

when he saw his glory, and spake of him," as connected with those, "Lord, who hath believed our report, and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?" For with what propriety could it be said, that Isaiah saw *the glory* of the Lord, in a chapter where he beheld and speaks of hardly anything but the poverty and disgrace, the sorrows and sufferings, of the Lord Messiah; in a chapter which contains very little besides one continued description of his humiliation? The humiliation of Christ is there described by,—The meanness of his extraction: "He shall grow up as a root out of a dry ground." The disgrace which attends him: "We hid as it were our faces from him." The afflictions he endures: "He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows." His meekness and patience: "He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth." His death: "When he shall make his soul an offering for sin." And the circumstances attending his burial: "He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death." It is indeed said, "The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand; He shall prolong his days; He shall divide the spoil with the strong;" but these promises lie so concealed among the many affecting images of his humiliation and complicated sufferings, that it is to the last degree unreasonable to call this a vision of *his glory*. See Isa. liii.

Had the evangelist thus expressed himself, "These things said Esaias, when he spake of him," it might have been supposed, with some little appearance of probability, that the phrase, *these things*, referred to the first passage cited by him, "Lord who hath believed our report?" Yet even then it would have been much more natural to connect it with the im-

mediately preceding citation. But he expresses himself otherwise; "These things said Esaias, WHEN HE SAW HIS GLORY, and spake of him." Now, the prophet beheld his glory in the *sixth* chapter, not in the *fifty-third*; for in the latter he saw very little besides his humiliation.

Equally unreasonable is it to suppose, "That Isaiah, in beholding the glory of God, saw the glory of Jesus Christ, because the latter is contained in the former."—If we may have recourse to such evasions, we may deny or maintain anything just as we please. Had that been the meaning, the inspired writer might have applied the oracle to himself and his brethren, as well as to Jesus Christ; because the glory of their character and office, as the children of God and the apostles of the Lamb, was contained in the glory of Jehovah and derived from it. According to this interpretation he might have expressed himself thus; "These things said Esaias, when he saw *our* glory, and spake of *us*."—Say not, "This would have been a profanation." For if that infinite disparity which is between the glory of Christ and the glory of Jehovah, do not prevent what was spoken only concerning the glory of the *latter*, from being applied to that of the *former*, then the difference between the glory of Christ and the glory of the apostles being finite, cannot hinder an oracle which describes the glory of Christ, from being with much greater propriety applied to them.

Again: The glory of Christ, if he be a mere creature, cannot be the same with God's; nor can the peculiar glory of God, such as Isaiah describes, be the same with Jesus Christ's. You might, therefore, with much more truth and propriety, say, He that sees the king's glory, beholds the glory of his meanest subject, than

to affirm with our adversaries, That Isaiah by seeing God's glory, saw the glory of Jesus Christ. Because in the *former* case the extent of the disparity is easily conceived, but in the *latter* it is inconceivable and unbounded.

Another passage full to my purpose is the following: "When he bringeth in the First-begotten into the world, he saith, **AND LET ALL THE ANGELS OF GOD WORSHIP HIM,**" Heb. i. 6. It is agreed on both sides that the sacred writer applies to Jesus Christ those words of the psalmist, "Worship him, all ye gods," Psa. xcvi. 7; or "all ye *angels,*" as the inspired author teaches us to understand the original word in this place.

That the psalmist speaks of the true God, when he says, "Worship him, all ye gods," or, "angels," appears by only reading the psalm. Thus it begins, "The **LORD** reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof," ver. 1. But why should the earth and the isles exult in the glory of this dominion, if their Creator be not the sovereign intended? Besides, the great name, **JEHOVAH,** so often applied to Him whose kingdom and sovereign dominion the sacred penman describes, and accompanied with so many characters of the glory of the Most High, could not be given to any other without manifest impiety. "Clouds and darkness are round about him: righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne. A fire goeth before him, and burneth up his enemies round about. His lightnings enlightened the world: the earth saw, and trembled," ver. 2—4. These, it must be allowed, are the characteristics of His presence who created the heavens and the earth. These are descriptions of His awful glories, who, whenever

he pleases, can shake the pillars of nature, can employ thunder and fire, and all the dreadful artillery of heaven to destroy rebellious worms, and to render his Divine majesty and sovereign dominion more conspicuous. "The hills melted like wax at the presence of the Lord, at the presence of the Lord of the whole earth," ver. 5. Nothing is more evident than that "the Lord of the whole earth," is a title peculiar to the Eternal Sovereign. "Behold, the ark of the covenant of *the Lord of all the earth*, passeth over before you into Jordan," says the magnanimous Joshua, Josh. iii. 11. "These are the four spirits of the heavens, which go forth from standing before *the Lord of all the earth*. And I will consecrate their gain unto JEHOVAH, and their substance unto *the Lord of the whole earth*," say the prophetic seers, Zech. vi. 5; Micah iv. 13. The manner also in which the title is given him in the text before us, is no less remarkable than the title itself. For the psalmist, designing to raise our attention, to excite our admiration, and to fill us with reverence of that Sublime Being of whom he speaks, redoubles his expressions, and with a singular emphasis says, "The hills melted like wax AT THE PRESENCE OF THE LORD, AT THE PRESENCE OF THE LORD OF THE WHOLE EARTH," And then he adds, "The heavens declare his righteousness, and all the people see his glory," ver. 6. But whose *righteousness* is revealed by the heavens, whose *glory* is beheld by the people, except those of their great Creator and Preserver? "Confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols," ver. 7. As it is the true God who is opposed to idols, and as it is the true God who is glorified by the confusion of idolaters, so none but He can be intended in this

place. "Thou, Lord, art high above all the earth; thou art exalted far above all gods," ver. 9. If these words do not express the idea of the true God, language is not capable of doing it; for nothing is more evident than that He only is to be supremely exalted.

If, then, each of these characters be adapted to show that the true, the great, the infinite GOD, is intended in this psalm, certainly such a collection of them must leave no room for doubt. Nay, such is the evidence in this respect, that if we refuse to acknowledge the Great Supreme in this devout and very sublime ode, we shall not be able with certainty to find his character, nor to behold his glory, in any oracle, or in any part of the Old Testament. For that immensely glorious Being whose perfections are here celebrated, is described by the same characters which are given to the true God throughout the ancient Scriptures, and especially by his great and terrible name, JEHOVAH; a name which he appropriated to himself on a very important occasion, which he signalized by a thousand miracles, which is here connected with the idea of universal dominion, and with the displays of his glory in heaven and earth. So that if it were any other than the true God, who is described by characters so essential and peculiar to Him, no expressions could be used about an affair of the most solemn importance, more ambiguous, or more deceitful.

Is it not then surprising, that Socinus should apply all these characters to Jesus Christ, to one whom he considers as a mere man? "Since it is evident," says he, "from the confession of all the world, that in this psalm there is a prophecy concerning the kingdom of Jesus Christ, why might not Christ (a man to whom all power in heaven and earth was

given, and being considered as entering on the possession of his kingdom, prophetically foretold and described) be with propriety called, *The Lord of the whole earth?*—Why? because he who bears that Divine title is described by so many other characters which are peculiar to the true God. Because He who is the subject of this psalm, is also the subject of that which immediately precedes, whose glory is thus described; “All the gods of the nations are idols: but the LORD made the heavens. Honour and majesty are before him: strength and beauty are in his sanctuary. Give unto the LORD, O ye kindreds of the people, give unto the LORD glory and strength. Give unto the LORD the glory due unto his name: bring an offering, and come into his courts. O worship the LORD in the beauty of holiness: fear before him, all the earth. Say among the heathen, that the Lord reigneth. Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein; then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the LORD: for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth,” Psa. xcvi. 5—13. That these two psalms are parallel is very evident. For they both speak of God’s glory, of his coming, and of his kingdom. They both exalt the true God above the divinities of the heathen. They both require mankind to worship the Lord, the eternal JEHOVAH, as having supreme dominion over all creatures. And they both invite inanimate creatures to rejoice at the presence, and in the government of God.

It is, then, of the true God these words were spoken, “Worship Him, all ye gods,” or, “Let all the angels of God worship Him.” But it was

concerning JESUS CHRIST that the high command was given. Of this an infallible author assures us. Of this, therefore, we ought by no means to doubt; nor do our opponents themselves deny it. Let them draw the inference, then, and acknowledge with us, that Jesus Christ is the true God, and is described in the ancient oracles as the Supreme Being. For, hence we learn, that those who are called gods, or, to adopt their own language, those who are gods *by office*, are here expressly commanded to worship Jesus Christ as God *by nature*.

Socinus in vain endeavours to solve the difficulty with which he is here pressed, by saying, "They who worship Christ, worship the Supreme God; because Jesus represents him in a singular manner, and in a very eminent sense."—For the question is not, Whether in adoring Jesus Christ we adore the true God; but, Whether these words, "Let all the angels of God worship him," were not spoken of Jesus Christ.

Should any one maintain, that he who loves his brother loves God, because he loves him only as bearing the image of his Maker, he would say nothing but what is warrantable. But were he to infer from thence, that when the Divine Lawgiver says, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," he speaks of our neighbour, and not of God only, his conclusion would be very extravagant. So were we to grant, that he who worships Christ, worships, in some measure, the true God, yet we should not be obliged to allow, that he who requires us to adore God, requires us by the same command to adore Jesus Christ, there being no consequence from the one to the other. Besides, if in adoring Christ we worship the true God, then the passage under consideration might have been applied to all the kings of

the earth. For they, in some respects, bear the image of God, and we honour them as God's vicegerents here below. But are we from hence authorized to say, That he who honours kings, honours God himself? If we be, we may apply to them the oracle in Psa. xcvi., as it is applied to Jesus Christ. For if it belong to Christ, though it be meant only of the Supreme Being, because in worshipping the former we adore the latter, nothing hinders us from saying that it belongs also to kings, because in honouring them we honour the *Eternal Sovereign whose image they bear.*

But the question is not, What subtlety can invent in order to elude the force of this argument, but, What is the natural import of the words as applied in the epistle to the Hebrews? and, Whether any can be excused from taking them in the sense adopted by us? seeing, on the one hand, they were spoken of the true God, and, on the other, that the infallible Spirit applies them to Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER III.

THE APOSTLES DID NOT APPLY THE ANCIENT ORACLES TO JESUS CHRIST BY MERE ALLUSION OR ACCOMMODATION.

CLEARLY to discern the importance of the argument which is drawn from that application of the ancient oracles which the apostles have made to Jesus Christ, we need only to inquire, Whether the Holy Ghost, when speaking by the prophets in the passages just considered, designed to characterize Jesus Christ. For, if that was his design, he certainly intended that we should consider him as **THE LORD; OUR GOD;**

THE CREATOR OF HEAVEN AND EARTH; JEHOVAH; JEHOVAH OF HOSTS; and THE MOST HIGH. But if he did not intend to represent the Redeemer by these characters; if they were designed for the true God, in distinction from Jesus Christ, then we must look upon their application to Jesus by the apostles, only as an *accommodation* of the ancient Scriptures to present events, founded on some sort of resemblance between the one and the other. But though such accommodation be not without example in Divine and human language, it has no place here, as may appear from the following considerations.

Some of these passages incontestably belong to Jesus Christ, by the intention of that Spirit who inspired the prophets, as has been already proved. These, therefore, demonstrate that Jesus is invested with the peculiar characters of God's glory, by the intention of the Holy Ghost. Nor will the design of the apostles, in citing and applying the ancient oracles to Jesus Christ, permit us to consider that application as merely by way of allusion or accommodation. For their design is, either to prove his Divine mission; or, to condemn the unbelief of the Jews, and to remove the scandal of it, by showing that it was foretold; or, to declare his infinite excellence and superiority over all creatures; or, to persuade mankind to render him those honours which are his eternal right, by showing that the Holy Spirit requires they should be addressed to him.

The apostles adduce these oracles to prove the *Divine mission* of Jesus Christ. On this account Peter, in his discourse to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, at the feast of Pentecost, cites a prophecy from Joel; "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh,"

Acts ii. 17. This prediction he afterwards applies to Jesus Christ in the following words, " This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are 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," ver. 32, 33. Hence I infer, that the apostles, designing to prove the Divine mission of their Master from the ancient prophecies, must have lost their reason if they did not see, that they defeated their own intention by applying to Christ such oracles as express the peculiar glory of the Deity, if they had not considered him as a truly Divine Person; because they could not be ignorant, that the great stumbling-block of the Jews was, that " Jesus had made himself equal with God." Consequently, a small degree of prudence would have been sufficient to show the apostles, that every application of ancient prophecy to Jesus Christ, which was in the least adapted to convey an idea of that kind, would be so far from convincing the Jews that he was the Messiah, that it would strengthen their prejudices and harden their hearts against him; and be considered by them as an additional evidence, that he was an usurper of the glory of God, and suffered death on the cross as the just reward of his blasphemy. Can it be supposed, then, that the apostles, who longed for the salvation of their brethren, would lay an invincible bar before them, by making arbitrary allusions and forced accommodations?

Another end intended by the apostles, in applying the prophecies to Jesus Christ, was, to *condemn the unbelief* of the Jews, and to *remove the scandal* of it, by showing, that their infidelity and hardness of heart were foretold by the prophets. For this purpose

the evangelist thus introduces the following passage from Isaiah, "Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their hearts, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them. These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him," John xii. 39—41. The reader will remember, that the prophet saw the glory of the true God, as proved already. Now, a design to show, that the unbelief of those who rejected the Messiah had been foretold, required the apostles to produce such oracles as *really* and *properly* respected the time and person of their Messiah; such as were originally intended to be applied to Him, and had been so applied by common tradition. So far were they from being obliged to make allusive applications that were unnatural, or accommodations that were impious, of the peculiar characters of Jehovah; that so to have done, would have justified the conduct of the Jews, and rendered their unbelief lawful.

A further design of the apostles, in making such applications to their Divine Master, was, to declare his *infinite excellence*; to assert his *superiority* and *dominion* over all creatures, without exception. This appears from the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews. But arbitrary allusions and accommodations are by no means suitable to this design. For with what propriety, truth, or honesty, could the author of the epistle just mentioned, attempt to prove, that the Old Testament speaks greater and nobler things of Jesus Christ, than it does of angels; by passages in which the Spirit of inspiration had the *former* no more in his eye, than he had the *latter*? If it were a bare accommodation, we need only a

turn of thought a little different from his, applying to an angel what he applies to Christ; and we shall, with equal reason, draw conclusions directly opposite.

Once more: The apostles designed, by these applications, to persuade mankind to *render those honours* to their Lord, which are his eternal right, by showing that the Holy Ghost requires they should be addressed to him. In pursuance of this intention, they cite such passages as command adoration to be given to him, and such as declare the purpose of God that it shall be paid. Of which number are the two following; "Let all the angels of God worship him," Heb. i. 6. "At the name of Jesus every knee should bow," Phil. ii. 10. But, as mere allusions and accommodations have their foundation in those resemblances which our imagination finds between ancient prophecies and present objects, it is absurd to suppose, that the apostles ground the worship of Christ upon them. Were this the case, they would act just like a man who should endeavour to prove, that a private soldier deserves the titles of majesty, and ought to be honoured as a prince and a conqueror, because he had met with some actions, or expressions, in the history of Alexander the Great, which might, by way of allusion or accommodation, be applied to him.

Besides, such accommodations would be impious and blasphemous, if Jesus Christ were not of the same essence with his Father. For if, out of regard to Christ, you would not dare to accommodate to any man living these words, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," John i. 29, a reverence for the Supreme Being ought still more forcibly to restrain us from applying to Jesus, a mere creature, the peculiar characters of the great Creator.

Because the disproportion, in the *latter* case, is infinitely greater than that in the *former*; and because the character contained in the words of the Baptist is not so peculiar to Jesus as those titles are to the Great Supreme, which are found in the ancient prophets. For, according to our opponents, Christ is in such a manner **THE LAMB OF GOD**, that another *might* have been so as well as he, if the Eternal Sovereign had so ordained: but the Supreme Being is in such a manner **JEHOVAH, THE MIGHTY GOD, THE KING OF GLORY, THE CREATOR OF HEAVEN AND EARTH, and THE LORD OF HOSTS**, that none but *He can possibly have the glory*. If, then, we could not, without blasphemy, apply to any other man, whether by way of allusion or of accommodation, this *one* character, **THE LAMB OF GOD**, which, though peculiar to Christ, has no relation to his essence; how much more impious would it be to apply to Jesus *so many* grand titles of the Most High, which are not only peculiar to him, but expressive of his essence! In the *former* case, the honour of a creature, highly beloved of God, is prejudiced; in the *latter*, the glory of God himself is injured. In *that* the only danger is, lest scandal be given by a profane allusion; in *this* there would be both scandal and seduction; such seduction as would terminate in idolatry and ruin, by confounding the creature with the Creator.

Our opposers, then, may put their imagination upon the stretch, and rack their wits; they may labour to render some books of the holy Scripture suspected, and speculate on the manner how the apostles were inspired, as long and as much as they please; but it will all be to no purpose, while it remains a fact, that the apostles have applied to Christ, whether by

way of allusion, or of accommodation, or otherwise, those oracles of the prophets which characterize the true God. For if Jesus Christ be not a partaker of the Divine essence; if he be a mere creature, to whom such characters cannot possibly belong; we must consider the apostles as betraying us into idolatry, by impious witticisms, and blasphemous applications of the prophetic writings. It necessarily follows, therefore, if the hypothesis of our adversaries be true, that the prophets did not foresee things as they were to come to pass; and that the apostles either did not understand the prophets, or they designed to betray us into error; consequently, that there is no harmony between the Old Testament and the New.

SECTION V.

IF JESUS CHRIST BE NOT THE TRUE GOD, NEITHER THE ANCIENT JEWISH, NOR THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, IS ATTENDED WITH SUFFICIENT CRITERIA TO DISTINGUISH IT FROM IMPOSTURE.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROPOSITION PROVED, IN RESPECT OF THE JEWISH RELIGION.

IN order to prove the proposition, it will be proper to consider, How God was pleased to manifest himself under the Old, and also under the New Testament. At the commencement of the Mosaic economy, Jehovah manifested himself to the son of Amram, upon mount Horeb, in a burning bush; but it is very observable, that he who appeared to Moses is called, *The Angel of the Lord*. "And the ANGEL OF THE LORD," says the sacred historian, "appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush. And Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great sight. And when JEHOVAH saw that he turned aside to see, GOD called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I. And he said, I am THE GOD of thy father, THE GOD of Abraham, THE GOD of Isaac, and THE GOD of Jacob," Exod. iii. 2--4, 6. But I forbear to transcribe the whole account of this wonderful vision; the reader may peruse it at his leisure.

It may, however, be remarked, that when Moses discovered a reluctance to obey the Lord, by going to Pharaoh, because he was slow of speech; he was rebuked by him in the following manner; "Who hath made man's mouth; or who maketh the dumb, or deaf, or the seeing, or the blind? have not I THE LORD?" Exod. iv. 11. And, Moses inquiring what he should say to the children of Israel, when they should ask who it was that sent him; God gave himself a new name; for he said, "I AM THAT I AM. Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you," Exod. iii. 14. At the same time, to obviate any suspicion which might arise in their minds, that Moses spake of an unknown God, the Divine Speaker adds, "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, THE LORD GOD of your fathers, THE GOD of Abraham, THE GOD of Isaac, and THE GOD of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: THIS IS MY NAME FOR EVER, AND THIS IS MY MEMORIAL UNTO ALL GENERATIONS," ver. 15. And afterwards, with great solemnity, adds, "I will stretch out my hand, and smite Egypt with all my wonders which I will do in the midst thereof: and after that he will let you go. And I will give this people favour in the sight of the Egyptians: and it shall come to pass, that, when ye go, ye shall not go empty," ver. 20, 21. And again; "When thou goest to return into Egypt, see that thou do all those wonders before Pharaoh, which I have put in thine hand: but I will harden his heart, that he shall not let the people go," ch. iv. 21. He, therefore, who spake to Moses in the bush, must be the same divinely glorious Person, who spake to the people of Israel from the top of mount Sinai, in the following language; "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of

the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," ch. xx. 2. Consequently, the very same who gave the law to Israel, with such solemnity, majesty, and glory.

He, then, who manifested himself to Moses, is, according to our hypothesis, The Angel of the Lord; the Messenger of the covenant; the Eternal Wisdom; the Son of God; JEHOVAH; GOD BLESSED FOR EVER; but so soon as you quit this hypothesis, you run into the most glaring and impious absurdities. That He who revealed himself to Moses, was the *Angel of the Lord*, we ought not to question, we cannot doubt; because it is expressly declared in the sacred text. Nor can any figure be here supposed. For, admitting that an angel of God might, by a figure, be called GOD; yet we are certain that God the Father cannot, by any figure, be called the *angel of the Lord*.

Here, consequently, according to our opponents, we find a creature investing himself with the names and the attributes, the works and the glory, of the infinite Creator; so appropriating them to himself, that it is impossible to distinguish him from the true God. For he who appeared to Moses, repeatedly calls himself GOD, and JEHOVAH. He, once and again, denominates himself, THE GOD of Abraham, THE GOD of Isaac, and THE GOD of Jacob; and, in so doing, assumes the several names which the Hebrews commonly gave to their God; whether to distinguish him from all his creatures, or to contrast him with the gods of the heathen, or to express his infinite perfections. Besides, this Angel appropriated these adorable names to himself on such an occasion, as rendered it of the first importance to Moses and the chosen tribes that he should not assume them. For

he took them at a time when he could not possibly do it, without *imposing* on him to whom he spoke; so imposing on him, as to betray him, and the Israelites in general, into idolatry: and this also when Moses was careful not to be deceived; when he drew near to see who it was that appeared to him; and at a time when it was of the utmost consequence for him to know, by whose authority he was to speak to the people of Israel, and who it was that sent him.

Again: He who revealed himself to Moses, not contented with those names which the God of Abraham had usually taken, and by which he made himself known to the patriarchs, gave himself a *new* name. Now, admitting that a creature might, on some occasions, lawfully assume one, or more, of the names of God; yet, certainly, no creature can give himself a *new* name of God, with whatever powers he may be invested, or to whomsoever he may speak. For God says, "I am JEHOVAH; that is my name. They shall know that my name is JEHOVAH," Isa. xlii. 8; Jer. xvi. 21. These declarations most emphatically show, that the great Name is not common to the creature with the Creator. They inform us, if any expressions can do so, that it is peculiar to the Supreme Being, and consecrated to his adorable essence; that it so belongs to the Most High, that it cannot be assumed by any other. How comes it, then, that we hear an angel say, "I AM THAT I AM. Say to the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you?" Exod. iii. 14. How came he to utter these words; "THE LORD GOD; THE GOD of Abraham, THE GOD of Isaac, THE GOD of Jacob this is MY NAME for ever; and this is MY MEMORIAL to all generations?" ver. 15.

Further: This angel did not only take the *names*

of God, but he also attributed to himself the works and the glory of God. The *works* of God. This he did, in a very emphatical manner, in those chiding interrogatories addressed to the procrastinating Moses. "Who hath made man's mouth? or who maketh the dumb, or deaf, or the seeing, or the blind? Have not I THE LORD?" Exod. iv. 11. These expressions evidently show, that the angel considered and revealed himself as the Creator of all things. The *glory* of God. This he did when he called himself, "The God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob." For Abraham's God was acknowledged by that illustrious priest Melchisedek, as the "Possessor of heaven and earth," Gen. xiv. 19; by Isaac, as the object of his worship, for he is called his "Fear," Gen. xxxi. 42; and by Jacob he is adored as "God Almighty," Gen. xxxv. 11. Besides, he said to Moses, "Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground," Exod. iii. 5. In which words he strongly demanded that devotional reverence which is due to none but God. And this Angel, after he had brought the Israelites out of Egypt (for we have shown that he who spake to Moses in the bush, was the deliverer and lawgiver of the chosen tribes) speaks from the summit of Horeb, and says, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," Exod. xx. 3.

Now, on the hypothesis of our opponents, it should seem, that this was done, to render the Israelites guilty of impiety and idolatry. Of *impiety*: for if the true God be more glorious and worthy of adoration than this angel, with what propriety could he say, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me?" Of *idolatry*: for with whatever characters this Angel might be invested, if he was not the Most High, he could not

lawfully require such honours as are peculiar to God. In a word, when the law commands us to worship God, and him only, it either speaks of a *supreme*, or a *subordinate* worship. If the *latter*, then, as before observed, there is no such thing as supreme worship mentioned in the decalogue. If the *former*, as our adversaries themselves acknowledge, then it follows, that this Angel, though inferior to Jehovah, required of the Israelites that supreme worship, which is due to none but the true God; and, consequently, betrayed them into idolatry.

This idolatry is of a remarkable kind, and has various peculiarities attending it which are very surprising. For it is *not criminal*, on the part of the Israelites. They cannot be justly blamed for concluding, that he who calls himself "the God of their fathers," is the true God; and that he who assumes the great name, JEHOVAH, and claims the honour of "making the dumb and the deaf, the seeing and the blind," is the Creator of all things. Nor are they culpable for paying to him, who reveals himself to them as the Creator and the mighty God, supreme worship.

Again: This idolatry is, if I may be allowed so to speak, of *Divine institution*. Idolatry usually springs from our corruptions; but this has its original in Divine revelation, if that which Moses received deserve the name. For God himself sent the Angel who assumed the peculiar characters of Jehovah's glory; or, at least, the Angel pretended to be God, the God of the Hebrews. For when he said to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," he either designed to pass for the God of those patriarchs, or he did not. If *not*, his discourse was impertinent from the

beginning to the end. If he *did*, it was he himself who betrayed the children of Israel into idolatry. Once more: This idolatry was *unavoidable*. For the ancient Hebrews could not avoid it without maintaining, either that the true God, the God of their fathers, when condescending to reveal himself to man, was not worthy of that adoration which he requires; or, that He who manifested himself to Moses in the bush, and to the people on Sinai, was not the true God, the God of the patriarchs.

“But,” our opponents say, “this Angel speaks in the person of Him whom he represents; and it is as an ambassador of the Most High, that he bears the names of God.”—Then he should have told Moses so, when he anxiously inquired of him *who* he was, and desired to be informed by *what name* he should make him known to his brethren in Egypt. Had that been the case, it was easy, it was natural, it was absolutely necessary for him to have said, “I am the *ambassador*, or the *messenger*, of Abraham’s God.” But, instead of that, he says, “I am **THE GOD** of Abraham.” Various reasons concur to assure us, that he did not consider himself, that he did not reveal himself, as an ambassador. For instance: An ambassador does not give *new names* to his master, when speaking in his person, and standing in his place. An ambassador, who represents his sovereign, cannot say, Ye shall have no other king but me; without forfeiting his allegiance, and deserving to be treated as an enemy to his prince. An ambassador, does not attribute to himself the *personal qualifications* of his master; such as his wisdom and power, as this Angel attributes to himself the perfections of God. Nor can any ambassador assume to himself the *names and titles*, the *works and honours*, of the

sovereign whom he represents, without provoking the jealousy of his master, and being guilty of high treason. For an ambassador is called to advance the honour of his master, not to assume his prerogatives, and rob him of his glory, as this Angel does, if he be only an ambassador.

Our opposers may search for examples as much as they please, to countenance such a conduct; yet, I will venture to say, they can find only one, which is that of the *stage*; on which we behold a private person, assuming all the names and titles of the king he represents, attributing to himself his works, and requiring his honours. But here it is all fictitious; there is nothing serious in it; or, if the actor were serious, he would be in danger, either of being despised for his weakness, or of being punished for high treason. Inexpressibly shocking would it be, to consider the Mosaic religion in the light of a comedy; in which an angel, a mere creature, acts the part of the Supreme Being. For that would represent *man* as deceived and ruined; **GOD** as dishonoured and blasphemed; and both by Divine connivance, both by Divine agency.

Yet, horrid as the thought is, it is countenanced by the hypothesis of our antagonists. For, according to their view of this passage, an angel of darkness, intending to draw mankind from the worship of the true God, and being permitted by Jehovah to practise his wiles and his malice, would have taken the same method as this angel did in order to succeed in his malignant designs. What else could he do so likely to answer his end, as to ascribe to himself the names, titles, and works of the Deity; by saying to the Israelites, “ I am **THE GOD** of your fathers; **THE GOD** of Abraham, **THE GOD** of Isaac, and **THE GOD**

of Jacob?" We cannot believe that he who speaks to Moses is a mere creature, without supposing that a mere creature designs to pass for the God of the Hebrews. For how is it possible to conceive that an angel, who does not design to be considered as the God of Israel, should say to Moses, with a view to inform him who he is, "I AM THE GOD of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob?" But if he be a mere creature, and yet designs to put himself in the place of God, he is guilty of impiety, and chargeable with a design of leading mankind into idolatry. Thus we must conceive of his conduct. And though we should afterwards find that he performs very wonderful works, yet they may be justly suspected; because the law directs us to judge of miracles by the doctrine, not of doctrine by the miracles, Deut. xiii. 1—5. Thus the Jewish religion loses its Divine characters; and, instead of being an appointment of God, and the practice of it communion with him, we conceive a black suspicion, that it is a trick of the spirit of darkness, and an idolatrous commerce.

The supposition is horrid; but, without abandoning the Socinian and Arian hypotheses, we cannot easily lose sight of it. For what criteria will you find in the Mosaic system, to convince you of its Divinity, if you once consider it as having its rise in deception and falsehood? Do you mention its *holiness*? but that, more than any thing, is called into question. For what holiness can there be in a religion which originated in imposture, and is maintained by idolatry? If you say, *God* spake to Moses; it is answered, Not God, but an angel, who put himself in the place of God. If you allege *the miracles* that were performed by Moses; I reply, Many and wonderful works were also wrought by Pharaoh's

magicians: so that little more can be inferred from thence, than that the spirit, of whose agency Moses was the instrument, was more powerful than he who favoured the magicians. For facts, however great or wonderful, ought not to be ascribed to the immediate agency and miraculous interposition of God, if inconsistent with holiness; which is manifestly the case, in the Mosaic religion, on the hypotheses condemned.

That the Angel, who reveals himself to Moses, acts inconsistently with the glory of God, supposing that Angel to be a mere creature, will further appear, if the following things be considered. It is evident, from the Scripture, that God's design was to exalt Jesus Christ above all the angels. For of him it is written, "He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy foot-stool? Let all the angels of God worship him," Heb. i. 4, 6, 13. This is the doctrine of the sacred Author. But Christ, according to the Socinians, is exalted above the angels, not on account of his *nature*; for the human is far inferior to the angelic nature; but in virtue of the *offices, trusts, and gifts*, which he received. For, on their principles, it is only on account of these that he is called GOD. If, then, he was a mere angel who appeared to Moses, and delivered the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, it unavoidably follows, that an angel was more exalted and more honoured than Jesus Christ, contrary to God's design.

This appears from hence. Jesus Christ, according to our opponents, is called GOD, by a kind of analogy; but this Angel calls himself, "The God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob." Christ is addressed only