

THE
TRUE MESSIAH,
IN SCRIPTURE LIGHT;
OR THE
UNITY OF GOD,
AND
PROPER SONSHIP OF JESUS CHRIST,
AFFIRMED AND DEFENDED.

SECOND EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS.

By David Millard,
MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL.

“A mediator is not a mediator of ONE, but GOD is ONE.”
“For there is ONE God and ONE Mediator between God and men.”
PAUL.

UNION MILLS, N. Y.
PUBLISHED BY THE CHRISTIAN GENERAL BOOK ASSOCIATION.
Printed at the Office of the Christian Palladium.

1837.

Digitized by Google

2 Nov. 1898

From the Library of
Prof. A. P. PEABODY

72

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

As a conscientious man, I have for a number of years believed the sentiments contained in this work ; indeed I may add, I have ever believed Christ to be the *proper* Son of God, since I was capable of thinking for myself. On account of my views being constantly misrepresented, I published a pamphlet in 1816, entitled the "True Messiah exalted, or Jesus Christ really the Son of God," in which I briefly discussed the subject of the present work. That pamphlet has undergone two large editions, and there is still a pressing demand for them, which could not be answered without reprinting them. By the importunity of my friends I have been constrained to investigate the subject more extensively, and now present it to the public in the present form.

I have been under necessity of assuming more of an air of controversy in the present work than I could have wished, as I have deemed it my duty to make some strictures upon two pamphlets which have appeared in public, written in reply to my former publication. A neglect to notice these, by many would undoubtedly have been construed unfavorably. I have also thought proper to pass a brief examination of Mr. S. Luckey's book.

In replying to my antagonists, it has been my aim to treat them with tenderness. I think no candid person who has read the works I allude to, can think I

have exercised undue severity. Indeed, it would be a grief to me to know that any thing of that cast had escaped my pen. If any part of the work may have that appearance in the least, it is what I have stated upon Mr. Luckey's publication. Should any of those remarks appear to Trinitarians too severe, they may do well in future to remember, that other people have feelings as well as themselves. Indeed, when I examine such abuses as are found in Mr. Luckey's book, I need a monitor within me to keep my pen under proper restraint. But I hope, in my remarks on his censorious publication, I have not sunk into a spirit of retaliation.

It will not be expected by such of my readers as are familiar with the subject, that this work will exhibit to them arguments which are entirely new. I have only pursued a path which has been trodden by many before me. The writings of the venerable Noah Worcester, have been a rich treasure for years past. I think he stands justly entitled to a rank with the first writers in our country upon this subject. His "Bible News" and his "Appeal to the candid," I could wish were in the hands of every sincere inquirer after truth. Those works have been of great use to me in arranging this. I have also derived assistance from the writings of Dr. Channing, for which I would make grateful acknowledgments. However, if there are errors in this work, they are mine and not another man's.

To elegance of style I make no pretension; I have

only aimed to exhibit my views in plain familiar language. I have not written for *critics*, but have used "plainness of speech."

I now commit this work to the hand of Providence, praying if it is *error*, it may sink into oblivion soon, and never be the means of leading one soul astray.— If it is *truth*, may it circulate extensively, and prove for the advancement of the cause of God. Dear reader whoever you are, into whose hands this little treatise may fall, give it a candid perusal before you pass judgment upon it, and then search the scriptures to see whether these things are so. And may the Father of all mercies bring you at last to possess *eternal life*, through the knowledge of the *only true God*, and *Jesus Christ whom he has sent*.

THE AUTHOR.

West Bloomfield, N. Y. March, 1823.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The favorable reception with which this work met, and the rapid demand for it, soon exhausted the first edition. The author retained a few copies to supply special calls, but all these were disposed of eight years ago. He has very frequently been solicited to publish another edition; but till lately has declined, intending at a leisure period to write over the whole, and leave out the controversial part with Messrs. Lucky and Harmon. But as the writings of those gentlemen are still in circulation, he has finally

concluded to give the work a brief revision, and permit another edition to appear before the public.

This work was written fourteen years ago, when the author was young; but in relation to the doctrine it contains, his mind has undergone no change. He is decidedly convinced that nothing is to be feared from the most critical investigation of the subject, for the more it is examined, the more it will spread and shine. A large number of persons, from reading this little volume, have become decided believers in the divine unity of God, and the Sonship of Jesus Christ; among whom are several able ministers of the gospel. Two instances have come to my knowledge of persons commencing to write against this work, and after expending considerable labor, gave up the effort, acknowledging the arguments it contains to be unanswerable. The late Elder Elias Lee, of Ballston Springs, is the only man who has published a pretended reply to this work. That appeared in 1825, and is still in circulation. Many of Mr. Lee's friends, however, admit that it is a failure. The same year I published a reply to Mr. Lee, in two letters which are now subjoined to this edition. For Mr. Lee I have ever entertained a very warm respect. He was a venerable and able Baptist minister, and notwithstanding the severity of his pamphlet against me, I shall ever respect his memory. I have sat under his ministry with profit when a child, as well as in later years. He was the first minister of any denomination that I can distinctly recollect of hearing

preach. But he has now gone, as I believe, to a brighter and better world, where I trust we shall both ultimately meet, in union of soul.

The doctrine mainly advocated in this work, has received in Europe during the present century, with remarkable strength. The Presbyterians in England are, at the present time, nearly all Unitarians. In Ireland, the same denomination have divided within a few years on this point, most of whom are on the Unitarian side. The old General Baptists in England, are mostly Unitarians. Even many ministers of the established church in England are decided Unitarians. There is also a considerable body in England, called Unitarian Methodists. In Scotland, the doctrine has spread to a very considerable extent. Within a-half a century, the doctrine has spread to a vast extent in Germany and Switzerland. Even at Geneva, where Calvin caused Servetus to be burned to death on the charge of being an Unitarian, the doctrine of the unity of God is the prevailing belief. All the pastors of Geneva are Unitarians, with the exception of two or three. Even the college founded by Calvin, and guarded by his Trinitarian creed, is now an Unitarian institution. These things I name here, because they are laboriously concealed by Trinitarian leaders in this country. See "*Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.*"

Within the present century, the extension of the doctrine, in these United States, has been wide and rapid. [In addition to the] multitudes who openly

avow it, a large number now in membership with Trinitarian sects, are Unitarians in belief. This fact is well known. The recent revolution experienced among Calvinistic sects, together with the spirit of free enquiry now abroad in the land, augur the time near at hand, when the mysterious and contradictory doctrine of the Trinity will be thoroughly exploded : when its remaining advocates will dwindle into sickly minority. In no sense has the doctrine ever benefitted christianity. It has rather been a hindrance than a help to its spread. It has furnished objections to the *infidel*, the *Jew*, and is even a stumbling block in the way of the heathen. A striking evidence of this occurred at Calcutta, within a few years, in the case of *Rammohun Roy*, a learned Bramin. Also, the uncharitable temper which the doctrine has always carried with it, ought to cause its present advocates to pause and consider.

The present edition, at the solicitation of many, is now submitted to the public. May it lead thousands to a more perfect knowledge of the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom he has sent.

THE AUTHOR.

Canaan, N. Y. November, 1836.

THE TRUE MESSIAH.

CHAPTER I.

THE UNITY OF GOD.

SECTION I.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY UNSCRIPTURAL.

THE advocates of Trinity, like the Chinese mythologists, would fain make people believe, that the records of their doctrine run back so far into antiquity, as to destroy the force of argument against it. They even tell us it has been a doctrine believed and affirmed by the most pious of all ages, that God exists in three persons. But before I acknowledge the assertion to be correct, I think it my duty to consult the scriptures of truth. If it be a fact, that the doctrine that God is three persons, was believed and affirmed by the pious in the first ages of the world, it is from the Bible alone we can obtain such information.

First, I examine the Old Testament for light upon the subject; but I can find no account of any such doctrine there. In all the revelations God was pleased to make to the ancient patri-

archs and prophets, we have no account that he revealed himself in three persons.

Moses, that eminent servant, who was with God in the mount, to whom God made the greatest revelation of himself, records nothing of his being three persons. Indeed he declared to the Jews something very materially different from it: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is *one Lord*;" not three Lords, nor three persons.

It is, however, urged by Trinitarians, that Moses records language in the book of Genesis, from which the inference may be drawn, that God is a plurality of persons; such as "Let *us* make man." "The man is become as one of *us*," &c. To this I reply, the plurality in these expressions does not necessarily imply more than two, and as God made all things by his Son, [*Heb. i. 2.*] it appears evident to me, that it was the Son to whom God spake. If it were God who spake, (which is not disputed,) it is evident he spake as one person in company with another, and not as though two or more persons were speaking at the same time. Instead of *we will* make man, the expression is, "*Let us* make man." How absurd is the conclusion, that one part of God spake to another part of himself! And how preposterous the idea, to represent God as a family of persons conversing with each other!

Again, if it be urged that the pronoun *us*, in these instances, be applied exclusively to the being of Jehovah, why do we not find it occur in other instances in scripture, where we know God is exclusively speaking of himself? Why is not God spoken to, and of, in the plural? Might we not in some instances expect, that the expression, "*I am the Lord your God,*" which we meet so frequently in scripture, would be changed to *We are the Lord your God*? Might we not expect among all the prayers we have recorded in scripture, in which God is always addressed in the use of the following pronouns: *thee, thou, thine, and thyself*, to find the plural pronouns *ye, you, your, and yourselves*, substituted in their room? If it be proper to speak of God as a plurality of persons, ought not christians to address him as such? But no where in scripture have we an account that God was addressed or prayed to in the plural. David in addressing God says, "O God, to whom vengeance belongs, shew *thyself*," not *yourselves*. "Lift up *thyself*, thou Judge of the earth." The Son of God spake thus: "And this is life eternal, that they might know *thee*, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom *thou* hast sent."

The Hebrew name *Elohim*, is often appealed to as proof that God is a plurality of persons. The argument used is, that this name must ne-

cessarily be of plural comprehension. This every learned Jew denies, and says it is a mere *idiom* of their language. Some of our most able Hebrew critics clearly prove, that instead of the name establishing a plurality of persons in one God, if it must be regarded as of plural comprehension at all, it must prove a plurality of Gods. But when the fact comes to be considered that the name *Elohim* is applied to *men* and things in the scriptures, the argument loses all its force. It is applied to Moses in Exodus vii. 1. "See I have made thee a god, [*Heb. Elohim,*] to Pharaoh." Certainly it will not be argued that Moses was a plurality of persons. The children of Heth gave the same title to Abraham. "Thou art a mighty prince among us." *Genesis xxxiii.* 6. In Hebrew, this passage reads, "a mighty *Elohim* among us." It will not be contended that Abraham was three persons. It is sufficient to state that the name *Elohim* is also applied in scripture to Aaron's molton calf, and to Dagon. With these facts considered, the argument falls like "the baseless fabric of a vision."

Secondly, examining the New Testament, I find the doctrine that God is three persons, equally unsupported. Through the whole of the gospel, God, instead of being spoken of as three persons, is plainly represented as one person—"the express image of *his* [God's] *person*,"

[*Heb. i. 3.*] Scripture further states, "To us there is but *one God*, the Father," [*1 Cor. viii. 6.*] This passage not only asserts God to be *one*, but also that *one God* is the Father. "A mediator is not a mediator of one, but *God is ONE.*" [*Gal. iii. 20.*] "The holy *One.*" "The high and lofty *One.*" How different are these expressions from stating God to be three!

The only passage found in our present translation of the New Testament, which comes anywhere near expressing the doctrine of three persons in one God, is 1 John v. 7. "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." In the former edition of this work I admitted this passage, with all the argument it could afford on the Trinitarian side of the question, believing if it was really genuine, it did not establish the doctrine. But while I find that about every learned and candid Trinitarian gives up the passage as a mere interpolation, and also that evidences of its spuriousness are overwhelming, I see no cause why I should contend for its genuineness. I will here state some of the strong evidences against the passage as constituting any part of divine revelation, and then leave the candid reader to judge for himself.

Mr. Buchanan, in his researches among the Assyrian christians in the east, says, that this

text is wanting in all their ancient manuscripts. In the new translation by Campbell, Doddridge, and McKnight, which has recently been published in this country, the text is rejected as spurious. In the improved version of the New Testament, we find the following note on this disputed passage: "1. This text, concerning the heavenly witnessess, is not contained in any Greek manuscript which was written earlier than the fifteenth century. 2. Nor in any Latin manuscript earlier than the ninth century. 3. It is not found in any of the early versions. 4. It is not cited by any of the Greek ecclesiastical writers, though, to prove the doctrine of the Trinity, they have cited the words both before and after the text. 5. It is not cited by any of the early Latin fathers, even when the subject on which they treat, would naturally lead them to appeal to its authority. 6. It is first cited by Virgilius Tapsensis a Latin writer of no credit in the latter end of the fifth century, and by whom it is suspected to have been forged. 7. It has been omitted as spurious, in many editions of the New Testament, since the reformation: in the two first of Erasmus, in those of Aldus, Colinacus, Zwinglius, and lately of Griesbach. It was omitted by Luther in his German version. In the old English Bibles of Henry VIII. Edward VI., and Elizabeth, it was printed in small types, or included in brackets; but be-

tween the years 1566, and 1580, it began to be printed as it now stands ; by whose authority it is not known."

Dr. Adam Clark, the Methodist commentator, gives the passage up as spurious. He says, "One hundred and thirteen Greek manuscripts are extant, containing the first epistle of John, and the text in question is wanting in one hundred and twelve. The first place the verse appears in Greek, is in the Greek translation of the Acts of the council of Lateran, held in A. D. 1215. Though it is found in many Latin copies, yet it does not appear that any written previously to the tenth century contain it. All the Greek fathers omit the verse though many of them quote both verse 6 and verse 8, applying them to the Trinity. It is wanting in the German translation of Luther, and in all the editions of it published during his life time. In short, it stands on no authority sufficient to authenticate any part of a revelation professing to have come from God."

Such testimony as the foregoing, it is presumed is sufficient to set at rest the question relating to 1 John v. 7. But should any still contend for its genuineness, let it be explained in connection with John x. 30. "I and my Father are one." It is urged from this passage, by Trinitarians, that Christ and his Father are one and the same being ; but if we compare this

with other passages, where the word *one* is used in a similar sense, we shall find that no such inference can reasonably be drawn from it. The word *one* fits various uses in the scriptures. Paul tells his Corinthian brethren, "He that planteth and he that watereth are *one*;" [1 Cor. iii. 8.] but in a few verses preceding this, he had told them, "I have planted, Apollos watered." Here Paul and Apollos are said to be *one*; yet Paul and Apollos are two persons. Of the church it is said, "ye are all *one* in Christ Jesus." [Gal. iii. 28.] Though all believers in Christ are said to be *one*, yet not one person. In Christ's prayer to his Father in the 17th chapter of John, speaking of his disciples he says, "And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them, that they may be *one*, even as we are one." Now as Christ prayed that his disciples might be *one, even*, or just as he and his Father are *one*, must it not follow, if the conclusion be correct that Christ and his Father are but one being, that his disciples must become but one being? Which then ought we to admit, that the Trinitarian doctrine is incorrect, or that Christ's prayer can never be answered?

If it cannot be admitted, from comparing scripture with scripture, that this text means that Christ and his Father are but one being, (and that such a conclusion would involve the

greatest absurdity I have clearly shown,) neither can we admit that the three mentioned in 1 John v. 7, are but one being. The *oneness* mentioned in both passages, means the same, and the extent of it is defined in Christ's prayer to his Father, that his disciples might be one as he and his father are one; not a oneness of being, but a oneness of union. The Lord hasten the happy day, when all the disciples of Christ shall thus be united.

Before I proceed any further, I must here notice a remark made by Mr. Thomas Harmon, in his pamphlet entitled "The true dignity of the Son of God, affirmed and defended." As this pamphlet was particularly written against my former publication, entitled "The true Messiah exalted," &c. I shall have frequent occasion to notice it, in the course of this work.

In my former work, my remarks were similar to my present upon the above passages, on which Mr. H. observes, "It cannot be that his observations are correct. If they prove any thing, they prove too much. They prove what he himself is not willing to allow; that Christ approaches as near to his Father in the union he has with him, as Paul to Apollos, or one believer to another." That there is as much of a *oneness of union*, between Christ and his Father, as there is between Paul and Apollos, I fully believe, and that I will consent to this, Mr. H. need no longer question.

Mr. H. further tells us, that the word "*even*" in the text, means *likewise*; and that Christ prayed that he and his Father were *one*, so *likewise* his disciples might be *one*. Now admitting this statement to be correct, I do not see that the sense of the passage is very materially varied. The meaning of "*likewise*," according to Walker, is, "in like manner." In this Mr. H. has indirectly acknowledged what I contend for, viz: that as Christ and his Father are *one*, so "in like manner" his disciples might be *one*. But Mr. H. adds, "not one in the same manner that he and his Father were." This appears to me to come very near contradicting himself and the text too. First he tells us that "*even*," in the text, means *likewise*, which is "in like manner," and then immediately argues, that they are one in a very different manner. I hope he will retract this mistake, and pray God to forgive him, for indirectly asserting that Christ's prayer cannot be answered, by saying the disciples cannot be *one* in the same manner that Christ and his Father are *one*.

With this view of the above passages, I can find nothing in the scriptures, to teach me that God is three persons. The writers of the Bible, particularly the New Testament, meant to have us believe that God is three persons, instead of *one*, might we not reasonably suppose,

they would have recorded the doctrine in the most plain and unequivocal terms? That a doctrine so important as this is said to be, at the same time so difficult to understand, should be left so undefined as to be made out by inference only, is a difficulty which needs much ingenuity to explain.

Christianity, it must be remembered, was planted in the midst of sharp sighted enemies, who overlooked no objectionable part of the system, and who would have fastened with earnestness on a doctrine involving such apparent contradictions as the Trinity. I cannot conceive of an opinion against which the Jews (who prided themselves in asserting the unity of God) would have raised an equal clamor. I would then ask, how it happens, that in the apostles' writings which relate so much to objections to christianity, not a word is said implying that objections were brought against the doctrine that God is three persons? Does not this consideration argue that the doctrine of the Trinity was not known at that time, to be objected against?

The Jews, while they stand as a monument for the truth of the scriptures, are a cloud of witnesses against the doctrine of the Trinity. They reject it as being contrary to their scriptures. If, as Trinitarians assert, "the doctrine of the Trinity has been believed and affirmed

by the most pious in all ages," why have not the Jews some knowledge of it from the Old Testament, if not by tradition? If God is to be worshipped now as three persons, he certainly was worshipped in the same manner in Old Testament times. If Abraham and all his pious successors, believed and taught that God is three persons, how is it possible that the knowledge of this should be utterly lost to all the Jews, from the days of the apostles to the present time?

Mr. Buck, in his theological dictionary, gives a summary of the Jewish thirteen articles of faith, which all professed Jews are bound to live and die in the acknowledgement of. The first five articles relate immediately to God, but in none of them is there the least appearance of Trinity. The second article reads thus: "That God is one; there is no unity like his. He only hath been, is, and shall be eternally our God." In respect to the doctrine of the Trinity, the Jews of the present day give it as their united testimony, "we have no such words, or forms, in the writings of Moses and the prophets; our fathers never worshipped a three-one-God."

As Trinitarians affirm that their doctrine is found in the Old Testament, to which the Jews exclusively adhere as the rule of their faith, why is it that no Old Testament Jew is a Trinitarian? Are not learned Jews, who are ac-

quainted with the customs of their nation, more capable of understanding Hebrew words and phrases, than we can pretend to be? And what peculiar temptation could a Jew be under to mislead him in respect to what the bible testifies concerning God? Why then do the Jews contend for the unity of God, that he is one person, and one only? Indeed, I think the only reason is, that in this they are supported by the true meaning of their scriptures, and by the well known faith and worship of all their pious ancestors.

Another argument may be considered against the doctrine that God is three persons, which in itself amounts almost to a demonstration. It is this, that God is uniformly in scripture worshipped as one person only. We have many prayers recorded in the scriptures, but in none of them do we find God addressed as three persons. If God be three persons, how shall we account for it that the scriptures afford us no example of his being worshipped as such? At the present day, we scarcely hear a Trinitarian pray, but we hear him close with a doxology to one God in three persons. But is this a scriptural manner of praying? If so, why have we not some scriptural example of it? Why did not the apostles and ancient saints pray to a

three-one-God ?* We have several of their prayers recorded. Why did not the Son of God teach his disciples to pray to a God in three persons? Have we not strong reasons to believe that mode of prayer was then not in use, but that it was an invention of a later age? To say, that in all the prayers and songs of praise recorded in the Bible, God is no where addressed, or spoken of as three persons, may be considered by some a bold assertion, but it is no more bold than true, Trinitarians themselves being judges. Let them shew me an instance, in all the scriptures, of God being addressed or prayed to as three persons, and I will confess my error in dissenting from the doctrine of the Trinity; but until they do, I must believe that the saints anciently did not pray as Trinitarians do now, and consequently must suppose there is an error somewhere.

*I hope it will not be considered that I use the term "three-one-God" by way of burlesque, as it is an expression which Trinitarians use themselves. I only borrow the phrase from them.

SECTION II.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY UNREASONABLE.

Having shown from the foregoing investigation that the doctrine of the Trinity is *unscriptural*, I shall now proceed to show that it is also *unreasonable*. I am however aware that Trinitarians are opposed to having their doctrine brought to the test of *reason*. But what point of doctrine is there laid down in the New Testament, on which the apostles did not reason? They abundantly *reasoned*, that Jesus was the Christ, and that there would be a resurrection of the dead. On these important points, it is said, Paul, in a certain place, *reasoned* three whole Sabbath days. "He reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come," while Felix trembled. The Lord said, "come now and let us reason together." If therefore I should attempt to reason upon this subject, I have not only the example of the apostles to warrant me in it, but also the command of the Lord God.

In the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians, we have a specimen of Paul's reasoning in order to obviate objections raised against the doctrine of the resurrection. He shows from analogies in nature, that there was a propriety in believing in the resurrection of the body. He brings the

figure of sowing grain ; that, that which is sown must perish, but should spring up and bear fruit ; so the body must perish in the grave, but should spring up in the resurrection, and bear a body such as God should prepare. But why did Paul condescend to reason upon the subject at all ? Why did he not tell the Corinthians, the doctrine of the resurrection is a *mystery*, which we can neither comprehend nor explain ; but you must believe it because it is so. Had he done this, he would have assumed the Trinitarian mode of argument.

I must object to the contemptuous manner in which many Trinitarians speak of human reason. *Reason* is the noblest faculty that distinguishes man. Take away his reason and he is an idiot. A man who does not exercise *reason*, is an unreasonable man ; from such Paul prayed to be delivered, and this is my prayer.

I contend that the gospel is a system of reason as well as truth. I honor revelation too highly to make it the antagonist of reason, or to believe it sinks into dormancy our noblest faculties. I honor our heavenly teacher too much, to ascribe to him such a revelation, if a revelation it might be called. A revelation is a gift of *light*, not calculated to thicken our darkness, and multiply our perplexities. Truth never can suffer by scrutiny ; like the pure gold, it has no dross ; but a doctrine that shrinks from investigation, betrays its origin.

Dr. Adam Clark, in his Commentaries on the Scriptures, has made one of the best remarks on this point, that I ever saw from the pen of a Trinitarian. He says, "the doctrine which can not stand the test of *rational investigation*, can not be true. We have gone too far, when we have said such and such doctrines should not be subjected to rational investigation, being doctrines of pure revelation. I know of no such doctrines in the Bible. The doctrines of this book are doctrines of *eternal reason*, and they are revealed because they are such."

Whether the doctor meant to reprove some of his Trinitarian brethren for going too far or not, I cannot tell, but it is certain his remark looks right at them. How frequent do we hear Trinitarians say, the doctrine of the Trinity is above reason, and therefore cannot be investigated by it; but that it is a doctrine of revelation, and we are bound to believe it. Mr. Samuel Lucky, in his treatise, entitled "A defence of the doctrine of the Trinity," &c. labors hard to make people think that it is heinously wicked, and "a species of ostentation not becoming a christian," to attempt to explain the doctrine of the Trinity. p. 106. This looks to me like a popish scheme to keep people in ignorance.

Mr. Harmon not only represents Trinity as something which we cannot understand, but also that it is that of which we are perfectly ig-

norant. He says—"But he seems to intimate, [alluding to me,] that the idea of a Trinity of persons in the Godhead implies a contradiction. But I would ask how he can make it appear a contradiction unless he fully understand it? Observe it is not the fact, but the mystery of that fact, which he supposes contradictory. Of the mystery, that is, the manner in which there are three persons existing in one God, he has no knowledge. Then how can he pass judgment upon that, of which he is perfectly ignorant." p. 3.

Whether or not Mr. H. meant to have us think that he considered me more ignorant concerning this *mystery* than himself, he has not told us; however, it is most probable that he would be understood to represent that we are all perfectly ignorant of it. Now if he admit that he is perfectly ignorant concerning it, as well as myself, I know not why he should question what I state concerning it, even should I say it implies a contradiction. If neither of us can have any *knowledge* of his supposed mystery, he has no more authority to say it does not imply a contradiction, than I have to say it does. From his representation, it may, or it may not; how does he know? But that the contradiction consists in a hidden mystery, is a mistake; it is in the doctrine taught by Trinitarians, as I shall endeavor to show.

The doctrine of the Trinity teaches that God is *three persons*, and yet but one being. Now, how to define the difference between *person* and *being*, where both terms are applied to rational *intelligences*, I am at entire loss. It is true, in speaking of the brutal creation, we may call them *beings*, but not *persons*; but wherever we apply the term *person* we naturally conceive of a being alluded to. In no instance can we form an idea of *one being* comprising *three persons*, or *three persons* constituting *one being* only. Therefore, in my view, it would be no more absurd to say God is *three beings*, than to say he is *three persons*; consequently, if the former be absurd, the latter is also.

Again, the doctrine asserts that each of these persons is God. That the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet that it takes all these three to constitute one God. But says Mr. Harmon—"If he mean to be understood as saying that Trinitarians suppose each person in the Godhead, *individually* and separately considered, is God, he labors altogether under a mistake. It is not so. They do not suppose that each person, separately considered, is God; but only in conjunction and inseparable union with the other two."

Here mark the expression, "each person in the Godhead, *individually* considered." As much as though there are three *individuals* in

the Godhead. What is this short of acknowledging three *beings* in the Godhead?

If Trinitarians do not *suppose* that each person in the Trinity is God, then Mr. H. is not a Trinitarian, or otherwise he has asserted what he did not *suppose*. In speaking of the person of the Father *individually*, he calls him "the self-existent God." In speaking of the person of the Son *individually*, he calls him "the very and eternal God," "the true God," "the self-existent God," and "the only wise God." In speaking of the Holy Ghost *individually*, he calls it God repeatedly, and through the whole labors to prove that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are only one God.

For Mr. H. to pretend to be a Trinitarian, and deny that Trinitarians assert what he asserts himself, looks to me like trying to cover absurdity with something worse. In this place he reproaches me very severely; accusing me with a want of candor, &c. and adds, "if they believe our system to be erroneous, let them shew it by plain scripture, fair reasoning, and legitimate conclusions." p. 4. This is my present business; and the *fair, legitimate* conclusion is, that Mr. H. with other Trinitarians, believe there is a God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, and that these three, whom they *individually* call God, are only one God. If this is not the case, Mr. H. ought to

retract some statements found in his pamphlet. That this is a mode of Trinitarian argument, I am prepared to show from a number of pertinent extracts from their writings, now in my possession. It is therefore hoped that no one in future, like Mr. H. will have the presumption to deny it.

Now I ask, is there any reason in the doctrine that God is divided into three persons, each of which persons is truly and properly God, and yet the three together constitute no more than one God? Can one God be three, or three only one? Who could form any rational conception of such a mode of existence? If it take three persons to compose one God, neither of these persons, *individually* considered, can be God, any more than a third constituent part can be the whole that it is only a part of. Or if there are three self-existent persons, each of which is truly and properly God, is it not a manifest absurdity to say there is no more than one God? This would be no more consistent than to say *one is three*, or *three are only one*, or three times *one* are only *one*.

But says Mr. Lucky, "they intimate that the contradiction consists in our saying three times one are one. This is a false representation of our sentiments. Our doctrine requires of us only to maintain that three or any other number more than one may exist in one. Of

the possibility of this, we have examples in very ordinary things. Instance the letter H, which is constituted of two straight marks connected by a hyphen. These marks make one letter; also the English spelling of the word God, which depends on three letters for its existence, though it is but one word." p. 166.

I thank Mr. L. for so much of an explanation of Trinity, although in another part of his book he reproves all who attempt to explain it. He says it is a false representation of their sentiments to say their doctrine teaches that three times *one* are only *one*. If Trinitarians do not directly say it, it is an irresistible conclusion drawn from their doctrine, and Mr. L.'s contradicting it does not clear them from the charge. "Our doctrine (says Mr. L.) requires us only to maintain that *three*, or any number more than *one*, may exist in one." But is this a true representation of Trinity? That three parts may exist in one *whole*, I admit; but that three *wholes* are only one *whole*, is a very different thing. In the letter H, composed of two straight marks connected by a hyphen, three direct parts constitute a whole. But that each of the straight marks and the hyphen, distinctly considered, should be called H, Mr. L. would agree with me would be absurd; yet this should be the case to make the letter H represent Trinity.

Mr. L. further observes—"Should it be said, that, if three persons constitute but one God, it would be improper to apply the word God to either of them separately, I would remark, that in the scriptures, the word is applied to each of them, and what God has said we cannot justly alter." p. 167.

That the word God is applied to all of them in the scriptures, is a mistake. The Holy Ghost is no where in scripture called God, as I shall hereafter show. -But I cannot but remark Mr. L's manner of getting rid of the difficulty, by laying it to the charge of the Lord God; and adding, "what God has said we cannot justly alter." Where has God said he exists in three persons, each of which is God, and yet that the three together constitute him but one God? Until Mr. L. can shew us from scripture that God has said or taught us this, it will not answer for him to lay such an absurdity to the charge of Jehovah, to clear himself.

Furthermore, the doctrine of the Trinity teaches that these *three* are three self-existent persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; and yet that the second person, viz. the Son, was begotten, and that the third person, viz. the Holy Ghost, proceeds from the Father and Son.

But, says Mr. Harmon, "who has ever affirmed that this is contained in the scriptures

of truth? What that the three persons in the Godhead are three self-existent persons? That three persons exist separately and independently of each other? Yet observe, Mr. M. well knew that his saying he never read this in the scriptures of truth, was calculated to lead his readers to suppose Trinitarians affirm they have. I have already remarked that they deny this: and I know of no apology that can be made for Mr. M. but that he was driven to this subterfuge for want of sound argument." p. 8.

In what manner Trinitarians affirm that three persons exist in the Godhead, whether separately, independently, or not, I have not yet stated; but I now state that Trinitarians have affirmed that God is three self-existent persons. How Mr. H. can presume to deny this, is to me unaccountable. Will he state that God is partly self-existent, and partly not, or will he affirm that he is wholly self-existent? If he is wholly self-existent, and constituted of three persons, those three must be three self-existent persons. But to prove that Mr. H. has affirmed what he here denies, I need only revert to other parts of his pamphlet, where he labors to prove that each of the three persons "*individually*" considered, is the self-existent God. In this, however, Mr. H. is not alone. Dr. S*****, a noted Trinitarian, says, "we judge that the orthodox have believed that there are three distinct *self-exis-*

lent persons, or substances in the Godhead, because the Bible, in view of impartial readers, most directly supports the incomprehensible doctrine." The general association of New Hampshire in their address on the Trinity remark, "Father, Son and Holy Ghost are names of office, not of essence, these three are *self-existent persons* in one God; they are persons in a peculiar and exalted sense." Thus we have the testimony of a body of Trinitarians, that they believe there are three self-existent persons in one God, and it is hoped Mr. L. will not implicate his character so much as to deny it again.

Now supposing that the three persons in the Trinity are self-existent, how can we reasonably suppose that either of them was begotten? Can the Son be *begotten*, if self-existent? Or can the Holy Ghost proceed from the Father and Son, if it be a self-existent person? Is not the assertion, that a person is self-existent and yet begotten, a gross absurdity? And is it judicious, is it wise, to wrap up such a perversion of common sense under the covering of "*mystery*."

If we admit that the "one God" mentioned in scripture, is three persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, who have we left for a mediator between this "one God" and men? However many persons there may be in the "one God,"

B

it is between this "one God" and us that the mediator is needed. Who then is it that stands as mediator between this "three-one-God" and men? Was he a "three-one-God," who sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh? who also spared not his own Son? and was Jesus Christ this "three-one-God?" Was he a "three-one-God" who anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost? and ordained him to be the judge of the living and the dead? and was Jesus this same "three-one-God," who anointed and ordained himself? Is "the HOLY ONE," "the MIGHTY ONE," the high and lofty ONE, who inhabiteth eternity," a "three-one-God?" If so, why were not these titles assumed? the holy *three-one*, the mighty *three-one*, the high and lofty *three-one*? and why did Christ and his apostles omit to say a single word about a "three-one-God?"

From the entire silence of scripture about a "three-one-God," may we not justly infer that no such being was known to the Holy One of Israel, nor to his Son Jesus Christ, nor to any of the prophets or apostles, or that they were all of the opinion that the knowledge of such a being would be useless to mankind?

Once more. If God is as much as three persons, how do we know by the same rule that he is not more than three? If the Bible has taught us that God is as much as three persons,

has it stopped at that exact number? Has it told us that he is no more than three? When we leave the divine unity of God, where shall we find a rational stopping place? Since we read of "the seven spirits of God," to which add the Trinity, and how do we know but that God is ten persons? It is easy, on the same principle to fancy that he is ten thousand persons; or even thirty millions, and equal the whole number of Hindoo deities. Where is the place for the mind to alight, when it has once commenced its airy flight in the boundless regions of conjecture? Is it not much safer to rest on the simple testimony of divine truth, that "the Lord our God is one Lord?"

SECTION III.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY OF HUMAN ORIGIN.

Believing the doctrine of the Trinity to be unfounded in either scripture or reason, I shall now search for it among the inventions of men.

Mr. Luckey states, that in order to confute the assertion that the doctrine of the Trinity is an invention of men, he collected a number of quotations from the writings of the ancient fathers, to show that this doctrine was acknowledged by the christian church from the earliest period of its existence; but that perceiving the same thing could be accomplished in a shorter

way, he declined introducing them into his book. p. 102. If Mr. L. had such extracts as he states above, I regret that he did not "introduce them," and I very much wonder he had not, since such evidence would have borne with far more weight in testimony, than his mere unqualified assertion. Indeed, I very much doubt whether Mr. L. or any other person, can produce testimony from any writer, as early as the third century, that the doctrine that God is three persons, was believed or known in the days of the apostles. From all I have been able to gather from church history, I am still inclined to think, that the doctrine of the Trinity was invented long since the days of the apostles.

In respect to what I am now about to exhibit, relative to the origin of the Trinitarian doctrine, I shall have particular recourse to Mr. Milners' Church History, Dr. Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, and Dr. Priestley's Church History ; but more particularly to the two former works. Mr. Milner was a zealous Trinitarian, and it is evident that his principal object in writing was, to support the Trinitarian doctrine. He has collected every expression he could find in the writings of the ancient fathers, which he thought in the least favored his cause. In this one particular, his history has been of use to me, as it has given me a view of

certain ideas, which first laid the foundation for the doctrine of the Trinity, as taught at the present day, and also, the manner in which that doctrine progressed, till it received its "finishing touch," as Dr. Mosheim expresses it. Dr. Mosheim was a Trinitarian, but wrote with candor, as also did Dr. Priestly, though a Humanitarian.*

*I must here remark, that the quotations which Mr. Harmon has given in his pamphlet, as he says from Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, and Justin Martyr, are not found in Mr. Milner's, nor any church history which has come under my inspection. The writings of Dionysius and Justin Martyr, are not known in this country, except such extracts from them as are preserved in church Histories. Dionysius, and Justin Martyr, are both particularly noticed by Mr. Milner, and every thing undoubtedly quoted by him, which he thought favored the doctrine of the Trinity. The circumstance mentioned by Mr. Harmon, of Dionysius being summoned before a council at Rome, to defend himself against the suspicion that he was not orthodox, is particularly related by Mr. Milner, and the words of Dionysius on the occasion quoted; but nothing mentioned like what Mr. H. has stated. Mr. Milner mentions Justin Martyr's apology to the emperor Antonious, and his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, and quotes from both works, but nothing like what is found in Mr. H's pamphlet. Is it probable, or even possible, that with the above works before him when he wrote, that no such expressions as are found in Mr. H's pamphlet are given by Mr. Milner, when he appears to have been so diligent in search of every thing he could find, that he thought favored the doctrine of

That the doctrine that God is three persons, or that Christ is the self-existent God, was not known as early as the first part of the second century, to me appears evident from a certain work mentioned by Dr. Priestly, written at that period, entitled the Clementine Homilies. Of this work the Doctor remarks, "with respect to ingenuity and information, it is not inferior to any of the writings of those usually called the Fathers." Again he says, "the author introduces all the theological knowledge of the times." Nothing, however, he informs us, is found in this work, which so much as intimates that the doctrine of the Trinity was then known of. In obviating the objections brought against christianity, (probably by the Jews,) that according to the rule laid down by

the Trinity? I shall therefore question the genuineness of Mr. H's quotations, until I have better evidence. He has not told us who he got them from, and in this he is certainly inexcusable.

It is with equal astonishment that I view Mr. Lucky's effort to prove that Dionysius was a Trinitarian, by giving his defence before the council at Rome, in two places in his book, in very different words. In page 27, Mr. L. gives the words of Dionysius as recorded by Mr. Milner, and in page 103, he pretends to give the words of Dionysius on the same occasion entirely different from the former. Was Mr. L. so blinded by party zeal, as to suppose both quotations were genuine?

Moses, Jesus ought to have been rejected, either as a false prophet or another God; the author replies, "To us there is one God, who made all things, and governs all things, whose son Christ is." Again says the author, "Our Lord, never said that there was any other God besides him that made all things; nor did he ever call himself God, but pronounced him blessed who called him the Son of God. Had the doctrine of the Trinity been acknowledged by the church at that early period, without any dissention, is it not remarkable to find such language as above quoted from an author at that day? Also, if the doctrine that God is three persons, or that Christ is the self-existent God, was known at that time, why was it not noticed among all the theological information contained in the work alluded to?"

It will be remembered that the first learned men who embraced christianity after the apostles, were generally such as had been educated in Platonic schools, and these for the first three centuries were the principal writers in the church. It is evident also, that they brought with them much of their vain philosophy, and by degrees mingled it with the gospel, by which means the "pure testimony" became adulterated. Filled with philosophical notions, they interpreted scripture in an allegorical, mysterious sense, and darkened council by words

without knowledge. Mr. Milner and Dr. Priestly, have quoted much from the earliest writers after the apostles, the one to prove the Supreme deity of Christ, and the other to disprove it; but in all they exhibit, many of the ideas of early writers relating to God and Christ, as well as on other subjects, are confused and unintelligible. Although the title of *God* is given to Christ by some of them, yet it appears evident to me that it was in a similar sense to which we call a person *man*, because he is the son of a man. One of the ancient fathers, speaking of Christ, calls him "*God, the Son of the Maker of the universe.*" This not only shews the sense in which that title was understood when applied to Christ, but also represents a distinction between the Father and Son.

About the middle of the third century, Origen flourished, who, according to Mosheim, became the great model whom the most eminent of the christian doctors followed in their explanations of scripture. In order then to understand what the principal doctors in the church were conformed to, we will enquire a little concerning their *model*. Both according to Mosheim and Milner, Origen was remarkable for giving allegorical meaning to the language of scripture. Dr. Mosheim observes, "the christian doctors who had applied them-

selves to the study of letters and philosophy, abandoned the frequented paths, and struck out into the devious wilds of fancy. Origen was at the head of this speculative tribe. This great man, enchanted with the charms of Platonic philosophy, set it up as a test of all religion, and imagined that the reasons of each doctrine, were to be found in that favorite philosophy, and their nature and extent to be determined by it." Again, speaking of Origen, he says, "Having entertained a notion that it was extremely difficult, if not impossible to defend every thing contained in the sacred writings, from the cavils of heretics and infidels, so long as they were explained literally, he had recourse to the fecundity of a lively imagination, and maintained that the holy scriptures were to be interpreted in the same *allegorical manner*, that the Platonists explain the history of the Gods."

Origen, in his *Stramata*, book x. expresses himself in the following manner: "The source of many evils lies in adhering to the carnal, or *external* part of scripture. Those who do so, shall not attain to the kingdom of God. Let us therefore, seek after the spirit and the substantial fruit of the word, which are hidden and mysterious."

Such was the model of the principal christian doctors of that age; a man literally spoiled

through vain philosophy. And what may we suppose the consequence was of the principal christian doctors imitating Origen in his manner of explaining scripture? May we not naturally suppose a rapid degeneracy in the church from gospel truth, as well as a rapid growth of error? Dr. Mosheim says, "the disciples of Origen, breaking forth from the limits fixed by their master, interpreted in the most licentious manner, the divine truths of religion according to the tenor of the Platonic philosophy."

While I trace the account further, I cannot but mourn for the adulteration of the gospel at that age, while I view the many inconsistencies hatched and brooded over in this nest of vain sophistry. Many at the present day, if they can light upon testimony from some father of the third or fourth century, in favor of some darling sentiment, they receive it with almost as much sanctity as they would scripture. But if such persons would search the history of the church in those periods, they would see abundant cause not to attach too much confidence to what was believed then.

It was in this age of darkness, that the foundation was late for the doctrine of the Trinity; for it is believed that no correct account can be given, that the doctrine that God is three persons, was believed previous to Origen's day. The first avowed step towards the doctrine was

Sabellianism, a doctrine which began to be propagated by Sabellius, about the middle of the third century. He maintained that God, though only one person, acted in three distinct offices, which were those of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. "That the Word and Holy Spirit are only virtues, emanations, or functions of the Deity. That he who is in heaven is the Father of all things; that he descended into the Virgin, and became a child, and was born of her as a son; and that having accomplished the mystery of our salvation, he diffused himself on the apostles in tongues of fire, and was then denominated the Holy Ghost."

This was a Trinity of offices. I say this is a step towards the doctrine of the Trinity, and indeed I might have said, a great part of Trinitarians are on the same ground, viz.: that one God only acts in three distinct offices. They sometimes, indeed, call those offices *persons*, as they say, for want of a better *term*, but when confuted upon the ground of *three persons*, they immediately assert that God acts in three *offices*, which is direct Sabellianism. It is therefore worthy of remark, how near many Trinitarians approach to the old doctrine of *Sabellianism*. "The Sabellians explained their doctrine by resembling God to the sun; the illuminating virtue or quality of which was the *Word*, and its warming virtue the Holy Spirit."

I have heard very similar arguments from Trinitarians; that the sun was *light, heat, and color*, and yet but one fountain; so God is three persons, and yet but one being, say they. Or, as Mr. Lucky has it, that the letter H is constituted of two straight marks connected by a hyphen, and yet but one letter. So near Sabellians and Trinitarians approach each other in their arguments.

We will now hear what Dr. Mosheim says of the decision of the church, relative to the Sabellian doctrine. We have already heard of one God in *three offices*, and we shall now hear about one God in three persons.

The doctor says, "soon after its commencement, [the fourth century,] even in the year 317, a new contention arose in Egypt, upon a subject of much higher importance, and with consequences of a yet more pernicious nature. The subject of this fatal controversy, which kindled such deplorable divisions throughout the christian world was the doctrine of *three persons in the Godhead*; a doctrine which, in *three preceding centuries*, had happily escaped the vain curiosity of human researches, and been left undefined and undetermined by any particular set of ideas. The church, indeed, had frequently decided against the Sabellians and others, that there was a *real difference* between the *Father* and *Son*, and that the *Holy*

Ghost was *distinct* from them both ; or, as we commonly speak, that three distinct persons exist in the Deity ; but the mutual relation of these persons to each other, and the nature of that distinction that subsists between them, are matters that hitherto were neither disputed nor explained, and with respect to which the church had consequently observed a profound silence. Nothing was dictated to the faith of christians in this matter, nor were there any modes of expression prescribed, as requisite to be used in speaking of this mystery. Hence it happened, that the christian doctors entertained different sentiments upon this subject, without giving the least offence, and discoursed variously, concerning the distinction between *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost* ; each following his respective opinion with the utmost liberty. In Egypt, and the adjacent countries, the greatest part embraced in this, as well as in other matters, the opinion of Origen, who held that the *Son* was *in God*, that which *reason* is *in man* ; and that the *Holy Ghost* was nothing more than the *divine energy*, or active force.”

Although the doctor was a Trinitarian, his impartiality is worthy of notice, as he lets us know that he made use of those terms used in his own times by Trinitarians, in speaking up-

on this subject. “*Or as WE commonly speak that three persons exist in the Deity.*” Not that the fathers used that mode of expression in the third century, but that it was the language of Trinitarians in defining what they considered the fathers believed then. It is believed that no correct testimony can be produced, that that mode of expression was in use at that period of which the doctor writes.

If the doctor is correct, we may learn, respecting the doctrine of three persons in one God, that it had escaped the vain curiosity of human researches till the commencement of the fourth century, and that the church, previous to that time, had, consequently, observed a profound silence relative to it. They had decided against the Sabellians and others, that there was a real *difference* between the Father and Son, and that the Holy Ghost was *distinct* from them both. That nothing was dictated to the faith of christians in this matter; the christian doctors discoursed variously upon the subject without giving the least offence; each following his respective opinion with the utmost liberty.

Now, I would ask; does this account indicate that the doctrine of the Trinity was at that time received into the church as an article of faith? If so, it must have been something very different from what it is now. As to Origen's *Trinity*, if one it may be called, I think orthodox

Trinitarians would not pronounce it very correct at the present day. He asserted that the Son was in God, that which reason is in man, and that the Spirit was no more than the *divine energy* or *active force*. If this is Trinity what man is there that has *reason* and *active force*, but is a Trinity of himself? Besides saying the Son was in God, that which reason is in man, is very different from saying the Son was the very God, and asserting the Spirit to be only a *divine energy* or *active force*, is very different from affirming it to be a person.

Perhaps what Origen founded his belief upon, that the Son was in God, that which reason was in man, was from the 8th chapter of Proverbs, where he considered Christ personified under the title of *Wisdom*, and that before the hills were settled, he was brought forth. However, I shall neither attempt to defend or explain Origen's doctrine, but am led to conclude that every candid Trinitarian will acknowledge, it is not the doctrine of the Trinity as taught at the present day. Yet Dr. Mosheim says, "in Egypt, and the adjacent country, the greatest part embraced Origen's doctrine in this respect." It must, therefore, be acknowledged, that the majority were not Trinitarians. Besides, does it appear probable that Origen's doctrine would have been so generally received, if the doctrine of the Trinity had been correctly taught at that

day? It is evident that Origen considered God but one person, and of course two-thirds of his Trinity only allegorical. -

We will now follow Dr. Mosheim, in his account of the result of this controversy, which we shall find began between Arius, a presbyter, and Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria. "In an assembly of the presbyters of Alexandria, (says the doctor,) the bishop of that city, whose name was Alexander, expressed his sentiment upon this head with a high degree of freedom and confidence; and maintained, among other things, that the Son was not only of the same eminence and dignity, but also of the same essence with the Father. This assertion was opposed by Arius, one of the presbyters, a man of a subtle turn, and remarkable for his eloquence. Whether his zeal for his own opinions, or personal resentment against the bishop, was the motive that influenced him, is not very certain. Be that as it will, he first treated as false the assertion of Alexander, on account of its affinity to the Sabellian errors, which had been condemned by the church; and then, running himself into the opposite extreme, he maintained that the Son was totally and essentially distinct from the Father; that he was the first and noblest of those beings, whom God the Father had created out of nothing, the instrument by whose subordinate operation the Al-

mighty Father formed the universe, and therefore inferior to the Father both in nature and dignity.

“The opinions of Arius were no sooner divulged, than they found in Egypt, and the neighboring provinces, a multitude of abettors, and among these many who were distinguished as much by the superiority of their learning and genius, as by the eminence of their rank and station in the world. Alexander, on the other hand, in two councils assembled at Alexandria, accused Arius of impiety, and caused him to be expelled from the communion of the church. Arius received this severe and ignominious shock with great firmness and constancy of mind; retired into Palestine; wrote from thence several letters to the most eminent men of those times, in which he endeavored to demonstrate the truth of his opinions, and that with such surprising success, that vast numbers were drawn over to his party, and among those Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, a man distinguished in the church by his influence and authority.”

In consequence of these contentions, the famous council of Nice was called, by Constantine the great, in the year 325. We will now go with Milner to this council, and see what light we can obtain there.

As Mr. Milner wrote under a full persuasion

that the council of Nice supported the doctrine of the Trinity, in his sense of the term, and as he wrote mainly to support that doctrine himself, we may well suppose that his representations are as favorable to his cause as he could make them, with a due regard to truth. If then it should be made to appear from Mr. Milner's own exhibitions, that even this council did not express the doctrine that God is three persons, we may safely conclude, that it was not yet adopted in the church, as an article of faith. We will then attend to Mr. Milner's representation of the decision of this council, upon the subject in question.

The council was composed of 318 bishops, from the various parts of the christian world; and, as many presbyters were there besides the bishops. It is supposed by Mr. Milner, that the whole number of persons assembled in the council was not less than 600. "They collected together the passages of scripture (says Mr. M.) which represent the divinity of Jesus Christ, and observed, that, taken together, they amounted to a proof of his being of the same substance with the Father. That *creatures* were indeed, said to be of God, because not existing of themselves, they had their beginning from him; but that the Son was peculiarly of the Father, being of his substance, *as begotten of him.*"

Nothing is found in the decision of the council at Nice, that God is three persons ; or that Christ is the true, and self-existent God ; or that the Holy Ghost is a person. They went no farther than to decide against the sentiment of Arius, who taught that instead of Christ being begotten of God, he was the first being God *created out of nothing*, which sentiment I view as derogatory to scripture, as did the council of Nice. Instead of Christ being *created out of nothing*, the scriptures affirm that he “proceeded forth and came from God.” [John viii. 42.]

I do not say, however, that all this council were with me in sentiment ; it is highly probable that a great part of them, had embraced Origen’s sentiment, “that the Son was in God, that which reason is in man, and that the Spirit is only the divine energy or active force.” But if they were on this ground, they were yet unprepared to assert the doctrine, that God is three persons ; for Origen’s system as plainly teaches that God is one person only, as it does that a man who has *reason* and *energy* is but one person. How much advance had been made in the minds of a certain part of this council from Origen’s system is not known ; however, it is certain, from all that Mr. Milner has exhibited, that they did not yet establish the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is now taught ; that work was yet reserved for a later period.

Room would fail me here, to particularize all the contentions, and revolutions that succeeded. Arius and his adherents were condemned in this council, and sent into exile. Constantine, however, in a few years afterwards, by the influence of the Arian priest, who had been recommended to him in the dying hours of his sister, Constantia, recalled Arius from his state of banishment, and repealed the laws which had been enacted against him. Athanasius, who was at that time bishop of Alexandria, refused to restore Arius to his former rank and office, in consequence of which Athanasius was excommunicated by the council at Tyre, held in the year 335, and was afterwards banished into Gaul. The people at Alexandria still refused Arius a place among the presbyters, upon which Constantine invited him to Constantinople, in the year 336. Here Arius died* shortly after his arrival, and the emperor Constantine survived him but a short time.

* The cause of Arius' death has been a subject of speculation among modern writers. In Dr. Mosheim's history it is thus stated: "The ancient writers, who considered this event a judgment of heaven miraculously drawn down by the prayers of the just, to punish the impiety of Arius, will find little credit in our times, among such as have studied with attention and impartiality, the history of Arianism. After having considered this matter, with the utmost care,

The controversy, however, did not cease with the death of Arius. After the death of Constantine, his empire was divided between his three sons, Constantius, Constans, and Constantine the younger. Constantius, the emperor of the East, was warmly attached to the Arian sentiment, while Constans and Constantine, the emperors of the West, warmly maintained the sentiments of the Nicenes. Hence arose animosities, seditions, treacheries, and acts of violence, between the two great contending parties. Council was assembled against council, and their jarring and contradictory decrees, spread perplexity and confusion throughout the christian world. Although it is evident that differences of opinion existed in both, yet the church, generally considered, was divided into two grand contending parties. The shift of power from one party to the other, (which alternately enabled the greater to vent their malignity on the lesser,) was various during the successive reigns of several emperors, till the year 379, when Theodosius came upon the throne.

it appears to me extremely probable that this unhappy man was a victim of the resentment of his enemies, and was destroyed by poison, or some such violent means. A blind and fanatical zeal for certain systems of faith, in all ages, has produced such horrible acts of cruelty and injustice."

This emperor, like Constantine the great, was a convert to christianity ; but when he became such, does not appear ; he, however, was warmly opposed to Arianism. When he first commenced his reign, he had not been baptised ; but being taken ill at Thessalonica, and finding the bishop of that place with him in sentiment, he was baptised by him. Upon his recovery he published a law to oblige all his subjects to profess the doctrine of the Nicene creed, and ordered, that all the churches in which it was not professed, should be considered heretical.

In 381, Theodosius called the famous council of Constantinople. This council was composed of such bishops as he supposed, agreed with him in sentiment. Dr. Mosheim says, “ an hundred and fifty bishops who were present at this council, gave *the finishing touch* to what the council at Nice had left *imperfect*, and fixed, in a full and determinate manner, the doctrine of *three persons in one God*, which is, as yet, received among the generality of christians.”

Here then, the doctrine of the Trinity was modelled out, and whether it was done by the majority or minority of this council, remains yet a question. Mr. Milner states the number who composed this council, to be 350, and Dr. Mosheim states, that an hundred and fifty bishops gave “ *the finishing touch*” to the

doctrine of three persons in one God. *The finishing touch*, therefore, must have been given by the minority, or otherwise there is a mistake between the two writers, relative to the number who composed the council. Be that as it may, the doctor has very obligingly told us when "*the finishing touch*" was given to the doctrine of three persons in one God. We might, however, have supposed, that had that doctrine been so important as it is stated to be, that *the finishing touch* would have been given it in the scriptures of truth.

We will now hear what Mr. Milner says of this council. "The council, (says Mr. M.) was very *confused* and *disorderly*, greatly inferior in *wisdom* and *piety* to the council at Nice." "*Faction* was high, and *charity* was low at this time." "This council very accurately defined the doctrine of the Trinity, and *enlarged* a little the Nicene creed; they delivered it as we now have it in our communion service." "The Macedonian heresy, which blasphemed the Holy Ghost, gave occasion to a more *explicit representation* of the third person in the Trinity."

Here we have it from this bigoted Trinitarian, that this council enlarged a little the Nicene creed, and gave a more explicit representation of the third person in the Trinity. It does not appear that the council at Nice gave any representation of the Holy Ghost as a per-

son, nor any idea of three distinct persons in one God ; and the additions made to their creed by the council at Constantinople, may perhaps be justly attributed to the spirit and character of that council, as given by Mr. Milner. He not only states that faction was high, and charity was low, at that time, but also that the council was very *confused* and *disorderly*, and greatly inferior in piety and wisdom, to the council at Nice.

The church in the fourth century, both according to Mosheim and Milner, made very rapid advances in degeneracy ; and if we may give credit to what has been collected from these historians, I think we are justly entitled to the following conclusion : that the doctrine of three persons in one God, was conceived in *Platonic philosophy* ; brought forth in *allegory* ; had its growth in the *degeneracy of the church* ; and its maturity, or "*finishing touch*" in a "*very confused and disorderly council*," when *faction* was high, and *charity* low. And shall it be deemed a crime to question the correctness of a doctrine thus produced, or bring it to the oracles of God for examination ?

It is my firm belief that no evidence has been produced by either Mr. Milner or Dr. Mosheim, that the doctrine that God is three persons, was known in the first three centuries, nor any idea that approached nearer to it than

Origen's allegorical Trinity in unity, which was that "the Son was in God, that which reason is in man, and that the Holy Ghost was only the divine energy, or active force." This, no Trinitarian would be willing to admit to be a correct view of their system.

Nothing is given us of the decision of the council of Nice, that proves the doctrine that God is three persons, was then agreed upon. A part of that council had probably embraced Origen's system of an allegorical Trinity, which by the heat of controversy was probably by degrees, transformed into a real Trinity, so that in fifty six years, an hundred and fifty bishops became prepared for the business, and gave the "*finishing touch*" to what the council of Nice had *left imperfect*, and fixed in a full and determined manner, the doctrine of three persons in one God. A worse character was perhaps never given to any council which bore the christian name, than Mr. Milner has given to the council of Constantinople. Yet it appears that this is the first council that ever asserted the doctrine that God is three persons.

Although the council of Constantinople was composed of such bishops as the emperor Theodosius considered with him in sentiment; yet it is evident from history, that even in that council, when the article of three persons in one God come to be adopted, there was a large number

of dissenters ; and that shortly afterwards, great numbers exposed themselves to the most violent persecutions by refusing to subscribe it.

At a time so near the apostolic age, can it be possible there could be such contention among christians, upon a point which the first christians received expressly from the apostles of our Lord ? Can it be, that all who attended on the ministry of the apostles, heard them teach as Trinitarians now teach, and heard them worship as Trinitarians now worship, and yet that the knowledge of it should become so confused as to cause such serious dissention within less than three hundred years after the ministry of the apostles was ended ? Is it not evident respecting the point in question, that the apostles and primitive christians did not teach and worship as Trinitarians do now ? In short, as to this serious fact, the explicit testimony of Mr. Milner and Dr. Mosheim, goes to confirm it. Mr. Milner expressly says, "Flavian" (of the fourth century,) "was the first who invented the doxology," "Glory be to the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost." And Dr. Mosheim says, "in earlier periods of the church, the worship of christians was confined to the one supreme God, and his Son Jesus Christ." *Ecc. Hist.* vol. 2nd, p. 176.

As the doctrine of the Trinity has often been asserted to be a doctrine of the reformation, I

shall further remark. The triune article of faith as fixed in the "confused and disorderly" council of Constantinople, has ever since been deemed a cardinal point in the creed of the church of Rome. What then was done by Luther and his coadjutors in regard to this matter? Certainly they did not originate an article of faith which had existed nearly a thousand years before their time; nor did they revive the use of that article, for the use of it had never been discontinued in the church of Rome from which they revolted. It is only true, that the reformers had no contention with the church of Rome on this point. As they had been Trinitarians while of that church, so they continued to be when Protestants. Nor is it at all strange, that they did not perceive at once, and in every particular, how far the papal church had wandered from the way of truth. It is rather wonderful that they, in so short a time, affected so much as they did, by way of reformation. If I do not mistake, I have somewhere read of the mild Melancton, that he perceived in the triune article of faith, so much departure from the simplicity of divine testimony, that he wept in view of the controvesy it must at some time occasion among the Protestants.

SECTION IV.

THE TRINITARIAN DOCTRINE OF INCARNATION EXAMINED.

By the Trinitarian doctrine of *incarnation*, we are taught that Jesus Christ is composed of two whole distinct natures, *human* and *divine*; that in his *human nature*, he is truly and properly a *man*, and that in his *divine nature*, he is the very and eternal God.

This doctrine to me appears as difficult to understand, as the assertion that God is three persons. Not content with asserting God to be three persons, Trinitarians would also teach us that the Son, one of the three, is *two* persons. I am, however, aware that they will be unwilling to admit this statement; but if their doctrine does not plainly imply it, I am at an entire loss to know the meaning of the terms they use.

As *man*, they tell us Christ possessed a human body and a reasonable soul. Every one knows that a human body and a reasonable soul, constitutes a complete *person* or *being*. This is one person. In his *divine nature* they assert that he is the very and eternal God, and this, according to their system, must be at least as much as *one person* more. As *one* and *one* make *two*, the plain conclusion follows, that the Trinitari-

an doctrine asserts the Son of God to be *two persons!!!*

But it is asserted, that "the two natures are so mysteriously united as to constitute but one person." Before I admit the correctness of this statement, I must require some other definition of the *two natures*, than to state the one to be *very man*, and the other *very God*, for I need not to be taught that "*very man*" is *one person* and *very God* another. It would be no more absurd, for Trinitarians to assert that God is three persons, and yet but one *person*, than it is to say, the Son of God is *very God* and *very man*, and yet but one person.

Did I believe that Jesus Christ was "truly and properly a man," and also the "very and eternal God," I would far sooner give up the idea that God is three persons, than that the Son is two. How Trinitarians get along with this difficulty I know not, for they are generally pretty silent about it. The Nestorians in the fifth century, in asserting the doctrine of incarnation, frankly owned their belief that Christ was two persons. And why are not Trinitarians, at the present day, willing to acknowledge the same sentiment, while their doctrine plainly implies it? Is it because they know it would involve a palpable absurdity? and do they aid their cause, in the least, by endeavoring to conceal an absurdity which their doctrine so plainly involves?

In arguments used by Trinitarians, they acknowledge a plain distinction between the *two natures*, as much so as to assert they are two persons. They say Christ sometimes spake as man, and sometimes as God. That sometimes the *human nature* spake, and sometimes the *divine nature*. That the *two natures* conversed together; that the one nature prayed to the other nature. And from these statements, what conception can we form of the two natures, but that they are *two persons*? But to acknowledge this, the support of scripture would still be needed. What scripture even asserts that Christ possesses *two whole* and distinct natures? When and where did he say, this I speak as God, and this I speak as man? this I affirm of my divine nature, and this of my human nature? Where, in the scriptures, have we an example of this strange phraseology? No where. It was demanded by the errors of a later age.

In the Methodist discipline, the incarnation of the Son of God is thus described:

ARTICLE II. "*Of the Word, or Son of God who was made very Man.*"

"The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the *very* and *eternal God*, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person,

never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile the Father to us."

Here we are told, firstly, that "the Word, or Son of God was made very man;" and secondly, that this Word or Son "is the very and eternal God," and, of course, from the two sentences connected, we are to understand the very and eternal God was made man!! Here some very serious questions naturally arise.

Did the very and eternal God experience no *change* when he was made *man*? When he became *man*, was he not as liable to suffering and death as any other man? Who was then "able to save him from death?" Who has governed the world, and who has been the Trinitarian object of worship since the very and eternal God was made man? Is the supreme object of Trinitarian worship a man? But is it argued that only one person in the very and eternal God, is meant? Be it so, I may then ask, did it imply no change in the very and eternal God, to have one person out of three made man? How many divine persons remained, when one out of the three was made man? After the Word was made *man*, was this man equal with God the Father? Besides, what sect ever gave the Messiah a lower character than to suppose he was a *man*?

Further, says the article, "The very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature." Here we may remark: 1. To tell of a *Father* to be the very and eternal God, looks rather preposterous. 2. By the expression, he "took man's nature," is, I suppose meant, that he took a *very man* into union with himself; on which I again remark—for the very and eternal God to be made man, is one thing; and to take a man into union with himself, is another, and a very different thing. Yet both of these are asserted by Trinitarians, and implied in the second article of the Methodist discipline.

The article continues, "so that *two whole and perfect natures*, that is to say, the *Godhead* and *manhood* were joined together in *one person* never to be divided." Here mark the expression, "*two whole and perfect natures*." Now if they were *whole natures*, they were not parts of natures only; and to render it definite what these *two whole natures* are, they are said to be "the *Godhead* and *manhood*." By the *Godhead* is meant the whole being of God, which Trinitarians assert to be three persons. Will it not follow then, according to this article, that three persons were joined to human nature never to be divided; and that the Son of God is three divine persons, and one human one? Besides, what is this short of asserting, that

three divine persons and one human nature, make but one person? Did the human nature of Christ die, and while dead, was the God-head still united to it, never to be divided? Or did they all die together?

From the next part of the article, we might rather conclude the latter was meant—"Whereof is one Christ *very God* and *very man*, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried." If Christ, who was very God and very man, was actually "crucified, dead and buried," we must conclude that they all died; and the third article strengthens the conclusion—"Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and took again his body." It is not said that the human nature arose from the dead, and united again with the divine nature, but that which arose from the dead is represented as taking again a human body. As a human body could not take "again a human body," of course the article asserts, that the very God arose from the dead! And to finish the climax, the whole took place, according to the articles, to reconcile God to us, instead of reconciling the world to God, according to scripture!

A few years ago, it was published in the Methodist minutes, that a preacher belonging to that connexion, was expelled from the Methodist church for rejecting this second article of their discipline. I cannot but commend his

candor and honesty, for a man who can believe at such a rate, is in little danger of being lost, if believing absurdities would save him.

Notwithstanding this article, Trinitarians, and even Methodists themselves, assert that only the human nature of Christ suffered and died. But if nothing but human nature suffered and died, I am at a loss to know what more they have than a human sacrifice.

This Mr. Harmon, indirectly acknowledges, though he labors hard to conceal it. He says, page 14, "It is admitted that the self-existent God did not die. But it is not admitted that the sacrifice is no better than a mere human atonement." For this conclusion he tells us his reasons are brief and full. He then states three reasons why he does not consider the sacrifice a mere human one, though nothing but human nature suffered and died. 1. "The sacrifice was appointed of God the Father. 2. Christ was without sin. 3. The human nature was united with the divine." Upon the last reason he states, "if we may be permitted to use a figure, his humanity was offered upon the altar of his Divinity; the altar sanctified the gift, and stamped the sacrifice with infinite value."

To these I remark; as Mr. H. contends that the sacrifice was infinite, his first two *reasons* are nothing to his purpose. His third reason, which is that Christ's humanity was offered on

the altar of his divinity, is wholly unfounded in scripture, as there is not a passage to support it. However, I shall examine Mr. H.'s *figure*, and show that it exposes what he has been laboring to conceal. "His humanity was offered upon the altar of his divinity," says Mr. H. Now, we need not to be told that the altar is one thing, and the sacrifice another. As Mr. H. represents divinity, or the very God to be the altar, and human nature the sacrifice, what is this short of indirectly acknowledging the sacrifice to be only a human one? The following questions naturally arise: If the very God was the altar, who was the human sacrifice offered to? Was it offered to the altar? If the very God was the altar, and human nature the sacrifice, Mr. H. ought to have told us who this human sacrifice was offered to!!

Upon the whole, I think Mr. H. will see he has been allowed to use a *figure*, which is unsupported by either scripture or reason, while it also exposes that which he is laboring to conceal.

As to this human sacrifice being connected with the divine nature, and this sanctifying it, and stamping it with infinite value, looks no better to me than Socinianism. Socinians hold that Christ was only a man, but that God the Father dwelt in him by the fulness of his spirit—that his Father, by this union, assisted Christ

to perform miracles, and supported him in the hour of death. It may be then asked, in what degree has the Trinitarian hypothesis the advantage over the Socinian theory? Might not the Socinians, with equal propriety, insist that though Christ only died as a man, yet his being united with, or filled with the divine nature, that union "sanctified the sacrifice, and stamped it with infinite value?" I am free to own that I have not discernment enough to see, that the Trinitarian doctrine of incarnation exalts Jesus above a man supernaturally endowed. Is there any thing more implied in the assertion, that the very God was united to a *proper man*?

Many Trinitarians openly confess that they believe in no more than a *human sacrifice*, and this is plainly implied by Mr H., though he labors to conceal it. His whole argument appears to rest upon the idea, that a human sacrifice may be so sanctified as to render it infinite. The merits of a sacrifice is to be determined by its quality or kind; and that which suffered and died was the sacrifice. If, therefore, nothing but human nature suffered, the sacrifice could be no more than a human one. How the death of human nature can be so sanctified as to constitute an infinite sacrifice, is left for Mr. H. to explain.

For the sake of argument, we will, for a moment, admit what Mr. H. contends for, viz. :

that an infinite sacrifice was needed to satisfy the demands of justice. We will admit the ground of *equivalency*, which he contends for, and I would then ask, could the death of one human atone for millions of human beings condemned to die? Could the death of mere human nature constitute a sacrifice sufficiently meritorious to answer all demands? Admit for a moment, the high Calvinistic scheme, that Christ died for the *elect* only; would not as many human sacrifices be needed, as there are elect ransomed?

That Christ died for all men, is a scriptural fact; and that the sacrifice is sufficient for the salvation of all who exercise repentance and faith, is my full belief; but the Lord pity those who trust in a mere human sacrifice for salvation.

The Trinitarian doctrine of incarnation, not only reduces Christ's *humiliation* to a mere shadow, but it almost wholly destroys the impressions with which his sufferings ought to be viewed. According to this doctrine, when fully explained, Christ was comparatively no sufferer at all. It is true, his humanity suffered, but this they tell us was an infinitely small part of Jesus, bearing no more proportion to his whole person, than a single hair of our head to the whole body; or than a drop to the ocean. The infinite Godhead of Christ, that which they say

was most properly himself, was infinitely happy at the very moment of the suffering of his humanity. While hanging on the cross, he was the happiest being in the universe; yea, as happy as the infinite God could be; so that his pains, compared with his felicity, were nothing. This Trinitarians do and must acknowledge.

The doctrine goes still farther. It teaches that the Son of God never suffered and died. It is true that Trinitarians bewilder themselves, and many others, by the pretext that the Son of God suffered in his human nature. But let their views be properly stated. By the Son of God they mean no other than the second person in the Godhead, whom they call the very God himself, and whom they suppose to be absolutely incapable of suffering at all. By the human nature they mean a "real man," to whom this Son of God was united. This "man" and the Son of God, of course, must be distinct from each other. Can any one then make himself believe, that the sufferings of human nature, distinct from the Son of God, can with any propriety be called the sufferings of God, or the sufferings of the Son of God in his human nature?

No possible union of God to a person distinct from him, can render it proper to denominate the sufferings and death of that person, the sufferings and death of God. If God be

absolutely incapable of suffering *at all*, he is certainly incapable of suffering by an union with human nature. If Trinitarians would only state their views in an intelligible manner, the difficulty would be easily perceived. Instead of saying the Son of God "suffered in his human nature," let them say as they believe, that the Son of God did not suffer at all, but that only a real man suffered, to whom the Son of God was united. This is stating the Trinitarian view of the subject, in a plain, correct manner. But as this happens to contradict the explicit language of the bible, they cast a mist over the whole affair, by saying, "the Son of God suffered in his human nature," while they at the same time positively deny his capability of suffering at all.

The suffering of the Son of God is thus illustrated by Dr. Lightfoot, an eminent Trinitarian. In reference to Gen. xxii. the doctor says, thus, "*Isaac* and the *Ram*, a true type of Christ's two natures, the one only suffering, and the other not; yet *that*, that *suffered not*, giving validity and value to *that* that suffered."—*Lightfoot's Remains*.

According to the doctor, Isaac, who "suffered not," represents the Son of God; and "the Ram that suffered," represents the man to whom the Son of God was united. What language could more emphatically convey the idea

that a *man* suffered as a *substitute* for the *Son of God*; and that “the sufferings of the Son of God, are a mere illusion, a phantom?” This is the very substance of the ancient Cerinthian heresy, that “the Son of God only suffered in appearance on the cross.” While the Trinitarian declaims the Cerinthian, might not the latter, with propriety, reply to the former in the language of the penitent thief, “Dost thou not fear God, seeing thou art in the same condition?”

Was there ever a more deceptive theory embraced by a human mind? And shall we impute such palpable deception to the oracles of God, as to suppose, that by the sufferings and death of the Son of God, is only meant the sufferings and death of a “very man,” who died in the room of the Son of God?

O, thou blessed Jesus, is this a true representation of thy sufferings! Did not the sun refuse to shine, the rocks rend, and the earth quake, when thou suffered? when thou hung bleeding on the cross? when thou died for sinners? Yea, creation still wears the shock; the severed rocks echo to the gospel sound, “**IT WAS THE SON OF GOD THAT DIED!**”

SECTION V.

THE HOLY GHOST NOT A PERSON.

In this section, I shall firstly examine the principal arguments brought to prove the Holy Ghost a person; and secondly, endeavor to show, from scripture, that it is not a person. It is acknowledged by Trintarians, if the *personality* of the Holy Ghost is proved at all by scripture, it must be done by *inference only*, as no pertinent scripture can be produced to the point.

The first argument that I shall notice, which is frequently brought to prove the personality of the Holy Ghost, is that the personal pronoun *he* is in some instances applied to it in the scriptures. To which I reply, that much scripture might be quoted to prove the same of a number of inanimate things. "The *depth* saith it is not in *me*, and the *sea* saith it is not in *me*." Job xxviii. 14. "*Destruction* and *death* say, We have heard the fame thereof with *our ears*." Job xxviii. 22. "When they were past the first and second ward, they came unto the *iron gate* that leadeth unto the city, which opened unto them of *his* own accord." Acts xii. 10. "And he prayed again, and the heavens gave rain, and the earth brought forth *her* fruit." James v. 18. Here the *sea*, *destruction*, *death*,

an *iron gate* and the *earth*, are personified ; yet no one considers them *persons*. My whole design is here to show that many things have personal pronouns applied to them in the scriptures, that are not persons, which is the case with the Holy Ghost.

In several instances the Spirit is represented as speaking, which is used as an argument in favor of its personality. The Spirit *said* unto Peter, "Behold three men seek thee." Acts x. 19. That is, the *light* of the Spirit revealed this to Peter. "The *Spirit* and the bride *say* come." Rev. xxii. 17. By its inward drawings the Spirit invites us to the waters of life. "The Spirit itself maketh intercession for us." Rom. viii. 26. The Spirit influences our minds aright to pray ; by its *light* unfolding our needs, and by its *operations* enditing our petitions. Though speech is applied to the Holy Ghost in these instances, it is no less emphatically applied to the starry heavens, by the psalmist. "The *heavens declare* the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their *voice* is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their *words* to the ends of the world." Ps. xix. 1, 4. It is presumed that in no instance is speech more plainly applied to the Spirit in Scripture,

than it is here to the *starry heavens*, and to *day* and *night*.

“And he that searcheth the hearts, knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit.” Rom. viii. 27. That the Holy Ghost is meant here, is admitted, and the argument raised from it by Mr. Harmon, is, “if it be not a person, how can it have a mind?” By the mind of the Spirit, here mentioned, is undoubtedly meant the things which God made known by his Spirit. As for instance, I sometimes say, I give my *mind* to others upon certain things, and whether they understand me or not, I know what is the *mind* or *intention* of my medium of communication. The Spirit is very frequently the medium, or organ, through which God makes known his mind to men.

“The Spirit of God hath made me.” Job xxxiii. 4. “Here,” says Mr. Harmon, “the work of creation is applied to the Spirit; but the work of creation is the work of God, therefore the Spirit is God.” This I am convinced, is wresting scripture from its proper meaning; and in this instance we may see what may be accomplished by detaching a part of scripture, without quoting its connection. The words quoted, are the words of Elihu to Job. In the preceding chapter he stated that the Spirit constrained him, and after rebuking Job’s three friends, he addresses Job, “Wherefore, Job, I

pray thee, hear my speeches, and hearken to all my words. Behold, now I have opened my mouth, my tongue hath spoken in my mouth. My words shall be of the uprightness of my heart; and my lips shall utter knowledge clearly. The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life. If thou canst answer me, set they words in order before me, stand up."

It appears evident to me that Elihu had no allusion to his creation, when he said the Spirit of God hath made me, but that the Spirit of God had made him do thus. Do what? Address Job as he did, while the breath of the Almighty gave him life, or animated his soul to do it. It is useless to multiply words; the meaning is obvious to every impartial reader. †

The next scripture which Mr. H. pretends to give, is Ps. cxxxix. 7. "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there." I have but very few remarks to offer upon this passage, for it presents no difficulties relative to my views. That God is every where present, no christian denies. But I cannot but remark the mangled form in which Mr H. presents the passage in his pamphlet. He quotes it thus, "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? If I ascend into heaven, thou art

there," &c. It will be perceived, in this quotation, that an important sentence is left out of the text.* By thus mutilating the text, he doubtless meant to have the reader suppose, that the pronoun *thou*, referring to *Lord* understood, was identified with the Spirit mentioned in the passage. He says, "the passage identifies the Spirit with God." If this is not wresting scripture, I know not what is; but it is not the only instance of the kind which occurs in Mr. H.'s pamphlet, as I shall have cause hereafter to notice.

But, says Mr. H., "in Acts v. 3. Peter says to Ananias, 'Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?' and in the 4th verse he says, 'thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.'" So confident is Mr. H. that these two passages put together prove the Holy Ghost a person, that he adds, "How it is possible for any one calling himself a christian, to say in opposition to these words of holy writ, that the Holy Ghost is not God, I know not." p. 9.

What Mr. H. founds his argument upon is, that because Peter, in this instance, accused Ananias of lying to the Holy Ghost, and also assured him that he had not lied unto men, but

* This passage is presented by Mr. Luckey, in the same mutilated form, (see his treatise, page 225,) and similar arguments used. Query. Was it an inadvertant mistake in both these authors?

unto God, he draws the inference that the Holy Ghost and God are the same. That this is a mistaken view of the subject, to me appears very certain. If the inference be a just one, that lying to the Holy Ghost and lying to God, prove the Holy Ghost and God to be the same, may we not, with equal propriety, draw the following inference: As Christ said to his disciples when he sent them to preach, "He that heareth you heareth me," that Christ and his disciples are one and the same being? and that there is no distinction between them?

God has been pleased to place in every human breast a certain principle called *conscience*; this monitor reproveth of falsehood as well as all other known iniquity. Who would not be willing to admit, that whoever is guilty of wilful falsehood, lies to his own conscience, and that he also lies to God, who placed this *reprover* in his breast? But would the inference be a just one, that a man's *conscience* is the very God himself? In like manner God, by the light of his Spirit in this instance, impressed the mind of Ananias with the importance of honesty, and taught him better than to keep back part of the price for which he sold his possession.

Therefore, in attempting to deceive, he lied to the Holy Ghost, by which he had been instructed, and also lied to God, who had given his Spirit, thus to instruct and reprove him.

Mr. H. next brings the following: "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Pet. i. 21. That the ancient prophets prophesied as God moved upon them, by the operations of his Spirit, is evident, nor can I see that the passage asserts any thing more.

The arguments already noticed, comprise the whole of Mr. Harmon's evidence, that the Holy Ghost is a person; but if this is all, we may yet venture to write upon it "*tekel*."

We will now hear some of Mr. Luckey's testimony upon the subject. He says, "The idea that the Holy Ghost is eternal sufficiently establishes its divinity; and this is inferred from the consideration that it is created or self-existent, derived or eternal. That it is not derived or created is clear from the absurdity that God derived or created his own Spirit, or that there was a time when it did not exist. Of course it is eternal, and whatever is eternal is God; therefore the Spirit is God." p. 224.

It would appear from this testimony, that Mr. L. would make no distinction even between the attributes of God, and God himself. God possessed certain attributes from eternity. We will say, for instance, that God possessed *power* from all eternity, and will Mr. L. say that *power* is the very God? Will he say, that from the *power* the devil possesses, that the devil possesses

the very God? We may admit that God delegates power to creatures, yet such creatures may possess no part of God; he may still be infinite in power himself, and they be "without hope and without God in the world."

Light may be as old as the *sun*, yet the light we enjoy is not the sun itself, but is only that which is caused by it, or that which emanates or proceeds from it. In like manner the Holy Ghost is a divine emanation from "the Lord God, who is a *sun* and shield." Ps. lxxxiv. 11. Jesus said, "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send you *from the Father*, even the Spirit of truth, which *proceedeth from the Father*." Can the Spirit of truth, which is here represented as proceeding from God, be the God it proceeds from?

"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Mat. xxviii. 19. This text, as it stands, is highly worthy of notice. It is generally understood by Trinitarians, to represent the authority by which the disciples were to administer baptism; as they conceive the authority is as much represented from the Holy Ghost, as from the Father and Son, they form the conclusion that the Holy Ghost is a person, equal with God the Father.

This argument may appear plausible at first

sight, but I think a more minute investigation will expose its fallacy. It does not appear to me that the word *name*, mentioned in the text, is intended to represent the authority by which the disciples were to baptise. It is well known that the word *name*, is many times used in the scripture in the place of *character*, as "A good *name* is better than precious ointment." It is also used for *renown*, *glory*, and *praise*, such as "his name shall be great." In this sense, in my opinion, it is to be understood in the text under consideration. As much as if the Savior had told his disciples, "go teach all nations, baptising them in *honor* of the Father who sent his Son; in honor of the Son who has lived your example, and in honor of the Holy Ghost which guides you into all truth."

It is well known that the preposition *in* used in the passage, is translated from the Greek word *eis*, and which may here be as well rendered *for* as *in*. For the *name* of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; or for the honor and glory of them.

It appears that Mr. Luckey had doubt, whether this passage could prove the real personality of the Holy Ghost, and indeed he had reason to, for it is the only solitary one which he quotes for that express purpose. "But whether we do or do not receive the Holy Ghost as a distinct person in the Deity," says Mr. L., "its

divinity forms a conclusive argument in my mind in favor of the divinity of the Son." As to the *divinity* of the Holy Ghost, and the *divinity* of the Son of God, I feel no disposition to question; I acknowledge them both in a proper scriptural sense; but the question to be decided is, whether the Holy Ghost is a person, or the Son of God the very God he is the Son of.

"Whether we do or do not receive the Holy Ghost as a distinct person in the Deity," says Mr. L. If the Holy Ghost is not a distinct person from the Father, the doctrine that God is three persons falls at once. "No matter whether we say there is a personal distinction between the Holy Ghost and the Father, or not," says Mr. L. p. 227. But why not as much "*matter*" to say there is a personal distinction between the Father and the Holy Ghost, as to say there is a personal distinction between the Father and Son, upon the hypothesis that there are three *distinct* persons in the Godhead? If Mr. L. would teach us that the Holy Ghost is the Father, he certainly has but two distinct persons in his Trinity, and the orthodox Trinitarians of course stand corrected by him.

Is it not astonishing to find such remarks from the pen of a Trinitarian? "No matter whether we say there is a personal distinction between the Father and the Holy Ghost, or not!" This appears to me about equivalent to

saying, it is not much matter what we say, if we only say we believe in Trinity ; and it is a manifest fact, that Trinitarians say and believe very differently about their doctrine, yet their fellowship for each other remains good, while they contend for Trinity, and declaim all who conscientiously dissent from them. It is not, however, to be thought strange, that people should think and talk very differently about that of which they themselves confess they have no knowledge.

I shall now adduce a number of scriptures, which, in my view, represent the Holy Ghost as something very different from a person.

The Spirit is represented as something with which a person can be anointed. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me ; because the Lord hath *anointed* me to preach good tidings unto the meek." Isa. lxi. 1. The Lord Jesus in this passage, is represented as one whom the Lord God had anointed with his Spirit. In another passage this same Spirit is called *oil*. "Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the *oil of gladness*, above thy fellows." Heb. i. 9. Here God is represented as anointing his Son with the *oil of Gladness*, which in the former passage is called the Spirit. Again the Spirit is represented as the *oil of joy*. "To give unto them beauty for ashes, and the *oil of joy* for mourning." John, in writing to his

brethren, calls the Holy Ghost an *unction*. "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." 1 John ii. 20. And Peter says, "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power." Acts x. 38.

Now I would ask my candid reader, how he can form any consistent idea of those passages of scripture, if he believe the Holy Ghost to be a person? It is represented by *oil*, and by an unction which God is represented as anointing his Son with. God said, "I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." Acts ii. 17. Here the Spirit is represented as something that may be *poured out*. When it descended upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost, I think it must have appeared to them as something very different from a person. The account is thus given: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all of one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them." Acts ii. 1, 3. Who could form any consistent idea from this account, that the Holy Ghost is a person? Did a *person* descend upon the disciples like a rushing mighty wind, and fill the room where they were sitting? Does God *pour out a person* upon all flesh? Did God anoint

Jesus of Nazareth with a *person*? What conception can we form of a God in three persons; the first person takes the third person, and anoints the second person with him? Does not the idea appear shockingly absurd? To me it really does, and I would to God that every Trinitarian would see it.

It may appear to some of my Trinitarian brethren, as bordering rather too near to sacrilege, to advance so far into their mystical sanctuary, but I would assure them that no harm is intended.

We can find no example in scripture, of worship being paid to the Holy Ghost, as a person. We are commanded to worship the Father and Son, but no where in the scriptures are we commanded to worship the Holy Ghost. The heavenly worshippers sung "Glory to God and the Lamb," but no mention is made that they sung glory to the Spirit. John mentions the throne of God and the throne of Christ, but no mention is made of the throne of the Holy Ghost. Stephen saw Christ standing at the right hand of God, but mentions nothing of seeing a third person. Indeed I can see no more consistency in calling the Holy Ghost, or Spirit a person, than I could in saying the seven Spirits of God, mentioned in Revelations, are seven persons; add to these Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and we should have ten persons in one

God! Instead of the holy Ghost being a distinct person, it is represented in scripture as the Spirit of a person; or a divine emanation from God, which he diffuses or pours out.

I shall now close the present chapter, and in the next shall give my views of the Son of God, by showing that he is *properly* a Son, and consequently not self-existent, or the Father of himself. In the foregoing investigation I have presumed to call in question the correctness of the doctrine of the Trinity, and if the system I am now about to establish, will not stand the test of scriptural and rational investigation, there is no man on earth who will be more happy to see it overthrown, than myself; for I call God to witness the sincerity of my heart in what I profess to believe. If I am in error I sincerely desire to be set in the right way. I can, with all my soul, adopt the language of the pious and celebrated Dr. Watts, who had written to vindicate the doctrine of the Trinity; but in his more advanced life, gave it up. In his solemn invocation to the ever-blessed God, he thus expresses himself:

“Hast thou not ascribed divine names, and titles, and characters to thy Son and thy Holy Spirit, in thy word? And yet art not thou, and thou *alone*, the true God?” * * * * *

* * * * *

“Hadst thou informed me, gracious Father,

in any place of thy word, that this divine doctrine is not to be understood by men, and yet they were required to believe it, I would have subdued all my curiosity to faith, and submitted my wandering and doubtful imaginations, so far as was possible, to the holy and wise determinations of thy word. But I cannot find thou hast any where forbid me to understand it, or make these enquiries. My conscience is the best natural light thou hast put within me, and since thou hast given me the scriptures, my own conscience bids me search the scriptures, to find out truth and eternal life. It bids me try all things, and hold fast that which is good. And thy own word by the same expressions, encourages this holy practice. I have therefore, been long searching into this divine doctrine, that I may pay thee due honor with understanding. Surely, I ought to know the God whom I worship, whether he be *one pure and simple being*, or whether thou art a threefold Deity, consisting of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

“ Dear and blessed God, hadst thou been pleased, in any one plain scripture, to have informed me which of the different opinions about the holy Trinity, among the contending parties of christians, had been true, thou knowest with how much zeal, satisfaction, and joy, my unbiassed heart would have opened itself to receive

and embrace the divine discovery. Hadst thou told me plainly, in one single text, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are three real distinct persons in thy divine nature, I had never suffered my mind to be bewildered in so many doubts, nor embarrassed with so many strong fears of assenting to the mere inventions of men, instead of divine doctrine; but I should humbly and immediately accepted thy words, so far as it was possible for me to understand them, as the only rule of my faith. Or, hadst thou been pleased to express and include this proposition in the several scattered parts of thy book, from whence my reason and conscience might with ease find out, and with certainty infer this doctrine, I should have joyfully employed all my reasoning powers, with the utmost skill and activity, to have found out this inference, and engrafted it into my soul. But how can such weak creatures (men) ever take in so strange, so difficult, and so abstruse a doctrine as this, in the explication and defence whereof, multitudes of men, even men of learning and piety, have lost themselves in infinite subtleties of dispute and endless mazes of darkness."

CHAPTER II.

ON THE SONSHIP OF CHRIST.

SECTION I.

JESUS CHRIST THE PROPER SON OF GOD.

IN the foregoing sections, I have endeavored to show the hypothesis that God is three persons, to be absurd and unscriptural; that on the contrary, "God is *one*." I shall now endeavor to show that Christ is properly the Son of the "one God;" and as such, a being distinct from his Father.

It is affirmed by Trinitarians, that the Son of God is the same *being* of his Father, or in other words, that there is no distinction of *being* between them. Now, if the reverse of this can be proved, every argument in support of their theory must fall at once. On the contrary, if this cannot be maintained, all my arguments are equally futile. The whole dispute may now be reduced to this single question, "Is Jesus Christ *properly* the Son of God, and as such, a being distinct from his Father?" And I am willing to risk the whole controversy upon this one turning point. If I fail of proving this from

the scriptures, then let all I have written against the doctrine of the Trinity, be consigned to oblivion; the sooner forgotten the better. If, on the contrary, I shall fairly prove this one point, that Christ is properly the son of God, and as such, a being distinct from his Father, then let Trinitarians candidly renounce their mysterious doctrine, and yield to the dictates of scripture and reason.

It will, no doubt, be acknowledged by my reader, that if the apostles and other writers of the New Testament, in delivering the revelations given them by the Holy Ghost, did not use such expressions as are to be understood according to some known acceptance of terms, their writings are not a revelation; for what they meant to communicate still remains to be revealed. It would then appear, that although they used words and phrases, which we perfectly understand in our common place conversation, yet, when they are found in the language of inspiration, we are at an utter loss for their meaning. Such a mysterious use of language would be the very reverse of revelation; it would be concealing rather than making known; it would perplex, but not instruct. Let it then be fixed in mind, that language relating to God and Christ, must be interpreted according to some known acceptance of terms. If, therefore, by this rule, the scriptures fairly imply a

distinction of being between the Son of God and his Father, let them thus be understood ; and if, on the contrary, they imply that they *two* are the *same being*, let the decision be accordingly, for it would be folly in the extreme, to suppose that in a revelation designed for the benefit of men, both learned and unlearned, that language is to be used in a sense foreign to every analogy.

We are abundantly taught in the scriptures, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Trinitarians say they believe this, but at the same time they affirm that Christ and his Father are one and the same being. This at once sets aside all revelation; respecting Christ being the Son of God. The scriptures which say Christ is the Son of God, on this principle, are no revelation to us ; the term *Son*, is used in a sense foreign to every analogy with which the human mind is acquainted, as foreign as it would be to use *son* for *daughter*, or *father* for *mother*. It is said, for instance, that Isaac was the son of Abraham, which is admitted at once ; but on the back of this it is immediately said by the same person, that Isaac was Abraham, and that there was no distinction of being between them ; would not any rational man say the two statements were palpably contradictory to each other ? If it is said that Isaac was the son of Abraham, we naturally suppose, according to the

use of language, that he was a distinct being from his father ; but if it be said that Isaac was Abraham, we say it is manifestly absurd to affirm that he was Abraham's son. In no instance, according to the use of language, can we form any conception of a son, without a distinction of being existing between him and his Father.

But, say Trinitarians, " we know nothing of the modes of divine existence, nor in what sense God uses the term *son*." Here we are at once thrown into the boundless regions of conjecture, in regard to all God says of *himself*, and his *Son*. On this ground, we can know nothing what is meant by God's so loving the world as to give his only begotten Son. And if we know not in what sense God uses terms respecting himself and his Son, no more do we know in what sense he uses terms respecting us, in his requirements, prohibitions, his promises and his threatenings. Of what use then is the bible, any more than so much blank paper, to be filled with our own conjectures? And in what sense is the bible a *revelation* of the *divine character* and *will*?

If we reject the hypothesis of a *proper Son*, we must then, like the Arians, have a strictly *created Son*, or an *allegorical Son*, for the Son of God must be one of these three. All who reject the idea of a *proper Son*, and a *created Son*, can have nothing better than an *allegorical Son* ;

and if we must admit an *allegorical Son*, I would as freely admit Origen's hypothesis, as any I know of. But if we adopt the hypothesis of an *allegorical Son*, what shall we say of the love of God in giving his Son? Had we not ought to view the *love* of God, in this event, as a kind of *allegorical love*? And is it not viewed too much in this light by those who reject the idea of a *proper Son*? But if the Son of God be not a *proper*, but an *allegorical Son*, and the love of God in giving his Son an *allegorical love*, what better have we to expect than an *allegorical heaven*?

To say that Jesus Christ is "the very God," and yet the Son of the very God, to me is equivalent to saying, that God is his own Son, and yet the Father of himself; which would be such a *Son* and *Father*, as could only exist in allegory. Or, to say that Jesus Christ is the only *begotten* Son of God, and yet the *unbegotten God* himself, would be about equal to saying the *unbegotten God* begat himself, and that all this took place without any "variableness or shadow of turning." Or, to say that Jesus Christ is the *self-existent God*, as Mr. Harmon does, is to me a denial that Christ is "God's own Son."

But, says Mr. H., "Mr. Millard's second letter is a labored and useless attempt, to prove that Christ is truly the Son of God, and a dis-

tinct being from the Father. That he is truly the Son of God, Trinitarians never denied; and I challenge Mr. M. to produce from any of their writings an assertion which amounts to a denial. He is altogether inexcusable for representing them in this light. They ever acknowledged this important truth, in terms so explicit, as not to be misunderstood." p. 17.

If Trinitarians agree so well with me, that Christ is "truly the Son of God," why does Mr. H. raise such a clamor against my views? This is the principal thing for which I contend, viz. : that Christ is the *true* and *proper* Son of God. But Mr. H. challenges me to produce from the writings of Trinitarians, an assertion that amounts to a denial of this. To gratify him, I will produce one from his pamphlet, which comes about as near to it as any that I have ever seen. In page 13, Mr. H. says, "Christ is the God of the Israelites, the *self-existent God*." If Mr. H. will tell me how a *self-existent being* can be a *begotten Son*, I will acknowledge that this assertion does not amount to a denial that Christ is truly the Son of God; but till he does, I shall still hold the charge pertinent. As well might he say, the earth was created and yet eternal.

"So here is the ground of his charge," says Mr. H., "Trinitarians deny that Christ is the Son of God, because they say he is the self-ex-

istent God. I confess I do not see the propriety of this conclusion." p. 17. And the reason is very obvious, because Mr. H. is determined not to see any *impropriety* in the Trinitarian system let it be ever so glaring. O *bigotry*, how dost thou blind the minds of thy infatuated votaries!

There are certainly no two characters which we can name, that express a clearer distinction of being between them, than a *father* and *son*, and if Mr. H. can see no absurdity in saying there is no distinction between them, I despair of helping him to see any thing.

But, says Mr. H., "the Bible declares Jesus Christ to be 'the true God,' 'the Mighty God,' 'the Lord of Lords,' &c., and yet says he is the Son of God. If Mr. M. says this is denying that he is the Son of God, let him remember that it is against the scriptures he brings his charge, and not so much against the Trinitarians." p. 17. I have reserved another part of this work to notice the divine titles given to the Son of God; and I hope to make it hereafter appear, that Mr. H.'s assertion, that Christ is the "true God," &c. is a perversion of scripture. Consequently I shall show that the charge is not against the scriptures, but against Trinitarians in full force.

Mr. H. says, that Trinitarians have ever acknowledged that Christ is truly the Son of God, in terms so *explicit* as not to be misunderstood.

But I appeal to Mr H. whether he can understand himself, in what sense Jesus Christ is the Son of God, while he represents him to be the *self-existent* God? Does he not, as well as other Trinitarians, represent Christ to be a Son, in some unknown or mysterious sense? How then can he so confidently assert, that Trinitarians ever acknowledged this truth, in terms so *explicit* as not to be misunderstood? I *understand* that when Christ is represented as a *Son*, it implies a distinction of being between him and his Father; and is Mr. H. willing to acknowledge this? If he is, he is by this time willing to renounce some of his *hidden, mysterious* absurdities.

Dr. Adam Clark takes the astonishing ground that all the Son of God which the Bible reveals to us is *human nature*, and I have in a few instances, heard the same sentiment advanced by Methodist preachers. The doctor in commenting on Luke i. 35, remarks, "we may plainly perceive here that the angel does not give the appellation of *Son of God*, to the divine nature of Christ, but to that holy person, or thing, which was to be born of the Virgin. The divine nature could not be born of the Virgin, the human nature was born of her. Two natures must ever be distinguished in Christ, the human nature in reference to which he is the Son of God, and inferior to him; and the divine nature which

was from eternity. Is there any part of the scriptures in which it is plainly said, that the divine nature of Jesus, was the Son of God? Here, I trust, I may be permitted to say, with all due respect for those who differ from me, that the doctrine of the eternal sonship of Christ is anti-scriptural, and highly dangerous."

Now if these remarks of the doctor be true, what becomes of his favorite Trinity? The doctrine of the Trinity teaches that God is three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Is the Son, one of those three persons, no more than human nature? Is one-third constituent part of the eternal God, human nature? If the Son of God is nothing more than human nature, this conclusion is irresistible, or otherwise there is no Son in the Godhead. But if God is now three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he was eternally the same; and if there was not eternally a Son in the Godhead, then the doctrine of the Trinity was not eternally true, and some later change must have taken place in the Godhead to make it true now. I fully honor the doctor's judgment, that the doctrine of "the eternal Sonship of Christ is anti-scriptural," but let him, or any other man sustain the doctrine of the Trinity without an eternal Son, if he can. How plainly is it manifest that this learned commentator, in struggling to

extricate himself out of a glaring absurdity, blunders into a palpable refutation of his own darling doctrine. But I find that Mr. Luckey rejects Dr. Clark's system; and Mr. Harmon intimates the same thing; while they both represent Christ as a Son in an *unknown* or *hidden* sense.

As Trinitarians envelope the sonship of Christ wholly in mystery, I shall now enquire in what sense the scriptures represent him as a Son.

The scriptures represent Christ as being with his Father before the world was. "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee, before the world was." John xvii. 5. It is admitted by Mr. Luckey and Mr. Harmon both, that *Wisdom* mentioned in the 8th chapter of Proverbs, alludes to Christ, which is my opinion. This appears to be confirmed by the apostle Paul, who informs us, that Christ "is of God made unto us *wisdom*," and says, "we preach Christ ——— the power of God, and the *wisdom* of God." 1 Cor. i. 24.

We will now begin at the 17th verse of the 8th chapter of Proverbs; and see whether the words of *Wisdom*, will not appear to be the words of Christ. "I love them that love me; and those that seek me early shall find me. Riches and honor are with me, yea, durable

riches and righteousness. My fruit is better than gold, yea, than fine gold; and my revenue than choice silver. I lead in the way of righteousness, in the midst of the paths of judgment; That I may cause those that love me to inherit substance; and I will fill their treasures. The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. *I was set up* from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, *I was brought forth*; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills *was I brought forth*: While as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When he prepared the heavens, I was there: when he set a compass upon the face of the depth: when he established the clouds above: when he strengthened the fountains of the deep: when he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment: when he appointed the foundations of the earth; then I was by him as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him."

Now, admitting this to be the language of Christ, every thing is acknowledged necessary to prove Christ a distinct being from his Father. The Father possessed him in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. He was set

up from everlasting, or ever the earth was; that is, he was with his Father before time began. It not only appears that the Father possessed the Son before time began, but also that the Son was *brought forth* from the Father before the world was. Mark these expressions: "when there were no depths *I was brought forth*. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills *was I brought forth*." Now compare these expressions with Christ's words to the Jews. "Jesus said unto them, if God were your Father, ye would love me: for *I proceeded forth and came from God*." Here we have Christ's own words for it, that he "*proceeded forth and came from God*." Two things may safely be inferred from scripture testimony: That Christ was *brought forth*, or that he *proceeded forth and came from God*. These being admitted, (which I think cannot be denied,) the conclusion follows, that *Wisdom*, the *Word*, or *Son*, was brought forth before time began.

Some have wholly denied the pre-existence of Christ, while others who have acknowledged it, have entertained different views in respect to it. It is not so important for me to explain in what *manner* Christ existed with his Father before he was made flesh; it appears that he did thus exist, and that he was then denominated *Wisdom* or the *Word*—I, therefore, leave the subject where the Bible leaves it.

Some have stated that they could make no distinction between a *created* and a *derived* existence; but to me the difference is obvious. The original and strict meaning of the word *create* is to bring something into existence from *nonentity*,* [see Encyclopedia,] which could not be said of the Son of God. He did not come into existence from *nothing*, as Arians supposed, but *proceeded forth, or was brought forth from God*, and consequently partook of that *nature* from whence he proceeded. It is true, we have all, by successive generation, derived our existence from Adam, the father of us all; but he being created, our existence is at best a created one. But as Christ derived his existence, or was brought forth from the self-existent God, he was not a strictly created being.

Mr. Harmon has represented my views of Christ as being exactly those of Arius. He says "Arius was expelled from the communion of the church. And why? For asserting that the Son was totally and essentially distinct from the Father. But according to Mr.

* Although the word *created* is variously applied in scripture, yet in a strict sense, I have stated the true meaning of it. It is applied in scripture to the changing of the *dispensations*, as also to the conversion of a soul into Christ; but it is believed that whoever examines the subject critically, will find that the term means as I have stated.

Millard, Arius was perfectly orthodox and held the doctrine of the Bible." p. 6. Here Mr. H. has either discovered his ignorance of Arius' views, or a wilful disposition to misrepresent the truth and stigmatise me. In what part of my former work, I have intimated that Arius' sentiments were perfectly orthodox, remains for him to show. It was not for asserting that the Son was distinct from the Father, that Arius was expelled from the church, but for asserting that "the Son was not only totally and essentially distinct from the Father, but the first and most noble being that God the Father *created out of nothing.*" If Mr. H. does not believe there is a distinction between the Father and Son, he is a Sabellian, and consequently an advocate for a doctrine which was condemned by the church before Arianism was known. My belief is that the Son *proceeded forth* from the Father, "being of his substance as *begotten of him.*" Thus I partly borrow the language to express my views, from the decision of the council of Nice. I wish to repeat it that Mr. H.'s labors to prove me an Arian amount to nothing at all in the present case. "He has stormed a citadel, in which nothing opposes him, but the phantom of his own brain."

"But further, (says Mr. H.) if Christ possessed but one nature, and this nature was created—and if we admit that Wisdom in the 8th

chapter of Proverbs refers to Christ, the strange conclusion is that God created his own Wisdom." p. 44. In what part of my former work I have stated that Christ was *created*, remains again for Mr. H. to show; consequently I know as little about God's creating his own Wisdom. But should I even say that God created his own Wisdom, (which I never did,) would it be more absurd than to intimate, as Mr. H. does, that God's Wisdom is himself.

That Christ is in scripture styled "the Wisdom of God;" "the Power of God," and "the Word of God," Mr. H. well knows; but who would infer from this, that distinct from the Son, the Father has no *wisdom* or *power*, and is unable to utter a word? They are only figurative titles given to the Son of God. These remarks may apply equally well to Mr. Luckey's sophistry, p. 122.

Again Mr. H. observes, "the passage which Mr. Millard has quoted from Proverbs to prove that Christ is a distinct being from his Father clearly implies the eternity of our Savior. 'I was set up from everlasting.'" p. 39. To this I reply, that previous to the commencement of time, nothing is known but *eternity*, which is here called *everlasting*, as the same term frequently occurs in scripture, in the room of *eternity*. The meaning of the term here is sufficiently explained in its connection. "I was set

up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was." From the beginning of creation, or before the earth was, Christ was set up by his Father. But is Mr. H. so unacquainted with the meaning of language, as to say, respecting that which was *set up*, there was no period before it was *set up*, as well as a period when this took place?

I have already remarked that Christ is styled in scripture "the Wisdom of God," and "the Word of God;" and Mr Luckey acknowledges that the Word mentioned in John i. 1. means the same as Wisdom in the Proverbs. p. 125. As this passage comes forward in this place, I shall offer a few comments on it. It reads thus: "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."

That the Word here alludes to Christ I admit. Twice in this passage the Word is said to be with God, and once the Word is called *God*. As the Word was said to be with God, which implies a distinction, the only difficulty that arises is, if the Word was not the God it was with, why is it said "the Word was God?" To this I reply, the word *God* is variously used in scripture, and is applied in different characters. David says, "worship him all ye gods." Ps. xcvi. 7. What David called God, Paul calls angels, and says, "let all the angels of God worship

him." Heb. i. 6. Hence angels are called gods. Different classes of men have the title of God given them. "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; he judgeth among the gods." "I have said, ye are gods; and all of you are children of the Most High." Ps. lxxxii. 1, 6. That men are alluded to here is plain from Christ's own words. When the Jews accused him of blasphemy, for saying he was the Son of God, he answered them, "Is it not written in your law, I said ye are *gods*? if he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scriptures cannot be broken; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, thou blasphemeth; because I said I am the Son of God?" John x. 34—36. *Judges* or *rulers* are called *gods* in the law given by God himself. "Thou shalt not revile the *gods*, nor curse the ruler of thy people." Exod. xxii. 28. Moses was a *god* and had a *prophet*. "The Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a *god* to Pharaoh, and Aaron, thy brother, shall be thy *prophet*."

"*Angels* and *men* are sometimes called *god*, it is true, (says Mr. Harmon) but always in such a manner that it is impossible to mistake the meaning." And had Mr. H. acknowledged the same respecting the Son of God, he would have done well. It is evident where Christ is called God in scripture, that it is as

plainly in distinction from his "God and Father" as words can express it.

But the question is asked, "why is he called God if he is not the very God?" I might ask with the same propriety, "why do the other characters which I have noticed, have the title god applied to them, if they are not so many persons in the Godhead?" But it is here emphatically said, "the Word was God." True; and God himself has equally emphatically spoken of *prophets*; "I said ye are gods." "Thou shalt not revile the gods," is the language of Jehovah, in allusion to Judges; and the title of *god* is equally emphatically applied to angels.

But it is still argued that where this title is given to any one besides the Supreme Being, the connection shows that the very God is not intended. This is granted; and it is equally so when the title is given to Jesus Christ. In John i. 1. we are repeatedly told "the Word was with God," that is with his God and Father. Is it given to him in Heb. i. 8, by God himself? "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." The reason is also assigned; because "thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity: therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."

When we are told in the passage under consideration, that "the Word was God," we are

not to understand, that he was identically and literally the Supreme God, but that he was so bright and clear an expression of God's mind, that it was not so much Jesus, as God himself, who appeared and taught mankind. In accordance with this explanation, we find Jesus frequently expressing the sentiment, that it was *not he* but *God* whom the people saw and heard in his miracles and instructions. "He that believeth on me, believeth *not on me*, but on him that sent me; and he that seeth me, seeth him that sent me." Thus the Word was God.

I can illustrate my meaning by a familiar case. Suppose we were to meet an ancient book, written for the purpose of recommending *Plato* to the admirers of *Socrates*, and that among the various declarations of *Plato's* striking resemblance to *Socrates*, and his peculiar intimacy with him, we should find expressions to this effect, "That *Plato* was in the beginning with *Socrates*: that whoever saw and heard *Plato*, saw and heard not *Plato* but *Socrates*: and that as long as *Plato* lived, *Socrates* lived and taught." What would we infer from these expressions? That *Plato* was literally *Socrates*? that *Socrates* and *Plato* were numerically one and the same being? Should we not rather consider the language as a strong and emphatic manner of teaching us how entirely *Plato* was formed on the doc-

trine, and imbued with the spirit of Socrates?

It is not unusual to call one person by the name of another whom he resembles. Thus John the Baptist is called Elias, because he came in the spirit and power of Elias. So a distinguished orator is called Cicero. We say of a son who has a strong likeness to his father, "he is his father in every respect."

If we compare the Word mentioned in John i. 1, with what is said of it in the 14th verse of the same chapter, we shall find it difficult to acknowledge it to be the very God. The 14th verse reads thus: "And the Word was *made flesh*, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the *only begotten* of the Father) full of grace and truth." Here it is said the Word was *begotten*; and also that it was *made flesh*. But would the candid scriptionian say the *very God* was begotten? If he was; when? and by whom? But will it be urged, that it was the human nature only that was *begotten*? Be it so. Let the nature be what it may, it was the *Word* that was *begotten*. But will any one dare to affirm that the Supreme God was *human nature*? It is also stated that "the Word was made flesh;" but was the Supreme God made flesh? and did that flesh die?

But here, perhaps, the Trinitarian would bring up his views of *incarnation*; that the very

God was only clothed with human nature. But for the Word to be made flesh, to me appears to be one thing; and for the Word to be only clothed with flesh, is another and a very different thing.

I cannot refrain from here noticing a charge which Mr. Luckey asserts against Mr. Smith, for some extracts which he had found in his writings against Trinity. The charge he alleges to Mr. S. so accurately describes the difficulty which all Trinitarians labor under, that it is to be hoped, some Nathan will yet say to Mr. L. "thou art the man." Relative to Mr. S. Mr. L. observes: "He says that the *Word* refers to the *power* and *wisdom* of Christ. If so, the Word was not made flesh, but was merely an inhabitant of it; and the Bible stands corrected by Mr. S.'s dictionary."

- If the Word was the very and eternal God, as Mr. L. confidently asserts, and charges all with dishonesty who conscientiously dissent from him, in what better situation is he than Mr. S.? Mr. L. intimates that all the apostle meant by saying "the Word was made flesh," was that divinity became veiled in humanity, or that the very God was clothed with human nature. "If so, the Word was not made flesh, but was merely an inhabitant of it," and the apostle John *stands corrected* by the Trinitarian theory.

According to the Trinitarian theory that

“Christ was very God and very man,” it is impossible for them to assent to the apostle’s testimony as it stands, “the Word was made flesh” as well as “begotten.” They confidently assert this Word to be the self-existent God; consequently not *begotten*; and that the Word was not only clothed with a human body, and of course was not made flesh, but was merely an inhabitant of it. I will not state of Mr Luckey as he does of us, that we can only support our doctrine by *contradicting* scripture, but would only entreat him to examine for a moment how much his system is at *war* with scripture here. Trinitarians may tell us they believe “that the very and eternal God was made man,” or made flesh, but when they explain themselves, their belief is very different from what they state. Indeed I am bold to assert, there is not a man on earth, who can believe that the *very God was made man*, and I doubt whether there ever was a greater absurdity proposed for human belief, than to say the very and eternal God was made man! It is a monstrous tax on human credulity, and the popish doctrine of *transubstantiation* is but a mere shadow to it. But that the Word was made flesh is perfectly consistent.

Trinitarians may still urge their doctrine, that as *man*, Christ was born, but as *God*, he was not; that as *man*, he suffered and died, but as

God, he did not ; and I would ask in what part of scripture their strange doctrine is asserted ? In what part of holy writ, has either God or Christ, the prophets or apostles, assured us of what Trinitarians declare to be the doctrine of the Bible. They tell us that Christ was composed of *two whole and distinct natures*, but on what scripture do they found their strange doctrine ? They tell us the Bible is full of it, but I challenge them to produce one text that affirms Christ is very God and very man. It is true Christ is called *God* and he is called *man* in scripture. And so are angels as well as the supreme Jehovah himself. The prophet speaks of “the *man* Gabriel ; and the angels who appeared to *Lot* and *Abram* are in the account called men ; yet it is believed by all that Gabriel, as well as the angels before mentioned, were not mere men. Moses sung “the Lord is a man of war ;” but who would infer from this that Jehovah was strictly a *man* ?

But it is urged that from statements given of Christ in scripture, that the inference may be naturally drawn, that he is possessed of two whole natures, as he is called God ; and that it is stated, “he took on him the seed of Abram.” It is frankly acknowledged that Christ is a superior character ; superior to either men or angels ; and of course different in his *nature* ; yet every thing said of him in scripture, when

rightly considered, will appear perfectly consistent with the idea, that he is a *proper Son*. When we hear of an extraordinary person, it is natural to enquire who he is, and from whom he descended; and of course his pedigree is traced, both in relation to his father and mother. No more than this is asserted in scripture, relative to Christ. God is declared to be his Father, and the Virgin Mary his mother. Of his descent from his Father, it is said, he "proceeded forth and came from God," and of his Mother it is said, he was made flesh; that he took not upon him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abram; that the children being partakers of flesh and blood, he also took part of the same. But in what respect do these passages assert, that Christ became possessed by his mother, of one whole *human nature*? "He also took part of the same," says scripture; that is he partook of his Father as well as his mother, yet not a whole complete nature from each; but that which proceeded from *both*, constituted one complete Son, composed of a holy, pure nature, which the scriptures call *divine*.

From the explanation given by Trinitarians of the term "*nature*," they make nothing less of it than a complete *person*. They tell us that Christ possessed two whole and distinct natures—a *divine nature* and a *human nature*,

They affirm that the *divine nature* was the very and eternal God; and that the *human nature* was really a *man*. But with the view of scripture testimony, that the very and eternal God was the Father of Christ, and the Virgin Mary his mother, I am at an entire loss for the propriety of such a conclusion. To say that a Son derives a whole nature from *each* of his *parents*, in the sense represented by Trinitarians, is to affirm that he is born two whole *persons* or beings, which is as great an absurdity as can be asserted.

That the *Son of God* partook of or *proceeded forth from God* his Father, and that the children being made partakers of flesh and blood, he also took *part* (not the whole,) of the same, is perfectly consistent with scripture. With this kept in view, we may see a perfect consistency in whatever is said of the *nature*, (not natures) of the Son of God. Do the scriptures affirm, that he "proceeded forth and came from God?" It is perfectly consistent as God is his Father. Do the scriptures say he was the seed of David? It was so by descent from his mother. Do they say he took not upon him the nature of angels but the seed of Abram? It is true in his descent by his mother, who was of the seed of Abram and lineage of David; nor do I now recollect one passage of scripture, but is perfectly harmonious with

the view that Christ was really and properly a Son. All Mr. Luckey's arguments, as well as those of Mr. Harmon, to prove that Christ possessed two *whole natures*, are only like shadows when we view Christ as a *proper Son*. Nor can they amount to any thing, unless it be to prove that Christ is not *properly a Son*, or that he is a Son in a sense foreign to every analogy that the mind can conceive.

John says, "the Word was made flesh," which I fully believe. That which proceeded forth from God before the foundation of the world, was made flesh in the womb of the Virgin, by the power of the Holy Ghost; so that Christ's flesh being made of the Word united with the seed of the woman, was and is far superior to *human nature*. As Christ proceeded forth from God and was made flesh, he is far superior to *human*, and is DIVINE. Hence the angel said to Mary, "the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also that *Holy thing* which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

It will be remembered that that which was born of the Virgin, was the SON OF GOD; but can any one be so presumptuous as to say that *human nature* was the *holy Son of God*, that was born of the Virgin? If nothing but *human nature* was born, (unless the Son of God

be human nature,) the Son of God never was born, and this idea would flatly contradict the angel Gabriel.

“But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the ungelts, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.” It was needful that he should be made flesh, that is lower than angels that he might suffer and die. All that is meant by his being made *lower* than angels, is his being made flesh; Christ's *nature* is far superior to either men or angels. Being made flesh, he became subject to pain, sickness, sorrow, and death; and thus, in all things he was made like unto his brethren, being touched with the feeling of their infirmities. As he proceeded from God and from the woman, he is called the Son of God about forty-five times, and the Son of man about fifty times in the scriptures, and hence is a proper mediator between God and men.

SECTION II.

THE SON OF GOD A DISTINCT BEING FROM HIS FATHER.

I shall now introduce a number of scriptures, which, in my view, clearly prove the Son of God a being distinct from his father. I must here again urge the importance of the scriptures being considered a *revelation*, or "a record which God has given us of his Son." If they are a revelation to men, they are to be understood by men; and if they are for our understanding they must be interpreted according to some known acceptation of terms. If then it shall appear that the channel of gospel testimony, plainly implies that Christ is a distinct being from his Father, the fact must be considered as established beyond a question.

How plainly then does scripture read, that God "gave his Son," and that God "sent his Son." These expressions are so familiar to my readers that I need not quote passages where they occur, to prove them scriptural. But I ask, what language can be more explicit of a distinction of *being* between the Son of God and his Father? Can we suppose that these expressions mean that God *gave himself, sent himself*, or even a part of himself? Or would the Trinitarian resort to his *two nature* scheme to defend himself, and say it was the *divine na-*

ture that *gave* and *sent* the *human nature*. But hear the words of Christ, "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." John vi. 38. As no one would argue that *human nature* came down from heaven, it must be admitted that it was the *divine nature*. But upon the hypothesis that Christ in his *divine nature* is the supreme God, I would ask who sent him? as that which came down from heaven was sent. Is it said his Father sent him? I again ask who is the Father of the Supreme God? Besides, Trinitarians affirm that Christ and his Father are one and the same being: and of course, from their hypothesis, the conclusion must be that God sent himself. But I again ask, whose will did he come to do? Is it said he came to do his own will? Let it be remembered that Christ said, "I came down from heaven *not to do mine own will*, but the will of him that sent me." There is no way for Trinitarians to conform this passage to their system, without making it contradict itself. And can any one be so blinded, as to suppose such language implies no distinction of being between Christ and his Father? "Jesus saith unto them, my meat is to do the will of him that *sent me*, and finish his work." "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father

which has *sent me.*" "My doctrine is not mine, but his that *sent me.*" Surely, my readers are too well acquainted with language to be ignorant of the meaning of these expressions.

We read in scripture of "the Lord and *his Christ.*" "The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord and against *his Christ.*" Acts iv. 26. Wherever *the Lord* and *his Christ* are mentioned, the language is very definite. The meaning of *Christ* is the anointed of God, or one anointed and sent. "The *Lord* and *his Christ,*" is the same as the *Lord* and his *anointed messenger.* But to say the *anointed messenger* was the supreme God himself, who anointed him, would be to render the apostle's words without meaning or propriety.

Many may perhaps have overlooked this with similar expressions in scripture, or have looked upon them indifferently, supposing they bore but little weight in argument; but a clear examination of them will show that they involve the Trinitarian theory in serious difficulty. As often as we read of "*the Christ,*" and "*his Christ,*" in scripture, just so often we are reminded that "the Christ" is a being distinct from "*the Lord*" whose Christ he is.

The apostle said to his brethren, "ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's." 1 Cor. iii. 23.

Here instead of Christ being represented as the supreme God himself, the apostle says, "Christ is God's." The apostle also represents a union existing between his brethren and Christ, as well as between *Christ* and *God*. "Ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's." What unprejudiced mind is there, but from this passage would draw the conclusion, that the *God* and *Christ* mentioned were two distinct beings?

John says, "Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son." 1 John ii. 22. While the scriptures represent Jesus to be the *Christ of God*, what would it be short of denying that he is *the Christ*, to represent him as the very *God*, whose *Christ* the scriptures state him to be? And to represent *Christ* and the *Father*, to be the same being, what is it short of denying the plain scriptural expression of "Father and Son?"

Again says the apostle: "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God." 1. Cor. xi. 3. From this passage we learn the following things. 1. The man is the head of the woman. 2. Christ is the head of the man: and 3. God is the head of Christ. Now might not a person conclude from this passage that the *woman* was the *man*, or that the *man* was *Christ*

as that Christ *was* the God spoken of? As clear a distinction of being is represented between *Christ* and *God*, as between the *man* and *Christ*, or the *woman* and the *man*. Consequently, from this view, Christ must be a distinct being from his Father.

Our Savior said to the Jews: "It is written in your law, the testimony of *two men* is true. *I am one* that beareth witness of myself, and the *Father* that *sent me*, beareth witness of me." John viii. 17, 18. In this passage our Savior represented himself and his father, to be as distinct witnesses as "*two men*," and I would ask, are not *two men*, *two beings*? And would it not be an insult to human understanding, to say that *one being* is two distinct witnesses?

"Jesus saith unto them, if God were your Father, ye would love me; for I *proceeded forth* and *came from God*; neither came I of myself, but he *sent me*." If Christ be not here represented as a distinct being from his Father, I am at a loss to know the meaning of language. We are firstly taught that he *proceeded forth* and *came from God*. Can he be the God he *proceeded forth* and *came from*? Is it stated that it was his human nature that proceeded forth from God? But do not Trinitarians state, that the *human nature* was made of the woman, and was "of the earth earthy?" He who proceeded forth and came from God, was the same who

said, "I came down from heaven." In what sense can we suppose he proceeded forth and came from God, and yet be the same being he proceeded from?

We are taught secondly, he that "came not of himself, but the Father sent him." What language can more plainly express a distinction between Christ and the supreme God? See the following passages: "For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that *I came out from God*. I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and *go to the Father*." The disciples said unto him, "by this we believe thou camest forth from God." John xvi. 27, 29. Again said Jesus to his Father, "for I have given unto them the words which *thou gavest me*; and they have received them, and have known surely that *I came out from thee*, and they have believed that thou didst *send me*." John xvii. 8. Surely these passages are too plain to need a comment.

The Lord Jesus is frequently spoken of as one who has a God as well as a Father. Paul speaks of "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ," and several times of "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." In every other case at least, he who has a *God* and *Father*, is a being distinct from the supreme God. However highly any person may be exalted; whatever

titles of dignity may be given to him ; whatever work may be done by him ; whatever homage may be paid to him ; as surely as this person has a God and Father, so surely he is not the "only true God," or the same being as his Father, unless the Father also has a God and Father. What could be more repugnant to common sense than to say the Father has no God, but the Son has a God, and yet the Father and Son are the same individual being ?

Christ is frequently represented as praying to his Father. Trinitarians, however, have a *rare* skill to dispose of this as well as a hundred other things by resorting to their *two nature* scheme. They tell us it was only Christ's *human nature* that prayed to his *divine nature*. Were there no scriptures to overthrow this assertion, every candid mind ought to despise so poor a subterfuge, as to assert that one part of Christ prayed to another part of himself. But what will not a Trinitarian rather resort to, than relinquish his *mysterious*, self-contradictory doctrine? Will scripture support the assertion that it was only *human nature* that prayed? I think not. "Now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory I had with thee before the world was." John xvii. 5. That which prayed was with the Father before the world was, while *human nature* was not created till after the world was made ; therefore it must

have been his divine nature that prayed, if it be true he possessed two whole natures. But if in his *divine nature* he was the supreme God, I ask who did he pray to? and what cause had he to pray at all?

But says Mr. Harmon, "Mr. M. has a curious comment on this passage, belonging, as he supposes, to the Trinitarian system." p. 19. Mr. M. never supposed the above passage belongs to the Trinitarian system, and if Mr. H. does, he is welcome to all the support he can derive from it. "The language, (adds Mr. H.) if coming from the mouth of a professed infidel, would not only be ridiculous, but highly savoring of a spirit of determined opposition against the mystery of godliness." Here Mr. H. has again manifested the weakness of his cause, by resorting to slanderous declamation, when argument, if he had any, would have done much better. And I cannot but remark the hostility discovered by him, whenever he finds his cause effectually overthrown. In such cases, like the present, he deals out invective in the room of arguments. Are these things specimens of Mr. H's candor and veracity?

I am here accused of using language that would disgrace a deist, merely for calling in question the propriety of the self-existent God praying to himself, or of one part of Christ praying to another part of himself. But does

Mr. H. suppose that his pronouncing me worse than an infidel, will support the argument that the self-existent God prayed to himself?

“I shall not enquire at present, (says Mr. H.) whether one nature prayed to the other nature, or the self-existent God prayed to the self-existent God.” And indeed I think Mr H. has been more wise, in deferring this inquiry, than in all he has said on the subject. I hope he will consider such an inquiry, (while he holds his present view,) too absurd to make. To say the self-existent God ever prayed, is downright presumption; and to assert that one nature of Christ prayed to the other nature, is too poor a subterfuge to substitute in the room of argument.

The Lord Jesus is said to have been anointed of God. “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power.” Acts x. 38. In what sense can we suppose the supreme God anointed Jesus, if it be a fact that Jesus is the supreme God himself? Besides if the *Father* is the “true God,” and the Son the “true God,” and the Holy Ghost the “true God,” which shall we say is the “*only* true God” mentioned in scripture? Or if it take all three to constitute the *only* true God, who is this Jesus of Nazareth; whom the only true God anointed, and what Holy Ghost did the *only* true God anoint Jesus of Nazareth with?

Was Jesus the being who anointed himself?

We learn from scripture, that God raised Christ from the dead. Peter said, "But ye denied the Holy One and the just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of Life, whom God raised from the dead." Acts iii. 14, 15. Is the poor subterfuge again resorted to that one nature of Christ raised the other nature from the dead? Hear his words to Mary after he had risen, "touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend to my Father and your Father; and to my God and your God." When Christ thus spake to Mary, his person must have been complete: that is, according to the Trinitarian theory, his two natures must have again become united. But upon the hypothesis that his divine nature was the very God, to whom did he ascend?

Stephen, filled with the Holy Ghost, saw the heavens open and Christ standing at the right hand of God. Mark says, "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the *right hand* of God." Mark xvi. 19. Peter says, "This Jesus *hath* God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore being by the *right hand of God* exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath

shed forth this which ye now see and hear." Acts ii. 32, 33. Paul says of Christ, "who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down *on the right hand* of the throne of God. Heb. xii. 2. How frequently is Christ represented in scripture as sitting at the right hand of God? Does this mean something, or nothing? Surely if it means any thing, it means something too plain to need an explanation.

Speaking of the day of Judgment, Christ says: "Of that day, and that hour, knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but my Father." Mark xiii. 32. Matthew has it "my Father only." Here my opponents resort to the *two nature* scheme again in order to evade the force of this text. They say Christ only spake of himself here, as a man; that is, in his *human nature*, he did not know when that day would be, but that in his *divine nature* he did know. This is a very unfair disposal of the text, besides it is indirectly accusing the Son of God with dishonesty. That Trinitarians may see the result of their mode of *reasoning*, we will suppose the following figure: A certain person is standing before me, and another asks me, do you see that person? I shut up one eye, and look at the person with the other eye and answer—No. I only mean, I do not see the person with the eye that is shut,

although I see him all the while with the one that is open. Who would not accuse me with dishonesty thus to conduct? Yet let Trinitarians remember, they lay just such dishonesty to the charge of the HOLY JESUS, in their explanation of this passage. All Trinitarians acknowledge that the Son, even in his divine nature, and the Father are two distinct persons. To assert then that the *Son*, even in his divine nature, is the same person of the Father, would be an absurdity. No matter (in aid to the argument,) how many natures the Son had, it could not lessen the difficulty, since the *Son* did not know that day, but *his Father only*.

At Mr. Harmon's remarks on this passage, I am not a little astonished, and indeed I seriously doubt when he comes to examine them again, whether he can believe them himself, if he ever did. He says, "Mr. M. excludes the *notion*, that Christ spake of himself here as a man, while as God he knew that day." p. 22. So far Mr. H. is correct; I exclude it as a *notion*, that originated when many other *notions* did. "But (says Mr H.) let us attend to what the Bible affirms. Peter addressing Christ as God says, 'Lord thou knowest all things.' But Christ speaking of himself as man, says, the Son knoweth not." That Peter addressed Christ as God, is only Mr. H.'s unqualified assertion, as well as his statement that Christ

spake of himself as *man*. Why have not the apostles given us some specimen of Mr H.'s mode of reasoning, if it be correct? and told us this is to be understood of Christ as God, and this of him as man; this has allusion to his *divine nature*, and this to his *numan nature*, And is it not a monstrous tax on the scriptures, to urge such unqualified assertions on them without their consent? I need only refer the reader to the passage quoted by Mr. H. (John xxi. 17,) to determine whether or no, he is correct in his assertion, that Peter addressed Christ as God. And I furthermore think, if we examine the connection with candor, we shall find what the "*all things*" mentioned, allude to. John writing to his brethren, thus addresses them: "But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and *ye know all things*." 1 John ii. 20. Indeed Mr. H. might with equal propriety, have quoted these words of John, to prove that John's brethren knew when that day would be, as to quote the words of Peter, to prove that the Son did know, what Jesus said the Son did not know.

But fearing this comment on the text would not *stand*, Mr. H. has given us another and very different *solution* of it. He says, "but admitting that Christ did not speak as man exclusively, I think the passage is perfectly consistent with the Trinitarian system. "Of that

day knoweth no man, no not the Son." The word *know*, not only signifies to *understand*, *perceive*, &c. but to *make known*, and *see discovered*." p. 23.

Now admitting this to be correct, that to know that day was to *make it known*, or *see it discovered*, it follows, that although men and angels and even the Son of God, did not *make that day known*, or *see it discovered*, yet the Father does. Of course then, it can no longer be a *secret* from Mr. H. at least, and he had ought to have told us when it would be. How Mr. H. can think this passage is perfectly consistent with the Trinitarian system, I know not. That his arguments upon it bear a very strong resemblance to the doctrine of the Trinity, I admit, for they are very *mysterious* and contradictory.

When Christ arose from the dead, he spake to his disciples saying, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." Matt. xxviii. 18. Let an unprejudiced person reason upon this text, and I think he must be convinced, that Christ is a distinct being from his Father. If all power was *given* to Christ, there must have been a time when he had not all power; for to say he possessed all power from all eternity, and yet had it given to him, is too gross an absurdity to merit notice. Upon the hypothesis that Christ is the supreme God, ~~when~~ was it.

E

that he did not possess all power in himself? besides, who gave the very God all power, in heaven and earth? Let Jesus answer who it was that gave him all power: "All things are delivered me of my Father."

But says Mr. Harmon, "If Jesus Christ was not the true God, and all power was given into his hands, then he possessed all the powers of the self-existent God. According to Mr. M.'s notion, he must either have possessed it alone and left the Father destitute of all power, or there were two self-existent Gods at the same time." p. 23. Is it possible that Mr. H. is so short sighted as to suppose his readers will not see he is raising his objections against scripture and not particularly against me? Christ said, "all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," and Mr. H. intimates that this cannot be, or it would leave the Father without any power, or suppose there were two self-existent Gods at the same time. It is to be hoped he will settle this controversy with the Son of God, before he meets him in judgment.

Relative to the extent of power *given* to Christ, it is highly probable to me, that it was all power in heaven and earth, relating to his kingdom or church, or as Paul defines it, "God hath given Christ to be head over all things to the church, which is his body." Ephes. i. 22.

"It will not answer to say this was delega-

ted to him," says Mr. H. p. 40. If Mr. H. will tell me how power, or authority, can be *given* and not *delegated*, I will confess he has told me "a new thing under the sun." To delegate power, or authority, means to *intrust* or *give* it, and Mr. H. might equally as well have said, all power was not *given* to Christ, as to have said, all power was not *delegated* to him. Indeed it appears to me that Mr. H. not knowing how to dispose of this text and support his theory, thought fit to give it a modest contradiction and set it aside.

I do not feel disposed to contend, whether we should say in this case, that all power was *given* to Christ, or *delegated* to him, as both terms are synonymous; unless it be that I like scripture terms the best. Yet it is worthy of remark, that some people, not thinking it safe to contradict scripture in the use of *scriptural* terms, do it in unscriptural ones. They vociferate their invectives against *delegated power*; but why are they not willing to leave their unscriptural phrases of *delegated power*, and come out openly, and object against all power being *given* to Christ, and thus contradict scripture in the use of scriptural terms? In such cases, common people would know what they mean.

"Then cometh the end, when he [Christ] shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down

all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed, is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifested that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself, be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. From this passage we learn that Christ will again deliver up his power, or kingdom, to God his Father, and become subject to him. Here the same difficulties follow the Trinitarian system, that do from the passage I have just noticed. If Christ be the very God, who will he *deliver up* the kingdom to? Who will *put* all things under him? Who will he become *subject* to?

All the arguments I have ever heard or read on this passage, have never borne with the least weight on my mind; and it is astonishing to me that men should contend for nothing better than that Christ received all power of himself—that he will deliver it up to himself, and become subject to himself. The *two nature* scheme can render no assistance here—that is to say, the *human nature* possesses all power in heaven and earth, and will at some future time *deliver it up* to the *divine nature*. Is it said, it is the *media-*

torial office that is to be delivered up? If Christ be the supreme God, and has now the *mediatorial office*, what God will he deliver it up to? Would he do any thing more than to throw it away?

Mr. Luckey occupies three pages and a half in commenting on this passage, but after reading it over, and over again, I am unable to tell what he means, and I am almost ready to say, I question whether he can himself. Mr. Harmon passes it over entirely in silence, no doubt because he knew not what to do with it.

“For there is *one God* and *one mediator* between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” 1 Tim. ii. 5. If it be a fact, as Trinitarians say, that Christ is the *one God* mentioned in this passage, I would ask who the *mediator* is between this *one God* and men? If Christ be the self-existent God, the true God, and the only wise God, as Mr. Harmon states, it is between him and men, that a mediator is needed. Who then is the mediator between Jesus Christ and men? What is a mediator! Let the apostle answer. “Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.” Gal. iii. 20. That is, a mediator is not one of the parties that he mediates between, but is a middle person, or one that stands *between two*. A mediator and *day’s-man* mean the same. Job said, “neither is there any day’s-man betwixt us, that he might lay his

hand upon us both." Job ix. 33. Thus Christ is represented as standing between God and men, that he might lay his hand upon both, and thus make reconciliation. Is God a mediator between himself and men? Does the supreme God stand between himself and men, to make reconciliation? Is it urged that only one person of the three, is the mediator? Be it so. Is there one whole God, and one mediator between God and men? Would this leave any more than two constituent parts of a God for the other third to mediate between, and men? Besides, does one part of God mediate, or intercede with another part of himself?

Is it said that God only acts in the *office* of mediator? Be it so. Who does God, in the office of mediator, intercede to? What God does he in the office of mediator, stand between, and men? This would be an *office mediator*, instead of a personal one, and would be direct Sabellianism. To me it is a palpable absurdity to say God is a mediator between himself and men, nor ought the covering of "*mystery*" to conceal it from examination or exposure. With how much more consistency than they do, might I assume the Trinitarian mode of treating opponents, and say, that to affirm Christ to be the supreme God, is denying the mediator; and also that to deny the mediator, is to deny the Lord that bought them? Let Trinitarians

show me how Christ can be the supreme God, and at the same time the mediator between God and men, and I will give up the point. The request is certainly reasonable, and it is hoped they will try to do it.

In the fifth chapter of revelations, God is represented as sitting upon a throne, with a book in his right hand, and Christ is represented as taking the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne. Can it be supposed, that he that took the book out of the hand of him that sat upon the throne, was the same being that sat upon the throne, out of whose hand he took the book ?

So plain is the distinction manifested between the Father and Son, that it is very difficult for Trinitarians to pray without acknowledging it. They thank God for the gift of his Son. They pray for all blessings for the Son's sake, and thank God for all blessings received through the Son. This is a scriptural mode of praying, and is acknowledging all I ask.

When we take the example of Christ in praying, how clear does he acknowledge a distinction between his Father and himself. In the 17th chapter of John we have a prayer of Christ's recorded, the longest prayer in the New Testament. Had I forged a prayer for the Son of God, in order to favor the sentiment I vindicate, could I have invented one more ex-

pressive of my views? "And this is life eternal that they might know thee the *only true God* and Jesus Christ whom thou *hast sent*." John xvii. 3. Instead of Christ asserting himself to be "the only true God," as Mr. Harmon supposes, he acknowledges his Father to be the only true God, and he the one whom the only true God had *sent*. Did the only true God send the only true God? Were he who was sent, and he who sent him, one and the same being? O! when will the eyes of people be open to discern between *truth* and *absurdity*.

There are many good christians who are professed Trinitarians; but when they pray to God, or relate the dealings of God to their souls, they overthrow their doctrine. How many have I heard, in relating their experience, advance sentiments like these: ***** I discovered myself a sinner, in a lost state, from whence I could not extricate myself. My sins rose as a cloud, that intervened between God and my soul. I saw them in the darkest die, and thought I deserved eternal banishment. I tried to pray for mercy, but my hard; my wicked heart seemed unwilling to relent. The more I prayed, the viler I appeared in my own view. Justice seemed to cry, "cut the sinner down," while my own conscience owned the sentence just. But at this moment, I cried, *save Lord, O for the sake of Jesus thine only Son, who*

died for sinners, save me from hell—let his blood cleanse me from sin—O God, for Jesus' sake, have mercy on me! **** Jesus at that moment seemed interceding with God for me. "Save him Father, I have died." His bleeding wounds opened as it were afresh, seemed to plead in my behalf! His tragic sufferings on Calvary, seemed all in view! His groans, his sweat, his blood, seemed to say *forgive!* while to me they said, "ye are bought with a price!" **** My hard heart melted at the scene! I said, "Lord, here I am: into thy hands I fall; I commit myself to thee for time and eternity." At this moment God smiled upon his Son; He cast a look of compassion upon me, and forgave my sins.

What christian is there, but in a good degree could witness to an experience like this. Who when they discovered their lost state, but viewed Christ as an advocate with the Father? At that moment, they viewed them to be two distinct beings. They could glorify God, for the gift of his Son; adore the Lamb that was slain; and rejoice in salvation obtained for Christ's sake. O the glory of a scene like this! my soul is enraptured with it! Yes, my dear reader, my experience was similar to this; such was the view I had of a Father and Son, when God for Christ's sake cast his *mantle* over me, and said, LIVE. Never, never, shall I forget

the soul enrapturing scene. Yea, with an eye of faith I still review it, while my soul exults in the prospect of viewing the Father and Son, in endless day, without a veil between; there to join the glorified millions in ascriptions of praise to the Lord God and the Lamb. Give me, O give me, an advocate with the Father; take not away my mediator.

My christian reader, were the Father and Son thus revealed to you by experience? Did you receive Jesus as "an advocate with the Father?" If so, "as ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him." Think of your experience often; and do not barter it away for the notions of men.

Thus I have exhibited a number, which I consider conclusive reasons for viewing the Father and Son two distinct beings. However, those who are well acquainted with the scripture, know that much more might be quoted to the same purpose; but I forbear to enlarge. If all these are to be explained in a sense for which we have no analogy in the use of language, it must be in vain to appeal to the Bible, for a decision of the point in debate. To me the scriptures bear testimony that Christ is the *proper Son of God*, and a distinct being from his Father. *Reason* unites its testimony to the same truth; and while *christian worship* acknowledges it, *christian experience* confirms the fact.

CHAPTER III.

SECTION I.

DIVINE TITLES GIVEN TO THE SON OF GOD.

From the title of God being given to Christ in the scriptures, many have endeavored to prove the Son of God to be that being who is called "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." This at first sight may appear so unreasonable as to scarcely need a refutation to show its inconsistency; but, however, a few things shall be stated in addition to what I have already said upon the same subject in another part of this work.

Whoever considers the different applications of the name *God* in the scriptures, must, I think, be convinced that this title is not a positive proof of Christ's self-existence. In another part of this work, I have shown from scripture, that the title *God* is given to different characters in an emphatical manner, in several instances as much so, as it is any where given to Christ. And that wherever this title is given to the Son of God in the scriptures, it as plainly implies a distinction between him and his God and Father, as the application of it to an-

gels and *men*, does between them and the supreme God.

If Christ being called God, prove him the self-existent God, by the same rule we may prove a multiplicity of self-existent Gods. Paul, however, explains the whole in 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6. "For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him: and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." Although the name God is given to several different characters in the scriptures, and even to the Son of God, yet we are to understand there is strictly speaking but *one God*; and besides this one God, one Lord Jesus Christ.

Isaiah ix. 6. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." This passage is thought by Trinitarians to be an incontestible proof that Christ is the self-existent God. We will then enter into a minute investigation of it. Here are five different titles given to a *child born*; but the titles on which particular stress is laid, are those of "mighty God," and "everlasting Father." From these titles it is affirmed that Jesus Christ,

is truly the self-existent God : yea, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But that Trinitarians may see the fallacy of their arguments, we will interpret the text according to their views. We will suppose for a moment, that this *child born* and *Son given*, was actually the supreme God of the universe. It may then be asked if this *child* was the supreme God, who was his Father? If the Father of all things be a *son given*, who is he son to? who gave him? Who is the Father of the Father of all things? Is it said that only the *human nature* of Christ is meant? But as Trinitarians affirm this child to be the mighty God and everlasting Father, it may again be asked, is *human nature* the mighty God? Is human nature the everlasting Father? Is the government on the shoulder of human nature? Surely this would be making *bad, worse*.

Again it will be remembered that according to the Trinitarian theory, God is three persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost. They admit that Christ is the second person of the three, viz. : the Son. Now if we say the *Son* is the *Father*, it would destroy the distinction of personality, which would again overthrow the doctrine of the Trinity. If God be three persons, to say the Son and Father are one and the same person, destroys the idea of three persons in one God. By the same rule we may say that Fa-

ther, Son and Holy Ghost are but one person; and thus argue Sabellianism in the extreme.

I am persuaded that Trinitarians cannot be fully satisfied with their interpretation of this text, for as they construe it, it proves too much. According to their comments, it proves that the very God was a *child born*, and a *son given*; and also that Christ is the *Father* of the *Son*, which sets their system at variance with itself.

Let the reader now view this passage with an unprejudiced mind; and in order to rightly understand it, let him for a moment imagine himself to be a Jew, living in the day when this prophecy was given. Let him imagine himself to be well acquainted with the Jewish practice of giving significant names. Let him remember there were men among the Jews, who were thus named—"God the Lord, or strong Lord," which in Hebrew is *Elijah*. "The God of conversion"—in Hebrew *Eliashib*. "The God of deliverance"—in Hebrew *Eliphalet*. "God with them, or him"—in Hebrew *Lemuel*. Let him then inquire of himself, do these names mean as much as that name mentioned in Isaiah ix. 6, the interpretation of which is, "Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace?" Let him ask himself, do I believe that the *man* whose name was *Elijah*, was that very *being* whose

character his name expressed? Was *Eliashib* actually "the God of conversion?" Was *Eliphalet* "the God of deliverance?" Was *Lemuel* actually "God with them or him?" I say, let him make this rumination in his mind and see what the effect will be. See if he can believe that this "child born," and "Son given," was actually the supreme God, any sooner than that *Eliphalet* was actually the God of deliverance.

The passage is frequently very wrongly quoted, as Mr. Harmon has done it, by saying he *is the mighty God*, and the *everlasting Father*, when the passage reads, "his name shall be called," &c. and then states what that name is, when translated into our language.

Whoever will take pains to examine the table of names at the close of our large Bibles, will find that all Hebrew names had significations. A child was generally named expressive of some event that transpired about the time of its birth, relative either to the parents or the Jewish nation. Persons were also prophesied of, under names expressive of what God would do in their day, or accomplish by them. When these facts are kept in view, we need not be misled by the import of Hebrew names. We shall not think strange that Christ should be named *Emanuel*; by interpretation, "*God with us*," which name signifies no more than

Lemuel, which is “*God with them or him.*”

No Jew, acquainted with the custom of their nation in this respect, would be likely to be misled by their significant *names*. In Hosea iii. 5, Christ is prophesied of, under the name of *David*; but would any Jew be likely to suppose that the Messiah was to be the man who killed *Goliath*? And have we any evidence that any Jew, learned or unlearned, ever understood the divine names given to the Messiah as importing that he should be the self-existent God? If any Jew from the prophecies, understood that the Messiah was to be the Supreme God himself, why do they now so generally reject that view, as well as the whole Trinitarian system? The Jews maintain that God is *one person* only.

Jeremiah xxiii. 6, “This is his *name* whereby he shall be called, the Lord our righteousness.” Although I may consider this *name*, in the same manner I have all other significant Hebrew names, but that my opponents may see what their manner of treating them will lead to, I will go a little further with the title. It is argued that “*Lord*” in this passage is the same as *Jehovah*, and implies self-existence. Be this as it may, it is certain that the same title is given to *Jerusalem*, by the same prophet. Jer. xxxiii. 16, “In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith *she* shall be called, The

Lord our righteousness." Would it be inferred from this significant name that Jerusalem was the self-existent Jehovah? The same title is here given to Jerusalem that is given to Christ. Rev. xii. 13, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." Much stress is laid on these titles given to the Son of God. *Alpha* is the first letter, and *Omega* the last letter in the Greek alphabet; consequently these titles mean the same as the *first* and the *last*. The importance of them is, however argued, from the consideration that they are in scripture applied to the supreme God as well as to Christ. Isaiah xlv. 6, "Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of hosts: I am the *first*, and I am the *last*; and besides me there is no God." From this scripture Mr. Luckey presumes to say that "Jesus Christ is the Lord of Hosts, the King and Redeemer of Israel, besides whom there is no God." Now if this be fair reasoning, we may draw the following conclusion, viz.: that "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," *is not God.*" Is it not amazing that Mr. L. should reason in such a manner? In several instances, his conclusions as fully exclude the *Father* from being *God*, as it is possible for language to do it. In Isaiah, God did not say besides *us* there is no God, but besides *me* there is no God; his words therefore as fully ex-

clude every other *person*, as every other *being*. When Christ said, "I am the *first* and the *last*," he immediately added, "I am he that liveth and was dead." He is therefore to be considered as the *first* and the *last*, in a sense which is consistent with his having been *dead*. There are several senses in which Christ may be considered the *first* and the *last*. He may be so called as the *author* and *finisher* of our *faith*. As the constituted head of the *church*; and as such the *first* in authority under his Father, when he received all power in heaven and earth; and the *last* in authority under him, when he shall deliver the kingdom up to God and become subject to him. Thus he is the *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *first* and the *last*.

Mr. Luckey, in comparing scripture and drawing conclusions from such comparisons, is as unfair as any author, whose writings I have ever perused. By one wrong conclusion he asserts that "Jesus Christ is the Lord of Hosts himself; besides whom there is no God." From this wrong conclusion compared with another scripture, he confidently asserts that Christ is the creator of all things. Thus in his own way, by one false conclusion, he lays the foundation for another, and *compels* the Bible to speak his own mind. What might not a person prove by scripture, in the same way? That the reader may see the event, I will try the experiment on

Mr. Luckey's plan. In Exodus xxxii. 7. it was said to Moses, "Go, get thee down; for *thy people*, which *thou broughtest* out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted themselves." In Leviticus xix. 36, the Lord says, "I am the Lord your God, *which brought* you out of the land of Egypt." In the last text we are told that the Lord God brought the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but it is said in the first verse, that Moses did it, and the people are called Moses' people. Therefore, according to Mr. Luckey's mode of comparing scripture, Moses is the Lord God of Israel.

I could bring passages of scripture to show that the children of Israel prayed to Moses—that Moses promised and commanded; and that the *law* was given by Moses. I should then only have to compare these passages with some in which the same things are said of the Lord God of Israel. I should then only have to compare this *false conclusion*, with some scriptures to prove Moses the creator of all things, and the upholder of the universe. All this I could do, by only pursuing the course which Mr. L. has taken to prove Christ the supreme God. But who would not see the fallacy of it? I shall, however, say more upon this particular hereafter.

In Isaiah xliii. 11, God says, "I, even I, am the Lord; and besides me there is no Savior."

But Jesus Christ is called Savior, and hence Trinitarians affirm, that he is the only Lord God. But if this argument be good we shall find that many others have claims to the same dignity. In Nehemiah ix. 27, we find the Jews acknowledging the goodness of God to their forefathers; and that he had given them *saviors*. In the same sense that God said, "besides me there is no Savior," we may say, besides him there is no king; yet he sat his Son as king on the holy hill of Zion; and sent him to be the Savior of the world.

In order to rightly understand the subject, we should remember, there was a time when Christ was sent to be a Savior, and consequently a time previous to it. That a Savior means the same as a *deliverer*, or *preserver*. That the supreme God was a being who had frequently effected the salvation or deliverance of Israel; therefore he taught them to look to him alone for *preservation* and *deliverance*, by saying, "I, even I, am the Lord; and besides me there is no Savior." This was *long* previous to his sending his Son to be a Savior. But he afterwards sent his Son into the world, and taught the world to believe on his Son, as the one whom God had sent to be the Savior of the world.

Whenever the title of *Savior* is applied to the Son of God in the scriptures, it is no where

intended to teach us that he is the supreme God, notwithstanding the same title is also given to God. Under the gospel, God may be called our Savior, because he saves by his Son; and Christ is our Savior, because he hath redeemed us by his blood. God in giving his Son, is the giver of salvation; and Christ by dying for us, opened the way for our salvation, to bring us home to God.

Mr. Harmon quotes Jude 25. "To the only wise God our Savior," and adds, "that this is the Lord Jesus Christ, I presume will not be questioned." p. 36. Why Mr. H. should thus presume, after reading my former work, to me is unaccountable; however, I shall presume to question it now. Mr. H. further intimates, that if Jesus Christ be not the supreme God, that he so far transcends all others, that "the Father compared with him would be a *foolish God*"!!! p. 36 It is to be hoped that Mr. H. will never accuse others of using language that would disgrace an infidel, without retracting this *extraordinary* sentence. However, I shall not censure Mr. H. alone, since he has copied the sentence verbatim from Mr. Luckey's book, where such specimens of *politeness* are found in superabundance. Yet the expression, bad as it is, can easily be reduced to a fact, providing Mr. H's inference be a correct one. If our Lord Jesus Christ be *the only wise God*, what

kind of a God must "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" be? Let Mr. H. answer.

But says Mr. Luckey, "admitting the doctrine of the Trinity to be true, there is no impropriety in saying that Jesus Christ is *God*, though he was sent to be the Savior of the world." p. 139. Admitting the doctrine of the Trinity to be true, and we can pass over *improprieties* very easily, for that doctrine abounds with them. Yes, then it will be no impropriety, to admit that the very God was *sent* to be a Savior of the world, though we could conceive of no being who *sent* him.

Mr. L. continues, "Jehovah says that there is no Savior besides himself, and sent his angels to announce the approach of his Son into the world under that very title. Now the conclusion is, that the doctrine of the Trinity, which recognizes the Son, as both God and man, is true, or Jehovah uttered a *falsehood*, when he said there is no Savior besides himself, or sent his angels with a lie in their mouths, when he authorized them to say to the shepherd, "Unto you is born, a Savior who is Christ the Lord." p. 40.

Such is the language of a Trinitarian; and perhaps Mr. L. concludes that "admitting the doctrine of the Trinity to be true, there is no impropriety in" such language. But that such

language comports with christianity, I think will be very difficult to prove. Is such presumptuous arrogance the fruit of the humble religion of Jesus? to assert that the doctrine of the Trinity is true, or Jehovah uttered a *falsehood*, and sent his angels with a *lie* in their mouths? O Lamb like spirit of humility, where hast thou fled!

But when was it that Jehovah said, there was no Savior besides himself? Was it not hundreds of years previous to his sending his Son into the world? Could not Jehovah, hundreds of years before he sent his Son to be a Savior, say there was no Savior besides himself; and afterwards send his Son to be a Savior? Could not all this take place without Jehovah's uttering a *falsehood*, or sending his angels with a *lie* in their mouths? and yet the Son be a distinct being from his Father? If so, it is to be hoped that Mr. L. will withdraw his *accusation* against the Lord God.

SECTION II.

DIVINE WORKS.

The miracles of Christ, such as his *healing the sick, raising the dead, casting out devils, stilling the tempest, &c.*, are all regarded by Trinitarians as evidences that he was the supreme God. But it may be observed in regard to miracles wrought by others, that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still; and some of the apostles not only healed the sick and raised the dead, but also cast out unclean spirits. With these things kept in view, no difficulty arises, from the consideration that the Son of God could perform even greater miracles than men, and yet not be the very God himself.

Mark ii. 10 "The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." From the circumstance of Christ *forgiving sins*, Trinitarians have frequently asked the Pharisaic question, "who can forgive sins but God only." But Jesus, instead of affirming himself to be the supreme God in this work, calls himself the *Son of man*; from which no Jew could have supposed he intended to represent himself as the very God. But instead of this being the work of God exclusively, it appears that Christ commissioned his apostles to *remit sins*. "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto

them: and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." John xx. 23.

John x. 17, 18. "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." The circumstance of Christ saying he had power to lay down his life, and power to take it again, is considered by some, an evidence of his being the supreme God. But to me the passage is a strong proof to the contrary. To say the *immortal* God, laid down his *life* and took it again, would be an assertion too preposterous for credibility.

The word *power* in the passage, imports the same as *authority*, which Christ said he had received of his Father. That is, his Father had *empowered* or *authorized* him, to lay down his life and take it again. The scriptures, however abundantly teach us, that God raised Christ from the dead. In raising Christ from the dead, the Father restored that to the Son which the Son committed to the Father on the cross, when he said, "Father, into thy hand I commend my spirit." Thus he laid down his life and took it again.

Matthew, xviii. 20. "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." "To be present

with all, (says Mr. Luckey,) who are in every place gathered together in church fellowship or otherwise, Christ must be omnipresent. Here I find an argument in favor of the Deity of the Son, which every effort of our opposers to answer, the more convinces me that it is unanswerable." p. 148. He adds on the next page, "until it can be made to appear how a finite creature can be so, the consequence, that he is Jehovah, is just, or the text is false."

The reader will not be surprised at the last sentence, as it is so common for Mr. L. to assert his doctrine to be true, or the Bible false. We are, however, only entitled to the conclusion, that he is bent on embracing infidelity if he cannot make his doctrine stand.

Mr. L. appears determined that we shall tell him *how* Christ can be omnipresent, if he be not the supreme God. If I wished to dispose of this text as Trinitarians do many which they cannot answer, I should only have to say "it is a *mystery*," which we can neither comprehend or explain; "and it is a species of ostentation, not becoming a christian, to attempt it." This on Trinitarian ground would settle the affair at once.

But such a subterfuge, I confess, would be too poor for me to resort to. I am willing to meet this question, as well as all Trinitarian arguments, on scripture ground.

It appears evident to me that Christ is represented in scripture, as present with his disciples in distinction from his God and Father. John xiv. 23. "Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." The word *we*, always implies as much as *two*; and who would have supposed from reading this text, that Christ and his Father are one and the same being? "And *we* will come unto him, and make *our* abode with him." Let the passage speak for itself.

So far would Mr. L. be from maintaining that none but the infinite God can be present in different places at the same time, that he will no doubt acknowledge that even *Satan* is in very many places at once. He may probably say there are legions of devils, but that the word *devil* is applied to different things in scripture, he no doubt knows. But that old serpent which is the devil and Satan is the one I allude to. That this *old accuser of the brethren* is in many places at the same time, he no doubt believes. If he is willing to admit this, (and I think he will not deny it,) why should he think it impossible for the Son of God to be present at different places with his disciples at the same time, and yet not be the very God himself?

It is said that creation is ascribed to Christ;

and that he is the creator of all things. This I dispute. We will, however, examine the passages brought to prove that Christ is the creator of all things. John i. 3. "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made." Colossians i. 16. "For by him, [Christ] were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in the earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities or powers: all things were created by him, and for him."

It will be noticed that it is not said in either of these passages, that the Son made all things, or created all things; or that he is the maker of all things, or the creator of all things. It is however, stated that all things were made by him, and that all things were created by him. By comparing these two passages with others, we shall ascertain their true meaning. Heb. i. 1, 2. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath, in these last days spoken unto us by his son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he [God] made the worlds." In this passage we learn that God made the worlds by his Son. Question. How were all things made by Christ? Answer. God made all things by him.

"All things were created by him." For a parallel passage see Ephesians iii. 9. "And to

make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." Now there is no way for us to have any consistent view of this passage, unless we admit that Christ and his Father are distinct beings. To say the passage means that God created all things by himself, I would beg leave to rank high on the list of absurdities. And to say that *divinity* created all things by *humanity*, is worse and worse. All things were created by Christ, because God created all things by him. By making these comparisons, the meaning of the above passages is at once understood, but for want of this, mistakes are frequently vindicated for truth.

In further illustration of this subject, I subjoin the following able written article from the pen of Elder Charles Morgridge, of New Bedford, Mass.

"1. It is perfectly analogous. So far as we are acquainted with the economy of God, we find it is his general method to operate by the agency of some intermediate minister. We do not know but this has ever been an established principle in the divine administration; from which there has been no departure. The uniformity, which appears wherever we can discover his method of operation, seems to require us to believe that God made the world and all

things by the instrumentality of some agent. And as his Son existed, not only before Abraham's day, but also 'before the world was,' it appears to me impossible to avoid the conclusion, independent of any *particular* information on the subject, that God must have performed the work of creation by the instrumentality of the same agent by which he now accomplishes the work of redemption.

"2. This conclusion, thus founded on analogy, is supported by the plain unequivocal testimony of the apostle Paul, who says—'God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, *by whom also he made the world.*' On admission of the doctrine of the Trinity, this passage is quite unintelligible. For if Jesus be God and man both, if he be the only true God, as well as the mediator between God and man, what can the word '*Son*' signify? It cannot signify the divine nature, for God cannot be *appointed heir* of all things, inasmuch as he is the original proprietor, and independent owner 'of all things.' An *heir* by appointment, is dependent for his heirship on him who *appointed* him. The word '*Son*' cannot signify the *human* nature, for it is impossible for the worlds to have been made by the *human* nature of Jesus, thousands of years before that human nature existed. And no Trinitarian, I believe, admits the pre-existence

of the human nature of Christ. The word 'Son' cannot signify the *constituted* character of Jesus, comprising the human *and* divine nature, because it would involve both the difficulties just stated, and render the sentence more unintelligible and contradictory than either of the above expositions. But if, without any deference to the doctrine of the Trinity, we take the testimony of the apostle just as we find it, the sense of the passage is too plain and easy to be mistaken; and the doctrine it contains analogous, scriptural and important. It teaches us that God made the worlds through the instrumentality of his Son; acting upon the same principles which he constantly regards in the works of redemption.

“ 3. I add one argument more taken from a rule of Greek syntax, well known to the learned. The Greek preposition *dia*, which in our common translation is rendered *by*, in all those passages that mention the creation *by* Jesus Christ, does not signify by any one as an original or *first* cause; but it denotes by any one or any thing as an *instrumental* cause. The noun, signifying the original or first cause, is governed by another preposition, *hypo*. This rule may be illustrated by the first passage in the New Testament, in which the prepositions *dia* and *hypo* occur. “Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken (hypo) *by*

the Lord (dia) *through* the prophet." Passages like this in the New Testament, which are quoted from the prophecies in the Old, are very numerous, and serve to illustrate this rule. The word denoting the *first* cause is uniformly governed by *hypo*, *by*, while the word denoting the *instrumental* cause is governed by *dia*, *through*. I am aware that there is one passage in the most common copies of the New Testament, in this country, that seems to some Trinitarians, to be an exception to this rule. But if they will carefully examine the best copies of Griesbach, I think they will not avoid the conviction that the rule was of universal application with the Greek writers of the New Testament; and that *hypo*, and not *dia*, is the true reading in that passage. Philo, the Jewish historian, who was contemporary with our blessed Savior, and who wrote in Greek, observed the distinction between *dia* and *hypo*; and their different application pointed out the difference between the *original* and the *instrumental* cause of a production.

“Origen, of Alexandria, a Greek scholar of the most profound erudition, and the brightest luminary with which the church was blessed in the third century, noticed the same distinction. In his commentary on the beginning of John’s gospel, he remarks thus; ‘if all things were made *through*, (dia) the word, they were not

made *by* (hypo) the word, but by one more powerful and greater than the word.

“ Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, who flourished early in the fourth century, a man of extensive knowledge of ecclesiastical history, thoroughly versed in all the branches of sacred literature, and whose well known accuracy in the knowledge of the Greek, together with his successful application to polemical theology, shows us that he could not possibly be ignorant of the meaning and use of two prepositions which he constantly used in conversation and writing, in his annotations on the first of John’s gospel, has these words: ‘ And when he says, in one place, (ver. 10) that the *world*, and in another, (ver. 3) that *all things* were made *through* (dia) him, he declares the ministration of the word to God. For when the evangelist might have said, ‘ All things were made *by* (hypo) him, and again, ‘ The world was made *by* (hypo) him;’ he has not said *by* (hypo) him, but *through* (dia) him; in order that he might raise our conceptions to the underived power of the Father as the original cause of all things.’ From such testimony as the above, as well as my own observation upon the different application of *dia* and *hypo*, I am satisfied that the writers of the Greek text in the New Testament, designed, by the use of *dia*, to mark the *instrumental*, and by the use of *hypo*, the original cause of a production.

Hence the meaning of those passages which represent the world, and all things as made by Jesus Christ, must be, that they were made by Christ, as the instrument employed by God, the original Creator. The true meaning of all these passages is literally expressed by St. Paul, who says, "*God created all things by Jesus Christ.*"

SECTION III.

DIVINE HONORS DUE TO THE SON OF GOD.

On this point, I shall in the first place examine the arguments of my opponents; and in the second place, endeavor to exhibit the scripture light of the subject.

"It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." From This passage, it is confidently affirmed, if Christ be not the very God, it is idolatry to worship him. But it appears to me, that with a little attention to the subject, we shall discover things differently. I ask when was it thus written; and when was this command given? Was it not hundreds of years before "*the first begotten*" was brought into the world? It certainly was. This command was given at a time when God declared there was no Savior besides him-

self. A *new dispensation*, brought in a new command. Under the gospel, the Father "when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him." Heb. i. 6. Can any one be so presumptuous as to suppose, the self-existent God alluded to himself when he commanded the angels to worship his "*first begotten*?" and that the angels were to recognize the supreme God as a *begotten Son* to himself in their worship? Let Trinitarians then, remember that the command given under the law, before the *first begotten* was brought into the world, does not affect his worship as the *begotten Son of God* under the gospel.

Again it is urged, "that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." True; but what does this scripture teach us more than that we are as equally commanded to honor the Son, as we are to honor the Father. When we closely examine the passage with its connection, I think we shall find nothing in it that teaches us to consider the Son in our worship, to be the very being who in the passage is called the *Father*. It stands thus: "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath *committed* all judgment unto the Son: That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which hath *sent him*" John v. 22, 23.

The subject appears to me in this light. To honor the Son as one *sent*, is honoring the Father who *sent him*. To reject Christ, is rejecting the Father who sent him. As Christ said to his disciples: "He that despiseth *you*, despiseth *me*; and he that *despiseth me*, *despiseth him that sent me*." An ambassador sent by a king to negotiate, if rejected and insulted by those to whom he was sent, the insult operates equally against the king who sent him. If received and honored, it is also honoring the king who sent him. Thus we are to honor the Son as one sent, even as we honor the Father who sent him.

Isaiah xlii. 8. "I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images." The argument urged from this scripture is, that if we worship the Son as a distinct being from the Father, we take that glory which is due to God alone, and give it to another. This may appear plausible, but in my opinion it is a mistaken view of the passage. We may honor the Son of God, and at the same time pay supreme worship to God his Father, because the scriptures represent that to honor the Son who is sent, is at the same time honoring the Father who sent him. "And that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the *glory of God the Father*." Phil. ii. 11. How then

can it derogate from the honor of the supreme God, to honor his Son whom he has sent? What Father would consider himself dishonored in witnessing due respect paid to his Son? particularly a king who had sent his son to negotiate with his subjects.

But says Mr. Harmon, "Mr. M. says, we nowhere learn that he [Christ] was worshipped as the supreme God. I ask then, as what, or how was he worshipped? As one of the idols of heathenism? Or as a subordinate Deity?" p. 28. How little do such irrelevant questions become the humble minister of Christ! Had Mr. H. asked the following questions, I should have thought it my duty to have answered him: "If Christ is not to be worshipped as the self-existent God, as what or how is he to be worshipped? As the *first begotten*, and as the *Lamb* that was *slain*?" To these I would have answered in the affirmative; and would again ask Mr. H. whether we are to worship the self-existent God, as "the *first begotten* of the *Father*;" and as a "*Lamb* that was *slain*?" If he answer *yes*, I would again ask who is the *Father* that the *self-existent God* is the "*first begotten*" of? And when was the self-existent God *slain*?

Mr. H. continues: "Mr. Millard worships two beings—two Gods. But the Bible teaches us that 'the Lord our God, is *one Lord*.'" "

And I should have been glad if Mr. H. had remembered this passage and written according to it. If he really believed that "the Lord our God is *one Lord*," I wonder he should labor so hard to prove that "the Lord our God" is *three*.

As to Mr. H's charge that I worship two Gods, it is unjust. My views on this subject are stated too plain to be misunderstood. I worship one *God*, and one *begotten Son*? one God, and one *Lamb* that was *slain*." How would Mr. L. relish the statement, should I say that he worships *three Gods*. And would not my charge be better supported than his? Let the candid judge.

We will now attend a little to Mr Luckey: He states that "Jesus Christ claims, and the Father commands angels and men to address to him the *same* worship that we are called on to address to the Father. And the conclusion is, that he must be God in the sacred Trinity of persons, or the Bible is a dangerous source of idolatry." p. 219. This is a statement which I challenge Mr. L. to prove. When and where did Christ claim to be worshipped as the very God? When did God command men and angels to worship his Son as any other than "his first begotten," or as a "*Lamb* that was *slain*?" Who was God's first begotten? Was it the supreme God himself? Are we commanded to

worship Jehovah as *the first begotten*, and as a *Lamb that was slain*? What will not Mr. L. rather advocate than relinquish his strange mysterious doctrine?

He winds up his remarks by saying, that Christ must be God in the Trinity, or the Bible is a dangerous source of idolatry! Is it not astonishing to meet such remarks so frequently from the pen of one who professes so much regard for the scriptures? As much as Mr. L. had said, Trinity must and shall stand; and if the scriptures will not support it, away with them, they are not fit to be among people.

As the Bible teaches us to worship the Lord God and his only begotten Son, it is the standard for us to go by. But Mr. L. instead of making the Bible his rule to determine what idolatry is, makes *Trinitarianism* a rule to judge the Bible by; and asserts if the doctrine of the Trinity be not true, the Bible is a dangerous source of idolatry. O preposterous thought! What if Mr. L., after all his struggle to support the doctrine of the Trinity, should like the amiable Robinson, who had written volumes to defend it, or the pious Dr. Watts, be constrained to give it up? Would he then think the Bible a source of idolatry? How would his hard, censorious remarks look to him?

In page 232, Mr. L. tells what he considers

idolatry to be: that it is "the act of addressing the worship due to God only, to any of his creatures." I feel no disposition to reject this definition of the term; but in my view, there is a difference between the worship we are to pay to the Son of God, and that which is due "to God only." As I do not consider the Son of God to be the very God himself, of course I do not pay to him that worship which belongs to God only, but worship him as one *begotten*, and one *slain*; and of course, on Mr. L's explanation of the term, I am free from idolatry.

While Trinitarians contend that it is idolatry to worship any thing but the very God, I would ask, is their system free from danger in this respect? They tell us they worship Christ, and that he is *very man* as well as *very God*. I would then ask, do they worship the whole of Christ, or only a part of him? If they worship only a part of him, they are certainly dishonest in their worship; and if they worship the whole of him, they must worship *very man* as well as *very God*. But on this principle, their own statements would prove them idolaters, since *very man* cannot be *very God*. Some Paul may yet arise and say to the rigid Trinitarian, "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein thou judgest, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things." Rom. ii 1.

Trinitarians affirm that nothing but human nature was *born*, and that nothing but human nature either suffered or died. What view have they then while they worship that which was *begotten* and *slain*? The heavenly host sung "glory to the Lord God and the Lamb," But how would the Trinitarian note chord with the heavenly song? "Worthy is a *human sacrifice* sanctified on a divine altar. Worthy is *human nature* that was *slain*, to which the Son of God was united. Worthy is human nature that suffered and died, in the stead of the second person in the Godhead, who could not die."

But says Mr. H. "I shall not stop to inquire whether if we worship only a part of him we are dishonest in our worship, or if we worship the whole of him, we must *worship human nature*; because the Bible has put no such question to me, nor has it demanded of me an answer." p. 28. Neither has the Bible involved such a palpable absurdity. I honor revelation too highly, to disgrace it with such a charge. But why has he deferred this inquiry? Is it because he knew it would expose the absurdities of his system? "Because the Bible has put no such question to me," says Mr. H. No, verily, for the writers of the Bible never taught Mr. Harmon's mysterious doctrine.

Again says Mr. H. "Divine worship is paid

to Jesus Christ; 'let all the angels of God worship him.' 'At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth.' Mr. Millard acknowledges the worship of the Son, but refuses him the honor that belongs to the Father. But the words of Mr. M. have not so much weight with me as the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, who declares 'that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father.'" p. 46,

The principle thing I have to notice in this quotation is, that these passages of scripture are wrested from their real meaning. Why did not Mr. H. quote a little of their connection? How different will the first passage appear with its connection. "When he bringeth in his first begotten into the world, he saith; and let all the angels of God worship him." It would not reflect much honor to Mr. H's understanding, to quote this passage to prove that Christ is the self-existent God; and perhaps this is the reason why he presented it in a maimed form. The second passage he quotes would appear equally different with its connection. Phil. ii. 10. "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth." Here Mr. H. stops; we will, however, read a little further. "And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God

the Father." That I worship the Son of God is a fact; yet I do not worship him as "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." Mr. H. insists "that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father;" and who disputes him? But would he have us honor the Son, as the Father of himself, or the Father as the Son of himself? or how are we to understand this strange phraseology?

The subject appears to be plainly stated in scripture, that we ought to worship the *Lord God* and the *Lamb*. To say it is idolatry to worship any being but the supreme God, is to accuse the supreme God himself of instituting idolatry, since he has commanded angels to worship his *first begotten*. Can we suppose that the *first begotten* was the self-existent God himself? Let the truth have due weight, however much it may cross the creeds of men. Was the *Lamb that was slain*, whom the heavenly hosts worshipped, the supreme God himself? It is to be hoped that my readers will view this point with candor.

Mr. Harmon and Mr. Luckey, have dealt out their *anathemas* beyond measure against our views, while they have not noticed a single objection against the mode of worship for which they contend. It really appears to me that they have only aimed to accomplish that by declamation, which they knew they could not by fair

argument; and I am sorry to say that this is a practice too generally resorted to by our opposers. If I am ever so happy as to join the heavenly worshippers, I expect to sing, glory to the *Lord God*, and to the *Lamb that was slain*.

SECTION IV.

DIFFICULT PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE EXAMINED.

A few more passages of scripture remain to be examined.

John xiv. 9, 10. "Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then show us the Father? Believest thou not I am in the Father, and the Father in me?" Those who suppose the above passage establishes the supreme Deity of Jesus Christ, suppose too much for their own system. If it proves his Deity, it also proves that he is the Father, which destroys the doctrine of the Trinity. If the Son is the *Father*, then they are not two distinct persons. The Athanasian creed says: "We worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity. Neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost." As

the doctrine of the Trinity asserts there are three *distinct* persons in the Godhead, and also that the persons must not be confounded, the text in question proves too much for Trinitarian use. It completely spoils the doctrine.

Again, understanding the Savior to mean *literally* that they who saw him, saw the invisible Jehovah, is to suppose the most palpable contradiction to other plain scripture testimony. John said, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." John i. 18. Speaking of the invisible God, Paul says: "Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light: whom no man hath seen nor can see." 1 Tim. vi. 16. The Lord said to Moses, "Thou canst not see my face, for there shall no man see me and live." Exodus xxxiii. 20. Now as no christian will for a moment admit that the Bible contradicts itself, or that our Savior designed to contradict the above plain scriptures, we are bound to search for a more rational meaning of the text in question, than that generally affixed to it by Trinitarians.

Whenever we see the *form, image, or likeness* of a particular person, we always, in a certain sense, see the person; because the person is reflected in his image, or likeness. Thus the disciples saw the prophet Elijah in the person of

John the Baptist. It is also certain that our Savior said John was Elijah, who had been predicted should come at the opening of the gospel day. In Malachi iv. 6, we read, "I will send you Elijah the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." This prediction related to the introduction of the gospel, and was made several hundred years after the old prophet Elijah had taken his exit from this world. We are then to understand that if Elijah was sent, he must figuratively come in some other man, who would be a likeness of him. This was John the Baptist, of whom our Savior said, "If ye will receive it, this is Elias which was to come." Matth. xi. 14. Also see Matth. xvii. 10—13. No scripture can possibly be quoted as stronger proof that the disciples in seeing Christ, saw the invisible God, than the above passages are that the same disciples in seeing John the Baptist, saw the old prophet Elijah. Yet no one supposes that John was literally Elijah the prophet, but that coming in the spirit of Elijah, they who saw him, saw Elijah reflected. Our Savior came in the spirit of his Father, and was the representative of the invisible God to men. He is said to be the "image of the invisible God." Col. i. 15; and also "the express image of his [God's] person." Heb. i. 3. In Christ the *image* or *likeness* of the invisible God,

the disciples saw all they could of the invisible God. They saw him reflected in the person of his Son. This is the only rational construction that can be given to this passage, unless we wish to make the Bible contradict itself.

“Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?” This portion of the passage is also clung to, as proof that Christ and his Father are one and the same being. As a parallel passage, see John xvii. 20, 21. “Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.” There is always a beauty in the scriptures when they are permitted to explain themselves, but when bent to the shape of a human creed, they are often compelled to speak a language never designed by the pen of inspiration.

Rom. ix. 5. “whose are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever.” I feel disposed to question that the word *God*, in this passage, has an allusion to Christ. Paul had been speaking of the Israelites and their peculiar privileges, and then adds, “Whose are the fathers and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all.” Here comes in a note of punctuation; and then the apostle adds, “God blessed forever.” If Christ was the God

spoken of in the passage, to have had it correctly punctuated, it should have stood thus: "Christ came who is over all God;" but it will be remarked by the careful reader, that the note of punctuation comes before the word *God*, and that *God* is immediately connected with "blessed forever." As much as if the apostle had said, "Christ came who is over all those of whom I speak, for which may God be blessed forever."

Phil. ii. 5, 6. "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." This passage is frequently urged in proof that Christ is the self-existent God; but for two grand reasons I dissent from that idea.

1. Christ is represented in the passage as the *form* of God. No person naturally understands the *form* of a thing, to be the thing that it is the *form* of. This expression means the same as the *image* of a thing. Christ is said to be the image of God. Every one knows that a person and the *image* of a person are two different things. If Christ be the *form* or *image* of God, we cannot rationally suppose him to be the very being he is the *form* or *image* of.

2. The word *equal* always implies two or more. Should I say one thing, (no matter what,) was equal with another thing, would the

reader understand me that both these things are but one thing? Or should I say a thing is equal with itself, would he not say I talked nonsense? Trinitarians will first say that Christ is the self-existent God; they will next affirm that he is *equal* with God, and the sum of both expressions must be, that God is *equal* with *himself*! One at first sight might suppose that such arguments originated at *Babel*, where language was confounded.

Furthermore, it appears to me that the Trinitarian theory, makes Christ more than *equal* with God. They tell us he is *very God* and *very man*. Now as *very God* is one being, and *very man* another, Christ must be *one being* superior to God; at least it must be admitted, that he is superior to God by an addition of one *whole man*, providing the Trinitarian theory be true. If this be the case, God is not *equal with Christ!!* Dr. Macknight, who was a Trinitarian, and whose correctness, as well as candor, is admitted by both the learned and unlearned, in his notes on the epistles, gives the following rendering to the passage in question: "Now let this disposition be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who, though he was in the form of God, did not affect to appear in divine majesty, but divested himself; taking upon him the form of a servant, being made in likeness of men, he humbled himself, and became obe-

dient to death, even the death of the cross." This rendering strips the passage of all difficulty.

Coll. ii. 9. "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." It will be remarked that this text does not say, the Godhead dwells in Christ bodily, but the *fulness* of it. The question then to be determined is, what is meant by the "fulness of the Godhead." The term GODHEAD, is used to express the *being* or *person* of God. I see no difference between the meaning of two expressions found in scripture, viz. : "The fulness of God," and "the fulness of the Godhead." Paul desired that his brethren might be filled with all the fulness of God. "And to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." Eph. iii. 19. Not that Paul desired that three persons bodily should dwell in each of his brethren, but that they might be filled with the Spirit of God. Christ had the Spirit given to him without measure. "For he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure to him," John iii. 34. From the above expressions, in the sense they are used, it is plain that "the fulness of God" and "the fulness of the Godhead" mean the same as the Spirit of God. Should the question be asked, Where can we have access to the divine Spirit?

the answer is given, In Christ ; for “ in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.” He is the only medium through which we can have access to God. Through him the Spirit flows to the soul of every believer. In Christ we have access to all the communicable perfections of God. ‘Thousands of happy believers often sing a hymn containing the following stanza :

“ O, the rapturous height, of that holy delight,
Which I felt in the life giving blood ;
Of my Savior possess’d, I was perfectly blest,
And was fill’d with *the fulness of God.*”

If Christ was filled with the same, does this prove him to be the supreme God ? In a word if this text proves that Christ is the supreme and eternal God, then every believer who is filled with the *fulness of God* is the same.

1 Tim. iii. 16. “ And without controversy ; great is the mystery of Godliness : God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.” The inference drawn from this passage by Trinitarians is, that the supreme God came down from heaven, and was clothed with flesh, by taking upon him a human body, and that in this consists the great mystery of godliness. We will, then examine the subject, to see whether such an inference is warrantable.

In the first place, I would remark that the reading of the text, as it stands in our common version, is very doubtful: and, in all probability, incorrect. It is so pronounced by Griesbach, who is considered by Trinitarians, a standard critic in the original Greek. The text from Griesbach is rendered thus: "Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: He who was manifest in the flesh, was justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."* This, beyond a doubt in my mind, is the correct reading of the passage; and with this reading, it presents no difficulty whatever. The whole connection of the passage seems to render this reading indispensable to make sense. If it be the supreme God who is alluded to in this text, who was it that Justified him in the Spirit? or whom was he justified before? And who received him up into glory? It would involve the inexplicable absurdity, that the throne of God in heaven, was vacated during the whole period from the birth of Christ to the time of his ascension. And even then, if Christ was the supreme God, there was no other God to receive him up into

* See "The New Testament, in common version, conformed to Griesbach's standard Greek text."—Boston edition.

glory. But as the Trinitarian may still insist on the reading of the text as it stands in our common version, I feel no fear of the issue, by meeting him on his own ground. Admitting the supreme God to be alluded to in the text, and then to say he was manifest in the flesh, or manifest in Christ, presents no difficulty to the doctrine I advance. That God was manifest in Christ, or revealed in the person of his Son, I have already stated. Of Christ, the apostle Paul says, "Who being the brightness of his [God's] glory, and the express image of his [God's] person." Heb. i. 3. Now an image is the likeness, representation, or manifestation of whatever it resembles. Thus God was manifest in Christ, who was the image or likeness of God. In the other part of the text, the Trinitarian has to meet the same difficulty that I do, in determining who it was that received him up into glory.

Before I dismiss this passage, however, I cannot but remark the use which Trinitarians make of the word *mystery* in it. They would represent that this great mystery consists in the doctrine of the Trinity, which the passage says nothing about. The passage does not say, great is the mystery of the *Trinity*; nor great is the mystery of a *God-man*; nor great is the mystery of a being who is *very God and very man*. None of these things are taught in this

passage. It simply states—"great is the mystery of godliness," and then informs us, that "God was manifest in the flesh;" all of which I freely admit. But I think it does not require much skill to demonstrate, that *godliness* and *Trinity* are two different things—that *Trinity* is one thing, and *godliness* another. Surely, if the doctrine of the *Trinity* be pressed out of this passage, it must be done as you would press cider out of cotton wool; that is, you must first put it in, before you can press it out.

Isaiah viii. 13, 14. "Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary: but for a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel." 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8. "The stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence."

From these two texts compared, Mr. Luckey draws the following conclusion: "Jesus Christ is the Lord of hosts himself." That by the Lord of hosts is here meant the self-existent God, is admitted. It is also admitted in the text quoted from Peter, that Christ is called a stone of stumbling and rock of offence. Isaiah says of the Lord of hosts, "He shall be for a stone of stumbling." But how shall the Lord of hosts be thus? I answer, in sending

his Son in the manner he did. In this he did that at which the Jews stumbled; and Christ in coming in the way he did, became a stumbling stone and rock of offence to the unbelieving of both houses of Israel. How absurd is Mr. L's conclusion!

1 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." This passage is generally urged with the utmost confidence that it affords incontestible proof, that Jesus Christ is personally the true and self-existent God. Let us then examine it impartially. Sometimes the sense of a passage is rendered obscure by the repetition of *pronouns*; and it is ever safe to substitute *nouns* for *pronouns*. Let us do so in examining this passage. The apostle had mentioned God in the preceding verse; he then goes on and says, "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know *God* that is true; and we are in *God* that is true, even in *God's* Son, Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." Now who would be at a loss to understand from this reading, that by the true God, John had reference to the very being, of whom Jesus Christ was a Son.

The whole strength of Trinitarian argument derived from this text, consists in refering the pronoun *this* to Christ, the nearest antecedent. But it must be remembered, that pronouns such as *this*, do not always refer to the nearest antecedent, but frequently to the subject matter of discussion, though more remote. I could bring a number of examples from scripture to warrant what I here state. I will, however, confine myself to one passage, which will demonstrate all that is necessary at this time. I refer to 2 John 7. "Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh; this is a deceiver and an antichrist." Now let any Trinitarian affix the same rule of grammer to this passage, that he does to 1 John v. 20, and he will prove that Jesus Christ is a deceiver and an antichrist. I invite him to make the experiment. I repeat it if the pronoun *this* in 1 John v. 20, refers to Jesus Christ, to prove that he is "the true God and eternal life;" then the pronoun *this* in 2 John 7, refers to Jesus Christ, and proves that he is "a deceiver and an antichrist." Let the Trinitarian take hold of either horn of the dilemma which he chooses.

But this same apostle John declares, that the Father is the only true God, in contradistinction to Jesus Christ. Our Savior, in praying to his Father, uses these words: "This is life eternal,

that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John xvii. 5. If Jesus was the only true God, who was the Christ whom the only true God sent?

The expression of doubting Thomas, on his unexpectedly seeing his Savior after he had arisen from the dead, is sometimes brought forward as proof of the supreme Deity of Christ. On his unexpectedly meeting his Lord, Thomas exclaimed, "My Lord, and my God!" John xx. 28. But this expression of surprise and admiration, neither proves Christ to be the supreme God, nor that Thomas addressed him as such. There is no probability that Thomas believed Christ to be the supreme God, because prior to then, he had not believed that the Savior was alive; and affirmed that he should not believe it, unless he should thrust his hand into his side, and his finger into the print of the nails. Is it at all probable, that Thomas would be instantaneously converted into the opinion, that the person whom he had seen crucified, and who, to that moment, he had thought was dead, was the supreme God, and had just come to life? Such a supposition would be in the face of all probable evidence. My opinion is, that Thomas' words were nothing more than a sudden exclamation, on seeing such an unexpected sight. Many persons will cry out,—My God, or My Lord God, on seeing a person killed by

accident, or on unexpectedly meeting a friend whom they thought was dead. In this case, the expression like that of 'Thomas', would only be an expression of wonder and surprise, which should not be regarded as direct evidence to prove any thing.

The expression of Peter to our Savior after his resurrection, "Yea, Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee," is often brought forward to prove, that Christ is the supreme, omniscient God. The disciples on another occasion, used a very similar expression. "Now we are sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee; by this, we believe that thou comest forth from God." Now the force of evidence that Christ is the supreme God, is destroyed by the last clause of the verse just quoted. If Jesus Christ *came forth from God*, he certainly was not that God he came forth from. This fact is as plain as a demonstration in Euclid. Besides, the very same language which Trinitarians regard as evidence of the supreme Deity of Christ, the apostle applies to his brethren. "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." 1 John ii. 20. It will be observed, that the knowledge here attributed to christians, is represented as arising from their *unction* or *inspiration* by the Almighty. Why then might not our Savior's knowledge arise

from the same cause? If the expression on the one hand, proves Christ to be the supreme, omniscient God; on the other hand, an expression in the same words, proves the same of John's brethren. In both cases, a knowledge of all things, simply means an extensive and various knowledge. Every attentive student knows, that the word "*all*" in scripture is many times used to signify *a very great number and variety*. That there are some things which Christ did not know, is evident from his own words. He declared that he did not know when the day of judgment would be. Mark xiii. 32.

Acts xx. 28. "Feed the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood." This passage, beyond a doubt in my mind, is not properly rendered in our common English version. Some of the best commentators, among which are several Trinitarians, substitute the word *Lord* in the room of *God*. This alteration is strictly conformable to Griesbach's standard Greek text. In the translation of the New Testament, made conformable to Griesbach, the text stands thus: "Feed the church of the Lord, which he hath purchased with his own blood." With this reading, the text presents no difficulty whatever. And the reading of the passage as it stands in our common version, presents as much difficulty to the

Trinitarian as it does to us. To say the supreme God shed his blood to purchase the church, is awful in the extreme.

CHAPTER IV.

SECTION I.

THE TRINITARIAN MODE OF ARGUMENT ASSUMED.

For a further investigation of the subject, I shall now adopt the Trinitarian mode of reasoning, and see what may be accomplished in that way.

1. That we may have a more perfect view of the arguments used to prove Christ the very and eternal God, let us see how far the same arguments would go towards proving the supreme *deity* of Moses. Moses as well as Jesus, has the titles of *Lord* and *God*. Thus said Jehovah to Moses: "I have made thee a God to Pharaoh; and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet," Exod. vii. 1. Wherever such a title is given to Christ in scripture, Trinitarians affirm that they prove Christ the supreme God, because God will not give his glory to another. On the same ground we should say that Moses had an independent claim to the dignity of God, and that this was acknowledged by another person with him in the Godhead.

In several instances we find one and another of the people of Israel, making supplication to Moses, and giving him the title of *Lord*. I shall mention two instances in which this was done by Aaron, his high priest. "Let not the anger of *my Lord* wax hot." Exod. xxxii. 22. "And Aaron said unto Moses, Alas! my Lord, I beseech thee, lay not the sin upon us, wherein we have done foolishly, and wherein we have sinned." Num. xii. 11. Now let it be asked, who should know the character of Moses better than Aaron? and why should Aaron beseech Moses not to lay the sins of the people upon them, if he had not been truly God, according to the Trinitarian mode of reasoning?

The supplications made to Jesus, and his not rebuking those who offered them, have been regarded as affording a very weighty argument of his being the very God. But we have seen that not only ignorant people, but even Aaron made supplication to Moses, and *prayed* to him, "lay not the sin upon us." Yet "who can forgive sins but God only?" say Trinitarians. And why did not Moses rebuke Aaron? According to Trinitarian argument, Moses might be considered a *person* in the Godhead, or an arrogant impostor.

That Christ is the supreme God, is also affirmed on this ground—the same divine works are ascribed to the Father and Son. Our be-

ing positively told in scripture, that God did these things "*by Jesus Christ,*" is not admitted as an answer to the argument. Let us then see what may be done in favor of Moses. The miraculous deliverance of the Israelites from their bondage in Egypt, was certainly a divine work; yet this work is repeatedly ascribed both to God and Moses. God ascribes it to Moses, and Moses ascribes it to God. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Go, get thee down; for *thy people, which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted themselves.*" Here the deliverance of Israel is clearly ascribed to Moses, and the people are considered *his people*. What more could Moses do, in giving the honor of this work to God? He did it several times, in nearly the same words. I might easily show that this work is many times ascribed to God, and many times to Moses; but it, is needless to multiply quotations. Therefore, if the Trinitarian mode of argument be good, Moses ought to be considered the God of Israel.

The giving the law at Sinai, is another divine work. This is often ascribed to God, and the law is called the law of God; but it is equally true, that the giving of the law is ascribed to Moses, and the law is called the law of Moses. John says, "the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus

Christ." John i. 17. Our Savior himself gives this honor to Moses; "For Moses said, Honor thy Father and Mother." Mark vii. 10 "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses." Luke xxiv. 44. "Did not Moses give you the law?" John vii. 19. Thus evident it is, that if the Trinitarian argument be good, there is no want of evidence that Moses should be considered the God of Israel, who gave the law at Sinai.

The style of Jesus in giving commandments, has also been urged as an evidence that he was the supreme God. "I say unto you," was the style he adopted; but Moses adopted a style not less imperative. "I command thee," "I command you," was the manner of Moses; and this we have repeated nearly forty times in the one book of Deuteronomy.

It is a truth, which I am willing to admit, that Moses was careful to let the people know, that what he said and did was by God's direction and assistance. But Jesus was not less careful than Moses, in this particular, yet his testimony on this point is so explained as to go for nothing in respect to his personal dependence. He could say "I can of mine own self do nothing." "I do nothing of myself, but as my Father hath taught me I speak these things." Yet Trinitarians as confidently say, he was the self-sufficient God, and that he wrought miracles

and gave commandments "in his own name." Why have I not as good ground to affirm the same in favor of Moses? There is, in truth, as much ground for the latter, as for the former.

To those who are acquainted with the present controversy, it is well known that much pains has been taken, to find something in Christ's own testimony in favor of the doctrine that he was the very God. We will now see a little of what might be done by a writer as much disposed to prove that Moses claimed the dignity of Jehovah. In the 11th of Deuteronomy, Moses speaks of God in the third person, until he comes to the 13th verse, and then says, "And it shall come to pass, if ye shall hearken diligently unto *my commandments* which I command you this day, to love the Lord your God, and serve him with all your heart, and with all your soul, that *I will give you the rain of your land* in his due season, the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil, and *I will send grass in thy fields.*"

In the same book, chap. xxix. 2—6, we read thus: "And Moses called unto all Israel, and said unto them, Ye have seen all that the Lord did before your eyes in the land of Egypt, unto Pharaoh, ——— Yet the Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and

ears to hear, unto this day. And *I have led you* forty years in the wilderness : your clothes are not waxen old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxen old upon thy foot. Ye have not eaten bread, neither have ye drunk wine or strong drink ; that ye might know that I am the Lord your God.”

If any passage could be produced from the testimony of Jesus, that had half the appearance of his assuming the dignity of God, that these have that Moses assumed such dignity, might we not expect to find them quoted in every attempt to prove that he is the very God? In that case, would it not be in vain to tell Trinitarians that Jesus spake as the representative of God? Would they not reply, “No! he spake in his own name as Jehovah. There is, however, nothing in the testimony of Jesus, which corresponds with the manner of speaking here adopted by Moses ; nothing which has half the appearance of assuming the dignity of God. In no instance did his language so much as apparently imply, that his works were done, that the people *might know that he was the Lord God of Israel*. On the contrary, he taught that his miracles were performed, that people *might believe that God had sent him*.”

If I were disposed to support the doctrine that Moses was “*very God and very man*,” I should need only to borrow the Trinitarian mode

of reasoning, to accomplish the purpose as fairly as has ever been proved that Jesus was such a being. I should say that Moses was constituted of *two whole and distinct natures, divine and human*. That some things were spoken of and by him *as God*, and other things *as man*. Should objections be made on the ground of his praying to God, his owning that God *sent him*, &c. these things, I should say, respected him *as man*. That as a man, he was dependent, or that although he was God, yet he had consented to act in a subordinate *office as mediator*. Nor am I aware of a single objection, but might be answered in the very manner which Trinitarians answer objections to their system, by saying Christ was *very God and very man*. And I may venture to add, that I can produce much more from the writings of Moses, in which he apparently assumed the dignity of God, than ever has been, or ever can be produced, from the testimony of Jesus, in favor of the Trinitarian view of his character.

Let any candid, judicious Trinitarian set down and write an answer to the arguments in favor of the proper deity of Moses, then apply the same reasoning to his own arguments in favor of Christ being the supreme God, and it is believed he would renounce both the systems as absurd and false.

I shall now, for a moment, assume the Trini-

tarian mode of *invention*, and in room of their *two nature scheme*, invent one full as scriptural and rational. Trinitarians affirm that some things are said of and by Christ as *God*, and some things as *man*. That this is actually the case, they can bring no positive scriptural proof, as they themselves must allow; they state, however, that they infer it as a necessary conclusion. And the plain fact is, they cannot vindicate their doctrine without it, therefore *necessity* has driven them to this subterfuge.

Instead of supposing that some things are spoken of Christ as *God*, and some things of him as *man*, we will suppose that some things are said of him *literally*, and some things *allegorically*. With this *invention* I should only have to pursue the Trinitarian track to evade every argument they could raise. All the scriptures which plainly imply a distinction between Christ and his Father, I should say were spoken of him *literally*, and if any should be urged in proof that he was *God*, I should say they were spoken *allegorically*. In this way I could support absurdities with ease.

Should any one tell me that my *invention* was unscriptural, I should reply that although I had no positive scriptural proof of it, yet it was a necessary conclusion, as I knew no other way to interpret certain passages of scripture relating to Christ. I must therefore conclude that some things were *literal*, and some things *alle-*

gorical. Should I be told it was unreasonable, I should only reply that it was *above reason*, and was a *mystery*; that although we could not fully understand it, yet we must believe it. This would only be supporting my *inventions*, as Trinitarians do theirs, nor am I in reality aware that it would be more objectionable. Let the candid Trinitarian examine his *two nature* scheme by the side of this one, and I think he will, like me, be willing to pronounce them both unscriptural and absurd.

The same mode of argument adopted by Trinitarians, will as clearly support the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, as the doctrine of the Trinity. Trinitarians urge that their doctrine is a *mystery*, and Papists urge the same of theirs. Trinitarians, however, say they do not found their doctrine wholly on the argument of *mystery*, and Papists say the same of theirs. If we must appeal to the scriptures for testimony in favor of either doctrine, I can find far more in support of Transubstantiation than of Trinity. The Popish doctrine of Transubstantiation is, that by the consecrating prayer of the priest, the bread and wine at the communion, are changed into the real flesh and blood of Christ. In proof of this they quote the words of Christ, who said of the bread, "this is my body;" and of the wine, "this is my blood." Again, "except ye eat the flesh

of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."

It must be acknowledged that Trinitarians cannot bring more pertinent scripture in favor of their doctrine, than these are of *Transubstantiation*. But says the Protestant Trinitarian, "it cannot be that literal bread and wine can be changed into the real flesh and blood of Christ." But says the Papist, "it is inferred from plain scripture." "It is unreasonable and absurd," says the Trinitarian. "It cannot be absurd," says the Papist, "for it is taught in scripture, and our reason cannot investigate it, because it is *above reason* and is a *mystery*." "It is a palpable absurdity," says the Trinitarian Protestant, "and our common sense teaches us so." "But hold," says the Papist, "it will not answer to bring *sacred mysteries* to the test of *human reason*. We indeed acknowledge, that to short sighted mortals it may appear absurd to suppose that the bread and wine in our holy communion, should be the real flesh and blood of Christ, yet Christ has said of the bread and wine, "this is my body," "this is my blood," and yet you will not believe that literal bread and wine may be changed into the flesh and blood of Christ, because it is a *mystery* and you cannot comprehend it. On the same ground you may reject the holy doctrine of the Trinity, which you profess to believe as well as we. It

is no more difficult to believe in the holy doctrine of Transubstantiation, than it is to believe in the doctrine of the Trinity. We only say that bread and wine are changed into the flesh and blood of Christ, by the prayer of consecration. You profess to believe that the very and eternal God was *made man*. That the very God was born of the holy Virgin, whom we call the *mother of God*. That God is *three distinct persons*, and yet but *one being*. That Christ is *very God* and *very man* and yet but *one person*, and that he is the Son of God and yet the very God that he is the Son of. These things we believe as well as you Protestants, but we marvel, that while you believe in the holy doctrine of the Trinity, that you cannot also believe in the holy doctrine of Transubstantiation, for it is no more difficult to believe in the one, than it is to believe in the other."

Should a Protestant Trinitarian thus be headed by a Papist, I am at a loss to know what defence he could make. The Papist certainly has it right when he says he has but one difficulty in his doctrine, which is the transformation of the bread and wine, while the Trinitarian has a number in his doctrine, full as absurd and mysterious. It really does appear to me, that if a Trinitarian would candidly look over his argument against the Popish doctrine of Transubstantiation, he would find them

equally bearing against the doctrine of the Trinity.

Trinitarians boast much that their system is calculated to reflect greater glory to God and his Son, than the one is which I now advocate. They can almost with the confidence of *judges*, accuse me of stripping the Son of God of his most essential glory, and of even *sapping* the foundation of the gospel. To their comfort, however, I hope they will remember that “nevertheless the *foundation* of God standeth sure.”

Respecting the Father and Son, I am unable to discover so great a difference as many pretend to, between the Trinitarian and Socinian systems. The Socinian believes about as much relative to God and Christ, as the Trinitarian does, though in a little different way. Trinitarians believe in a *very God*, and a *very man*, to constitute the Father and Son. Socinians believe the same. Trinitarians believe that only *a man* suffered on the cross, and Socinians believe the same. Trinitarians say that God being united with the man Jesus, that union sanctified the sacrifice. Socinians say that God by the fulness of his Spirit dwelt in the man Jesus, and sanctified him, and contend that they have as great a sacrifice as Trinitarians have. Now the only real difference I can see in these two systems thus far, is that the one asserts that *God and man* are but *one being*, while the oth-

er asserts them to be two, yet the one believes just as much as the other upon the whole. The sense in which Trinitarians view Christ to be *God*, and worship him as such, is, they say God was the divine part of Christ. Though Socinians can see no propriety in saying that God and man are but one being, yet they worship the very being which Trinitarians call the divine part of Christ. Who then does not see that Socinians have as much to constitute the *Father* and *Son*, as Trinitarians have? Socinians have one God and a mere man, and Trinitarians have no more than one God and human nature.

A candid examination of the subject will discover my view to be far more exalted than those of either Trinitarians or Socinians. Instead of believing in *one God and human nature only*, to constitute the true God and Jesus Christ, I believe in one God, self-existent and infinite, and in the room of human nature, in *one holy divine Son of God*, far superior to either men or angels. Instead of believing that mere human nature suffered on the cross, I affirm that this holy Son of God actually died for the sins of the world.

Is it not then plainly seen, that my views of God and Christ, considered together, are far more exalted than those of my opponents? When closely scanned it must be confessed, that

Trinitarians have no more than one God and a "*real man*," to constitute the *God* and *Christ* which they believe in; while I acknowledge one God, and a Son far superior to men or angels, and consequently have a sacrifice far more dignified than theirs. Why then am I thus reproached? Why charged with stripping the Son of God of his glory? Mr. Harmon considers that I have "debased the Son of God from his true dignity." Let him carefully examine his own system by the side of the one which I advocate, and see which believes in the most. Let him frankly confess who it is that believes in one God and *human nature* only, for a Father and Son. Let him acknowledge that Trinitarians believe in no more than a human sacrifice.

SECTION II.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS ON MR. LUCKEY'S PUBLICATION.

I have already noticed a considerable contained in Mr. Luckey's book, but on account of paying a more strict attention to Mr. Harmon, who had written particularly in reply to my former work, much more remains to be noticed relative to Mr. L's performances. However, room at present will not permit me to notice Mr. L. as extensively as I could wish; yet I determine to examine some of the leading features of his work, believing it to be my duty to clear the connection in which I stand, of some of his hard censorious charges.

Mr. L. appears to please himself by representing all heresies relative to the point now in debate, as being particularly raised in order to overthrow the doctrine of the Trinity. He intimates that the *Cerinthians*, *Gnostics*, and *Ebionites*, raised their heresies particularly against the doctrine of the Trinity, as taught at that day. Such statements, I think, reflect either against the honesty or understanding of Mr. L. when he ought to have known that the doctrine that God is three persons, was not taught in the days of those heresies. That the errors of the *Dacetae*, and *Ebionites*, were her-

esies of apostolic times, he need not inform those who have paid a proper attention to church history; but does this prove that the doctrine of the Trinity was known in apostolic times? That the apostles opposed those heresies, is admitted, but we have no account that they taught the doctrine of the Trinity in doing it.

Mr. L. continues: "The writings of the apostles give clear evidence, that this opposition to the doctrine of the Trinity existed in their time." p. 22. This is an unqualified assertion. When have the apostles stated that they had to encounter opposition to the doctrine of the Trinity, any more than to the doctrines of *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, or *Penance*, when none of these doctrines were known at that time? The doctrines of *Purgatory* and *Penance*, were brought into the church by Platonists, as early as the second century; which entitles them to as much credit from antiquity as Trinity, for they are undoubtedly as old doctrines.

Again he observes; "I have reserved it for another place, to enquire after the apostles' faith concerning the Trinity." p. 24. And that *place* is perhaps not contained in his book, for he has presented us with no quotations from the apostles concerning any such faith; and

“how could they believe in that of which they had not heard?”

Speaking of Messrs. Smith and Plummer, he says—“When these polemical gentleman, or any of the people at whose head they appear, are presented with the plain declarations of the word of God, in favor of the deity of Jesus Christ, they will meet them with such queries as these, “how can a Son be as old as his Father?” or “if begotten, there was a time when he was not begotten, and a period when he was begotten,” &c. And all the arguments that can be brought from scripture, or elsewhere, are by them over ruled by this single question about the relation between Father and Son.” p. 33. As the whole connection are classed together, in this remark, I reply: such declarations from the word of God, as Mr. L. speaks of, cannot be produced. Christ is no where in scripture represented in any other light than as the *begotten Son of God*, while the supreme God is declared to be the Father of Christ. Where then is the impropriety of that mode of reasoning which Mr. L. condemns? Does he condemn it because it so plainly exposes the absurdity of his system?

Again says Mr. L.: “To what can all these queries amount, while the word of God proves that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that the Son of God, is very and eternal God?—

Thus it is expressed in our articles of faith— And in this point of light we should contend for it—We receive Christ as our Savior—We adore him as our proper object of worship— We find ourselves authorized to ascribe to him all the perfections of the Deity. We rejoice that for us, he was manifest in the flesh—We believe in him as a *mediator* and trust in the merits of his death, for our salvation.” p. 40.

In my opinion this is laying rather a heavy tax on the scriptures, to assert that they prove that Jesus Christ is both the Son of God, and the very and eternal God ; that is, the Son of himself and the Father of himself. I should not think I honored revelation very highly, to attribute to it such palpable absurdities ; and I may venture to say, that from reading the sacred oracles, I have not so learned Christ.

“This is expressed in our articles of faith, and in this point of light we should contend for it,” says Mr. L. Its being thus expressed in the Methodist *discipline*, makes it no better for me. In that same discipline it is stated in substance, that the very and eternal God was *made man!* one of the most glaring absurdities ever proposed for human belief.

In what sense Mr. L. believes in the very and eternal God as a *mediator*, is left for him to explain. Who does the very and eternal God mediate between? We read of a media-

tor *between* God and men; and if Christ be the very God, it is *between* him and men that a mediator is needed. I am at a serious loss to know, who Mr. L. has left for a *mediator*. Let him beware of denying the mediator, lest he "deny the Lord that bought him."

Mr. L. continues, "what is it to us in what sense the Holy Ghost styles him Son? If it has not revealed to us that he is an *eternal Son*, it has revealed to us that the Son of God is *eternal*. If it has not told us that the term *Son* is used only in relation to his human nature, it has told us that the Son in the sacred Trinity sustains a dignity equal to that of the Father."

Such metaphysical reasoning may suit such as are in the habit of making great use of the word *mystery*, but to plain people, I think it not very instructing. If we know not in what sense the Holy Ghost styles Christ *Son*, the scriptures on that point are no *revelation* to us. The meaning of the term *Son*, is familiar to the weakest capacity, and if we must be at a loss to know what it means in one part of the Bible, why may we not be at a loss to know what it means in every part? If we know not what is meant by familiar terms in scripture, how are we to understand them? Our minds can certainly form no conception of a hypothesis, that a father and son are the same individual being.

To tell of an *eternal Son*, is a gross absurdi-

ty; yet Mr. L. thinks this sufficiently revealed in scripture; but where he has not told us. He states that the Bible has told us, that "the Son in the sacred Trinity, sustains a dignity equal to that of the Father." And I am at a loss to know what he will not lay to the charge of the Bible. The Bible has told us nothing about "sacred Trinity," or a "Son in the sacred Trinity." Mr. L. remarks in his preface, that he has written more particularly for the instruction of common people; but does he suppose *common people* have never read their Bibles? This is making rather large allowances for the credulity of his readers.

Again says Mr. L. "The reason why I have enlarged so much upon this subject, is that all the opposers of the doctrine of the Trinity, have dwelt particularly upon the point to which Arius so strictly adhered, in his efforts to spread his heresy, which I think tends to darken counsel rather than any thing else, and in my opinion all who wish to come at the truth, ought strictly to avoid it." p. 41.

As to the manner in which Arius spread his heresy, or the particular *point* he dwelt upon in doing it, is not what I am now concerned in, as I am not an Arian: but my object is the point in debate. Is Christ the Son of God, and the God that he is the Son of? Does this inquiry darken counsel? If it does, it must be such coun-

sel as Trinitarians give. This is one of the important questions now pending, and if Mr. L. had known his business, he ought to have given a satisfactory answer to it. But instead of doing this, he states that it is darkening counsel, and in his opinion, all who wish to come at the truth, ought strictly to avoid it. But why *avoid it*? Is it not a scriptural fact, that Christ is the Son of God? And who can form any conception of a *Son* being his own *Father*, or a *Father* being *Son* to himself? The only reason why Trinitarians wish to *avoid it*, is because it is a barrier in their way, which they cannot easily surmount.

“The Bible can speak but one language, (says Mr. L.) and if it speak in favor of the deity of Christ, it can no where speak against it.” p. 95. This is a true remark; but the Bible no where mentions the deity of Christ. Mr. L. of course will be willing to allow me the same privilege; that is to say, if the Bible asserts that Christ is the Son of God, it does not contradict it. But can he say his system does not?

Mr. L. occupies a number of pages in commenting upon the word *God*, and acknowledges it is given to different characters in the scriptures besides the supreme Jehovah. He then very unfeelingly calumniates us for making the same use of it, that the scriptures do.

He remarks, "there can be no reason for them to use the word *God* as they do, but to subserve their interest, and deceive the unwary. And to contend, because creatures are called Gods in the way above described, that Jesus Christ may be, in the way he is, though he be not equal with the Father, is shrewdly to conceal all distinction with God and his creatures; and is calculated to lead people directly from the knowledge of the true God, into the deepest recess of idolatry." p. 120.

I am persuaded that this remark will bear equally as much against the scriptures as against me, if it may be admitted that it possesses any weight in argument. It is certain that a number of different characters have the title of God given them in scripture, as unequivocally as the Son of God has. If this is shrewdly concealing all distinction between God and his creatures, the Bible is culpable for it, which I do not believe is the case. This remark does not reflect much honor to a man who professes so much regard for the scriptures as Mr. L. does.

Instead of saying there is no distinction between God and his creatures, I assert that there is a very obvious distinction. That although creatures may receive the appellation of *God*, yet it is in a very subordinate sense; yea, although even the Son himself receives this title, yet the God and Father of our Lord

Jesus Christ is to bear it in a superlative sense.

But this, says Mr. L. is calculated to lead people directly from the knowledge of the true God, into the deepest recess of *idolatry*. It would appear as though he had set up his own judgment as a criterion by which to determine what is and what is not *idolatry*. Which is the safest rule for us to determine by, what is or what is not idolatry, the doctrine of the Trinity or the Bible?

Again Mr. L. observes, "There is something unaccountable in the manner the Smithites dispose of the word *God*, with the distinguishing epithets of "the mighty God," "the only wise God," &c. when applied to Christ. They readily say all these titles are applied to him, but they gravely inquire, where is he called the self-existent God?" p. 115. Respecting the manner in which the *Smithites* dispose of the word *God*, I have nothing to do, neither have my brethren, for we are not *Smithites*. Mr. L. must therefore settle his difficulties with the *Smithites*, if he knows who they are. I am, however, unwilling to admit, that the epithet of "only wise God," should be applied to Jesus Christ, because the Bible does not apply it to him. Respecting the term "the mighty God," I shall refer the reader to my remarks on Isa. ix. 6, in another part of this work.

On page 129, Mr. L. has given us a comment

on Jude, 4th verse, "Denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." He insists that the Lord Jesus Christ, means the same as the only Lord God, mentioned in the text, and says the text may be thus transposed: "Denying the only Lord God, even our Lord Jesus Christ," or "denying our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the only Lord God." It is one thing for Mr. L. to make such comments on scripture, and another thing to make people believe them. To me this appears like wresting scripture. Jude mentions an *only* Lord God, and besides him a Lord Jesus Christ. But do Trinitarians teach this?

After occupying a number of pages in proving that such mysteries exist as no person disputes, he asks the following questions: "Now how is it possible for them to support their cause? How do they certainly know that Christ cannot be very God and very man? Or that the doctrine of the Trinity cannot be true? While they admit of *mystery*, they cannot, and of course, cannot support their cause." p. 163.

What Mr. L. means by saying Christ is *very God* and *very man*, is, that he possesses *two whole and distinct natures*; and by the doctrine of the Trinity, that God is three persons. We will now suppose that it is asserted, that Christ is composed of *four distinct natures*, and that God is *nine persons*. The Bible does not ex-

pressly say that Christ does not possess *four natures*, or that God is not *nine persons*; and how will Mr. L. prove it is not so, on his principle of reasoning? If he should pretend to reason against the statement, it might be said, "you admit there are mysteries, and this is one of them, now how is it possible for you to support your cause." I do not say mysteries do not exist, but the above remarks are intended to show the absurd use Mr. L. makes of the term *mystery* in argument.

Again says Mr. L.—"It is certain that the apostle meant by our Lord Jesus Christ the same as the Lord God, or inspiration has *erred* in applying these titles to him, and is calculated to support idolatry rather than suppress it." If Christ being called *Lord* and *God* in scripture, prove him to be "the only Lord God," we may prove Moses and others the same, by the same rule; for Moses had the titles of *Lord* and *God* given to him. But Mr. L. insists, if Jesus Christ be not the only Lord God, inspiration has *erred*, and is calculated to support *idolatry*! Is it not certain that Mr. L. is determined to condemn the Bible if it will not support his mysterious doctrine? How would Mr. L. know what *idolatry* is, if the Bible did not inform him? The issue then lies between him and the Bible, wholly upon the supposition that the doctrine of the Trinity must be true.

Is there no possibility for him to be mistaken? It really appears to me that he does not depend upon the Bible for information upon this point, or he would not say the scriptures are a source of idolatry, even if they do not teach the doctrine of the Trinity.

Preposterous as such statements may appear, Mr. L. has gone yet farther. After repeating it over and over again, that his doctrine is true or the Bible is *false*, and a source of idolatry, he adds, "If Christ be not God and a proper object of worship, then the conclusion, that he was an *impostor*, is a just one." p. 245. In page 246 he states, "if Jesus Christ be not God he was an *impostor*, and the Jews did an act incumbent on them to crucify him, as a transgressor of the laws of God;" and in page 257 he asserts Christ to be the supreme God, or Mahomedanism is an important reformation to christianity.

How such remarks may appear to my readers I know not; but to me they are shocking. What! is a professed minister to set up his system of faith as a rule, not only to judge the scriptures by, but also to arraign the character of the divine Son of God to! To virtually say, "if my doctrine is not true, thou art a base *impostor*! The doctrine of the Trinity must and shall stand, or I shall say Mahomedanism is an essential reformation to christianity." Is this the language of Trinitarianism! "O my soul,

come not thou into their secret ; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united—cursed be their anger for it was fierce, and their wrath for it was cruel. I will divide them in Jacob, I will scatter them in Israel.” Gen. xlix. 6, 7.

Mr. L. very frequently accuses those who dissent from him, of having little or no regard for the scriptures ; but what for a picture has he drawn of himself? That he would rather throw away his Bible and become a deist, than give up his mysterious doctrine. He even tells us that he sees no place for him between being a Trinitarian or a *deist*. Are we not then entitled to the conclusion, that he considers there is but one step between his system and deism? That they are so nearly allied that all other systems are farther off than his? I do not say this is actually the case, but I think his statement looks like it.

Mr. L. insists that all our arguments are founded upon the supposition, that the doctrine of the Trinity is not true ; and appears to represent that people would so naturally believe that doctrine from reading the scriptures, that they would scarcely ever have thought of any other in the room of it. Might I not with equal propriety assert that all Mr. L's arguments are founded upon the supposition that the doctrine of the *divine unity* is not true? A very modest remark indeed for Mr. L. to make.

So incorrect is the statement that all our arguments are founded upon the supposition that the doctrine of the Trinity is not true, that we found our arguments upon scripture testimony, our enemies themselves being judges, for they acknowledge that we bring much scripture to our support. How many there are who had been conversant with their Bibles for many years, who never thought of such an idea as that God is three persons! and when they first came to hear a controversy upon the subject, have been astonished at it. Many have said, "why, I never had such a thought enter my mind, that Christ is the very God that the Bible says he is the Son of. I never had any other view of God and Christ, than as a Father and Son." Many old and pious christians have made remarks like these, while they have manifested an astonishment that people should contend upon a point so plain! These indeed were my impressions from a child.

Again, Mr. L. would make people believe that those who reject the doctrine of the Trinity, have no *system of faith* in the room of it. p. 64. But does Mr. L. suppose he can make people of common sense believe this assertion? that before a person can be made to believe in Trinity, he has no *system of faith*! While I contend for the divine *Unity of God*, have I not an equal right to say that none but such as believe

as I do, have a *system of faith*? The Trinitarian system of faith in substance is, that God is *three persons*, and yet but *one being*; and that Jesus Christ is *two beings*, and yet but *one person*! Can there be no system of faith without believing this? Suppose we conscientiously believe that God is but *one* instead of *three*; that is, that he is one person only; that Jesus Christ is properly "God's own Son," and that the Holy Ghost is a *divine emanation* from God; should we not have as really a system of faith, relative to this subject, as Trinitarians have? These things we contend for as conscientiously as Trinitarians do for their theory, though it is to be hoped in not so censorious and uncharitable a manner.

Mr. L. may probably contend that all Unitarians do not think alike. This I readily acknowledge, neither do all Trinitarians. I have now before me about twenty different views, published by Trinitarians, relative to their doctrine, which I am prepared to exhibit when called for. Can Mr. L. tell of twenty different views relative to this subject, among professed christians who do not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity? It is a fact, which I am prepared to prove, that Trinitarians differ very much in their views. Yet all these things are overlooked by them, if they are only wil-

ling to bear the Trinitarian name, and fight well for their cause.

SECTION III.

REMARKS ON MR. LUCKEY'S BOOK, CONTINUED.

Dismissing Mr. L. for the present upon the Trinity, I shall now turn my attention to some of his censorious remarks particularly aimed at the people with whom I stand connected. As he has taken the liberty to stigmatize and reproach, as well as to warn people to beware of us, it shall be my business to show that his censures are unfounded, as well as unfeeling.

The first thing which I shall notice, in his effort to fix on us certain names which we have never assumed. Such as *Christ-ians*, pronounced by giving the *i* in the first syllable a long sound, and *Smithites*. He says, "If I have been rightly informed, they adopted the name of *Christians*, with pretensions that the adoption of every other name was a species of idolatry, and that they alone were what this name imports; to whom all others must come to constitute a millennial church." p. 76. This statement is correct only in part. The first in the connection adopted the name of Christians, it is true, considering it the most proper name to

distinguish the disciples of Christ from the *world*. Also that this name, if properly revived, was calculated to bury all party names, and thus far promote a union in the christian world, so much to be desired. To this principle, we, as a connection, still adhere. We think unscriptural party names, injurious to the peace of the church, calculated to foster pride, and covet popularity. At least they are of no benefit to the church, and must one day be laid aside.

We are perfectly free to adopt and address each other, by any name or title, which Christ has given to his disciples, as recorded in the scriptures, or themselves have assumed; whether it be *Christians, friends, brethren, saints, or disciples*. But we reject all unscriptural names, considering that we have no more right to exchange the name or titles, which our divine Master has given us, than a child has to exchange the name given him by his parents, for another.

But Mr. L's assertion that we assumed the name of *Christians*, considering that we *alone* are what this name imports, is an unjust charge. This would suppose that we disfellowship all other professing christians, which is not the case. We fellowship all as christians, whom we can gain an evidence have the *fellowship* of the *Father* and *Son*. We believe all God's

children are one, and we profess a union with all such, and if a want of union still exist, we resolve it shall be on their part, and not on ours. Though we are far from being indifferent in respect to what a person believes, yet we do not think that certain controverted points among christians, ought to be made the *test of fellowship*, but that *religion*, or the love of God in the soul, is what alone can constitute it. We do not set ourselves up as *infallible*, and therefore dare not *judge* a brother for whom Christ has died. We are willing to live and let live, to think and let think. We esteem the right of *private judgment* a privilege too dear to be deprived of; then why should we wish to usurp that from others, which we esteem so precious ourselves. We cannot withhold the hand of fellowship from a christian brother, whoever he be, nor virtually say, "stand by, I am more holy than thou." We believe where true charity reigns in the heart, that a union of soul may be enjoyed and fostered, even where a great difference of sentiment exists.

"Then why should circumstantials mar
That union so divine?
Or *controversials* ever bar,
Those whom they cannot join?"

"No forms, or tenets can unite,
Or bring one soul to heaven;
Then for them let no Christian fight,
Where God has all forgiven."

Mr. L. continues, " But it was changed from *Christians* to *Christ-ians*, in conformity to their characteristic vociferation against human invention." But who made the change? Mr. L. ought to have told us. The mode of pronunciation is a barbarity of language, and the name one which we do not assume. Our opposers have endeavored to palm it upon us, for which we do not thank them.

Mr. L's effort to fix on us the appellation of *Smithites*, is equally disgusting. If he had possessed good manners enough to treat us with common place civility, we might supposed he would have despised the low habit of giving *nicknames*, and have given us the name which we assume. How would Mr. L. relish the statement should I pronounce him a *papist*? It is certain that all *papists* are Trinitarians. We call ourselves *Christians*, in conformity to scripture, and we wish thus to be considered, as far as we live like such; and I hope that our opposers in future, in respect to this request, will at least show themselves possessed of *good breeding*. Why should others envy us this name? We do not assume it as ours exclusively. We shall rejoice when all the followers of Christ, shall be willing to lay aside their unscriptural names, and share this in union with us.

Mr. L. represents that our assuming this *name*, begets in him a suspicion that it is for an

improper use. To this I reply, if assuming the best and most proper *name* we could find in the scriptures, must subject us to such *suspicion*, I would ask what we should do to escape it? Ought we to assume an unscriptural name, in order to escape censure? What! has it come to this, that Christians are to be suspected the most, who conform the nearest to scripture! And must we abandon the scriptures to escape the censure of those who profess christianity! Christians, look at this! O shame, where is thy blush!

In respect to what we believe, Mr. L. observes: "If it be asked, as it frequently has been, what this sect believe in, I am obliged to say I cannot tell. But when it is recollected that they are not only destitute of any *established system of faith*, but make it a virtue, if not a principal part of their religious duty, to decry them with clamorous vehemence, it will not be thought strange that this question cannot be answered." p. 77.

But would Mr. L. assert that the Bible is not an established system of faith? or does he suppose we are destitute of the Bible? If Mr. L. prefers any thing to the Bible for a system of faith, I only have to regret that he does not respect his Bible more. What rule can we have superior to the scriptures?

Is it not astonishing that those who adhere

solely to the scriptures for their religious belief, are pronounced destitute of any established system of faith? We know that *infidels* do not receive the Bible as a rule for their belief, but do Christians reject it as a system of faith? Had Mr. L. said that we reject all systems of faith but the Bible, and make this our only written rule of faith and practice, he would have told the truth.

Mr. L. says he cannot tell what we believe in; but darkness is not farther from light, than this statement is from one found on the very next page, where, in respect to our belief, he remarks, "But in relation to this we shall perceive in the sequel, that their writings afford us an ample source of information concerning their views, with which to acquaint the public I took much pains when I first entered upon this work; but as their notions have become more notorious, to be less definite will suffice."

Notwithstanding Mr. L's pretended ignorance of our views, he has, in the course of his work pretended to investigate our very leading sentiments. I do not say he has been correct in his representations, but for him first to state that he cannot tell what we believe, and then undertake to expose our belief to view, is calculated to sink his candor and veracity into very low repute.

Mr, L. not only intimates that he does not

know what we believe, but that we conceal our sentiments only when we see fit to divulge them. He says, he states this with the utmost confidence, from an acquaintance with our practice in this respect. The object of Mr. L. in such representations is very obvious, but the correctness of them remains in question. Indeed, as far as my acquaintance has extended with the connection, I know him to be incorrect. It has very frequently been my practice, on visiting strange places, to deliver one sermon embracing my general belief; and this I know to be the practice of a number of my brethren in the ministry. At any proper time for conversation upon the subject, I ever have, and still do pledge my honor, to freely give my belief on any point in theology; and I hope this remark may influence people to use a freedom in conversation with my brethren in the ministry, and thereby prove either the truth or falsity of Mr. L's statement.

Mr. L. further asserts, that there is not a uniformity of sentiment existing among us. That we do not all think alike in every respect, I freely admit. And what sect is there in which all its members think exactly alike in every thing? Can he even say the Methodists themselves do? From my acquaintance with the Methodists, which has been considerable, I know that difference of opinion does exist

among them, notwithstanding their articles of faith. Mr. L. well knows that Mr. John Wesley asserted his belief in the resurrection of the brutal creation to a state of eternal felicity, which sentiment I do not think all the Methodists believe. Some of the preachers in that sect have advocated the belief that the soul and body die together, and remain in a state of insensibility till the resurrection; which sentiment Mr. L. condemns. Some of their preachers contend for the *eternal Sonship* of Christ, while others contend that it only commenced with his birth of the *virgin*. Some advocate *sprinkling* for baptism, while others wholly disbelieve in that mode. Some contend for their *Episcopal* mode of church government, while others believe it to be not only unscriptural, but tyrannical. These are a few of the differences of sentiment which do exist among the Methodists, and which Mr. L. cannot deny. Why then does he condemn others for the very *thing* which he allows himself? The plain truth is; we contend that a *christian union* does not spring from a strict agreement in *belief* in every point, but from holiness of heart, which constitutes a union with God, and ought to constitute a union with one another. It is evident that the reason why Mr. L. raises this *clamor*, is because we reject human *creeds, platforms, articles, and confessions of faith*, as useless inventions of men, believing the scriptures to be a sufficient rule for faith and practice.

Relative to articles of faith, Mr. L. remarks—
 “Whether having articles of faith reduced to writing, be denying the people the right of private judgment, and binding their consciences or not, is a matter we are willing to submit to a candid public.”

“If I have a right understanding of the subject, (continues Mr. L.) two things are necessary to constitute the offence of binding men’s consciences and denying them the right of private judgment. The first is to adopt articles of faith, and the second is to compel them to subscribe them. But as this last,

which is indispenably necessary to constitute the offence, is not recognized in the charge, it is altogether futile." p. 85, 86.

This is a very plausible representation of his cause, it must be confessed; but I am prepared to show it to be an incorrect one. It is not strictly necessary to compel people to subscribe men-made articles, in order for them to bind their consciences; as they may operate to that effect after they have conscientiously subscribed them. Nine cases in ten, converts, when they first profess religion, have not so far matured controverted sentiments in religion, as to adopt a conscientious view of them. Even if they have done this, their bounds are now set as soon as they have set their names to the men-made code. It is virtually said, "*thus far shall thou go and no farther.*" Who then does not see, that their belief is restricted to what is expressed in the articles to which they have subscribed? If their minds should change, to what they might conscientiously consider a more perfect knowledge of the truth, they are liable to be dealt with for heresy, and excluded from church communion, and thus be exposed to denunciations and disgrace. And there is no doubt in my mind, but that many through *fear*, have thus *strained* their minds to constantly consent to what they would gladly have had otherwise.

There have been a number of instances, to my knowledge, among different denominations, in which conscientious christians have had to expose themselves to be dealt with for heresy, and have an excommunication put upon them, or groan under a restriction of privilege, on the very subject of debate in this work. Some have boldly preferred the former, while some have timidly submitted to the latter.

Instances have been, where a vote has been taken in Methodist classes, that all who believed that Jesus Christ is the very God, would manifest it by rising up. A part and sometimes the greatest part kept

their seats; in consequence of which their names were dashed from the *class paper*, by the preacher present. Frequently the most pious and spiritual have been among the number thus thrust out. They were then denounced as heretics, by those with whom they had stood in fellowship; and why? because they were *honest people*, and would not deny what they conscientiously believed. Should this statement be questioned, I am prepared to inform the public where such occurrences have transpired.

I have already noticed in another part of this work, a circumstance recorded in the Methodist minutes, that a preacher was expelled their connection, for rejecting the second article of their discipline.* A number of others have shared a similar fate in this part of the country. Several preachers in that connection, who had become convinced that the doctrine of the Trinity is unscriptural, freely acknowledged their change, and requested a dismissal from the Methodist connection, but it was not granted them. They were pronounced heretical, though no other accusation was brought, than that they rejected the doctrine of the Trinity and *Episcopacy*, or the arbitrary power of the Methodist bishops. Not being permitted peaceably to withdraw, they requested that they might be tried by the scriptures, and thus have the means of vindicating themselves; but this was not granted. They were arraigned by the Methodist discipline as offenders; stretched on this *iron bedstead*, they were found too *long* and were *cut off*. These things are well known in this section of country.

It is not by way of retaliation on Mr. L. for his unfeeling declamations against us, that I make these statements: for it is no pleasure to me to dwell on church difficulties, but it is in my own defence I am constrained to do it. He declaims against us because

* Joseph Sampson, of the Philadelphia conference. See the Methodist Minutes for 1816.

we are unwilling to have any other *creed* than the scriptures, and insists that all should adopt other articles of faith. We insist that the scriptures do not warrant us to do it; and contend that the *rule* already given is *perfect*, without an additional one. If it is not *binding conscience* for a man to profess, and even have to preach what he does not believe, or otherwise be *expelled*, and be denominated a *heretic*, I know not what can do it.

The more I examine men-made creeds, the more I see the impropriety of them. After they have said all, they generally insist upon the following: "that the scriptures are the *only*, and *sufficient* rule of faith and practice." Why then add to them? Is not an *only* and *sufficient* rule already complete without additions? In the fifth article of the Methodist discipline I find the following judicious sentiment enforced: "The holy scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation: so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." Among the general rules of the Methodist societies, it is thus stated: "These are the general rules of our societies: all which we are taught of God to observe, even in his *written word*, which is the *only* rule, and the *sufficient* rule both of our *faith* and *practice*." I might easily multiply similar quotations, but I forbear to enlarge. But how inconsistent the practice, to inculcate the principle that the scriptures are "the *only* rule, and the *sufficient* rule," and then strenuously urge an additional rule! When will people be consistent with their profession?

Were it my whole business to vindicate our practice of adopting the scriptures as our only rule of faith and practice, in doing it I should adopt the very language which I have quoted from the Methodist discipline: that the scriptures are "the *only* rule and the *sufficient* rule, both of our faith and practice." I

consider that Christ has not left his church without a law to govern it, but has given one which James calls "*the perfect law of liberty.*" If the gospel dispensation afford a *perfect law*, all other laws to govern the church are superfluous. Whatever is *perfect*, needs no addition to render it so; consequently *the perfect law of liberty*, needs nothing added to it, to be a sure guide, and to make us wise unto salvation, through faith in Christ Jesus.

The *popish* assertion, that the Bible cannot be understood by common people, but should be explained by the learned, is a mere deception. The essential rule of faith and practice, is sufficiently plain in the scriptures, that he who runs may read, and "way-faring men, though fools, need not err therein." One important cause, in my opinion, for so much division in sentiment, is the want of strict adherence to scripture. Instead of taking the scriptures for their "*only rule, and sufficient rule* of faith and practice," many have submitted to men's explanations of scripture for their rule. Thus they have forsaken the fountain of living waters, and hewn out to themselves cisterns, broken cisterns that can hold no water.

Suppose the inhabitants of several towns in the state of New-York should adopt the principle, that our constitution is not sufficiently plain to be understood by *common people*. Suppose each of those towns should resort to the expedient of choosing certain delegates to compose a council or *body politic*, who should form out a general explanation of our constitution, so that *common people* could know what it means. They, after setting a length of time, form up certain articles of belief for the people of their town to submit to, relative to what the *constitution* means. What would be the consequence of this mode of procedure? Would not the people then submit to the opinions of their *council*, instead of the *constitution* itself? And would not this course of proceedings be likely to have the dangerous tendency of setting various towns

by the ears, as badly as different denominations of christians are at the present day?

Who will dare to say the Bible is not a sufficient rule of faith and practice? Perhaps my opponent may say, no one who professes the christian religion. But is it not virtually saying it is not a *sufficient rule*, to urge men-made creeds in addition to the Bible? And even reproach those who cannot conscientiously adopt them? What point is there of either *faith* or *practice*, contained in the scriptures, which needs to be enlarged on? What difficulty can arise in the church, but what the scriptures afford us a rule to settle it by? Until I am convinced that the scriptures are *imperfect*, and that men-made articles of faith are not worse than useless, I shall continue to exhort the disciples to "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not again entangled with the *yoke of bondage*." Gal. v. 1.

Against other denominations uniting with us in worship, Mr. L. has raised his warning voice. After reproaching us for extending the hand of fellowship to all christians, he remarks: "There is nothing more important which separates us from deists and Mahomedans, than what they [the Christians,] have preferred as points of separation between them and us." p. 95. On the next page he observes, "so important are the points of difference which separate us. And if, under these circumstances, they can worship with us, I cannot with them, I wish they would never propose it, for the excess of their licentiousness, in this particular, is such a picture of human depravity, degraded to the lowest extreme, that it cannot but afflict every sincere man."

As Mr. L. undoubtedly would not be understood, that he would forbid our worshipping the Lord God and the Lamb with Trinitarians, where we should happen in a congregation with them; what he evidently means is, that Trinitarians ought not to admit us to the *communion* with them. On this point then

he would be understood, that he would as freely commune with Mahomedans and deists, as with professed christians who do not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity. This gives a view at once of the extent of his charity; and on what he founds his fellowship. Though the conduct of professors may be ever so godly and sincere, yet if they do not acknowledge Trinity, Mr. L. would as freely commune with deists, as with them. O! heaven born *charity* where hast thou fled!

Who has authorized Mr. L. to make the doctrine of the Trinity, the *test* of christian fellowship and communion? Is it impossible for a person to be a christian, and not be a Trinitarian? Have not many been born of the Spirit, who never so much as entertained a thought that God is three persons, or that the Son of God was the very and eternal God himself? Who then has constituted Trinitarians the judges of hearts and given them a right to say who are the most pure and pious christians, whether themselves or others? Such *pharasaical* boasting, in my opinion, justly lays them under censure with those to whom Jesus once spake a parable: "that they trusted in themselves, that they were righteous and despised others." I have never allowed myself to call in question the piety of Trinitarians, nor am I now disposed to do it; but their perpetual proclamations, of the piety of their own party, do not, in my opinion, add one *cubit* to their *stature*.

Mr. L. acknowledges, that he believes there are sincere christians among us; but that they are deceived, and yet he could as freely commune with *deists* or *Mahomedans*, as with them; because they do not believe the doctrine of the Trinity. Is this the extent of *Trinitarian love*? Is this their "*mantle of charity*?" O "tell it not in Gath."

Mr. L's remarks on this particular, the more astonished me, because his discipline even authorizes his communing with *unregenerate persons*. This as-

assertion may be questioned, but if it is not correct the Methodist discipline, as well as their practice, ought to be corrected. It is well known that a great part of the members in the Methodist connection, make no pretensions to having received a change of heart. They were only received as *seekers*, on their manifesting a desire for religion, and are kept in society six months, if their morals continue good. During this time, it is enforced in the discipline, and urged by the preachers among other duties, for them to stately come to the communion. These facts Mr. L. cannot deny. Yes, he can even commune with those who do not think they have ever experienced regeneration, if they are only Trinitarian Methodists; yet he would as freely commune with *deists*, as with professed christians, if they happen to dissent from the doctrine of the Trinity.

Though Mr. L. has acknowledged that there may be christians who are not Trinitarians, yet this avails nothing with him, in respect to fellowship. It is not *christians* he is in search of, but it is *Trinitarians*. But I would ask, does not God own and bless christians, whether they be Trinitarians or not? Does not God commune with all christians? And what christian is there who cannot commune with all whom God communes with? Who that possesses the temper of Christ, but can fellowship all who have the fellowship of the Father and the Son? Christians, I appeal to you, what is the test of Christian fellowship and communion? Is it not the love of God in the soul?

If there be any principle injurious to the peace of the church, and detrimental to the reception of *pure holiness of heart*, it is the uncharitable sentiment that religion consists more in correctness of opinion, than in love to God and our neighbor. What would it avail Mr. L. though his sentiment be ever so correct, without holiness of heart? The same question may be asked in respect to me. Would it not be more tolerable for Sodom, in the day of judgment, than for us, if we

did not possess something more than correctness of sentiment? May it not be possible that even the devils have correct notions of God and Christ? Yet will these entitle them to salvation? Is an admission then to church fellowship and communion on earth, to be predicated on more strict principles, than a title to the joys of heaven?

How many there are, who make their own creeds the *test* of all their fellowship and communion. All the evidences the dissenting brother can give of his acceptance with God, avail nothing. The unfeeling *bigot* can yet virtually say to him, "stand by thou ignorant *Gentile*, I am more holy than thou. I am right, and thou art wrong—God has given me a better understanding than he has thee. Stand off thou *heretic*, I am *orthodox*, and thou art *heterodox*." If Mr. L. can here see his *picture*, one object at least, will be answered by the above remarks.

Mr. L. expresses a hope that we will never propose to worship with *him*, for, he says, "if they can worship with us, I cannot with them. I hope they will never propose it." For one, I will assure Mr. L. that I shall not *propose* communion with him at present; for if he could *commune* with me, I could not with him, under present existing circumstances; not till he retracts some of his unfeeling, censorious, and unchristianlike statements. Let him acknowledge that he has wilfully aimed to stigmatize a body of professing Christians. Let him confess his misrepresentations and hard sayings. Let him beseech God to forgive him; and then let him manifest marks of Christian humility. Let him remember, that though he may contend ever so strenuously for his sentiments, they will avail him nothing without *Christian love*. It is far more important to possess the *temper of Christ*, than even the most correct views of his personal dignity.

Notwithstanding the Son of God has expressly commanded, "judge not, that ye be not judged," yet

Mr. L. has presumed to do it, in respect to those who do not believe in 'the doctrine of the Trinity. He says, "on account of the want of candor and sincerity in these people, *I judge* them to be enemies to the christian cause; and *seriously* admonish all who have any regard for piety and the salvation of their souls, while their Christian benevolence may prompt them to treat their persons with the civility of men, not to unite with them in their worship, nor patronize a cause so evidently designed to destroy the worship of the true God." p. 97, 98.

How *serious* Mr. L. was while writing the above paragraph, or whether he was *serious* at all, must yet remain a question. However, had he said, "*I madly admonish,*" instead of "*I seriously admonish,*" he would have expressed himself more in accordance with the spirit he so plainly breathes: for the paragraph looks to me more like the production of a *madman*, than of a *serious* one. He can *judge* his religious opponents in respect to the Trinity, to be *enemies to the Christian cause*, as much as though the Christian cause wholly depended upon the doctrine of the Trinity. He can warn all who have any regard for piety, or the salvation of their souls, to beware of them. Though he can deal out his hardest invectives against those who dissent from him, one consolation remains, that he does the worst in his power, being restricted by the laws of our land. Thanks to God for civil, as well as religious liberty.

"They increase my conviction," says Mr. L. "that with all their pretended fidelity in the scriptures, they are, in reality, *infidels*, and use the Bible only to *deceive* the people." p. 132. What it is that *convicts* Mr. L. that we are *infidels* and use the scriptures to *deceive* the people, I know not: Do *infidels* teach that the Bible is true? Do *infidels* teach that Jesus was the divine Son of God? Do they insist that men must be born again, or be miserable? Do they urge

faith and repentance, as requisite to salvation? They do not. Yet the very people which Mr. L. judges to be infidels, and enemies to the Christian cause, teach these very things. On what then does he found his *judgment*?

Such are the impressions which this *very charitable* writer, would wish to make on the minds of his readers; and such impressions, probably he has made on the minds of many. But from my soul I abhor such language, and sooner would I have doomed my hand to the flames, than to have employed it thus to stigmatize and reproach a denomination of Christians. By such unhallowed means the church has been kept in a state of anti-christian warfare, for fourteen hundred years. Though Mr. L. can, contrary to the express command of Christ, *judge* and condemn us in his own narrow mind, we have yet one consolation left, that he is not appointed *Judge* of all the earth.

I could easily multiply similar quotations, but I forbear to enlarge; indeed his book abounds with censorious invectives against all who do not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity. From reading his performance, I am led to conclude, that he has vainly endeavored to accomplish that by *declamation*, which he feared he could not by *fair argument*, which is an effort too frequently made by Trinitarians. Mr. L. in the preface to his work, says. "I am not conscious of having indulged in any undue severity towards my antagonists." I know not what he would call *undue severity*. He has judged us to be *infidels*, and *enemies to the Christian cause*, and has admonished people to shun us as such; and asserts that we have *no regard for the scriptures*, but only *use them to deceive the people*. Is not this *severity*? and how much more of it ought Mr. L. to use, before he would pronounce it "*undue severity*?" May I be permitted to ask, are such things the fruits of *love*? Indeed, if such are the fruits of *Trinitarian love*, we have good cause to entreat them that they would *love us no more*.

Mr. L's work was particularly intended as a reply to a work written by Elder F. Plummer, entitled "The Mystery Revealed." That work was first published in 1812, and was a series of letters particularly directed to Mr. L.* Mr. L's publication, however, did not appear till six years afterwards. The reasons which he assigns for this delay was, that he could not obtain permission of the methodist conference to publish, though he made a number of requests. And it further appears, that in order to obtain that liberty of his *superiors*, he had to *alter* and *expunge* a considerable. However, had his request been denied till he had *altered* and *expunged* a considerable more, it would have been to the honor of the methodist body; and had he *expunged* the whole, by committing it to the flames, it would have been to his own honor.

Why ought we as a people, to be thus stigmatized and reproached? We contend for *holiness of heart*, and urge it in our lives and conversation. We believe in a religion that may be enjoyed and manifested; and that without holiness no man shall see the Lord. As preachers, our grand business is to persuade men to be reconciled to God. In doing this, we urge repentance and faith in the most persuasive terms. And that our preaching has been instrumental of the conversion of souls to God, our opposers themselves know. The many powerful reformations that have succeeded our labors, must evince to every one not wholly *blind*, that the gospel we preach comes "not in *word only*, but in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance." Not unto us, but unto God and the Lamb, be all the glory.

Mr. L. is a methodist preacher; and the methodists ought to be the last people to raise the arm of oppression against dissenting Christians. But a few years since, they well knew what it was to endure such

* It has since undergone another edition.

kind of treatment themselves, and I regret that they have so soon forgotten the *wormwood* and the *gall*. They are now fast treading in the tracks of their predecessors, and I would to God they would be seasonably apprised of their degeneracy.

There are, however, honorable exceptions to be made among them, of both preachers and people. With many of the methodists, my acquaintance has been sweet, and with such I feel myself bound by the strongest ties of fellowship. The above remarks are only intended for such as are of Mr. Luckey's cast. Of such, I find too many, particularly among the preachers. Reports as false as they were unfavorable, have been carried from circuit to circuit. With such, *Trinity* is their *God*, and the Christian sect the object of their animadversions. Indeed, if I were to judge by the conduct of some, they have labored with more zeal to effect the downfall of the people who call themselves *Christians*, than they have to overthrow the devil's kingdom, by persuading sinners to repent. Whether or no this has not been the case, may be a matter worthy of serious enquiry, by some individuals at least. If these remarks may in the least excite such inquiry, my object in making them will be answered; for I call God to witness, that I wish the methodists well in well doing and holy living.

CONCLUSION.

It is now time to bring this book to a close. The principal arguments I have to adduce, are already before the reader. Those who are accustomed to *think for themselves*, are earnestly requested to weigh them with candor; but from those who make it a practice to *pay others to think for them*, I can scarcely expect a candid perusal.

From passages already quoted in the course of this work, we are assured of the following things: That

God has a *son*—that *God gave his Son*—that *God raised his Son from the dead*—that *God gave his Son all power in heaven and in earth*—that *God has exalted his Son at his own right hand*—and that *God will judge the world by his Son*. We are also assured, that *Jesus Christ has a Father*—that he is the *Son of God*—that he was *with God* before the foundation of the world—that he *proceeded forth and came from God*—that he was *begotten of God*—that he came to *do the will of God*—that he *prayed to God*—that he *ascended to God*—that he sits at the *right hand of God*—that he is a *mediator between God and men*—that he will *deliver up the kingdom to God*, and become *subject to God*.

All these expressions are plain and definite, nor do I think the tenor of scripture destroys or renders their meaning obscure. Yet in order to vindicate the Trinitarian system, there is not one of these expressions, but must be wrested from their literal reading. And from this view, I may venture to say, that if all the passages I have quoted in proof of the system I vindicate, must be explained in a sense contrary to every analogy in language, it is in vain to appeal to the scriptures for a decision on the point in debate.

As a conscientious christian, I am constrained to believe, and assert the *unity of God*, and the proper Sonship of Jesus Christ. In view of scripture declarations on the point in debate, I cannot be a Trinitarian.

In expressing my views, I have aimed to do it in the spirit of tenderness. Indeed had I written in the spirit of *illiberality* so generally manifested by Trinitarians, I should have serious cause to regret that I had written at all. Some of the Trinitarian clergy, have, without warrant from scripture, made a belief in their doctrine, essential to communion with them. Many parents, from imbibing such principles, transfuse these unfeeling prejudices into the minds of their children, and cause them to grow up prepared to despise the most amiable characters, if they happen to

be found among dissenters from the *mysterious doctrine*. What better can they expect of children, who hear their parents and their ministers, frequently *thundering* out the vengeance of heaven against all who dissent from their supposed *mystery*. But is there not a possibility that those very *thunderers*, may feel what they have so unmercifully dealt out to others? "Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned. With the same measure that ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do."

It is indeed, my hope and belief, that God will be more merciful to many Trinitarians than they have been to their dissenting brethren; for should he think proper to try them by their own standard, their situation must be extremely dangerous. Should God even insist on a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity from them, as a term of admission to the joys of heaven, as they have made a term of admission to the privileges of the church on earth, can it be expected he will admit of the belief of it in twenty different ways, completely contradictory to each other? When I hear a person say he believes in the doctrine of the Trinity, I know not in what sense he understands the term; so various are Trinitarian views. If the doctrine then be absolutely essential to salvation, in what sense must a man believe in it, in order to escape the anger of the Judge?

If there be any doctrine, the belief of which is represented as essential to salvation, it is this, that Jesus is the Son of God. John interrogates thus: "who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" He also affirms that "whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God." John the baptist "saw and bare record that he is the Son of God." And the same John further says: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath

of God abideth on him." And the Son testified of himself, saying, "I am the Son of God." And he also declared himself to be "the only begotten Son of God." When I seriously attend to such passages, I cannot but shudder in view of the contempt which certain persons have shown to the idea that Christ is properly God's own Son.

But those who are now disposed to treat the doctrine with indignation and contempt, would do well to remember that they are not the first who have treated it in this manner. This is the very doctrine for which the Jews accused the Savior of men with blasphemy, and adjudged him worthy of death. In accusing him to Pilate, they said, "we have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself *the Son of God.*" Will any one say that the Jews understood Christ as affirming that he was the self-existent God? Let it be remembered that the high priest adjured him by the *living God*, to tell whether he was the Christ, the *Son of God*, or the *Son of the blessed*—and his answer was "*I am.*"

With respect to those who have felt disposed to traduce and destroy my character, because I have taught that Jesus is properly the Son of God, I wish them to remember that one infinitely more worthy than I am, has been condemned as deserving death for affirming the same doctrine. The honors of this world I do not covet, and its censures I fear but little. TRUTH is what I aim to vindicate. As an advocate for truth, I voluntarily expose myself to the malignity of my enemies, believing that for the worst they can say or do respecting me, they may find an example in the Jewish sanhedrim.

And I would humbly entreat the prayers of Christians to God for me, that I may be enabled in meekness and humility to imitate the example of the first person who suffered for teaching that JESUS CHRIST IS THE SON OF GOD.

APPENDIX.

TWO LETTERS TO ELDER ELIAS LEE.

LETTER I.

SIR :—Your pamphlet which you had the goodness to send me, containing remarks on a work entitled “*The True Messiah in Scripture Light,*” has been duly received. I have endeavored to give it a careful reading, and shall now bring your principal arguments to the unerring standard of truth, for examination. My manner of expression is plain, therefore let not plain words offend you, neither think me your enemy because I tell you the truth.

In your pamphlet, page 7, you join issue with me, that “*Christ is the proper Son of God,*” and say, you are “willing to risk the whole controversy on this one turning point.” You then very correctly state on the same page, “by a *proper son*, is always understood a *natural*, or *real son*, in distinction from an adopted son, or a son in a figurative sense.” By this I understand you to mean that a *proper son* is one *begotten* and *brought forth* according to the rules of generation. In this “thou hast well said,” and had you continued to advance forward by this rule, you would have for ever left behind you, the mysterious doctrine for which you contend in other parts of your book; and entered a field of gospel consistency, brightening before you as you advanced. But instead of this, after establishing the position that Christ is the *proper Son of God*, in the fullest sense of the term you make a strange retrograde. Your immediate argument is, that he is *self-existent* and *eternal*—that he was not really begotten;

in a word that he is none other than the very God that he is declared to be the Son of! ! and your book is filled up with arguments to this amount. I cannot, sir, but express my utter astonishment, that you should acknowledge one of the most important truths in the plainest definite manner, and then proceed immediately to overthrow it, in as plain unequivocal terms. In what sense can any being be a *proper* or *real son*, and yet his father not have existed prior to him. In what sense can any being be a *proper*, or *real son*, and yet be the very identical being that he is the son of? If Jesus Christ be the very and eternal God, as you labor to prove, he is *son* to no being whatever; neither can he constitute any part of a son, to either God or man. How then, sir, can you reconcile your first acknowledgement, that Jesus Christ is the *proper* or *real Son of God*, with what you afterwards endeavored to maintain viz: that he is in reality the very God himself? The two sentiments are as foreign from each other as light is from darkness, and cannot be reconciled. As well might you attempt to weld iron and wood together.

By the above, sir, it will be plainly discovered, that you have wholly departed from the "turning point," on which you agreed to risk the whole controversy. This, however, is not all. In attempting to maintain that the Son of God is self-existent, while the scriptures declare he was *begotten*, you are driven to admit, in indirect terms, what at first you condemned, viz: that he is only a son in a *figurative sense*. Your words are as follows, page 13. — "Every class of Unitarians, so far as my knowledge extends, come out against the eternity of it [Christ's nature, or being] by *overstraining* the *figurative* application of the word *begotten*." Now, sir, as the term *begotten* is an important term, when relating to a son, we will venture to rest its meaning, with the kind of son we have occasion to speak of. When we speak of a *figurative son*, we will

say he was only *figuratively begotten*; but when we speak of a *proper* or *real son*, we will say he was *properly* or *really begotten*. You will now, sir, please to remember that the "turning point" of the controversy is, that Jesus Christ is the *proper*, or *real Son of God*. Can he be the *proper*, or *real Son of God*, and yet be only *figuratively begotten*? If he was *properly*, or *really begotten*, in what sense can he be self-existent? Somehow, sir, here appears to be an absurdity in your system, too obvious to escape your notice.

You attempt to bewilder your readers with the idea, that the word *begotten*, when applied to the Son of God in the scriptures, relates particularly to his resurrection. That this may be the case in Rev. i. 5, I shall not attempt to dispute; but is it the case in every instance in scripture? Is it so with regard to Heb. i. 6? "When he [God] bringeth in the *first-begotten* into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him." Does not this text have particular allusion to the time when the Son of God was born in Bethlehem? If you still contend that he was only *figuratively begotten*, you may as well enlarge your figure a little, and say he was only *figuratively brought into the world*.

But that the fact may be more clearly understood, that you hold Christ to be a son only in a figurative sense, I will follow you a little further on this point. In page 27, and onward, you say considerable of a certain system of *economy*, which the Bible says nothing about. Your system of *economy*, if I am enabled to understand you, is this: That the eternal God, though but one being, arranged a plan for the salvation of men, as though he were three distinct persons. That he acts the several parts of these persons (which are called *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost*,) literally himself—That in acting the part of *Father*, he assumes a superiority over the other two. In acting the part of *Son*, he assumes a quite inferior and subordinate sta-

tion, so as to say "my Father is greater than I," and in acting the part of Holy Ghost, he assumes a subordinate station to the other two. Hence you would have us understand that every thing said in scripture, which expresses subordination in the Son of God, such as his praying to God, his having all power given to him, his delivering up the kingdom to God, and his mediating between God and men; must be interpreted strictly according to the above described system of economy. So then, indeed, this is quite a discovery! But how came you to find out that God has formed such a system of economy? You have not told us, and surely the Bible says not a word about it. Will you be so good, sir, as to inform us how you obtained your information of such a system, and perhaps others may be encouraged to go in search of more light.

Now, what is all this but a mere visionary scheme, without the least pretension to reality? I will venture further, sir; what is it but to represent the plan of salvation when acted out, to be only a mere farce? The best we could say of such a system, would be to call it figurative. The Father would be only figuratively so; the Son, such only in a figurative sense—the same of the Holy Ghost; and neither of them distinct, or personal in reality.

Is this the way and manner you would have people understand Christ to be the proper, or real Son of God? and is this the light in which you would represent "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ?" Give me leave to tell you, sir, that when you acknowledged Jesus Christ to be the proper, or real Son of God, you forever closed the door against playing such a farce as this on the public mind.

I am convinced, sir, that the principal arguments which you advance against my views of Christ's proper sonship, are founded in the misconception you have formed of my real ideas. By wresting from

their intended meaning, certain expressions found in the work you controvert,* some of your arguments as they stand at present, are pretty well calculated to blind the superficial reader, as well as to please such as desire only to glance at one side of the question. Let us however, sir, advance with candor, and with prayerful hearts to a closer view of the subject. In the work entitled "The True Messiah in Scripture Light," I asserted Christ to be the proper Son of God, and as such, a distinct being from his Father—that he proceeded from God and from the Virgin, and consequently partook of both, as a real son of both—that the Word was made flesh, &c. I stated these facts as warranted from scripture, that they were not figurative, nor visionary, but real—and so I still insist. You several times quote my words, that Christ partook of his Father, as well as of his Mother. You then state the nature of God to be eternal, self-existent and immutable; from which premise you seem to contend, that if God has a proper Son, born of the Virgin Mary, this Son must be equally eternal, self-existent and immutable, as himself. I confess I do not see any force to such an argument; and I now appeal to you as an honest man before God, do you see any yourself? As I acknowledge the word to proceed from God, (even before the world was,) you contend that if it really was made flesh, (as John declares it was, John i. 14,) the nature of God must have been changed. This you state, page 10, to be an "absurdity which appears in this affair, that God has reduced and changed his own nature." Now, sir, what can be your object in this kind of reasoning, but merely to bewilder your readers? Is it not a fact

* In several instances the quotations which Mr. Lee makes from my writing are mutilated and unfairly represented. His readers will therefore be on their guard.

abundantly declared in scripture, that Christ is the Son of God, and the son of Mary? Then what will avail a thousand arguments to prove he is not so? Could not the very God have a proper son, and yet remain God distinct from his Son, as fully as a man could have a son, and yet remain a whole man distinct from the son he had begotten? Could not the Son of God partake of his Father, and yet God remain unchanged as much as any son could partake of his Father, without producing an absolute change in his parent. This is just what I have contended for. Admit this sir, and then acknowledge Christ to be the Son of God, and the son of Mary, and what have you accomplished by all your routine of argument?

Your remark in page 14, is very unbecoming your age and station. "They think the Almighty was once like a young man, who coming to maturity, married a wife, and had a son, and is going on with his affairs, like the world of mankind." This sir, is a low irreligious cant, thrown out for the want of argument, and deserves only to be treated as such. It would have come with much better grace from a professed infidel, than from one who professes to be a minister of Christ. Your remark in page 26, is calculated to excite a smile, even on the rugged face of controversy. Of my views you state, "all his reasoning is as if one should say to him, you are neither the son of your father, nor the son of your mother; you are only the half-son of each, and therefore have no right to call yourself the son of either." Permit me to ask you Mr. Lee, do you believe I am the real son of my father, and also of my mother? And do you think I am only one proper son of them both, or do you really think I am two whole and complete sons, somehow mysteriously united in one person? Indeed sir, I think such a specimen of your reasoning faculty, is truly laughable.

However, sir, this remark affords a tolerable index

of Christ's incarnation according to Trinitarian views. This doctrine I find asserted in different parts of your book, although your arguments on the subject afford nothing peculiarly new. The Trinitarian doctrine of incarnation, is briefly this : That Christ possesses two whole and complete natures--human and divine. That in his human nature, he was truly and properly a man possessing a human body and reasonable soul;" and that in his divine nature, he is the very and eternal God. In the work which you controvert, I exhibited my views in plain terms, in relation to the two-nature scheme, and rejected it for reasons which I still think conclusive. 1. The doctrine is no where taught in the scriptures. In no passage of scripture are we told that Jesus Christ is properly a man, and at the same time, the very and eternal God. 2. This would destroy the idea of Christ's being the proper or real Son of God; as it would be the height of absurdity, to say a proper son, is the very being that he is said to be the son of. 3. The doctrine teaches that Christ is two whole and distinct persons. In his human nature this doctrine teaches that he is really a man, possessing a human body, and a reasonable soul; which must be as much as one person. In his divine nature, he is declared to be the very and eternal God, which must at least be as much as one person more. Now, sir, putting the two together, what have you but a Christ composed of two whole and distinct persons? It is true, you deny this charge in your book, but what avails the denial of a fact as plain as the sun at noon-day? Remove these difficulties out of the way sir, if you can, but remember something more is needed than your mere denials or affirmations to do it.

This doctrine sir, is in truth, calculated to weaken our sympathies for the sufferings of Christ. His human nature was all that could suffer, as Trinitarians allow. Compare this with that of his divine nature, or what Trinitarians call most properly himself, and it

will measure no more than a single hair of the head to the whole body or than a drop to the ocean. At the very time of the sufferings of his humanity on the cross, he was the happiest being in the Universe; yea, as happy as the infinite God could be; so that his pains compared with his felicity, were nothing. When you tell us the Son of God suffered and died, what do we find in your system? All it teaches is that a mere man suffered. Is this all we are to understand by God's so loving the world, as to give his Son to die for us? Is this the wonderful stoop of heaven for the salvation of man? Alas sir, was I made to believe this was all, I should feel compelled to write upon it ICHABOD, "the glory is departed!"

I have already exceeded my intended limits. In my next, I shall notice your arguments on this part of the subject. In the mean time, believe me,

Yours respectfully, D. MILLARD.

LETTER II.

SIR—Your views relative to Christ's expiating sin in his own person, appear to me rather novel and strange, as well as wholly unsupported by scripture. After remarking in page 25, "that all the sins of a multitude of people which no man can number were laid upon Christ," you then proceeded to state, "that the nature of God within, supported the sacrifice in suffering to that amazing degree, as to enable it to bear in a short period of time, all the evils arising from a display of the penalty of the law in the execution of it, equal to what the display of it would have been, if it had been executed upon all that multitude to all eternity. Thus Christ in his own person, expiated sin." Now sir, if your views on this point be correct, I see not why you have not established the universal salvation of all men. The apostle Paul declares, that "Christ by the grace of God tasted death for every man"—"that he died for all," and "that he gave himself a ransom for all." Do you sir, as fully believe this, as the apostle expresses it? If so, sir, your doctrine must be, that Christ in his own person expiated the sins of the whole human family without the least reserve.

However, as you have been careful not to acknowledge that Christ died for all men, you most probably adopt the high Calvinistic scheme, that Christ died for only a part of the human family. But sir, this only renders your scheme the more odious, and is in fact a direct contradiction of scripture. There is no fact more positively revealed in the Bible, than that Christ died for all men, without exception. Can you sir, believe, there are millions of your fellow men, for whom Christ did not die; and who are, consequently, wholly destitute of the means of grace? Does God call on such to repent and believe in his Son that they may be saved, when no means of salvation is provided for them? Did God enter into a covenant with his Son, to redeem only a part of the human family, and purpose the remainder to perish without a gleam of hope or mercy? Will the Judge in the great day of accounts, say to such, "I called but ye refused, I stretched out my hand and ye disregarded," when he had purposed they should not hear, that they should not regard or be saved? Can you sir, believe all this of him who has sworn, he has "no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but had rather they would turn and live." Sooner, far sooner, let my name be blotted from among the living on earth, than I should thus impeach the character of Jehovah.

Your representation of God supporting human nature to suffer in a few hours, as much pain as all the damned in hell put together, will suffer to all eternity, is a mere phantom, an illusion, without one shadow of proof, consistency, or even necessity. Were this the case, why the necessity of repentance and faith? Will it not be well to remember that notwithstanding Christ has died for all men, yet he has not repented for one individual, nor believed for one, and that sin must be repented of, before it has forgiveness? I have thought proper to follow you through this part of your book, because I think your arguments in this place, manifest in distinguished colors, the weakness and absurdity of your system. You attach abundant merit to a sacrifice which is only human; by concluding that a mere human sacrifice atoned for all the human beings who will finally be saved? Verily, sir, your statements on this part of the subject, need much of that proof, of which they are wholly destitute.

Your remarks on certain passages of scripture, show the confused state of your mind. In page 26 you state, "Mr. M. contends warmly for the delegated power, or as he chooses to call it, the power given to Jesus Christ, and complains of some people who he says, 'vociferate their invectives against it.' Who

those people are I know not, but understand Trinitarians believe as much in delegated power as does Mr. M. himself. They only object to the substitution of this power, in the place of natural power, with a design to impeach the latter." That Trinitarians have denied that power was delegated to Jesus Christ, I think you cannot be as ignorant as you pretend to be. In my work which you controvert, and in connection with the very passage which you object to, I quoted the words of Mr. Harmon, a Trinitarian, that "it would not answer to say power was delegated to Christ." In bishop M'Kendry's sermon on the doctrine of the Trinity, nearly the same words are expressed, as well as in other Trinitarian writings. Are you sir, so ignorant of Trinitarian arguments, as to render you honest in this case?

I must, however, give you much credit for acknowledging that power was delegated to the Son of God. This is, indeed, advancing in part to the truth as it is in Jesus, and I entreat you not again to retrograde from it. But you say, Trinitarians object to the substitution of this power in the place of his natural power. So then here it is. You contend that Jesus Christ is the very and eternal God—omnipotent; and will you have the goodness to inform me if you can, what power can be delegated to Omnipotence? What delegated power can we substitute in the room of Omnipotence? On page 27, you state, "delegated power is founded in economy, and signifies the transfer of proper and lawful authority, from one to another, for the transaction of some kind of business; and hence always implies two or more parties in the case." This sir, is acknowledging well for a Trinitarian, and it is astonishing to me, that you do not see the force of your arguments turned directly against yourself. You have acknowledged a transfer of power from one party to another, and admit that a delegation of power always implies a transfer from one to another. Now, Christ said, "all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," do you admit that this implies as much as "two parties in the case?" If so, do not two parties imply as much as two individual beings? What could be more repugnant to common sense, than to say, one being is two parties, or that two parties are no more than one being? If all power was given to Christ, as he declares it was, there must have been some one to have given it to him, and consequently a period prior to his having received all power, which could not be said of the self-existent God.

This subject is brought to view in 1 Cor. xv. 24, and onward, where the apostle speaks of Christ delivering up the kingdom

to God, and becoming subject to him. Your attempt to evade the force of this passage; as well as that of several others, is wholly futile and visionary. Your remark is as follows: but at "the end," i. e. the end of the economy, the Son will deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father and be subject to him." p. 29. With regard to your system of economy, which you so frequently name in your book, I have shown in my former letter that it is a mere religious farce, no where named in scripture, and it is truly surprising to me, that you should so frequently avail yourself of this mode of argument, with a seeming confidence in its infallibility. What you term a system of economy is only a small addition to the two nature scheme, and bears a strong resemblance to what in your preface you term, "a nose of wax, which may be turned any way."

You continue, "on this subject Mr. M. again asks, if Christ be the very God, who will he deliver up the kingdom to? Who will put all things under him? Who will he become subject to?" You then add; "We have already given a sufficient answer, to this kind of reasoning, and shall have no further occasion to notice it as such, until it is proved that the nature of God has been changed; for it depends wholly upon that question." Why does it depend upon that question Mr. Lee? and who has taught you that the nature of God has been changed? "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," is an old command, which you may do well to remember. In what part of your book have you given a sufficient answer to that kind of reasoning? You will recollect you are laboring to prove Jesus Christ to be the very and eternal God, for which reason I ask, who will the very and eternal God deliver up the kingdom to? and who will he become subject to? The questions sir, yet stare you in fair view. They demand an answer—they deserve something better than the sneering language you have subjoined to them.

Your comment on Mark xiii. 32, relative to Christ's not knowing when a certain day would be, is probably the best you had to give; but it is to be deeply regretted that your system could afford nothing better on the occasion. Your words are as follows: "the text is strictly economical, and in my view, only means, that it does not belong to Christ or to his office to give out the knowledge of that day, but to the Father," p. 36. Can you sir, as an honest man, dispense with plain scripture testimony after this manner! When Jesus said "of that day and that hour, knoweth no man, no not the angels, neither the Son, but my Father only," did he only mean that it did not belong to him to tell of that

day, although he knew perfectly well when it would be? Verily, sir, if you can manage scripture after this sort, you are prepared to meet any argument whatever, and prove just what you please. I feel myself bound to state that I firmly believe no person of common sense, possessing an honest heart, can be satisfied with your comment on this text; and shall, therefore, leave it to speak for itself. In page 30, you disallow the idea that the human nature of Christ prayed to his divine nature, as some Trinitarians have asserted; and of course you are driven to indirectly admit that the very God prayed to himself! However, in page 31, you say, "he might in some instances prayed as a mere man;" but you immediately conclude that he most generally prayed as the very God. In this respect you say, "still he liveth to make intercession for his saints, & will continue to pray for them, until they are all in heaven." Now does it appear reasonable, that the very God is praying in heaven, and interceding with himself? No person can read your remarks on this point and not understand this to be your sentiment. But what shall I think of your honesty sir, when in page 33, you state as follows: "these conclusions, the self-existent God prays to the self-existent God; Christ prays to himself; God mediates with God, and such like, which Mr. M. has drawn from the Trinitarian scheme, are more properly founded in his own." Why are they more probably founded in my own, Mr Lee, when I have ever declared such a position to be manifestly absurd? Have you not just acknowledged the sentiment that Christ prays and mediates as God? Why then would you shift your absurdities on me? In page 24, speaking of God, and a mediator between God and men, you state, "nothing can be more evident than that the same God, sustains both of these characters; the one separately from, and the other in the mediator." How unreasonable, as well as unscriptural, is this statement! Paul declares, "there is one God, and one mediator between God and men." Now sir, with what shadow of propriety can you affirm that the very God is a mediator between God and men? A mediator can never be one of the parties that he mediates between, but is always a middle person. When you see that it is BETWEEN God and men, that there is a mediator, you will see things as they are.

In page 37, you comment at length on Coll. ii. 9. "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and object to my views that the two expressions of scripture, "fulness of God," and "fulness of the Godhead," mean the same. However, you have brought no proof that I am incorrect, and I still feel a con-

fidence in my present views, finding them in unison with those of several able commentators on this text. The apostle prayed that "the fulness of God," or the spirit, might fill his brethren. Eph. iii. 19. So it dwells in Christ without measure, as it flows through him to all his disciples.

In page 38 you declare beyond a doubt, that Christ is the only true God, but forget to tell us who the Jesus Christ is, whom the only true God sent. Jesus said in praying to his Father, "this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John xvii. 3.

In page 31, you give us a specimen of your reasoning, which I deem very unreasonable, to prove that God is three distinct persons; but you adduce nothing very new, neither do you remove one objection out of the way of your system. You have not quoted a passage of scripture to prove there are three persons in the Godhead. I will now, sir, ask you, if you know that God is as much as three persons, how do you know he is no more than three? If you can prove God is more than one person, what authority have you to limit him to the exact number of three? Since we read "of the seven spirits of God," may it not be as possible that God is seven or ten persons as that he is three? and by the same rule may he not be more than even ten persons? In this way you might very easily enumerate as many distinct persons in God, as the Hindoos have of deities that they worship. Think of these remarks sir as you may, but I must state with boldness, that it shocks my mind to view the indefinite sense in which the doctrine of the Trinity involves the being of that God whom we worship.

It is a fact, God is always spoken of, and addressed, as one person only. All the prayers and songs of praise, contained in the Bible, mention God as only one person. How sir, can you account for this, if he is three distinct persons? The Jews as a people have been, and still are taught to believe in the Old Testament part of the Bible; and why do they not know of the doctrine that God is

three persons? If God is three persons now, he ever was the same; and if it is ~~now~~ necessary to believe and teach that God is three persons, it was equally so in Old Testament times. Why then is it that the Jews have no knowledge of any such doctrine? or were the prophets more deficient in teaching important truths, than men are now a days? The Jews as a people, protest against the doctrine of the Trinity, and to enforce a belief of it on them, in order to christianize them, is only a stumbling block before Israel. In vain do you tell them that the God of Abraham, is three persons. In vain do you teach them, that their expected Messiah is the very God they worship. They cannot, they will not believe it.

You have labored at some length, to prove my views of christian liberty dangerous, and contrary to gospel rule, in which attempt you have clearly manifested the illiberality of your own views, as well as to give a wrong coloring to ours. You intimate that it matters but little with the Christians, what our members believe, provided they only attempt to prove their doctrine from scripture. This is a great mistake; we reject every doctrine calculated to foster sin, or lead to licentiousness. On this principle, we do not fear to "live and let live—to think and let think." We dare not set up our judgment as a standard for the faith of others in every respect. You represent that a diversity of sentiment exists among us, but you must have forgotten that the same may be said of your own people. Among the Baptists are Calvinists, Arminians, Trinitarians and Unitarians—some who believe Christ died for all men, and some who think he died for the elect only; and you appear from your book, to be one of the latter number. That these different sentiments do exist among your denomination, I know, and am prepared to further substantiate it, if required. Why then condemn others for the very things which are allowed among your own people? We do insist on the rights of conscience. We dare to fellowship all whom God fellowships—receive and commune with all whom God receives and communes with. This however, you pronounce "an indifference to error." You state in page 4,

“there are certainly capital errors lying between Unitarians and Trinitarians, and to determine which are the farthest from truth, we need only to determine which are the most indifferent to error.” This language connected with the whole tenor of your book, speaks loudly in favor of coercive measures, with a design to monopolize the faith of others. Because the Christians do not denounce anathemas, on all who differ with them, as Trinitarians are apt to do, you pronounce their clemency and liberality a proof that they are under “capital errors,” and by capital errors, you would probably be understood to mean damnable errors. Such is your mantle of charity!

John Calvin, the founder of the heart-chilling doctrine which you teach, you will probably say was not indifferent to error, for he pronounced such to be dogs as rejected his relentless doctrine of fate. He also caused Michael Servetus to be roasted on a fire made of green fuel, for rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity. Papal Rome has not been indifferent to error, but has put to death more than fifty millions for heresy, and an inveteracy to supposed error, has probably caused the heathen world to put to death a still greater number. The very principle of your denunciations has in other instances produced bloodshed and death; and the principal difference is that you are limited, while some others have not been. Persecution, whether by declamation and reproach, or by fire and faggot, originates from the same principle, and the only difference is in the extent of it. Now the ground on which you accuse the Christians with an indifference to error is because they refuse to resort to either, but fellowship all as our brethren whom we have evidence God owns as his children. This sir, is the only consistent ground for union among the Lord's people.

I must now for the present take my leave of you, as the length of this letter already renders it necessary for me to draw it to a close. In the brief examination which I have passed of your book, I have discharged a duty which I felt incumbent on me. Much more might be said, but I will assure you sir, that when you remove the objections I

have already brought against your doctrine, I will endeavor to present you with another list. I shall forbear to make any remarks on that part of your pamphlet which relates to Mr H. Grew's publication, as he is of age, and has answered you for himself in a candid and conclusive manner. I take my leave of you sir, with an earnest desire that you may be convinced of your errors, and renounce them. Strive sir, in all you say and do, to possess the spirit of Christ, that you may be truly his. And O, may the light of truth shine uninterruptedly into your heart and mind. May the spirit of the ever living God lead us out of all error, and guide us safe to heaven and immortality, that with all the redeemed of the Lord, we may join the everlasting song of praise to him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb that was slain.—Adieu.

DAVID MILLARD.

West Bloomfield, N. Y. Aug. 18, 1825.

PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE EXPLAINED IN THE FOREGOING WORK.

Passages.	Page.	Passages.	Page.
Gen. i. 26	10	John xxi. 17	186
Job xxxiii. 4	75	Acts v. 3	77
Prov. viii. 17—30	98	“ xx. 28	187
Isa. ix. 6	140	Rom. viii. 26	74
“ xlii. 8	164	“ “ 27	75
“ xliii. 11	147	“ ix. 5	175
Jer. xxiii. 6	144	Phil. ii. 5, 6	176
Matt. iv. 10	162	Coll. i. 16	156
“ xviii. 20	153	“ ii. 9	178
“ xxviii. 19	80	1 Tim. iii. 16	179
Mark ii. 10	152	1 Pet. ii. 7, 8	182
John i. 1	104	2 Pet. i. 21	79
“ i. 3	156	1 John v. 7	13
“ v. 23	163	“ “ 20	183
“ xiv. 9, 10	172	Jude 25	149
“ xx. 28	185	Rev. xxii. 13	145

ERRATA.—Page 64, fourth line from top, dele “ BE.”

Page 167, tenth line from top, for “ As much as Mr.” read “ As much as IF Mr.”



