

sent me," John vi. 38, from what is contained in these, My flesh was formed by the wonderful power of God? For, in the *former*, there is a sending antecedent to a coming down; and a coming down, consequent to a sending; but in the *latter*, not a tittle of all this. The interpretation, therefore, which our opponents put on these passages of sacred writ, renders them absurd and ridiculous.

Once more: The language of Scripture, in the texts before us, according to the Socinian creed, is not agreeable to common modesty, nor to that respect we owe to the Deity; and, consequently, it must be *impious*. For, if Jesus be a mere man, he is *of the earth*, as well as the first man. He cannot, therefore, so often speak of "coming from above;" and of "coming down from heaven," in contradistinction to the original of other men, without being chargeable with immodesty; without being guilty of arrogance. Much less can it be said of him, as a mere man, "He is **THE LORD** from heaven." We do not use to speak thus of one who naturally belongs to the earth, and obtains the inheritance of heaven, and the title of **LORD**, only by grace. On the contrary, truth and modesty require that we should say, Jesus Christ being of the earth, is, by nature, earthly; but, by the favour of God, he is the Lord from heaven. Now, as one cannot be void of modesty, in this respect, without falling into impiety; because a person cannot assume such honours to himself, without infringing on the glory of God; so it is evident, that the language of Scripture is not only obscure and false, not only absurd and ridiculous, but also *impious*, if Jesus Christ be a mere man. The Arian hypothesis shall be considered in a following chapter.