrine of the Trinity, is fraught with insuperable objection. 'It is unreasonable! Absurd! A relic of dark ages! No *enlightened* mind will believe it!'

Now, go to that man with your 'testimony.' Open to him the Bible, and read, that 'Christ is the *supreme God, the true God,*

the *great God*; that he made all things, and without him nothing was made, that is made; that angels and arch-angels, in the high heavens, cast their crowns at his feet, and worship him.'—Read to him all this, in language as plain as ever dropped from the pen of inspiration; and what have you accomplished? 'O, it cannot be true! It were absurd to suppose it! That language *must* mean *something else*—or, it ought not to be there!' Convince that man by testimony from the Bible? He is convinced already. It is *too late* for God to teach him, for he *knows* better. He is determined to see but *just one thing*, and that is his *objection*. He is holding an opaque body directly before his eyes; and he cannot see the sun, although it is pouring its beams all around him.

Excepting, in this connexion, those, who seem not to think at all—who appear little else than mere masses of physical organization, that just live and breathe;—and, excepting those who, spending their whole lives in a restless fever of worldly cares and pleasures, never lift their souls calmly upward to God; or send a solicitous thought onward, to the rolling ages of their eternal being;—and excepting also those, whose minds seem only to *respond*—whose sentiments are the mere echo of the sentiments of others;—passing by all these, and contemplating individuals of character, intelligence, sound judgment, in many other matters, and sober thinkers upon the great truths of revealed religion; we may perceive the action of two causes, even in the minds of such, conspiring to resist the revealed fact, under consideration. The first, a habit of ruminating upon the *mode* of it, to the neglect of the positive evidence of its *existence*,—the second, an undue, (and perhaps unconscious) ascendancy of the will,—antipathy, of some sort, resisting the power of evidence.

Remove these, and every mind which admits that the Bible teaches the immortality of the soul, would also admit, that it teaches the supreme divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. For, every difficulty in the way of the admission of the one fact, resulting from ignorance of its *mode*, lies equally in the way of the other fact. So far then, their claims to our credence are

equal. But the passages of Scripture, of unquestionable genuineness, and unambiguous import, that explicitly inculcate the Deity of Jesus Christ, are more numerous than those, that inculcate the immortality of the soul. This is fact. If any doubt it, let them dismiss from their minds, all that is contingent to the fact in question, and give themselves to a thorough examination of the Bible, in reference to this individual point, and see if it is not so.

To deny that this fact is taught in the Bible, would seem then to imply some jar in the mind, when undertaking to act upon this subject. It would seem that the balance of the soul is lost, by some violence offered to that law of its accountable being, which demands the belief of a moral truth, when commended by evidence. On other subjects, the man may reason profoundly, and where he has examined, and I have not, I may be grateful for his opinion, and confide more in it than in my own. But on *this* subject, he demonstrates that his judgment is unsound. This he does, by assuming to *know*, where it is certain that he is *ignorant*; and resisting evidence to a fact, on the strength of his ignorance, when the testimony of the Word of God to the fact, is full and explicit. Here, then, I must take a respectful leave of his opinion, and confide in the 'testimony,' remembering my individual responsibility to God. My immortal interest demands it.

Still he is my friend, and still do I owe him all the duties of social and religious life. If he fall within the compass of my ministration, duty and love to him, shall still make me faithful to preach to him, as I receive it from the Bible, the pure and the entire gospel of Christ. "Charity," which is only another name for benevolence, which "rejoiceth in the TRUTH,"—which faithfully seeks the ultimate good of its object, even at the expense of declaring the *truth*, whatever it be;—Charity, which should induce me to seek *him*, and not *his*—his eternal interest, rather than his applauding breath—should make me faithful to declare to him the "whole counsel of God," whether he will hear, or whether he will forbear. If he forbear that same Charity, which "hopeth all things, and never fail-

eth," shall still sustain my hope, and my unflinching effort, in respect to him, as long as we exist together, in a world of probation;—and if he go down into the dark valley before me, I will follow him, even there, holding the light of the glorious gospel, till I see him tremble on the point where the two worlds meet, and disappear!

Do you, my hearers, *admit* the revealed fact, that "God was manifest in the flesh?" So far it is well; but suppose not, that an evangelical mind, is equivalent to a pious heart. Receive not this truth, in distant and cold abstraction. Believing that *God has* moved thus earnestly for you, believe also that *you* are called upon, to move earnestly too. Religion, in this view, presents itself to you, as the grand concern of being—the amazing reality, for which all things exist, commanding your first and most earnest attention. It presents God Almighty as calling to you, in a voice so loud, so urgent, so kind, that you can give no adequate response to his call, till you respond with the *whole heart*. It is a call, descending into the deep fountains of the soul, and bidding them to move, and pour forth a tribute to *redeeming love*.

Appreciating the 'exceeding riches of God's grace, in his kindness towards you, in Christ Jesus,' you will appreciate the demand upon your *own* efforts, to 'strive' for the salvation of the gospel—not, indeed, by contending with the contentious, or hurling the weapons of wordy combat at any, who may choose to dispute, rather than obey the gospel—nor yet, by attempting to make the '*narrow way, that leadeth unto life,*' a *broad way*—but by entering upon it, *just as it is*, with ready and elastic step. The King hath made it, and he hath blessed it—none shall make it better. If it be narrow, it is safe.—Already, hath the Captain of salvation conducted millions of the redeemed upon it to Mount Zion, with songs and everlasting joy.

Nor ought we to refuse the consolation, imparted by the fact, that the high and lofty One, who inhabiteth eternity, has thus, in his Son and Spirit, come down to the sympathies and necessities, of our existence in the flesh.

In the chamber of sickness and pain, we wish to speak of an *omnipresent Jesus*, who has also 'suffered in the flesh,' and 'can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities.'—When assembled for worship, and reminded of Christ's promise, given to encourage his disciples, that 'where two or three should assemble in his name, he would be in the midst of them,' we wish also to remember his *ability* to fulfil his promise.—When I see lost sheep, scattered and wandering upon the dark mountains, I wish to call to them, in the name of the 'good Shepherd,' and assure them, that his *omniscient eye* is upon them, and his kindness inviting them, into the 'green pastures.'

When I see the desponding christian, ready to faint with fear, in obedience to my duty to 'comfort the feeble minded,' and 'support the weak,' I wish to apply the potent argument of Paul, 'If, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, *much more*, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life;' and thus inspire the sentiment of christian triumph, 'I *know* whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is *able*, to keep that which I have committed unto him, against that day.'

Should I ever vainly attempt to subdue the hard heart of sin, by simply holding before it an image of the moral beauty of virtue, despairing to melt down ice with moonbeams, I wish to present the sun.—When I look abroad over the great mass of human character, and behold it heaving and tossing in angry rage, like the troubled sea; aware of human impotency to control it, I wish to contemplate the **CROSS OF CHRIST**, as the mighty instrument of heaven's ordaining, to smite down pride, and lust and rebellion, and lay a subjugated world in meek and quiet homage, before the eternal throne.

As often as I accost those, in whose minds is nothing but the image of things visible, having no confidence but in what appears, because they have not 'heard whether there be any Holy Ghost,' I wish to assure them, that there is really a Holy Ghost, imparting energy to truth, when faithfully invoked, and insuring its success.

As often as I find those to whom I am commissioned to publish 'glad tidings,' bending beneath a burden of care and sin, I wish to address to them the invitation of Christ,— 'Come unto me, all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;' assuring them, that he, who gave the invitation, was not only once in Judea, but is now *present*, so that they *can* come to him, and he can give them rest.

When called to administer baptism, employing the sacred names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I wish to contemplate the presence of Father, son, and Holy Ghost, approving the solemn ordinance.

When I have conducted the christian pilgrim to the final verge of his mortality, and see him about to resign himself to the dust, then do I wish to remind him of an almighty Redeemer, 'the resurrection and the life,' who was able, as he informed us, to lay down his *own* life, and to take it again; and who is able to redeem *his* life also from the dust, and clothe him with immortality.

I remember, that Christ said to his disciples, I go to prepare mansions for you. I will never forget that.—And as often as I see this green earth dressed in living charms,—as often as I lift my eye to heaven, and behold the sun walking in his strength by day; and the moon, in her silent majesty by night; and the wide firmament, bespangled with stars, all shining to their maker's praise; and contemplate this, as the workmanship of that same Being, who said to his disciples, 'I go to prepare mansions for you;'—then, will I consider, how glorious must **THOSE** mansions be! Did he bestow so much splendor on this *temporary* abode of man? O! then, how surpassing splendor, must **HEAVEN** be; where *himself*, in glory, with his *redeemed*, shall *abide forever!* There, may we meet at last,—redeemed, sanctified, saved,—and sound, in concert, the loud anthem of heaven,—'BLESSING, AND HONOR, AND GLORY, AND POWER, BE UNTO HIM THAT SITTETH ON THE THRONE, AND UNTO THE LAMB.' AMEN.

NOTE.

These Lectures, part of a course delivered in the hearing of a portion of the people to whom the author ministers, published for the service of them all, are respectfully and affectionately presented to their candid and prayerful attention.

Nothing is farther from the intended object, than to provoke a controversial feeling, or excite any other emotion than a sincere desire to know the truth, and do our duty. Be it never forgotten that we are *learners*. It is hoped that nothing will appear to have been said, implying disrespect to whatever is superior in age, talent, and excellence of character, in any, from whose sentiments, in this article, the testimony of God compels a dissent. The wisest and best *sometimes* err. Remembering too, that if a man is intelligent he will be intelligible, and that honesty has but one face, it is hoped that none will identify plainness with arrogance.

In condescension to the necessities of erring man, we believe that God has caused the Bible to be written, so much under the supervision of his own eye, that we are authorized to receive it, as sound testimony;—to *rely* upon its decisions.—The only question then is, whether I have *departed* from this. Dear brethren and friends, ‘I judge not mine own self.’ I can only say, if I *have* wandered, or ever *shall* wander, from this “testimony,” go not with me, I pray you. Let my wanderings be lonely as the grave.

Some evils were noticed, in the introduction, incidental to religious controversy; still, when properly conducted, it has its redeeming tendencies, as an important instrument to elicit truth, and expose error. This is doubtless a reason why errorists, when driven from the citadel of argument, declaim so abundantly upon the evils of controversy. Such declamation usually betokens well, as a signal that the truth is advancing.

The *present* subject, however, if properly conducted, is hardly a theme for controversy. Draw the line, broad and fair, betwixt knowledge and ignorance, in the style of true philosophy, and it becomes a matter of simple *enquiry* at the Oracle.

It would seem that many, (I would say it with respect,) who have undertaken a defence of Bible facts, and especially this one, have undertaken in a wrong way. Because the denyer of it has wandered into the kingdom of ignorance, and there framed his crazy theories, which he supposed mighty instruments against it, the advocate of it has thought best to follow him thither, and frame theories too—And there they have beat the air together.

Might it not be respectfully suggested, whether it were not better, if any one choose thus to stray beyond the limits ordained us here by heaven, to permit him to go *alone*? Do him the pleasure of your company, and he will do himself the pleasure to *remain* there; and as long as you remain there together in the dark, he can see as well and be as wise as you. But let him once find himself entirely *alone* there, and his *inclination* may dictate to his true interest, to return to the world, in which he was designed, for the present, to see and act. Recover him thus to the world of real knowledge, and you can reason with him to advantage.—Perhaps he may yet learn.

If any are as much troubled with the word 'person' as the author of "Bible News" seems to have been, they had better dispense with it as soon as possible. If they cannot contemplate God, in the person of the Father, and in the person of the Son, and in the person of the Holy Ghost, without associating with the term *person* the whole idea of a *human being*, and thus making, *ipso facto*, three Gods! They will probably do well to keep clear of this, and all *other* anthropopathic expressions applied to God. Let them beware how they say that God sees, lest they must suppose that he has human eyes.—Let them beware how they call God a rock, lest they suppose him a solid mass of matter.—Let them beware how they say God repented, lest perchance, (I tremble to so write,) they should think that he has sinned! If possible, let them enter into a more abstracted and sublimely rational contemplation of

Jehovah, in all his revealed, endearing relations, as him '*whom no mortal eye hath seen, or can see.*'

The word *person* is used only to represent the distinction in the Godhead, which is necessarily implied, in the revealed fact of the Deity of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. If no word can be employed to represent that distinction, which does not trouble them, let the distinction itself go *without* any representation. Let them simply take the ultimate *fact* revealed,—that is all.

I partly prepared a table, containing a classification of all the passages of Scripture, which speak of Christ; but find it too extensive for insertion here;—besides, the urgency of other duties allows not time to do it justice. I have not been able to find a passage, which does not arrange itself in one of the classes, mentioned in the second Lecture, page 26. It will be observed, that the first class of passages prove simply *one* fact; to wit, that Christ had a human nature, which all admit. The second class imply another fact; to wit, a previous glory from which he was humbled. The third class prove directly the Deity of Christ. The first class neither prove or disprove the Deity of Christ, the second *imply* it, the third *prove* it.—The difference then between the faith of him who admits, and him who denies, the Deity of Christ is, that the one believes *all* these passages, and the other only a *part*.

The passage in Mark XIII. 32. has been often adduced, to prove that Christ had only limited knowledge. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Knapp, in his critical edition of the New-Testament, says of the clause "neither the Son," "*Omissa haec dicit Ambrosius, in Codd. Graecis.*" It appears then that this clause, according to Ambrose, was wanting, in some of the ancient manuscripts, and not occurring also in the other gospels, has been thrown into doubt, with the other questionable passages. But is the fact that these few passages happen to be wanting, in some of the ancient manuscripts, sufficient proof against them, to authorise us to reject them?

Before the art of printing, when transcribing was a merely mechanical business—a trade—pursued too usually by illiterate men, who only knew how mechanically to make the letters, without being able to even read a sentence; was there not a hundred chances, after all their caution, of their accidentally omitting a clause or passage, to one chance of their actually making one, and inserting it? A sentence thus accidentally dropped in one manuscript, would of course be wanting in the manuscripts copied from it.

I did not intend, however, to enter upon the enquiry, which respects the genuineness of these passages; both from my inability at present to do it justice, and because it does not much concern the present subject. Admit the clause “neither the Son” to be genuine. Every Biblical scholar is familiar with the nature and force of the Hiphil conjugation in Hebrew, in which words are taken in a *causative* and *permissive* sense. He is also aware, that the Hebraistic idiom is carried from the Old into the New-Testament. Thus, when Paul says, “I am determined to *know* nothing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified,” he means, ‘I am determined to *cause to be known*’—to *proclaim*—to *preach* nothing but Christ &c. This conjugation has either an *active* or a *passive* signification—active, when applied to the actor; and passive, when applied to the receiver. I will not *know* a given event among you, and you shall not *know* it, is equivalent to saying, in English idiom, I will not *make known* the event among you, and you shall not *be made to know*—or be informed.

The event spoken of, in the contemplated passage, is the destruction of Jerusalem. Men and angels, under the ancient dispensation, were commissioned to announce many future events; Christ, under the new, announced many more. By examining the whole chapter, it appears, that Christ gave a very minute and circumstantial account of the *event itself*, and the facts attending it; (which, of course, demanded immeasurably a greater amount of prescience; than simply to know the *time* of it;) but, for important purposes, the *time* of it was not to be announced. ‘Of that *day* and of that *hour*, no man should make known; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.’ The *time* of the event was to remain a

profound secret, until the Father, whose more peculiar office it is to *send forth*, to *commission*, should commission the destroyers to bring "sudden destruction" upon the devoted city. Christ then proceeds to make use of the fact, that they were not permitted to know the time of this event, as a reason why they should watch, and be *always* ready for it. 'Take ye heed, watch and pray, for ye know not—are not made to know—are not informed—when the *time* is.'

Supposing even, that we were to take the word *know*, when applied to Christ, who spoke, as well as when applied to those who heard, in the sense of passive knowledge; the *passage* still really amounts to nothing, in disproving the prescience of Christ. It might be predicated simply of his humanity;—or, such might be the nature of the distinction in the godhead, that *passivity* might be predicable of the Father in a sense, in precisely which sense it might not be of the Son.

There are three principal ways, by which an attempt is made, to evade the proof of the Deity of Christ. First, by making abundant reference to those passages, which teach us that Jesus Christ possessed a human nature. This has just nothing to do with the question. Secondly, by taking words and passages out from their connexion, in violation of the sound principles of interpretation, and explaining those that are plain, by the meaning of those that are figurative. For instance, the significancy of the Divine name, when applied to Christ, has been explained, by its significancy, when applied figuratively to human and terrestrial objects. Is it asked, how we are to know in which sense it is applied, by the sacred writers? If it cannot be conclusively determined, by a candid and cautious attention to the *connexion* in which it appears, it may be, by attending to the account, which the sacred writers give us, of the *object himself*, to whom they apply the name.. If you mention the appropriate name of any object to another, and *only* the name, he may possibly evade your meaning; but when you proceed to specify the *qualities* of the *object itself*, and they are qualities which belong to no *other* object in existence; then there is no possibility of reasonable mistake.

Precisely so the sacred writers have done. They have informed us, that he, who 'became flesh, and dwelt among us, to whom they apply the name of the Supreme Being, is the identical Being who created the universe, and who is entitled to the worship of all creatures. Here there is no ambiguity. Do they predicate this of any other being or object, to whom a Divine name, or any other name, was ever applied? *That* is the question.—And it is not only certain that they do not, but that they repeatedly and throughout deny it, in language as solemn as eternity, of every other being in the universe, but the true God.

The *dernier* resort, is finding fault with the Bible. And truly it does appear to be a most unfortunate Book for any, who would deny the Deity of Jesus Christ. Could they have dictated to the sacred penmen, perhaps it would have been made a different book.—But it is just the thing it is, and it is found very difficult to seriously alter it. The hand that *dropped* the truth from the skies, seems also to protect it.

All that can be said about ambiguities amounts, in sober earnest, to about nothing, in evading the great and fundamental truths of the bible. It is a species of pedantry, which has little to do, either with brightening or obscuring the bolder image of revealed truth. That image, adapted to the observation of *every* eye, is too much like the Sun in the heavens, to be destroyed in this way. We may call for the clouds to cover it, or we may shut our eyes upon it and complain, but still it shines.

Every mind conversant with the history of the past, has made observation upon the vibrations of human sentiment. It has also noticed this interesting fact, that every successive age has thought itself the wisest, and the best that ever existed—just emerged from chaos and night—none so enlightened—none so wise. It is a pleasing compliment, which man loves to pay himself. Ambition and conceit are never more delighted, than when sporting with the opinions of others. In religion as in philosophy, it sometimes becomes the principal business of the ambition of one age, to demolish the work of the preceding. The present happens to be the age of demolishing; and when

the work of demolition is fairly done, the work of rebuilding must commence.

Nothing is more certain, than that opinions raised upon objections to the opinions of others, are but a 'baseless fabrick.' When all of every description, now mainly intent on finding fault with others, and telling what they do *not* believe, have fairly told us their important story, the wave will recede; and voices loud, 'as the voice of many waters,' will be heard to say, *What DO you believe?*

The high relations of my immortal being demand a *positive* answer. Such an answer, heaven in kindness has deigned to give. *Is this testimony sound?—All—all—all—is at stake here! The hope of this world is here suspended!* Conceit may not so apprehend, but so it certainly is. If you take from me the testimony of heaven, or any portion of it, which experience has tested, and found precisely adapted to the exigencies of my moral being,—which *does* restore the injury, sustained by the violence myself have offered to this noblest work of God,—which *does* allay the fever of the mind, and make every chord in my soul to vibrate with holy joy,—which *does* remove the cloud intercepting my vision, and give me to see far onward into the calm, bright regions of eternal day,—which *does* enkindle hope heavenly and divine, when all earthly hopes die,—which *does* convert mourning into rejoicing, and bid 'sorrow and sighing flee away,'—which *does* make the bed of sickness and pain 'as soft as downy pillows,' while the voice of Jesus, all heavenly and divine, is kindly inviting the suffering believer to lay down his dust, and be happy with him,—ah! trifle not with me here! I am now in earnest!—*what would you do?*—If ye take from me the testimony of heaven, which, by the grace of God, *does all this*; then hasten—*hasten*—and provide something else, itself as good, *and as safely supported*, in its place.—If ye cannot do it, then away with your "philosophy falsely so called." Ye are not so wise as ye had supposed.—The 'light that is in you is darkness'—ye are a 'blind leader'—ye are even conducting me unconsciously backward into the dark ages.—Your motive may be good, but ye have sadly mistaken your own wisdom:—"To

the law and to the testimony. If ye speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in you."

So the immortal spirit of man, for which the gospel was designed, will ultimately speak out, in spite of every thing. It demands no prophetic tongue to announce, that the sickly and capricious dreams of imagination cannot long hold its place, or stand in its way. Everlasting truth is on its march. The gospel of Christ, whole and entire, was *designed* for man, as the 'power of God and the wisdom of God for his salvation;' and he *must have it*, just as God gave it.

"The darkness is past, and the *true light now shineth*," said the beloved disciple, when provoking to love, from contemplations upon the "*eternal Life*, which was with the father, and was manifest unto us."

To occupy no room, in a note already too long (I fear) for the reader's patience, in useless enquiry, whether the first person of God's Trinity is called the Father, from the paternal relation which he sustains to his creatures in that person,—and whether the second person is called the Son, simply because of his incarnation—and whether the third is called the Spirit, because of his invisible efficiency,—we simply remark, that it seems to be the divine economy, that the respective persons of the Trinity should glorify each other; and that thus Jehovah seems to radiate and reflect the glory of his Eternal Being.

It has been assumed, that were Christ truly possessed of the divine nature, which is ascribed to him by the doctrine of the Trinity, he would doubtless have proclaimed it, as with trumpet-tongue, the first thing he did. This, be it remembered, is reasoning from the *conduct of men*. Our glorious Redeemer, in the days of his incarnation, was an exemplar to us, among other things, by exhibiting (with reverence I say it) the genuine modesty of heaven. His "*works*," not his words, praised him. When worshipped, he was usually silent, (which, by the way, was evident imposture, if he was not the true Deity) and the main object on which he seemed ever intent, was to glorify the Father.

Follow him on to near the closing scene, and hear him then [See John, XVI. and XVII.] "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world, and go to the Father," &c.—"These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come, *glorify thy Son*, that thy *Son may also glorify thee*: as thou hast given him power over all flesh, [his mediatorial reign] that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent"—"that they might know thee, the only true God, in the person of the Father; and also in the person of the Son Jesus Christ, whom the Father sent."—"I have glorified *THEE*, on the earth; I have *finished* the work which thou gavest me to do—and now, O, Father, glorify *thou ME*, with *thine own self*; with the *glory which I had with thee, before the world was.*"

Thus Jehovah, by the second person of his Trinity (in a manner suited to the condition and the apprehension of his creatures, to whom the representation is made) reflects the glory of the first, and the first reflects the glory of the second.—The Son glorifies the Father, and the Father glorifies the Son.

Hear too what the Spirit was to reveal. "When he [the Holy Ghost] is come, he will guide you into *all truth*—*HE SHALL GLORIFY ME*; for he *shall receive of mine*, and *shew it unto you*. *All things that the Father hath are mine, therefore*, said I, that he *shall take of mine*, and *shew it unto you.*" Thus the Son testified of the Spirit, and the Spirit was to testify of the Son. As the Son glorified the Father and Spirit, so the Spirit was to glorify the Father and Son.

Accordingly the Spirit *did* 'take of the things of Christ, and show them unto the beloved disciple;—he *did* glorify Christ, together with the Father, by showing that *all which the Father hath are his*,—and the disciple has transmitted the faithful record of it to the world.

He has also informed us that when, "in the Spirit on the Lord's day," he was favored with a vision of the *heavenly* world, he saw the myriads of celestial worshippers chanting their

praise, "to HIM THAT SITTETH ON THE THRONE AND TO THE LAMB," in songs of lofty and eternal adoration.

Thus it appears, that the revealed doctrine of a Trinity in the Being of God, implies a sublime peculiarity in the mode of his existence, by virtue of which, in the person of the Father, is reflected the glory of the Son and Spirit; in the person of the Son, that of the Father and Spirit; and in the person of the Spirit, that of the Father and Son; and thus the radiance is reflected and re-reflected, gathering brighter lustre at every reflection, until the High and Holy One, who inhabiteth eternity, shines forth through all his works, in glory transcendent, dazzling, divine.