

the glory of *God*, described also the glory of *Christ*; because the latter is contained in the former. But these suppositions and assertions are all so wild and unnatural, that a man must be blind not to see through them, and exceedingly fond of error not to despise them.

As the evangelist through the whole chapter treats of Jesus Christ, not at all of God the Father, what reason has any one to believe that these words must relate to the Father? "These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him." Who does not perceive, and what but a predilection for an unscriptural hypothesis can prevent a man from acknowledging, that the last clause of the sentence is to be understood of the very same person that is intended in the immediately following words? "Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him," John xii. 4. If Jesus be meant in the *latter*, why not in the *former* verse? The prophet spake of the true God on every occasion. This the evangelist knew; of this he could not be ignorant. These things said Esaias "when he spake of God." *When he spake of God!* Why, then, he must say them all his life; say them continually; say them in every page of his prophecies; because, through the whole course of his ministry he spake of God, proclaiming his glories, revealing his will, and asserting his dominion. "But this," they say, "is a parenthesis." How does that appear? Have they nothing to do but to suppose or assert, without proving? Yet if it were, the pronoun *him* would still refer to Jesus Christ, because both in the foregoing and following verses the evangelist speaks of Christ, and of him only.

Nor is there the least shadow of reason for any to consider these words, "These things said Esaias,